

Electronic Offprint

Force, Commemoration, and Morality in the Worldview of Manya Shohat and Yosef Aharonovitch

MEIR CHAZAN

Manya Shohat and Yosef Aharonovitch represented opposing attitudes within the Zionist Labour Movement to the use of force in the struggle for a Jewish homeland, and the related issue of who was worthy of commemoration among the Zionist pioneers. Their personalities, outlooks, and lifestyles reflected attitudes to the use of force and to the way of commemorating the Zionist enterprise that led them sometimes to converge and sometimes to collide. The themes addressed here – violent force and commemoration – were crucial elements in the establishment of the Labour Movement's hegemony in the *Yishuv*.

Introduction

The ethos of defence was given pride of place in the *Yishuv* (Jewish pre-state community in Palestine) during the first decades of the twentieth century because it furthered the struggle for national independence and fostered national consciousness. From the dawn of the Zionist Movement and ever since, the field of defence – the ideology of using force to defend the Jewish community in Palestine – more than any other field of individual and collective endeavour, has produced personalities that have been presented as paragons and whose heroic stories have been transformed into myth. The biographies of these exemplary figures helped forge a patriotic ideology informed by the transformation of victims into symbols of national heroism. Combatants did not seek the glory of heroes who fought for their homeland. On an individual level such acts were imperative for survival, yet their moral value was perceived as secondary. On the other hand, anonymous, unsung self-sacrifice, manifested in uncompromising devotion to hard, monotonous physical labour in agriculture, was considered the epitome of heroism.¹

The scholarly literature on the commemoration of this period has often claimed that the imagery of death reveals a crucial dimension in the features and essence of the Zionist movement. This attitude nationalised individual death and subordinated it to the needs of the collective in-the-making by intensifying the ritual of heroism and its associated manifestations of force.

Electronic Offprint

88

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

The resurrection of the national spirit, with the fallen in battle as its distinct, concrete expression, symbolised the renewal of national life, dramatically attesting to its vitality.² In contrast, the central argument underpinning this article is that the need to create a pantheon of heroes and leaders in order to shape the nation was not universally accepted and that the support for establishing such a pantheon was related to the perception of the role of force in the Jewish rebirth in Palestine.

In the Hall of Fame of the Second *Aliya* (wave of Jewish immigration to Palestine, 1903–14), if one is ever established, a place of honour will be reserved for Manya Shohat (née Wilbnshevitze) and Yosef Aharonovitch. They will have earned it due to their responsibility for two of the most conspicuous enterprises during that era: Shohat established the collective at Sejera (one of the first Jewish agricultural settlements in the Lower Galilee) and Aharonovitch edited the journal *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*. The Sejera collective, which lasted for about ten months in 1907–8, was considered one of the founding kernels of the rural settlement movement in Palestine. *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, first published in 1907, was the most important journalistic and literary Hebrew-language forum in Palestine during the years of the Second *Aliya*.³

Shohat and Aharonovitch, each in his/her own way, represented the opposing attitudes within the Zionist Labour Movement to the use of force in the struggle for a Jewish homeland, and the related issue of who was worthy of commemoration among the Zionist pioneers. This article describes where their views converged and diverged and, in so doing, sketches several features of their biographies. Their personalities, outlooks, and lifestyles reflected attitudes to the use of force and to the way of commemorating the Zionist enterprise that led them sometimes to converge and sometimes to collide. The themes addressed here – violent force and commemoration – were crucial elements in the establishment of the Labour Movement's hegemony in the *Yishuv* in both the immediate and the longer terms, and have usually been discussed with reference to the attitudes of leading members of the Labour Movement such as David Ben-Gurion, Berl Katznelson and Itzhak Tabenkin. My focus here on Shohat's and Aharonovitch's pronouncements on these matters is intended to provide a different perspective on the movement's worldview in this period.

Several tens of thousands of Jews reached Palestine during the Second *Aliya*. About 2,000 of them, affiliated with the Labour Movement, lent this period its name and became its most conspicuous representatives in terms of history and collective memory. Those were young women and men in their early twenties and even younger, who had come from Eastern Europe imbued with socialist beliefs and ambitions. Some took issue with the emphasis on class questions and the connection with events in the European socialist world, as these were irrelevant to the conditions in Palestine. Furthermore,

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

89

they objected, in principle, to dogmatic models of life and socio-political structures, not necessarily because they wished to discard the need for a social revolution and subordinate it to the national revolution.⁴ Overall, from an ideological-moral standpoint they hoped for a life of brotherhood and mutual understanding. Still, their quests had a revolutionary dimension intent on undermining the conditions of life in *Eretz-Israel*: they strove for a Hebrew majority and a nationally-based settlement, advocating the physical ideal of a 'muscular Jewry' as opposed to spirituality, enlightenment and emancipation as a basis of national and individual creativity. Since they attributed a national revolutionary value to the return to nature and to Hebrew agricultural work as means of shaping a 'new human being' and a 'new society', they soon found themselves at the vanguard of the struggle against the Arabs.⁵ At the same time, they contended with physical hardships, loneliness, and separation from the family and childhood environment that they had left behind in Eastern Europe. Those who remained in Palestine were individualists by temperament and displayed exceptional willingness to expose themselves and their comrades to extreme hardship, in order to fulfil what they considered their national destiny. Their ability to endure and surmount the hardships of the time was especially evident in their struggle with the despair caused by the tension between their grand vision of creating a 'new Jew' and their inability to bring their vision to life due to the paucity of resources.⁶

In view of these difficulties, Shohat and Aharonovitch were even more exceptional among members of the Second *Aliya*, if only because of their decision to marry. Marriage was unusual among their proletarian comrades at the time. Such people were reluctant to settle down; they tended to lead migrant lives in Palestine due to personal adventurism, a quest for new experiences, and the relentless need to make a living at seasonal agricultural work and other odd jobs. The choice of marriage, especially by well-known and influential personalities affiliated with the Labour Movement, was more than an optimistic public statement about the possibility of establishing a family in Palestine; it was actually a covert statement that carried an internal code that everyone in Labour circles understood clearly – a vote of confidence in the values and way of life that they had espoused. Furthermore, neither Shohat nor Aharonovitch chose an anonymous spouse. In May 1908, Manya Wilbushewitz married Yisrael Shohat, head of the secret defence order Bar Giora and subsequently the leader of *Hashbomer* (The Guardsman, Jewish guard organisation).⁷ In October 1911 Yosef Aharonovitch married Devorah Baron, who has been called the first Hebrew writer. They were the most important and best-known couples during the Second *Aliya*, and Manya and Yosef were key personalities of the period.

Shohat's and Aharonovitch's marriages were long-lasting but plainly unhappy, as was widely known.⁸ The fact that they married at the time can

Electronic Offprint

90

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

partly be explained by their age: they were older than their comrades who had come to Palestine in their teens or their early twenties. Manya arrived in January 1904 at the age of 25; Yosef debarked two years later, in January 1906, at the age of 29. Both were associated with what Nahum Twersky called the 'volcanic eruption' of the First Russian Revolution.⁹ Thus, they belonged to a minority of Jews who had decided to explore the possibilities of life in Palestine, as opposed to emigrating to the United States, in view of the failure of attempts to transform the life conditions of the Russian working class at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Shohat and Aharonovitch belonged to the two labour parties that had been established in the Second Aliya – *Po'alei Tsiyyon* and *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, respectively. Both, however, felt very little affection for political life and were especially averse to the power and interest struggles that were implicit in it. From the early 1920s, they gradually distanced themselves from regular involvement in party campaigns. Their paths crossed during this decade when Shohat participated in a *Histadrut* (Federation of Jewish Workers) delegation that set out in 1921 to raise funds for the establishment of Bank Hapoalim – which Aharonovitch would eventually direct – and in a special committee that the *Histadrut* established in 1926 to investigate the doings of 'the Kibbutz', a secret defence cell that former members of *Hashomer* had established under the umbrella of the Labour Brigade (*Gedud Ha-Avoda*, an activist revolutionary organisation within the workers' movement in Palestine). Manya refused to testify to Aharonovitch's committee, explaining that she was unwilling to lie and unable to tell the truth.¹⁰

A striking feature of both Shohat and Aharonovitch was their stress on moral principles, which influenced their approach to a broad range of issues and which their contemporaries repeatedly stressed as the dominant motif in their personalities.¹¹ It is this feature that unites them despite their deep disagreement on various issues. In May 1938, on the first anniversary of Aharonovitch's death, Manya Shohat wrote about him as if writing about herself as well: 'When the psychosis of "might makes right" takes over the world, and we too, as it were, acquiesce in and succumb to this reality, it is necessary to recount the life of a person who was motivated in all his actions – private and public – by his moral principles'.¹²

Our discussion of Shohat's and Aharonovitch's attitudes toward the use of force and the commemoration of those who as Zionists practised what they preached will relate to their moral principles. This article is based, among others, on four sources that helped to consolidate the collective memory of the Second *Aliya*: a *Yizkor* (memorial) collection that came out in 1911, the book *Dreamers and Fighters*, published in 1921; a series of books called *La-No'ar* (For youth) that the Jewish National Fund began to publish in the late 1920s, and the *Hashomer Collection* (1937). These sources, published during

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

91

the Second, Third, and Fifth *Aliyot*, commemorated the feats of the Labour Movement during its first few decades from various points of view. They made such an impact on contemporaries that they acquired an almost canonical status. Although produced by diverse institutions (a political party, a private entity, an establishment agency, and organised labour, respectively), they all sought to create a modern Jewish–Zionist–Yishuvic martyrology, aimed especially at young people and new immigrants to Palestine. Each successive publication was perceived as an attempt to create a unified, succinct, and systematic synthesis, suitable for the masses, of the epos of heroes and heroism that was taking shape in the *Yishuv*. The appearance of these publications was an integral part of the process of drawing a composite portrait of the Jewish national society-in-formation in Palestine. They helped to create a patriotic ideology based on the transformation of the fallen into symbols of national heroism.

The Commemoration of the Fallen during and after the Second *Aliya*

The *Yizkor* collection, published in December 1911, memorialised eight Jewish farmers and workers most of whom had been killed by Arabs in 1909–11.¹³ Two of the eight had been members of *Bar Giora* and *Hashomer*, two others were killed shortly before the establishment of *Hashomer* in Sejera, and a fifth had been annexed to the organisation. The others were farmers. The motto of *Bar Giora* and *Hashomer* – taken from a poem by Ya'akov Cahan, 'By Blood and Fire Did Judea Fall, by Blood and Fire Will Judea Arise' – evidenced the use of mythical sources of inspiration from bygone days of national strength. *Yizkor* was the first publication to use imagery that aimed to create a national myth by glorifying those who had fallen in 'battle' for the rebirth of the Jewish people in its homeland.¹⁴ The hardships of life and the rigidly spartan way of life, two salient features of life during the Second *Aliya*, found no expression in *Yizkor*, which instead was devoted to elevating individuals to the rank of martyrs, irrespective of the realities of their lives and the way they actually lived them.

Although *Hashomer* and the *Po'alei Tsiyyon* Party were closely associated, the party was hardly involved in preparing the *Yizkor* collection. Furthermore, in contrast to convention, *Yizkor* was produced under the auspices of a pronouncedly partisan organisation – the rival Labour Party, which had always rejected the notion that defence should share primacy with labour in the fulfilment of Zionism.¹⁵ The members of the committee that had been established to publish *Yizkor* were Alexander Siskind Rabinovitz (Azar), Yosef Haim Brenner, Ya'akov Rabinowitz, Joseph Sprinzak, and Michael Teitelman (Tamari). Its composition points to a close relationship with the *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir* party, since Sprinzak was the secretary of the party's Central Committee

Electronic Offprint

92

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

and Taitelman managed its eponymous journal. However, the party's leading publicist, Yosef Aharonovitch, was not included. Was it due to lack of time or interest that Aharonovitch did not take part in editing the collection? Or had he simply not been invited?

The truth is apparently different. Two months after *Yizkor* appeared Aharonovitch published a eulogy to Joseph Vitkin who died in 1912. Vitkin was a well-known teacher within the Zionist Labour Movement, and earned the right to be part of its pantheon after calling young people to come to live and work in Palestine in 1905. What distanced Aharonovitch from *Yizkor* was its attempt to endow the dead with an aura of peerless heroism, irrespective of the realities of their lives and the circumstances of their death. At the beginning of his eulogy to Vitkin, he criticised the *Yizkor* collection in subtle but pointed terms. Aharonovitch states that he wrote his appreciation of Vitkin in 'silent sorrow, at complete rest, without excessive admiration and without excessive sighing'. He felt close to Vitkin the teacher, one of the few teachers in Palestine at the time who identified wholeheartedly with the Labour camp. His eulogy begins as follows:

People waste away in poverty – and who notices them? Their souls freeze to death – and who warms them? ... But the moment one closes one's eyes, once the flame of one's life is extinguished – one becomes a martyr. The quality of cruelty toward the living looms large among us, and larger still is the quality of bombast in praising the dead. [Vitkin] so despised bombast and exaggeration; they disgusted his fine soul. His personality was fine enough without bombast.¹⁶

Aharonovitch refused to beatify Vitkin in the manner of *Yizkor*. He preferred to describe him as the first important figure to have died among those customarily included in the Second *Aliya* (even though Vitkin formally belonged to the First *Aliya*). Practically speaking, Aharonovitch refused to join those who were establishing the infrastructure of a Zionist martyrology that fictionalised the lives of workers who had been killed and, worse still, the realities of life in Palestine, for the advancement of certain goals.

Aharonovitch was basically a rationalist who fiercely objected to any manifestation of mysticism. For example, in his introduction to the writings of A.D. Gordon, he wrote that as a young man in Russia he had heard much about Gordon. He had imagined Gordon not as a human being but as 'something like a Wailing Wall [in Jerusalem]. And just as I did not rush to see the Wailing Wall, I didn't rush to see him either'.¹⁷ Aharonovitch, however, was not a rationalist in all matters. Manya Shohat, observing his futile efforts to grasp a hoe correctly – after several months of work – in contrast to his prowess in teaching, told him that 'as a divinely graced teacher' he should abandon labour and devote himself to teaching. Aharonovitch responded

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

93

heatedly that she was taking a 'rationalistic-economic approach', whereas 'I have come here to save my soul, the soul of the Jew'.¹⁸

Despite this statement, and like many who would eventually rise to high stature in the Zionist Labour Movement, Aharonovitch quickly renounced physical labour. He became a chef and manager of a general store for workers in Rehovot. Concurrently, his wife did bookkeeping work at the collective in Sejera. Thus, despite the 'conquest of labour' doctrine and his lofty pronouncements about the crucial need for the transition to a life of physical labour as an imperative in the formation of the 'new Hebrew', both performed service jobs that supported productive labour but did little personally to implement the dictates of the ideology that they espoused. Later on, they became fixtures in public affairs. In our context, it is of interest to note the gender element in their transition to that field. Manya was seen as an example of the free-spirited, fully focused, physically strong and proud Jewish woman. Nevertheless, she was fired from her job with the bookkeeping department of the farm in Sejera because ICA (Jewish Colonization Association, a philanthropic organisation that was responsible for the Jewish settlements in Palestine) officials felt that women could not do such work satisfactorily. From then on, after a brief interim period, she spent most of her time managing the activities of *Hashomer* – especially taking care of everyday problems – and creating personal relations with individual members. Her comrades described her as the mother of the organisation.¹⁹ Sarah Malkin, in contrast, one of the best-known women proletarians of the Second *Aliya*, was urged to learn from Aharonovitch the craft of cooking for workers in Rehovot in order to free him to edit the journal *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir* and do organisational work for his party.²⁰

At the initiative of two members of *Po'alei Tsiyyon*, Jacob Zerubavel and Izhak Ben-Zvi – and, subsequently, of Ben-Gurion as well – a new and expanded edition of the *Yizkor* anthology was published in the United States in 1916.²¹ When the updated collection came out Dov Ber Borochoy, one of the leading Socialist mentors of Jewish youth, announced, 'The executed Jewish terrorist [in Russia], has found a successor in his deserving and worthy path – the Jewish defender'.²²

Even earlier, in 1913, Zionist youth associations in Lvov and nearby provincial towns named their cells *Hashomer*, inspired by *Yizkor*.²³ For these young people, the future founders of the *Ha-Shomer ha-Tsa'ir* movement – renowned for cultivating visions of Jewish–Arab coexistence – the *Yizkor* collection was a revelation that transformed the vision of Palestine from imagination into living reality. Every detail of the 'amazing legend' of those Hebrew farmers and guardsmen became an 'injunction to take the place of the fallen'.²⁴ A German edition of *Yizkor*, translated by Gershom Scholem, appeared in 1918 and was signed off with a statement that reverberated

Electronic Offprint

94

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

widely: 'Hidden along the path from the colony [moshava] to the cemetery is the new mystery of Palestine!' In retrospect, Scholem noted that he did not know whether this sentence reflected a profound truth that was correct in its time or whether it was pretentious kitsch.²⁵ Be this as it may, the appearance of *Yizkor* was plainly a very exciting event even in circles that subsequently advocated Jewish–Arab compromise in Palestine. Its contents responded to the yearnings among young Zionists for paragons with whom they could identify and by whose means they could express their national pride. They found these paragons, foremost, in the idealised, romantic, dashing – sometimes in an exaggerated form – image of the defenders.

Aharonovitch valued *Hashbomer's* defence activities highly but accused the organisation's members of not confining themselves to defence alone. As he expressed it, they aspired to create a proletarian military force and to educate young people to attain political goals by force. This direction, he warned, had a dangerous potential; today the organisation was geared to defence but later it would become oriented to attack.²⁶ What upset him most was that the members of *Hashbomer*, while aspiring to create an ideal 'Hebrew hero' figure, imitated the Arab in attire, language, and behaviour. Although he knew he would be bombarded with clichés about 'cowardice', 'heroism', and 'duty', Aharonovitch demanded the preservation of the Hebrew essence of the formative national hero.²⁷

Two sayings born in the aftermath of incidents between Arabs and defenders during the Second *Aliya* reflected the crux of the dispute in Labour Movement circles about the use of force at the time. Yehezkel Nisanov, a member of *Hashbomer*, was killed in February 1911 when Arabs attempted to steal his mules. Yisrael Giladi, a leading figure in *Hashbomer*, quoted in *Yizkor* a reprimand by Nisanov to a peasant whose mules had been rustled, presenting it as a model for emulation: 'How is it that you stayed alive and your animals are gone? Shame on you!'²⁸ This utterance embodied a principle that *Hashbomer* members regarded as a sacrosanct basis of their organisation's defence heritage: that the Jews had to make it clear to the Arabs that they were not 'sons of death' (*walad el-mut* – i.e. easy prey), but defenders of personal and national dignity willing to sacrifice their lives to their cause.²⁹

After another incident in which *Hashbomer* members were killed – a confrontation with inhabitants of the Arab village of Zarnuga, near Rehovot, in July 1913 – Aharonovitch in deliberate contrast to Nisanov pointedly warned: 'Let's take care not to kill off our children for a bunch of grapes'. He added, 'A hero is not one whose life is *always* ripe for the picking but rather one who knows to make his life ripe for the picking when necessary'.³⁰ This statement became a catchphrase among his contemporaries. The 'bunch of grapes' expression encapsulated Aharonovitch's belief that force should be resorted to only in situations of definite mortal danger. In the characteristic manner of

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

95

expressions that leave an imprint on contemporaries, it aptly and tellingly reflected the needs and reality of the time. Few slogans such as these survive the passing of time, but those that do, engraved in the collective memory, are perceived not merely as pithy sayings but as succinct expressions of an entire world, capturing a pattern of thought, a *Zeitgeist*, a public style, an ideological approach, and a political stance. The 'bunch of grapes' expression was precisely such an expression, at least for a while.

Aharonovitch warned against placing excessive emphasis on honour, cheapening the value of life, and misreading the real conditions in Palestine. His remarks enraged the members of *Hashomer*, who accused *Ha-Po'el ba-Tsa'ir* of 'cowardice', a term that became a symbol in the tense relations that prevailed between the two. Aharonovitch's contemporaries gave him no credit for fathering the 'bunch of grapes' expression, even though they sometimes used it to explain their views on the issue of force. They knew full well whence it had originated but neglected to note the fact, since it was usually invoked in the context of criticising opposition to the use of force. Given their esteem for Aharonovitch, they did not wish to imply criticism of him.³¹ Even historical research sometimes fails to note the source and original intent of the 'bunch of grapes' expression, possibly in the belief that it was nothing more than a striking turn of phrase and without an awareness of its deep implications.³²

Aharonovitch staunchly opposed the desire to manufacture and immortalise heroes – with or without quotation marks – and to glorify their feats in order to create a set of belligerent myths for the Zionist national movement. He adhered to this stance even during the period of volunteering for the Jewish Brigade in 1918, which he opposed vigorously. After World War I, he expressed his attitude toward the matter in acrid tones:

With equanimity we relate to the education of our offspring, whom we fatten from childhood on fictional accounts of martyred war heroes and strive to accustom to admiration of all manner of warmongers, murderers, and shedders of blood. It also happens that we envelop this education in a mantle of sanctity: we call it education in patriotic fervour and take pleasure in it.³³

A few months after Aharonovitch had decried such patriotic education by means of a pantheon of martyred war heroes, his warning evaporated in one stroke. In March 1920, Tel Hai and Joseph Trumpeldor, who fell in its defence, became mainstays in the formation of the Zionist hero ritual myth in Palestine and national symbols of the Jewish people's rebirth in its national homeland. It is no wonder that Aharonovitch, who had supported the retention of Tel Hai before the battle, never expressed his view about those who died defending it and refrained from participating in shaping the ethos and the myth that were constructed around Trumpeldor and his comrades.³⁴

Electronic Offprint

96

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

Shohat, who disagreed with Aharonovitch in many matters of principle, recounted at a later time that they were uncommonly close soul-mates. The origin of this closeness is revealed in remarks she made during a fierce emotional debate that took place on the first anniversary of the battle at Tel Hai, held at the graves of the fallen in Kibbutz Kfar Giladi. The debate revolved around the question of whether the graves should be returned to Tel Hai or left at Kfar Giladi. As tempers flared, Shohat climbed aboard a wagon and ruled:

I am a person of *Hashomer* and my attitude toward death is simple. What is death? Judea will be built not on labour alone; it will also come into being with blood, with death. The defenders have fallen. What does it matter where their bones lie? I don't understand what the fuss is all about. Even if they are transferred – should it really be done hastily and with a great deal of publicity and glory?³⁵

Shohat and Aharonovitch both opposed nurturing legends of the fallen, even though they appreciated the personal sacrifices that had been made. The sanctification of Tel Hai and those who fell for it, especially Trumpeldor, can perhaps be better understood in the wider context of the martyrology process that swept Europe at the end of World War I – a process of which those in Palestine were also aware. From this perspective, Aharonovitch and Shohat's disapproval of the sacred ritual that was being concocted around Trumpeldor and his Labour Movement comrades may be partly explained by the fact that both of them were exiled, along with their families, from Palestine in 1915 – Shohat to Turkey and Aharonovitch to Egypt. Neither of them returned to Palestine until 1919. Thus, they experienced the formative event of their generation, World War I, in a traumatic deportation that they thought best to banish from memory. Their own lives contained no heat of battle, fantasies of heroism, or rituals constructed around the fallen. Shohat and Aharonovitch, shunted to the margins of the historical event, did not identify with the cult of sacrifice, revelation, and resurrection that permeated post-World War I culture.³⁶

Although in total disagreement about the role of 'blood and fire' in the fulfilment of Zionism, Shohat and Aharonovitch agreed that the Yishuv must be able to defend its members. They regarded the availability of force as a necessity for repelling Arab attacks and refuting the view of Jews as 'sons of death'. However, they disagreed about how to bring about a Jewish–Arab accord. Aharonovitch doubted the ability of Jewish political action to facilitate a rapprochement and prevent an overt clash in the future. He preferred to postpone what he considered the inevitable clash with the Arabs to the latest possible time and propounded the goal of attaining a 'Hebrew majority', toward which only moral action was permissible. Shohat, in contrast, always

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOCHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

97

believed it essential to take proactive measures – personal, social, and political – for rapprochement and encouragement of Jewish–Arab dialogue, even though she also favoured attaining a Jewish majority in Palestine.³⁷ These two conflicting views on the role of force in resolving political issues and on the likelihood of an understanding between Jews and Arabs in Palestine would remain unresolved for decades to come. Meanwhile, the recurring clashes created more and more candidates to join the pantheon of fallen heroes. In this regard, Aharonovitch adhered to his view whereas Shohat preferred to join those who cultivated the myth of Jewish heroism in Palestine. Aharonovitch's silence in regard to the elaboration of Zionist martyrology would eventually give way to very blunt language two years after the events in Tel Hai.

Dreamers and Fighters

In December 1921, ten years after the *Yizkor* anthology was published, the journalist and author Jacob Yaari (Poleskin) produced a sweeping and impressive work titled *Dreamers and Fighters*,³⁸ which sketched the personalities of prominent First and Second *Aliya* figures and several victims of clashes with the Arabs. Its goal in the words of the newspaper *Ha'aretz*, was to present the future historian with 'the tapestry of the inception and sparks of the character' of the first generation of the Zionist revolution and the 'soul of its endeavour', free from political-party differences and political polemics.³⁹ The book portrays the enterprise in Palestine as the fruit of the labour of a few uniquely endowed individuals and not as that of a collective human effort that slowly and persistently sought to overcome physical and psychological hurdles. It was mostly the act of fighting, and not necessarily the agonies of pioneering, that was the criterion for inclusion in the volume. Some of those recalled in the book were still alive and active in Zionist affairs. One of the most prominent of them was Shohat, the only woman included in the second part of the book, nearly all of which was devoted to well-known contemporary leaders such as Baron Edmond de Rothschild, Chaim Weizmann, Arthur Ruppin, Zeev Jabotinsky, Joseph Trumpeldor, and A.D. Gordon. Thus, Shohat was perceived at the time as worthy of inclusion among the generation's most accomplished personalities. *Dreamers and Fighters* took two years to edit. Poleskin, Zalman Gissin (the publisher) and the writer Brenner chose the protagonists in the book and the order of their presentation. According to Gissin, in any case of disagreement Brenner's view prevailed.⁴⁰ Thus it was Brenner, with his weighty authority in Labour Movement circles, who determined who was worthy of being considered the most significant representatives of the Zionist *Yishuv* canon.

Poleskin was the first to introduce Shohat as one of the most important

Electronic Offprint

98

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

living symbols who had arisen in Russia and, subsequently, in early twentieth-century Palestine, and as a paragon for the younger generation. He was also the last to write about her before her public status began to decline and her moral image became sullied. His depiction of Manya's revolutionary-terrorist career in Russia and her relations with the head of the czarist intelligence service, Sergei Zubatov, provided ammunition for those who sought to oust her from political life. At the time the book was published, Shohat was in the midst of a turbulent struggle for her reputation in the face of political attacks from Bundists and other anti-Zionists in the United States, who used the same materials that were the basis for Poleskin's praise and admiration as evidence that she had betrayed her colleagues in the revolutionary Socialist Jewish underground in Russia.⁴¹ Shohat, enraged, wished to publish an open letter in *Kuntres*, the journal of the *Abdut ha-'Avoda* Party, accusing Poleskin of having inserted unauthorised passages in his book, not to mention hyperbole and inaccuracies.⁴²

Aharonovitch was also unhappy with *Dreamers and Fighters*, to put it mildly, but for different reasons. Several days after the book came out he encountered its publisher, Gissin, on the street in Tel Aviv and asked him angrily where he had found the money to publish the book and whether he had read it.⁴³ Aharonovitch, irked, believed that the book included lies, exaggerations, and fictional accounts. He decried the use of such literature for Zionist propaganda purposes. The book, he believed, did not describe the hardships in Palestine as they really were but rather created a bubble of fantasy around horseback riding and feats of heroism.⁴⁴ Indeed, articles in a similar vein, painting the realities of the frontier of Palestine in grand romantic colours, appeared quite often in Diaspora newspapers. 'From our distance', one paper enthused, 'Hashomer looks like a lovely legend, an act of magic that is being effected day by day by warm-hearted, free-spirited Jewish heroes'.⁴⁵ This pattern of writing, especially with living people as its objects, had troubled Gordon himself and prompted him to write his first published piece, in which he protested against the genre of 'military imagery' that creates glorious heroes in valorous attire who never existed.⁴⁶ Presumably, however, it was not this pattern of writing that Shohat found bothersome, since it could be used to nurture the legends of *Hashomer* even after the organisation disbanded in June 1920. This seems to be the factor that prompted Shohat to give Poleskin the testimony on which the chapter about her was based. Indeed, other chapters in the first part of the book, which was devoted to less well known personalities, included ten members of *Hashomer*.

This also seems to be the part of the book that Aharonovitch resented the most, bringing him to urge that it be banned:

We don't want our offspring to be raised from childhood to pose and prepare for an exhibition of heroes of Eretz Israel. We also don't want

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

99

their concepts of heroism to be those in this book, just as, by the way, we don't want all their patriotism to be reflected in football matches, in which they'll regard these victories as their national victory.⁴⁷

In the heat of his criticism of *Dreamers and Fighters*, Aharonovitch wrote a revealing sentence that reflected a profound disquiet shared by other members of his generation: 'For lack of choice we acquiesce in the verdict of history, to serve as fertilizer for some vague future that no one alive today will be privileged to see.'⁴⁸ Manya Shohat recounted an incident in which, when members of Kfar Giladi returned from work one afternoon and found nothing for lunch but bread and onions, one of them called out, 'We're just fertilizer for the next generation', and the group broke into a spontaneous dance in the dining hall, repeatedly shouting this phrase.⁴⁹ She explained that this view of being 'just fertilizer for the next generation' meant, from the standpoint of contemporaries, that the daily hardships should be gauged by some other measure. This is how they overcame their despair over the lack of food, which symbolised the poverty and distress that settlers faced at the time. It was a handy and expedient way of avoiding a head-on confrontation with their current woes, which seemed impossible to overcome.

Such rationalisations were not unique to these members of Kfar Giladi. Like revolutionaries elsewhere and at other times, members of the first generation of Zionist pioneers habitually portrayed themselves as a 'desert generation'. They laboured to establish the myth of the 'new Jew', expecting their offspring to be endowed with the physical and psychological strength needed for the national project for which they had blazed the trail.⁵⁰ Aharonovitch believed that it was enough for the pioneers to pledge their entire lives to the Zionist project even if its success was not certain. This did not justify exhibiting them like pictures in an open-air market for sales-promotion purposes, as had been done in *Dreamers and Fighters*, even if this were an accepted way to market Zionist propaganda.

Dreamers and Fighters became a milestone in the commemoration of those who took their Zionist beliefs to their practical conclusion. As the *Yishuv* grew and consolidated during the 1920s, the commemorative process gathered momentum and even the Labour Movement hastened to climb onto the bandwagon. Its first publication for this purpose was the collection *Mesila* (path), issued by the *Histadrut* in 1924. Although its subtitle was rather neutral – 'A Textbook and General Reading Matter on the History of the Jewish Labour Movement in Palestine', its real purpose was to canonise the values, principles, and way of life of the Labour Movement, to educate youth and new immigrants, and to create an infrastructure for Zionist propaganda abroad. *Ha-Po'el ba-Tsa'ir* circles greeted the publication of *Mesila* with fierce indignation. The chapters on matters related to guarding and defence stressed

Electronic Offprint

100

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

the exploits of *Hashomer* members and cited those who favoured volunteering for the Jewish Brigade. The only materials taken from *Yizkor* were quotations that expressed no disapproval of militarism. The editors even omitted articles that had appeared in *Ha-Po'el ba-Tsa'ir* about Tel Hai. The editor of *Ha-Po'el ba-Tsa'ir*, Yitzhak Lofban, who had replaced Aharonovitch after the latter's resignation in late 1922, acridly wrote that it would suffice to insert a few rousing war songs into the material cited in *Mesila* about the Brigade for the book to serve as appropriate reading material for Prussian Junkers as well.⁵¹ By implication, Aharonovitch's hope that they would refrain from educating the future generation of the Zionist Movement in the spirit of militarism was dashed.

What Are We Teaching Our Youth?

The challenge of educating teenagers in the Labour Movement and their adherence to its values was one of the issues that most preoccupied the heads of the movement. They were often frank about the intense hopes that they pinned on young people growing up in Palestine and their concern about their character and behaviour. For example, Joseph Baratz, a founder of Degania and a member of the second-tier leadership of *Mapai*, described both the positive and negative traits of the children of the first *gevutsa* (collective). On the one hand they were practical and were excited by public and national events (such as the assassination of Chaim Arlosoroff in 1933). They related to their 'homeland' not in the abstract but naturally and palpably, without the psychological and ideological complexities of their parents. On the other hand, however, they lacked basic human sensitivity. They were unaware of the complex relations within the Jewish Diaspora communities. They failed to show sympathy to the poor and the sick or pity for those in distress, and the relations among them lacked tenderness and sensitivity. Their love of homeland often led them to display exaggerated patriotic sentiments.⁵² The leaders of the Labour Movement viewed the nature and actions of young people growing up in Palestine as evidence of the potential of their parents' project and vivid proof of its success. At the same time, Baratz's remarks make clear that the first generation was intensely concerned about these and other traits among young people, which seemed liable to threaten the long-term viability of the Zionist enterprise. Aharonovitch and Shohat also expressed their hopes and concerns. However, when they tackled the substantive question – what should we teach, and what should our teaching impart to youth? – they offered contrasting answers.

At an event marking the inauguration of the Writers' House in Tel Aviv in August 1931, a discussion about the essence of the biographical novel was held. In the debate that developed among the participants, Professor Joseph

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

101

Klausner posed a dilemma that he had encountered as a lecturer at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. In his research, he had found quite a few uncomplimentary details about the lives and actions of people who were considered national luminaries. Was it at all permissible to reveal these deficiencies to the younger generation, or was it better to cover them up, clothe the heroes in idealised attire, and offer them up as faultless paragons? About two weeks later, in an article titled 'Truth', Aharonovitch replied flatly: 'You have to tell, write, and lecture only the unvarnished truth, as it is.'⁵³ Aharonovitch decried the tendency of some contemporaneous educators to instil in their pupils the belief that people can behave like angels. Such idealisation may swamp teenagers 'in waves of "sins" up to their neck'. A biography that depicts a great person as having led the life of an angel and not that of a human being who struggles with his passions sets an unattainable threshold for young people. It can only induce despair, especially among those who have reached a critical phase in the formation of their character, and will undermine their hope of eventually succeeding in their endeavours. Thus Aharonovitch insisted on strict adherence to the truth in educational materials for youth.⁵⁴

Manya Shohat, in contrast, demanded repeatedly over the years that the *Hashomer* veterans publish pamphlets for young people with stories of the organisation's achievements. Shortly before her death, she urged *Hashomer* veterans and aficionados – in what was, in fact, her last initiative – to commit their feats to writing, to recount the biographies of *Hashomer* members, and to describe special, tragic, and funny incidents, heroic exploits, etc., that would ignite the passions of young people, inform them about *Hashomer*, and induce them to identify with what it stood for. Shohat even proposed that these stories be reworked for children and that, for this purpose, authors of the highest stature be recruited – Lea Goldberg, Natan Alterman, and Miriam Yelan-Shtekelis.⁵⁵ An example of how Shohat wished to commemorate the *Hashomer* enterprise may be found in a story that she often told about a dream that her daughter, Anna, had had when she was eight years old. The dream took place after the bodies of six early members of *Hashomer* were taken to their final resting place at the cemetery of Kfar Giladi. The *Hashomer* veterans regarded this event as a vastly important milestone and the *Hashomer Book* deliberately ended with an episode related to it.⁵⁶ Thus Shohat described her daughter's dream:

I'm walking alone fearlessly among the graves of the *Hashomer* people, and suddenly I see the supine defenders suddenly come to life, circulating among the farm buildings and groves of trees as if still on watch. ... I asked them in amazement, 'But you are already dead, how are you still able to get up and walk?' 'Yes' – they answered with a deep

Electronic Offprint

102

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

sigh, 'we really are dead, but it's our duty to get up to watch over the Jewish fields, to carry on as we had, even though it's a great strain for us since as dead people we no longer have the strength to get up and have to push aside a heavy load of soil and stones and rise from the depths. But it's our duty to stay on guard because we undertook this [duty] the day we made defence our mission. Therefore, we get up every night to visit [Kfar Giladi] and stand it on its feet, taut and watchful.' My daughter asked, 'If that's the case, how long will you continue to exhaust yourselves by rising from your graves?' The answer: 'Until this whole desolate Huleh [Valley] in front of us is covered with blossoming, flourishing settlements, defensive Hebrew settlements.'⁵⁷

These two examples, one from the late 1950s and one from the 1920s – periods of relative calm in the lives of Jews in Palestine/Israel – illustrate Shohat's main concern: that in quiet times, the crucial importance of the defence enterprise would diminish. The need to find appropriate ways to convey this message to young Israelis perturbed Shohat to her dying day. Furthermore, it is instructive to note that the parents' generation, that of the revolutionary pioneers, regarded the ability to withstand the ordeal of violence and fighting as the most convincing evidence of the young generation's success in coping with the challenges of assuring the survival of the Zionist venture. This was especially evident in the memorial and commemorative pamphlets that were written in honour of offspring who fell in the War of Independence.⁵⁸

The leaders of the Labour Movement invested time and thought in the question of commemoration. The establishment of canonical texts, such as Berl Katznelson's *Yizkor* for the fallen at Tel Hai, the creation of paragons for admiration and emulation, and the development of a unique world of cultural experience were important elements in the formation of their ideological, political, organisational, and educational strength. Their profound awareness of what they had done and the vast importance that they attributed to conveying their worldview were reflected in their political activity and also in their writing, which was intended to educate the young. From this standpoint, it is interesting that they repeatedly saw fit to invest time in presenting and glorifying the heroism of those who had been killed in violent confrontations with Arabs and usually refrained from commemorating actions by people whose heroism was not closely related to the use of force. Conspicuous examples are Berl Katznelson's introductions to *Sefer me'ora'ot tartsav* (Book of the Riots of 1936) and *Sefer ba-gvura* (Book of Heroism).⁵⁹ A more obscure example pertains to Ben-Gurion. Although he was turned down for membership in *Hashomer* and found himself in a fierce conflict with its veterans in the second half of the 1920s, he nonetheless undertook to write

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

103

the first definitive history of this organisation under the auspices of the Jewish National Fund's La-No'ar Library. Zeev Jabotinsky had been a previous candidate for this task, but had been rejected.⁶⁰ It was not so much a keen interest in historical documentation that prompted the two leaders to covet the post of historian of the *Yishuv*'s first defence organisation as their wish to assimilate that history into their personal biographies. They evidently assumed that writing about *Hashomer* would help them portray themselves as pioneers in shaping the Palestinian–Jewish defence doctrine and enable them to invoke the *Hashomer* venture to the benefit of the current political situation and defence needs as they understood them.

Ultimately, it was Aharon Ever-Hadani, assisted by an editorial board composed of Yisrael Shohat, Eliezer Shohat, and Izhak Ben-Zvi, who edited the *Hashomer* volume in the La-No'ar series. Practically speaking, Yisrael Shohat gathered, sorted, and prepared the material by himself. Preparations for Ben-Gurion's transfer of responsibility for commemorating *Hashomer* to Yisrael Shohat in January 1930⁶¹ were preceded by the return of the *Hashomer* veterans to the *Histadrut* consensus after they had been ousted from the labour federation following the split in the Labour Brigades and the exposure of the 'Kibbutz' underground in 1926. Their reinstatement occurred in the aftermath of their assistance in defending the *Yishuv* during the violence of August 1929.⁶²

In the lengthy standoff between the *Hashomer* veterans and a group headed by Eliyahu Golomb, Dov Hoz, and Shaul Meirov (Avigur) concerning the structure, doctrine, and leadership of the *Hagana*, Manya Shohat twice expressed in private letters what could be construed as a threat to assassinate the leaders of the *Yishuv*. One of these threats was aimed at Ben-Gurion in 1926;⁶³ the other occurred during the Arab uprising, when the *Hashomer* veterans made their last attempt to return to the decision-making core of the *Hagana*. On this occasion, Shohat used unprecedentedly harsh language in a letter from late 1938:

They, that is – that little group that currently has the fate of the leadership in its clutches, is afraid of our people. He, Golomb, is the worst of them. He's a classic Jesuit type, who always sets a trap for his opponents. He prepares the trap very thoroughly, with forethought, under a camouflage of pleasant talk, compliments, and friendly conversations. Potentially he's a very dangerous man. If he controlled the GPU [Soviet political police], he'd be very cruel. Fortunately for us, there's no GPU in Palestine yet. But if such an institution ever does come into being, he'll run it with great success and pleasure. I hate Golomb because deliberately and consciously he pinned down our best forces and will soon make them into mental cripples. I feel such enmity

Electronic Offprint

104

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

toward him that if I read in the paper that he'd been killed, I'd be satisfied.⁶⁴

It was the failure of the *Hashomer* veterans' attempt to join the decision-making mainstream of the *Hagana* (defence: *Histadrut's* military organisation for self-defence) that engendered this extreme verdict on Golomb, which, needless to say, was groundless. Going to the extreme if not beyond was one of Shohat's most conspicuous traits throughout her life.⁶⁵ As her political career unfolded within the workers' movement during the stormy days preceding the first Russian revolution, Manya was imbued with a sense of absolute justice and believed direct militant action would achieve it. Relying on a unique individual scale of values, she assumed that the pervasive motivation to avenge iniquities, familiar to those whose formative and ideological-political cradle was revolution in public life, made it possible to eliminate those who stood in the way of realising these values.

She persisted in attributing the assassinations in which she had been involved to exalted idealistic and moral motives. In a booklet published by her kibbutz, Kfar Giladi, on the first anniversary of her death, this was precisely how her involvement in 1924 murder of the *Agudath Israel* functionary Jacob Israel de Haan was presented: 'A small group of comrades, persuaded by Manya, decide to liquidate him and it was done.' This assertion still awaits corroboration, as historical research has not yet determined who was responsible for the assassination of de Haan.⁶⁶ What is clear, however, is that this is how Shohat's comrades wished to remember her and to communicate her worldview and *modus operandi* to posterity.

In talks between Yosef Aharonovitch and Manya Shohat, the former said on various occasions that he was quite familiar with Shohat's biography and knew that groups she had belonged to had been involved in several assassinations, including some in Palestine. 'The Jewish ethic is founded on an absolute principle: Thou shall not murder! And you can't twist, turn, or interpret your way out of it', he insisted.⁶⁷ Shohat published his remarks during the 1936–39 Arab uprising, as the *Yishuv* was in the throes of a fierce controversy between Labour and the Revisionist Movement about how to respond to the Arabs' assaults and whether innocent Arabs were fair game in this response. Although she was involved in preparing a plan to assassinate the Mufti, Haj Amin al Husseini, Shohat refused to sanction physical attack as a universal response to opponents, especially when such attacks would result in injury to innocents.⁶⁸

Apart from the moral imperative that guided him, Aharonovitch's approach to this issue was determined by a basic *Weltanschauung* that denied the individual's decisive role in history. In the summer of 1935 at a party marking the publication of the fiftieth booklet in the Jewish National Fund's *La-No'ar* series, Aharonovitch set forth the principles that, in his opinion, should guide

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOCHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

105

the authors in this project. He explained that he would speak in terms of abstract rules and refrain from substantiating them with examples, because 'The people portrayed in those booklets as miracle workers are no longer among the living and it isn't right to anger the dead.'⁶⁹ Aharonovitch believed that with the exception of a few institutions and enterprises, the settlement of Palestine 'is a product of the collective personality and not at all of the individual personality. The *Yishuv* never had an individual personality of true stature. The level of the collective was extraordinarily high'. Furthermore, fewer than a dozen people in the *Yishuv* really had exceptional personalities. At the time, several deceased members of the Second *Aliya* were recognised as such, in particular Vitkin, Joseph Bussel, Trumpeldor, Brenner, Gordon, and the poetess Rachel Bluwstein. The Labour Movement placed creative endeavour at the very core of Zionist fulfilment and Aharonovitch concurred with this view. However, he argued that anyone who, when writing a monograph about a certain place of settlement, focuses it on an individual commits a twofold sin in the falsification of historical truth. First, 'He inflates an ordinary person and forces him to be a historical hero', thus distorting his persona, and making him look ridiculous in the eyes of acquaintances and associates who would ask in mock amazement, 'What, he's also among the prophets?' Second, this kind of writing diminished the role of others whose efforts and contribution were no less than those of the imagined hero.⁷⁰

The form of commemorative writing that Shohat and her colleagues in *Hashomer* found acceptable first appeared in the collection *Divrei po'alot* (The Words of Women Workers), edited by Rahel Katznelson-Rubashov (Shazar) and published in November 1929 in order to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Second *Aliya* and retell the stories of women workers who participated in it.⁷¹ The editor gave her friend, Shohat, the privilege of opening the collection. This choice was probably not made for mere chronological reasons, i.e., Shohat's arrival in Palestine at the dawn of the Second *Aliya*, but rather as an acknowledgment of her status as the most dominant and charismatic woman of the Second *Aliya*, whose personal story symbolised the exploits of women at the time and their willingness to sacrifice themselves for the advancement of the Zionist cause. Furthermore, the collection was based on personal stories, some of which did not ignore the physical and psychological hardships of existence but rather wove them into a web that glorified a group that had fulfilled its vision despite all obstacles. The *Hashomer* veterans considered this method worthy of emulation, as shown by the *Hashomer Collection* (and its successor, the 1957 *Hashomer Book*), another anthology of articles by members of the organisation that was obviously meant to secure their place in the collective memory. The collection was published in January 1937, during a lull in the Arab uprising.

The *Hashomer Collection* appeared at this relatively late date mainly

Electronic Offprint

106

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

because of difficulties in gathering and editing the material from the early 1930s until the project received assistance from the Labour Archives. However, the *Hashomer* members had to pay the *Histadrut* a 'tax' in order to obtain its support for the publication of their book: the inclusion of articles by Shmuel David Yaffe (of the erstwhile *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir* Party) and Ben-Gurion (of *Po'alei Tsiyyon* and later of *Abdut ha-'Avoda*), which had naturally not been included in the original plan of the book.⁷² Some members on the fringes of the Labour movement argued heatedly about the message that the *Collection* was meant to convey with regard to the use of force in assuring the existence of the *Yishuv*.⁷³ Overall, the public gave the *Collection* an appreciative reception. Both editions of the book, in print runs of 3,000 copies apiece, were sold out within a year.⁷⁴ Given the protracted violent struggle that was taking place in Palestine at the time, the publication of the *Hashomer Collection* was presented as a timely event. The articles in the book stressed the unbroken strand between the past tales of heroism and the *Yishuv's* self-defence at the time and the strong connection between defending the *Yishuv* and building and populating it.⁷⁵ The *Collection* demonstrated the realisation on the part of the *Hashomer* veterans that it was time for them to join their history to that of the rest of the *Yishuv*. Stories about new heroes were being spun, such as members of the *Hagana* and Wingate's Special Night Squads (small commando units set up by the British Army in the late 1930s to guard against Arab attacks), Shlomo Ben-Yosef (member of *Betar*, the Revisionist youth movement, who attacked an Arab bus and was executed in 1938) and the fighters of the *Irgun Zva'i Le'umi* (underground Jewish organisation associated with the right-wing Revisionism). These figures, along with *Nili* (an espionage group set up during World War I to gather and supply information to the British Army in Egypt), whose story was being given much greater prominence than before, would compete with *Hashomer* for positions in the pantheon of Israeli heroism. For example, Yaari-Poleskin, who published a book on the history of *Nili* (sponsored by right-wing circles in the *Yishuv*) at the time the *Hashomer Collection* came out, claimed that it was only for political reasons (i.e. in order to attribute the realisation of Zionism only to those affiliated with the Labour movement and to inflate the *Yishuv's* accomplishments for propaganda purposes), that 'The members of *Hashomer* have received a huge down payment on account of their historical glory'.⁷⁶

The *Hashomer Collection* exemplifies the glorification of outstanding personalities that Aharonovitch decried repeatedly. The elitist tendencies, so typical of revolutionary and clandestine circles, were prominent in *Hashomer*, and around the same time that the book appeared Shohat publicly regretted the price that the wives of the organisation's members had paid for them.⁷⁷ In the final reckoning, however, her volte-face was merely an admission that one

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

107

who takes the revolutionary road is not absolved of errors and injustice. In the future, too, Shohat would continue to glorify those select individuals whose self-sacrifice had, in her opinion, paved the way to the rebirth of their nation.

Epilogue: The Commemoration of Manya and Yoseph

Shohat became a historical hero during her own lifetime and before most of her comrades, with the possible exceptions of Joseph Bussel (who drowned in Lake Kinneret in July 1919) and the writer Yosef Haim Brenner (murdered in the violence of May 1921 in Jaffa). To varying degrees, all the commemorative books discussed in this article helped to prepare her for admission to the Israeli national pantheon. She was involved in fields of public life that were unusual for a woman: from fundraising to arms smuggling and involvement in the assassination of opponents. In her teen and adult years, she never hesitated to risk her life for what she regarded as the collective cause. Nevertheless, she is not remembered as a Zionist Amazon, in contrast to Sarah Aaronsohn, for example. Shohat carefully camouflaged all evidence of the effect of personal crises on her public activity, thereby preventing biographers from depicting her actions as having been inspired by 'personal tragedies' and the intricacies of human relations, as happened in the case of Aaronsohn.⁷⁸ Shohat's involvement in defending the *Yishuv* and her exceptional daring were unusual in the male-dominated society of the time. When she and her acquaintances reminisced about such events she had experienced, they highlighted Shohat's exceptional personality, her courage, and her intrinsic adventurousness, rather than heroism – if only because she had emerged from these deeds unscathed.⁷⁹ Her unquenchable thirst for action led her to disregard the 'small print' of ideological doctrine. Therefore, she made no attempt to elaborate a coherent view on commemoration. Ultimately, her views on this matter were fuelled by her naive faith in the power of the individual to influence the fate of the nation. Rachel Katznelson-Shazar wondered in a tribute written on the first anniversary of her death about the origin of this faith – whether it was inspired by the yearning, typical of many of the leaders of the *Yishuv*, to be involved in every possible field of activity, or whether it reflected a 'national defect' of a people that had been removed from active political life for so long. This issue requires separate study.⁸⁰ For our purposes, it suffices to note Katznelson-Shazar's judgement: 'Of all the outstanding personalities in Shohat's generation, none other is so swathed in legend.'⁸¹

Shohat had a long life – she died in February 1961 at the age of 82 – but played no substantive role in public life after 1942. On the back of a photograph of herself and her son, preserved in the Labour Archives, she wrote: 'The mother of Hashomer and the Defenders, Manya Shohat

Electronic Offprint

108

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

(Wilbushewitz), with her young son Gideon.⁸² Her self-definition concisely expresses the special nature of her leadership, which was akin to the charismatic patterns of the activities of the *tzadik* (righteous) who serves as a sort of 'confessional father' in Hasidic society and to whom organisation members turn for advice and guidance, telling him their problems.⁸³

Although she was not regarded as desiring to aggrandise her actions, she bequeathed at least ten different versions of her life during the Second *Aliya*. The *Hashomer* members took care to cement their proper place in history by holding annual conferences, writing the *Hashomer Book*, establishing their pantheon at the cemetery in Kfar Giladi, and founding the Hashomer House nearby. Apart from Rahel Yanait Ben-Zvi, the wife of the second President of Israel and Manya's close friend,⁸⁴ it was David Ben-Gurion, Israel's founding father, who did the most to secure the place of *Hashomer* and Shohat in the collective memory. Ben-Gurion, deeply aware of the importance of the written and spoken word in shaping the past, present, and future, overlooked his bygone disputes with *Hashomer* and termed the organisation 'the grandfather of the Israel Defence Forces' – a sobriquet that the veterans of *Hashomer* eagerly adopted.⁸⁵ Although his relations with Shohat were punctuated by several fierce conflicts, Ben-Gurion described her on numerous occasions as a link with Biblical heroines such as Sarah, Rebecca, and Deborah the Prophetess. To encourage women to enlist in the Israel Defence Forces, Ben-Gurion depicted Shohat as the paragon of a woman soldier who dedicates her every fibre to service of the nation and the homeland.⁸⁶ The emphasis here was not so much on the military aspect of Shohat's activities as on her profound moral commitment to nation building. If so, two of the leading personalities in Israel's formal and non-formal leading establishment took action to foster the legend of Manya Shohat. Yanait Ben-Zvi and Ben-Gurion did so in order to keep her image alive after the establishment of the state, a process that witnessed changes in ethos, identity, and self-image, as one of the most salient symbols of the founding fathers' generation.⁸⁷

From the very outset of his career Aharonovitch had been keenly aware of the first signs of a concern about a 'place in history' in Labour Movement circles – the appearance of the *Yizkor* collection – and vehemently opposed this tendency all his life. Nevertheless, he was unable to avoid a similar fate. When he died in March 1937, his erstwhile comrades in the *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir* Party, who had always shunned affectations of leadership and, all the more so, the explicit title of 'leader', bestowed on him the crown that he had refused to wear while alive. Some 3,000 people convened in Tel Aviv to mark the seventh day of his passing. For two days the newspaper *Davar* devoted its entire front page to Aharonovitch's death. *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir* published 28 articles in his memory in two consecutive double-length inserts. The *Histadrut* published a commemorative book about him roughly a year after

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

109

his death. Two volumes of his writings were published with assistance from Bank Hapoalim. Aharonovitch was one of the first to be buried in the pantheon-like plot at the Tel Aviv cemetery where leading Labour Movement figures such as Chaim Arlosoroff, Eliyahu Golomb, and Moshe Sharett are interred.⁸⁸ However, Aharonovitch was neither considered a historical hero of Shohat's magnitude nor memorialised as such, and his image is no longer remembered as a prominent figure of the early Labour Movement. At the time, he was described as the advocate of the ideal of a political organisation that, for ideological and educational reasons, favours moral values over political pragmatism, but his insistence on remembering the contribution of ordinary people and collective action in the Zionist enterprise rather than glorifying the special qualities and feats of extraordinary individuals, steadily eroded.

His warning, 'not to kill off our children for a bunch of grapes', met a similar fate. Those who bothered to remember it made sure to remove its sting. The attitude it expresses was mostly depicted as characterising people who preferred words instead of joining the essential fight for Jewish honour and life in Palestine. Indeed, it is no longer a 'bunch of grapes' that stands at the focal point of Jewish–Arab violence since 1920 but rather an increasingly extreme collision between two peoples. The main message in Aharonovitch's phrase, however, has been ignored. Even before World War I, Aharonovitch accused *Hashomer* of 'developing in young people a militaristic ideology that is foreign to the spirit of Judaism'.⁸⁹ He questioned whether all those random battles at the gate were really necessary or whether some were merely provocative, inflammatory, and fought out of habit, on a false pretext, in an environment that considers the sacrifice of lives as routine. Aharonovitch's warning, and what he represented, steadily eroded, as the factor of force became a fixture in the reality of Palestine/Israel and with it the number of candidates for inclusion in the pantheon of Jewish heroism and rebirth escalated. Concurrently, the number of books devoted to the 'enchanted, legendary, vivid and alluring folk tradition that was folded into the history of *Hashomer* and handed onward to its followers' has been steadily increasing.⁹⁰ The broader and deeper these processes become, the more Aharonovitch's warning is blurred and forgotten.

NOTES

1. Yael Zerubavel, 'Qrav, Haqrava, Qorban: Tmurot be-Idiologiyat ha-Haqrava ha-Patri'yotit be-Israel' [Fighting, Sacrifice, Victim: Changes in the Ideology of Patriotic Self-Sacrifice in Israel] in *Patriotizm: Obavim Otakb Moledet* [Patriotism: Homeland Love] ed. by Avner Ben-Amos and Daniel Bar-Tal (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-Me'uhad, 2004), pp.61–99; (pp.63–5); George L. Mosse, *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp.19, 38–9; Joanna Bourke, *An Intimate History of Killing: Face-to-Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare* (London: Granta Books, 1999), pp.120–25; Oz Almog, *Ha-Tzabar: Dyukan* [The Sabra: A Profile] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1997), pp.88–90.

Electronic Offprint

110

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

2. Yael Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots: Collective Memory and the Making of Israeli National Tradition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp.41–7; Idith Zertal, *Israel's Holocaust and the Politics of Nationhood* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Arieh Bruce Saposnik, 'Exorcising the "Angel of Nation Death": National and Individual Death (and Rebirth) in Zionist Palestine', *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 95.3 (2005), pp.557–78.
3. For more on Aharonovitch and *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, see *Kitvei Yosef Aharonovitch* [The Writings of Yosef Aharonovitch] ed. by Devorah Baron and Eliezer Shohat (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1941). For more on Manya Shohat and the collective at Sejera, see Shlomo Shva, *Shevet ha-Noazim* [The Daring Tribe] (Merhavia: Sifriyat Poalim, 1969); Rachel Yanait Ben-Zvi, *Manya Shohat* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1976); Shulamit Reinhartz, 'Manya Wilbushewitz-Shohat and the Winding Road to Sejera', in *Pioneers and Homemakers: Jewish Women in Pre-State Israel* ed. by Deborah S. Bernstein (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1992), pp.95–118.
4. See, Zeev Sternhell, *The Founding Myths of Israel: Nationalism, Socialism, and the Making of the Jewish State* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), p.73.
5. Anita Shapira, *Land and Power: The Zionist Resort to Force, 1881–1948* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp.62–5; Shmuel Almog, *Zionism and History: The Rise of a New Jewish Consciousness* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1987), pp.108–11; Gideon Shimoni, *The Zionist Ideology* (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 1995), pp.205–7.
6. Jonathan Frankel, *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp.366–70; Zeev Tzahor, 'Tnuat ha-Poalim: Itzuv ha-Hanhaga' [The Labor Movement: Shaping of the Leadership] in *ba-Hazon veba-Heshbon* [Vision and Reckoning] (Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim, 1994), pp.15–16.
7. Their wedding was the first in Hashomer and Bar Giora circles; it was followed in later years by quite a few. For a discussion of weddings in Hashomer, see Margalit Shilo, 'Ha-Isha ha-Ivrit ha-Hadasha: Panim Rabot La' [The Multi-faceted Image of the Modern Israeli Woman], *Bikoret ve-Parshanut*, 34 (Summer 2000), pp.13–16.
8. On relations between the Shohats, see Ben-Zvi (see note 3), p.108. On Aharonovitch's relations with Baron, see Amia Lieblich, *Rekamot* [Tapestries] (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Shoken, 1991), pp.145–8, 176–7, 203–6.
9. N. Twersky, 'Imo' [With Him], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 6 April 1937. Manya was seven years older than her oldest peers in Hashomer. Aharonovitch was described as the second-oldest worker in the Second Aliya, after A.D. Gordon.
10. Testimony Manya Shohat to Shaul Avigur, 26 August 1951, Hagana Historical Archives, Tel Aviv, File 132.6.
11. See, for example, R. Binyamin, 'Ledmut shel Yosef Aharonovitch Zal' [On the Persona of the Late Yosef Aharonovitch], *Ha'Olam*, 8 April 1937; R. (Rachel Katznelson-Shazar), 'Manya Shohat', *D'var ha-Po'elet*, February 1961, p.43.
12. Manya Shohat, 'Ha-Tzav ha-Musari' [The Moral Imperative], *D'var ha-Po'elet*, 29 May 1938, p.74.
13. A.Z. Rabinowitz, ed., *Yizkor* (Jaffa: n.p., 1912). In regard to this collection, see Jonathan Frankel, 'The "Yizkor" Book of 1911: A Note on National Myths in the Second Aliya', in *Religion Ideology and Nationalism in Europe and America: Essays Presented in Honor of Yehoshua Arieli* (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center, 1986), pp.355–84.
14. Emmanuel Sivan, *Dor Ta'shab* [The 1948 Generation] (Tel Aviv: Ma'arakhot, 1991), pp.175–7; Shapira, *Land and Power* (see note 5), pp.32–3.
15. See Meir Chazan, 'Reshit ha-Metinut be-Mifleget Ha-po'el Ha-tza'ir 1905–1917' [The Beginning of the Moderate Vision in Hapoel Hatzair 1905–1917], *Iyunim Bitqumat Israel*, 12 (2002), pp.242–60.
16. Yosef Aharonovitch, 'Yosef Vitkin Zal' [The Late Joseph Vitkin], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 11 February 1912.
17. Yosef Aharonovitch, 'Reshimot le-Toldot A.D. Gordon' [Biographical Notes about A.D. Gordon], in *Kitvei A.D. Gordon* [Writings of A.D. Gordon] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1945), vol.A, p.xxiii.
18. Shohat, 'The Moral Imperative' (see note 12).
19. Derek J. Penslar, *Zionism and Technocracy: The Engineering of Jewish Settlement in Palestine, 1870–1918* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991), p.35; Shulamit Reinhartz, 'Irma "Rama" Lindheim: An Independent American Zionist', in *American Jewish*

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOCHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

111

- Women and the Zionist Enterprise* ed. by Shulamit Reinharz and Mark A. Raider (Hanover, NH and London: Brandeis University Press, 2005), p.261.
20. Sarah Malkin, *Im ba-Aliya ba-Sbniya: Zikbronot* [With the Second Aliya: Memoirs] (Tel Aviv: Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir, 1929), p.12.
 21. Shabtai Teveth, *Kin'at David* [The Zeal of David] (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Shoken, 1976), vol.A, pp.341–52.
 22. Ber Borochoy, 'Ha-Terrorist ve-ha-Shomer' [The Terrorist and the Guardsman], May 1916, in Mendel Singer, *Beresbit ha-Tsiyonut ha-Sotsialistit* [The Beginnings of Socialist Zionism] (Haifa: Yalkut, 1959), pp.406–8.
 23. Matityahu Mintz, *Hevlei Neurim* [Pangs of Youth] (Jerusalem: Ha-Sifriya ha-Tzionit, 1995), pp.34, 88–9.
 24. David Cnaani, 'Rishonim: Im Kovetz Hashomer' [Forerunners: With the 'Hashomer' Collection], *Ha-Shomer ha-Tsa'ir*, 18 (15 April 1937) 5–7; Haim Dan, 'Ha-Shahar' [At Dawn], 14 May 1969, Hagana Historical Archives, Tel Aviv, 124/60/2.
 25. Gershom Scholem, *Mi-Berlin le-Yerushalaim* [From Berlin to Jerusalem] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1982), pp.95–6.
 26. Shohat, 'The Moral Imperative' (see note 12).
 27. Yosef Aharonovitch, 'Klapei Prnim' [For Internal Consumption], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 1 November 1912.
 28. Yisrael Giladi, 'Zikhront' [Memoirs], *Yizkor* (see note 13), pp.16a–16b.
 29. For more on the expression 'sons of death' and its meaning, see, for example, Yisrael Shohat, 'Shlihut ve-Dereh' [Mission and Way], in *Sefer ha-Shomer: Divrei Haverim* [Hashomer Book: Comrades' Remarks] (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1957), p.20.
 30. Tmidi (Yosef Aharonovitch), 'Le-Inyanei ha-Saha' [On Current Affairs], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 1 August 1913 (emphasis original).
 31. For example, Mordechai Kushnir, 'Dvarim Shelo be-Itam' [Inopportune Remarks], in *Ba-Havodab* [In Labour] (Jaffa, August 1918), pp.85–6; Berl Katznelson, 'Ha-Av u-Bno' [The Father and the Son], *Davar*, 24 July 1932. With regard to Ben-Gurion and Katznelson's great respect for Aharonovitch, see Teveth, *Kin'at David*, vol. B (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Shoken, 1980), p.296; Anita Shapira, *Berl* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1980), vol.A, p.217, vol.B, p.653.
 32. In this context, see *Sefer Toldot ha-Haganah* [History of the Haganah] ed. by Benzion Dinur, vol.A, part I (Tel Aviv: Ma'arakhot, 1954), pp.288–9, part II (Tel Aviv: Ma'arakhot, 1956), p.721; Yaakov Goldstein, *Ba-Derekb El ha-Yabad* [The Forefathers of the Israel Defence Forces (IDF): The Bar Giora and Ha'shomer Underground Associations 1907–1935] (Tel Aviv: Ma'arakhot, 1994), p.41.
 33. Yosef Aharonovitch, 'Ma'agal ha-Ksamim' [The Vicious Cycle], *Ma'abarot*, I.1 (August 1919), 52.
 34. On the myth of Tel Hai, see Shapira, *Land and Power* (see note 5), pp.98–109; Zerubavel, *Recovered Roots* (see note 2), pp.41–5, 84–95, 148.
 35. Dov Rabin, 'Ba-Azkara Ha-Rishona le-Halalei Tel Hai' [On the First Anniversary of the Deaths of the Casualties of Tel Hai], *Davar*, 19 March 1961; Shohat, 'Moral Imperative' (see note 12).
 36. On the commemoration of casualties of World War I, see Mosse (see note 1), pp.70–106.
 37. See, for example, Yosef Aharonovitch, 'Amityot Muskhamot' [Conclusive Truths], *Hedim*, no. 11–2 (September 1923), 25–33; Manya Shohat, 'Mikhtav' [Letter], *She'ifoteinu*, no. 3 (July 1929), 30–33.
 38. Ya'akov Yaari (Poleskin), *Holmim ve-Lohamim* [Dreamers and Fighters] (Jaffa: S.Z. Gissin, 1921).
 39. Yehuda Silman, 'Holmim ve-Lohamim' [Dreamers and Fighters], *Ha'arets*, 30 January 1922.
 40. Yaari, 'Manya Shohat', *Dreamers and Fighters* (see note 38), pp.238–49; S.Z. Gissin, 'Tshuva Gluya le-Mar Y. Aharonovitch' [An Open Reply to Mr. Y. Aharonovitch], *Ha'arets*, 6 February 1922.
 41. Motti Golani, 'Manya: Aliyata ha-Ktzara u-Nefilata ha-Aruka' [The Rapid Rise and Protracted Fall of Manya], *Israel*, 3 (2003), 2; Yaacov Goldstein, *Mania Vilbuschevitz-Shochat* (Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1991), pp.9–23, 75–107.
 42. Manya Shohat, letter to Poleskin, 13 February 1922, Labor Archives, IV-104; Manya Shohat, letter to Izhak Ben-Zvi, 13 February 1922, Central Zionist Archives, A116/109–124. The letter was ultimately not published. After Aharonovitch's sharply worded article against *Dreamers and*

Electronic Offprint

Fighters was published (see below), Manya left the decision about whether to publish the letter to Ben-Zvi. Ben-Zvi evidently believed that her letter would only inflame tempers, which were heated to begin with, instead of helping to calm matters. Therefore, he decided not to publish it.

43. Gissin (see note 40).
44. Yosef Aharonovitch, 'Shonot: Gam Zo Sifrut' [Difference: This is Literature, Too], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 12 January 1922; idem, 'Shonot: ve-Od be-Oto Inyan' [Difference: More on the Same Topic], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 20 January 1922.
45. Moshe Shalit, 'Me-Hayei ha-Shomrim' [From the Lives of the Guardsmen], *Ha-Z'man*, 4 March 1914.
46. 'Interested Party' (A.D. Gordon), 'He'arot' [Comments], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, August–September 1908, 15–16.
47. Aharonovitch, 'Difference: This is Literature (see note 44).
48. Aharonovitch, 'Difference: More on the Same Topic' (see note 44).
49. Manya Shohat, 'Lema'an ha-Dor ha-Ba...' [For the Next Generation...], *Tzror Mikbtavim*, 29 November 1946, 11.182 (247), pp.76–7.
50. Anita Shapira, 'Ha-Mitos Shel ha-Yehudi ha-Hadash' [The Myth of the New Jew], *Yebudim Hadashim Yebudim Yesbanim* [New Jews Old Jews] (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1997), pp.156–7.
51. Yitzhak Lofban, 'Mesila' [Road], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 12 October 1924.
52. Remarks by Joseph Baratz, 'Ba-Khinus ha-Hinukhi be-Degania' [At the Educational Conference in Degania], *Niv ha-Qevutsa*, 7 August 1933, pp.26–7; Shapira, *Land and Power* (see note 5), pp.262–3.
53. Yosef Aharonovitch, 'Emet' [Truth], *Moznayim*, B, 20 August 1931, pp.14–15.
54. *Ibid.*
55. Manya Shohat, letters to Rahel Yanait Ben-Zvi, 17 October 1960, 11 December 1960, Israel State Archives, Jerusalem, Bloc 160, P-2120, file 31.
56. Tova Portugali, 'Sheshet ha-Aronot' [The Six Coffins], *Hashomer Book* (see note 29), p.446.
57. 'Du-siah Im ha-Mavet' [Remarks by Manya Shohat at Memorial Ceremony for Hashomer Members at Kefar Giladi Cemetery], *Rimon*, 18 April 1957; Irma L. Lindheim, *Parallel Quest: A Search of a Person and a People* (New York: T. Yoseloff, 1962), p.142. For remarks about the agitation, confusion, and shock that gripped Anna at the memorial event, see Anna (Shohat), 'Mi'pi Yaldei ha-Komuna: ha-Azkara ha-Rishonah' [From the Mouths of Children of the Commune: The First Memorial Ceremony], *Mi-Hayenu*, 91, 23 March 1929, p.67.
58. See Katznelson, 'Father' (see note 31); Sivan (see note 14), pp.57–60.
59. Berl Katznelson, 'Mavo' [Introduction], in *Sefer Me'oraot Tartzav* [Book of the Riots of 1936] ed. by Bracha Habas (Tel Aviv: Davar, 1937), pp.xiii–xvii; idem, 'Im ha-Sefer' [With the Book], in *Sefer ha-Gvurah* [Book of Heroism] ed. by Israel Heilperin (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1941), vols. A–B, pp.ix–xii.
60. In regard to Ben-Gurion, see Youth and Schools Department of the Jewish National Fund Main Office, 'El Ka'al ha-Kori'm ba-Aretz' [To the Community of Readers in Palestine], *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 1 February 1929. As for Jabotinsky, see Yoram Bar-Gal, *Sokbenet Ta'amula Eretz-Israelit* [An Agent of Zionist Propaganda] (Haifa: Haifa University Press, 1999), pp.122–3, 136–9.
61. Letter Nathan Bistricki to Eliezer Shohat, Yisrael Shohat, and Izhak Ben-Zvi, 6 January 1930, CZA, Jerusalem, KKL5/3628/1; letter Yisrael Shohat and Aharon Feldman (Ever Hadani) to Nathan Bistricki, 29 December 1930, CZA, Jerusalem, KKL5/3634; [Aharon] Ever-Hadani, *Hashomer*, La-No'ar, 29–30 (Tel Aviv: Eretz Israel Library of the Jewish National Fund, 1931).
62. Goldstein, *The Forefathers* (see note 32), pp.145–50; Ze'ev Tzahor, 'Va'adat ha-Berur le-Bdikat ha-Kibutz ha-Hashai be-Gedud ha-Avoda' [The Committee to Investigate the Clandestine Commune in the Gedud ha-Avoda], *Cathedra*, 58 (1990), 128–54.
63. *Ibid.*; Teveth, *Kin'at David*, vol.B (see note 31), pp.291–3.
64. Manya Shohat, letter to Zvi Nadav, 11 December 1938, Anna Shohat's personal archives.
65. 'Mavo' [Introduction], in *Im ha-Zerem ve-Negdo: Manya Shohat: Igrot ve-Teudot 1906–1960* [A Fearless Visionary in the Land of Israel: The Letters of Manya Shohat 1906–1960] ed. by Jehuda Reinharz, Shulamit Reinharz, and Motti Golani (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press, 2005), pp.23–7; Nachman Ben-Yehuda, *Political Assassinations by Jews: A Rhetorical Device for Justice* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1993), pp.109–11, 121–3, 135–6, 360, 396.

Electronic Offprint

THE WORLDVIEW OF SHOCHAT AND AHARONOVITCH

113

66. *Manya Shohat: Shana le-Motab* [Manya Shohat: Anniversary of Her Death] (Kefar Giladi: n.p., February 1962), p.17. On the de Haan affair see, for example, Shlomo Nakdimon and Shaul Mayzlish, *De Haan: Ha-Retzab ba-Politi ha-Risbon be-Eretz-Israel* [De Haan: The First Political Assassination in Palestine] (Tel Aviv 1985); Michael Berkowitz, 'Rejecting Zion, Embracing the Orient: The Life and Death of Jacob Israel De Haan', in *Orientalism and the Jews* ed. by Ivan Davidson Kalmar and Derek J. Penslar (Hanover, NH and London: Brandeis University Press, 2005), pp.109–24.
67. Shohat, 'The Moral Imperative' (see note 12).
68. Testimony of Eliyahu Elath to Rachel Yanait Ben-Zvi, Archives of Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2/0/6/1. On the dispute between the Labour Movement and Revisionism, see Ya'akov Shavit, '*Havlagab' o Tguva*' ['Self-Restraint' or 'Reaction'] (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1983), pp.7–35.
69. Y. Aharonovitch, 'He'arot (Le-Hamishim ha-Hovrot "La-No'ar" Shel ha-KKL) [Remarks (Marking the Fifty Booklets of the JNF 'La-No'ar' Project)], *Moznayim*, vol.D (August 1935), 202–3.
70. Ibid.
71. Manya Shohat, 'Ha-Kolektiv (Me-Zikhronotai)' [The Collective (from My Recollections)], in *Diarei Poalot: Me'asef* [The Plough Woman, ed. by M.A. Raider and M.B. Raider-Roth (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 2002), pp.3–12] ed. by Rachel Katznelson-Rubashov (Tel Aviv: Moetzet ha-Poalot, 1929), pp.3–7; Golani (see note 41), pp.3–4.
72. See [Aharon] Ever-Hadani, letter to Ben-Gurion, 8 November 1932, *Labor Archives*, Tel Aviv, IV-208-1-254. The *Hashomer* veterans spent three years negotiating with the Labor Archives, and only in August 1935 was the material handed over for preparation.
73. For example, Moshe Smilansky, 'Koho Shel "Heder"' [The Strength of a 'Cheder'], *Bustenai*, 24 February 1937; Devorah Dayan, 'Romantika Tzvait?' [Military Romantics?], *D'var ha-Po'elet*, 16 January 1938, p.207.
74. For the sales data, see Labour Archives Administration, 'On the Publication of the Third Edition', January 1947, *Hashomer Collection* (Tel Aviv: Labour Archive, 1947) (no page numbers cited).
75. See, for example, Mordechai Kushnir, 'Im Kovetz Hashomer' [With the Hashomer Collection], *Davar*, 5 February 1937.
76. Y. Yaari-Poleskin, *Nili: Tzabarim* [Nili: Sabras] (Tel Aviv: Massada, 1938), vol. B, pp.124–5. On the struggle between former members of different military organisations for the shaping of the collective memory, see also Mordechai Bar-On, 'Lizkor ve-Lehazkir: Zikaron Kolektivi, Kehilot Zikaron ve-Morasha' [To Recall and Remind: Collective Memory, Remembrance, Communities, and Legacy], in *Dfusim Shel Hanzaba* [Patterns of Commemoration] ed. by Matityahu Mayzel and Ilana Shamir (Tel Aviv: Ma'arakhot, 2000), pp.38–9.
77. See Manya Shohat, 'Ha-Ishah be-Hashomer' [The Woman in Hashomer], *D'var ha-Po'elet* (October 1937), 121–2.
78. Rachel Katznelson-Shazar, *Adam Khmo She'bu* [The Person as She Was] ed. by Michal Hagitti (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1989), pp.323–4. For discussion of the collective memory and Sarah Aaronsohn, see Billie Melman, 'The Legend of Sarah: Gender, Memory and National Identities, 1917–1990', *The Journal of Israeli History*, 21.1–2 (2002), 55–92.
79. Manya Shohat, 'Darkhi Be-Hashomer' [My Career in Hashomer], *Hashomer Book* (see note 29), pp.389–91; recollections of Manya Shohat by Saadia Paz and Pinhas Shneorson, Hashomer Archives, container 18, file D/32.
80. Katznelson-Shazar (see note 78), 30 December 1940, pp.369–70; Aharon Cohen, 'Lenose Manya Shohat ve-Brit Shalom' [About Manya Shohat and Brit Shalom], *Me'asef*, 1 (March 1974), p.193.
81. Rachel Katznelson-Shazar, 'Manya Wilbushewitz-Shohat (A Year after Her Passing)', *D'var ha-Po'elet* (March 1962), p.99.
82. See photos in Golani (see note 41), pp.10–1.
83. Reinharz, 'Manya' (see note 3), pp.105, 113–5; Eyal Kafafi, 'The Psycho-Intellectual Aspect of Gender Inequality in Israel's Labor Movement', *Israel Studies*, 4.1 (1999), pp.188–211 (p.197).
84. Yanait Ben-Zvi did this by publishing a series of more than ten articles about Manya Shohat in *D'var ha-Po'elet* in 1961–62 and, later on, by writing a monograph about her.
85. Letter Ben-Gurion to Yisrael Shohat, 15 January 1956, Ben-Gurion Archives, Sde Boker, correspondence division. Ben-Gurion's turn of phrase was repeatedly cited afterwards by

Electronic Offprint

114

JEWISH CULTURE AND HISTORY

- Hashomer veterans and aficionados, and to this day it is festooned on the brochures of the Hashomer Museum at Kfar Giladi.
86. See for example David Ben-Gurion, 'Be'ikvot Dvorah' [In the Footsteps of (the Biblical) Devorah], speech at concluding ceremony of women officers' course in Tsrifin, 1 March 1951, *Hazon ve-Derekb* [Vision and Path] (Tel Aviv: Ma'arakhot, 1952), pp.75–81.
 87. In this context, see Anita Shapira, 'Bein Yishuv le-Medina: ha-Markivim Shelo Avru' [Elements of the National Ethos in the Transition to Statehood], in *Leumiyut ve-Politika Yehudit: Perspektivot Hadasbot* [Jewish Nationalism and Politics: New Perspectives] ed. by Jehuda Reinharz, Gideon Shimoni and Yosef Salmon (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center, 1996), pp.253–71 (pp.266–8).
 88. *Davar*, 29–30 March 1937; *Ha-Po'el ha-Tsa'ir*, 27–28, 6 April 1937; 29–30, 22 April 1937; Shmuel Dayan, 'Lohem ve-Manhig' [Warrior and Leader], *Davar*, 27 April 1937; Haim Shorer, *Y. Abaronovitch* (Tel Aviv: Ha-Histadrut ha-Klallit, 1938); Baron and Shohat (see note 3).
 89. Shohat, 'The Moral Imperative' (see note 12).
 90. Congratulatory message from the author Matti Megged at a conference of Hashomer veterans in Kfar Giladi on 26–7 April 1957, upon the publication of the *Hashomer Book*. Hashomer Archives, Kfar Giladi, container 9, file 46.