

THE RELATION BETWEEN RELIGION AND NATIONALISM IN

EARLY ZIONIST THOUGHT:

A study in the prehistory of the State of Israel.

by

Guenter Strothotte

Dr. theol., Erlangen University, 1955

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department

of

History

© GUENTER STROTHOTTE 1971

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

November, 1971

APPROVAL

Name: Guenter Strothotte
Degree: Master of Arts
Title of Thesis: The Relation Between Religion and
Nationalism in Early Zionist Thought:
A study in the prehistory of the State
of Israel.

Examining Committee:

Chairman: Dr. Charles L. Hamilton

~~Dr. J. Martin Kitchin~~
~~Senior Supervisor~~

Dr. Allan B. Cunningham

Dr. Janos M. Bak
External Examiner
Associate Professor
Department of History

Date Approved: December 21, 1971.

ABSTRACT

The emergence of the State of Israel in 1948 was a result of the work of Jews, who late in the nineteenth century began to call themselves "Zionists". The object of the thesis here presented is to investigate the rationale of the forerunners, as well as of the founders and the early adherents of the Zionist movement mainly up to 1914. Of special concern is the extent to which these early Zionists were influenced by contemporary European nationalism. This is compared with motives springing from the Jewish religion. Also considered is the influence which the rise of modern anti-Semitism had upon Zionist thought. The development of Zionism is seen against the different backgrounds of Jewish life in Western and Eastern Europe. The paper summarizes the principle arguments over these issues.

Zionism is shown to be a Jewish national movement of self-liberation, patterned after similar movements in Europe at that time. Jews were urged to consider themselves across the international borders as one people, and no longer just as adherents of a certain religion. They were to focus their attention on one country, which was to become their national home and where they could eventually live a normal national life as one people, like all other nations. Anti-Semitic outbursts were a decisive factor in the developments of Zionist thought. They have to be considered, however, as the immediate rather than the main cause.

Opinions of the religious leaders were divided. Most Reform Jews rejected Zionist aspirations out of considerations of principle. They saw them as a danger for emancipation and assimilation. The first to suggest Zionist thought were Orthodox Jews. In their writings the influence of contemporary European nationalism is clearly discernible. They were forced to reinterpret some religious principles, arousing the opposition of many of their colleagues. Nobody was opposed to the founding of agricultural

✓
(settlements for Jews in Palestine.) The Talmud considered it even a meritorious act for a Jew to live in the Holy Land. Jewish agricultural settlements could perhaps even hasten the coming of the Messiah. But many Rabbis feared that the Torah could not be properly observed in these settlements.

→ [It was also believed that man was not permitted to interfere in the affairs of the Almighty. Self-help as suggested by the Zionists was considered to be precisely this. The ingathering of the exiled from the four corners of the earth was to be accomplished by God's Messiah. Many were opposed to the founding of a state.] ✓

Most of the leaders, who were able to found a Zionist organization were secular-minded and were embarrassed by religious arguments. They wanted a land for their poor and suffering brethren, not the Holy Land. They wanted to found a modern state, not the kingdom of God. The majority of religiously-minded Jews stayed away or were even outrightly opposed to Zionism. There was, however, a minority of observant Jews within the movement. They advocated the observance of religious precepts and the building up of a Jewish national homeland on the basis of the Torah. ✓

The official position of the leadership of the Zionist movement with regard to religion was one of neutrality. The discussion of religious questions was not permitted at Zionist Congresses. This was, however, not always possible. The most troublesome issue became the attempt of some Zionists to further the development of secular Jewish culture. This was seen by others as an infringement on religious prerogatives. Whenever the "cultural Question" came up for discussion, religious issues were also debated. When it was decided actively to support cultural work, many of the religious faction broke away from the organization and founded their own movement. ✓

There were also those, who tried to overcome the differences between

religion and nationalism. As an example for such attempts some of the thoughts of Martin Buber are summarized.

Table of Contents.

	page
Introduction	1
Chapter I: Judaism Prior to Modern Zionism	4
Chapter II: Precursors of Zionism	10
Chapter III: Beginnings of Zionism in Russia	26
Chapter IV: Nationalism and Religion in the Debates of the Lovers of Zion	36
Chapter V: Nationalism and Religion in the First Zionist Debates in Central and Western Europe.	68
Chapter VI: The First Zionist Congress and the Religious Issues.	93
Chapter VII: The Debates Concerning Religion and National Jewish Culture in the Zionist Movement Between 1897 and 1909.	107
Chapter VIII: The Debates Concerning Religion and National Jewish Culture at the Zionist Congress in 1911 and the Consequences.	147
Conclusion	170
Footnotes	180
Selected Bibliography	212

Introduction

The emergence of the State of Israel in 1948 was a result of the work of Jews, who late in the nineteenth century began to call themselves "Zionists". The object of the following paper is to investigate the rationale of the founders of the movement and the debates concerning its objects among the early adherents. It is a well known fact that Zionism had two sources, namely Jewish nationalism and the Jewish religion, Of special concern in this paper will be the question, to what extent the early Zionists and their precursors were influenced by the ideals and ideas of European nationalism of the nineteenth century. ✓

This will be compared with the motives originating from the Jewish religion. Of special interest will be the question, how the impetus coming from these basically different sources merged in the thought-world of some outstanding Zionists. It will also be investigated to what extent the ideas emerging from the two different sources caused conflicts in the ranks of the early adherents of the movement, and set the stage for a Kulturkampf.¹ A third factor needs to be taken into account, the rise of modern anti-Semitism in Europe, itself a product of the nationalism of that period.² The extent to which Zionism was a Jewish reaction and counter-measure to this phenomenon will also be discussed.

The paper will mainly be confined to the period prior to 1914. The First World War brought about many changes for the Zionist movement, especially as a result of the Balfour Declaration. Nevertheless, some of the basic positions derived at in the debates prior to World War I remained fundamental and still are so today in some respects, especially in the field of education in Israel. The outlines of the debates concerning nationalism and religion in the Zionist movement are not only a contribution to the pre-history of the Jewish State. Nationalism has become a world-wide phenomenon. It has even been called a modern religion. Jews were no strangers to such suggestions. There were people among them, who wanted the Jewish religion to be replaced by Zionism, as will be shown. Many of the problems of nationalism and religion, which the

Zionist thinkers thought through, are also of interest to those, whose national and religious background is different. It should be of special concern to those, who have partially the same background, namely Christians, and in another way Muslims. A study of Zionist thought is a study of a part of our own Zeitgeist. Many of the questions raised exist in one form or the other in many places and demand answers.

The paper had by necessity to be limited in some way. Not dealt with are three closely related questions, which certainly would deserve fuller treatment, than the scope of the topic was thought of to permit. The first of these are the ideas Christians had concerning the return of Jews to the Holy Land and their influence upon the development of Zionism. It can be shown that Christian groups had more religious reasons for a move of Jews to Palestine than most Zionists had. But they started from different presuppositions, which should be explained in more detail. The second area not dealt with are national Jewish movements other than Zionist. These were omitted because they were not as directly influential upon the founding of the State of Israel as Zionism was. The third question not dealt with are the Arab-Zionist relations. This question was mentioned occasionally and had caused some minor problems in the period dealt with in this paper. It was not foreseen by the early Zionists, however, that it could ever become a major problem. It indeed did not become such, until the Arabs developed national movements of their own many years later. A comparison between the different stages in the development of the Jewish and Arab national movements, which to-day are pitched against each other, would be an intriguing topic, but it would be a new thesis in itself and more extensive than the one here presented.

Chapter I

Judaism Prior to Modern Zionism.

In 70 A.D. the second Jewish temple in Jerusalem was destroyed and the ancient Jewish state ceased to exist. From then until the twentieth century, the history of the Jewish people and that of their ancient homeland were separate. The land changed hands several times and was ruled by various nations. The Jews themselves were scattered as minorities in different countries. Nowhere did they rule over a country of their own. They considered this an unnatural situation and referred to their existence as "in exile", "in the Diaspora", or, using a Hebrew word, "in the Golus". There were always Jews, who managed to visit the Holy Land, some even to settle there for some length of time. But the vast majority lived outside this land. In the dispersion they managed to retain their identity through their religion. The Bible and - after its completion - the Talmud were read and studied, and synagogues were established, wherever Jews lived. Otherwise there were no bonds connecting all of world-Jewry. There were no organizational ties spanning all countries, nor was there a religious centre. Jews adopted many different languages for everyday use. Hebrew was elevated to become the Holy Tongue, the language of worship exclusively.

It was religion also, which wove an inseparable bond between the people and their ancient home. The memory of the Holy Land, of Zion and Jerusalem, where God had once acted with the people of Israel in miraculous ways, was kept alive in liturgy, prayer, and religious ceremonies in Jewish homes. The Jews continued to love that land, which, they believed, God himself had given them as an everlasting property. They had lost it, many felt, because of their sins. The hope also was cherished that one day they would be able to return home. Many generations of pious Jews found consolation in the Biblical prophecies which forecast that the Lord God himself would

on the last day gather all his people from the four corners of the earth and restore them in his favour. Such redemption, as it was called, was to be accomplished by a Messiah, whom the Almighty would send. Many different concepts existed of this figure.² Several times throughout the centuries there were men, who proclaimed themselves "Messiah", announced that the prophesized "end of days" had come, gathered people in order to lead them back to Palestine, and called on all other Jews to prepare for the move towards Zion. Such false Messiahs, as Jacob Frank, Solomon Molcho, David Reubeni and Sabbatai Zevi attracted much attention. Invariably such efforts ended in disaster and the memory of the failures made many Jews cautious.

In Europe Jews were generally considered as outsiders by the majority of the people, in whose midst they lived. Persecutions on religious grounds were frequent. The Jewish religion was, however, the only non-Christian faith, which was able to survive in the Christian countries.

This was accomplished under incredibly hard sacrifices. Often Jews were driven out of the countries where they were born and forced to wander from land to land. In the Middle Ages two centres of Jewish life developed: Spain and Germany. Jews adopted the respective languages of these countries and retained them with but few changes, when they wandered to other lands. Hence there were two main streams of European Jewry: the Sephardim, who spoke a Spanish dialect, called Spaniolic, and the Ashkenazim, who spoke a kind of Germanic dialect, which became known as "Yiddish", often referred to also as the "Jargon". Many of the Sephardic Jews wandered to Muslim countries after their expulsion from Spain in the fifteenth century, others to the Netherlands and to England. Many of the Ashkenazic Jews moved to Poland in the late Middle Ages. Special legislation existed in many countries, which severely restricted the rights of Jews. They were barred

from many professions, and had for many centuries to live in special quarters of the cities, the so-called ghettos.

The development of mercantilism, capitalism and rationalism had some beneficial effects on Jewish life in Western Europe in the eighteenth century. The differences between Jews and their Christian neighbours diminished slowly. Some privileged Jewish families were emancipated in different countries. (The enlightenment began to influence also Jewish thinking.) Outstanding among its adherents was Moses Mendelssohn, who was born in Dessau, Germany in 1729 and lived most of his life in Berlin. He tried to defend Judaism as a rationalistic, humane theology. His arguments and his personality impressed among many others Gotthold Lessing, who portrayed Mendelssohn in his play "Nathan the Wise". Mendelssohn's main impact was on his own people. He tried to awaken secular interests among them and to introduce them to German culture. One of his most famous works was a translation of the Torah, the Five Books of Moses, into German. This stimulated the Jews in Germany into acquiring a reading knowledge of that language.

A fundamental change for the approximately four hundred thousand Jews in Western Europe came as a consequence of the French revolution. The American Revolution had already given equal rights to the few thousand Jews living in North America. In 1789 the French National Assembly adopted a Constitution prefaced by the Declaration of the Rights of Man. In it the equality of all men was proclaimed. The rights of all men, regardless of their station or birth to participate directly or indirectly in the affairs of government, were legalized. Lengthy discussions and arguments took place, whether or not these principles should be applied to the approximately forty thousand Jews living in France. Finally they were given full rights of French citizenship in 1791. Wherever the French armies marched during the following years, Jews were also emancipated and the ghetto walls torn down by French soldiers.

Complaints against Jews caused Napoleon in 1806 to call a number of Jewish Notables to Paris to answer certain questions. They asserted among other things that the Jews considered France the country to which they owed loyalty and which they were willing to defend. The next year Napoleon had a Sanhedrin called, an institution which had not existed since the days of the ancient Jewish state. He wanted it to be a new Supreme Court for world-Jewry charged with the task to transform into official Jewish law the decisions which the Jewish Notables had reached in 1806. The members of the Sanhedrin affirmed that there was no hindrance, religious or other, for Jews to be loyal to that state, which had emancipated them. They gave specifically the assurance that rabbinical jurisdiction in civil and judicial matters was a matter of the past. The Jews were no longer a nation within the nation. They had given up their corporative status and the traditional hope for a return to Palestine. Judaism was only a religion from now on, a denomination, similar to other confessions, which co-existed within the state. Jews were to be Frenchmen of Mosaic (or Israelite) persuasion. The wider implications of Jewish civilization in its ethnic and cultural aspects were rejected. These decisions set the tone for Jewish life in most of Western Europe and North America for over a century to come.

After the Napoleonic Wars new difficulties arose. At the Congress of Vienna it was decided, that the rights which were granted to Jews by the states represented, were to be retained. Since in most cases not the states, but the occupation armies had emancipated the Jews, they lost many of their rights in this settlement. This setback resulted in a fight for Jewish emancipation during the following decades in many countries. Not until about 1870 were Jews given full and equal rights in all of Western Europe.

These external developments had their repercussions in Jewish life and thinking in general, and in the religious field in particular. Soon after

the Napoleonic Wars some Jews in Germany felt that the worship in the synagogues was outdated and needed to be reformed. Leading among the reformers were men like Israel Jacobsohn, David Friedlaender and Samuel Holdheim. The guiding principle in all their efforts was rationalism. They did not only intend to change the outward forms of Jewish worship, like the introduction of organs and choir singing. It had to be dignified, simple and decorous. They wanted also to discard Sabbath observance, the rite of circumcision and Hebrew prayers. German was to be introduced as the language for sermons and prayers. Above all, the content of the prayer-book had to be altered. Any mention of Zion and of loyalty to the Holy Land had to be eradicated. The Jews tried to prove in this way their loyalty to the state, which had emancipated them. References to a future return to Palestine could have been interpreted as a claim to Jewish nationhood and the expectation of political independence. Such misunderstanding had to be avoided. A house of Jewish worship was now to be called "temple", a name, which had up to that time been reserved for the destroyed sanctuary in Jerusalem. These suggestions led to a reform movement, which spread particularly throughout Northern Germany.³ Several congregations were founded along the new principles.

A new strong impetus for the reform of the Jewish religion came from the romantic movement and the emphasis upon historical studies in the first half of the nineteenth century. It was felt that the validity of any institution or idea had to be measured by its origin and history. Jews were also influenced by this general trend in Western Europe and began to study the history of their own people in a scientific way. Outstanding among these historians were Leopold Zunz, Moritz Steinschneider and later on Heinrich Graetz. Their studies showed among other things that religious practices had evolved at certain later times which had not originally been connected with the Jewish religion. Since there had always been adjustments and changes

in Judaism, new reforms seemed justified. Some Jewish leaders, among whom Abraham Geiger was outstanding, proposed changes in Jewish worship on these grounds. Contrary to the earlier rationalists, these reformers had a certain respect for tradition and were therefore more moderate in their approach. In the middle of the nineteenth century a series of rabbinical conferences were held in Germany, in order to clarify questions of theology and ritual. It proved not only impossible to arrive at a uniform solution. At the Frankfurt Synod of 1845 a split occurred between the radical and the more conservative reformers. The leader of the moderate group was Zechariah Frankel, who became the founder of Conservative Judaism in Europe. Since that time Judaism was divided into three groups: the orthodox Jews, who followed the unbroken tradition; the reform Jews, mainly influenced by rationalism; and the conservative Jews, with a romantic-historical approach. Both the reform and the conservative movements spread to other countries, notable North America, where they developed further. Traditional, orthodox Judaism continued to exist particularly in Russia and in many parts of the Habsburg Empire, where the majority of the world's Jews lived. Hand in hand with this religious split of Judaism in Western Europe and North America went an abandoning, in large measure, of the traditional concern for religious values. Like their Christian neighbours, many Jews were influenced by materialism and secularism, which began to triumph over religion.

3
Jews

Chapter II

Precursors Of Zionism.

Another important development took place in the first half of the nineteenth century in Europe, and that was the rise of nationalism. Movements of national self-liberation among minority groups flourished in many countries. The study of national historic traditions became important. Inspired by such efforts, some Jewish historians began to emphasize the national character of Judaism. Heinrich Graetz, for example, claimed that the history of world-Jewry was even after the loss of statehood not only a history of a religion, a kind of church-history, but in the first place a history of a people. Some Jews went a step further. They compared the situation of their own people with other oppressed minorities and began to dream about a national rebirth. The ideal became a life as a free people in one's own land. It was suggested that the Jews should become like the other nations and found their own state again. Many events of the ancient past became important in these considerations, for example the return of Jews to Palestine after the Babylonian captivity, the rise of the Maccabees, the loss of statehood in 70 A.D. and the war of liberation under Bar Kochba in 132-135 A.D. It was discussed at great length, which patterns history provided for use in the present. Palestine was considered as a logical place for a new national Jewish centre. The immense difficulties with which a Jewish resettlement would be confronted in this neglected and barren country were realized by many Jewish nationalists. Therefore other lands also came into consideration as places of Jewish settlement. History and the natural Jewish feeling spoke for Palestine as the location of a national rebirth. Many religious reasons spoke against such nationalistic aspirations with regard to the Holy Land. This might seem at first sight surprising, since the religious history had been so closely connected with that

country. The conviction that this land belonged to Israel and the hope of a return were for such a long time an important part of the Jewish religious faith. It was, however, precisely this part of the Jewish faith, which had been sacrificed in the reform movement, in the radical as well as in the moderate forms. It was special nationhood which had been denied by the Paris Sanhedrin in 1807. The religious reformers wanted to apply this principle in their efforts. Jews in many countries were still fighting to reverse the decisions of the Congress of Vienna and attempted to gain equal rights as citizens. At such a time a call for national independence in Palestine would have adverse effects on their struggle for emancipation. Nationalistic aspirations were therefore not only unpopular among most Jews in Western Europe, but were considered by the majority of them as something like high-treason. The orthodox Jews moreover, had an additional reason for resisting attempts at a national rebirth of the Jewish people. It would require self-help, for they felt it was appropriate to wait for the actions of the Almighty, who would only on the last day act himself on behalf of Israel. As long as the Messiah had not come, the Jews were not permitted to gather the exiles from the ends of the earth. It was the kingdom of God, which was to be established in the Holy Land, not a state like the other states. The scene was thus set for a conflict between nationalistic and religious ideas.

A contributing factor to such a conflict was the fact, that a few thousand Jews lived in Palestine in the first half of the nineteenth century for religious reasons. Some considered it their religious duty and to be a meritorious act, to devote their lives to a study of the law of God in the Holy Land. Others went there, when they were old, so that they would die in that land, where the resurrection from the dead would begin, and where God would some time in the future establish his kingdom. Most of these

pious Jews lived in utmost poverty. They either refused to work for their livelihood, or were unable to do so. They rather depended on gifts from their co-religionists in other parts of the world. This system of charity was called "Chalukkah". It will be shown that the ideals of these religious-minded people living in Palestine did not coincide with the aspirations of those Jews, who were inspired by European nationalism.

The first suggestions in modern times, that the Jews return to *see Shun /*
Palestine did not come from among their own people, but from outsiders. Napoleon did so during his Egyptian campaign.¹ Christian groups in Britain developed plans for such projects.² The first Jews in modern times to propose a resettlement of Palestine were two Rabbis, namely Jehuda Ben Salomo Chai Alkalai and Zebi Hirsch Kalischer. It will be shown how they attempted to harmonize nationalistic aspirations with the Jewish faith. The Rabbis tried to dispel the traditional religious objections to a national rebirth. On the contrary did they show that there were compelling reasons for a colonization of Palestine. These precursors of the later Zionist movement met with fierce opposition from their colleagues in all camps, and found but few friends. They were not influential in their own time and their writings were soon forgotten. The movement, which began in 1881 felt no indebtedness to them. Nor was it influenced by the writings of Moses Hess, who had less concern for the Jewish religion and was compelled by purely secular considerations to suggest similar plans. A comparison of these proto-Zionists with their later counterparts is instructive, since their rationale was very similar and they anticipated many developments, which actually took place later on. It can be shown that not the ideas themselves were decisive to get a movement of Jews towards Palestine going, but that outside events had to trigger it. The contemporaries of these proto-Zionists had not experienced such outbursts of anti-Semitism as those,

which were to happen two generations later. It appears that this was the main reason, why the call of these proto-Zionists fell on deaf ears.

Rabbi Yehuda Alkalai was born in Sarajewo, Serbia, in 1792 and moved to Semlin in 1826. He was a Sephardic Jew and his first writings were in Spaniolic, while he wrote in Hebrew later on.³ For a while he studied in Jerusalem, came under the influence of Cabbalists and became interested in the problems of messianism. Under the impression of the rising nationalism in the Balkan countries he came to the conviction that also a Jewish national Renaissance was possible. In his writings Jewish messianism and nationalistic ideas merged, but he had to break with the religious tradition. He told his fellow Jews that they should not be discouraged by the fact that some of the essentials for a national rebirth were missing, namely a common land and a common language. These problems could be solved. He felt that religious reasons compelled the Jews to return to the Holy Land. It was a fulfillment of a divine commandment. Alkalai claimed that Israel as a people could properly be called Israel only in the land of Israel. This meant that only there the Divine Presence of the Almighty could be felt and only if at least 22,000 Jews had returned to Zion. Alkalai was convinced that eventually a collective return of all Israel, as foretold by the prophets, would come about. When this happened it would be a miraculous favour of the Almighty. However, the pious Rabbi refused to expect any supernatural event in this connection. One can detect here the influence of European rationalism. This was one of the reasons, why Alkalai was greeted with silence by his colleagues, as well as by those Orthodox masses in Eastern Europe, whom he wanted to help. It was a silence "which betokened the desire to ignore a potentially dangerous aberration from the true faith", as Arthur Hertzberg rightly observed.⁴ Alkalai expected that the redemption would come slowly and by degrees and had to begin with efforts by the Jews

themselves. This contradicted the traditional belief that the Messiah would accomplish the ingathering of the exiles suddenly and all at once. The Jews themselves would first of all have to prepare the land, which was waste and desolate at that time, build houses, dig wells, plant vines and olive trees. Many Jews would have to remain in the dispersion for a time, in order to help the first settlers in Palestine, who would be from among the poor.

Alkalai realized that the language problem was a further difficulty. Jews no longer could speak the same language and would not understand each other, if gathered by the Almighty into their land. Such a divided community could not succeed. Also in this connection he resented the belief in a supernatural miracle. Nobody should expect that God would send an angel to teach the Jews the seventy languages of mankind. Rather, efforts would have to be made to maintain and strengthen the holy tongue, Hebrew. A further necessity was that the Jews organize themselves and choose leaders, an international assembly of elders. From such a fully authorized assembly the Messiah, son of Joseph, would come. The elders would have to be men of high calibre, so that the people of the Lord would cease to be like sheep without a shepherd. The elders would have to take special care, that those commandments be observed, which applied in particular in the Holy Land. As an example he quoted the stipulation that the soil be fallow every seventh year. The blessings, which came from the land depended on the faithfulness, with which the Jews would adhere to such laws.

A further step to be taken was the forming of a company, which should be incorporated like an insurance company or a railway company. One of its tasks would be to appeal to the Sultan to return Palestine to the Jews for an annual rent. Alkalai was convinced that the Sultan would not object, since he knew that the Jews were loyal subjects. He was sure that once the name of Israel was applied to the land again, all Jews would support the

company with all means at their disposal. He expected the beginning of the venture to be modest, but its future to be great.

In response to Alkalai's call a few small circles of friends were organized, all of which were short-lived. (The time was apparently not ripe for a realization of such ideas. Events had to shake the souls of men.) Two generations later other people proposed similar plans, which finally succeeded in producing the necessary response among Jews, though not even then was the goal accomplished.⁵ In the meantime many more things had to happen. The strongest opposition to Alkalai's plans came from the Chalukkah mendicants on religious grounds. The Rabbi wanted to do something, which the Almighty had reserved for himself, they claimed. Alkalai died in 1878 with his dreams unfulfilled. Modern scholarship made his writings public. His contemporaries did not pay much attention to them.

Religious considerations, though not of the traditional type, were still predominant in a book by the Rabbi of Thorn, Germany, Zebi Hirsch Kalischer, with the title "Seeking Zion", which appeared in 1862.⁶ In his book he presented a plan for the colonization of Palestine, for which purpose an organization had been founded in 1860 in Frankfurt a.O., Germany, and of which he was a member. Kalischer described how he understood the hope for the future redemption of Israel, which was the belief in the eventual ingathering of the exiles into the Holy Land. Like Alkalai he rejected the conventional view of a sudden miracle by the Almighty through the sending of the Messiah, accompanied by the sound of the great trumpet. First of all, he expected, Jewish philanthropists would have to give their support and other nations would have to consent to the return of some Jews to the Holy Land. He was sure that all promises made by the prophets would eventually be fulfilled, but the return would come about in natural ways, gradually and by slow degrees. He was convinced that Jews would have to concern

themselves with the condition of Mount Zion and of the entire Holy Land, and should not leave it up to God to do something about it, as most pious Jews did at that time. Kalischer searched the Jewish religious tradition and collected many "proofs" which supported his view that every Israelite was to consider it his "religious-sacred duty"⁷ to do something about the redemption of Zion. They should start with prayers for the restoration of Jerusalem and the former glory of Zion. Then they should support generously those pious Jews, who were already there and who passed their days by studying Torah, but lived in utter poverty. The best means to do so, he proposed, would be to persuade Jews to involve themselves in agriculture in Palestine. This, in turn, would increase the Jewish population in the land. Even then, support by the colonization organization would be needed for some time. All efforts would have to be directed towards an Israelite national purpose, namely, the slow emancipation of the territory of Palestine. The Jews should make room for the goals of Jewish national history, which had been so splendidly pictured by all the prophets of Israel with the colours of heavenly truth. It is interesting to note, how Kalischer mixed the old religious concepts - prophets, heavenly truth - with the contemporary ideals - national history, emancipation, national purpose and territory.

One of the major concerns of Kalischer was a religious question, namely, whether or not it was permissible according to the Talmudic laws to reintroduce the sacrificial cult on the mountain, where the temple had once stood, even prior to the messianic era. He came, after lengthy discussions, to the conclusion that this not only could be done, but should be done in order to hasten the ultimate messianic redemption.

While such religious considerations were very important for him, he did not lose sight of the contemporary political scene. The time was opportune for all attempts at the colonization of Jews in Palestine. Most

of the constitutional states of Europe had emancipated the Jews and there were some brothers in the faith, who had even reached high positions. These would surely influence the powerful masters of Europe to grant protection and security to those Israelite colonists, who would venture to settle in Palestine. In his summary he listed as the first reason for his plans the principle of nationalism. Other people, like the Italians, Hungarians, and Poles, stood up for their national purpose. They sacrificed with the greatest joy their possessions and lives for the preservation or the re-establishment of their nationality. Therefore the Jews should not put their hands into their laps, but should regain their national property, the most holy inheritance of their ancestors, namely the most glorious and holiest of lands. They should not remain silent anymore, when other people pointed to Palestine as their proper fatherland. That would be a denial of their nationality, upon which they were, with good reason, so proud. The Jews were, however, spiritless and should be ashamed of themselves. All the other peoples had striven only for the sake of their own honor, how much more should they exert themselves. They had an additional reason for struggle. Their duty was not only to labor for the glory of their ancestors, but for the glory of God, who chose Zion.

Prior to publication Kalischer had shown his proposals to some friends. Among their objections to his plan of colonization was the possible hostility of Arab neighbours towards the new Jewish settlers. The insecurity of property in Palestine was being emphasized: the "Arab hordes"⁸ would rob the Jewish farmers of their crops. Kalischer refuted this criticism by assuring that robberies by Arabs could not occur. As the main reason for this claim he referred to the fact that the present Pasha loved justice very much and severely punished every robbery and theft, of which his subjects became victims..

The Rabbi was eventually successful in getting a group of people to buy land for the purpose of Jewish colonization on the outskirts of Jaffa in 1866. He also was able to persuade the "Alliance Israelite Universelle", an organization founded in 1860 for the international defense of Jewish rights, to found an agricultural school in Jaffa in 1870, the name of which was "Mikveh Israel" (The Hope of Israel). Kalischer died, without having seen his dreams come true, in 1874.

Entirely different motives moved Moses Hess to propose similar plans. The "Communist Rabbi", as he was dubbed, was born in 1812 in Bonn, Germany and had received a thorough Jewish religious education as a boy. He became estranged, however, from both his family, as well as the faith of his forefathers. For a long time he was preoccupied with philosophic and socialistic thoughts. In the forties of the nineteenth century he became a friend of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. By the time Marx published his Communist Manifesto, however, they had parted, and Marx named and attacked Hess in this famous pamphlet.⁹ Hess became involved in the 1848 revolution, and had to flee his native country, and lived for many years in France. He wrote about political and philosophical questions, and in 1862 he published a book, which dealt among other things with the Jewish question. It was written in German and had the title: Rome and Jerusalem. The Last Question of Nationality.¹⁰ In it he admitted that he had been estranged from his people for many years, and it had been an anti-Jewish outburst which made him think about his nation. This was to happen many more times in the later history of Zionism, that Jews rediscovered their nationality in reaction to anti-Semitic outbursts. Most Jews, however, did not get very disturbed since this incident took place in the Near East, and seemed to be an isolated case. It was the Damascus Affair of 1840, the false accusation that some Jews had murdered a monk, in order to use his blood for ritual purposes.

Such "blood-libels" had been frequent occurrences in the Middle Ages, but were thought to be outdated in the nineteenth century. Hess reported that this event had made him aware for the first time in his socialist activities that he belonged to an unfortunate, slandered, despised and dispersed people. At that time he had already intended to express his Jewish patriotic sentiment, but the greater pain, which the suffering of the European proletariat had evoked in him, had made him remain silent. Then, more than twenty years later, a thought, which he had believed was forever buried in his heart, was revived in him anew, namely the thought of his nationality. He felt that this was inseparably connected with the ancestral heritage and the memories of the Holy Land and the Eternal City. These locations were important, because they were, what he called, the birthplace of the belief in the divine unity of life, as well as the hope in the future brotherhood of men.

While looking at the regeneration of other nations, Hess became convinced that the Jewish people also would experience a national Renaissance, that is, a political rebirth, and would eventually found a Jewish state. It was his opinion that the springtime of the historical peoples began in 1789 with the French revolution. Since then the resurrection of nations had become a natural phenomenon, and he referred to Greece and Rome, Poland and Hungary, as examples. There was also, so Hess asserted, a movement of unrest among other subjected people and these would eventually rise against their oppressors. Among the nations believed to be dead, but which eventually would struggle for their national rights, was Israel. This people had conserved its nationality in the form of its religion, and had united both inseparably with the memories of its ancestral land. No modern people, struggling for its own former fatherland, could deny the right of the Jewish people to their former land, without at the same time undermining the justice of its own strivings.

It was the political situation which demanded, in the opinion of Hess, the establishment of Jewish colonies at the Suez Canal and on the banks of the Jordan. This would only be the beginning of the restoration of the Jewish state, which, he was sure, would become a reality. What was necessary, was to keep alive the hope of the political rebirth of the Jewish people and to reawaken it, wherever it slumbered. Precisely this was a major difficulty, as Hess clearly realized. The main problem of the Jewish national movement was not of a religious nature. It centered rather around the question, how the patriotic sentiment in the hearts of the progressive Jews could be awakened, and how the Jewish masses could be liberated by means of this patriotism from a spirit-deadening formalism. Hess took issue on the one hand with the reform Jews, who denied the national character of the Jewish religion. He protested as vigorously against the orthodox, who were in his eyes dogmatic fanatics, and seemed unable to develop the Jewish historical religion along modern lines. They sought shelter under, what he termed, the wings of ignorance, and thus avoided a struggle with the deductions of science and criticism. Hess made it clear which side in this struggle he himself favoured. What was necessary, he felt, was the revival of the holy, patriotic spirit of the Jewish prophets and sages. From this would arise a new kind of religious reform. The Jews would again become participants of the holy spirit, which was in his opinion, the Jewish genius. It alone had the right to develop and form the Jewish law according to the needs of the people. When the third exile would finally have come to an end, the restoration of the Jewish state would find the Jews ready for it.

Hess did not, however, dare to make any definite predictions, how this new religious reform would look. He had been asked whether or not the bloody sacrificial cult of the ancient Israelites, which had been performed in the Jerusalem temple, would be restored. Kalischer had had no doubt

that this would take place. The only question for him was, whether or not this was permissible, even before the Messiah was to come. Hess, on the other hand, did not think that this cult was an inseparable part of either Jewish nationality, or of the historical religion of the Jews. Any rigidity of religious norms would disappear, when the now extinct national life came into existence again. The holy spirit, the creative genius of the people, out of which Jewish life and teaching arose, had deserted Israel, when its children began to feel ashamed of their nationality. But this spirit would again animate the people, when they would awaken to a new life. It would create new things, of which he and his contemporaries had not even a conception. No one could foretell what form or shape the newborn life and spirit of the regenerated nation would assume. As regards the religious cult, especially the Jewish cult, it would certainly be different from the present as well as from the ancient form.

One did not have to agree with Heinrich Heine and other enlightened Jews, so Hess believed, that the Jewish religion was more a misfortune than a religion. He was sure that the rigid crust of orthodox Jewry would melt, when the spark of Jewish patriotism, now smoldering under it, was kindled into a sacred fire. This would herald the coming of what he termed the spring and the resurrection of the Jewish nation to a new life.

A feature, which was to reoccur quite frequently can be noted here already. Hess freely used religious terminology when referring to secular matters. For example, the "Holy Spirit" was no longer the spirit of God, but the "Jewish genius"; "Jewish patriotism" had to be turned into a "sacred fire", which was no longer in the temple. "Resurrection" was no longer a "resurrection from the dead", but the "regeneration of the nation". A further example for such secularization of religious language was the reference to the "messianic age". For Kalischer this was in the future, at

the end of days, ushered in by the Almighty. He had gone to great lengths to show that man was permitted to prepare the beginning of the coming of that age. For Hess the messianic era was that one, in which the Jewish nation and all other historical nations would arise again to a new life. Expressions like the time of the "resurrection of the dead", or "the coming of the Lord", or of the "New Jerusalem" had only a symbolic meaning. The messianic era was actually the present age, which had begun, so Hess felt, with the teachings of the man who was his great master, namely Spinoza. The messianic age had finally come into historical existence with the French revolution.

It is an open question, whether or not Hess realized, how radically he was changing the meaning of the religious terminology, which he used. Whether he realized it or not, apparently it did not matter much to him, because he expected radical changes in the Jewish religion anyhow. Nor were religious differences inside Judaism important for Hess. He was convinced that all Jews who still possessed a Jewish heart would support the national cause. If Jewish nationalism became a life movement, it would obtain a political regeneration, and this would unite Jews whatever their religious outlook. When Hess became acquainted with Kalischer's book Seeking Zion, which appeared in 1862, while he was writing his own, he exclaimed with enthusiasm: "Was I not right, when I praised the practical sense of our people to you and asserted that pious Jews will join hands with the enlightened on the common ground of Jewish Nationalism?"¹¹ Though Hess had in many respects views which differed from those of Kalischer, he agreed with regard to the practical proposals. He felt that the organization of the society proposed by the pious patriot would become a reality; so would its ultimate goal, the settling of the Holy Land with Jewish colonists under the protection of the Western civilized nations.

Hess found one of the justifications for Jewish nationalism in the race question. He believed that racial antipathy was the cause of antagonism towards Jews, from which neither reform of the Jewish religion nor conversion to Christianity could liberate them. Hess claimed that the German hated the Jewish religion less than the race; he objected less to the Jews' peculiar beliefs than to their peculiar noses. Jewish noses could not be reformed, and the black, wavy hair of the Jews would not change through conversion into blond, nor could its curves be straightened out by constant combing. The author believed that the Jewish race was one of the primary races of mankind, which had retained its integrity, in spite of the continual change of its climatic environment. The Jewish type had conserved its purity through the centuries. Hess was convinced that even in cases of intermarriage the Jewish type remained predominant. The Jewish race possessed especially the ability to acclimatize itself more than other races. Jews had played an important part in universal history and were destined to for a still greater one in the future, he predicted.

With regard to the language question, Hess seemed to favour Hebrew over any other tongue, and he had words of praise for the Hebrew Renaissance. He was deeply moved by Hebrew prayers, because of their connection with patriotism:

The most touching point about these Hebrew prayers is that they are really an expression of the collective Jewish spirit; they do not plead for the individual, but for the entire Jewish race. The pious Jew is above all a Jewish patriot. The 'new' Jew, who denies the existence of the Jewish nationality, is not only a deserted in the religious sense, but is also a traitor to his people, his race and even to his family.

It was in line with his views on the messianic age that Hess did not expect that all Jews would return to Palestine. He had historical reasons for this assumption. At the time of the return from the Babylonian exile

not all the Jews settled in Palestine. The majority remained in the lands of exile, where there had been Jewish settlements since the dispersion of Israel and Judah. In the same way one should not look forward to a larger concentration of Jews at the future restoration.

Hess called on his fellow-Jews to reclaim either by compensation or by other means the ancient fatherland from Turkey, which had devastated it. Providence had prolonged the existence of the Jewish nation for the holiest of missions, namely the rebuilding of the gates of Jerusalem and the resettlement of the banks of the Jordan. This, he felt, would have wider repercussions. A great calling was reserved for the Jews. They would become a living channel of communication between three continents. They would be the bearers of civilization to the primitive people of Asia, and the teachers of the European sciences, to which their race had contributed so much. Hess desired, however, that not only science should be taught. The Jews would become the moral stay of the East. They had written the book of books, and should now become the educators of the wild Arabian hordes and the African peoples. The ancient wisdom of the East, the revelations of the Zend, the Vedas, as well as the more modern Koran and the Gospels should be grouped around the Jewish Bible.

W
ist
!

Hess became almost poetic, when he encouraged his nation:

March forward! At the sight of your rejuvenation, our hearts will beat fast, and our armies will stand by you, ready to help... March forward, ye sons of the Martyrs! The harvest of experience which you have accumulated in your long exile, will help to bring again to Israel the splendour of Davidic days and rewrite that part of history of which the monoliths of Semiramis are the only witness.

R

Hess anticipated with almost prophetic insight many of the developments, which eventually took place. He foresaw problems, which arose by necessity, but he also shared some of the illusions of those, who finally were successful in getting Jews to move to Palestine. Hess died in 1875.

It was not his call, which set the Jewish nation marching. His pleading went unheard. Not until the Zionist movement was well established was tribute given to this forerunner, more so than to Alkalai or Kalischer. His purely secular approach was more to the liking of most later Zionists, though they were perhaps even more critical of the Jewish religion than he was.

Chapter III

Beginnings of Zionism in Russia.

The year 1881 was one of the major turning-points in Jewish history, both with regard to external developments of world-Jewry, as well as the Jewish self-consciousness. Mass-movements began then, which eventually moved the centre of gravity of world-Jewry from Russia to the West. It has been estimated, that about one third of the Jews living in Europe during the generation preceding the First World War, left the continent for overseas.¹ A small, but continuous movement back towards Palestine began in 1881, which led to the establishment of Jewish agricultural settlements in that land with the support of friends in many countries, but especially in Russia. All this was accompanied by an intellectual ferment, during which eventually the very idea of "Judaism" was redefined.

Before dealing with the specific events of that decisive year, it seems appropriate to consider the general situation of Jews in Russia at that time.² Around 1880 more than half the Jews in the world, approximately five million,³ lived inside the borders of the Russian Empire. They were, however, not evenly distributed in the Empire of the Czar. Most of them were concentrated and confined to the so-called "Pale of Settlement",⁴ which was approximately equal in size to the former Kingdom of Poland, *"Pale"* regions that is, which had become Russian possessions during the partitions of Poland (1772; 1792; 1795) and during and immediately after the Napoleonic wars. Jews had not been permitted to settle in the older Russian state. Hardly anywhere did the Jews form a majority of the population, not even in the towns and cities of the "Pale"; they were rather a minority of twenty per cent or less.⁵ In 1865 Czar Alexander II had allowed a specific group of Jews, namely, university graduates, skilled artisans and large-scale merchants, to settle in other parts of the Empire. Some Jews had become

quite wealthy in Russia, and as in other countries their success attracted attention and caused the envy of many people. What was frequently overlooked, was the fact, that quite a few Jews eked out a precarious existence in the Pale of Settlement. They were concentrated in certain professions, in which there was a sharp competition. What made their living conditions hard, was the custom of early marriage, quite frequently between ages of 14 to 16. They usually had many children. Consequently their number increased rapidly during the nineteenth century, from an estimated one million around the turn of the century, to about five million in the eighties. Another handicap was the kind of education many young Russian Jews got in the old-fashioned Jewish school system, where Talmudic studies dominated everything else. While this had a beneficial influence in the realm of ethics and even of hygiene, (the children did not learn much in the line of what to-day would be considered practical knowledge.) Nevertheless there were hardly any illiterate people among the Jews, as there were among their Polish and Russian neighbours. In spite of the deficiencies in their education the Jews had many advantages over their still poorer educated fellow-countrymen.

The Jews in Russia formed closely knit communities, which had little contact with the surrounding world. The most influential aspect of Jewish life was religion. The synagogue was not only a religious centre, but a social and cultural one as well. Since religion encouraged charity, the Jews had established an imposing welfare system, which cared for fellow-Jews in all kinds of need. The everyday language of the Jews in Russia was Yiddish, and almost all the men knew at least some Hebrew, which enabled them to read the Bible and the Talmud. In the eighteenth century a kind of religious revival had taken place. The adherents to this movement were called "Hasidim" (the pious ones). Among them personal devotion, emotional

revivalist prayers, faith healing, joy and ecstatic flights of the soul were emphasized. Bitter controversies had taken place between them and the orthodox, who stressed ritual, strict adherence to the law and Talmudic studies. By the second half of the nineteenth century the two groups had found a modus vivendi. A new enemy, to which both were equally opposed, had arisen by that time, namely a form of enlightenment, called "Haskalah."⁶ Western ideas had made their inroads into the Jewish communities even in Russia and changed the outlook of tens of thousands of people. The belief in the eventual victory of reason over superstition and intolerance, the faith in the equality of men, liberty and brotherhood, the progress of humanity, and similar concepts became current. Secular interests were awakened, and the importance of practical knowledge was stressed. A professional stratification of Jews was advocated. They should become productive, rather than merely rely on petty trade and middle-men positions. Changes in the education of the young were proposed and often put into practice. The "Maskilim", as the followers of the movement were called, were convinced that they suggested a way of life which would eventually solve most of the political, economic, and cultural problems of Russian Jewry.

One feature of the Haskalah taken over from early nineteenth century Western European thinking was the idea of nationalism. Such men as Solomon Rappoport, Nahman Krochmal and Peretz Smolenskin studied Jewish history and philosophy in a scholarly fashion and called for a Jewish national revival. Howard Sachar wrote about nationalism as a Europe-wide phenomenon and its influence upon Jews:

For if one truth emerges from modern history it is that Jewish nationalism was not merely a reaction to anti-Semitism - any more, indeed, than German nationalism was merely a reaction to Napoleonic invasion. The history of modern Jewish nationalism begins with the basic fact of a cohesive ethnic group, living as a separate nation

in Eastern, but not in Western Europe, a "nation within a nation" the czars called it, apparently unassimilable, clinging tenaciously to ancient ways, costume, diet, language, as well as to a common religion.

Closely connected with this nationalism was the attempt of some enlightened Jews, to revive Hebrew as a modern language and the national tongue of the Jews. This movement was often referred to as the Hebrew Renaissance. Its goal was to use the ancient language for the dissemination of secular, cultural values, and a remarkable modern Hebrew literature was created in this way. This revival, however, was considered by many of the religious-minded people as a profanation of the Holy tongue, and they tried to stop the spread of this new literature. They were afraid that this new movement would lead people away from the ancestral faith. Developments in Russia seemed to prove them right. Among the practical things, which, according to the Maskilim should be studied, were also other languages, especially, of course, Russian. Many young Jews learned this official language of the state and found it useful for advancement. They also tried, however, to amalgamate with the environment and were soon more or less lost for the Jewish communities. It therefore appeared to many of the religious leaders, as if the Hebrew Renaissance were but a transitional stage and the first step towards eventual assimilation, or the exact contrary of what had been intended.

Since such a great percentage of the world's Jews lived in Russia at that time, any action taken with regard to Jews in this country was of great significance for Jewry as a whole. The events of the year 1881 were thus to have consequences which were felt at once throughout the world, and were to have further effects later. In March Czar Alexander II (1855-1881) was assassinated in St. Petersburg. That brought to an end a period of reforms in the Empire, from which the Jews had benefitted, particularly

in the earlier years of Alexander's reign. Moreover, Jews were held responsible for his death, since a Jewess had been an accomplice of the assassins. The press suggested, and rumors were spread among the illiterate masses of Russians, that the Jews had played a leading part in the plot. Six weeks later anti-Jewish riots began to sweep across many of those provinces, in which the majority of the Jews lived, which were of a severity and magnitude as had not been experienced since the days of the Middle Ages in other parts of the world. Such "pogroms", broke out in several places on and off for almost two years. As a consequence tens of thousands of Jews were made homeless, stores and houses were looted, synagogues ruined, almost a hundred Jews were killed and thousands wounded. A mass flight across the borders began.

Particularly upsetting for the Jews was the fact, that not only the illiterate masses had participated, but many of the intelligentsia had either supported the rioters, or had done nothing to prevent them from murder and destruction. Definite plans must have been behind the outbreaks, so it was believed, because it was apparent that the pattern was everywhere the same, with people having been brought to the scenes of the tumults immediately before they started, and who disappeared immediately afterwards. Frequently the police had stood by idly for one or two days while the looting, pillaging and murdering went on. In many cases the rioting masses were not dispersed until troops arrived on the scene. Though it could never be proved, many Jews assumed that the government was behind the outbursts; in any case very little had been done by the authorities to prevent them. Those rioters, who finally were arrested and convicted, got relatively light sentences. As if to add insult to injury eventually the blame for the disorders was laid upon the Jews themselves. Some months after the first outbreaks of violence the official explanation was that the outbursts

were a reaction to what was termed, the economic domination and exploitation of the Russians by the Jews. This caused the promulgation of new legislation in 1882, named after the month, during which it was issued, the "May-Laws". Though these were supposed to be only temporary measures, they remained in effect until 1917. Through these decrees the freedom of movement of Jews even within the "Pale of Settlement" was limited; further restrictions concerning the rights of settlement were introduced; a

numerus clausus in schools and universities was introduced, which prevented many young Jews from getting the kind of education they desired. Hundreds of students from then on attended universities in Central and Western Europe, a fact which was to have great significance later on for the Zionist movement. Although the pogroms and the May-Laws caused physical and material damage to a great many, if not almost all, Jews, living in Russia, the psychological impact was even greater. Jews lost all confidence in the Russian government and people. Many had cherished the hope that the Russian autocracy would be turned into a constitutional monarchy and had been convinced that the Russian state would eventually grant the Jews full equality and remove the residence restrictions and all the other oppressive disabilities. Such faith was now shattered. Hardest hit were the enlightened ones, who had believed in reason and progress. Many of those, who had tried to amalgamate with the rest of the population became again aware of their origin and found their way back to their own people.

The miseries and the hopelessness caused tens of thousands of Jews to leave the country, most of them going to the United States of America, which was destined eventually to become the most important country for world-Jewry, but where in 1880 less than 230,000 Jews lived. Others went to South America and South Africa. A few, however, considered Palestine as the goal of their wanderings. (In 1880 there were approximately 24,000 Jews

in this part of the Ottoman Empire. Most of them were Chalukkah mendicants. This welfare system already played a role in the considerations of Rabbi Kalischer, and had been fateful for Rabbi Alkalai, as mentioned above. Religious reasons alone made these people live in the Holy Land. It was different with those Jews, who considered an emigration to Palestine in 1881. They were determined not to rely on charity, but to work with their own hands and to live off the produce of the land. Some 7,000 Russian Jews departed for Palestine in 1882 and more during the following years. This first wave of immigration was later to be called the "first Aliyah".⁸ It was the first immigration of Jews to Palestine in modern times for other than exclusively religious reasons. The settlers founded some agricultural settlements like Rosh Pinah, Zichron Ya'akov and Petah Tikvah. These beginnings were extremely hard. The soil was barren and neglected for centuries, sicknesses like Malaria were to strike hard at the pioneers. Poor crops made life tough in that land, which once flowed with milk and honey. Among those, who went to Palestine in 1882, were some fourteen young men, mostly university students, who had been influenced not only by national ideas, but also by Marxist thought. They called themselves "Biluim".⁹ These young pioneers were backed up by an organization of friends in Russia, who in 1882 already numbered about five thousand. It was their intention to found a cooperative. They rejected violently any form of petty trade, which to them was the tragic fate of Jewry in Russia. They did not, however, have any experience in agriculture or any knowledge of the country, except what they had learned about it in the Bible and Talmud. It was reported, for example, that they had taken seed from the Ukraine along and had hoped to grow the same kind of wheat in Palestine. They settled near Jaffa. In spite of their enthusiasm and determination to sacrifice, their attempts failed badly. Not only the Biluim, but practically all immigrants

of 1882 were soon to get into serious difficulties. Nevertheless was this this modest beginning, about which Rabbi Alkalai had already dreamed, for which Rabbi Kalischer had worked, and of which Moses Hess had been convinced that it would come about.

One of the first men to put into words the thinking of the first aliyah generation, was Peretz Smolenskin (1842-1885), one of those scholars, who had stressed before 1881 the national character of Judaism. He had written around 1875: "Is the name Israel based on religion, law, observance, or custom? This name exists because of national sentiment."¹⁰ He asserted that the Jews were not like other people, because they were a spiritual nation. The foundation of its national identity was never the soil of its land, but the Torah. Though the form of its unity was different from that of other nations, Jews were nevertheless a people. They were good citizens in the lands in which they lived and fulfilled their obligations like all the other nationals. Jewish nationalism had at that time nothing to do with Palestine, as far as Smolenskin was concerned. The land, in which the Jews dwelled was their country. They once had had a land of their own, but it was not the tie that united them anymore. Their Torah was their native land, which made them a people, a nation only in the spiritual sense. In the normal business of life they were like all other men.

In 1880 Eliezer Ben Yehudah (1858-1923), the famous lexicographer of modern Hebrew, had attacked Smolenskin in a letter, published in a Hebrew journal, precisely on this point.¹¹ Ben-Yehudah stated that the hearts of men were not moved by reason, but by emotion. The Jews may argue all day and cry aloud that they were a people, even though they were bereft of a homeland. All this would be futile and meaningless. One could, however, appeal to people's feelings and address oneself to the hearts of the Jews, saying: The land of your fathers is waiting for you. Go, and colonize it,

and by becoming its masters, you shall again be a people like all others. Such words would be listened to attentively. The human heart was tender, and would easily be conquered by such an emotion, even the heart of a Maskil, an enlightened one. It is important the stress, what made, in Ben-Yehudah's opinion, a return of Jews to Palestine imperative: "land of our fathers", "hearts of the Jews", "emotion", "we shall again be a people like all others". He made it quite clear, that the emotions were not of a religious character, but a national one. The nation had to be revived, otherwise even the revival of the Hebrew language was of no avail. Only by returning to their fatherland could the Jews achieve a lasting salvation. Short of such a solution they were lost, lost forever. The Jewish religion would, no doubt, be able to endure even in alien lands; it would adjust its forms to the spirit of the place and age, and its destiny would parallel that of all religions. The nation, however, could not live except on its own soil. Only there could it revive and bear magnificent fruit, as in days of old.



The pogroms of 1881 seemed to have convinced Smolenskin finally that Ben-Yehudah was right, because thereafter he himself called on his fellow-Jews to return to "Eretz Jisroel" (the land of Israel), although he did no longer live at that time in Russia, but in Vienna.¹² He realized that many Jews had to leave countries, in which they were hated. If the wave of emigration were to be directed to one place, it could only be Palestine. This land had considerable advantages for Jews over other countries. Those, who cherished the memory of their ancestors would gladly go, if they could be assured that they could make a living. Like Moses Hess before him, Smolenskin did not expect that all Jews would go, but only those, who were destitute or persecuted, would look for a place to which to emigrate. He was addressing himself to the sensible people among the Jews, to those, who

felt for their brethren and were willing to make sacrifices on the altar of love for their people. Such persons would listen, understand, act and succeed. | They should be told that there was no other land that would lovingly accept the exiles save the Land of Israel, and that only there could they find truth and lasting peace. | Again one has to note the religious terms | used for secular matters: "sacrifices on the altar of love", "truth", | "lasting peace". Smolenskin also made it quite clear, that there were no religious reasons behind his suggestions. On the contrary, he knew, that the reform Jews would be opposed to his project, those people, who, in his opinion, hated Zion and Jerusalem. | He also found it useless to argue with the orthodox, who expected a miraculous redemption. | Those people should be told that there was no intention to attempt to force the arrival of the Messiah, nor to establish the kingdom of God in Palestine at that time. All that was sought, was to provide bread in a land, in which there was hope, that those, who laboured on it, would find rest.

Chapter IV

Nationalism and Religion in the Debates of the Lovers of Zion.

In September of 1882 an anonymous pamphlet appeared under the title Auto-Emancipation: An Appeal to His People, written in German, which became a sensation among Russian Jews almost overnight.¹ It was no exaggeration, when the editor of an English translation said in 1945, that this pamphlet "opened a new era in the history of the Jewish people; it is undoubtedly one of the greatest documents that has ever been written on the Jewish question."² Theodor Herzl was to admit later, that he never would have written his own book The Jewish State, which was to become so significant, if he had known Auto-Emancipation.

The author of this pamphlet was soon identified as Dr. Leo Pinsker, a physician from Odessa. He was one of the Maskilim, who had been assimilated to a large degree, and who advocated the use of the Russian language by Jews and the spread of secular culture among them. He did not know much Hebrew and in all likelihood was not aware of what Smolenskin and Ben-Yehudah had written in a Hebrew journal just prior to the publication of his booklet, although the general principles of the Hebrew nationalists were common knowledge among Russian Jews by that time. Pinsker was sixty years of age, when the pogroms of 1881 started, which shook the foundations of his liberal world-view and his belief in the progress of humanity. It was this shock also, which caused the immediate favorable response among many Russian Jews. His book was hardly welcomed by Jews anywhere else.

Pinsker proposed a solution to what he called the "Jewish Question". The essence of this burning problem was the fact that the Jews formed in the midst of the nations among whom they resided, a distinctive element, which could never be assimilated or readily digested. Legal emancipation was the crowning achievement of the nineteenth century, but that did not mean social

emancipation. Jews were still in an exceptional social position and they would remain isolated, because they were aliens to the nations in which they lived. It was necessary to find means of adjusting the relations of this exclusive element with the other nations. He was sure that he proposed the only possible solution for this problem, and he was confident that his plan would solve this age-old question forever. Such a final solution would be accomplished, when the relations of the Jews with the other nations were regulated and secured by international law and by treaties, and the Jewish nation were treated as equal in rank. The future of the Jews would remain insecure and precarious so long, as their position was not radically changed. This could not be accomplished by the civil emancipation of Jews in one state or the other, but only by the auto-emancipation of the Jewish people as a nation; that is, by an act of national self-help. They had to found a colonial community which one day would become their inalienable home, their fatherland.

This was the first clear expression of what later on became a generally held assumption of the Zionists. It was the conviction that the nineteenth century attempt at assimilation of Jews had failed, and that it had failed by necessity. Jews could never be amalgamated with the surrounding peoples. They had to be recognized internationally as a separate nation and be treated accordingly. The other nations would do this only if the Jewish people had a land of their own, a fatherland. *Quote.*

Before they could get such a land, however, they would have to become conscious of their nationality. It was an open question in the second half of the nineteenth century, whether or not the Jews constituted a nation at that time. While Hess, Smolenskin and other Jewish writers had asserted this, Pinsker felt that the Jews lacked most of the attributes which were characteristic of a nation. Among these he listed: a common language;

common customs; a common land, which would serve as a rallying point and a centre of gravity; a government of their own; national independence; and accredited representatives. (He even denied that the Jewish people had a distinctive national character, national consciousness and national self-respect.) The other nations did not have to deal with a Jewish nation, but always with Jews as individuals. Things had not always been that way in Pinsker's opinion. Like all later Zionists he saw as a unit the centuries of Jewish Dispersion since the loss of the ancient Jewish state. This time of exile had to come to an end.

Eighteen hundred years earlier the Jewish people had been a living nation, but then they had lost their state and their independence. Nevertheless, they had not been totally destroyed at that time, but continued to exist thereafter as a spiritual nation. The national consciousness existed throughout these centuries only in a latent state of martyrdom. Pinsker stated that the Jews lived in disgrace without a single attempt to cast it off. He was to be corrected later on this point. Heroic attempts of self-liberation had been made, but they had invariably failed.

After the loss of their fatherland, the Jewish people appeared to the other nations as one of the dead walking among the living, having a ghostlike apparition. This was something scarcely paralleled in history and could therefore not fail to make a strange, peculiar impression. Since the fear of ghosts was something inborn, the fear of the Jewish ghost had been handed down and was even strengthened throughout the centuries. It led to a prejudice and together with other forces, especially superstition, paved the way for Judeophobia, fear of the Jews, a form of demonopathy, with the distinction that the Jewish ghost was not disembodied like other ghosts, but was a being of flesh and blood. The physician spoke out of Pinsker, when he presented his diagnosis: "Judeophobia is a psychic aberration. As a psychic

myths

aberration it is hereditary, and as a disease transmitted for two thousand years it is incurable."³ He went on to show that the prejudice against the Jewish race rested upon all kinds of anthropological and social principles, innate and ineradicable. (The other nations would forever reject the Jews by reason of an eternal, natural antagonism. He reasoned that the Jews should give up fighting against anti-Semitism, just as one would give up contending against other inherited predispositions. (Polemics of this kind were a waste of time and energy. Against superstition even gods fight in vain. L

There was only one solution for the problem, the Jews had to become a nation again and live in their own land. They had to find a home; if not a country of their own. They should seek their honour and (note the use of the religious term) (1) salvation by restoring a national bond of unity. (Pinsker made practical proposals for the organization of Jewry, which were not very different from what eventually became a reality under Theodor Herzl. (2) A nucleus was already there, he felt, in the form of societies, which promoted resettlement of Jews. These had to be transformed, and had to convoke a national congress, or at least a kind of directorate which would have to supply a place of unity. Such an institute, would have to be representative of the national interest and be comprised of leaders of the people. The first task of such a national institute would be to discover anywhere in the world a territory adapted to the purpose, as far as possible continuous in extent and of uniform character. Like Kalischer and Hess before him, Pinsker felt that the time was opportune, since other nations had won their independence, and he referred to the Serbians and Roumanians. The task for the Jews was more difficult than for other nations, however, for these had had the advantage of living on their own soil and speaking one language. All the more determination and readiness for sacrifice was needed on the part of the Jews. Silu
2

As far as the internal situation of Jewry was concerned, the time was also opportune. Pinsker asserted that the Jews had been strongly influenced by the general trends of European thought. The great ideas of the eighteenth century certainly had left a trace. Jews felt not only as Jews, but as men. As such they were anxious to be a nation like the others. Pinsker was apparently not aware, when he wrote this, that this topic had a pre-history with religious connotations. The question, whether or not Israel could or should ever become like all the other nations was to become one of the central points of discussion between the secular nationalists and the religious-minded people. Pinsker felt that a national rebirth could be accomplished through self-help. Only then would other people help as well. Such self-liberation would even produce automatically an additional beneficial effect. Pinsker indicated this by closing his pamphlet with the German proverb, which was to be quoted by later Zionists quite frequently: "Help yourselves, and God will help you!"⁴ Not all religious authorities were to be in agreement with the author.

Pinsker realized that the Jews had an unshakeable faith. He was sure that they would take with them the most sacred possessions, which they had saved from the shipwreck of their former fatherland, namely the God-idea and the Bible. This was to him apparently the essence of the Jewish religion. Religious ideas were detectable in his argument, although in a somewhat diluted form. He asserted, for example, that the Jews were the chosen people. This had for him, however, only a negative meaning; they were "the people chosen for universal hatred."⁵ There is nothing in Pinsker's book about such ideas as "blessing" or "covenant" connected with the term "chosenness". He admitted to his sorrow that the Jews were a stiff-necked people. This had for him nothing to do with their relations towards God, but it referred to the "national resolution",⁶ which could so easily be destroyed by conservative

opposition. Like Hess before him, Pinsker used an illustration reminiscent of the Bible, when he lamented that the Jews were a flock scattered over the whole face of the earth, without a shepherd to protect them and gather them together. They prayed only for a little place anywhere to lay their weary heads to rest.

Even religious history was reinterpreted. The flight from Egypt under Moses had been for Pinsker an orderly departure in unity and serried ranks. One looks in vain for such a reference in the Bible. Pinsker regretted that in his own days the Jews were not only without a Moses as their leader, but were even "without a promise of land, which we are to conquer by our own might."⁷ This quotation is one of the most important expressions of Pinsker's rather negative attitude towards the Biblical tradition. By implication he denied that any of the promises of a land were valid in his own days, for example the promise to Abraham as recorded in Genesis 12.

He also implied that the conquering of the Holy Land after the flight from Egypt was not, as the Bible asserted, by the might and under the guidance of God, but by the people's own might. Religious people could not fail to notice such differences and to react accordingly.

~~Pinsker made it quite clear that his plans for the Jews to get a land of their own again were not inspired by religious considerations.~~ The Jews should not dream of restoring ancient Judea. They should not attach themselves to the place, where their political life was once violently interrupted and destroyed. (The goal of their present endeavours should not be the Holy Land, but a land of their own.) Perhaps the Holy Land would become a Jewish possession again, and that would certainly be desirable. Practical considerations, however, were decisive in this respect. First of all it had to be determined which country was accessible and suitable to offer a secure and unquestioned refuge to all those Jews, who had to leave their present homes.

Pinsker was at the time of the publication of Auto-Emancipation what was later to be termed a "Territorialist". The Jewish home did not necessarily have to be Palestine. For example, it could very well have been a small territory in North America, or any Pashalik in Asiatic Turkey. The only condition was that it was an area sufficient to allow the eventual settlement of several million people.

Pinsker considered certain religious ideas as harmful for the national Renaissance. The Jews had to abandon the delusive idea that they were fulfilling a providential mission by their dispersion, a mission in which nobody believed anyway. This was a reference to a nineteenth century reform Jewish claim, based on Isaiah 49, which did not belong to the traditional concepts of the previous centuries of Jewish thought.

Inevitably the Jewish belief in the Messiah came up in Pinsker's considerations, as it had done in those of the proto-Zionists. This was to him the belief in the intervention of a higher power, which was to bring about the political resurrection of the Jewish nation. This idea, as well as the assumption that a punishment inflicted by God had to be born patiently, had caused the Jews to abandon every care for national liberty, for unity and independence. These religious concerns had caused them to forget their fatherland and this was a disgrace to a people, which once had its Maccabees. These religious freedom fighters of the second century B.C. were to be proclaimed, as examples to be followed, more often by later Zionists.

Pinsker felt that things were altogether different after the 1881 pogroms. These outbursts of anti-Semitism had awakened the national consciousness of the Russian Jews and had produced an irresistible movement towards Palestine, which was something other than fatalistic submission to a punishment by God. All this did not mean that the Jews had renounced Judaism and their faith, but only that they revolted against undeserved ill-treatment.

Nevertheless, not prayers were required by the situation. Since the other nationalities had recently been allowed to regain their independence, the Jews should, becoming like one of them, not sit a moment longer with folded hands. They should rather devote all the remaining moral force to re-establishing themselves as a living nation, so that they would eventually assume a more dignified role in world affairs.

If Pinsker's analysis of the situation was right, and there seems to be no reason to doubt it, the beginning of the modern "Back to Palestine" movement was a re-awakening of national feelings among Jewish masses in Russia caused by severe anti-Semitic outbursts. Many aspects of it were contrary to some features of the traditional religious attitude. Though this start was not outrightly anti-religious, the movement was in any case not caused by any religious impulse. Secular considerations were to become decisive in the later Zionist movement as well, as will be shown. It is no surprise then that more tradition-bound religious people rejected such aspirations.

This, however, was not true for all of them. One of the few Rabbis, whose heart was touched by Pinsker's appeal, was Rabbi Ruelph of Memel. He lived near the Russian border, and had first-hand experience with Jewish refugees. Ruelph stated that he was unable to endorse Auto-Emancipation without qualification, and therefore he wrote a book of his own about the same topic.⁸ Like Pinsker he was one of the assimilated Jews and had believed that their eventual full emancipation was inevitable, if only they would fulfill their duties as loyal citizens of the states, in which they lived. This belief was shattered for both men through the events of 1881 in Russia. This alone, however, had not been enough to change the Rabbi's outlook. It was rather Pinsker's book which had made an ineradicable impression upon him and had redirected his thoughts and aspirations. Ruelph

acknowledged his indebtedness by admitting that his own booklet was inspired by that of Pinsker, and that it was perhaps only a translation of Pinsker's words into his own. While he disagreed with him in many respects, these differences had been caused by personal factors and local conditions; the Russian physician had by necessity to evaluate things in a different way from that of the German Rabbi. | With his book Ruelph became one of the fathers of those religious-minded Jews, who felt that their religious convictions should not prevent them from supporting the goals of a secular Jewish-national movement, and who finally founded a religious faction within the Zionist movement. One can see in Ruelph's book that such participation required both a reinterpretation of traditional religious concepts, as well as a reformulation of the national goals. |

The points of agreement between the two men were considerable. Both saw the cause of the century-old hatred of the Jews mainly in the fact that they were a people without a land. | They were confident that this problem could be solved by a reunion of the Jews in all the world, by giving them a country and by the founding of a new Jewish state. The national self-consciousness and pride had to be reawakened and the national honour re-established. Ruelph agreed that the time was opportune for the regaining of a national home, because other people had united and had won independence. Like others, the Jewish nation should again begin its own independent life in freedom. Only then would the Jews be treated as equals and the relations could be secured and regulated by international treaties. | Ruelph even agreed with Pinsker, that contrary to the traditional religious belief, this could be accomplished only by self-help. | If the Jewish people would help themselves, they could be sure of the help of God as well. The Rabbi condemned also passivity in the face of unjust attacks and favoured self-defence, although he seemed not to object, if that were accompanied by prayers.

Ruelph agreed with Pinsker that legal emancipation was not full emancipation, and that the mere fact that certain people had to be "emancipated" and made equal before the law, was a shame. While Pinsker had complained bitterly about the lack of "social" emancipation, Ruelph felt that the laws were made ineffectual by their interpretation which did not let full equality become a reality.

While Pinsker had asserted that Jews formed an element that could not be assimilated, Ruelph stressed that they did not want to be completely assimilated, and with good reason. There was not only a contrast between Israel and all the other nations, but a contradiction, and this could not be overcome by progress in culture, education, humanity or faith. For Ruelph the Jewish people were not only the people hated by others, but a universal people, the people of God. But he did not have to say anything about the "chosenness". It was to remain a problem for Zionists, how the chosenness of the Jewish people, and their attempt to imitate other nations could be squared.

Ruelph disagreed with Pinsker in other ways, too. He doubted that Judeophobia, fear of the Jews, was a major force, or even existed at all, let alone that it was an instinctive, inherited evil. It was not fear of ghosts, which caused hatred of the Jews, but only ethnological principles. Prejudices against the Jews were not inborn, but products of education.

Ruelph felt that an organization for the re-establishment of the Jewish state did not have to be created. It existed already in the form of the "Alliance Israelite Universelle" with headquarters in Paris.⁹ When it had been founded some thirty years earlier, consciously or unconsciously the beginning of Israel's liberation and salvation had been made. He called on all Jews, orthodox or reformed, even on non-Jews, to support the Alliance, because this organization was bound to solve one of the major world

problems. Ruelph asserted furthermore against Pinsker that the Jews had to fulfill a mission among the nations, and he was in favour of it. The Israelites were the ambassadors of the kingdom of God on earth. As ambassadors they were the representatives of the holy person, the monarch himself, and as such they were holy and immune themselves. God had sent them among the nations to further by their good example the brotherhood of mankind, love, good order, truth and righteousness. Ruelph emphasized, however, that the national aspirations of the Jews did not have to suffer because of this religious calling. On the contrary, these aspirations got their full justification only through this mission. The Jews had had more influence upon the course of world history and the cultural development of mankind than any other nationality. Since the youngest and least important of these nations were granted the right to establish national unity and to gain independence, nobody could deny the Jewish nation the right to re-establish their state and fatherland.

The problem of language did not worry Ruelph, as it seemed to bother Pinsker. (Hebrew,) the language of the fathers, was not altogether dead. The Jews had preserved the Bible and had always called upon their God in that language. Furthermore, it had been revived by Russian Jews during the nineteenth century as a living language, and was in use for business and everyday affairs, as well as for literature and even for the press. The Russian Jews had made salvation possible in this way, Ruelph asserted; which meant, that they had made an important contribution to the national Renaissance. Hebrew alone could become the national language in the new Jewish state.

Ruelph disagreed with Pinsker in the evaluation of the Jewish belief in the Messiah, and praised it because of its genuine national content, although he realized that he was the only one to see it that way. This faith had been a source of strength for Jews throughout the ages. Their Jewish-

national patriotism and consciousness had found an adequate expression in this belief. Ruelph saw a danger for the nation precisely in the fact that only a tiny minority still believed and hoped for the coming of the Messiah. He regretted the lack of knowledge of the Bible and the Talmud and a general weakening of religious faith among his co-religionists.

While Pinsker seemed to have been sorry that the Jews lacked a new Moses, Ruelph felt that no such leader was required, because the old Moses was and remained the spiritual leader. What was needed indeed was a "Jehoschuah", a helper sent by God, and it appears that Ruelph projected some aspects of the Messiah belief into this figure, although he avoided the term in this connection. For the Geullah, the salvation, the Jeschuah, the help of God was necessary, and this would come with the self-help. It is probable that it is this aspect, self-help, which traditionally did not belong to the Messiah expectations, which made Ruelph avoid the term Messiah. Otherwise he connected prophecies with what he hoped would take place, which traditionally were understood to be Messianic. He asserted that eventually the savior for Zion would appear, as the prophet Isaiah had foreseen, the man in whom the spirit of God would rest, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of God. This hope, he reasoned, should not hinder the Jews from acting at once. The actions required at the moment did not have in the first place a religious motivation. To be sure, there was some religious aspect to it. By their nationalistic efforts the Jews could pave the way for the coming of the saviour. Delay of their efforts would even hinder his work and coming. This argument was later picked up again by religiously minded Zionists. It seemed, however, so vague and unimportant to most of the later Zionists that they omitted it. This was especially so, since Rabbi Ruelph himself took a stand against the traditional religious

attitude. He urged his co-religionists not to wait for the beginning of the salvation, that is for the coming of the saviour. When they could act themselves, it would be a crime against the nation, as well as against the saviour, if they would resign and condemn their people to further servitude. The man of counsel and of might would not come to a people, who would be without counsel and might and who did not know how to help itself. It was not he, who was supposed to awaken the nation, but the nation would awaken him. He was to be only primus inter pares, who would be the incarnation of the genius of the people and of its aspirations. Not a moment longer should the Jews wait for his coming because the task at hand was so urgent. This work, which was required, was not of a religious but of a secular nature, and in this respect Ruelph and Pinsker agreed. The Jews needed a fatherland, a genuine home for the whole nation, in order that they might gain recognition among the other nations, and destroy the hatred of the Jews once and for all.

The most important disagreement between Ruelph and Pinsker was with regard to the problem of which land should be the new fatherland of the reawakened Jewish nation; that is, where the Jewish state could be re-established. (It was no question for Ruelph that this could only be Palestine.) Every other location would mean only a new exile, A Jewish colony or even a state in America or Australia would be considered a curiosity by the other nations. Only the original home of the fathers would re-establish the national honour. This land had been taken from them by force. They had been driven away and were scattered across the face of the earth. Only in the original fatherland could the Jews defend themselves, if need be, with the sword. It was absolutely necessary that they connected the thread of history at that point, where it had at one time been cut off. The Holy Land alone could in reality and truth become their country again. It was the

property of the Jews for two reasons. The first was a religious one, which Ruelph mentioned in passing, but on which he did not elaborate. He asserted that the land belonged to the Jews by divine right. It had been promised to their forefathers as an eternal inheritance. The country was theirs also by human right. Their forefathers had taken it with the sword and it still belonged to the Jewish people according to the right of the conqueror.

Ruelph was, of course, aware, that the land had been conquered by others in the meantime. He did not mention the Arabs at all, but only the Ottoman Turks. Since the land was under their sovereignty, the Jews had to reconquer it, but this time not with the sword, but with weapons of culture and civilization, by immigration and (colonization) (An additional means could be used, which actually was to be tried later on by Zionists, though unsuccessfully.

The land was ruled by the government of Istanbul, the "Porte", and with a play of words he asserted that with a golden key all "doors" could be opened. The government of the Turkish Empire needed money and was anxious to get a good deal. But whether she wanted to or not, even if she should perish in the process, she had to be forced to let the Jews take their own land back. Which forms, ways and means were used, was irrelevant. Important was, that the original home, the land of the fathers was recovered and the Jewish state re-established. Reaching this goal was, he felt, neither unjust nor unfair.

Ruelph agreed with Pinsker, when he expressed his firm conviction that all obstacles could be overcome, if there would only be a united national determination. With the help of the modern means of transportation, especially the railway, many people could move long distances. This could bring about something, which Pinsker had not considered. The promise of Scripture could be fulfilled really fast, namely, that God would gather his people from the ends of the earth, and, if they found favour in his eyes,

he would give them their land back. This is but one example, of how secular and religious concepts intermingled and were harmonized in the mind of the pious Rabbi. What he actually asserted was this, that national determination and modern means of transportation were preconditions for the fulfillment of the Scriptures. It was but a small step for a less religious-minded person to abandon the Scriptures and to concentrate on the national determination and the means of transportation. This was especially the case, since opposition to the whole scheme of national rebirth came from religious circles, which did not reinterpret the religious tradition in the way Rabbi Ruelph did.

Pinsker was delighted, when he received Ruelph's book and felt that it was an improvement over his own. He sent a letter to the Rabbi and thanked him, that he had cured, where he had hurt, stressed, what he had forgotten, and had covered with light and honour, what he himself had neglected.¹⁰ He did not want to argue with him over the few points of disagreement, which were to remain. Gradually Pinsker was won over to the idea, that Palestine had to be the land, where the new Jewish state was to be established. He felt, however, that his idea of a Congress was better than Ruelph's trust in the Alliance, which was outmoded and would not support the national work. The religious issues, which Ruelph had mentioned, led Pinsker to clarify his position in this regard. He made it obvious, that he was by no means anti-religious, but that he simply considered questions of nationality more important than religious motives. Like Hess before him, he favoured a religious reform, in which the principle of tolerance would be a major factor to prepare the road for a new development of the national affairs of the Jews. This could be accomplished by the Congress, proposed by him, but it had to be initiated by Rabbis like Ruelph. Pinsker felt that something good would come out of such efforts: "Progress in our religion will also

represent the progress of our national idea, and vice-versa. We should only stress: Progress."¹¹ He regretted that the Jewish people were scattered and divided with regard to the places where they lived, but also in their secular and even in their religious views. There was, however, a solution for this problem: "The national idea provides the natural cement with which to unite all these diverse elements."¹² Religious partisanship would bring harm to the national unity and solidarity. Religious concerns were subjected to the national idea in that movement, which chose Pinsker as its leader. With almost prophetic insight Moses Hess had foreseen twenty years earlier that the national ideal would become all-embracing.

Another Russian Jew, who had become a Jewish nationalist under the influence of the 1881 pogroms, and who was eventually to become a close associate of Pinsker, was Moshe Leib Lilienblum (1843-1910). As early as 1862 he began to advocate vigorously the resettlement of Palestine by Jewish people and considered questions of religious differences inside Judaism as secondary. The only important problem for him was national rebirth. In 1883 he proposed the "Renaissance of Israel in the land of its forefathers, where the next few generations may attain, to the fullest extent, a normal national life."¹³ Lilienblum was remarkable because of his evaluation of the currents of nineteenth century thinking in relation to the Jewish situation. He was in favour of nationalism, which to him represented progress, and he believed, that it would ultimately do away with war and would direct humanity, with all its nations, to the way of true unity. The drive for national self-determination, however, was to his regret also the very soil, on which anti-Semitism flourished. This was like the thorn of a rose. It was like the shadow of a light, namely, of the otherwise fine contemporary civilization. Anti-Semitism made great strides and was to become a terrible danger for the Jewish people, as he rightly

foresaw. There was only one remedy for the Jews, and that was to make use of the good aspects of the present situation and to participate in the current strife for national self-determination on their own. Lilienblum made it quite clear that not religious reasons made a return of Jews to Palestine so urgent, but the precarious situation of Jewry in Europe at that time. He recognized that anti-Semitism in the nineteenth century was much more dangerous than it had been in the Middle Ages. To be sure, it was the old barbarism, only polished and given a new gloss; difference of faith then, difference of nationality in his time. During those earlier centuries persecutions had taken place at a given time and place, and the Jews had had the chance to take refuge elsewhere. If oppression began in the country of a refuge they were usually able to return to their original home, because the inhabitants had begun to feel the absence of the Jews, who were virtually the only merchants. In the nineteenth century other people were just as adept in all branches of commerce, and, he felt, did no longer need the Jews. Where were they to flee, if pressure was applied? There was only one country, where they could feel completely secure, and that was the land of Israel, the ancestral home. Lilienblum was confident that God would give the Jews strength in their efforts to find rest there.

In the Middle Ages the Jewish religion had been under attack, and the Jews held on to it with all their might. In the nineteenth century the national identity was under attack. It would again become their most prized possession, they would shield it as their ancestors had defended their faith. The problem at hand was a matter of life and death. If the Jews would not solve it, they were doomed as a nation.

In 1881 and during the following years a number of circles sprang up all over Russia, in which Jews united with the resettlement of Palestine as their goal. They became known as the "Lover of Zion", using Hebrew words:

"Howewe Zion". The movement as a whole was often referred to as "Hibbat Zion", Love of Zion. These groups collected money for the support of the colonists in Palestine and held courses for the study of Jewish history and the Hebrew language. Gymnastic and self-defence organizations were founded by them, which were called Maccabee Clubs, in memory of the second century B.C. Jewish freedom fighters. In November 1884 a Palestine conference took place in Kattowitz then belonging to Germany, but situated near the Russian and Austrian borders. Thirty-six delegates from all walks of Jewish life represented most of the "Lovers of Zion" at this gathering. At this occasion Dr. Leo Pinsker was elected President of an organization, which was to further Jewish agricultural settlements in Palestine. It was to have its main strength in Russia, but was illegal there for a number of years. The organization did not get government recognition in Russia until 1889. Its official name was then "Committee for the support of Jewish agricultural workers and artisans in Syria and Palestine". Dr. Leo Pinsker was recognized as President, headquarters were in Odessa, Russia, and consequently it became known as the "Odessa Committee".

Meanwhile the colonies in Palestine got into serious financial difficulties. The contributions, which the "Lovers of Zion" were able to send to Palestine were so small that they would not have been able to keep even those few settlements alive, let alone support further immigration. Help came, however, from a Jewish financier, Baron Edmond de Rothschild of Paris, who was to spend large amounts of money for many years. He sent trusted advisors to Palestine to administer these funds and to help keep the Jewish settlements alive. He had large wine cellars built in Rison Le-Zion, most of which are still in use to-day. For many years Rothschild bought the wine above the resale value in order to keep the production going. Rothschild never closed his ears to requests for aid from the settlers. His motives

were honorable; his methods, nevertheless, tended to undermine the initiative of the settlements. The administration of the funds, moreover, came under attack for various reasons during the following years. Most of the later Zionists had only contempt for this kind of philanthropy.

Difficulties were caused in the 1880's by religious questions. Tensions arose between the recipients of the Chalukkah and the settlers in the colonies. The former accused the new-comers of leading ungodly lives and constantly breaking the religious laws, while the farmers had contempt for people, who only prayed and studied the law of God and expected other Jews to support them. The most important issue, which was to become an almost perpetual point of contention in the later Zionist movement, was the observation of the Biblical commandment to keep the land fallow every seventh year, the so-called Schmittah. Alkalai had mentioned this point already and had considered it to be extremely important. While the religiously minded Jews demanded strict observance, others felt that in view of the poverty and the many difficulties which beset the settlers anyway, this was impossible. The question became a serious issue for the first time in 1888-89.

These differences had their repercussions in the work of the Lovers of Zion. [Tensions arose between the secularly minded nationalists, who were in the majority, and those few men, for whom religion was most important. The latter felt that they could nevertheless support the movement, but demanded to be heard on issues, which had religious implications. It was apparently possible to reach compromises in many cases.]

①
Relig.

A new element was introduced into the Back-to-Palestine movement by a deep and original thinker. (His name was Asher Ginzberg, but he became almost exclusively known by his pen-name Ahad Ha-am ("One of the People").¹⁴ A first article by this author appeared in 1889 in a Hebrew journal under

the title: "The Wrong Way".¹⁵ In 1894 a first collection of articles was published under the title: "At the Parting of the Ways",¹⁶ to be followed by other volumes later. \ The titles suggested that the Jewish people had reached a time of crisis. It was to decide, where its future lay and Ahad Ha-am proved for several decades to be both a severe critic of wrong ways and a guide on what he thought was the right way. Many men, who were strongly influenced by the thought of Ahad Ha-am, became later important leaders of the Zionist movement.

\ Ahad Ha-am was an ardent Jewish nationalist with a burning love for the ancient Jewish homeland, but he was critical of the way in which the organization of the Lovers of Zion moved. , In his first article he asserted that he and others felt their Jewish nationality in their hearts and they derided anybody, who tried to argue out of existence something of which they had "an intuitive conviction".¹⁷ \ He belonged to that group of Jews, who "were still attached to their people by bonds which had not lost their strength, and had not yet abandoned belief in its right to exist as a single people."¹⁸ The author believed in the possibility of a national rebirth, that is in a revival, in which men were inspired with a deeper attachment to the national life and an ardent desire for the national well-being. His ideal was the devotion of the individual to the well-being of the community. This rebirth was closely connected with the ancient Jewish homeland. The heart of the Jewish people was the foundation on which that land could be regenerated.

But Ahad Ha-am was very critical of the colonization in Palestine as practiced by the Lovers of Zion. For one thing, they had started too early with their practical efforts. \ What they should have done first was to create "the invincible faith and the indomitable will that are needed for a great, constructive national effort".¹⁹ \ They should have aroused the

Built without unity

"spiritual"

→ contrasts to Herzl (see Herzberg)

necessary determination and should have obtained devoted adherents of the ideas. They should have made strenuous endeavours to train up Jews, who would have worked for their people. | They should have striven gradually to extend the empire of their ideal in Jewry, until at last they could have found genuine, whole-hearted devotees with all the qualities needed. | Ahad Ha-am also criticized the first champions of the national ideal for having had "a spice of individualism in their nationalism".²⁰ They had not been capable of planting a tree so that others might eat of its fruit, after they themselves were dead. Most of the first emigrants to Palestine had "by no means been prepared to submit cheerfully to discomfort for the sake of the national ideal".²¹ Since the national building was founded on the expectations of profit and self-interest, it had fallen into ruins. The Jewish settlements in Palestine were full of intrigues, quarrels and pettiness. Now that the ruins were there, it was necessary to mend and improve as far as possible. But the Lovers of Zion should not base their hope of ultimate success on this work. They should rather endeavour to give the idea strong roots and to deepen its hold on the Jewish people, "not by force, but by the spirit".²² | Ahad Ha-am continually stressed this spiritual aspect. | The ancestors of the Jews had learned from their prophets "to despise physical strength, and to honor only the power of the spirit."²³ On account of this emphasis Ahad Ha-am's approach was later termed "spiritual Zionism", as opposed to what was considered to be simply "practical Zionism", of which he was so critical. In spite of the reference to the prophets, the word "spirit" had not direct religious connotations. What was meant, was not the spirit of God, but like in the writings of Moses Hess, the intellectual products of the genius of the Jewish people. *"spirit" def*

The Lovers of Zion sent Ahad Ha-am to Palestine several times during the early nineties and asked him to report about his impressions. He did

so in articles entitled "Truth from Palestine".²⁴ In these he painted a gloomy picture of the situation of the Jewish settlements, and made practical proposals for the improvement of the situation. He also founded an organization by the name of "Sons of Moses", a secret society in the style of a lodge, in which the kind of devotees to the national idea were to be trained, who could bring the national ideal to realization. But Ahad Ha-am became most influential with the publication of other articles, in which he further explained his basic insights. What was needed most of all, in his opinion, was the creation of a spiritual centre in Palestine. It was only natural for Jews to imitate the cultures of other countries. Such absorption in itself was no danger to be feared. Each Jewish community enriched its Jewish individuality through competitive imitation. But there was in time the danger that these differing cultural environments would produce such a degree of diversity as to reduce Jews from a single nation to a number of separate tribes, as there had been in the beginning of the Jewish history. A new centre in Palestine could weld the scattered Jewish communities together, in spite of the disintegrating effect of the different local influences. The kind of centre Ahad Ha-am had in mind would impose itself on every community in the diaspora and would serve them as a "transmuting and unifying force".²⁵

With all these ideas Ahad Ha-am touched on religious questions. Many religiously minded Jews even felt that he got right into the centre of such concerns. His nationalism brought him quite naturally into conflict with Reform Judaism. Ahad Ha-am asserted that he could not agree with those, who felt that Jews had ceased to be a nation and were held together only by the bond of religion.²⁶ He did, however, not consider the Reform movement a danger to be feared. It was not, as even some of the reformers themselves thought, a long step towards complete assimilation. If the


Reform Jews had a genuine desire to be absorbed in the foreign life, there would be no incentive to adapt the inherited Jewish tradition to modern requirements. The attempts of the reformers were precisely the proof that on the religious side the Jewish individuality was still alive. "It is a shrunken and one-sided individuality, but it is not dead. Whether they themselves admit it, or not, they are in fact trying to express their Jewish personality while they imitate non-Jewish models".²⁷ Ahad Ha-am observed that scientific developments had shaken the foundation of every faith. The Jewish faith had not escaped. Nevertheless, those Jews, who had no spiritual guide left except that religion which was losing its hold on them, still felt that they could not give up their Judaism. Ahad Ha-am suggested what the chain was, which held the reformers fast and did not allow them to be free. It was "the instinctive national feeling which they have inherited, which is independent of religious beliefs and practices".²⁸

The reformers were in Ahad Ha-am's opinion wrong, because they thought that it was possible to strip the practical observance of the Jewish religion and retain only the kernel. They failed to see that it was just the ancient cask with its ancient form, which was holy, and not the content. The cask was filled with new wine from time to time. The "content changes ceaselessly with the progress of life and culture".²⁹ The natural instinct of the people did not react against that change of content. But it protested against those, who dared to lay hold on the holy cask. "Laugh who will at this zealous regard for the cask; the history of those, who have treasured the wine will give him pause."³⁰

Ahad Ha-am also charged that the reformers attempted to purify religious life and practice by the methods of an outdated logical criticism, which applied the measuring-rod of their own age to ancient ideas and customs. They should instead enquire objectively into the circumstances of the

emergence and the developments of these traditions. If the reformers would do that, they would come to the same conclusions, which Ahad Ha-am had reached: "Bible, Talmud and Shulhan Aruch are simply three different expressions of the genius of our people, each reflecting the circumstances and the requirements of a different epoch in its history."³¹ It was perfectly obvious to Ahad Ha-am that there was no longer any widespread demand for an iron code in the Jewish religion. The present generation could not have invented the Shulhan Aruch. But this law code had a powerful defence in the sentiment of reverence for the past. Ahad Ha-am himself thought it to be possible that some day the need for a new approach to the Jewish religious tradition would be felt. The natural process of its evolution would then be understood. The aim would then be to discover the source of the prescriptions of the Torah in the psychology of the Jewish people. It would have to be shown how and why the laws grew out of the people's material conditions and mentality, or were adopted from the outside, under stress or need. Even when such insights were to be made the basis of a new religious reform, the affection and respect for the genius of the Jewish people would be undiminished, or may even be enhanced. Something would be different, however, after such a reform along Ahad Ha-am's ideals: "But we shall no longer feel compelled to regard all the minutiae of our inherited tradition as laws and precepts binding on us everywhere and for all time."³²

This criticism of Reform Judaism implied that Ahad Ha-am was not in favour of all aspects of Orthodoxy either. (He was particularly concerned, when he felt "...that the religious ideal had conquered the national..."³³ He knew that the idea of Jewish nationalism in his own days had found adherents mainly among those Jews, whose religious faith had weakened, and who had no longer the patience to wait for divine miracles. (But this nationalism and the Jewish religion, rightly understood, had in his opinion basic-



ally the same object. He stated that the Jewish people, sunk in poverty and degradation, had been sustained by faith and hope in the divine mercy for many centuries. Something was different now. Modern Jewish nationalism promised to bring down faith and hope from heaven. Both were to be transformed "into living and active forces, making our land the goal of hope and our people the anchor of faith."³⁴ This was in accordance with all the laws and ordinances, all the blessings and curses of the Law of Moses, which had "but one unvarying object: the well-being of the nation as a whole in the land of its inheritance. The happiness of the individual is not regarded."³⁵ The individual was but one minute part of that living body, which was the community, the people of Israel, throughout the generations. It was difficult to say definitely, whether or not at any period the Jewish people as a whole really entertained the sentiment of national loyalty to a high degree, or whether it was only a moral ideal cherished by the most important section of the people. It was clear, however, that only after the destruction of the first Jewish temple had Jews begun to be more concerned about the fate of the righteous individual, who perished despite his righteousness. Not until then could the well-being of the community no longer inspire enthusiasm and idealism. It was discovered that the individual wanted pleasure and happiness and demanded reward for his personal righteousness. The national ideal had ceased to satisfy, but continued to play a part in the political life of the people. But since on the political side there was a continuous decline, the religious life grew correspondingly stronger. The individualist element prevailed more and more over the nationalist element and drove it ultimately from its last stronghold, namely the hope for a future redemption. The nation hoped for a Messianic Age in the distant future, which would give that, what the present could not give. In its original form this meant simply the emanci-

pation of Israel from servitude. Living men and women, however, were no longer satisfied with the abundance of good, which was to come to their nation in the latter end of days, when they would be dead and gone. Therefore religion began to satisfy the demand of the individual for his private and personal share of the expected general happiness. Less emphasis was placed on the redemption of the nation than on the resurrection of the dead. To seek life in death was in Ahad Ha-am's opinion a "spiritual disease",³⁶ because it led away from attending for this world.

Ahad Ha-am charged that religion had within a few centuries completely changed its own original national ideal. Patriotism was then no longer pure, selfish devotion. The common good was no longer the highest of all aims. On the contrary, the summum bonum was for each individual his personal well-being in time or in eternity. The individual cared about the common good only in so far as he himself participated in it. Subsequent events, especially the destruction of the second temple, intensified immeasurably the personal anxiety of every Jew. Interest concentrated primarily in the life of the family and that of the congregation, in which the individual found satisfaction for his needs. The national life of the people as a whole practically ceased to matter to the individual. This had created the demon of egotism, individual or congregational, which haunted all Jews and suppressed the rare manifestations of national feeling. It was to this state of feeling that an appeal had to be made in the present.

Ahad Ha-am launched also other attacks on what he thought were misunderstood religious principles. He charged that Jews were with regard to their Torah "a people of the book"³⁷ (and a slave of the book. (The book had nearly two thousand years ago ceased to be a source of ever-new inspiration and moral strength. It had rather crushed all spontaneity of action and emotion, until men had become wholly dependent on the written word and had become

incapable of responding to any stimulus in nature or in human life. The people stagnated, because heart and mind did not react directly and immediately to external events. Jews had not always been a people of the book in this sense. } Both in the era of the prophets, as well as during the Second Temple period, the source of the law and the arbiter of the written word could still be found in the heart. } If the spontaneity of thought and emotion brought Jews into conflict with the written word, they did not efface themselves to its dictates, but they revolted against it, where it no longer met their needs. The moral judgement of the people was the highest tribunal.

General

But then the Oral Law, that is the inner law, the law in the moral sense, was reduced to writing and fossilized. Conscience had no longer any authority in its own right. The written word became the arbiter in every human question. Conscience did not even have the right to approve of what the written word prescribed. The Haskalah writers of the previous generation, who had criticized the tyranny of the written word, had not got down to the root cause. They had put the blame primarily on the hard-heartedness and hide-bound conservatism of the Rabbis, who thought nothing of sacrificing the happiness of the individual on the altar of a meticulous legalism. The Haskalah writers had appealed to the moral sense of the common man against the harshness of the law. But this was a mistake. There was no difference between the attitude of the Rabbi and the ordinary man. He did not revolt either against the rigour of the law, if there was a conflict between the moral sense and the written word. The natural play of heart and mind was stifled. Logic, experience, common sense and moral feeling were alike powerless to lead men into new paths toward a goal of their own choice. This general condition had put obstacles in the way of the solution of any and every one problem. Ahad Ha-am went on to ask what was for him the paramount

question, namely, whether or not there was any possibility of curing this long-standing disease. He answered in the affirmative. He was convinced that it was possible for the Jewish people to shake off its inertia, regain contact with the actualities of life and yet remain the Jewish people. As proof for his assertion that this was possible, he pointed to the fact, that a native-born urge of this kind had come into play recently in the form of the Love of Zion movement, as he understood it. It neither excluded the written word, nor sought to modify it artificially by addition or subtraction. Love of Zion.

stands for a Judaism which shall have as its focal point the ideal of our nation's unity, its renascence, and its free development through the expression of universal human values in the terms of its own distinctive spirit.

This is the conception of Judaism on which our education and our literature must be based.³⁸

These ideas as disruptive

Ahad Ha-am reported that the Haskalah movement had tried to normalize the attitude to life of young Jews by introducing them to European culture through education and literature. It had brought humanism into Jewish life, but it had disturbed the Jewish continuity. Since it had come into Jewish life from the outside, it had created an entirely new mould for its followers. It had not repaired the defects of the Jewish mould while preserving its essential characteristics. What was required now, was a new compelling urge towards normalization springing up from Jewish life itself. This had to fuse with the humanism of the Haskalah, but had to prevent the latter from overwhelming and obliterating the Jewish mould. The ideal of the national renaissance had to become an organic element in the Jewish consciousness and an independent dynamic force. The Jewish mould had to be freed from its shackles and had to regain contact with the broad stream of human life. Ahad Ha-am was particularly concerned that it should not like the Haskalah have "to pay for its freedom by the sacrifice of its individuality".³⁹

Ahad Ha-am felt that every generation had its own needs and its own truths. It was right for the ancients to think and to act as they did in their time. It was right for his own generation to think and to act as it did in the different conditions of its own time. This created necessarily a conflict between reverence for the past, the Jewish religious tradition, and criticism of what the past had bequeathed. Such a battle was in full swing in the Jewish camp. In 1897, however, Ahad Ha-am reported that the noise of battle had died down, "and for many years there has been little controversy about our traditional laws and beliefs."⁴⁰ This was because the national idea had captured most Jewish publicists. Ahad Ha-am observed that this development had a rather peculiar effect. (The national "idea, based as it is on reverence and affection for our national genius, leads many of its adherents to consider themselves duty bound to pay homage - even if it is only lip-service - to every hallowed tradition."⁴¹ (

During the years about which Ahad Ha-am reported in these statements, a truce was observed between the religiously minded and the secularly minded Lovers of Zion.

One of those, who was most influential in arranging a compromise was Rabbi Samuel Mohilewer. He was like Rabbi Ruelph among the pious supporters of the Lovers of Zion. Mohilewer served as Rabbi in Radon, Poland, until 1883, and in Bialystok until to the time of his death in 1898. It was also the pogrom of 1881 which had convinced him that the time had come for Jews to resettle Palestine, and he was led into contact with national-minded people. A great moment had come for him, when he had been able to help persuade Baron Rothschild to support the Jewish settlement in Palestine. Mohilewer had a difficult stand in the Lovers of Zion movement. He was attacked from the outside, namely by his orthodox colleagues, for cooperating with what they considered to be avowed agnostics, who did not keep the

religious laws. On the other hand he felt that he had to urge his fellow nationalists within the movement not to offend the orthodox by overstepping the commandments of the Torah. A long series of differences between him and the main office of the "Lovers of Zion" in Odessa led in 1893 to the decision to create a new centre to win orthodox Jews for the national cause.

This new organization, which chose Rabbi Mohilewer as its head, was called Mizrahi.⁴² It was to be the pattern for that faction within the later

Zionist movement, which was founded in 1901 under the same name by disciples of Mohilewer. Rabbi Mohilewer became best known through a letter which he sent to the first Zionist Congress, and in which he summarized his thoughts and experiences in the Hibbat Zion movement during the 1880's and early 1890's.⁴³

In that letter he made it clear, why he, an observant Jew, could cooperate with people, who did not observe the religious precepts. It was as if a fire had taken hold of a home, imperiling human life as well as property.. Under such circumstances everybody would welcome anybody else who came to his rescue, even though he were irreligious in his eyes. A great fire, a fearful conflagration, was raging in the midst of Jewry, and they were all threatened. The religious Jews should gladly take the hands of those of their brethren, who stretched them out in aid, even if they did not agree with them in many respects. They should all work in complete harmony and fraternity, and the covenant of brothers would stand. These considerations of Mohilewer proved both Hess' and Pinskers' predictions right, namely that the Jewish national idea was capable of uniting different world-views, religious and secular.

Mohilewer furthermore urged his fellow-nationals not to do harm to the Chalukkah, because thousands depended on this type of charity. The livelihood of these religious-minded Jews in Palestine was in jeopardy as long as they did not have another source of income.

The Rabbi asserted moreover, that the resettlement of the Holy Land was one of the fundamental commandments of the Torah. This then was a truly religious reason for a "Back-to-Palestine" movement, one which had been important already in Rabbi Kalischer's consideration, and which was to be cited later. Mohilewer made it quite clear, that settlement meant the purchase of land and the building of houses, the planting of orchards and the cultivation of the soil in Palestine. Noteworthy is that he did not mention the founding of a state.

Mohilewer felt also, that the Torah which was the source of the life of the Jews, should be the foundation of their regeneration in the land of their fathers. Finally he dealt with the problem of the Messiah, that crucial issue with which the Jewish religion confronted the Jewish-national movement. Mohilewer's stand on this question indicated again his middle-of-the-road position, which sought to bring about a compromise. The Rabbi opposed those people who had declared that the promises of future bliss and consolation made by the prophets were in the form of symbols and parables. According to these interpreters of the Bible the coming of the Messiah would not end the dispersion, but would establish the Kingdom of Heaven for all mankind, while Israel would continue to be in exile and would serve as a light for the nations of the world. On the other hand, there were those, who had declared that nationalism was contrary to the belief in the Messiah, and rejected the Jewish-national movement for this reason.. Mohilewer himself felt that Jewish nationalism and the belief in the Messiah were not exclusive of each other. He affirmed his hope and faith that the Messiah would come and gather all the scattered people of Israel. They would eventually all live as a nation, in the fullest sense of the word, and be in their own country. Then they would no longer be the contempt and mockery of the other people, but would be respected. The honour of the Jewish people

was closely bound up with their land, and their happiness depended upon the rebuilding of Jerusalem in joy.

Mohilewer hoped that the Redeemer of Israel would bring to pass the saying of the prophet Zechariah, in which he had promised that God's people would be brought from East and West and they would dwell in Jerusalem.⁴⁴ This meant that the work of the Jewish-national movement in Palestine was something different from the belief in the future work of the Messiah, who would gather in all of Israel in the Holy Land. One can note here Mohilewer's concern, that the similarity of goals could cause confusion. | He was afraid that the secular Jewish nationalists might abandon the belief in the Messiah, and perhaps all other concerns for religion, while on the other hand the religious people would reject the Jewish national movement on religious grounds. | He himself felt that the adherence to both Jewish religion and Jewish nationalism was possible. This view, however, was not to be shared by many people, and was to be the cause of continuous debates and countless conflicts.

Chapter V

Nationalism and Religion in the First Zionist Debates in Central and Western Europe.

The "Lovers of Zion" did not find many friends in Central or Western Europe. Jewish nationalism was not a natural phenomenon there, as it had been in Russia. Nor was it thought possible that anti-Jewish outbursts like the 1881 pogroms in Russia could ever happen anywhere else. Pro-Palestine agitation was generally limited to Russian-Jewish student circles, particularly in Berlin and Vienna. Friends of Palestine formed a Maccabee Club in London, which was destined eventually to become an important platform for the first appearances of Theodor Herzl. There were, though, a few individuals whose thoughts went in the same direction as those of Pinsker, and who began to advocate similar ideas. One of those men was Mathias Acher, who wrote under the pseudonym Nathan Birnbaum. He founded a journal in Vienna, under the title Autoemanzipation, and published articles about the Jewish-national question. He became important because he coined the word "Zionism" in 1886 for that movement which sought a national rebirth of the Jewish people in its own land as the only means to solve the Jewish question.¹ He was to regret later that he had chosen this term and felt then that the word "Jewish Renaissance", which he had not coined, would have been more appropriate to summarize his ideas.² Eventually he was led to return to religious aspirations, and to reject the Zionist movement on religious grounds. In the 1880's and 1890's, however, Nathan Birnbaum was a pure, secular nationalist, who showed clearly the influence of the secularism of Pinsker. He emphasized that the Jews appeared as a nation, even where the Jewish religion had ceased with its influence, because of a "unique ineradicable national past, unique emotional feelings, temperament and ways of thinking."³ He felt that the national force of Jewry would be set free only at that moment, when it

would be able to begin a continuation of its history, that is when it would recover its language and its land.

In Cologne, another man rediscovered his nationality and began to publish a series of articles in the early 1890's. He was a lawyer by the name of Max Bodenheimer. In his memoirs he recollected that the Zionist idea was the result of a sudden inspiration. He became filled with a holy zeal to serve the cause of his people and he saw the futility of assimilation for the people as a whole. Though he was puzzled about the origin of his new ideas, he was sure that they did not come from a traditional source:

At any rate the change was inexplicable to myself, especially since it had nothing to do with religion. Rather I remained a godless atheist [sic] - if a man can be so designated who regards the idea of a personal God as the superstition of a primitive people.⁴

He related how he had encountered anti-Semitic ideas and the way in which he reacted. For him the root of the misfortune of the Jewish people was their homelessness, their dispersal among the nations. The founding of a Jewish state would change all this. As early as 1889 he had arrived at an immediate clarity, as to where the country was, which would serve as an asylum for Jews. This could only be Palestine, the old home of the Jewish people. Though he felt that religion and history both pointed in that direction, it was not religious considerations which moved him to propose that this land again become the home of the Jewish people; rather: "the awakening of a national feeling seemed connected with this country".⁵

Bodenheimer was soon to find out to his surprise that his ideas clashed with the religious convictions of other people. Among those, who opposed him, was the director of the Cologne Teachers' Seminary, Rabbi Dr. Plato, who belonged to the strictly traditional orthodox school. He told Bodenheimer that under certain circumstances he would be in favour of agricultural colonies in Palestine. He felt, however, that it would be difficult for

the settlers to keep the Schmittah and the laws of the Talmud, in which case he did not want to have anything to do with such colonies in Palestine. Rabbi Plato made it clear, that he was opposed in principle to a political solution of the Jewish question by the establishment of a Jewish state. For the first time Bodenheimer heard the objection on religious grounds to the efforts of the Jewish nationalists, which was to be mentioned more often later. The redemption was in the hands of God and the Jews should do nothing to expedite it until the Messiah came. This did not deter Bodenheimer from publishing in 1889 a brochure entitled Whither the Russian Jews?, in which he developed practical plans for the resettlement of Jewish refugees from Eastern Europe in Syria and Palestine.⁶ A few months later he called on the Zionists, in the way in which Karl Marx had called on the Proletarians some decades earlier: "Zionists of all countries, unite!"⁷ All Zionist societies throughout the world should form one great organization.

Bodenheimer proved to be a typical nationalist in his attempt to reinterpret history. In his memoirs he recalled a meeting of the Society for Jewish History in which the second century B.C. Maccabean struggle was discussed. While most participants held the traditional view, that only religious motives had been involved, Bodenheimer himself described it "as a national uprising for the liberation of the Jewish people from the ignominy of alien rule."⁸

Bodenheimer, like most of the other Zionists, was not consciously anti-religious. He knew that religion had been one aspect of Jewish life in the past and he expected that it would remain so after the national rebirth of the Jewish people in Palestine. He reasoned that certain changes would take place then. A national and political centre was to be created "as the foundation for a moral, religious, and social revival of the Jewish people."⁹

The problems, which anti-Semitism presented, were dealt with by Western Jews also in other ways than by Zionism. Most of them emphasized all the more their loyalty to their countries of residence. Interesting is the title of an anonymous pamphlet, which was published in Nuernberg, Germany, in 1893:

We will not go to Jerusalem,
but we will, if necessary, march against the enemies
of Germany together with our Christian brethren
with God for Kaiser and fatherland.

A pamphlet dedicated in love to his Catholic and Protestant brethren,
by a German of Mosaic religion
who returned to his beloved home after an absence of 38 years.¹⁰

The author stressed that the constitution of the country was the reliable ground on which the Jews in Germany could depend. It was the sanctuary around which they should rally, and which they should defend in cooperation with the noble elements among the German nation. If they would do that, anti-Semitism would pose no grave danger for them.

Representative for the specific arguments against Zionism was another pamphlet, written in 1894 by Dr. S. Adler under the title: Assimilation or National Judaism?¹¹

The author expressed his opinion that the Jews had ceased to exist as a nation, when the temple had been destroyed. Since then, the individual Jew had the same task, which the Jewish state had had up to that time, namely to hasten the coming of that era when God would be king over all the earth; and to do so in the midst of non-believers, by his confession and by his life. During past centuries the Jews had hoped for the descendant of David, who would bring them their freedom. Jerusalem would then be rebuilt as an everlasting place for the worship of the one, true God. After such a long time, during which the Jews had waited patiently and had suffered persecution, some states had accepted them as equals. This was of political, as well as of religious significance for the Jews: "They had gained Jerusalem,

the freedom, in the land of slavery."¹² They had ceased to lament in their prayers over the loss of the Holy Land, but they did not forget their mission to proclaim, as priests sent by God, his divine name everywhere through their confession. Ever since their emancipation they had been anxious to become loyal citizens of those states, which had given them their freedom, separated from their brethren only by their religion. The counter-movement of anti-Semitism would be of no avail. Nobody would believe in all seriousness that the Jews would again lose their rights and be placed under special legislation as aliens, as it had been suggested in Germany at the time. The Jews should serve "their" states with honest love. The honour and the greatness of the fatherland should give them the highest degree of happiness. Adler felt that such service could not be given by those few who had decided to join the national-Jewish movement, which had its origins in Russia and had found adherents in Austria. In Germany this movement could never had found acceptance, if it had not been for the devastating influence of anti-Semitism. Everywhere, in school and university, in business, and even in the military service, the young German Jews suffered injuries and restrictions of all kinds. Fatherland and freedom were proclaimed as the highest ideal of men, but narrow-minded people recognized as German only those, who could trace their Arian origin through many generations. Therefore young German Jews began to seek their fatherland and their freedom in the Holy Land. They emphasized their own nationality in response to the hollow enthusiasm of the German nationalists. They tried to revive the old Jewish culture, because the German culture had been wrongly over-emphasized. They claimed the superiority of the old Jewish morality in response to the senseless claim that the morality of Judaism was inferior to that of the Christians. All exaggerations and the one-sidedness of Germans

was producing an echo among Jews. What worried Adler most of all was the fact that the Jewish nationalistic enthusiasts almost completely neglected or even despised precisely that high idea, which had inspired and edified their forefathers, namely their religion. Even though they emphasized the study of Jewish history and literature and of the Hebrew language, they considered these in the first place as means for the furthering of their national ideas, but not as "sacred witnesses and monuments of an exalted confession".¹³ The result of all this was the rather surprising spectacle that national Judaism dealt in conformity with anti-Semitism with a Jewish question, which never existed and never would exist for the better and reasonable people. Both claimed, that assimilation of the Jews was impossible. The Jew remained a Jew, so these people said, even if he was of the opinion, that he had become a German, an Englishman, a Frenchman, or a Hungarian. The reason for this phenomenon was the common history of a few thousand years, race, social position, and the same pressure from the outside. Adler rejected this view by claiming that the history of the Jews had been a history of a state only in its first part. Since the temple had been destroyed, the Jews had been tied to each other only through the martyrdom, which they had to suffer for the sake of their religion, and through the development of the exalted idea of God in different periods, the highlights of which were connected with the names of Maimonides and Mendelssohn. Such a development of religious traditions could also be found in the other communities of faith. The political history of the Jewish Germans was identical with German history, ever since they had become German citizens. They had not had any political history from the time of the destruction of the Jewish state until they had been emancipated.

Jews helped their suffering and poor co-religionists in Russia in the

present, just as the Protestants in Germany had helped the Huguenots in 1685 and the Salzburger in 1731. Jews all over the world were delighted to hear that 5,000 of their brethren had found a new home in 24 settlements in Palestine through the efforts of organizations and individuals. Adler did not care, where the persecuted Jews were resettled. If the leaders of the (Lovers of Zion) movement had, after careful consideration of all conditions, come to the conclusion, that those people would find a happier and more comfortable life in Palestine, than in any other country, Adler had no objection to the settlement in the Holy Land. He warned, however, against what he considered a folly namely, of trying to establish a new Jewish state there. Nobody should attempt to make fighters out of those people, who had just been liberated from their misery, and who were to become laborious farmers, who would eat the fruits of the work of their hands. Such a utopia would bring only new, and possibly, increased misery for themselves and for their descendants. Those people, for whom not the Jewish faith, but the Jewish nationality was the highest good, would without doubt abandon their faith also, if their idea were to fail.

[The most decisive impetus for the Zionist movement came from a book written in German, by Dr. Theodor Herzl under the title "The Jewish State" (Der Judenstaat).¹⁴] The author was a journalist and playwright with a Doctor's degree in law, who lived in Vienna.¹⁵ From 1891 to 1895 he had been Paris correspondent for the leading Viennese newspaper "Neue Freie Presse." In this position it was his duty to cover among others things the beginnings of the "Dreyfus Affair." Herzl was deeply disturbed about the reaction of the public, when the verdict was pronounced and the army officer was degraded. There was apparently joy and jubilation among the on-lookers at the scene of humiliation of a soldier. When he enquired in amazement, as to why the people seemed so happy about the event, he was told that this

was because the accused was a Jew. Herzl heard even shouts of "Death to the Jews!" All this shattered him completely. Why should all Jews die, he asked himself, because one was supposedly a traitor? How could all this happen in France, of all countries, more than a century after the declaration of the rights of men? It seemed to Herzl, as if the edict of the great revolution had been revoked at that moment. He was to declare later on, that he had become a Zionist at that stage of the Dreyfus Affair.

Under the impression of this anti-Semitic outburst Herzl was to reach independently conclusions, which were very similar to those ideas, which Leo Pinsker had written down under the impact of the 1881 pogroms in Russia. Herzl did not know Pinsker's Autoemancipation, when he wrote his own book "The Jewish State", and he was to declare that he would not have written his pamphlet, if he had known that of his predecessor. Nor for that matter did he know any of the other contributions to the question, like those of Moses Hess, Rabbi Ruelph, Max Bodenheimer, Nathan Birnbaum, or others. He was aware, however, of the attempts at colonization in Palestine and of the existence of a Zionist movement, both of which he did not regard too highly.

Like Hess and Pinsker before him, Herzl proposed the restoration of the Jewish state. He stressed that his scheme was not a Utopia and he was absolutely convinced that this state would eventually be created. Herzl doubted, however, that he himself or others, who inaugurated the new movement towards this end, would live to see its glorious close. If enough Jews would cooperate, the plan could become a reality, and the accomplishment would present no difficulties worth mentioning. The Jewish state would open a bright prospect of freedom, happiness, and honour to ambitious young men.

What made this move necessary, was the Jewish question, a remnant of the Middle Ages. It existed, wherever Jews lived in perceptible numbers. Wherever it did not exist, it was carried by Jews in the course of their wanderings. Naturally they moved to places, where they were not persecuted, but there their presence produced persecution. The seed of anti-Semitism was thus carried even into highly civilized countries. ~~The nations in whose midst the Jews lived were all either covertly or openly anti-Semitic.~~ Herzl was convinced that old prejudices were lying deep in the hearts of the people. The Jews could not hope for a change in the current of feeling.

The Jewish question was no more a social than a religious one, although it could take these and other forms. Nobody should confound modern anti-Semitism with the religious persecution of Jews in former times.

Although it took a religious bias in some countries, it was mainly a result of the emancipation. Following this generous action by the civilized nations, the Jews had attempted to assimilate with the people in whose midst they lived. They honestly endeavoured everywhere to merge in the social life of the surrounding communities, while preserving the faith of their fathers. They were, however, not permitted to do so. In vain they were loyal patriots. In countries, where they had lived for centuries, they were still cried down as strangers. Assimilation was not only external conformity in dress, habits, customs, and language, but also identity of feeling and manner. That, however, could only be effected by intermarriage. The need for mixed marriages would have had to be felt by the majority, Jews and non-Jews alike, which was not the case. Not even Herzl himself desired such an end. The Jewish national character was too historically famous, and in spite of every degradation, too fine to make its annihilation desirable. The distinctive nationality of the Jews could not and would not be destroyed. The Jews might perhaps be able to merge entirely with the surrounding races, if

these were to leave them in peace for a period of two generations. But they would not leave them in peace. Toleration lasted always only for a short period, and then hostility broke out again. ←

Like Pinsker before him, Herzl under the impact of anti-Semitism had reached the conclusion that the Jews were a people. Their enemies had made them one. (The Jewish question was a national one. (It had to be solved by making it a political world-question,) to be discussed and settled by the civilized nations of the world in council.) The Jews should ask for sovereignty over a portion of the globe, large enough to satisfy the rightful requirements of a nation. The movement towards the organization of a Jewish state would have a very beneficial effect for all concerned: * it would stop anti-Semitism at once and forever. (It was the conclusion of peace. The new state would be neutral, and would probably have no enemies.)

Previous efforts to solve the Jewish question had failed. Herzl criticized the foolishness of those Zionists who would have liked to revert to old stages of civilization. The attempts to convert the Jews into peasants was a retrograde step. The peasant was a type which was in course of extinction. (The attempts at colonization made by benevolent men were too petty.) No individual could transport a nation from one habitation to another. Only an idea could do that, and the idea of a state had the requisite power. One could learn, however, from the experiences and mistakes of the philanthropists, who were the practical fore-runners of the Jewish state. This would assure that the idea could be carried out successfully, if undertaken on a large scale. Herzl regretted, that these attempts at colonization had done harm, too. By an artificial infiltration the Jews had not only carried anti-Semitism into countries they wished to settle. Far worse was the circumstance that unsatisfactory results tended to cast

doubts about the feasibility of any such project on intelligent men. Herzl felt that the Jews were strong enough to form a state, even a model state. Theirs would become the promised land indeed, among other things, because they would introduce a 7-hour work day.

Herzl went to great lengths in giving practical suggestions, as to how the plan could be accomplished. It would be carried out by two agencies: the Society of Jews and the Jewish Company. The Society of Jews would do preparatory work in the domains of science and politics. It would confer and deal with governments in the name of the Jewish people. The Society would thus be acknowledged as a state-creating power. Among its tasks would be to acquire land, which had to be secured by international law. The Jewish Company would be the liquidating agent of the business interests of departing Jews, and would organize commerce and trade in the new country. Herzl described in detail the activities of these two agencies, and how their work would effect both the departing Jews and those, who wished to remain in their old countries. The departure would not be a sudden one. It would be a gradual, continuous flow, and would cover many decades. The poorest would be the first to go. Only the desperate made good conquerors. A hundred, or even fifty years earlier Herzl's plan would have been nothing more than a dream. The technical achievements of his own age made it possible that the scheme could become a reality. In one respect, however, it would be a repetition of history. Herzl exclaimed: "The Maccabeans will rise again!"¹⁶ The Jews would again live as free men on their own soil, and die peacefully in their own homes. The world would be freed by their liberty, enriched by their wealth, magnified by their greatness. Whatever they attempted to accomplish for their own welfare, would react powerfully and beneficially for the good of humanity.

An open question for Herzl was, where the land should be, and he was

as much a "Territorialist" at the time when he wrote "The Jewish State" as Pinsker was, when he wrote Autoemancipation. For Herzl two territories came under consideration, Palestine and Argentine. In both countries experiments of colonization had been made, though on the mistaken principle of gradual infiltrations. Immigration was futile unless the Jews had the sovereign right over the land, preferably under the protectorate of the European powers. Enormous advantages would be offered to the present masters of the land. The Jews would chose that country, which was given to them and what was selected by Jewish public opinion. Argentine was for various reasons a definite possibility. Palestine, on the other hand, had the advantage of being the ever-memorable historic home of the Jews. The very name would attract the Jewish people with a force of marvellous potency. If the Sultan would give this land to them, they would in return undertake to regulate the whole finances of Turkey. It was not religious reasons, which moved Herzl to propose this land as a possible home for the Jewish people. Not a kingdom of God was to be built there, but:

We should there form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism.¹⁷

Herzl never made a secret out of the fact that there really was no religious motivation behind his plan. He told later Chief-Rabbi Guedemann of Vienna and Chief-Rabbi Adler of London that he was not obeying any religious impulse in his project. This was not to mean that he was anti-religious. Herzl assured them: "But I certainly honor the faith of my fathers, at least as much I would honor other faiths."¹⁸

The same attitude towards the Jewish religion was expressed in The Jewish State. Herzl made it obvious that he realized the importance of his religion in the past. The ancient faith had kept the Jews together and they recognized each other even in his own time only by their religion.

Herzl was firmly convinced that the religious leaders would whole-heartedly support his idea. After all, he proposed the realization of the ancient dream: Next year in Jerusalem! The Rabbis would be the first to cooperate for the realization of the national idea. Prayers would be offered in the temples. These prayers would contribute to the festive spirit before the departure and during the journey of the Jews to their own state. A centre for the deep religious needs of the people would be created there. The temple would be seen from a long distance. Herzl emphasized that he did not want to hurt anyone's religious sensitivities by words which might be wrongly interpreted.

goal

All this did not mean, however, that anybody should be forced to adhere to certain religious precepts in the new state. There would be religious toleration, which the Jews had learned in Europe. Everybody could find salvation in his own particular way, free and undisturbed in his faith or disbelief. Herzl welcomed above and before all the immortal band of Jewish freethinkers, who were continually making new conquests for humanity. No more force would be exercised on any one than was necessary for the preservation of the state and of order. Herzl excluded Jewish religious concepts in this connection. The theories of a divine institution or of superior power would not be the basis of the constitution of the state, but rather the theory of rationality. The penal code would have the same principles as in every other civilized nation, which meant, of course, that it would not be based upon Biblical or Talmudic laws. Any theocratic tendencies coming to the fore on the part of the religious leaders would be prevented. The clergy would be confined to the temples in the same way, as the professional army would be kept within the confines of their barracks. Army and priesthood would receive honours as their valuable functions deserved.

They would, however, not be permitted to interfere with the administration of that state, which conferred distinction upon them. Otherwise they would conjure up difficulties without and within.

Herzl was surprised and angered, when the Chief-Rabbi of Vienna attacked Zionism for religious reasons. Dr. M. Guedemann published in 1897 a pamphlet under the title National Judaism ("Nationaljudenthum"), in which he did not mention Herzl by name. It was, however, quite obvious, that he intended to refute his ideas and those of his friends. Guedemann stated that national Judaism owed its existence to anti-Semitism, and was less than thirty years old. Jews had used to claim German, French or English nationality, depending on where they lived. It was only when anti-Semitism adopted a national character, that Jews reacted by using the term Judaism, which up to that time had designated their religious conviction, also for their nationality. Since Jews were no longer a nation, and did not possess their own territory, it was only natural, that those people, who called themselves national Jews, tried to reawaken the Jewish state. This was the goal of the so-called Zionist movement. (It had a purely religious root, namely the veneration of the place, where the former sanctuary, the temple, had stood. (This veneration in itself, however, had nothing to do with political conditions, just as the Jewish religion in general was free of such ties. (The persecution of the Jews in Russia had given the impetus for the foundation of a political Zionism in Eastern Europe, which merged with the national Judaism, which was represented in the West.

Guedemann tried to explain this phenomenon psychologically. The movement was caused by indignation, embitterment, and pride. After it had been started, the Jewish-national question had been discussed from different points of view, ethnological, political and economic. Some saw in the national rebirth of the Jews the salvation, others an unfortunate aberration.

In the arguments concerning the future fate of the Jews, something had almost completely been overlooked: the Jewish religion. Guedemann felt that its guidance should in all Jewish questions be considered first and should be decisive. The desirable improvement of the external living conditions were bought at too high a price, if the Jewish religion were falsified. To deal with Judaism in accordance with the needs of the hour, was unscientific and it could happen that it would be destroyed in the process, precisely while one wanted to help it.

One should take only those views into consideration, which were in harmony with the eternal truths of Judaism and the spirit of its history. This was important not only for the Jews. Their Holy Scriptures were one of the foundations upon which the culture and the morality of the whole, civilized world was built. Even if the climate of opinion of the age were hostile to the Jews, the traces of the religion of Israel, had not been eradicated. A treatment of the idea of nationality and its meaning within the Jewish religion would therefore be of interest to the general public.

Guedemann asserted the historical fact that the Jews, also called Israel, had once been a nation. Between the time when these people settled down in Palestine until to the time when the second temple was destroyed, all the features were apparent, on which national consciousness rested: unity with regard to fatherland, language, religion, law, and customs. To that extent Israel had been like the other nations. In another respect, however, there was a very basic difference. Wars were considered in Israel as wars of God. Men fought before him and for him. Victories were God's victories, and not those of men, even if these had the stature of Moses, Deborah or David. Not men were glorified in song and poem, but God was always the true hero. It was different among all other nations. There the

human element was emphasized to such a degree, that war heroes were sometimes elevated to Gods. To be sure, Greek and Roman heroes recognized the share, which the God had in their triumphs. This was, however, hardly comparable with the kind of humility and gratitude with which a man like David glorified the divine rule of the world in a passage like psalm 18.

This attitude of the Israelites had its consequences in the definition of the idea of a nation. All other nations were created and were later on destroyed through war. Through fighting the national enthusiasm was kindled and the masses were united. It was different in Israel. (Not the sword created the national consciousness and unity there, but the covenant with the one, eternal God. | The ideas of the nation and of God were inseparable. Israel became a people by becoming the people of God. Therefore could the national consciousness and national feelings never become as predominant in Israel, as they had been among all other people in antiquity or even in the present. The Israelites saw precisely in the different ideas with regard to nationalism the basic difference between themselves and all others, who were summarily called "the nations". It was really not Israel, but its God, who was confronted with the nations and therefore with their Gods. Guedenann presented several passages, especially from the Psalms, as proof for this claim.²⁰ The Israelite poets spoke in the name of God to the nations. They proclaimed to them that all human power and greatness, which were the pride of the nations, would come to nothing before him. Therefore the people of Israel could hardly regard as very important such differences as birth and ancestry. These were only weak lines of differentiation, which disappeared before the equalizing power of death. Everything that divided people was also nothing, if compared with the one remaining and indestructable fact, that the eternal one ruled. Guedenann did not deny

that there were differences between the nations. They had their possessions and their borders. Israel, however, was not tied to the possession of its soil, or to a certain land. It was itself the possession of God. There never was a feeling of superiority towards the alien on the part of the Israelites. They always considered themselves strangers and sojourners even in their own land. Their vision and their longing were directed towards something higher, eternal, and universal. This was the true home of Israel. A kind of transcendental direction of its longings was its peculiarity. Therefore Israel felt called to become the teacher of the nations, to bring salvation unto the ends of the earth. It was remarkable that this calling was proclaimed by the second Isaiah, who prophesied when Israel did not have a land of its own. Judah had been extinguished as a nation during the Babylonian exile, but it developed into Judaism. The state became a church, the nation became a congregation, and Judaism discovered its world mission. In this religious task, and not in an emphasis on the national character, rested the often misunderstood claim of the chosenness of Israel. It was chosen, because it did not care for the very values, which were the ambition and pride of the other nations: the state, its expansion, and citizenship in it.

Israel's hope was precisely that some time in the future all the nations would give up their primitive, national pride. On the ruins of the national and political ambitions would one day be built the messianic kingdom. Salvation did not come through the exclusiveness of an innate national consciousness for any nation, let alone for Israel. Guedemann intended to show with all this that the modern emphasis on everything "national" was contradictory to the spirit of the Torah, of the prophets and of the Psalms. It was therefore contrary to the way, which was predestined for the people

relig-

* quote

of Israel. They were constantly warned in the Pentateuch not to imitate the other nations; not to walk in their paths, but rather to separate from them. This referred not only to religious and ethical aberrations, but above all to the emphasis on the national individuality and the development of an innate national consciousness. Israel's task was precisely to work for an amalgamation of the nations. ✓

The warnings against following in the paths of the other people had been necessary already in antiquity. According to its own statement²¹ Israel was tempted to establish kingship only for the reason, that it wanted to be like all the other nations. Kingship was the natural expression of that national self-consciousness which was striving for earthly power and greatness. It was therefore never conducive for the higher calling of Israel. The prophets opposed more or less openly and corrected constantly the institution of kingship.

Guedemann saw on the other hand, that national consciousness was also a protection, when the independence and the religion of the Jewish people were endangered. It awoke during such times, or it was kindled by the leaders. One should realize, however, that the national consciousness was gradually transformed into a purely religious consciousness. In this way was during the Babylonian exile the first "Zionism" created, which was only in its outward appearance political, but in its inner core of a religious nature. It led to the re-establishment of the state and of the temple.

Guedemann had something to say in this connection also about those events, which Pinsker, Bodenheimer, Herzl, and other Zionists had referred to, and had hoped would be repeated: the rising of the Maccabees in the second century B.C. The Rabbi reported that once more were the Jewish

national feelings aroused, when the Syrian yoke had to be shaken off and the religious convictions had to be protected against the influence of the Greek Weltanschauung. Again did the national consciousness find its adequate expression in the establishment of kingship, in this case the Hasmonaïc. There was, however, at that time already a widespread Diaspora. While Palestinian Judaism, clothed with national and political independence, moved towards destruction, the Diaspora adopted and furthered the mission to mankind. The Diaspora felt its national consciousness disappear gradually and was connected with the motherland only through religious ties. This had the effect of weakening the national consciousness even of the heathen people, in whose midst the Jews lived. It had never happened before, that people, who had ceased to be a nation and who were without their own territory, continued to be a united community of faith. This caused other nations to think about the vanity of states, which were built solely upon a national foundation. Guedemann felt that the Jewish religion was anti-national. It managed even after the destruction of the Jewish state, to undermine the great Roman Empire. On the other hand this religion was also capable of letting it dawn on the world of antiquity that on the ruins of the national barriers a brotherhood of mankind could and would be erected, united in the faith in the one, invisible God. The means, which the scattered Jewish colonies used in this work, was the Greek Bible.

Guedemann asserted that Jewish nationality and religion were not identical. The Jewish Diaspora did not have a national peculiarity. It had exchanged it with a higher point of view, which gave it a wider horizon. Contrary to the Zionists, Guedemann had a high regard for the Jews in the Diaspora. They were not the by-product of the people of Israel, not its cut-off branches. They were rather the executors of the testament of the prophets. They were the people of God, scattered and without fatherland.

Only in this way were they capable of directing the views of the heathen towards an ideal fatherland, common to all mankind, namely the kingdom of God, in which there would be no more nationalities, but only human beings. One can detect in these statements influences of the German enlightenment. But Guedemann himself was convinced that he was dealing with genuine and original Jewish concepts. He went on to say that the kingdom of God was the central idea of the Jewish religion with which even Christianity identified itself and which it had developed further. Israel had suffered for that idea for eighteen hundred years, but had never given up the hope that it would eventually be fulfilled.

Guedemann stated that emphasis on nationality was neither Christian nor Jewish. If all adherents of Judaism would try to become a nation again, this would mean suicide. The future would be sacrificed for a dubious present. Judaism had on the contrary the historical mission to work for the abandonment of the individuality of the nations and to strive for a union of all mankind in one big family.

In the evaluation of the nineteenth century Jewish assimilation Guedemann differed also from the Zionists. This was nothing new. Jews had in many ages and in different countries been able to assimilate to the surrounding nations and to adjust themselves to the conditions of the times. This did not mean, however, complete abandonment of their peculiarities. During the Middle Ages they were forced into isolation in the Ghetto. Some Jews began to get accustomed to isolation and liked it. But this undercurrent of the history of the Jews did not stand before the judgement throne of history. The highlights of the Diaspora were connected with the great names of Philo, Maimonides and Mendelssohn. Assimilation was to be condemned only, if it went to the extreme of abandoning Judaism and its principles. Jews should continue to assimilate, if they followed those

great examples and made the content of the teachings of Judaism available to a greater public. Guedemann felt that the national Jews were not only wrong in criticizing the recent attempts at assimilation. They themselves were products of an extremism of assimilation, because they introduced the national chauvinism of the present into Judaism. If Israel had to heed to any Biblical warning, it was the one not to imitate the other nations. It should do so particularly in this respect. Judaism would really get to sit between two chairs among the people, in case it would accomplish a national restoration. It would have to worry about the protection of the restored independence more than ever before. How difficult it was even for powerful states to survive, showed their military budgets, which exhausted the capabilities of the people to pay taxes. A Judaism with guns and bayonettes would exchange the role of David for that of Goliath. To work for a national restoration would mean to reject the spirit of the Jewish religion. This would be true even in case the European powers would transfer and guarantee Palestine to the Jews. They would then consider as fair the judgement of those who considered the two thousand years of Jewish Diaspora as a sign of divine rejection. In reality it was one of the most glorious periods of the history of Judaism. It showed that Judaism was indestructible. Jewry was more than a national entity and it was not tied to a certain location.

These insights should not prevent anybody from supporting those, for whom life was too difficult in their old home, and who therefore had to migrate. One could only wish and hope that the Jewish colonies, whether they were in the Holy Land, or somewhere else, would flourish. It would, however, be wrong, and contradicted the spirit of Judaism and of its history, if this colonization would be combined with national aspirations.

and be considered as a fulfillment of Biblical prophecies. (The future, which the prophets forecast, was not a national rehabilitation, a national restoration in Palestine with all the requirements of the independence of a state.

It was rather the brotherhood of all mankind, its ethical perfection. Many Jews longed to be in the Holy Land. Some wanted to be buried there. The veneration of Zion did not and would not disappear from the hearts of Jews. Settlement in the Holy Land was a meritorious and pious act, justified through history. But never had any authorized person issued a call to all Jews to recover their national independence in a kind of bloodless crusade. This would always have been considered as an interference with the guidance of God, in whose plans the Diaspora had a foreordained place. Zion was considered by the Jews as the symbol of their own future, and of that of all mankind. This was the meaning of the Jewish prayers for the return to Zion, a meaning which was obviously all but national. The teachings of Judaism and its history did not prevent the Jews from fulfilling their civic duties in the countries in which they lived. This conviction was based on Jeremiah 29:7 f. The exiles should seek the welfare of the city, where the Lord had sent them. Jews should be loyal citizens, and beware that their civic rights were not taken from them. Judaism was strong enough to survive even the adverse conditions of the present. Guedemann felt strongly about what he thought was the danger posed by every national movement, including Zionism:

Do not let anybody lay the cuckoo's egg of the nationality into our nest, nothing good will be hatched out. What does Grillparzer say? 'From humanity - through nationality - to bestiality'.

Jews should be warned against participation in such a development.

They had only one guideline, and this they should follow: their faith.

Herzl responded with an article, in which he tried to ridicule Guede-

mann and charged him with being inconsistent and contradictory.²³ The Chief-Rabbi had received the manuscript of The Jewish State prior to publication and had found nothing to criticize. He had apparently changed his mind in the meantime.²⁴ Guedemann was, however, not the first Chief-Rabbi, who publicly took a stand against national Judaism. The Chief-Rabbi of London, Dr. Adler, had done so before, while another Chief-Rabbi, Dr. Gaster, was in favour of Zionism. Herzl could not understand, why Guedemann claimed on the one hand that the Jewish religion should have nothing to do with the political conditions, and on the other hand had to be consulted concerning the Jewish-national question. Reference was made to a recently published pamphlet by a Jewish merchant in Russia. The writer had pointed out that the colonization movement had been founded by pious people fifty years earlier with the clear intention of eventually creating a state. The book Seeking Zion contained more than a hundred favorable evaluations by the greatest Rabbis. This proved Guedemann wrong in his claim that there had never been an authorized person who had issued a call to all Jews to regain their national independence. Nevertheless, Herzl felt, that religion should not be decisive. This would mean to leave it up to the arguments of the theologians, who were too learned ever to come to an agreement. Zionism represented all sons of the Jewish nation, whether free-thinkers or Orthodox. It wanted to lead to the Zion of the poor, the young and even the pious people.

Herzl could not understand Guedemann's statement that Jews had been a nation in antiquity, but were no longer one or should not even be one in the present. Herzl also rejected the idea of a Jewish mission. He had learned from the Chief-Rabbi himself that Judaism did not want to make converts. Those, who claimed to be Jewish missionaries, were all well off,

while Zionism wanted to help the poor. Herzl found most outrageous what Guedemann had to say concerning prayers for Zion. Precisely when the general conditions of the times made the return to Zion a real possibility, did the Chief-Rabbi feel compelled to tell the people that the prayers to this end had only a symbolic meaning. Guedemann had also claimed that the true Zionism could not be divorced from the future of mankind, as a whole. This was true. It was in fact precisely what was meant, when he, Herzl himself, spoke about Zionism, namely the social reforms (seven-hour work day), the tolerance and the love towards the poorest among the rejected people.

Shortly thereafter Max Nordau also felt compelled to refute Dr. Guedemann's pamphlet with similar arguments.²⁵ The author stated that Guedemann wanted to fight against Zionism in the theological arena. It would be childish to accept this challenge. Nordau declared emphatically: "Zionism has absolutely nothing to do with theology. It is not a religious movement, but a political, economic, moral (sittengeschichtlich), and sociological one."²⁶ The fact that the name of the movement made one recall Biblical events should not be misused to introduce arguments originating from the Torah and the Mishnah. The name Zion was chosen not for religious reasons, but for historical ones. The emergency situation of the present time and not the Torah and the Mishnah had moved Jews to desire the establishment of a new Zion-Empire. The name Zion had not created and did not justify the Zionist aspirations. It had rather added dynamic emotions through the memories which it awakened. This still was an important function, but "it is not a religious function".²⁷

Herzl's book about the Jewish State stirred up many other debates and caused very different reactions all over the world. By way of contrast to Guedemann's reply it is interesting to note that great enthusiasm was

aroused among the Jews in Sofia. The Chief-Rabbi of Bulgaria is supposed to have considered Herzl to be the Messiah.²⁸ This was, however, a suggestion, which Herzl himself as well as his followers, refuted just as vehemently, as they rejected attacks on religious grounds. Max Nordau wrote in 1898 concerning the Messianic question:

The leaders of the Zionist movement do not lay the blasphemous claim, to be the Messiah or to be a small version of the Messiah. They feel they are²⁹ incapable of performing miracles and they do not promise it either.

When Herzl was in Jerusalem that same year, he avoided carefully every movement, which could have been interpreted by over-eager followers as a Messianic claim.³⁰ He did not mount a white horse, or a white ass, out of fear, that this could be interpreted as a fulfillment of a Biblical prophecy concerning the coming of the Messiah.³¹ On one occasion Herzl was, however, compared with Joshua.³² More often parallels were drawn between him and Moses. When this was done at one occasion by - of all people - Chief-Rabbi Guede am, Herzl reacted, as he probably always did in a case like this, in the following way: "I laughingly rejected the thought, and I was completely sincere about it."³³

Max Nordau was often called a new Jeremiah, who proclaimed the lamentations of his people. This comparison was apparently thought to be quite appropriate,³⁴ although it did not mean that Nordau was considered to be a religious leader. He himself declared in 1900:

I have never claimed that Zionism is a matter of faith for me. I have always said exactly the contrary. I have always declared that the Zionist movement is a national-Jewish one, which I can join, because I belong to the Jewish race, the Jewish people. The Jewish people include pious adherents of the religious tradition, as well as free-thinkers.³⁵

He himself belonged to the latter group. Like many other Jews of Western Europe, he did not have the hope any more, that the Messiah would come and would exalt them to glory on a day of miracles.³⁶

Chapter VI

The First Zionist Congress and the Religious Issues.

Theodor Herzl had considered it to be his task to propose the founding of the Jewish State. He felt that with the publication of his book he had done his duty. Against even his own expectations he was to find himself within only one and a half years in the role of the leader of a world-wide movement. Plans for a Zionist Congress were discussed in earnest during 1896 and early in 1897. This was to be that representative assembly of world-Jewry, about which the forerunners of Zionism had dreamed and which Herzl himself had proposed in his programmatic book. The final decision to call such a Congress was reached in Vienna by Herzl and some friends in March of 1897. The proposed location was Munich. During the preparations within the next few months religious issues came to the fore and protests against both the planned Congress, as well as the projected founding of a Jewish state were issued, because they were supposedly in contradiction to the essence of the Jewish religion. This made it necessary to change the location of the Congress. It also had an impact on the strategy of Herzl and his friends at the proceedings of that meeting and on their policies in general for years to come.

Neither the Rabbi nor the Jewish congregation ("israelitische Kultgemeinde") in Munich were officially informed about the plan to hold the Zionist Congress in their city. They read about the projected "Munich Congress" in newspaper reports, which were carried by the press both in the U.S.A. as well as in Germany. The Board of the congregation thereupon studied the matter carefully, exchanged letters with Herzl and finally protested formally against Munich as meeting place. One reason for this protest was the fear that the loyalty of Jews towards their country of birth could be doubted and that the whole idea of national Judaism would just add

grist to the mills of the anti-Semites. In a newspaper article written by a member of the Jewish community and published in June 1897 it was pointed out that the idea of the founding of a Jewish state found followers only in countries, where Jews were exposed to persecutions. German Jews, as well as the greatest part of Jewry in general rejected those aims and considered them as fancies, which originated from pathological conditions and would disappear as quickly as they had come. It was stated that the congregation was not opposed to the building up of agricultural centres in Palestine. However, the entire Jewish population of Munich, so the report said, was of the opinion "that national Zionist aims are contradictory to the spirit of Judaism and must be rejected with all determination possible".¹ Herzl and his followers thereupon changed the location. The Congress was finally held in Basel.

Protests using similar arguments were to come not only from the Munich congregation, but also from Rabbinical assemblies, meeting in the summer of 1897, both in North America, as well as in Germany. On July 6, 1897 the "Central Conference of American Rabbis", representing Reform Judaism met in Montreal. In his opening address President Dr. I. M. Wise referred to the planned Congress as messianic and one which would not concern Jews in America, if it were not for the fact that the projects had been discussed at public meetings and in the press even on this continent. Dr. Wise left no doubt where he himself stood, when he described the meetings of Zionists in America, at which delegates for the Congress were elected, and the press reports covering the events. The advocates of the political schemes

compromised in the eyes of the public the whole of American Judaism as the phantastic dupes of thoughtless Utopia, which is to us a fata morgana, a momentary inebriation of morbid minds and a prostitution of Israel's holy cause to a madman's dance of unsound politicians.²

By dubbing the movement "messianic" Dr. Wise suggested that it was bound to failure like earlier attempts led by a false Messiah.³

The Committee dealing with Wise's annual message replied dutifully on July 8, 1897 with a resolution totally disapproving of any attempt to establish a Jewish state. Such ideas were a misunderstanding of Israel's mission, which was the promotion among the whole human race of that broad and universalistic religion which was first proclaimed by the Jewish prophets. The resolution also expressed concern about the situation of Jews in countries where they were still persecuted. The Zionist program confirmed the assertion of the enemies, that the Jews were foreigners in the countries in which they were at home, even though they were in fact everywhere most loyal and patriotic citizens. The resolution closed with the following statement:

We affirm that the object of Judaism is not political nor national, but spiritual, and addresses itself to the continuous growth of peace, justice and love in the human race, to a messianic time, when all men will recognize that they form 'one great brotherhood' for the establishment of God's kingdom on earth.⁴

Here then was the ideal of what was thought to be the true messianism spelled out, which was very different from the narrow nationalistic goals of the Zionists.

The same topic came up at a meeting in Germany, where the thinking of many Rabbis was similar to that of their counterparts in North America. The executive of the association of Rabbis in Germany ("Rabbiner-Verband in Deutschland") representing Reform Jews as well as Orthodox, published on July 6, 1897 the following appeal in the German press, which was to be reprinted in many newspapers and quoted in the Zionist literature:

Due to the fact that a Zionist Congress was called and its agenda published, such erroneous ideas about the teachings of Judaism and the goals of its adherents were spread, that the executive of the association of Rabbis in Germany feels compelled to make the following statement. 1) The goals of the so-called Zionists, to establish a Jewish state in Palestine, contradict the messianic promises of

of Judaism contained in the Bible and in the later religious literature. 2) Judaism makes it an obligation for its adherents, to serve the fatherland to which they belong with devotion, and to further the national interests with all their heart and with all their strength. 3) Not in contradiction to these obligations are those efforts, which have as their goal the colonization of Palestine by Jewish farmers, because they are not related to the founding of a Jewish state. Both religion and the fatherland oblige us therefore in the same way, to ask all those, who care for the welfare of Judaism, to abstain from the above mentioned Zionist aspirations and especially to stay away from the Congress, which is still being prepared in spite of all warnings against it.

The German Zionists were ready for a fight and refuted the appeal with a counter-declaration dated July 11, 1897.⁶ In this reply reference was made to Kalischer's book Seeking Zion, in which the author had shown that Zionism was not in contradistinction to the messianic promises of Judaism. Moreover, it was stated, Zionism did not deal with the teachings of Judaism at all, but with the abnormal conditions under which the Jewish people had to live. Herzl himself wrote only a few days later an article in his own paper Die Welt arguing in a similar way.⁷ He tried to use those Rabbis, who supported Zionism against his opponents. He dubbed the latter "Protest-Rabbis" and declared them to be enemies of the Jewish people. Their attitude was in his eyes monstrous. Their declaration rested on a basic untruth. In the invitation to the Congress there was no mention at all of the teachings of Judaism. If wrong notions about these teachings were really spread, it must have had different causes. The Congress would take place in spite of the admonitions of the Protest-Rabbis, because the scattered people were longing for it with their aspirations and hopes. Zionism would lead to a wholesome crisis within Judaism. The differences of opinion which were created would lead to a purge of the national character. It was good that a distinction could now be made between those Rabbis, who suffered with their poor brethren in faith when these were persecuted, and between those employees of the Synagogues, who worked against the salvation of their own people,

namely the "rotest-Rabbis.

In this kind of debate Herzl was at his literary best, and he hit his opponents hard. The term "rotest-Rabbis" stuck. The fact, however, that Herzl was forced into such an argument, was a real blow for him, because basically he was not anti-religious. In his plans for the founding of the Jewish state he had assigned a special role to the spiritual leaders of the congregations. Only a year and a half earlier he had written:

Our Rabbis, on whom we especially call, will devote their energies to the service of our idea and will inspire their congregations by preaching it from the pulpit ... The Rabbis will receive communications regularly from both Society and Company, and will announce and explain these to their congregations. Israel will pray for us and for itself.

And now a number of these spiritual leaders of Israel warned their congregations against Zionism and launched protests against the Congress, which was to take place only six weeks later. Professor Schapira in a letter to Dr. Bodenheimer gave expression to what Herzl and his friends probably all felt concerning religious arguments at the time: "That was all that was missing! The Congress will have to avoid religious polemics..."⁹ The Zionist leadership seems to have been resolved in any case to observe strict neutrality towards the Jewish religion. The program of the movement should not be based on religious precepts, so as not to offend the free-thinkers, or those adhering to a different brand of religious tradition. On the other hand were religious issues to be avoided, so as not to offend the religiously-minded people among the Jews. Herzl compared the direction of the proceedings at the Congress to an "egg-dance amongst eggs which are all invisible". Among the "eggs", which worried him most of all, he mentioned: "2. Egg of the Orthodox. 3. Egg of the Modernists."¹⁰

(The First Zionist Congress was finally opened on August 27, 1897 at Basel with 204 delegates from all parts of the world attending.) Herzl

recalled that in spite of his determination to avoid religious questions, right at the start, before he had even taken the chair, "things didn't click".¹¹ The opening address was given by Dr. Karl Lippe of Jassy, who was presiding as senior chairman.¹² Herzl reported in his Diaries:

It had been agreed that he was to talk for ten minutes at most. In the great hubbub he had not submitted his speech to me; and now, when he was standing up there, he spoke without stopping for a half-hour and made one blunder after another. I sat below him on the platform, next to Nordau, sent word up to Lippe four times, begging him to stop and finally threatening him. The thing was beginning to verge on the ridiculous.¹³

The opening speech by Lippe and Herzl's vote of disapproval are significant, because they give an indication of the issues at stake with regard to the relation of Jewish nationalism to the Jewish religion. Dr. Lippe was one of those few religiously-minded Jews, who felt that not only should his religious convictions not prevent him from Zionist activities. Even though he had to reject some traditional religious concepts, similar to the way such proto-Zionists as Alkalai and Kalischer had done, he felt that there were also compelling religious reasons to engage in Zionist work.

Dr. Lippe opened his address by reporting about his own role in the Lovers of Zion movement, praised its achievements and then expressed his joy over the big leap forward and the progress made during the past few years. These references were probably the first blunder in Herzl's eyes. He himself had been extremely critical and contemptuous of the previous colonization work¹⁴ and wanted to make a fresh, clean start with the Congress and not have it considered as continuation of the Lovers of Zion efforts. Lippe went on to say that this assembly was the first of its kind within eighteen hundred years of the third exile. The subject matter to be discussed was the return of the Jews to the land of their fathers, the Holy Land, which God had promised to Abraham and to his descendants. It will be recalled that

Herzl had wanted a land for the Jews and the founding of a state, even if it was not in Palestine.¹⁵ He had rejected "theories of a divine institution, or of superior power, or of a contract, and the patriarchal and patrimonial theories"¹⁶ with regard to the legal basis of the new state, as well as "theocratic tendencies".¹⁷ Pinsker had stated even more clearly that Jews in his own days sought precisely not the "Holy Land", but just a land of their own.¹⁸ The following argumentation of Dr. Lippe in his opening address did probably not meet Herzl's approval either. The speaker said that the Jews had waited for salvation from their dispersion through a divine, supernatural miracle. Pressed by enemies from all sides they had got tired of this waiting and now tried to gain their salvation in a natural way, just like their forefathers had done when they were in Egypt and later in Babylon. After the exodus from Egypt they fought their way back in a natural way. The exiled people in Babylon returned after diplomatic negotiations and on the basis of an international treaty. The prophet Zechariah had, to be sure, promised them a supernatural salvation by consoling them. "Your king (the Messiah) will come to you, humble, riding on an ass."¹⁹ But the forefathers of the Jews did not wait for the fulfillment of this prophecy, but used the first opportunity to return home. The prophet Isaiah did not even hesitate to call the Persian king, Cyrus, a Messiah. Lippe asked the delegates not to wait for the Messiah, the rider on the ass, either, but to return to the land of Israel again on the basis on an international treaty. The modern reader of this speech may wonder, at what points Herzl sent his notes up to Lippe and where he felt the verge of the ridiculous had been reached. Lippe himself was probably unaware that he displeased Herzl with the content of his speech. He seemed, however, to have been fully aware that he displeased religious traditionalists. Lippe namely went on to declare that the pious people, who were still waiting for the ass-riding king could remain in the

dispersion and wait for his arrival. In reference to the Chalukkah mendicants he stated, that if the pious people permitted beggars, idlers and old people to settle in the Holy Land, they should also permit the Zionists to bring strong, young people there, who through their work would change the land from a desert into an Eden. Lippe left, however, the possibility open, that the Messiah would come after all, an apparent concession to the pious Jews. He said, that if the humble king would in reality still come, the Zionist workers would give him a more dignified welcome, than those Schnorrer ("beggars"), that is the Chalukkah recipients. Lippe also took a stand on the question of the Jewish mission among the nations. If this mission was really not yet fulfilled, then that, what still was outstanding, could be supplied from the old Jewish homeland. This was probably another blunder in Herzl's eyes. At every occasion he had derided the idea of that mission. Lippe closed his address by quoting from Isaiah 2:3: "For out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem", a motto which, one can be sure, was far removed from Herzl's rationale.

[The speeches of Herzl and others were quite different in character, stressing the nation rather than religion. The motivation for the Zionist efforts was provided by the suffering of the Jews of the present, rather than by Biblical prophecies and religious principles. This suffering was so real and the plea for help so urgent, that religious reasons against the movement could not deter its leaders either. Zionism was to be a conscious break with the idea, that Judaism was a purely religious concept. Jews formed a nation, wherever they lived, and whatever their religious convictions were. If the religious notions of some Jews were in conflict with this insight, as indeed they were in many cases, it was religion which had to be reformed and its adherents had to readjust their stand, not the Zionists. [A program was adopted at the First Zionist Congress, which remained the basis for the

Zionist efforts for a long time to come. This "Basel Platform", as it was termed later on, stayed clear of all references to religious concepts. It stated:

The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a publicly, legally assured home in Palestine. In order to attain this object, the Congress adopts the following means:

1. To promote the settlement in Palestine of Jewish agriculturists, handicraftsmen, industrialists, and professional men.
2. The centralization of the entire Jewish people by means of general institutions agreeably to the laws of the land.
3. To strengthen Jewish sentiments and national self-consciousness.
4. To obtain the sanction of Governments to carry out the objects of Zionism.

Besides principal papers on the state of world-Jewry, especially the economic conditions, questions of organization of the movement filled most of the hours of the First Zionist Congress. It was not possible, however, completely to exclude questions touching on religious issues. To most observers it appeared that Herzl himself had referred to the problem. Much speculation was caused by a vague phrase, which he had used in his first address. He said: "Zionism is the return home of Judaism, even before the return to the land of the Jews."²¹ This sentence was welcomed by the religiously-minded Jews, but noted with alarm by secularly minded Zionists. Only those close to Herzl knew that this statement did not mean a return to religion or an attempt to convert the Zionist movement into a religious revival.²² Differing from most speeches and statements was a letter by Rabbi Mohilewer, which was delivered by his grandson. Its content has been considered in this paper at an earlier stage,²³ because it is in a way a summary of the insights of the previous generation. Mohilewer did apparently not make much of an impact at the First Zionist Congress. The new movement had to fight out the old problems all over by itself. Mohilewer's concern was to bring about a compromise between religion and nationalism. Contrary to Dr. Lippe's statement in the opening address, Mohilewer firmly asserted the

belief in the Messiah and tried to show that there was no conflict between this concept and nationalism. Suggestions which Fohilewer made were disregarded; f.e. when he urged that an address be sent to Baron Rothschild thanking him for his work.²⁴ During the last session of the Congress a paper was read about the Hebrew language and literature by Rabbi Dr. Marcus Ehrenpreis.²⁵ The speaker pointed out that the Jewish question was not only an economic one. Zionism was also the consequence of a hunger for cultural achievements. These could be accomplished only within the norms of the national spirit. Just as the political rebirth of the Jewish people could come about only in Palestine, so the spiritual rebirth could come about only through a return to the Hebrew language. The speaker called for efforts to teach more Jews Hebrew and to acquaint them with the Hebrew literature written during the nineteenth century. The creation of this literature had been an expression of a homesickness of the Jewish people and the expression of a latent Zionism even prior to the founding of the movement. In the following debate questions concerning the Jargon language and the possibility of founding a University in Palestine were discussed.²⁶

At the very end of the Congress Herzl himself was forced to take a definite stand on a religious question. The Rabbi of Basel, Dr. Cohn, who was not a Zionist, but had attended the proceedings, as a guest, had asked for permission to speak.²⁷ He admitted that he had learned a great deal about the situation of Jews in the world and about Zionism, a movement which he and his friends had underestimated. His hope was, that national Judaism would be but a transitional stage towards religious Judaism. But he expressed the concern, which he and other Orthodox Rabbis had. It was the reason why he and his friends had been reluctant up to that time to support the Zionist movement. The Orthodox Rabbis showed reverence for everything connected with Zion and were in sympathy with colonization in Palestine. But they were

afraid that, if the new state were created, the holiness of the Sabbaths could be violated. If a definite statement could be made with regard to this question, the Orthodox Rabbis might change their minds and turn towards Zionism. Herzl gave the following answer: "I can assure you that Zionism does not intend to do anything that could injure the religious sentiments of any group within Judaism."²⁸ This assurance remained the official position of the Zionist organization for a long time to come. How difficult Herzl's position was in this egg-dance on invisible eggs can be seen from remarks by Chaim Weizmann, who felt that Herzl was too lenient towards the spiritual authorities of Judaism. Weizmann recalled:

Herzl was an organizer; he was also an inspiring personality; but he was not of the people, and did not grasp the nature of the forces which it harbored. He had excessive respect for the Jewish clergy, born not of intimacy but of distance. He saw something rather occult and mysterious in the Rabbis, while he knew them and evaluated them as individuals, good, bad, or indifferent. His leaning towards clericalism distressed us,...

This charge of leaning towards clericalism was laid against the same man, who openly declared himself to be a free-thinker, who wanted to confine the Rabbis to their temples and not let them run the new state, who rejected theocratic tendencies, who fought with Chief-Rabbi Guedemann and with the Protest-Rabbis, and who was so uneasy about the blunders of Dr. Lippe in his opening address. Herzl seemed to have anticipated this type of difficulty, when he wrote in his diary three days prior to the opening of the First Zionist Congress concerning his task: "It is one of the labors of Hercules..."³⁰

The First Zionist Congress was in spite of all difficulties an unexpectedly great success. It won Herzl and his followers the respect of many Jews, friend and foe alike.³¹ [Zionism became a topic of discussion and argument throughout the Jewish world.] The relation of Zionism to the Jewish religion remained an issue. [As far as most leading Zionists were concerned it was

an embarrassing side-issue. For many pious Jews it remained the key question. One such debate took place in Germany, the land in which the Protest-Rabbis had voiced their opinion.

The next Zionist Congress was planned for the following year, 1898, to take place at the same location, Basel. A general meeting of the association of German Rabbis was to take place prior to this Second Zionist Congress. On the agenda for the Rabbis was the topic "Zionism". In anticipation of these two events, the Berlin chapter of the Zionist organization in Germany published a pamphlet, in which the question was discussed, as to whether or not Zionism was in contradiction to the Jewish religion.³²

The author, Dr. H. Salomonsohn, quoted verbatim both the protest declaration of the association of German Rabbis of the previous year, as well as the Zionist Basel Platform. He then asked, whether or not the Rabbinical criticisms could be applied to this Basel program, which had been adopted after the declaration of the Rabbis. He referred to several Talmud passages in which the colonization of Palestine was considered to be a holy duty. This had, of course, been admitted by the Rabbis. The only thing Jews were not permitted to do according to the Talmud, was to enforce the founding of a state with weapons. But even there an exception had been granted to Bar-Kochba by Rabbi Akiba. This, however, was not really the point to be concerned about, since the Basel program did not speak about a state, but only about the publicly, legally assured protection of the Jewish home. This argument shows, how cleverly the Basel Platform was worded, although it did not convince many Rabbis, as will be shown.

Dr. Salomonsohn dealt also with the objection that Jews were not permitted to do anything about their salvation, but had to wait patiently, until the Lord himself would call them from the ends of the earth. He assured the pious people who used this argument, that the Zionist endeavours

were not an interference with the government of God. He provided many references to religious authorities, which anticipated that the salvation would come in a natural way without accompanying miracles. Actions like those attempted by the Zionists were precisely the precondition for the coming of the messianic era. He finally called on the Rabbis to assume the leadership position in the movement. They may remove whatever was wrong, but they should not kill the bud of the good, which was within Zionism. It had already two million adherents³³ and nothing could stop its course anymore. It would be the hardest blow for Judaism, if a chasm were created between the guardians of the faith and the people, through the unexplainable resistance of the leading Rabbis. Salomonsohn called on these to avoid such schism by joining the Zionist movement and thereby restoring the internal peace of Israel.

The general assembly of the association of German Rabbis met in 1898 shortly after the publication of Salomonsohn's pamphlet. The executive defended its actions of the previous year by stating that modern Zionism posed dangers for Judaism inside and out.³⁴ In order to make sure that the endeavours of the Zionists were not held against all Jews, the executive had been forced to publish the protest declaration of 1897. The matter had been urgent, since the Congress was to be held soon. Therefore it had not been possible to have the matter come to a vote before an assembly. The declaration had been proper and timely, which was proven by the fact that it was considered to be the classical expression of the patriotism [sic] of the West-European Jews. The assembly approved the actions of the executive without debate, not however without some dissent.

In fact, not all German Rabbis were of the same opinion. In the same year, 1898, an association of Orthodox Rabbis met in Frankfurt and adopted resolutions dealing with the same subject.³⁵ They stated that the theories

of Zionism did not contradict the religious teachings of Judaism and had nothing to do with the messianic salvation of the nation. The German Orthodox Rabbis could, however, not follow leaders, who had different principles with regard to religion. It seemed therefore advisable to support the colonization of Palestine, which was a religious matter of prime importance, through a parallel movement. The founding of a state or any other political institution was left completely out of the program.

In North America the issue was also discussed further. When, for example, the Association of American Rabbis met again in 1899, two papers were read condemning Zionism in language similar to that used in 1897.³⁶ But the reading of a paper under the title: "The justification of Zionism" was also permitted.³⁷

A handbook on Zionism published in 1908 reported the negotiations of the German Rabbis in 1897 and 1898 and voiced the opinion, that even in Germany the topic would find a fairer treatment, if it were raised again. The disturbing fact remained, however, that the protest declaration of 1897 had never been revoked. But the reader of the handbook was given the consoling assurance: "Fortunately the declarations of the association of Rabbis are not being codified. They do not have the binding power of the Schulchan Aruch."³⁸

Chapter VII

The Debates Concerning Religion and National Culture in the Zionist Movement Between 1897 and 1909.

Soon after the First Zionist Congress the debates concerning nationalism and religion were to take a different shape. A new contestant entered the field and the argument switched to the question, how a new Jewish national culture was to be related to the Jewish religion. The man who started the debate was the old critic and friend of the Lovers of Zion in Russia, Ahad Ha-am. He had attended the First Zionist Congress, but reported afterwards that he sat solitary among his friends "like a mourner at a wedding-feast."¹ He published a short note in a Hebrew paper a few days after the conclusion of the Congress and a longer article a few months later, which was to be a commentary on the first one. In the latter he reported that he felt "the heavy hand of despair beginning to lay hold on"² him. This was precisely, because he did not reject everything that the Congress had accomplished. He agreed with Herzl, Nordau and the other leaders of the Zionist movement in that he also wanted the strengthening of the Jewish national consciousness and the eventual founding of a Jewish state in Palestine. This was to be attained by natural means and not by the expectation of a miraculous redemption. Jews were certainly not inferior to other people and had no reason to efface themselves. Ahad Ha-am praised the Congress for having proclaimed aloud to all the nations that the Jewish people still lived and desired to live. Zionism was a good and useful thing for those Western Jews, who had almost forgotten Judaism and had no link with their people, "except a vague sentiment which they themselves do not understand".³ Zionist activities lifted them from the mire of assimilation and strengthened their Jewish national consciousness. These pursuits cured them of their moral sickness, namely of the feeling of inferiority.

Ahad Ha-am disagreed, however, with the leaders of the Zionist movement

in many other respects. They were in his opinion too impatient and wanted too much. He himself felt that the founding of a Jewish state was but a distant vision and would take a long time. But even when that state were eventually established, it would not end the material trouble of the Jews. Liberty to seek a livelihood was not enough, a person had to be able to find what he sought. Jews would be able to settle in the new state only little by little. The determining factor would be the resources of the people themselves and the degree of economic development reached by the country. The natural increase of the Jewish population in the world would continue and in spite of continual emigration to Palestine the number of those remaining outside would not diminish very much. Ahad Ha-am also felt that the founding of a state would not necessarily solve the Jewish problem. A political ideal which did not rest on the national culture was apt to seduce Jews from loyalty to their spiritual greatness. There would be a tendency to find the path of glory in the attainment of material power and political dominion. Jews should not be merely a nation in the political sense, but a nation living according to its own spirit. If the aim of Zionism were really to bring the people back to Judaism in this sense, then the Congress would not have postponed questions of national culture to the last moment. The most vital and essential questions were those concerning language and literature, education and the diffusing of Jewish knowledge.

Ahad Ha-am charged furthermore that the leaders of the Zionist movement knew hardly anything about the Eastern form of the moral problem of Jewry and that the Congress had paid little attention to it. The Eastern form of the moral trouble was absolutely different from the Western:

In the West it is the problem of the Jews, in the East it is the problem of Judaism. The one weighs on the individual, the other on the nation. The one is felt by Jews who have had a European education, the other by Jews whose education has been Jewish. The one is

a product of anti-Semitism, and is dependent on anti-Semitism for its existence, the other is a natural product of a real link with a culture of thousands of years...

Not only Jews had come out of the Ghetto, Judaism had come out of it too. For Jews the exodus was confined to certain countries and was due to toleration. But Judaism had come out or was coming out of its own accord wherever it had come into contact with modern culture. This contact overturned the defences of Judaism from within. Judaism could no longer live isolated. The spirit of the Jewish people was striving for development. It wanted to absorb elements of the general culture and make them a part of itself. But the conditions of the exile were not suitable. Ahad Ha-am then went on to reiterate his demand for a spiritual centre.⁵ Judaism had to return to its historical homeland in order to live there a life of natural development. What was needed was not in the first place an independent state, but the creation of conditions favorable to the development of a great national culture. There was to be a good-sized settlement of Jews working without hindrance in every branch of culture, from agriculture and handicrafts to science and literature. This Jewish settlement was to grow gradually. In course of time it would become "the centre of the nation, wherein its spirit will find pure expression and develop in all its aspects."⁶ From this centre the spirit of Judaism would breathe new life into the communities of the Diaspora and preserve their unity. When the national culture had attained that level it would produce men in Palestine who would be able, "at a favourable opportunity, to establish a State which will be a Jewish State, and not merely a State of Jews."⁷ Even when that was accomplished, the greater part of the people would remain scattered in strange lands. Ahad Ha-am felt that it was better to face the bitterness of truth, than to have an illusion, which he himself certainly did not share:

"To gather our scattered ones from the four corners of the earth" (in the word of the Prayer Book) is impossible. Only religion, with its belief in a miraculous redemption, can promise that consummation.

Ahad Ha-am seemed to have been fully aware that he challenged both the leaders of the Zionist movement, as well as the religious leaders of the people, especially the religiously minded Zionists, with his provocative ideas and plans. Since he was quite influential among many Russian Zionists, his criticism was to have repercussions in the negotiations at the next Zionist Congresses, even though Ahad Ha-am did not attend any one of them for several years.

Herzl and the other Western leaders had apparently not yet taken note of this new challenge, when the Second Zionist Congress was opened on August 28, 1898. For Herzl the religious question was still confined to the problems raised during the previous year. In his opening address he referred once again to the protests of Rabbis⁹ and suggested a new solution to the issue. He pointed out again that it was a curiosity to pray for Zion and to be against it at the same time. Zionism could not be dependent upon the present leaders of the congregations. A change had to come about which would bring to an end the agitation of Jewish congregations against Zion. Election campaigns had to start, which would bring men into leadership positions, who were favourably inclined towards the national idea. One of the next goals of the movement was the "conquering of the congregations".¹⁰

A foretaste of future troubles came soon after the opening of the Congress when the names of a committee for the study of Jewish culture was presented. Delegate Nachman Syrkin¹¹ protested against the fact that the committee existed almost exclusively of Rabbis, who had a specific opinion concerning Jewish culture. If Jewish culture were left to the Rabbis this would be dangerous. There were people within Jewry who represented an

atheistic point of view and who were also of a different opinion as far as social questions were concerned.¹² The number of Rabbis on the committee had to be limited to a minimum and people had to be elected, who were atheists, or who were at least liberally minded. In reply, another speaker, Dr. Neumark claimed that there was no such thing as a Rabbinical point of view.¹³ He also pointed out that the committee had not to deal with religious questions, but with the Hebrew literature. Thereafter the debate was closed and the list of committee members as presented was adopted.

The questions concerning culture were again left for the last sitting of the Congress. There was, however, an improvement compared with the previous year, in that this time three speakers dealt with the subject.¹⁴ The first one was again Rabbi Dr. Ehrenpreis. He mentioned that the word culture had alarmed certain orthodox people in Russia. The culture about which he and his friends were talking was not of the kind, which would come into conflict with any one group within Judaism. It was neither "of a religious nature, nor anti-religious, but a national one."¹⁵ He suggested that the Congress should become active in the field of education. The conquering of the Jewish congregations, which Dr. Herzl had demanded, was a goal far off. What could be done in the present was the organizing of Jewish education outside the congregations, which would supplement the work done by these. In the first place the Hebrew language had to be taught, but also Jewish history.

The second speaker was Chief-Rabbi Dr. Gaster.¹⁶ He pointed out that a national regeneration could not be limited to material things. The values in the field of education, knowledge and faith should not get lost. The Western attitude of the speaker became apparent, when he declared, that Jews could identify with the culture of the nations among whom they lived. Everything that was great, noble, and powerful in a spiritual sense was also

religious. Important was only that the foreign cultures were completely assimilated and adjusted to the Jewish spirit. Knowledge and faith should not be eradicated among Jews. On the contrary, Zionism should become a school-house. Culture and Zionism should be identified. Cultural progress and Zionism were inseparable. Nothing of the accomplishments of the past should be given up. This was also true of the religious tradition. He did not wish to impose upon the movement a religious character. But there should be mutual tolerance. Zionism should not do anything which would injure the feeling of any one, who was faithful to the traditional law. The movement worked not only for the economic and political regeneration of the Jewish people, but also for a spiritual one. It was thereby on the grounds of modern culture to the achievements of which it adhered. A third speaker, Dr. Leopold Kahn, suggested the creation of a scholarly Dictionary of the Hebrew language.¹⁷

In the following debate, the contribution of Rabbi Seph from Russia was especially remarkable.¹⁸ He presented a typical Eastern point of view with regard to the question of the relation between culture and religion. The Rabbi pointed out that in spite of the great eloquence of Dr. Gaster the conflict between the tendencies of the Torah and those of modern culture had had by no means been ended. Modern civilization did not tolerate the introduction of religious aspects into the national legislation. In the Bible there was on the other hand a connection between religion and legislation in the laws concerning the Sabbath. The Torah also stressed a religious aspect in the field of education. Dr. Gaster had promised that Zionism would not do harm to the Torah. In reality the Torah was more demanding. It identified itself with Israel, that is with the Jewish people. The Torah therefore demanded that Zionism as a movement of the Jewish people had as its basis the Torah, which was the same as Judaism. To harmonize the Bible with

modern civilization was a gigantic task, to which the future would belong. But the conflict would still cause much work and arguments. The Rabbi then expressed his own view concerning the questions posed. In his opinion Israel was the people of God, the people of the Bible. The regeneration of Israel had to come about in the traditional and hallowed ways of the Torah.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Nordau, who was then chairman of the Congress, interrupted the speaker and remarked that he did not understand what he was talking about.¹⁹ Delegate N. Syrkin¹⁹ apparently understood better, but disapproved. He stated that it could not be tolerated that the Congress was misused for what he called "romanticism."²⁰ Also another speaker, Schach, felt that the arguments concerning Orthodoxy and liberal Judaism were not called for. Every honest Zionist should keep his religion to himself and leave the other person alone with his religion.²¹

Finally the resolution as suggested by Dr. Gaster, was adopted, which read as follows:

Zionism does not only work for the economic and political, but also for the spiritual regeneration of the Jewish people, and finds itself thereby on the ground of modern culture, to the achievements of which it strongly adheres. Zionism will not do anything that is in contradiction to the religious laws of Judaism.²²

It was apparently of no concern to many delegates that the two parts of the resolution were considered to be contradictory by many religiously-minded Jews. The Congress decision committed Zionism ultimately to the furtherance of modern secular culture among Jews. The differences between the tendencies of modern culture and those of Orthodox Judaism were to be a source of conflict and hot disputes for many years to come. For the time being these were, however, theoretical debates. No action was to be taken for several years to come.

While important decisions were reached as far as the building up of

the Zionist organization and the founding of a Jewish Bank were concerned, little progress was made with regard to the question of national culture for quite some time. At the Third Zionist Congress in 1899 dissenting voices were again silenced and outwardly a compromise was reached. At its beginning Herzl had apparently still not yet grasped the full implications of the storm that was in the making. He told the delegates that he had asked Chief-Rabbi Dr. Gaster, what the cultural question was, which according to the information he had received, was being discussed passionately in many places. If cultural question should mean the relation of Zionism or of the Congress to questions of the religious confessions it should not be discussed. The Zionist movement rejected the mingling in the different forms of the confessions which were customary among Jews. It could not be the task of the Congress to conduct religious debates. The delegates were thereby no less Jewish than the Rabbis, who excluded the discussion of religious questions, when they came together. It would not strengthen Zionism, if differences of opinion, which were so natural in this field, were to be introduced into the movement. Every religious conviction was respected, but was no matter of concern. It was not the common ground, on which Zionists had to work. They had rather come together as nationally minded Jews. Differences of opinion in the field of religion were not dangerous, when they came at the right time. But their discussion at the moment would weaken the movement.²³

The leadership of the Zionist movement seemed nevertheless to have felt that the cultural question could be discussed at the Congress, if religious implications were excluded. It was this presupposition which eventually came into the centre of the debate. If the Torah was considered to be more demanding, then every cultural question was also a religious one. At the Third Congress the first paper on the problems of Jewish culture was presented by Dr. Gaster.²⁴ The speaker expressed again the opinion that cultural

progress could be achieved without getting involved in religious problems. He pointed out that Zionism had not only the task to organize the material strength of the Jewish nation, but also its spiritual strength. Organization and finances were in his opinion secondary matters. The main thing was the liberation of the spirit and the progress of humanity. But a "Catechism for Judaism"²⁵ would not be written. Religious questions would not be touched. All that he asked for was respect for the holy teachings, but the religious problems would not be thrown open for debate.

Another speaker, Martin Buber, defined as one of the tasks of the movement the internal agitation, which was the furtherance of Jewish culture. This consisted of the guarding of the common national goods, the cultivation of the national spirit, study of national history and the education of the people.²⁶ Another paper on the cultural question was read by Dr. L. Kahn. He reported that this problem was the "child of sorrows" of the Congress.²⁷ Passions had run so high here as in no other field. Consideration had therefore been given to eliminate the question from the Congress agenda altogether. But the matter was so important that it was actually a question of life or death for Zionism. Opposition had come from the very pious, from the Orthodox. This was not because they were against culture as such. But they were afraid that a special brand of culture was furthered, such as "the so-called culture of the Maskilin, who considered it a great achievement to ridicule time-honoured customs and to injure the feelings of those, who were faithful to the Torah".²⁸ The speaker wanted to inform the Orthodox that their fears were unfounded. Culture was not identical with hostility towards religion or with lack of religion. Religion was itself a large part of culture. The fact that humanity had reached a higher level of morality was due in the first place to religion. But progress in the field of culture was necessary and it was important that the Jewish spirit was taken into account.

He hoped that a time would come, when a specific Jewish culture and Jewish science would come into being, which was the general sciences in a Jewish-national perspective. The speaker then proposed Ahad Ha-an's idea of a spiritual centre. Only there such a genuine Jewish culture could flourish. He reiterated that what was necessary in the present was the study of Jewish literature, of the holy language, and of Jewish history, where the treasures of the Jewish spirit were stored.

In the following debate Rabbi Reines assured the delegates that the Rabbis were no enemies of culture. They were delighted that the Zionist movement brought not only help to suffering brethren, but had brought back many Jews, who had been considered lost. Nevertheless the Congress as such should not deal with the cultural question, because it was open to so many different interpretations. Every Jew should work in his own city for the furtherance of the Hebrew language and the Jewish culture. But the Congress should not do anything that could cause a division. No decision should be reached with regard to the cultural question, which would cause dissension and disunion.²⁹

Another speaker, Nahum Sokolow, in turn, supported Dr. Gaster's view and rejected that of Rabbi Reines. He reiterated that Zionism would not touch the field of religion, but had nevertheless to do cultural work.³⁰ The whole program of cultural work of Zionism contained in his opinion nothing, that was unacceptable to the extreme Orthodox party. For him even the speech of a Rabbi and an Orthodox Talmud association was Jewish culture, just as a society for the furtherance of Hebrew literature and history. Other speakers agreed that cultural work, which would leave religious questions alone could not be objectionable.³¹ Only one decision was reached at this Third Zionist Congress as far as the cultural question was concerned. It was the adoption of a resolution to subsidize the publication of Hebrew school books for the

general sciences to be used in Palestine by those schools, which used Hebrew as the main language.³²

This rather meagre result still was more of an accomplishment than the Fourth Congress meeting in London in 1900 could take to its credit. At this assembly no decision whatsoever was reached as far as the cultural question was concerned. This was not, because the delegates had lost interest in these problems, but on the contrary, because the issue had become too hot. Nahum Sokolow reported that many articles and pamphlets had been written and condemnations and excommunications issued in connection with this problem.³³ The leadership of the movement had to defend itself against the accusation that it had done nothing with respect to cultural and religious questions. The reason was that they had become too controversial.³⁴ The word culture itself was so disputed, that it had been proposed to replace it by "spiritual uplifting" (geistige Hebung).³⁵

Regardless, however, which words were used, the problems remained, and the Fourth Zionist Congress helped to articulate the different positions. The official speakers reiterated that cultural progress in Judaism was called for and would not in any way injure religious feelings. Dr. Gaster³⁶ stated that Jews had absorbed the results of the intellectual activities of all mankind. They learned from everybody, but had made it their own and had put the stamp of Judaism upon it. Jews may yet reach a new synthesis of all knowledge and proclaim "a new salvation" to mankind.³⁷ In his opinion this was no danger for the Jewish religion and for its faith.³⁸ The second official speaker, Nahum Sokolow, also spoke in favour of what he termed a "spiritual and moral development",³⁹ which was in harmony with Jewish peculiarity, as well as with the humanistic task of mankind in general. Sokolow charged that Zionist cultural activities had to be defended against attacks from two sides. The "super-zealots of conservatism" considered

them to be a first step towards unbelief. At the same time did the pseudo-progressives consider these activities to be a fanatical reaction. Sokolow himself felt that Zionism had to accept the tasks of civilization of the present. The modern development of the Jewish people itself also had to be recognized. Jewish culture, like any genuine culture, had to be humanistic as well as national.⁴¹

Criticism against the inclusion of the problems of culture into the program of the Zionist movement was again raised by Rabbi Reines. He reported that for those Rabbis, who had remained in Russia the idea was something "terrible".⁴² He himself felt that the cultural question was something foreign for Zionism. The only goal was to get back to Palestine. — Those, who wanted to include the cultural question in the Zionist program did not understand Zionism, or if they understood it, acted towards it in a negative way. At the end of the Congress, his son, who was also a delegate, moved that no cultural committee be elected. The motion was lost.⁴³

Another Rabbi, Landau, charged that the masses of the Jewish people stayed away, if their religious feelings were injured, even if that were done in a subtle way. The cultural question was the red rag for them. The so-called Western culture had done too much harm already. At the bottom of their heart the people were all Zionists, but they would not join a specific organization, if they became suspicious. The leadership of the movement should never have permitted that the cultural question was raised.⁴⁴

Delegate Dr. Kahn felt that he suggested a compromise between the warring factions, when he proposed a resolution, which was supposed to make it a duty for every Zionist to work for the spiritual uplifting of the Jewish people in religious, moral and national respects. In every country, where Jews were not admitted to the general school system, special schools were to be established, in which the study of the Hebrew language, Jewish litera-

ture and Jewish history were compulsory subjects.⁴⁵

Time and again during this Congress, more often than at any previous one, the assurance was reiterated that the discussion of cultural questions was not intended to injure religious feelings. At one occasion Dr. Chaim Weizmann stressed, that the question of religion was a private affair of every individual. Zionism did not deal with personal affairs.⁴⁶ The Jewish masses were in his opinion not indifferent because of the cultural question, as Rabbi Landau had suggested, but because nothing tangible had as yet been accomplished by Zionism. But when Weizmann realized that all these assurances and the compromise proposal of Dr. Kahn was to no avail, he launched a counter-attack. His short speech appears - at least in retrospect - to have been not only a highlight of the Fourth Zionist Congress, but a first climax in the debate concerning culture and religion as a whole.⁴⁷ He stated that a confusion of language had taken place. For two years the word culture was misused to such an extent, that it was hard to establish its meaning. This was a shame for a Jewish Congress, which should represent a synthesis of all Jewish forces. He could not see, why the cultural question should be eliminated from the Congress agenda, as it had been suggested. Some Rabbis had claimed that the masses of Jewish people were repelled by the word culture. This was a self-illusion. Weizmann charged that the Rabbis themselves had lost contact with a great part of the Jewish masses. Besides this, it was they themselves, who had confused the minds of many people for several years with their pamphlets. Long before the word culture was mentioned at a Zionist Congress, the Rabbis had already started a crusade against Zionism. Weizmann could not see why they came now and wanted to express distrust towards the representatives of the Jewish spirit, who were talking about national Jewish education. Every year it had been stated that the Congress would not get involved in religious questions. This, however,

was not enough for the Rabbis. They wanted to win the field. He asked these leaders, why their congregations went to ruin. The speaker charged that they had done nothing for the improvement of the life of their parishes, the founding of schools or for charity. Now, that the Zionists were doing these things, the Rabbis claimed to have the confidence of the masses and that they were the leaders. Therefore Weizmann demanded that the Congress make no concessions to the Rabbis. The adoption of the resolution of Dr. Kahn would be precisely this. He himself, Weizmann, was violently opposed to the inclusion of the word "religious" in the program of the movement. This would automatically exclude a great number of delegates from the Congress. Weizmann preferred an open fight over a poor peace. The cultural question had to be and would become the "nerve-centre" (Lebensnerv)⁴⁸ of the Congress. If they could not enforce it this time, then at a future Congress, would the cultural question become its substance. Culture had always been the substance of life. Such things could never be excluded from the Congress, regardless of how he and his friends were intimidated. He asked that this Congress may decide to start regular cultural activities in the different countries, depending on the situations in these lands. In every country a committee was to be elected which had the responsibility to report to the Congress.

The inclusion of the word "religious" in the program of the spiritual uplifting of the Jewish people became for some time the centre of argument in the following debate. Since not even the representatives of the cultural committee were able to come to an agreement, it was easy for the chairman, Dr. Herzl, to close the debate without having to let any resolution come to a vote. The Congress proceeded with other business without picking up the cultural question again.⁴⁹

Weizmann recalled in his memoirs especially this Congress. It was in his

opinion of historical significance because of the establishment of the Jewish National Fund. But otherwise it had for him for various reasons "a depressing effect."⁵⁰ Nevertheless, so we wrote, he went back to Geneva which was then his home, more than ever committed to Zionist work. He became even the initiator and a leader in the open fight, which he had proposed at the last Congress, and which was to break out in earnest soon thereafter.

In April 1901 an assembly of the Zionist student organization was held at Munich. The key speaker was Chaim Weizmann, who outlined a program for the founding of a new Zionist organization on the basis of the Basel Platform.⁵¹ He called on the Zionist students and other Jewish youth, as well as on the Jewish intellectuals, to become the centre of a new group. This new organization would turn its attention to the work of the present, namely on cultural work. Fruitful work in the field of Jewish culture could not be expected from the official Zionism, because it was forced out of necessity to be satisfied with any compromise, in order to please everybody. The cultural committee which had been established by the Congresses, consisted of different contradictory elements. The clash of these elements led to an internal fight, which prevented the group from producing positive results. Weizmann felt that he and his friends were not in the position to keep away from the committee those factors, which prevented any fruitful work. Weizmann did not say it, but it was quite clear that he referred to the Orthodox Rabbis. He called on his hearers to do the cultural work themselves. Culture had to be understood in the widest sense. It had to embrace not only Hebrew culture, but the principles of the general European culture. One had to use the tools of the European sciences. Zionists like Ahad Ha-am, Nathan Birnbaum, Bernhard Lazare and others had stayed away from the Congresses, because it was impossible for them to cooperate with what he called "the

guardians of an empty formalism",⁵² who became vocal there. Another field of activity for the new organization was the settlement of Jewish refugees in Palestine and work in the economic field.

The new organization was founded under the name "Democratic Faction", often referred to simply as the "Faction", on the eve of the Fifth Zionist Congress in December 1901 at Basel. The Faction was led by Chaim Weizmann and Leo Motzkin. Among the other members were Martin Buber, Arthur Feivel, Davis Trietsch, E. M. Lilien and Jizchak Gruenbaum. Weizmann recalled in his memoirs that he and his friends had recognized that the Congress had come to stay. Like Herzl, they regarded it as the Jewish state in the making. It was within the Zionist organization that his opposition "sought to strengthen and deepen the spiritual significance of the movement, and to make the organization the reflection of the forces of national Jewry."⁵³

The front-lines were quite clear at the outset of the Fifth Zionist Congress. The leadership of the movement again wanted to avoid any decision, or even a full discussion of the cultural question. They took this stand, not because of a basic disagreement with the members of the Faction. Herzl, Nordau and the other Western leaders had absorbed the general European culture so thoroughly and were so much a part of it, that the whole matter was not only no problem for them personally. They learned even only gradually to understand that there existed an issue for many Zionists in the East. But the leaders were quite willing to postpone a discussion of such questions for the sake of a show of national unity and for the sake of unity within the movement. They were quite concerned about the impression upon the outside world and wanted to turn the Congress into a "demonstration", as Weizmann had charged.⁵⁴ The situation was different for young Russian intellectuals like Weizmann and his friends. Most of them had gone through the traditional religious education and had discovered modern European culture more through

chance than by design. They had had to struggle personally to shake off, what they felt were ill effects of their religious past, in order fully to become modern man. For them the problems of culture were very personal ones and they wanted to force the Congress publicly to take a stand, even if that caused a split in the ranks of the movement. The internal problems of Zionism were more important for them than the impression the Congress made on the outside world.

Herzl stated at the Fifth Zionist Congress, that he could not understand, why anybody could suggest that the leadership of the movement was against culture. For various reasons, including - admittedly - opportunistic ones, religious questions and differences had been "respectfully" (ehrfurchtsvoll)⁵⁵ excluded from the Zionist Congresses. The same was not true with regard to cultural endeavours. Even the speeches at the Congresses were themselves an element of modern culture. But Herzl had learned during past years, that some delegates considered the Torah to be more demanding. For these the discussion of cultural questions was in fact a discussion of religious problems, precisely what Herzl wanted to avoid.

The fighting mood, which Weizmann and his group were in, became apparent already at the beginning of the Congress when the agenda was presented.⁵⁶ The members of the Faction, Buber and Feiwel, demanded more time and earlier treatment of the questions of the spiritual uplifting. They also wanted the scheduled speech of Max Nordau on the spiritual, physical and economic uplifting of the Jewish people connected with those speeches presented by members of the cultural committee. Delegate Ussischkin, on the other hand, demanded that the "practical" questions, namely Bank and Organization be dealt with first, and only then the "theoretical" ones.⁵⁷ Martin Buber countered, that the questions of the spiritual uplifting were eminently practical and even the cultural committee would present practical resolutions,

which were designed to initiate large-scale propaganda.⁵⁸ The agenda proposals of the Faction were finally adopted. Thus the stage was set for a victory of the Faction.

A kind of prelude to the major battle of this Congress was a marked difference of opinion, which became apparent in the papers presented by Max Nordau and Martin Buber. Nordau spoke about the physical, spiritual and economic uplifting of the Jewish people. He had much to say and to propose concerning the physical and the economic aspects of his topic. But he shied away from a treatment of the spiritual aspects. For that, he felt, there was not as yet money. Jews did not have the means to produce good Jewish literature or to establish their own schools.⁵⁹ Buber was to speak on the Jewish arts. He stated that Nordau had spoken about the questions of the spiritual uplifting in such a way that he, Buber and his friends, were deeply hurt. Nordau had refused to discuss those questions, which concerned the "wonderful budding of a new Jewish national culture."⁶⁰ The Congress days were the only Zion-days during the long Golus-year. The changes that were taking place with regard to culture should not only be dealt with on the convention floor, but everything should be done, to encourage the efforts. This Jewish Parliament did not fulfill its task, if it did not deal with this resurrection; that meant the Jewish cultural activities. It was as if the delegates would recognize on a human organism only nerves and muscles, bones and veins, but not the soul. Buber reminded Nordau, that he himself had once written, that Jewish arts were one of the best means of propaganda. Zionism had not only to deal with the poor Jewish proletariat, but also with the well-to-do Jews. And it was especially these latter, who had thoroughly to be re-educated in spiritual and moral respects, before they provided "capable and worthy human material for Palestine".⁶¹ He and his friends presented the means for this kind of education, which would strengthen the

movement and lend new strength to the national cause. One example of what they had in mind, was what he, Buber, was to report about, namely Jewish arts. He went on to give a lengthy report about Jewish creations in the field of music, painting and poetry in the past and in the present. Buber felt that Jewish arts were a testimony of the nation for its strength and its will-power to live. He claimed that even Zionists themselves could be educated by creations of Jewish arts, for the following reason:

The deepest secrets will be revealed in them and will shine with the splendour of eternal life. We will look at them and will recognize them. We will look at them and will venerate our sanctuary. I expect a wonderful deepening and intensifying of Zionism through Jewish arts.⁶²

In this field, which could be expanded endlessly, Zionists had great and inevitable duties. These consisted of the collection of historical art treasures of the Jewish people, in the creation of new art in accordance with the national peculiarity, and in the aesthetic education of the nation.

Nahum Sokolow also was again one of the official speakers. He delivered this time a paper on Jewish history and science. First he presented a thorough and learned outline of Jewish intellectual endeavours in the past and in the present. He called on his fellow-Zionists, who were the "proclaimers of the Renaissance of the Jewish people",⁶³ to be the guardians of all Jewish knowledge. They, and not the hair-splitting exegetes, were able to understand writings like that of the prophet Isaiah. Zionists would write the best commentary about it, namely "the commentary of realization".⁶⁴ It was important to found associations, schools and seminaries for the dissemination of Jewish knowledge. Different groups within Zionism should consider it their duty to be active in this respect.⁶⁵

These speakers on cultural questions avoided any reference to controversial religious questions. Two speakers, who debated problems related to the Zionist organization as such, were not as cautious. Delegate Ussischkin

reported that the organization of the Jewish people had prior to the nineteenth century a "peculiar synagogal-religious character".⁶⁶ The essence, however, did not consist of the form, but of the inner consciousness of its necessity. When the foundations of the Jewish organization began to be shaken in the nineteenth century, the existence of the Jewish people was threatened. But the Jewish people proved again its ability to survive. Its better elements understood, that the Jewish organization had to be retained, while its outward form had to change. The speaker made it quite clear, what he was referring to, when he stated: "The religious-synagogal organization had to be replaced by a social-national one. Zionism presents itself as a doctrine, which characterizes such endeavours."⁶⁷ Another delegate, Scheinkin, expressed himself in a similar way. Referring to the cultural questions, he felt that these should be discussed, since there was no other organization, which embraced all of Jewry. Everyone wished that Zionism embraced his whole life. Religion had codified life until now for the fathers and forefathers. In the same way Zionism should codify all of life for the present generation.⁶⁸

A dramatic scene took place at the last night session of the Congress. Herzl had first of all given Weizmann and Buber permission to present resolutions concerning cultural questions and to motivate them. He also allowed some other delegates, including two Rabbis, to speak on the subject. He did so, because he wanted to keep the resemblance of a balance,⁶⁹ that meant between the representatives of the Faction and their religious opponents. This procedure resulted in a heated argument concerning culture and religion. Herzl then wanted to stop this debate and proceed with the elections, which were absolutely necessary for the continuation of the Zionist organization.⁷⁰ He promised that he would continue with the cultural debate, as far as time permitted. Mindful of Herzl's parliamentary tactics concerning the same

question at the previous Congress, the members of the Faction first insisted on the continuation of the debate. They then reduced their demands by asking that at least their resolutions were brought to a vote. Leo Motzkin wanted to have determined, whether or not Zionists dealt with cultural problems. If no vote was taken, this remained a big question mark, as it had done at the four previous Congresses.⁷¹ Herzl countered that the Congress agenda itself was proof that Zionism dealt with cultural questions, but that such matters could not be rushed.⁷² Herzl then let the question come to a vote, whether or not the elections would be next. When the Congress voted in favour of this motion, an unprecedented spectacle at a Zionist Congress took place. Several delegates, the members of the Faction, left the room. The Congress proceeded with the elections without them. After the return of the group some time later, Peiwei presented the Congress with a declaration signed by 37 delegates protesting against the way in which the Congress chairman had dealt with the resolutions of the cultural committee.⁷³ By this time the elections were over and Herzl permitted not only a vote on those resolutions, but indicated in most cases, that he was in favour of them.

The proposals of the cultural committee dealt with the support for a library in Jerusalem, the publication of a Hebrew Encyclopedia, the founding of the Jewish Publication House Juedischer Verlag, and the establishment of committees in the different countries, which were charged with the duty to report about cultural activities to the Congress. The motion to back up the founding of the Juedischer Verlag with a guaranteed loan, was lost. But most of the other motions were adopted. Most of them were acceptable even for the religiously minded Zionists, some were even moved by Rabbis. The most decisive and really controversial motion, however, was the following: "The Congress declares that the cultural uplifting, i.e. the education of

the Jewish people in a national spirit, is one of the most essential elements of the Zionist program. The Congress makes it a duty for all its adherents to cooperate in this respect."⁷⁴ The motion was voted on in two parts, because the second sentence seemed to exclude automatically many religiously minded Zionists, just as the inclusion of the word "religious" in the cultural motion of the previous year would in the opinion of some delegates have excluded others.⁷⁵ The majority of the delegates voted in favour of both parts of the motion.⁷⁶

The religious opposition of the Faction had a chance to become vocal at this Congress, after Weizmann and Buber had presented their resolutions and Herzl had wanted to establish a balance.⁷⁷ But this was, before the final vote had been taken. Rabbi Rabbinowitsch acknowledged that none of the speakers, who were in favour of culture, had said anything against religion.⁷⁸ But the Orthodox had no confidence in the initiators of the matter. The Rabbi quoted as example the speaker, who had claimed that religion should be replaced by Zionism. That was a wrong principle. Religion had not come to an end and would not come to an end. Rabbinowitsch claimed that a Jew, who was not a Zionist, was nevertheless a Jew, but not a logical one. On the other hand had in his opinion a Jew, who was not strictly religious, still not completely given up religion, even if he was a free-thinker. Religion united Jews and so did Zionism. The speaker considered Zionism as a means to strengthen religion and vice versa. He expressed the opinion that religion was the latest word of civilization. It had been the first word of civilization, which was spoken 3,000 years earlier on Mount Sinai. Eventually everyone would see that the Jewish religion was the right way. The Torah had given the true civilization, the true light. A general program for culture was therefore not called for.

The speaker then gave another example of something which had disturbed

the Orthodox. Israel Zangwill had declared on the Congress floor that Rabbi Jochanan ben Sakkai had prayed only for the Torah and not for the country.⁷⁹ He had asserted also, that this man, whom he had called the father of anti-Zionism had typically been carried away alive in a casket. Zangwill had later explained in a private conversation, that he had not intended to say anything against the authority of Rabbi Jochanan ben Sakkai. He had claimed only that the same had been just concerned about the religion and not about the country of the Jews. Rabbi Rabbinowitsch explained that things had really been different. Whenever in Jewish history an enemy had attempted the destruction of the Jewish religion, the Jewish authorities had resisted, because they had been afraid of the destruction of the nation. But whenever the enemies wanted only political superiority, and did not touch Jewish religion and culture, the Jewish authorities had been against the use of force. In such cases they foresaw the end of the political regime of the enemy and did not consider it as a danger for the nation. This was true for Rabbi Jochanan ben Sakkai. He was in truth the father of Zionism. When the hard times were gone, Zionism which was only seemingly dead, was reawakened. In such times as those, during which Jochanan ben Sakkai lived, even men like Herzl, Nordau and Zangwill would have proposed a different course of action. The speaker closed with the claim, that cultural, economic and spiritual uplifting was of no use.

The most outspoken declaration from the point of view of religion came from Rabbi Reines. He lamented:

The cultural question is a misfortune for us. Culture will destroy everything. Our district is completely Orthodox. It is lost through culture.

The cultural question should not have been in the Basel Platform. A mistake was made, which has to be made good for and has to be reversed. We have to be prepared to give our lives for our people, for our country, and God will help us.

The last session of the Fifth Zionist Congress ended at 5:30 a.m. the

next morning, December 31, 1901. It had brought clarification on many points, not only in the cultural field. But that kind of unity, which Herzl had so anxiously guarded at the previous four Congresses, was destroyed forever. A further step was taken in committing the Zionist movement towards the furtherance of modern secular culture and thereby alienating religiously minded Jews. With the Democratic Faction having won a substantial victory, there was the danger of a secession of the very important and strong element within Zionism: the Orthodox. In order to forestall this distinct possibility, Herzl secretly approached shortly after the Congress one of the Orthodox leaders, namely Rabbi Fishman, (later Maimon), and suggested to him to take the initiative in the establishment of a Zionist party uniting religious Jews. Rabbi Maimon passed the information on to Rabbi Reines, who founded in the spring of 1902 what was called the Mizrahi Party. This name reminded of the party founded by Rabbi Mohilewer within the ranks of the Lovers of Zion in 1893.⁸¹

A founding convention of the new Mizrahi organization was held in the spring of 1902 at Vilna. The expenses for this meeting were defrayed by Herzl himself from his own pocket. Herzl's involvement in the whole affair remained a secret until 1955, when Rabbi Maimon himself revealed it to the public.⁸² The founders of Mizrahi were convinced that the establishment of the people of Israel in the Land of Israel had to take place in accordance with the precepts of the Torah. Mizrahi saw as its task to bring the message of Zionism to the masses of Orthodox Jews. The religious Zionists tried to convince their fellow-believers that practical work for the redemption of the Jewish people did not contradict the messianic expectations of Judaism. They also attempted to instill a feeling of unity into the hearts of religious Jews and to encourage them to cooperate with their secularist brethren in the rebuilding of the national Jewish home. Thus the principles laid down by

Rabbi Mohilewer were carried on.⁸³ This did not mean, however, that there was unanimity among the founders of Mizrahi. In fact, the origins of a later split can be detected right at the beginning. Two trends were represented already at the founding meeting.⁸⁴ There were those, who strove to guard what they thought was the purity of political Zionism and opposed the decisions of the Fifth Zionist Congress concerning cultural work. Others were not against cultural work as such. They understood its importance and demanded that Mizrahi itself engaged in religious educational activities. A first public proclamation of Mizrahi brought about a compromise between both trends. It declared that Zionism did not only strive for the creation of a safe refuge for the Jewish people, but also to redeem them spiritually. In the Diaspora "it is impossible for the soul of the nation, which is its holy Torah, to exist in full force and for its commandments to be fulfilled in their essential purity."⁸⁵ Mizrahi intended to gather those Zionists, who wanted to purify official Zionism from all foreign accretions. It also advocated religious-cultural work "in accordance with local conditions and in the spirit of Orthodoxy."⁸⁶ Rabbi Reines suggested that the Mizrahi branches united their members through spiritual activity such as Torah studies. A central office of Mizrahi was established in Lida, where Rabbi Reines lived. A widespread propaganda on behalf of the new organization was launched immediately with great success.

With the founding of the Mizrahi organization the unity of the Zionist movement was preserved outwardly. Inwardly there was a split. This had a lasting effect. Eventually two completely different educational systems were created which are basically still in existence today. The groundwork for this was laid at the first official convention of Russian Zionists held in October, 1902, at Minsk, at which Mizrahi made its first public appearance. This seven-day conference was attended by more than 500 delegates and about

200 guests.⁸⁷ Both Mizrahi, as well as the Democratic Faction were strongly represented. The majority of delegates, however, were neutral and did not belong to one of the two groups. Besides problems of organization, the cultural question was on the agenda. The key speaker was Ahad Ha-am. He showed solutions for the disputed issues and helped to bring about an acceptable compromise in the argument within the Zionist movement, thereby restoring peace for the time being.

In this historical address⁸⁸ Ahad Ha-am first analyzed the situation and proceeded to offer his solutions to the problems. He stated that it was not a mere accident, that the question of Jewish culture had come to the front with the rise of political Zionism. The Zionism of the Lovers of Zion, which existed earlier, knew nothing of any problems of culture. It knew only one aim, namely the placing of Hebrew nationality in new conditions, and to give it the possibility of developing all the various sides of its individuality. Political and cultural work was combined. Any work which strengthened and developed Jewish nationality was Zionist work. The epithet "political" of the newer Zionism added nothing, because the hope for the distant future of the Lovers of Zion had always been political. It had become obvious now, that even the newer Zionism was not more successful in this field. It could "not bring the Messiah 'today or tomorrow'"⁸⁹ either. It was thus political also only in its hopes for the future. Therefore the epithet "political" was often understood as taking something away. The aim was only the founding in Palestine of a safe refuge for the Jewish people, no longer the development of the Hebrew national individuality, which meant Jewish nationality. The speeches at the five Congresses had stated repeatedly and emphatically that Zionism wanted to solve the economic and political problems of the Jews. This was a narrowing down of the Zionist conception. Thus the problem of culture was a child of political Zionism. For centuries

the Jewish people had suffered for the preservation of the products of their national spirit. They had finally recognized that suffering alone was not enough, but that it was necessary to work actively for the national survival. And now it had become a question of whether the strengthening of the national spirit and the development of the nation's spiritual products were essential parts of the work of the revival. Ahad Ha-am observed that this question was answered by many in the negative, a reference, of course to the Orthodox. This did not involve opposition to cultural work as such. They only did not want to have it made obligatory. They themselves were in fact taking part in cultural work by founding schools and libraries, and in some cases even helped in the diffusion of Hebrew literature. Many Zionist societies were actually kept alive by such work. Those, who felt that cultural work was something foreign to Zionism just did not want to discuss the purely theoretical questions. In actual practice most Zionists did their share. This was right only from the point of view of the interests of culture. It was not right from that of the interests of Zionism. Cultural work needed no express sanction from Zionism. But Zionism was bound to rely on the help of cultural work. There was a danger in the idea that diplomacy and financial transactions were all that was needed. This would make Zionism an empty, meaningless phrase. Internal national work had great attractions and could slake the thirst for activity.

What was necessary therefore was a clear and explicit statement that work for the revival of the national spirit and the development of its products was of the very essence of Zionism, and that it was inconceivable without such a work. In this way the honour of Zionism would be saved and it would be preserved from narrowness and decay, which were inevitable, if it were confined to the political aspects. But before an attempt were made to make cultural work a part of the Zionist programme, a distinction should

be made between two branches of that work. These were the culture a nation had produced and the state of its cultural work at any given time. A nation's culture had something of a reality of its own. It was the concrete expression of the best minds of the nation in every period of its history. This remained for all time and was no longer dependent on those who created the cultural products. But the state of the cultural life meant the degree to which culture was diffused among the individual members of the nation and was visible in their private and public lives. Applied to Jewish culture this meant two things. In the first place the body of culture which the Jewish people had created in the past had to be perfected and its creative power had to be stimulated to fresh expressions. In the second place the cultural level of the people in general had to be raised. The objective culture had to be made the subjective possession of each of its individual members. Ahad Ha-am asserted that the existence of an original Hebrew culture needed no proof. The Bible was testimony for the creative power of the Jewish mind. Those, who felt that Jews were still a people had a right to believe that the Jewish creative genius still lived and was capable of expressing itself anew. It had become fashionable lately to assume that there was no true Hebrew culture outside the Scriptures and that the literature of the Diaspora did not express the true Hebrew genius. This view had no foundation. The unfavorable conditions of the Dispersion had naturally left their mark on the literary work. But the Jewish genius had not undergone any change in its essential characteristics, and had never ceased to bear fruit. The changed conditions had given its fruit a different taste. Only in the latest period, that of emancipation and assimilation had Hebrew culture become sterile and had borne practically no fresh fruit. Not that the creative power had suddenly been destroyed. Rather the tendency to sink the national individuality and merge it in that of other nations had produced

two characteristic phenomena. This was on the one hand the conscious and deliberate neglect of the original spiritual qualities and the striving to be like other people in every possible way. On the other hand there was the loss of the most gifted men and the abandonment of Jewish national work for a life devoted to the service of other nations. Ahad Ha-am went on to give many examples for this. He then dealt with the national literature. This was often taken in a wide sense to include everything that was written by men of Jewish race in any language. But this conception was fundamentally wrong. The national literature of any nation was only that which was written in its own national language. This was Hebrew in the case of the Jews. Ahad Ha-am then dealt with the question of Yiddish, "the Jargon", which had in his opinion no greater importance than any other language spoken by Jews in the Diaspora. He expressed his conviction that the Jargon would soon cease to be a living and spoken language. The nation would never regard it as anything but an external and temporary medium of interaction. Hebrew alone was linked to the Jewish nation inseparably and eternally as part of its being. The Hebrew literature of the recent past was extremely poor and meagre in Ahad Ha-am's judgement. It had reached a high level of perfection in one branch only, that of self-advertisement. The speaker concluded that the spiritual trouble of the Jewish people was no less a danger than the physical trouble. He went on to renew his appeal for the creation of a home of refuge for the national spirit, which was just as necessary as a home of refuge for the homeless Jewish wanderers. The work for national revival could not be confined to the material settlement alone. Jews were not at liberty to neglect the effort to create in Palestine "a fixed and independent centre for our national culture, for learning, art and literature."⁹⁰ The ruins in the country had to be repaired, but also the spiritual ruins. Ahad Ha-am expressed his opinion, that the founding

of a single great school of learning or of art in Palestine, or the establishment of a single University, would be a work of highest importance.

It would do more for the fulfilment of the final goal than a hundred agricultural colonies. These were but bricks for the building of the future.

They could not mould anew the life of a whole people.

But a great educational institution in Palestine, which should attract Jews of learning and ability in large numbers to carry on their work on Jewish national lines in a true Jewish spirit, without constraint or undue influence from without, might even now rejuvenate the whole people and breathe new life into Judaism and Jewish literature. ⁹¹

The speaker warned that the re-centralization of the spiritual potentialities could not be carried out easily. To lay the foundations for a spiritual refuge for the national culture demanded preparations no less extensive than for those of a material refuge for persecuted Jews. Besides the work of preparation for the future, there was also a great deal of work to be done in the present. The national creative power remained the same in all ages, and had not ceased even in exile to work in its own specific fashion. Every achievement or creation of promise in any branch of culture had to be supported. But the Zionist organization could not possibly be saddled with the task of reviving the national culture. Therefore a special organization for cultural work had to be established in Ahad Ha-am's opinion.

The speaker then dealt with the second branch of cultural work, where things were simpler. The Jewish people as a whole stood in need of improvement from the point of view of culture. But this was not in itself a task for Zionism. This movement did not have to diffuse enlightenment. Modern life itself forced Jews to pursue this end. But Zionism was bound to supply the work of enlightenment with the nationalist basis. Ahad Ha-am then came to the highlight of his address. He reported that at one of the earlier Congresses the battle-cry had gone out to win over the Synagogue organization. Zionists everywhere had responded obediently and had started

an unequal struggle with communal leaders. But their labor had scarcely anywhere had any tangible results. It would have been better to have encouraged Zionists to win over the educational organizations. In the Synagogue one dealt with parents, in the schools with children. To conquer the parents, to infuse a new spirit into grown men, did not bring much profit. It were better to lay out the energy on the conquest of the children. If a large squadron of younger men were put into the field to fight their elders - the products of the school against the leaders of the Synagogue - it would be the children, who would win against their parents.

The duty of Zionists in the sphere of education was not confined to schools of the enlightened type. The old, traditional - meaning the religious - system, was still strong, though it lost ground every year. This too, had to be reformed in a suitable way. One should not set out with the idea that the traditional system was opposed to the national spirit. The atmosphere of the religious school was Jewish through and through. There was not a book which did not remind the young reader of their people and its history in happiness and exile. Nevertheless this did not make them automatically Zionists.

Yet it is obvious and undeniable, however extraordinary, that most orthodox Jews who have been trained in this system, for all their devotion to the community of Israel, are unable to understand the ideal of the regeneration of Israel as a people. The masses stand aloof, and regard the new movement with complete indifference; and their leaders are mostly opposed to it, and try, by every means that jealousy and hatred can suggest, to put obstacles in its path.⁹²

It was the business of the orthodox Zionists to reform this educational system. Ahad Ha-am then came to the heart of his proposal. He explained that he had referred to the orthodox Zionists advisedly. There was no need and no right to demand of any section that it entrusted the education of its children to another section, which was fundamentally opposed to its views on human life. The modernists could not sacrifice the education to

satisfy the orthodox and vice versa. It was a natural desire and a right of every man to educate his children so that they would grow up to be of his own way of thinking. Since the two main sections of the Jewish people were united under the banner of Zionism, they had both to recognize the points of union and of difference between them in every department of life and especially in that of education. Each section had the right to act as it thought best, with absolute freedom in all its affairs. But Zionism had to demand from both sections that each made the ideal of the national revival, in the modern sense, the basis of its education. On this foundation each was at liberty to erect its own superstructure in its own way. Ahad Ha-am had hoped that his words had cleared up the conceptions involved in the phrase "cultural work" and created a true appreciation of the nature and object of that work. If that were done, practical results would follow.

Nahum Sokolow also presented a paper at this Minsk Conference in 1902. His topic was: "National education from a practical point of view."⁹³ He agreed with Ahad Ha-am on the principle that national Jewish culture had to be furthered. But he felt that the national culture would flourish quite naturally, once the territorial basis was secured. He therefore suggested that large-scale and free colonization of Palestine should be stressed above all by Zionism. Sokolow made practical proposals concerning cultural work. Among other things he suggested that Hebrew should become the official language of the Zionist movement. New schools should be established, including a training centre for Rabbis run by Zionists in the spirit of Jewish nationalism.

A stormy three-day debate followed, during which delegates of the Democratic Faction and Mizrahi got into heated arguments. Ahad Ha-am's suggestion that a separate organization for cultural activities be created, was rejected even by members of the Faction, who were afraid of a splitting

up of Zionist forces. But Rabbi Reines of Mizrahi agreed to the naming of two parallel educational committees, one religious, the other non-observant. In this way a compromise was reached between the two warring camps. The formula finally adopted read as follows:

In order to fulfill the Congress resolution in regard to mandatory national educational activity, and taking into consideration the fact that there are among us two equal trends the traditional-nationalist and the progressive-nationalist the Congress is to name two Committees on Education, with each side choosing one of the two.⁹⁴

Out of this compromise eventually different school systems arose, which will be dealt with in this paper later on.

The Minsk decisions preserved the unity of the Zionist movement for the time being and the cultural question came to rest for a few years. The main reason for this was the fact that extremely important political questions came to occupy the minds and therefore the agendas of the next Zionist Congresses. In political matters Mizrahi did not want to represent a special point of view. The compromise decisions at the Minsk Conference had, however, their repercussions immediately within the ranks of Mizrahi itself. At the first convention of Mizrahi in Lida in the spring of 1903 a sharp debate arose concerning the cultural question. Those members, who were opposed on principle against cultural work fought vigorously against the decisions of the Minsk Conference. But it was still possible to patch up the differences by a compromise. It was resolved that

the Mizrahi program shall not include activities which have no direct relationship to political and practical Zionism. However, it is up to the local branches to engage in spiritual activity in accordance with our faith and our holy Tora; the head office is to instruct the branches to engage in such activity.⁹⁵

Beginning with the next Zionist Congress in 1903 Mizrahi was represented as a Faction in its own right. Its members acted as a voting bloc and some delegates spoke in the name of the organization as a whole. One such occasion, when this was deemed necessary came at the Sixth Congress in connection with

the interpretation of a historical question. Israel Zangwill referred once again to Rabbi Jochanan ben Sakkai and the remarks made by Rabbi Rabbino-witsch at the Fifth Zionist Congress.⁹⁶ It was true, Zangwill said, that Jochanan ben Sakkai had saved Judaism, when the Jewish state was destroyed. But if he had been able to foresee the tragedy which was to last for eighteen hundred years, he would probably have preferred to die with the patriots in Jerusalem, instead of being carried alive in a casket into the Roman camp. This casket became the symbol for the living death which was from then on the future of his people. The price with which Jochanan ben Sakkai had saved Judaism had been too high. And even his spiritualization of the Jewish religion was not a complete job in Zangwill's opinion. Judaism was detached from the soil not through Jochanan ben Sakkai, but through the disciples of Christianity. Judaism gained many adherents in Asia Minor and Rome during the fifty years after the destruction of the Jewish state. But nevertheless religion lost the chance to regain its national basis. Jochanan ben Sakkai retained the old territorial terminology, but gave it a cultural form. Agriculture was changed into culture. The process had now to be reversed.

This interpretation of an important moment in Jewish history upset the religious Zionists even more than the remarks about the same subject at the previous Congress. But this time it was not only an individual, who responded, but the Mizrahi Faction as a whole. In its name Dr. Nobel stated,⁹⁷ that the basis of the Zionist organization had to be the principle that the discussion of religious problems had to be avoided. Nothing should be said that offended any one. If Mr. Zangwill knew what the name Jochanan ben Sakkai meant to the members of the Mizrahi Faction, he would not have talked the way he did. Dr. Nobel protested especially against the reference to the casket of Jochanan ben Sakkai as a symbol of the living death of his people.

Since Jochanan ben Sakkai had a religious mission in Jewish history, the matter was a religious question. Israel Zangwill answered⁹⁸ that he had had no intention of speaking about religion. But it was a peculiarity of the Jewish people, that religion and politics were indissolubly mingled with each other. It was impossible to deal with anything Jewish without making it obvious that everything had both a religious as well as a political aspect. Zangwill wanted to deal only with the political side. He respected Jochanan ben Sakkai for his role in the codification of the principles of the Jewish religion after the destruction of the temple. But Zangwill claimed that Jochanan ben Sakkai had also been a politician. And it was the political aspect which he intended to criticize. There could be no doubt that Jochanan ben Sakkai had saved the Jewish religion. But there could also be no doubt that he had surrendered the Jewish people to eighteen hundred years of suffering.

The Mizrahi Faction was not satisfied with this explanation. It had an official statement read at the next Congress session protesting emphatically against the way in which Israel Zangwill had dealt with religious problems and had thereby injured Jewish religious consciousness. The expectation was expressed that the Congress would not deal with such religious questions in the future.⁹⁹

The main topic at this Sixth Zionist Congress was what became known as the Uganda-Project.¹⁰⁰ The British Government had offered to the Zionist Organization land in East Africa for the establishment of a semi-independent Jewish state as a British protectorate. This was a historical moment. For the first time within eighteen hundred years would Jews have their own administration in a territory of considerable size. The offer was also the first political success of Herzl. A European government had given recognition to the Zionist movement as the representation of the Jewish people. But

it was not Zion, not Palestine, not the ancient Jewish homeland, which was offered. This fact was played down by the leadership of the movement by describing the possibility of Jewish settlement as a "shelter for the night" (Nachtasyl).¹⁰¹ It could perhaps offer a considerable number of persecuted Jews a temporary haven of refuge. Acceptance of the offer would not mean a giving up of the final goal, namely Zion. East Africa could become a stepping-stone on the way to Palestine. Herzl considered it simply as an act of courtesy to consider the matter. After stormy and heated debates the question came finally to a vote, whether or not the offer by the British Government should be investigated by a commission of the Zionist Organization and an expedition sent to East Africa. In a dramatic vote, 295 delegates were in favour of the resolution, 178 were against it, with 98 abstaining. When the result was made public, those, who had voted "no" left the room en bloc.¹⁰² They returned the next day, after Herzl himself had pleaded with them personally. But it took years to patch up the psychological rift that this affair had created. Among those, who voted in favour of the East Africa expedition, were most of the members of Mizrahi. The members of the Democratic Faction voted with many others, especially Russian delegates, against the proposal. They wanted nothing else considered but Palestine. They called themselves the Zionists of Zion, while they dubbed their opponents Africans.

An interesting report about this incident was given shortly after the Congress by the Chief-Rabbi of Papa, Hungary, M.A. Roth.¹⁰³ He was a member of Mizrahi, who had participated as an official Congress delegate. The Chief-Rabbi described how deeply he was moved, when he met co-religionists from around the world.¹⁰⁴ He was, however, saddened by the observation that there were irreligious elements in the midst of the Jewish people. It was especially a group of Russian delegates, who belonged to the so-called Faction, who he found disgusting and depressing. These men demonstrated their contempt for

the Jewish religion with a cynism, which was hard to describe. It made virtually curdle his blood. But the East Africa debate had reconciled him somewhat. These same Russian delegates fought for their Zionist ideal with an enthusiasm, which moved the Chief-Rabbi deeply. He himself like most other Mizrahi delegates did not share their point of view. Most of the religiously minded Zionists had voted in favour of the sending of the expedition to East Africa. But the love for Zion, for the land of their forefathers, which these Russian delegates had demonstrated, was simply overwhelming and had moved the Chief-Rabbi to tears. He thought that men, who were so faithful to their ideal of Zion could not be as bad, as it had seemed at first. He said to himself that their heart was probably better and more Jewish than their tongue. Not even with regard to them was all hope lost for Judaism. Roth also thought that Western Jews would eventually be drawn nearer to the Jewish religion through Zionism. Even if the fathers were not full Jews, the following generation would be.

The book, in which these personal observations and considerations were recorded is interesting for other reasons as well. It shows how during that time an Orthodox was able to harmonize his religious beliefs with Zionist activities. Basically the author used Kalischer's arguments, from whose book "Seeking Zion" he quoted extensively.¹⁰⁵ Roth claimed that the holy doctrine of Judaism knew no difference between "religious" and "national".¹⁰⁶ Everything religious were at the same time national, and everything national were also religious. The distinction between religious and national were of non-Jewish origin and had been imposed upon Judaism from the outside. The Torah was neither religious nor national in Roth's opinion. It was a doctrine which embraced all human spheres, including the national one. Only that Jew were truly observant, who fulfilled all duties of the Torah, whether they were of a religious or national nature. It was hard to imagine that a truly religious

Jew would not be led through his religion to Jewish nationalism. On the other hand would a truly national Jew be led to religion, if his nationalism were genuine, Jewish, and consequent.¹⁰⁷ Roth assured his readers that the danger for Orthodoxy had been removed, since the Orthodox did no longer participate in the Zionist movement as individuals, but as a well-organized party with an Orthodox program, namely the Mizrahi-group.¹⁰⁸

Mizrahi seemed to have become quite popular among Orthodox Jews during that time and many must have looked at it in the same way as Chief-Rabbi Roth. A first international convention of the organization was held in the summer of 1904 at Pozsony (Pressburg), Austria-Hungary (now Bratislava, Czechoslovakia). The program for the Mizrahi World Organization was summarized as follows:

1. Mizrahi is a Zionist organization based on the Basel Program, striving for the national rebirth of the people of Israel. Mizrahi considers the existence of the Jewish people dependent on the observance of the Tora and the tradition, the fulfillment of the commandments, and the return to the Land of the Fathers.
2. Mizrahi shall remain within the Zionist Organization and fight within it for its own views and outlook. However, it shall create its own organization for the purpose of conducting its religious and cultural activities.
3. The mission of Mizrahi shall be to achieve its aims by explaining its ideal in all religious circles, creating and disseminating religious-nationalist literature, and educating the young in its spirit.¹⁰⁹

A severe blow for the Zionist movement was the sudden and unexpected death of its founder and leader, Dr. Theodor Herzl, in July 1904 at the age of forty-four. It came at the height of a crisis and contributed considerably to a general confusion within the ranks of the organization. The next few years were devoted to the necessary reorganization and reorientation. A new leader was finally found in the person of David Wolffsohn, and the headquarters of the movement were moved from Vienna to Cologne. The Uganda crisis was settled, when the report of the expedition was negative and protests from white settlers in East Africa had also cautioned the British Government. It was

decided that from now on only a resettlement of Palestine was envisioned. This caused a split within the movement.¹¹⁰ There were those, who still felt that another territory might be easier to get than the ancient Jewish homeland and they founded their own "Jewish Territorial Organization" with Israel Zangwill as President. The question foremost under discussion in the Zionist Organization was, whether the emphasis of Zionist work should be as in Herzl's days on political activity, or whether practical work in Palestine itself should be stressed.

During this period questions of religion and culture moved into the background, and were mentioned only occasionally, without causing arguments. At the Seventh Congress in 1905 it was reported that a group of Orthodox Rabbis in Hungary had recently felt it to be necessary to issue a proclamation against Zionism. This sad document was the work of an unbelievable terrorism of a few fanatics, who had managed even to get the signatures of notorious friends of the national movement. The reporter gave the assurance that the masses of Hungarian Orthodox were in favour of Zionism, and would shortly join its ranks officially.¹¹¹

The cultural question was mentioned by some speakers at this Congress,¹¹² but it was felt that its discussion was certainly not called for at the moment.¹¹³

At the Eighth Zionist Congress in 1907 the phrase "synthetic Zionism" was coined.¹¹⁴ Chaim Weizmann pointed out that political work was important, but it had to be backed up by colonization in Palestine itself.¹¹⁵ Specific reference was made to the principle of religious neutrality, which all previous Congresses had observed and which had been clearly spelled out.¹¹⁶ Papers were read concerning national education in Palestine and the Diaspora.¹¹⁷ A complaint was launched that none of the decisions of the Congresses concerning culture had been put into practice. Cultural Zionists were systematically forced into the background by the leadership of the movement.¹¹⁸ It was

pointed out that the Zionist organization had not done cultural work of its own due to the lack of funds.¹¹⁹ It was, however, decided at this Congress to create a commission for national education.¹²⁰ The Mizrahi organization announced that it intended to found a secondary school in Palestine.¹²¹

In the winter of 1908 Mizrahi leaders decided that this federation should create an educational network of its own. It was to launch an educational and cultural program in Palestine. Practical steps in this direction were taken immediately.¹²²

At the Ninth Zionist Congress in 1909 lack of funds for national education was again regretted.¹²³ One speaker lamented that nobody cared for culture anymore.¹²⁴ It was, however, also reported that the relations between Mizrahi and the rest of the Zionists had improved considerably. There was no longer any difference, but full harmony. Mizrahi had shown that it was by no means hostile to culture.¹²⁵ But a disconcerting note also came to the fore at this convention. Rabbi Dr. Abrahamsohn, representing Mizrahi, spoke in favour of all practical work in Palestine. But he warned against dealing with culture, which would create in his opinion a Kulturkampf. He was not afraid of it, but he felt that the time for this had not yet come.¹²⁶ When considered together, these last remarks gave an indication of the nature of the problems that were still in the air. They also gave a glimpse at the fact that there were basic differences of opinion concerning the policy, which was to be followed by religiously minded Zionists. These disagreements were eventually to lead to a split within this camp. That came about, when the cultural question was discussed again under changed circumstances.

Chapter VIII

The Debates Concerning Religion and National Culture at the Zionist Congress in 1911 and the Consequences.

The Tenth Zionist Congress took place at Basel in 1911. It was to become a turning point in the history of the Zionist movement. Shortly before this convention, an organization for the furtherance of Hebrew language and culture was founded with the name Histadruth.¹ The agenda for the Congress also called for the discussion of cultural questions. In view of these facts the Mizrahi Faction held a pre-Congress meeting in order to determine its position. It was decided to oppose the introduction of cultural activities into the Zionist program.²

When the Congress convened it became obvious from the start, that the time had come for radical changes. Right at the beginning David Wolffsohn announced that he felt forced to resign in the interest of the movement.³ Jakobus Kann, in a letter read on the Congress floor, expressed his hope that this assembly would mark the beginning of a new era. He wished that the negotiations and results may carry a new spirit into the movement and its organization.⁴ It was the beginning of a new era. The Congress elected Professor Dr. Otto Warburg of Berlin as President of the Zionist World Organization. Its headquarters were subsequently moved to that city. Only practical Zionists were elected into the executive. This was a victory of synthetic Zionism. It became clear that political efforts would be continued, but the emphasis of Zionist work was no longer on such activities. Detailed discussions were held on practical problems of colonization in Palestine. It was decided that such projects were urgent. Fundamental changes in the constitution were adopted. New regulations concerning finances were introduced. Policies were adopted with regard to the support of Jewish emigration and immigration. All these changes were voted upon only after struggles and

heated debates. Religious and cultural questions were also debated extensively. But in no other area did the emotions run as high as in these fields.

The first discussion concerning religious issues was caused by some remarks of Dr. Bodenheimer, which he made in his report about the work of the Jewish National Fund.⁵ He mentioned a new difficulty, which had arisen. Mizrahi had filed a complaint. It claimed that workers in Palestine, including such, who lived on properties of the National Fund, had injured the religious feelings of a great part of the Jewish population of Palestine. The bureau of Mizrahi had asked what steps the administration of the fund intended to take in order to prevent such things from happening again. Bodenheimer declared that he did not know about such behaviour by workers. But he felt that the Jewish National Fund was not entitled to work like a "religious police".⁶ He was in favour of a ruling which would state, that every observant Jew could live and work on the property of the J.N.F. without hindrance according to his religious convictions. It was possible to create the preconditions for the religious freedom of the most pious Jews. But there should be no coercion through which the freedom of conscience of the individual would be limited. The speaker insisted that on all J.N.F. properties the Sabbath and the Jewish religious holidays were kept, as far as the administration could help it. Also the religious laws concerning the Shmittah were observed.⁷ Bodenheimer indicated that there was one way, in which the observant Zionists could change, what they thought was wrong. They could become the dominant factor. If Mizrahi would manage to do more positive work in this direction, the complaints would probably stop. The adherents of the observant wing would have enough to do with their own practical work of maintaining and developing their settlements.

Hermann Struck answered in the name of Mizrahi that it was an outrageous

insult by Dr. Bodenheimer to call the Mizrahi-Zionists "religious police".⁸ At an earlier time they had already been ridiculed by leading circles with terms like Sabbath-watchers and spies. Struck then read a letter by the Chief-Rabbi of Jaffa and the colonies, Abraham Jizhak Hakohen Kook.⁹ The latter felt forced to bring to the attention of the Congress a matter which he thought concerned the nature and the foundation of the Jewish colonization, its honour and its development. Kook charged that the profanation of the Sabbath and the other religious holidays were very frequent in all parts of the settlement, but especially on the properties of the Jewish National Fund. The workers and administrators were not in the least concerned about what was sacred for Israel. They desecrated with contempt the sacredness of holy days through public works, driving, horse-back riding, carrying objects and by starting fires like on ordinary days. This grieved all those people, in whom there was still Jewish feeling. They observed with resentment, how their holiest of holy was trampled down by brethren in the Land of Israel, in the Holy Land. The matter had reached such proportions, that only God knew, what the end of the scandal would be, unless the evil would be stopped through wise and just counsel. The superiors had the duty to direct the workers and administrators on the properties of the National Fund through strict order and severe reprimands to amend their ways. In future they should meet everything, which was **sacred** to Israel, with regard and respect and had to beware of any profanation of the sacred day. Struck remarked that this matter was not only one which concerned Mizrahi, but it was a general Zionist concern. He therefore made the motion that the administration of the National Fund had to see to it that the Jewish law was kept on all its properties.¹⁰

The remarks by Dr. Bodenheimer and the reading of the letter of Chief-Rabbi Kook became the subject of two heated debates on the floor of the Tenth Zionist Congress. First of all the representative of the J.N.F. in Palestine,

Dr. Jacob Thon replied, that the Sabbath and the Jewish holy days were strictly observed.¹¹ It should, however, be taken into consideration, that the Orthodox were not represented very well among the young people, who made up the majority of the workers and the administrators. It was not appropriate to intrude into the personal, private lives of those, who worked there. But nevertheless was the Sabbath observed strictly according to the law. Another delegate, Dr. Zuckermann spoke as representative of the Zionist labour party, Poale Zion, which in his opinion had aims and goals contrary to those of Mizrahi. The speaker claimed that the motion made by Struck justified the expression used by Dr. Bodenheimer, namely "religious police".¹² He felt that this religious policing had to come to an end. It was a big question, whether or not "love your neighbour as yourself" was not a more important Jewish commandment. The clericalism of Mizrahi had to be cast off. The principle should be religious freedom. Every Zionist should be permitted to live in Palestine with respect to religion as he himself thought right.

Rabbi Schmelkes on the other hand declared that the people of Israel would no longer live, if it were not for its Torah. The law should be the fortress of Zionism. This statement was not an expression of clericalism. The Jewish Torah knew no such thing as clericalism. All Zionist institutions should be directed in the spirit of the Torah.¹³ The chairman, Dr. Eschlenow, finally reminded the delegates, that the subject under discussion was not religion, but the Jewish National Fund. Zionism had always and would always keep the principle that nothing would be done to injure the religious conscience. Even those people, who were not considered fully observant by Mizrahi, knew very well that the Jewish religion possessed "a nationalizing and uniting power".¹⁴ Jews had left Palestine with the Torah and would return with the Torah. But in order to give the law back the old moral force a first condition was to be observed, and that was tolerance. They all served

Zionism, the religious conviction was a private affair. The chairman suggested that the topic of religion should be left and the discussion about the Jewish National Fund be resumed. Nevertheless the religious argument started again, when the National Fund debate was continued during the next Congress session.¹⁵

Delegate Struck claimed that he had been misunderstood. He did not have the intention to be intolerant, and to limit the freedom of individuals. But he demanded that the executive and the administration respected the Jewish commandments. The next speaker, Dr. W. Lewy, pointed out that there had been no other force, which had worked for the preservation of the Jewish nationality during the two thousand years of dispersion as strongly as the Jewish religion. Zionists worked to build a new home in Palestine. They did not only do this in order to give bread to the poor Jews. But Zionism also wanted to give a home to the Jewish spirit, so that the Jewish teachings would be revived in Palestine. The speaker complained especially about the slowness, with which the administration of the Jewish National Fund had acted with regard to proposals by Chief-Rabbi Kook concerning the Schmittah. The Chief-Rabbi had shown how through a purely formal concession it was possible to respect this age-old Jewish national law.¹⁷

Several other speakers also dealt with the subject. Many controversial points were clarified in the discussion. When finally the assurance was given by the Executive of the National Fund, that there was no intention to break the religious laws, Hermann Struck withdrew his motion. It was in his opinion no longer necessary in the light of the statements made.¹⁸

A whole session at the Tenth Zionist Congress was set aside for the "question of the spiritual-cultural Renaissance".¹⁹ A lengthy paper was read by Nahum Sokolow in Hebrew about the Hebrew language. He asked that it be recognized in Palestine as the official national language. He reiterated his

demands that the Zionist organization founded and sponsored Hebrew schools and associations and academies. Sokolow specified his proposals in detail. In the following discussion Dr. Nacht pointed out, that the speaking of Hebrew was an important, but not the only principle. The language was just a means for the preservation of the Torah.²⁰ Delegate Dr. Daiches remarked that everybody had got used to consider the cultural question as a stumbling-block. Only a few days earlier was there the fear expressed, that a cultural debate would be a danger for the Zionist organization. But this was an error. The Tenth Congress had so far already demonstrated, that the cultural question was the most important question of the national life. This was now agreed upon by both Mizrahi as well as the Histadruth, which furthered culture in different ways. The speaker asked the delegates to re-establish the Jewish people. He also pointed out that Jews did not understand the ancient literature. This was true, whether they were Orthodox or Reformed. The spirit of the legislature, prophets and seers was no longer fully grasped, because Jews were too far removed from their land. The understanding of the Bible was linked with the understanding of the country. Jews had to recover their antiquity. They had to become again the people of the Bible. But that was possible only in the land of their fathers. Hebrew had to become the everyday language of the young people. Associations had to be founded, which would further the knowledge of the new, as well as the old Hebrew literature, including the Talmudic one.²¹ Delegate M. Berlin spoke in the name of Mizrahi.²² He expressed his joy that finally had the national language also become the official one. He agreed with Sokolow that a bureau for Hebrew culture could be founded. But it was not possible to do it at this time, because Jews did not have homogenous spiritual prerogatives. This was the result of the different atmosphere in the countries, in which Zionists lived. It was therefore not possible to give definite directions in this respect.

The things concerned feelings and conscience and the majority should not coerce the minority, meaning the observant Jews.

After some further discussion Sokolow made a final remark. He thought that it was wrong that some speakers had introduced the religious question into the debate. There was no difference of opinion with regard to the Hebrew language among the different groups. There were differences between Orthodox and modernists with regard to other questions. But they were all nationally minded. Objections on religious grounds to Hebrew were not called for.²³

During a later session the Palestine Committee surprised the Congress delegates with a resolution in which the growth of the national schools in Palestine was to be welcomed. The coexistence of institutes representing different tendencies was supposed to be considered something quite natural. The expectation was to be expressed that the relations of the two systems were nothing but one of peaceful competition in the educational and spiritual fields.²⁴ Immediately a representative of the Mizrahi group, delegate Moeller, protested against the fact, that such a resolution was presented at a time, when the cultural question was by no means settled. He therefore moved that the motion be referred to the cultural committee. Delegate Dr. Pasmanik declared that this was not a resolution concerning the cultural question, but simply a request to keep peace. Moeller's motion to refer the resolution to the cultural committee was lost. The resolution itself was adopted.²⁵ Another resolution, which was adopted after some discussion, declared that Hebrew was the official language of the Congress. As long as it was practical, however, the deliberations would be in German. The delegates had the right to use other languages. Such contributions would be partially translated by secretaries.²⁶

The really crucial discussion came about in a situation reminiscent of the fateful cultural debate at the Fifth Congress.²⁷ At the last session of

the Congress, just before the elections were to come, Dr. Marmorek, who happened to chair the meeting, announced that "the cultural debate"²⁸ was next. President Wolffsohn remarked that this was not on the agenda and did not know, how this had come about. It could only be a vote on resolutions. Delegate H. Syrkin thereupon presented motions, which, he explained, had been worked out during the preceeding two days by the cultural committee. From all sides, except one, the attempt had been made to ease the stands and to compromise. The result of all these efforts were the resolutions which the committee presented, and which read as follows:

The committee which was established by the Congress and which consists of representatives of all groups and federations makes the following statement:

The different schools of thought and factions of the Congress agree in their conviction, that our cultural and educational work are intimately linked with our Hebrew language and all the cultural treasures, which our people have accumulated throughout some thousands of years. Based on this conviction, the committee takes pleasure in presenting the following resolutions:

- 1) The Tenth Zionist Congress asks the Inner Actions Committee to organize and centralize the cultural work in Palestine and in the Orient.
- 2) The Tenth Zionist Congress indicates its determination to see to it, that in the institutions for cultural work created by the Zionist organization, nothing will be done, that is in contradiction to the Jewish religion.
- 3) The Congress declares that the cultural work in the lands of the Diaspora is an autonomous matter of the different local organizations. But it is being made the duty of every Zionist, as well as all local organizations and federations, to work for the furtherance of Jewish-national culture in all fields of Jewish work and national life.²⁹

A procedural debate ensued in connection with the presentation of these resolutions.³⁰ All speakers agreed that it was too late for a full debate. Some of those, who were opposed to the matter, wanted it referred to the executive for further study. Another delegate proposed to have the subject debated at the next Congress. The majority wanted to vote without debate right away. A short debate took place nevertheless. It became obvious during this short exchange that the subject matter was extremely controversial for the Mizrahi Faction. Delegate Struck stated³¹ that the adherents of Mizrahi

had always been ready to cooperate with Zionists of all tendencies in the political field. It was different in the field of culture. This was in Judaism intimately linked with religion. There Weltanschauungen were opposed to each other. In this respect the members of Mizrahi could for reasons of conscience not cooperate with friends who held different views. Therefore Mizrahi asked that the Congress left the execution of the cultural tasks to the different federations. This was necessary for the sake of the unity of the organization and it was a pre-condition for further useful and peaceful cooperation. Mizrahi itself made it a duty for all its members to further the cultural work and to continue the expansion of the school system and the work of the recently founded Jewish cultural association. In case the Congress would not go along with the demands of Mizrahi, further steps might be taken and the representatives could not be held responsible for the consequences. Struck assured his fellow-Zionists that he and his friends were with all their heart in the Zionist movement. They wanted to fight with the others for the great goal and they wanted to win with them. Struck conjured the other delegates not to leave the common ground.

Among others delegate Kaplansky replied that the Zionist organization supported cultural institutions of Mizrahi. He supposed that the representatives of Mizrahi could also agree that cultural institutions were supported by the organization, which were not Orthodox.³² Dr. Thon reported that all representatives in the cultural committee had agreed with the resolutions, including Rabbi Reines and Rabbi Rabinowitsch.³³ This statement was disputed by delegate Hoeller, who claimed that the representatives of Mizrahi had been opposed.³⁴

After these remarks Rabbi Reines got permission to speak. He reported that before he was a member of Mizrahi, he had believed, that Zionism could unite different tendencies. He saw, now that the cultural work divided the

people. Nevertheless he called on the Mizrahi to remain faithful to the organization. But he also asked for exclusion of the cultural question, because it destroyed the internal unity. Dr. Tschlenow reminded the assembly that the resolutions presented were nothing new.³⁵ The second Congress had already adopted similar statements. If the resolutions were adopted, even those members of Mizrahi would not leave the movement, who had joined after the second Congress. Rabbi Rabinowitsch then made a short statement concerning the debate in the cultural committee.³⁶ He reported that one of the Mizrahi delegates had predicted that all Mizrahi members would leave the Zionist organization, if the cultural resolutions would be adopted by the Congress. This had deeply moved and upset him. But he himself declared that he would stay, even if he were the last and the only Mizrahi member. He did not know where he should go. He would not find better Jews among the anti-Zionists.

Nevertheless he and Rabbi Reines had expressed their opinion in the committee meeting, that it was better not to have the cultural question dealt with by the Congress. This would only cause misunderstandings among the people. But he had added, that he would not vote against the resolutions, if they were presented to the Congress contrary to his advice. But he had attached a few conditions. He worked among Orthodox people, who kept the commandments concerning the Sabbath. This was one of the greatest and most important laws. The Rabbi demanded that all Zionist institutions had to be closed on Sabbath. The Congress should explicitly state its wish in this regard. Among all peoples, who had imitated the Jewish Sabbath with their Sunday, this latter was respected by all classes among the people. It was a shame, that the Jews did not respect such a day. Even the progressives should agree with the principle that everything should be closed on the Sabbath, "and everybody should keep the Sabbath."³⁷ [sic]

In a closing remark the chairman of the cultural committee, delegate Syrkin, stated that he could not comprehend, how these differences of opinion could still come about.³⁸ The Rabbis had agreed with the proposals of the committee. Everybody knew that Zionism had to do cultural work, whether they liked it or not. This concerned a basic educational work in Palestine. The matter under discussion were not religious differences or hair splitting. At stake were rather the great tasks of national work and of a living national culture. All Zionists had really always been united in this respect, regardless of differences in ritual matters and without having had to make concessions. And they had to be united. He therefore made a last plea to adopt the resolutions.

When the vote was taken, the resolutions concerning cultural work³⁹ were finally adopted with an overwhelming majority. Resolution two, which referred to the Jewish religion, was even passed unanimously.⁴⁰

In a final address to the Congress, Dr. Tschlenow gave a review of the work of the last fourteen years and the achievements of the Zionist organization. He closed with the old motto of the Maccabees: "Whoever is on the side of God, let him come to us!"⁴¹

At this Congress there was an observer, who did not say a word publicly himself, but whose ideas had strongly influenced many delegates. He had not attended a Zionist Congress since the first one in 1897. The visitor was Ahad-Ha-a. Following his attendance at Basel he travelled through Palestine for fifty days. After his return he recorded his experiences and published in 1912 an article entitled Summa Sum arum.⁴¹ He reported that he had opened his mind wide to the different impressions that crowded in on him from all sides. And - for a change - he was delighted at what he had seen. He confessed that it was a long time since he had spent such happy days as those of this trip. That did not mean that all was right with the Zionist movement.

The sun had not shone on the work and driven away shadows and had spread light and joy everywhere. But one fact had become increasingly clear. The Zionist work was not an artificial product. It was not a thing that was invented to give the people something to do, a kind of palliative for the national sorrow. The driving force of the movement was not reasoning reflection, but something deeper. It had to be achieved for the perpetuation of the Jewish national existence. Whether the Zionists understood the true import and purpose of their work, or whether they preferred not to understand, in either case history worked through them, and would reach its goal by their agency. Ahad Ha-am reported that all he saw and heard at Basel and in Palestine had strengthened his conviction, that the instinct of self-preservation neither slumbered nor slept in the nation's heart. Despite the mistakes made, this instinct created through the agency of the Zionists just what the national existence required most of all at the present. That was a fixed centre for our national spirit and culture, which will be a new spiritual bond between the scattered sections of the people, and by its spiritual influence stimulate them all to a new national life.⁴⁵

The Tenth Zionist Congress was in the author's view an extraordinary medley of languages and ideas. It was the result of an internal crisis of which everybody was conscious, but which everybody had tried hard not to see. There was a struggle between two sections, the political and the practical Zionists. And yet the politicals declared that they were also practical, and the practicals professed to be political, too. In the end the practicals won. The essential work of Zionism was pronounced to be the extension of the Jewish settlement, and the furthering of education and culture in Palestine. The star of political Zionism had waned. Zionism was no longer justified on the ground of anti-Semitism. The practicals were mostly Eastern Jews and their Western pupils. For them national Judaism was the very centre of their being. But even these people did not repudiate that article of

faith, which alone had made Zionism a popular movement, namely "the redemption of the nation".⁴³ It was not acknowledged that the end the Zionists were working for, differed from that of the Zionist tradition as established during the previous fourteen years. They sought no longer a home of refuge for the people of Israel, but a fixed centre for the spirit of Israel. This real object remained beneath the threshold of consciousness of the makers of history inside the Congress Hall. But outside the Hall, Ahad Ha-am thought he saw what history really had been doing during the last fourteen years. A new kind of Jew had joined, namely men in whom the national consciousness was deep-rooted and for whom it was an all-pervading and all-embracing sentiment. Most of these were young men, who had come from the ends of the earth, able and willing to work for the national revival. When Ahad Ha-am saw these men, who were the heirs, he did no longer trouble about the delegates in the Congress Hall. These latter thought that with their speeches and resolutions they hastened the redemption. The author thought that the distant redemption may not be any nearer, but the hearts were drawing near. History was doing its work at that place, and these men inside the Congress Hall were helping, whether they knew it or not.

The writer claimed that he found the same historical tendency in Palestine, which he then described at length. He also wrote about the future redemption, which was an age-long national hope. It was still cherished by every Jew, who was faithful to his people, "whether as a religious belief, or in some other form."⁴⁵ It became obvious, that for Ahad Ha-am the future redemption was not a religious belief, but had some other form.

The author was enthusiastic, because he saw his dream of twenty years ago in the process of realization in Palestine, though with differences in detail:

What has already been accomplished in Palestine entitles one to say with confidence that that country will be "a national spiritual centre of Judaism, to which all Jews will turn with affection, and which will bind all Jews together: a centre of study and learning, of language and literature, of bodily work and spiritual purification; a true miniature of the people of Israel as it ought to be so that every Hebrew in the Diaspora will think it a privilege to behold just once the centre of Judaism; and when he returns home will say to his friends: 'If you wish to see the genuine type of a Jew, whether it be a Rabbi or a scholar or a writer, a farmer or an artist or a business man - then go to Palestine, and you will see it.'⁴⁶

The new type of national life about which Ahad Ha-am dreamed was not yet in existence, but it was in the making in Palestine. In the Jewish colonies one felt a Hebrew national atmosphere. In this country only was to be found the solution to the problem of Jewish national existence. With a wording reminiscent of the prophet Ezekiel, Ahad Ha-am stated that from Palestine "the spirit shall go forth and breathe on the dry bones that are scattered east and west through all lands and all nations, and restore them to life."⁴⁷ The author was very pleased with the educational work done in the land. The national education was a revival of the spirit and created a new Hebrew type. Hebrew education in the Hebrew language had succeeded in producing a "spiritual revolution."⁴⁸ All Jewish settlements, whether they were in the country or in the cities, were generating stations, which appeared as a single national centre. Even in its infancy it exerted a visible and appreciable influence on the Diaspora.

Hence a man need not believe in miracles in order to see with his mind's eye this centre growing in size, improving in character, and exerting an ever-increasing spiritual influence on our people, until at last it shall reach the goal set before it by the instinct of national self-preservation: to restore our national unity throughout the world through the restoration of our national culture in its historic home. This centre will not be even then a "secure home of refuge" for our people; but it will surely be a home of healing for its spirit.⁴⁹

In the present state of spiritual disorganization Jews had no idea of the volume of their national strength. The generations that were to come afterwards

would know the measure of their power. But Ahad Ha-am and his contemporaries were not concerned about the hidden things of the distant future.

Naturally not everybody was delighted about the decisions of the Tenth Zionist Congress. Not only were the political Zionists disturbed, but the Mizrahi Faction considered itself a loser also. This latter group was not opposed to practical work in Palestine, but the decisions concerning Zionist cultural activities were the stumbling block.⁵⁰ Immediately after the Congress the Mizrahi confederation held a convention in Berlin. The main problem was to determine the attitude towards the Congress decisions. The suggestion was made to secede from the Zionist World Organization altogether. The majority of delegates, however, favoured a fight for the cause of the Torah within the movement. Thereupon a split developed within the ranks of Mizrahi itself. There were those, who wanted the basic concept of the unity of the World Zionist Organization unaltered. They retained the name Mizrahi, but made some organizational changes. This group intensified the practical work in Palestine, especially in the field of education. This was co-ordinated with efforts in the Diaspora. Mizrahi also established a fund for the creation of religious garden suburbs, especially for members of the old generation of settlers, who devoted their lives to religious studies. This was obviously intended to counter the criticism of the Chalukkah system.⁵¹ The religious garden suburbs were to enable those people to engage in agricultural work and enjoy the fruits of their own labor.

The second group of Mizrahi members seceded from the World Zionist Organization as well as from Mizrahi. They founded their own movement with the name "Agudat Israel".⁵² The founding convention was held in 1912 at Kattowitz with 300 delegates attending. The new organization was comprised of three main

groups, namely German neo-Orthodox followers of Samson Raphael Hirsch, Hungarian Orthodoxy and Orthodox Jews in Poland and Lithuania. These three groups differed among themselves with regard to religious practice, as well as the structure of Jewish communal life. Even Western knowledge and culture remained a problem, because German neo-Orthodoxy had adapted itself to the social patterns of the non-Jewish environment. The Eastern European Jewish communities on the other hand considered this as potentially destructive to their way of life. But there were enough points of agreement on basic issues to justify the founding of the new organization. Common to all Agudat Israel members was the conviction that everything in Jewish life should be based upon the Torah. At the founding convention in Kattowitz a Council of Rabbinic Leaders was established. This distinguished Agudat Israel from secular Jewish political organizations and movements. It assured that no political action would be undertaken, which ran counter to the Torah. Since the Jewish law considered it meritorious, if not mandatory, for a Jew to settle in Palestine, Agudat Israel supported such moves. But it was opposed to the building of a new society there. The concept of a Jewish National Home and of a Jewish State not founded on Jewish law and tradition was rejected. Agudat Israel upheld the messianic expectations of traditional Judaism. The time for the Ingathering of the Exiled and the Return to Zion had not yet come.

Jewish nationalism, especially the Zionist brand, was considered as something disastrous. How high the emotions ran in the arguments between Agudat Israel and the World Zionist Organization may be seen from some remarks made by Isaak Breuer, one of the founders of the new group. He concluded "Zionism is the most terrible enemy, which has ever arisen for the Jewish nation."⁵³

Among the reasons for this condemnation he cited the following. Zion-ism did not acknowledge the law of God as the national law. Zionism did not know anything about the national history of Judaism. It falsified its ideals and misused the name Zion. The political aspirations were not supported by history. Zionism did not know the national culture of Judaism. It did not call on its talents. On the contrary, it tried to create a brand-new culture. It was about to recommend to the Jewish nation a distillate of the culture of the Western nations as a cultural substitute. Unconsciously Zionism led a fight against the nation. If Zionism should fully win and succeed with its political aspirations, the world had a new nation, a new national state."But the Jewish nation of history would be dead."⁵⁴

Breuer acknowledged that Zionism was tolerant towards the Jewish religion. But reciprocal demands were made. Nothing more or less was expected of religion, than to resign and to be satisfied with a merely honorific position.⁵⁵ This was a sin against history. "The husk of the Jewish nation did not contain any other cultural content than the Jewish religion."⁵⁶ If religion and nation were separated, Israel's past was emptied.⁵⁷ Israel's history was one of a "nation of religion" (Religionsnation).⁵⁸

The fight with the Zionist movement made Agudat Israel members use Zionist terminology, but give it a different meaning. A typical example for this is a booklet by Dr. Moses Auerbach with the title: Agudas Jisroel in Erez Jisroel.⁵⁹ The author asked the observant Jews to make the Land of Israel "the cultural centre of the Jewish people."⁶⁰ But he did not mean the same thing as Ahad Ha-am. Auerbach was concerned about "the true Jewish culture, based upon the divine teaching and governed by it in all its manifestat-

ions."⁶¹ Educational institutions had to be created in the Land of Israel, in which Jewish youth would be trained to become consciously Torah-abiding Jews. The civil code in the Land of Israel had to be based upon the Torah, so the author claimed.⁶² Agudat Israel wanted "to win back the Land of Israel for the people of God, the people for the land, people and land for the Torah."⁶³ This was certainly a goal related to and yet different from either Herzl's Jewish State or Ahad Ha-am's spiritual centre.

Attempts were made also during those years and more so later, to bridge the gap between secular Jewish nationalism and culture on the one hand and the Jewish religion on the other hand. One of those thinkers, who proceeded with such endeavours, was Martin Buber. Already in his "Three Speeches about Judaism", published in 1911, this was one of his major concerns.⁶⁴ In the first speech entitled "Judaism and the Jews"⁶⁵ he asked the question, what the meaning of Judaism was for present-day Jews. He tried to determine of what kind the community was, for whose existence people testified, when they called themselves Jews. Buber answered that there were two words, with which a definition for the term of Judaism could be given, namely religion and nation. If one looked only at the formations of the external life, both terms could be applied to Judaism. But if one looked at the "internal reality",⁶⁶ neither real religiosity nor nationality were in existence. In religion one could find both tradition and the ability of Jews to assimilate. There was, however, no direct Jewish religiosity, that meant no elemental feeling for God, no holy burning God-power. Nowhere was "God's mind, the absolute"⁶⁷ being done. Jewish religiosity was in the memory, perhaps existed even as a hope, but not as a present reality.

The same was in Buber's opinion true for the term nation. The natural, objective relation of the Jew, especially of the Western Jew, towards his nation was nonexistent. All elements, which constituted a nation and could make them a reality, were missing, namely land, language and custom.⁶⁸

Buber claimed, however, that in every Jew the substance of his being was banished into deep solitude. There was only one form, in which this substance manifested itself, and that was in his descent ("Abstammung")⁶⁹. This meant not only connection with the past. But something was placed into every Jew, which would never leave him and which determined everything he did. This reality was "the blood as the deepest power-level of the soul".⁷⁰

Buber believed that Judaism had not only a past, but especially a future. Judaism had in truth not yet done its work. The great forces which lived in this most tragic and most incomprehensible of all people, had not yet spoken their most genuine word in the history of the world.⁷¹ What was necessary for the individual Jew in the present, therefore, was not a confession, nor consent to an idea, or membership in a movement, but that he saved himself. Jews were no longer able to save themselves through devotion to the one God, whom in Buber's opinion nobody could make real anymore. It was possible only through devotion to the ground of their nature, the unity of the substance within them, which was so unique.⁷²

In another speech, entitled "The Renewal of Judaism"⁷³ Buber redefined his insights and made a little more clear, what he meant. He took again issue with those, who considered Judaism as either merely a confessional or merely as a national community.⁷⁴ As living, leading representatives for the first view he considered Moritz Lazarus, for the second view Ahad Ha-am. Both wanted a renewal of Judaism, but Buber felt he could not agree with either one of

them. Lazarus demanded the introduction of real prophetic Judaism. But what Lazarus really meant, in Buber's opinion, was not renewal, but continuation of an easier, more elegant and European, a more fashionable form of Judaism. Even Ahad Ha-am did not propose an absolute renewal of Judaism according to Buber. The spiritual centre which Ahad Ha-am demanded, would not bring about the reversal and transformation, the revolution of all elements.⁷⁶ The normal and confident existence of settlers in their own country was even detrimental to the renewal as Buber saw it. He then proceeded to present his own ideas. Buber admitted that as far as the outward organization was concerned, Judaism was a confession. One reached a deeper level of reality in his opinion, if one defined Jews as a nation, a people. But in Buber's opinion neither term described the inner nature of Judaism. The latter was rather "a spiritual process, which has documented itself in the internal history of the Jewish people and in the works of the great Jews."⁷⁷ This spiritual process of Judaism was the attempt to perfect the realization of three connected ideas, namely that of unity, of action and of the future. Ideas did not mean here abstract concepts, but natural tendencies of the national character, which expressed themselves with such great strength and permanence.⁷⁸

The spiritual process in Judaism was, in Buber's opinion, interrupted. But Judaism had to regain absolute life. This meant, that its spirit had to be raised to new life. This real life had to create the consciousness of the immortal substance of the nation. The Jewish Renaissance with its flowering of the new Jewish literature was not yet a renewal of Judaism.⁷⁹ This had to start on deeper levels, on the "ground of the spirit of the people."⁸⁰

It had to begin, where in times past the great tendencies of Judaism had been born. It had to start, where the flames of the great spiritual battle had once burnt. Out of the blaze of this fire three giants had once stepped forward, the Unity-God, the Messiah, who was the carrier of the future, and Israel, the man who was struggling for action.

Buber thought that the "battle for completion" had to be renewed.⁸¹ This meant that a "new creative synthesis of the three ideas of Judaism" had to be brought about, which were in harmony with the Weltgefuehl of the future generation.⁸² Nobody could predict how this synthesis would look like. But everybody had to be prepared for its birth. To be prepared did not mean to wait impassionately. It meant to educate oneself and others towards "the great self-consciousness of Judaism".⁸³ It meant to let come to realization the tendencies of unity in the personal life of the individual Jew. To be prepared meant to prepare.

Buber dealt with the same topic, the bridging of the gap between the Jewish religion and Jewish nationalism all his life. A statement from his later years expressed this attempt in a more mature and perfected way, than the speeches of the young man. Buber wrote in 1934:

Moreover, Israel will not fit into the two categories most frequently invoked in attempts at classification: "nation" and "creed". One criterion serves to distinguish a nation from a creed. Nations experience history as "nations". What individuals as such experience, is not history. In creeds, on the other hand, salient experiences are undergone by individuals, and, in their purest and sublime form, these experiences are what we call "revelation". When such individuals communicate their experience to the masses and their tidings cause groups to form, a creed comes into being. Thus, nations and creeds differ in the same way as history and revelation. Only in one instance do they coincide. Israel receives its decisive religious experience as a people; it is not the prophet alone but the community

as such that is involved. The community of Israel experiences history and revelation as one phenomenon, history as revelation and revelation as history. In the hour of its experience of faith the group becomes a people. Only as a people can it hear what it is destined to hear. The Unity of nationality and faith which constitutes the uniqueness of Israel is not only our destiny in the empirical sense of the word: here humanity is touched by the divine.⁸⁴

It would go beyond the scope of this paper to outline the debates concerning the question of nationalism and religion and the many other attempts at bridging the gap during the years following World War I. It is certain that such efforts of reconciliation made their contribution to the nation-welding, the founding of the State of Israel and its functioning ever since. But many problems remained, others were made acute precisely by the founding of the State. J. L. Talmon wrote concerning the question of religion and the State: "With the emergence of the State of Israel the Jews began to realize to their dismay the intractable nature of the problem."⁸⁵ This was true in many areas, but especially in the field of education. In the light of the debates at the early Zionist Congresses concerning the "cultural question" it is of particular interest to note, that the "State Education Law" of 1953 recognized the threefold division, which was developed in the period dealt with in this paper.⁸⁶ The law provided for a public school system on the elementary level. This was to be unified, but two trends were recognized, State schools and religious State schools. The State schools represented the ideals of the majority of delegates at the Zionist Congresses between 1897 and 1911. The religious State schools were a continuation of the work launched by Mizrahi prior to World War I. All schools in Israel have compulsory courses in Bible and Jewish values. But while the State schools emphasize "Jewish consciousness", the religious State schools are "observant of Orthodox Precepts

as to their way of life, curriculum, teachers and inspectors".⁸⁷ The 1953 law also provided for what was termed "recognized schools", which were independent religious schools. These were not "official", but nevertheless received some financial support by the State. It was mainly the Agudat Israel schools, which were given this status. These tried to approximate the East European Orthodox schools, unchanged for centuries.

Many dreams of the forerunners, the founders and the early adherents of the Zionist movement have come true. Herzl was proven right with his prediction that the State idea was not a utopia. But many of the problems, which the early Zionists foresaw and debated, have also caused difficulties and are still doing so. Not the least of these is the relation between the ideals of nationalism and religion to the extent that these do not coincide.

Conclusion

The land of Israel and the religion of Israel were for more than three thousand years intimately linked to each other. It was generally believed that God had given this land to his own people as an everlasting inheritance. Even after the loss of statehood in 70 A.D. and the following dispersion until the beginning of the nineteenth century, Jews hoped for an eventual return to their promised land. They did not, however, consider themselves to be a nation during these centuries. They thought of themselves and were looked upon by others as a religious community. They claimed to be God's chosen people, separated from what they called summarily "the nations". The hoped-for return to what they considered to be the "Holy Land" was termed "the ingathering of the exiled from the four corners of the earth". This was to be accomplished "in the end of days" by God himself through his appointed Messiah. "The kingdom of God" would then be established, which would bring "everlasting peace". It was believed by most Jews, that man was not permitted to interfere in the affairs of the Almighty and to bring about by his own actions, what God intended to do himself. The pious people were to wait patiently with folded hands for the new acts of God in favour of his chosen ones. There was no one clear conception of how the kingdom of God would look like, or what the exiled would do there after their return. But it appeared that it was generally thought of as a this-worldly monarchy, rather than an other-worldly, heavenly realm, although some of the expectations had phantastic and supernatural aspects. Among the things hoped for was the rebuilding of the Jewish

temple according to the specifications of the Messiah.

When at the end of the nineteenth century a mass-movement for the return of Jews to Palestine started under the name Zionism, and as a consequence in the middle of this century a new, independent Jewish state was finally founded, hardly any of the above mentioned religious considerations were of significance. What was founded was not a theocracy, but a modern, secular, national state. This is at first sight perhaps a startling observation. The outsider will find it even more surprising to hear that many religiously minded Jews had not only hesitations to join the new movement, but some were outrightly opposed to these developments precisely on religious grounds. The paper here presented traced the thinking of those who started^a Back-to-Palestine movement. It was shown that the main roots of the underlying thinking were not found in the Jewish religion, but in the general European situation in the nineteenth century with its ideal of nationalism and the widespread weakening of traditional religious loyalties. This helped to explain why as a consequence most of the early leaders of the Zionist movement were secularly minded, some of them were even professed atheists or what was termed free-thinkers. It also accounted for the fact that there were frequently conflicts between Zionists and religious leaders and constant tensions within the movement itself caused by religious issues.

This did not mean, that religious motives were totally absent. There were Jews, who believed that the resurrection from the dead would begin in Jerusalem. Therefore many elderly people moved to Palestine, so

that they would die at that location and be buried in what was considered to be "sacred soil". According to the Talmud it was thought to be a meritorious act to live in the Holy Land. Some Jews therefore spent their lives there, studying the Torah and being dependent on welfare money sent from their pious co-religionists in other countries. But even these people were not in Palestine in order to build the kingdom of God there, nor did the benefactors expect them to do so. It is true that some believed that man might be able to speed up the coming of the Messiah. This could be done by punctual fulfillment of all details of God's Torah. But all Jews had to co-operate in this endeavour, regardless of where they lived. Another factor had to be taken into account. In the nineteenth century many Western Jews no longer considered the belief in the future kingdom of God and the return of the chosen people to the Holy Land to be an essential aspect of the Jewish religion. These hopes were given up in the reform movements in Central Europe and in North America. The religious reforms were both the result of and went hand in hand with the Jewish struggle for emancipation and the attempt at assimilation.

The early forerunners of Zionism around the middle of the nineteenth century were religious leaders.¹ Their writings show clearly, how impressed they were by contemporary movements of national self-liberation in Europe. The authors urged their co-religionists to imitate the pattern set by national minorities in various countries. The religious motives of these precursors of the later Zionist movement, had to be different from traditional beliefs. No longer was the patient

waiting for the actions of the Almighty condoned and self-help rejected. These writers tried to show that a national movement of self-liberation and a return of Jews to Palestine did not contradict the messianic expectations. New emphasis was laid on the meritorious aspect of the living in the Holy Land. Reform Judaism was rejected, because it had given up all hopes with regard to the future kingdom in Palestine. But no mass movements resulted from the suggestions of the precursors. Their writings were soon forgotten. Most religiously minded Jews considered such ideas as an aberration from the true faith, while the secularly minded were alienated by the religious terminology.

The view that it was the general European situation which caused Zionist thought, rather than specific Jewish religious precepts, can be supported by the observation, that a secularist philosopher came to similar conclusions as the religious forerunners of Zionism. It was Moses Hess, the socialist, Young-Hegelian, and admirer of Spinoza. He began to discover his Jewish nationality under the impact of an anti-Jewish outbreak of violence, and the subsequent false accusations, the so-called Damascus incident of 1840. The same had already shocked the religious forerunners of Zionism. Things like that were thought of belonging to the medieval past and overcome in the enlightened period of the nineteenth century. It was to happen again later, that an incident like this was the immediate cause of Zionist thought and led to the discovery of Jewish feeling of togetherness on other than religious grounds. Hess expected that the national idea would unite all Jews, whatever their religious out-

look. He urged other Jews to consider a move to Palestine and the founding of agricultural settlements and eventually a Jewish state there. But even the call of Moses Hess went largely unanswered. The time was not yet ripe.

Independent from the ideas of these precursors of Zionism were national ideas developed by Jews in the second half of the nineteenth century in Russia. Here Jews formed cohesive groups, different from their neighbours in dress, language and habits. But it was the pogroms of 1881 which sparked a strong Jewish reaction and led to the discovery of Jewish nationality also among enlightened and largely assimilated elements in their midst. This caused the founding of the Back-to-Palestine movement of the so-called Lovers of Zion. The writings of Leo Pinsker were most influential in this respect, even though his secular precepts did at first not even make him think that the new Jewish state to be founded as a result of the national awakening had necessarily to be in Palestine. He made it quite clear that Jews did then not want to found the kingdom of God, but a state. They did not seek the Holy Land, but a land of their own. In response to this appeal a German Rabbi, Ruelph, tried to express the same thoughts in religious terms and urged both Pinsker and his followers to consider Palestine only as the site of the new national Jewish settlement. This they did. But it was not Rabbi Ruelph who earned fame and was adhered to, but the secularist Pinsker, who became the leader of the national movement. Only a minority of the Lovers of Zion were religiously minded. Tensions led to the founding of a religious faction within the movement, called Mizrahi. One of its major

concerns was the observing of the precepts of the Torah in the new settlements. Only a few thousand Jews went to Palestine as a result of the efforts of the Lovers of Zion. Even these few soon got into serious difficulties and required support from friends in other countries.

A new beginning was made with the appearance of the book The Jewish State by Dr. Theodor Herzl in 1896. The author knew nothing of the writings of the religious forerunners, of Moses Hess, or even of Leo Pinsker. He was only vaguely familiar with the colonization efforts of Jews in Palestine. He looked with contempt on these petty solutions to the Jewish question and sought one on a grand scale. Herzl proposed to start with political activities and the attempt to get a charter for the land first, before engaging in actual settlement. Like for Pinsker, the impetus for his activities came not out of a religious impulse. Herzl also reacted to anti-Semitism, in his case to the Dreyfus Affair, which he had observed first hand. But this was only the immediate cause. Once realized, Jewish nationalism developed, whether it was again stirred up by anti-Semitism or not. For both Pinsker and Herzl the discovery of their own Jewish nationality was a sudden inspiration, not the influence of any one particular European thinker outside Judaism. Hannah Arent wrote: "Herzl thought in terms of nationalism inspired from German sources - as opposed to the French variety, which could never repudiate its original relationship to the political ideas of the French revolution."² Hans Kohn, quoting Hannah Arendt, added: "According to the German theory, people of common descent or speaking a common language should form one common state."³ Neither Arendt nor Kohn named any German nationalists in part-

icular. A common language Jews did not speak. But Herzl certainly mentioned the common descent. He spoke about "the parent stem"⁴ and about the "historic group with unmistakable characteristics common to us all."⁵ The decisive thing for Herzl, however, was the same fate experienced by Jews everywhere: "We are one people - our enemies have made us one without our consent, as repeatedly happens in history."⁶

Neither Pinsker's nor Herzl's ideas were possible without the general European background in the late nineteenth century. Zionism was a late-comer on the scene, because the Jewish situation was so different from that of any other nationality. It grew out of a dissolution with what was considered to be the failure of the attempt at assimilation. An obstacle which had to be overcome was the generally accepted view that Judaism was only a religion. This assumption had even been strengthened by the Reform movements in the nineteenth century. The nationalists on the other hand pointed out that Jews had been a nation in antiquity. They could become one again, if national consciousness was awakened and a national Renaissance took place. Herzl and his followers felt that the main work in this regard had been done by the anti-Semites, the enemies. The greatest difficulty for Jewish nationalism was the fact that Jews did not yet live in the land, in which they intended to build their nation and found their state, different from all other European groups struggling for their national self-determination. Palestine was considered for historical and sentimental reasons. Most Zionists did not consider it essential for religious reasons. In the Uganda debate, for

example, most religious Zionists sided with the "Africans". Both Pinsker and Herzl were ready to accept also another country anywhere in the world, as long as it was one unit and large enough to house several million people. For Pinsker and Herzl the language question was not a serious problem. Both lived in multi-language states. Herzl's ideal was Switzerland with several equally acceptable languages. Yiddish as well as Spaniolic were genuinely Jewish languages. But they were looked down upon by the cultured European gentlemen, who spoke High-German. Hebrew was not thought to be acceptable, because neither Herzl nor most of his friends knew it well enough. The language question had by necessity to become a controversial issue in such a national movement. Hebrew was finally adopted not for religious reasons, but for historical ones. It was the language, which Jews had spoken in antiquity, when they still were a nation and had been in their own land. Both the Jargon as well as Spaniolic were considered to be Diaspora languages which were destined to die with the end of the dispersion.

The fact that Zionism was an application of the contemporary European ideals to the Jewish situation, was clearly recognized by many religiously minded Jews and caused their opposition. This paper traced many of the almost continuous arguments concerning this problem. Chief among the objections on religious grounds was the claim that the Messiah had not yet come and Jews should not do anything, which contradicted the messianic expectations. Religiously minded Jews were also afraid that the Torah could and would not be properly observed by Jews in Palestine. The idea of the founding of a modern, secular Jewish state was also not considered proper by many Orthodox Jews. The Chief-Rabbi of Vienna, Guedemann, claimed that Zionism was just another form of assimilation. He considered it precisely as the attempt of Jews to imitate the modern nationalism of Europe and to be like all the

other nations. Israel had always been warned against such attempts. It was the people of God and should be different. It should not imitate "the nations", not even with regard to modern nationalism. Rabbis protested at some of their assemblies against the founding of the movement. The place of meeting of the First Zionist Congress had to be changed due to opposition from religious circles.

Herzl was surprised and angered, when he was attacked on religious grounds. He had supposed and hoped that the religious leaders were the natural allies of any Jewish national movement, especially when the goal was the recovery of Palestine. One result of the religious opposition to Zionism was that it was not permitted at Zionist Congresses to discuss religious questions. The principle established right from the start was absolute religious neutrality and tolerance. All Jews were to be welcomed in the national movement, whatever their religious outlook. Religion could bring disunity. It was shown in this paper that the Zionists were not always in the position to enforce this principle. The main reason was that religious questions were touched upon, whenever basic decisions concerning the development of the movement had to be reached. Religious problems were important especially in connection with the so-called cultural question. It was decided at Zionist Congresses to further a new, secular Jewish culture and the establishment of a secular school system. This aroused the opposition of a religiously minded group within the World Zionist Organization. But it finally led to the split of the religious faction. Out of the discussions and arguments on this question eventually three

different school systems developed differing from each other concerning the emphasis laid on religious issues. It was shown in this paper that the basic decisions in this respect had been reached prior to World War I. The divisions and principles then established did not become law in the state of Israel until 1953.

Many other questions involving religious principles have not as yet been settled, such as the adoption of a constitution. This paper tried to throw some new light on the prehistory of such problems.

Footnotes.

Introduction.

¹See on this the excellent study by Emile Marmorstein,
Heaven at Bay: The Jewish Kulturkampf in the Holy Land (London, 1969)

²The word anti-Semitism itself was coined only in the seventies of
the nineteenth century and did not become popular until about 1880.
See on this: Ismar Elbogen, Ein Jahrhundert juedischen Lebens ("A
Century of Jewish Life"), ed. by Ellen Littmann (Frankfurt am Main,
1967), pp. 153 ff.

Footnotes.

Chapter I.

- ¹ Cf. James William Parker History of Palestine:
from 135 A.D. to modern times
(New York, 1949)
- ² Cf. Julius H. Greenstone The Messiah Idea in Jewish History
(Philadelphia, 1906)
(Hereinafter referred to as Messiah Idea)
- ³ Cf. David Philipson The Reform Movement in Judaism
reissue of new and rev. ed. by Solomon B. Freehof
(n.p., 1967)

Chapter II.

¹Cf. Nahum Sokolow, History of Zionism:1600-1918 (New York, 1969) I, 63-66.

²Cf. Albert M. Hyamson, British Projects for the Restoration of the Jews, The British Palestine Committee, Publication No. 1 (N.P., 1917); and: Barbara W. Tuchman, Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour, Minerva Press (New York, 1956).

³A list of his writings in: N. M. Gelber, "Alkalai Ben Salomo Chai" Encyclopaedia Judaica: Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Berlin, 1928) II, 326-29. An excerpt from his writings in English translation in Arthur Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea: A Historical Analysis and Reader. With an Introduction and Bibliographical Notes. Forward by Emanuel Neumann. Harper Torchbooks (New York, 1959) pp. 105-107. (Hereinafter referred to as The Zionist Idea).

⁴ibid., p. 34.

⁵Among the few admirers and disciples of Rabbi Alkalai was a certain Simon Loeb Herzl, grandfather of Dr. Theodor Herzl. One of Alkalai's grand-daughters was to attend the first Zionist Congress in 1897 at Basel.

⁶Some letters have come to light, which show, that the author had expressed these ideas to some friends as early as 1830. On the life and work of the Rabbi see: S. A. Horodezky, "Kalischer, Zebi Hirsch Ben Salomo", Encyclopedia Judaica: Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Berlin, 1932) IX, 825-27. A German translation from the original Hebrew edition appeared in 1865: Hirsch Kalischer, Drischath Zion, oder Zions Herstellung ("Seeking Zion"), trans. by Dr. Poper (Thorn, 1865). Excerpts in English translation in: Arthur Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea, pp. 11-14.

⁷ German translation, p. 16.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 99.

⁹ Cf. the introduction of Moses Hess, Ausgewahlte Schriften ("Selected Writings"), ed. by Horst Lademacher (Cologne, 1962), pp. 6-7. (Hereinafter referred to as Ausgewahlte Schriften).

¹⁰ "Rom und Jerusalem: die letzte Nationalitaetsfrage". The German original was reissued recently in Moses Hess, Ausgewahlte Schriften, pp. 221-320. The book was translated into English and appeared under the title: Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism, trans. with introduction and notes by Meyer Waxmann (New York, 1945).

¹¹ *ibid.*, p. 155.

¹² *ibid.*, p. 55.

¹³ *ibid.*, p. 140.

Chapter III.

¹See Salo Wittmayer Baron, Modern Nationalism and Religion, Meridian Books (New York and Philadelphia, 1960) p. 222.

²Cf. regarding the history of Jews in Russia in general: Semen Markovich Dubnov, History of the Jews in Russia and Poland, trans. by I. Friedlaender, Vol. II (Philadelphia, 1918); Jacob Frankin, ed. et al., Russian Jewry (1860-1917), trans. by Mirra Ginsburg (New York, 1966); Ismar Elbogen, Ein Jahrhundert, pp. 69-101, 202-221; 333-378.

³Exact figures are available only for the year 1897; see Arthur Ruppin, Die Juden der Gegenwart: Eine sozialwissenschaftliche Studie ("The Jews of the present time: A sociological study") 2d. ed. (Cologne and Berlin, 1911), p. 37. (Hereinafter referred to as Die Juden).

⁴A map of the "Pale of settlement" in Howard Morley Sachar, The Course of Modern Jewish History, Delta Book (New York, 1958), p. 189. (Hereinafter referred to as Modern Jewish History).

⁵For details see Arthur Ruppin, Die Juden, p. 42.

⁶See on this Jacob S. Raisin, The Haskalah Movement in Russia, (Philadelphia, 1913).

⁷Howard Morley Sachar, Modern Jewish History, p. 261.

⁸Aliyah, a Hebrew word, meaning "going up". It is being used for immigration to Palestine, which is considered to be a going up, since the heart of the land, the city of Jerusalem, is located in a mountain area. Coming from any direction, one has to go up, in order to reach the city.

- ⁹The word was formed from the Hebrew initials of the words from Isaiah 2:5: "O House of Jacob, come ye and let us go!"
- ¹⁰Quoted from the translation in Arthur Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea, p. 146.
- ¹¹An English translation in Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea, pp. 160 -165.
- ¹²Excerpts from the writings of Smolenski in 1881 and 1883 in English translation in Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea, pp. 148-157.

Chapter IV.

¹English translation in Leo Pinsker, Road to Freedom: Writings and Addresses, with an Introduction by B. Netanyahu (New York, 1944) pp. 74-106. (Hereinafter referred to as Writings).

²Writings, p. 78.

³ibid. p. 50.

⁴ibid. p. 106.

⁵ibid. p. 79.

⁶ibid. p. 95.

⁷ibid. p. 95.

⁸I(saak) Ruelf, Arucha's Bas-Ammi: Israel's Heilung ("Israel's Salvation") (Frankfurt am Main, 1883).

⁹The "Alliance Israelite Universelle" was founded in 1860 in order to counter anti-Semitic attacks. For details see Ismar Elbogen, Ein Jahrhundert, pp. 62 ff. Cf. also above, p. 18.

¹⁰Leo Pinsker, Writings, p. 132.

¹¹ibid., p. 137.

¹²ibid., p. 138.

¹³noted in Arthur Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea, p. 177.

¹⁴For details on the life of the man see: Leon Simon, Ahad Ha-am: Asher Ginzberg, a Biography (Philadelphia, 1960). (Hereinafter referred to as Ahad Ha-am, a Biography).

- ¹⁵A translation in Hans Kohn, Nationalism and the Jewish Ethic: Basic Writings of Ahad Ha-am (New York, 1962), pp. 34-43. (Hereinafter referred to as Basic Writings).
- ¹⁶There is no translation of the volume as a whole; various articles appeared in translated selections of Ahad Ha-am's writings.
- ¹⁷Hans Kohn, Basic Writings, p.36.
- ¹⁸ibid., p.34
- ¹⁹ibid., p.41.
- ²⁰ibid., p.41.
- ²¹ibid., p.42.
- ²²ibid., p.43.
- ²³Leon Simon, Selected Essays by Ahad Ha-am, trans. from the Hebrew (Philadelphia, 1948), p.117., (Hereinafter referred to as Selected Essays).
- ²⁴Cf. Leon Simon, Ahad Ha-am, a Biography, pp. 59 ff.
- ²⁵Leon Simon, Ahad Ha-am: Essays, Letters, Memoirs, trans from the Hebrew and ed. (Oxford, 1946), p.75. (Hereinafter referred to as Essays).
- ²⁶Cf. Hans Kohn, Basic Writings, pp. 36, 54 ff; a.o.
- ²⁷Leon Simon, Essays, p. 74.
- ²⁸Hans Kohn, Basic Writings, p. 55.

²⁹Leon Simon, Selected Essays, p. 43.

³⁰ibid., p.45 .

³¹Leon Simon, Essays, p.68.

³²ibid., p.70.

³³Leon Simon, Selected Essays, p.77.

³⁴Hans Kohn, Basic Writings, p.34.

³⁵ibid., p. 37.

³⁶Leon Simon, Selected Essays, p. 169.

³⁷This is the title of one of his articles. A translation was published in Leon Simon, Essays, pp. 58-64.

³⁸Leon Simon, Essays, p. 63.

³⁹ibid., p.64.

⁴⁰ibid., p. 67.

⁴¹ibid., p. 6 7.

⁴²Abbreviation for the Hebrew words: merkaz ruhani, "spiritual centre".

⁴³English translation in Arthur Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea, pp.401-05.

⁴⁴Cf. Zechariah 8:7-8.

Chapter V.

- ¹A summary of his ideas in the 1880's and the early 1890's is found in the article: Die nationale Wiedergeburt des juedischen Volkes in seinem Lande, als Mittel zur Loesung der Judenfrage: Ein Appell an die Guten und Edlen aller Nationen("The National Rebirth of the Jewish People in its Own Land as a Means for the Solution of the Jewish Question: an Appeal to the Good and Noble Among All Nations"); reprinted in Nathan Birnbaum, Ausgewaehlte Schriften zur juedischen Frage ("Selected Essays concerning the Jewish Question") (Czernowitz, 1910), I,1-21.
- ²ibid., p. 160.
- ³ibid., p. 12.
- ⁴Henriette Hannah Bodenheimer, ed., Prelude to Israel: The Memoirs of M. I. Bodenheimer, trans. by Israel Cohen (New York, 1963), p. 60. (Hereinafter referred to as Prelude).
- ⁵ibid., p. 64.
- ⁶Max I. Bodenheimer, Wohin mit den russischen Juden? ("Whither the Russian Jews?") (Hamburg, 1891).
- ⁷A photographic reproduction of the first page of this article in Henriette Hannah Bodenheimer, Im Anfang der zionistischen Bewegung: Eine Dokumentation auf der Grundlage des Briefwechsels zwischen Theodor Herzl und Max Bodenheimer von 1896 bis 1905 ("In the beginning of the Zionist movement: A documentation on the basis of the letters exchanged between Theodor Herzl and Max Bodenheimer between 1896 and 1905") (Frankfurt am Main, 1965), p. 441. (Hereinafter referred to as Im Anfang).

⁸ Prelude, p. 78.

⁹ ibid., p. 68.

¹⁰ Nach Jerusalem gehen wir nicht, sondern ziehen, wenn es noetig ist, gleich unseren christlichen Bruedern mit Gott fuer Kaiser und Vaterland gegen die Feinde Deutschlands. Ein Schriftchen gewidmet aus Liebe seinen katholischen und protestantischen Mitbruedern von einem Deutschen mosaischer Religion, nach 38 jaehriger Abwesenheit in die geliebte Heimat zurueckgekehrt. (Nuernberg, 1893).

¹¹ S. Adler, Assimilation oder Nationaljudenthum? ("Assimilation or National Judaism?") (Berlin, 1894).

¹² ibid., p.5.

¹³ ibid., p.11.

¹⁴ Theodor Herzl, The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question, trans. and ed. by Jacob M. Alkow (New York, 1946). (Hereinafter referred to as The Jewish State).

¹⁵ Many biographies have been written about this rather interesting man. The most outstanding appears to be: Alex Bein, Theodor Herzl: A Biography of the Founder of Modern Zionism, trans. by Maurice Samuel, Meridian Books (Philadelphia, 1962). A list of other biographies ibid., pp. 533-34.

¹⁶ Theodor Herzl, The Jewish State, p. 157.

¹⁷ ibid., p. 96.

¹⁸ Theodor Herzl, The Complete Diaries, ed. by Raphael Patai, trans. by Harry Zohn (New York and London, 1960), I, 278. (Hereinafter referred to as Diaries).

¹⁹M(oritz) Guedemann, Nationaljudenthum(National Judaism"), (Leipzig and Vienna, 1897). (Hereinafter referred to as Nationaljudenthum).

²⁰ibid., pp.16-17.

²¹1. Samuel 8:5f.

²²M.Guedemann, Nationaljudenthum, p.42.

²³The article appeared originally in "Bloch's Wochenschrift", and was reprinted in Theodor Herzl, Gesammelte Zionistische Werke ("Collected Zionist Works") (Tel Aviv, 1934) I, 138-47. (Hereinafter referred to as Gesammelte Werke).

²⁴The relations between Herzl and Guedemann, which were apparently full of misunderstandings, are the subject of a chapter in Saul R. Landau's book Sturm und Drang im Zionismus ("Storm and Stress in Zionism") (Vienna, 1937), pp. 250-57, in which material from Guedemann's own memoirs was published. One has to conclude from these statements that Guedemann did not change his mind at all, as Herzl had suggested. Cf. also Theodor Herzl, Diaries, I, 229 ff; Alex Bein, Theodor Herzl, pp. 148-52; 220 f.

²⁵This reply of Nordau was apparently considered to be so important, that it was put first in the selection of his collected works, which were published in 1909. The article entitled "Ein Tempelstreit" ("A temple Argument") appeared first in No. 2 of the official Zionist paper Die Welt ("The World") in 1897, reprinted in Max Nordau, Zionistische Schriften ("Zionist Writings") (Cologne and Leipzig, 1909), pp. 1-17. (Hereinafter referred to as Schriften).

²⁶ *ibid.* p.4.

²⁷ *ibid.* p. 5.

²⁸ Theodor Herzl, Diaries, I, 310; cf. Richard Lichtheim, Die Geschichte des deutschen Zionismus ("The History of German Zionism") (Jerusalem, 1954), p. 125.

²⁹ Max Nordau, Schriften, p. 320.

³⁰ Cf. Alex Bein, Theodor Herzl, p. 282.

³¹ Cf. Zechariah 9:9; see also the Christian interpretation of this passage in Matthew 21:2 ff.

³² Alex Bein, Theodor Herzl, p. 282.

³³ Theodor Herzl, Diaries, I, 233. Cf. Protokolle X, 15: Dr. Herzl, "the Moses of our time".

³⁴ See for example the designation of the Actions-Committee which appeared as a preface to Nordau's Schriften.

³⁵ *ibid.*, p.369.

³⁶ Protokolle I, 29; cf. Max Nordau, Schriften, p. 22.

Chapter VI.

¹Werner J. Cahnmann, "Munich and the First Zionist Congress", Historia Judaica, ed. Guido Kisch, Vol. III, April 1941, No. 1, p. 13; cf. Ben Halpern, The Idea of the Jewish State (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), pp. 80 ff. (Hereinafter referred to as Idea)

²Central Conference of American Rabbis, Year Book, Cincinnati, O., 1898, p. xii. (Hereinafter referred to as Central Conference Year Book).

³Cf. above p. 5.

⁴Central Conference Year Book, 1898, p. xli.

⁵Photographic reproduction in Henriette Hannah Bodenheimer, Im Anfang, p. 48; cf. Ben Halpern, Idea, pp. 144 ff.

⁶Henriette Hannah Bodenheimer, Im Anfang, p.48.

⁷The article appeared first in Die Welt ("The World") on July 16, 1897; reprinted in Theodor Herzl, Gesammelte Werke, I, 169-74.

⁸Theodor Herzl, The Jewish State, p.125.

⁹Henriette Hannah Bodenheimer, Toldoth Tochnith Basel ("Prehistory of the Basel Program") (Jerusalem, 1948), p. XXXVI.

¹⁰Theodor Herzl, Diaries, II, 578.

¹¹ibid. II, 583.

¹²The complete text of this opening address in Protokolle I, 11-14.

A summary in English translation in The Zionist Congress held at Basle, Switzerland Aug. 29, 30 and 31, 1897 (New York, 1897), pp. 10 ff. (Hereinafter referred to as The Zionist Congress).

- ¹³Theodor Herzl, Diaries, II, 578. Cf., however, the judgment concerning Lippe's speech by Max J. Bodenheimer: "His address was dignified in form and content." Prelude, p.101.
- ¹⁴Cf. Theodor Herzl, The Jewish State, pp. 70; 81 f; 87; 93 f; 130 f.
- ¹⁵Theodor Herzl, The Jewish State, pp. 95 f.
- ¹⁶ibid., p. 137.
- ¹⁷ibid., p. 146.
- ¹⁸Leo Pinsker, Writings, p.94.
- ¹⁹Cf. Zechariah 9:9; also above p. 92, note 31.
- ²⁰Cf. The Zionist Congress, pp. 42-44.
- ²¹ibid. p. 13. See on this question the illuminating article by Joseph Adler "Religion and Herzl: Fact and Fable", Herzl Year Book, ed. Raphael Patai (New York, 1961-62), pp. 271-303. (Hereinafter referred to as "Religion and Herzl").
- ²²Cf. for details Joseph Adler "Religion and Herzl", pp.288 f.
- ²³Cf. above pp. 64 ff.
- ²⁴Protokolle I, 128; cf. 130.
- ²⁵Protokolle I, 208 ff.
- ²⁶Protokolle I, 212 ff.
- ²⁷The text of his address in Protokolle I, 215.
- ²⁸Protokolle I, 216; cf. the translation in The Zionist Congress, pp. 57 ff.

²⁹Chaim Weizmann, Trial and Error: The Autobiography, Schocken Books (New York, 1966), p. 45. (Hereinafter referred to as Autobiography).

³⁰Theodor Herzl, Diaries, II, 579.

³¹The reaction of Christians is a matter, which deserves more attention, but would go beyond the scope of this paper. Here are some glimpses. Bodenheimer observed at Basel: "At the inns there was a great deal of talk about Zionism and the Congress. I found that the non-Jewish public accepted the Zionist plan as something quite natural." Prelude, p. 99. Max Nordau stated frequently that Zionism did not have enemies among Christians; Schriften, p. 330; Protokolle III, 19.

³²Dr. H. Salomonsohn, Widerspricht der Zionismus unserer Religion? ("Is Zionism in contradistinction to our religion?") (Berlin, 1898).

³³This was a gross exaggeration. It is hard to estimate the number of sympathizers. But the number of paying members (Schekelzahler) in 1898 was 78,000; even if many more were in favour of Zionism, the number did definitely not go into the millions. Cf. Zionistische Vereinigung fuer Deutschland, ed., Zionistisches A-B-C-Buch ("Zionist A-B-C-Book") (Berlin, 1908), p. 234. (Hereinafter referred to as Zionistisches A-B-C-Buch).

³⁴ibid., p. 229.

³⁵ibid., pp. 229 f.

³⁶Central Conference of American Rabbis, Year Book (Cincinnati, O., 1899), pp. 167 ff.

³⁷ibid., pp. 179 ff.

³⁸Zionistisches A-B-C-Buch, p. 230. The "Shulhan Arukh" is an authoritative interpretation of the Torah, written in the sixteenth century by Joseph Karo. It provides the final decisions on almost any legal and ritual question of Jewish religious practice. See on this Simon Glustrom, The Language of Judaism (New York, 1966), pp. 308 f.

Chapter VII.

- ¹Achad Ha-am (Asher Ginzberg), Ten Essays on Zionism and Judaism, trans. by Leon Simon (London, 1922) p. 30. (Hereinafter referred to as Ten Essays).
- ²ibid. p. 55.
- ³ibid., p. 54.
- ⁴ibid., pp. 42 f.
- ⁵Cf. above pp. 57 ff.
- ⁶Achad Ha-am, Ten Essays, p. 44.
- ⁷ibid., p. 45
- ⁸ibid., p. 38.
- ⁹Protokolle II, 5.
- ¹⁰Protokolle II, 6.
- ¹¹Protokolle II, 35.
- ¹²Nachman Syrkin was one of the fathers of Socialist Zionism; see his Essays on Socialist Zionism (n.p., 1935); cf. Arthur Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea, pp. 331 ff.
- ¹³Protokolle II, 36.
- ¹⁴Protokolle II, 197 ff.
- ¹⁵Protokolle II, 198.
- ¹⁶Protokolle II, 202.

¹⁷Protokolle II,207 ff.

¹⁸Protokolle II,212.

¹⁹Protokolle II,213.

²⁰Protokolle II,213. Concerning delegate N. Syrkin cf. above pp.110 f.

²¹Protokolle II,214 f.

²²Protokolle II,222.

²³Protokolle III,78.

²⁴Protokolle III,160 ff.

²⁵Protokolle III,162.

²⁶Protokolle III,190f.

²⁷Protokolle III,198 ff.

²⁸Protokolle III,199.

²⁹Protokolle III,207.

³⁰Protokolle III,210.

³¹Protokolle III,213;215; a.o.

³²Protokolle III,206, cf. p. 235.

³³Protokolle IV,196 ff.

³⁴Protokolle IV, 85.

³⁵Protokolle IV,218; cf. p. 203.

³⁶Protokolle IV,189.

³⁷Protokolle IV,195.

³⁸Protokolle IV,193.

³⁹Protokolle IV,200.

⁴⁰Protokolle IV,201.

⁴¹Protokolle IV,203.

⁴²Protokolle IV,221.

⁴³Protokolle IV, 281.

⁴⁴Protokolle IV,92 f.

⁴⁵Protokolle IV,218; cf. pp. 220, 223 ff.

⁴⁶Protokolle IV,95; cf. pp.99; 106; 108; 222; a.o.

⁴⁷Protokolle IV,222 f.

⁴⁸Protokolle IV,223.

⁴⁹Protokolle IV,226.

⁵⁰Chaim Weizmann, Autobiography, p. 57.

⁵¹Full text of the speech reprinted in Chaim Weizmann,

Reden und Aufsätze:1901-1936 ("Speeches and articles:1901-1936"),

pp. 2-6. (Hereinafter referred to as Reden).

⁵²ibid. p. 5.

⁵³Chaim Weizmann, Autobiography, p. 69.

⁵⁴Chaim Weizmann, Autobiography, pp. 56 f; Reden, p.3.

⁵⁵Protokolle V, 425.

⁵⁶Protokolle V, 27 ff.

⁵⁷Protokolle V, 28; cf. pp. 29 f. This debate shows, that not even the Russian delegates were united, not even the followers of Ahad Ha-am. Ussischkin was a member of the lodge Benai Moshe; of. Chaim Weizmann, Autobiography, pp. 58 ff.

⁵⁸Protokolle V, 30

⁵⁹Protokolle V, 114 f.

⁶⁰Protokolle V, 151.

⁶¹Protokolle V, 152.

⁶²Protokolle V, 157.

⁶³Protokolle V, 144.

⁶⁴Protokolle, V, 144.

⁶⁵Protokolle V, 146.

⁶⁶Protokolle V, 206.

⁶⁷Protokolle V, 206.

⁶⁸Protokolle V, 229.

⁶⁹Protokolle V, 397; cf. p. 419.

⁷⁰Protokolle V, 398 ff.

⁷¹Protokolle V, 398.

⁷²Protokolle V, 399.

⁷³Protokolle V,417.

⁷⁴Protokolle V,427; cf. p. 389.

⁷⁵See above pp. 118 ff.

⁷⁶Protokolle V, 427.

⁷⁷See above, p. 126 .

⁷⁸Protokolle V,393 ff.

⁷⁹Cf. Protokolle V,325. Rabbi Jochanan ben Sakkai lived in the first century A.D. and became famous on account of actions during the first Jewish War (66-70 A.D.). He founded a rabbinical academy at Jabne. The survival of Judaism as a religion after the destruction of the second temple and the loss of statehood is largely attributed to him. For details see the excellent book by Jacob Neusner, A Life of Yohanan Ben Zakkai;Ca.1-80 C.E., 2.ed.compl.rev.(Leiden, 1970)
Cf. also below p. 140.

⁸⁰Protokolle V,395.

⁸¹See above p.65; cf. pp. 101 f.

⁸²See Joseph Adler "Religion and Herzl", pp. 298 ff.

⁸³See above pp. 64 ff.

⁸⁴The following information is derived from "Mizrahi", Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, 1971, Vol. 2, p. 792.

⁸⁵ibid.

- ⁸⁶ ibid.
- ⁸⁷ Cf. "Minsk Conference", Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, 1971 Vol 2, p. 788; also Zionistisches A-B-C-Buch, pp. 140 ff.
- ⁸⁸ That part of the address, which dealt with the cultural question was published in an English translation in Ahad Ha-am, Selected Essays, pp. 253 ff; another selection also in Essays, pp. 83 ff.
- ⁸⁹ Selected Essays, p. 254.
- ⁹⁰ ibid., p. 289.
- ⁹¹ ibid., p. 290.
- ⁹² ibid., 302.
- ⁹³ Cf. Zionistisches A-B-C-Buch, p.141; Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol.2, p. 789.
- ⁹⁴ Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol.2, p. 792.
- ⁹⁵ ibid.
- ⁹⁶ Protokolle VI, 132; cf. above pp. 128 f.
- ⁹⁷ Protokolle VI, 144 f.
- ⁹⁸ Protokolle VI, 145.
- ⁹⁹ Protokolle VI, 146.
- ¹⁰⁰ Protokolle VI, 8f; cf. 214 ff. On the background of this offer and its implications, see "East Africa Scheme", Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol.I, pp. 263 f.

¹⁰¹Protokolle VI,71.

¹⁰²Protokolle VI,230; cf. p. 236.

¹⁰³M. A. Roth, Der Zionismus: vom Standpunkt der juedischen Orthodoxie beleuchtet ("Zionism: looked at from the point of view of Orthodoxy") (Nagytapolscany, 1904). (Hereinafter referred to as: Der Zionismus).

¹⁰⁴ibid., pp. 57 ff.

¹⁰⁵Cf. above, pp. 15 ff.

¹⁰⁶M. A. Roth, Der Zionismus, p. 17.

¹⁰⁷ibid. p. 24.

¹⁰⁸ibid. pp. 71 ff.

¹⁰⁹Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol. 2, pp. 792 ff.

¹¹⁰See "Jewish Territorial Organization", Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol. I, pp. 636.

¹¹¹Protokolle VII,34. The book by Chief-Rabbi Roth was issued in Hungary and the Mizrahi Congress took place there. One may suspect that these events had a connection with the issuance of the proclamation. The Orthodox Rabbis referred to, might have felt compelled to take a stand on the issues, because Zionism had come so close to home to them.

¹¹²Protokolle VII,89; 108.

¹¹³Protokolle VII, 151.

¹¹⁴Protokolle VIII, 301 ff; 325.

115 Protokolle VIII, 298 ff.

116 Protokolle VIII, 318.

117 Protokolle VIII, 214 ff; 226 ff.

118 Protokolle VIII, 109.

119 Protokolle VIII, 214.

120 Protokolle VIII, 337; 341; 382.

121 Protokolle VIII, 312.

122 For details see: Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol.2, p.793.

123 Protokolle IX, 136.

124 Protokolle IX, 110.

125 Protokolle IX, 209.

126 Protokolle IX, 226.

Chapter VIII.

¹Protokolle X, 14.

²Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol. 2, p. 793.

³Protokolle X, 14.

⁴Protokolle X, 40.

⁵Protokolle X, 112 ff.

⁶Protokolle X, 118.

⁷See above, p. 54.

⁸Protokolle X, 123 f.

⁹Protokolle X, 124. On Chief-Rabbi Kook see Arthur Hertzberg, The Zionist Idea, pp. 416 ff.

¹⁰Protokolle X, 125.

¹¹Protokolle X, 125f.

¹²Protokolle X, 126.

¹³Protokolle X, 128 f.

¹⁴Protokolle X, 131

¹⁵Protokolle X, 142 ff.

¹⁶Protokolle X, 142.

¹⁷Protokolle X, 144 f.

¹⁸Protokolle X, 158.

¹⁹Protokolle X, 194 ff.

- ²⁰Protokolle X, 209.
- ²¹Protokolle X, 209 f.
- ²²Protokolle X, 211 f.
- ²³Protokolle X, 217 f.
- ²⁴Protokolle X, 270.
- ²⁵Protokolle X, 271.
- ²⁶Protokolle X, 294 f.
- ²⁷See above, pp. 126 ff.
- ²⁸Protokolle X, 328.
- ²⁹Protokolle X, 329.
- ³⁰Protokolle X, 328 ff.
- ³¹Protokolle X, 329.
- ³²Protokolle X, 332.
- ³³Protokolle X, 333.
- ³⁴ibid.
- ³⁵Protokolle X, 333 f.
- ³⁶Protokolle X, 334 f.
- ³⁷Protokolle X, 335.
- ³⁸ibid.

³⁹See above, p. 154.

⁴⁰Protokolle X, 335.

⁴¹Protokolle X, 345.

⁴²Hans Kohn, Basic Writings, pp. 125 ff.

⁴³ibid., p. 127.

⁴⁴ibid., p. 130.

⁴⁵ibid., p. 145.

⁴⁶ibid., pp. 147 f. Some words in this quotation are a quote from an article written by Ahad Ha-am himself in 1892.

⁴⁷Hans Kohn, Basic Writings, p. 149; cf. Ezekiel 37:1-14.

⁴⁸Hans Kohn, Basic Writings, p. 151.

⁴⁹ibid., p. 153.

⁵⁰The information concerning the following is derived mainly from "Mizrahi", Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol. 2, p. 793.

⁵¹See above, pp. 12;15;65; a.o.

⁵²See "Agudat Israel", Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol.I, pp. 11 ff.

⁵³Isaac Breuer, Judenproblem ("Jewish Problem"), 4 th ed. (Frankfurt am Main, 1922), p. 138.

⁵⁴ibid., p. 139.

⁵⁵ibid., p. 99.

⁵⁶ibid., p. 102.

⁵⁷ibid., p. 104.

⁵⁸ibid., p. 105.

⁵⁹Moses Auerbach, Agudas Jisroel in Erez Jisroel ("Agudas Israel in the Land of Israel") (Frankfurt am Main, 1920).

⁶⁰ibid., p.5.

⁶¹ibid.

⁶²ibid., p.14.

⁶³ibid., p. 23.

⁶⁴The quotations in this paper are from the following edition:

Martin Buber, Drei Reden ueber das Judentum ("Three Speeches about Judaism") (Frankfurt am Main, 1919). (Hereinafter referred to as Drei Reden).

⁶⁵"Das Judentum und die Juden", ibid., pp. 9 ff.

⁶⁶ibid., p. 14.

⁶⁷ibid.

⁶⁸ibid., pp. 21 ff.

⁶⁹ibid., p. 22.

⁷⁰ibid.

⁷¹ibid., p. 29.

⁷²ibid., pp. 30 ff.

⁷³"Die Erneuerung des Judentums", *ibid.*, pp. 57 ff.

⁷⁴*ibid.*, p. 63.

⁷⁵*ibid.*, p. 67.

⁷⁶*ibid.*, p. 69.

⁷⁷*ibid.*, p. 70.

⁷⁸*ibid.*, p. 71.

⁷⁹*ibid.*, p. 97.

⁸⁰*ibid.*, pp. 97 f.

⁸¹*ibid.*, p. 98.

⁸²*ibid.*, p. 100.

⁸³*ibid.*, p. 101.

⁸⁴Martin Buber, Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis, Schocken Books (New York, 1963), p. 169.

⁸⁵J. L. Talmon, The Unique and the Universal: Some Historical Reflections (New York, 1965), p. 288; cf. pp. 281 ff.

Talmon observed in this connection also: "There are signs of an incipient Church and State struggle on the medieval model."

Ibid., p. 290.

⁸⁶See Joseph Badi, Religion in Israel Today: The Relationship Between State and Religion (New York, 1959), pp. 25 ff.

Eliezer Goldman, Religious Issues in Israel's Political Life
(Jerusalem, 1964), pp. 39 ff.

Gershon Winer, The Founding Fathers of Israel (New York, 1971),
pp. 226 ff.

⁸⁷Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel, Vol. I, p. 274.

Conclusion.

¹See on this now also the book by Mordechai Hacohen, Al Harishonim ("The First Ones") (Tel Aviv, 1969), which deals with this period in detail.

²Hannah Arendt, "The Jewish State Fifty Years After: Where Have Herzl's Politics Led?", Commentary, May 1946, Vol. I, No 7., p. 6.

³Hans Kohn, "Zion and the Jewish National Idea", in Zionism Reconsidered: The Rejection of Jewish Normalcy, ed. by Michael Selzer. McMillan Paperback. (New York, 1970), p. 187.

⁴Theodor Herzl, Jewish State, p. 92.

⁵ibid.

⁶ibid.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Adler, Joseph. "Religion and Herzl: Fact and Fable"
in Herzl Year Book. Edited by Raphael Patai.
New York, 1961-62, pp. 271-303.

Adler, S. Assimilation oder Nationaljudentum?
(Assimilation or National Judaism?)
Berlin, 1894.

"Agudat Israel"
Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel 1971, vol.I.

Ahad Ha-am (Asher Ginzberg)
Nationalism and the Jewish Ethic: Basic Writings.
Edited by Hans Kohn. New York, 1962.

Ahad Ha-am (Asher Ginzberg)
Selected Essays.
Translated by Leon Simon.
Philadelphia, 1912.

Ahad Ha-am (Asher Ginzberg)
Ten Essays on Zionism and Judaism.
Translated by Leon Simon.
London, 1922.

Arendt, Hannah.
"The Jewish State Fifty Years After: Where Have Herzl's Politics
Led?"
Commentary, May 1946, Vol. I, No. 7, pp. 1 - 8.

Auerbach, Moses.
Agudas Jisroel in Erez Jisroel.
("Agudas Israel in the Land of Israel")
Frankfurt am Main, 1920.

Badi, Joseph.

Religion in Israel Today: The Relationship Between State and Religion.

New York, 1959.

Baron, Salo Wittmayer.

Modern Nationalism and Religion.

Meridian Books.

New York and Philadelphia, 1960.

Bein, Alex.

Theodore Herzl: A Bibliography of the Founder of Modern Zionism.

Translated by Maurice Samuel.

Meridian Books.

Philadelphia, 1962.

Ben - Horin, Meir.

Max Nordau: Philosopher of Human Solidarity.

London, 1956.

Birnbaum, Nathan (Mathias Acher).

Ausgewahlte Schriften zur juedischen Frage.

("Selected Essays concerning the Jewish Question")

Vol.I. Czernowitz, 1910.

Bodenheimer, Henriette Hannah.

Im Anfang der zionistischen Bewegung: Eine Dokumentation auf Grund des Briefwechsels zwischen Theodor Herzl und Max Bodenheimer von 1896 bis 1905.

("In the beginning of the Zionist movement. A documentation on the basis of the correspondence between Theodor Herzl and Max Bodenheimer from 1896 to 1905")

Frankfurt am Main, 1965.

Bodenheimer, Henriette Hannah.

Prelude to Israel: The Memoirs of M. I. Bodenheimer.

Translated by Israel Cohen.

New York, 1963.

Bodenheimer, Henriette Hannah.

Toldoth Tochnith Basel.

("Prehistory of the Basel Program")

Jerusalem, 1948.

Bodenheimer, Max J.

Wohin mit den russischen Juden?

("Wither the Russian Jews ")

Hamburg, 1891.

Breuer, Isaac.

Judenproblem.

("Jewish Problem") 4th. ed.

Frankfurt am Main, 1922.

Buber, Martin.

Israel and the World: Essays in a Time of Crisis.

Schocken Books.

New York, 1963.

Buber, Martin.

Drei Reden ueber das Judentum.

("Three Speeches about Judaism")

Frankfurt am Main, 1919.

Cahnman, Werner J.

"Munich and the First Zionist Congress,"

Historia Judaica, ed. by Guido Kisch, vol.III,

April 1941, No. 1, pp. 7-23.

Central Conference of American Rabbis, Year Book.

Cincinnati, O., 1898.

Central Conference of American Rabbis. Year Book.
Cincinnati, O., 1899.

Dubnov, Semen Markovich.

History of the Jews in Russia and Poland.
Trans. by I. Friedlaender, Vol.II.
Philadelphia, 1918.

"East Africa Scheme".

Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel. 1971, vol.I.

"Education in Israel".

Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel. 1971. vol.I.

Elbogen, Ismar.

Ein Jahrhundert juedischen Lebens.
("A Century of Jewish Life")
Edited by Ellen Littmann.
Frankfurt am Main, 1967.

Frumkin, Jakob; Gregor Arosen; Alexis Goldenweiser, ed.

Russian Jewry (1860 - 1917)
New York, 1966.

Gelber, N. M.

"Alkalai, Jehuda ben Salomo Chai"
Encyclopedia Judaica: Das Judentum in Geschichte und
Gegenwart. Vol. II, pp. 326 - 29.
Berlin, 1928.

Glustrom, Simon.

The Language of Judaism.
New York, 1966.

Goldmann, Eliezer.

Religious Issues in Israel's Political Life.
Jerusalem, 1964.

Greenstone, Julius H.

The Messiah Idea in Jewish History.

Philadelphia, 1906.

Guedemann, Mortiz.

Nationaljudentum.

("National Judaism")

Leipzig and Vienna, 1897.

Hacohen, Mordechai.

Al Harishonim.

("The First Ones")

Tel Aviv, 1969

Halpern, Ben.

The Idea of the Jewish State. 

Cambridge, Mass., 1961.

Herzl, Theodor.

Zionistische Schriften.

("Zionist Writings") vol.I of Gesammelte Zionistische Werke.

("Collected Zionist Works") 3rd ed.

Tel Aviv, 1934.

Herzl, Theodor.

The Complete Diaries.

Edited by Raphael Patai

Translated by Harry Zohn. 5 vols.

New York and London, 1960.

Herzl, Theodor.

The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution
of the Jewish question.

Translated and ed. by Jacob M. Alkow.

New York, 1946.

Hertzberg, Arthur, ed.

The Zionist Idea: A Historical Analysis and Reader.

With an Introduction and Biographical Notes.

Foreward by Emanuel Neumann.

Harper Torchbooks.

New York, 1959.

Hess, Moses.

Ausgewahlte Schriften.

("Selected Writings"). Edited by Horst Lademacher.

Cologne, 1962.

Hess, Moses.

Rome and Jerusalem: A Study in Jewish Nationalism.

Trans. from German with Introduction and Notes

by Meyer Waxmann.

New York, 1945.

Horodezky, S. A.

"Kalischer, Zebi Hirsch ben Salomo"

Encyclopedia Judaica: Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Vol. IX, pp. 825 - 27.

Berlin, 1932.

Hyamson, Albert M.

British Projects for the Restoration of the Jews.

The British Palestine Committee, Publication No. I.

n.p., 1917.

"Jewish Territorial Organization"

Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel. 1971, vol. I.

Kalischer, Hirsch.

Drischath Zion, oder Zions Herstellung.

("Seeking Zion") Translated by Dr. Poper.

Thorn, 1865.

Kohn, Hans.

Nationalism and the Jewish Ethic: Basic Writings of Ahad Ha'am.
New York, 1962.

Kohn, Hans.

"Zion and the Jewish National Idea" in
Zionism Reconsidered: The Rejection of Jewish Normalcy. ⑦
Edited by Michael Selzer.
MacMillan Paperback.
New York, 1970. pp. 175 - 212.

Landau, Saul Raphael.

Sturm und Drang im Zionismus.
("Storm and Stress in Zionismus").
Vienna, 1937.

Lichtheim, Richard.

Die Geschichte des deutschen Zionismus.
("The History of German Zionism")
Jerusalem, 1954.

Marmorstein, Emile.

Heaven at Bay: The Jewish Kulturkampf in the Holy Land.
London, 1969.

"Minsk Conference".

Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel. 1971, vol.II.

"Mizrachi"

Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel. 1971, vol. II.

Nach Jerusalem gehen wir nicht, sondern ziehen, wenn es noetig ist,
gleich unseren christlichen Bruedern mit Gott fuer Kaiser und
Vaterland gegen die Feinde Deutschlands. Ein Schriftchen gewidmet
aus Liebe seinen katholischen und protestantischen Mitbruedern
von einem Deutschen mosaischer Religion, nach 38 jaehriger Ab-

wesenheit in die geliebte Heimat zurueckgekehrt.

("We will not go to Jerusalem, but we will, if necessary, march against the enemies of Germany with our Christian brethren with God for Kaiser and Fatherland.

A pamphlet dedicated in love to his Catholic and Protestant brethren by a German of Mosaic religion, who returned to his beloved home after an absence of 38 years.")

Nuernberg, 1893.

Neusner, Jakob.


A life of Yohanan Ben Zakkai: Ca.I-80 C. E. 2. ed. compl. rev.
Leiden, 1970.

Nordau, Max.

Zionistische Schriften.

("Zionist Writings") ed. by Zionistisches Aktionkomitee.
Cologne, 1909.

Parker, James William.

History of Palestine: from 135 A. D. to modern times. 
New York, 1949.

Philipson, David.

The Reform Movement in Judaism.
Rev. ed. Solomon Freehof.
N.p. 1967 .

Pinsker, Leo.

Road to Freedom: Writings and Addresses.
With an Introduction by B. Netanyahu.
New York, 1944.

"Population in Israel".

Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel. 1971. Vol. 2.

Proceedings of The Zionist Congress.

Held at Basle, Switzerland, August 29, 30, 31, 1897.
Reprinted from The Jewish Chronicle of London.
New York, 1897.

Protokolle.

Besides the translation of the proceedings of the first congress the following editions of the Stenographische Protokolle der Verhandlungen des Zionisten-Kongresses ("Stenographic protocols of the Zionist Congress") were used:

1. Congress, 1897 at Basel; Prag, 1911.
2. " 1898 at Basel; Vienna, 1898.
3. " 1899 at Basel; Vienna, 1899.
4. " 1900 at London; Vienna, 1900.
5. " 1901 at Basel; Vienna, 1901.
6. " 1903 at Basel; Vienna, 1903.
7. " 1905 at Basel; Berlin, 1905.
8. " 1907 at Haag; Cologne, 1907.
9. " 1909 at Hamburg; Cologne, 1910.
10. " 1911 at Basel; Berlin, 1911.

Raisin, Jakob S.

The Haskalah Movement in Russia.
Philadelphia, 1913.

Roth, M. A.

Der Zionismus vom Standpunkt der juedischen Orthodoxie beleuchtet.
("Zionism looked at from the point of view of Orthodoxy")
Nagytapolcsany, 1904.

Ruelf, I(saak).

Aruchas Bas-Ammi, Israels Heilung.
("Israel's Salvation")
Frankfurt am Main, 1883.

Ruppin, Arthur.

Die Juden der Gegenwart: Eine sozialwissenschaftliche Studie.
("The Jews of the present time, a sociological study")
2d ed.; Cologne and Berlin, 1911.

Sachar, Howard Morley.

The Course of Modern Jewish History.

Delta Book. New York, 1958.

Salomonsohn, Dr. H.

Widerspricht der Zionismus unserer Religion?

("Is Zionism in contradiction to our religion? ")

Berlin, 1898.

Simon, Leon.

Ahad Ha-am: Essays, Letters, Memoirs.

Translated from the Hebrew and ed.

Oxford, 1946.

Simon, Leon.

Selected Essays by Ahad Ha-am.

Translated from the Hebrew


Philadelphia, 1948.

Simon, Leon.

Ahad Ha-am: Asher Ginzberg, a biography.

Philadelphia, 1960.

Sokolow, Nahum.

History of Zionism: 1600 - 1918. 

New York, 1969.

Syrkin, Nachman.

Essays on Socialist Zionism.

N. p., 1935.

Talmon, J. I.

The Unique and the Universal: Some Historical Reflections.

New York, 1965.

Tuchman, Barbara W.

Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from Bronze Age to Balfour.

New York, 1956.

Weizmann, Chaim.

Reden und Aufsätze: 1901 - 1936.

("Speeches and Articles: 1901 - 1936.")

Berlin, 1937.

Weizmann, Chaim.

Trial and Error: The Autobiography.

Schocken Books.

New York, 1966.

Winer, Gershon.

The Founding Fathers of Israel.

New York, 1971.

Zionistische Vereinigung fuer Deutschland

("Zionist Organization for Germany").

Zionistisches A-B-C-Buch ("Zionist A-B-C-Book").

Berlin, 1908.