

Ksharim



Lesson 42

Different Directions within Zionism

1. Outline

- a. Religious vs. secular Zionism
- b. Socialist vs. liberal Zionism
- c. Cultural vs. political Zionism

2. Introduction

From the very beginning, Zionism meant very different things to different people. Coming on the world historical scene at a time of great change, in the midst of the collapse of the old order in Europe and the conflicting currents of thought which gave rise to decades of bloody conflict there, Zionism couldn't help but develop different facets, that reflected these different currents. Like many revolutions, Zionism knew what it wanted to change (exile existence), but wasn't quite sure what the new order would look like. Later developments – and current dilemmas – in the State of Israel very much reflect these original conflicting visions. This lesson examines three of the major fault lines: a) between those who saw Zionism as a rebellion against Judaism and those who saw it as the fulfillment of Judaism; b) between those who saw in Zionism the hope for creating a socialist utopia and those who sought “normalization;” and c) between those who anticipated the ingathering of all the exiles and those who saw the state as a sustaining center for a revitalized world Jewry.

3. Lesson goals

- a. Awareness of the necessity of “hyphenated Zionism” – Zionism does not have meaning as a “pure” concept, but needs definition.
- b. Knowledge of the ideological roots of current discourse about and within Zionism
- c. Exploration of participants' personal views on competing directions in Zionism

4. Expanded outline

- a. Religious vs. secular Zionism
- i. On the one hand, of course, Zionism is based on the Jewish messianic belief in the restoration of our sovereignty. On the other hand, however, it is at the same time a rebellion against God's management of the Jewish people's history. The Jews had learned to live in exile, praying for redemption, waiting for God to bring it about. Zionism, in its initial manifestation as a movement, called for us to take matters into our own hands. The Orthodox leaders who saw Zionism as a direct violation of the Jewish understanding of the world and as a threat to Judaism were not

hallucinating; for indeed, many Zionists explicitly sought to replace Jewish religion with secular nationalism, to redefine Jewish identity as national, not religious.

Jacob Klatzkin can serve as a perfect example: the son of a rabbi from Russia, he published a book of rabbinical scholarship before rebelling against his religious upbringing, moving to Germany for academic studies. He became a leader of various institutions in the Zionist movement, and articulated forcefully the view that Judaism's "religious phase" had to give way to a new definition, purely national.

Source 1

For discussion:

- For a Jew who had lost faith, but for whom Jewish identity was important, what other options were there? Do we believe one can be a Jew without faith?
 - If Judaism is not a religion, what do we do with our religious texts, with our religious behaviors?
- ii. Views like Klatzkin's helped reinforce the enmity of much of the Orthodox world to Zionism. What we call today "ultra-Orthodox" refers to the movement within Orthodoxy that took a position actively opposed to Zionism; in 1912, leaders of this stream organized into a movement and political party, *Agudat Israel*. However, other Orthodox Jews felt attracted to Zionism, either as a practical solution to the Jewish problem based on age-old traditions encouraging return to Israel – or out of a belief that if we could in fact create a Jewish state in *Eretz Yisrael*, then perhaps the messiah was en route. Thus, from the very beginnings of the Zionist movement, there were tensions between Zionists who saw their Zionism as integral in their Judaism and those whose Zionism was a rebellion against Judaism, a reformation.

For example: Yehiel Michael Pines, a product of the traditional Polish Jewish community, made aliyah in 1878 and represented a bridging figure, involved in Zionism, yet believing that Zionism without religion was impossible.

Source 2

And a different kind of example: Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook was appointed by the British as Ashkenazic chief rabbi of Palestine in 1921. Before him (as in the case of Pines, above), Orthodox Zionism fought for a vision of Zionism as embedded within Judaism (not a rebellion); Rabbi Kook is the leading thinker of the school that sees Zionism as not just a mitzvah opportunity and a solution to

historical problems, but as the fulfillment of the messianic hope. In other words, Zionism is not just an option for a religious Jew - it is central to Judaism.

Source 3

- What would a Jewish state look like according to Klatzkin, Pines, and Kook? Is a compromise or synthesis possible?
- Which vision seems dominant in Israel today?
- Which vision seems dominant in Israel today?
- Do you think that the state of Israel represents a turning point in history – the “first flowering of our [messianic] redemption?”
- What is the relationship between Zionism and Jewish religion in your own identity?

b. Socialist vs. liberal Zionism

- i. The messianic idealism that drove Zionism among young Jews in Eastern Europe gave rise to another redemptive movement: socialism. Marxism prophesied the end of religious and national divisions, and hence, socialism and Zionism were opposing forces. Indeed, there was ongoing enmity between the Jewish socialist organization (the Bund) and the Zionists.

What was the Bund?

- The Bund was the Jewish Social Democratic party; *its raison d’etre* was twofold: a) to reach the Jewish proletariat, it was necessary operate a campaign in Yiddish, geared to the particular cultural needs and background of the Jewish workers; and b) an unwillingness to give up Jewish identity completely — together with the realization that our Russian fellow-revolutionaries wouldn’t let us even if we wanted to.
- The high point of the Bund’s activity in Russia came in the 1905 revolution, when it had about 30,000 members (compared to under 9,000 members in the Russian Social Democratic Party).
- The Bund in Russia was disbanded after the Bolshevik revolution; it continued its activities in Poland.

What was Jewish about the Bund?

- A commitment to work in — and preservation of — the Yiddish language and the (secular) Jewish culture associated with it.
- A recognition of the right-to-exist of the Jewish nation as a national-cultural (but not geographical or political) entity.
- A concern with the particular problem of the persecution of the Jews.

How could the existence of the Bund be reconciled with socialist universalism?

- This was indeed the ideological issue that split the Bund from Lenin's Social Democrats, who argued that the Bund could be at most a temporary means for reaching out to the Jewish masses; beyond this utilitarian function, it had no long-term right to life in the new order.
- The Bund, on the other hand, had been formed out of a realization that there was no pure universalistic culture, and that Russian socialism, with its Russian cultural foundations, would never be able to welcome the Jews as full, equal comrades.

The opposition of the Bund to Zionism continued through the Holocaust.

What were the origins of socialist Zionism?

- The first attempt to articulate a synthesis of socialism and Zionism was Moses Hess' *Rome and Jerusalem*, published in 1862. Hess, after spending most of his career as a socialist thinker and activist, came to the conclusion that the socialist society was only implementable in a national context — and hence, the Jews must return to establish a free, independent, socialist Palestine.
- Then, in 1898, with the rising the tension between Jewish identity and commitment to the revolutionary movement, Hess' synthesis found an energetic proponent in Nachman Syrkin. Syrkin played an active role in seeking to turn the newly organized Zionist movement toward the goal of establishing a socialist society in Palestine.

Over the next few years, as ideological ferment among Russian Jewish students and intellectuals grew more intense — and especially after the pogroms of 1903 — this goal attracted more and more adherents. Circles of *Poalei Zion* (Workers of Zion) formed in various cities. The combination of the rise of the Zionist movement and the beginning of actual colonization in Palestine with the growing disillusionment with the prospects for Jewish life in revolutionary Russia made socialist Zionism an attractive solution for many young Jews. In 1904 the first groups of *Poalei Zion* made their way to Palestine to begin the struggle to build the socialist Jewish state. This marked the beginning of what is termed the "Second Aliya," a period of

immigration that lasted until the First World War, and provided much of the political and intellectual elite of Israeli society during its formative years.

How could socialist Zionism be reconciled with socialist universalism?

- Socialist Zionists argued that nationalism and socialism were not mutually exclusive. On the contrary, the classless society could best be realized in the context of national self-determination. The Jewish people (like every other nation) could build utopia. The values might be universal, but the implementation had to be particular, to fit the history and needs and culture of each nation.

Source 4

- Syrkin writes: “For a Jewish state to come to be, it must, from the very beginning, avoid all the ills of modern life.” In his utopian messianism, this secular socialist Zionist sounds rather like a religious Zionist! Do we ourselves harbor such utopian perceptions of the Zionist endeavor? Should we? Aren’t we disappointed when we discover imperfections in Israel?
- ii. The socialist Zionists dominated the institutions of the Zionist movement and of the New Yishuv (the Zionist community in Palestine) – and of the state, from the mid-1930s until 1977. However, throughout that time, there was an active and strong opposition to the socialist Zionist vision, that saw it as utopian and out of touch with reality. Many Zionists believed that the main thing was normalization, the creation of a national state for the Jews – and that the debate on world-redeeming economic systems was beside the point. For example, Herzl’s friend and disciple, Dr. Max Nordau, is remembered for his association with the concept of “normalization;” his comments on the socialist vision are given in source 5.
- Herzl and Nordau and the other “normalizers” saw Zionism as the answer to anti-Semitism: by becoming strong, proud, productive, and naturally rooted in their own land, Jews would prove the falsity of the reasons behind anti-Semitism. How does this sound a century later?

c. Cultural vs. political Zionism

i. What was “political Zionism?”

- Herzl’s conception of Zionism, a messianic dream of establishing a sovereign Jewish state, is the classic expression of political Zionism. Herzl was not interested in small-scale efforts, or in consciousness raising. He was playing all-or-nothing. He shuttled on the international diplomatic circuit, trying to play off the interests of the great powers, in order to extract from them a state for the Jews. He saw himself as negotiating salvation.

For political Zionists, the Jewish problem was a political and economic one, the anomaly of the status of the Jews in European society. The solution can be seen as a kind of assimilation: the Jews would become a nation like all other nations — we would become “normal.” For political Zionists, the state came first; the culture would then take care of itself. This approach had two practical implications: a) Palestine was not the only possible solution; and b) one could support the program regardless of one’s relationship to the tradition — it created no conflict for the religiously observant.

See source 6

ii. What was “cultural Zionism?”

- Cultural Zionism, identified with Ahad Ha’am, advocated the establishment of a Jewish state primarily as a means for the revitalization of the Jewish people world-wide. International recognition was not an important priority, nor did cultural Zionists seek to shut down the Diaspora and move all Jews to Palestine. Rather, they sought to establish a spiritual and cultural center that would create new meaning and new pride and infuse these into the traditional forms that had become lifeless under the assault of modern secular humanism. Ultimately, the new society thus created would, in due time, give rise to a Jewish state. See source 7

Cultural Zionists, unlike, political Zionists, could not consider any option other than Palestine. And since cultural Zionism was essentially a secular movement, seeking an alternative source of vitality in the tradition (i.e., an alternative to faith in God and His commandments), it constituted a problem for Orthodox Zionists — and indeed was the impetus for the formation of an independent religious strand within the Zionist movement. Had the movement limited itself to political mobilization and colonization without

cultural and educational activities, the Orthodox would have been able to find a place in the movement without a special “section.”

- An interesting paradox to consider: if secular political Zionism had dominated, the whole issue of religion and state would not have arisen – the state would be neutral – but the connection with Jews in the Diaspora would be problematic; cultural Zionism allows for a mutual relationship between Israel and the Diaspora, but since it defines the state as something more than just a nation state, as a cultural center, it gives rise to the bitter controversy over the definition of Jewish culture (vis a vis religious tradition).

5.Thoughts on practical applications in the classroom, materials

This lesson lends itself to a “choose sides” kind of activity, in which participants read about the three sets of two positions and choose their preferred option in each case and justify their choices.

Another possibility is to bring a particular current issue from the news media to the class and together seek the roots of the present conflict in one of the divisions presented in the lesson (e.g., setting policy regarding withdrawal from Gaza – do we operate on a religious or secular democratic basis?; is Israel a cultural center for us? Does Israel have an obligation of be a model of social justice? Is it fair of us to demand it be a utopia?)

6.Connections to previous and future lessons

This lesson is supposed to follow a discussion of the origins of Zionism, and precede an examination of practical Zionism (which is not discussed here) – the settlers of the first two aliyot – who manifest, between the first and second aliyot, the conflict between socialist and general Zionism, and between religious and secular Zionism.

Sources

1. Jacob Klatzkin, “Boundaries” [1914], in Arthur Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Atheneum, 1973, pp. 316-8

What is really new in Zionism is the territorial-political definition of Jewish nationalism. Strip Zionism of the territorial principle and you have destroyed its character and erased the distinctions between it and the preceding periods. This is its originality - that Judaism depends on form and not on content. For it the alternatives are clear: Either the Jewish people shall redeem the land and thereby continue to live, even if the spiritual content of Judaism changes radically, or we shall remain in exile and rot away even if the spiritual tradition continues to exist.

In longing for our land we do not desire to create there a base for the spiritual values of Judaism. To regain our land is for us an end in itself - the attaining of a free national life. The content of our life will be national when its forms become national. Indeed, let it not be said that the land is a precondition for a national life; living on the land is *ipso facto* the national life.

It is no accident that the theory of Judaism as a spiritual outlook, even in its nationalist form, has fought hard against the territorialist conception of Zionism. It feared, correctly, that from such Zionism it would receive its deathblow. All the varieties of "spiritual" thought, including the nationalist, have joined in combating political Zionism in the name of the spirit of Judaism, i.e., the ethics of the prophets, and have asserted that the ultimate goal of the Jewish people is not a political state but the reign of absolute justice. All these schools of thought mocked Herzl, the hero and genius of our renaissance, by saying: We are a priest people, a nation of prophets - what does he mean coming to us talking about political action? The "spiritists" all cited the Galut as evidence that the basis for our life is the eternal content of Judaism.

Zionism stands opposed to all this. Its real beginning is *The Jewish State* and its basic intention, whether consciously or unconsciously, is to deny any conception of Jewish identity based on spiritual criteria.

Zionism began a new era, not only for the purpose of making an end to the Diaspora but also in order to establish a new definition of Jewish identity - a *secular definition*. I am certain that the builders of our land will in the future sacrifice themselves for national forms, for land and language, as our ancestors accepted martyrdom for the sake of the religious content of Judaism. But we are, as yet, standing at the crossroads and do not yet see the distinction between one period and another. The Galut figure of Ahad Ha-Am still obscures the nationalist light of Herzl.

The "spiritual" criterion is a grave danger not only to our national renaissance but, even more, to our renaissance as individuals. It binds our spirit with the chains of tradition and subordinates our life to specific doctrines, to a heritage and to the values of an ancient outlook. We are constrained by antiquated values, and, in the name of national unity and cohesiveness, our personalities are crippled, for we are denied freedom of thought. Moreover, the "spiritual" definition of what is a Jew leads to national chauvinism. National freedom is meaningless unless it fosters the freedom of the individual. There can be no national renaissance worth fighting for unless it liberates and revives human values within the national ethos.

2. Yehiel Michael Pines, "Religion is the Source of Jewish Nationalism [1895] – in Arthur Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Atheneum, 1973, pp. 412-414

Science and education are no less precious to me than they are to you, secularists. I set a high value on this divine light which has been given us by our Creator at our birth. I, too, no less than you, would like to see the Jewish people advance in scientific knowledge and in worldly education, for I know how important such advance is in improving human nature, in improving manners and ethics, and in raising the cultural level. I also know how much real knowledge can contribute to the ennobling of religious feeling. But knowledge divorced from faith is not what I consider a desirable goal. That is not the enlightenment which our better leaders of the preceding generation declared to be the sister of faith, while their predecessors thought it the handmaiden of faith. But a sister or a handmaid who sets herself up as a rival to her sister or her mistress will only lure the master away from his wife; without leaving even a small corner in his heart for the affection he once bore her.

The enlightenment we seek is one that is organically integrated in faith, so that the two are inseparable. Why should we try to isolate the one from the other? Have we not been given the Torah to teach us to purify our thoughts and our sentiments as the goldsmith refines the gold? Has not reason been given us by Heaven so that we may be able to contemplate the greatness of our Creator as revealed in His work and the glory of the Law He implanted in our hearts? In the world of the spirit there are no compartments. Whatever the man thinks and feels, if it is directed toward Truth, is enveloped in holiness.

Nor have you, the secularists, any monopoly on the Zionist sentiment. I am as much a Lover of Zion as you are, not a whit less. But mine is not the Love of Zion which you have abstracted from the whole Jewish tradition to set it up in a separate existence. Any other people can perhaps have a national aspiration divorced from its religion, but we, Jews, cannot. Such nationalism is an abomination to Jews. Moreover, it cannot succeed, since it has no roots in our reality. What is Jewish nationality divorced from Jewish religion? It is an empty formula, nothing but pretty phrases. After all, what is "nationality" if not a concept, or, in other words, a thought-image. But a thought-image which has no basis in reality is an illusion. What other basis in reality can there be for the thought-image of Jewish nationality except the unity of the Jewish people with its Torah and its faith?

I know the answer you will give me: Our history and our language also form part of our national heritage. True enough, a common past is a national heritage, but it is not the begetter of nationality. It is unheard of for an effect to turn around and become the cause of its own cause! Can a man sate his hunger by eating his own flesh? And as for the Hebrew language you mention - perhaps, if we still spoke it, it might offer some slight basis for our nationality, but in view of the state of the Hebrew language today, one can hardly see why you are ready to dedicate yourself to it. Who or what forces you to bring it back to life? Is it national sentiment? Again we see the effect becoming

a cause! All of the vitality of national sentiment is in the national language, but the language itself has no vitality except in so far as it is nourished by national sentiment! But this is a circular argument which can go on *ad infinitum*!

The nationalism I represent is the nationalism of Rabbi Yehudah Halevi and of Rabbi Moshe ben Nahman, of blessed memory, a national sentiment organically integrated in faith, nationalism whose soul is the Torah and whose life is in its precepts and commandments.

3. Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook, *Orot*, in Hertzberg, *ibid.*, pp. 430-1

There is an eternal covenant which assures the whole House of Israel that it will not ever become completely unclean. Yes, it may be partially corroded, but it can never be totally cut off from the source of divine life. Many of the adherents of the present national revival maintain that they are secularists. If a Jewish secular nationalism were really imaginable, then we would, indeed, be in danger of falling so low as to be beyond redemption.

But Jewish secular nationalism is a form of self-delusion: the spirit of Israel is so closely linked to the spirit of God that a Jewish nationalist, no matter how secularist his intention may be, must, despite himself, affirm the divine. An individual can sever the tie that binds him to life eternal but the House of Israel as a whole cannot. All of its most cherished national possessions - its land, language, history, and customs - are vessels of the spirit of the Lord.

How should men of faith respond to an age of ideological ferment which affirms all of these values in the name of nationalism and denies their source, the rootedness of the national spirit, in God? To oppose Jewish nationalism, even in speech, and to denigrate its values is not permissible, for the spirit of God and the spirit of Israel are identical. What they must do is to work all the harder at the task of uncovering the light and holiness implicit in our national spirit, the divine element which is its core. The secularists will thus be constrained to realize that they are immersed and rooted in the life of God and bathed in the radiant sanctity that comes from above.

Despite the grave faults of which we are aware in our life in general, and in *Eretz Yisrael* in particular, we must feel that we are being reborn and that we are being created once again as at the beginning of time. Our entire spiritual heritage is presently being absorbed within its source and is reappearing in a new guise, much reduced in material extent but qualitatively very rich and luxuriant and full of vital force. We are called to a new world suffused with the highest light, to an epoch the glory of which will surpass that of all the great ages which have preceded. All of our people believes that we are in the first stage of the Final Redemption. This deep faith is the very secret of its existence; it is the divine mystery implicit in its historical experience. This ancient tradition about the Redemption bears witness to the spiritual light by which the Jew

understands himself and all the events of his history to the last generation, the one that is awaiting the Redemption that is near at hand.

The claim of our flesh is great. We require a healthy body. we have greatly occupied ourselves with the soul and have forsaken the holiness of the body. We have neglected health and physical prowess, forgetting that our flesh is as sacred as our spirit. We have turned our backs on physical life, the development of our senses, and all that is involved in the tangible reality of the flesh, because we have fallen prey to lowly fears, and have lacked faith in the holiness of the Land. "Faith is exemplified by the tractate *Zeraim* (Plants) - man proves his faith in eternal life by planting."

Our return will succeed only if it will be marked, along with its spiritual glory, by a physical return which will create healthy flesh and blood, strong and well-formed bodies, and a fiery spirit encased in powerful muscles. Then the one weak soul will shine forth from strong and holy flesh, as a symbol of the physical resurrection of the dead.

[4. Nahman Syrkin, "The Jewish Question and the Socialist Jewish State," \[1898\] in Arthur Hertzberg, *ibid*, pp. 347-50](#)

For a Jewish state to come to be, it must, from the very beginning, avoid all the ills of modern life. To evoke the sympathetic interest of modern man, its guidelines must be justice, rational planning, and social solidarity. Once a Jewish state has been realized on such scientific social principles, the time will come for modern technology to flourish within it. The Jewish state can come about only if it is socialist; only by fusing with socialism can Zionism become the ideal of the whole Jewish people - of the proletariat, the middle class, and the intelligentsia. All Jews will be involved in the success of Zionism, and none will be indifferent. The messianic hope, which was always the greatest dream of exiled Jewry, will be transformed into political action. The Jewish people, presently living in misery, will gain lofty content.

Not only the Jews, and the countries which desire to be rid of them, will be greatly interested in the socialist Jewish state, but also all those who strive for higher forms of social life--the socialists and the social reformers.

Because the Jews are placed in an unusual situation, that they are forced to find a homeland and establish a state, they therefore have been presented with the opportunity to be the first to realize the socialist vision. This is the tragic element of their historic fate, but it is also a unique historic mission. What is generally the vision of a few will become a great national movement among the Jews; what is utopian in other contexts is a necessity for the Jews.

The Jews were historically the nation which caused division and strife; it will now become the most revolutionary of all nations. From the humblest and most oppressed

of all peoples it will be transformed to the proudest and greatest. The Jews will derive their moral stature from their travail, and out of the pain of their existence will come a pattern of noble living. The Jew is small, ugly, servile, and debased when he forgets and denies his great character. He becomes distinguished and beautiful in the moral and social realms when he returns to his true nature.

Israel is to be compared to a sleeping giant, arising from the slough of despair and darkness and straightening up to his infinite height. His face is rimmed by rays of glory of the pain of the world which he has suffered on his own body. He knows his task, to do justice and proclaim truth. His tragic history has resulted in a high mission. He will redeem the world which crucified him.

Israel will once again become the chosen of the peoples!

5. Max. Nordau (*Zionistische Schriften*, quoted in W. Laqueur, *A History of Zionism*, Schocken 1976, p. 388)

Socialism will bring the same disappointments as did the Reformation, the Enlightenment, the movement for political freedom. If we should live to see socialist theory become practice, you'll be surprised to meet again in this new order that old acquaintance, anti-Semitism. And it won't help at all that Marx and Lasalle were Jews... The founder of Christianity was a Jew too, but to the best of my knowledge Christianity does not think it owes a debt of gratitude to the Jews. I do not doubt that the ideologists of socialism will always remain faithful to their doctrine, that they will never become racialists. But the men of action will have to take realities into account. In the foreseeable future the feelings of the masses will dictate to them an anti-Semitic policy.

6. Theodore Herzl, *The Jewish State*, 1896; in Arthur Hertzberg, *The Zionist Idea*, Atheneum, 1973, pp. 220-226

The whole plan is essentially quite simple, as it must necessarily be if it is to be comprehensible to all.

Let sovereignty be granted us over a portion of the globe adequate to meet our rightful national requirements; we will attend to the rest.

To create a new State is neither ridiculous nor impossible. Haven't we witnessed the process in our own day, among nations which were not largely middle class as we are, but poorer, less educated, and consequently weaker than ourselves? The governments of all countries scourged by anti-Semitism will be keenly interested in obtaining sovereignty for us.

The plan, simple in design but complicated in execution, will be executed by two agencies: the Society of Jews and the Jewish Company.

The scientific plan and political policies which the Society of Jews will establish will be carried out by the Jewish Company.

The Jewish Company will be the liquidating agent for the business interests of the departing Jews, and will organize trade and commerce in the new country.

We must not visualize the exodus of the Jews as a sudden one. It will be gradual, proceeding over a period of decades. The poorest will go first and cultivate the soil. They will construct roads, bridges, railways, and telegraph installations, regulate rivers, and provide themselves with homesteads, all according to predetermined plans. Their labor will create trade, trade will create markets, and markets will attract new settlers - for every man will go voluntarily, at his own expense and his own risk. The labor invested in the soil will enhance its value. The Jews will soon perceive that a new and permanent frontier has been opened up for that spirit of enterprise which has heretofore brought them only hatred and obloquy.

The founding of a State today is not to be accomplished in the manner that a thousand years ago would have been the only possible one. It is silly to revert to older levels of civilization, as many Zionists propose. Supposing, for example, we were obliged to clear a country of wild beasts, we should not set about it in the fashion of the fifth-century Europeans. We should not take spear and lance and go out individually in pursuit of bears; we would organize a grand and glorious hunting party, drive the animals together, and throw a melinite bomb into their midst.

If we planned to erect buildings, we should not drive a few shaky piles in a marsh like the lake dwellers, but should build as men build now. Indeed, we shall build in bolder and more stately style than has ever been done before; for we now possess means which heretofore did not exist.

The emigrants standing lowest in the economic scale will be gradually followed by those of the next grade. Those now in desperate straits will go first. They will be led by the intellectual mediocrities whom we produce so abundantly and who are oppressed everywhere.

Let this pamphlet serve as the beginning of a general discussion on the question of Jewish emigration. That does not mean to suggest, however, that the question should be called to a vote. Such an approach would ruin the cause from the outset. Whoever wishes may stay behind. The opposition of a few individuals is quite immaterial.

Who would go with us, let him fall in behind our banner and fight for the cause with word and pen and deed.

Those Jews who agree with our State idea will rally around the Society. Thereby they will give it the authority in the eyes of governments to confer and treat on behalf of our people. The Society will be recognized as, to put it in terminology of international law, a State-creating power. And this recognition will, in effect mean the creation of the State.

Should the powers show themselves willing to grant us sovereignty over a neutral land, then the Society will enter into negotiations for the possession of this land. Here two regions come to mind: Palestine and Argentina. Significant experiments in colonization have been made in both countries, though on the mistaken principle of gradual infiltration of Jews. Infiltration is bound to end badly. For there comes the inevitable moment when the government in question, under pressure of the native

populace - which feels itself threatened - puts a stop to further influx of Jews. Immigration, therefore, is futile unless it is based on our guaranteed autonomy. The Society of Jews will treat with the present authorities in the land, under the sponsorship of the European powers, if they prove friendly to the plan. We could offer the present authorities enormous advantages, assume part of the public debt, build new thoroughfares, which we ourselves would also require, and do many other things. The very creation of the Jewish State would be beneficial to neighboring lands, since the cultivation of a strip of land increases the value of its surrounding districts.

7. Ahad Ha'am, "The Jewish State and the Jewish Problem," published in *Hashiloach II*, 1897; in Hertzberg, *ibid*, pp. 267

Judaism is, therefore, in a quandry. It can no longer tolerate the *Galut* form which it had to take on, in obedience to its will-to-live, when it was exiled from its own country; but, without that form, its life is in danger. So it seeks to return to its historic center, where it will be able to live a life developing in a natural way, to bring its powers into play in every department of human culture, to broaden and perfect those national possessions which it has acquired up to now, and thus to contribute to the common stock of humanity, in the future as it has in the past, a great national culture, the fruit of the unhampered activity of a people living by the light of its own spirit. For this purpose Judaism can, for the present, content itself with little. It does not need an independent State, but only the creation in its native land of conditions favorable to its development: a good-sized settlement of Jews working without hindrance in every branch of civilization, from agriculture and handicrafts to science and literature. This Jewish settlement, which will be a gradual growth, will become in course of time the center of the nation, wherein its spirit will find pure expression and develop in all its aspects to the highest degree of perfection of which it is capable. Then, from this center, the spirit of Judaism will radiate to the great circumference, to all the communities of the Diaspora, to inspire them with new life and to preserve the over-all unity of our people. When our national culture in Palestine has attained that level, we may be confident that it will produce men in the Land of Israel itself who will be able, at a favorable moment, to establish a State there - one which will be not merely a State of the Jews, but a really Jewish State.