

TEL-AVIV UNIVERSITY
THE CHAIM ROSENBERG SCHOOL OF JEWISH STUDIES
THE INSTITUTE FOR ZIONIST RESEARCH
FOUNDED IN MEMORY OF CHAIM WEIZMANN



Editor: Daniel Carpi
Editorial Board: Gavriel Cohen, Yosef Gorni,
Michael Heymann, Jehuda Nini, Anita Shapira
Editorial Secretary: Raya Adler

The Institute for Zionist Research founded in memory of Chaim Weizmann was set up in 1962 at Tel-Aviv University through the initiative and with the assistance of the Executive of the World Zionist Organization, with the aim of furthering the research and the teaching of the history of the Zionist idea, the Zionist movement and the Land of Israel in modern times.

ZIONISM

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE ZIONIST MOVEMENT
AND OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITY IN PALESTINE

IX

Tel-Aviv University
Hakibbutz Hameuchad
Publishing House
Printed in Israel 1984

CONTENTS

ARTICLES:

DAVID VITAL

The Afflictions of the Jews and the Afflictions of Zionism 9

ELIEZER SCHWEID

Two Approaches to the 'Negation of the Diaspora' in Zionist Ideology 21

YOSEF GORNI

The Utopian Features in Zionist Thought 45

ELIEZER DON-YEHIA

Jewish Orthodoxy and Zionism 55

MICHAEL A. MEYER

American Reform Judaism and Zionism: Early Efforts at Ideological Rapprochement 95

YA'AKOV SHAVIT

A National Society and National Hebrew Culture 111

ZOHAR SHAVIT

The Literary Center in Eretz Israel, 1910-1920 123

SHMUEL ALMOG

From 'Muscular Jewry' to the 'Religion of Labor' 137

MATITYAHU MINTZ

The Upbuilding of Eretz Israel and Work in the Present - A Concept of Unity versus the Actuality of Contradiction 147

HANNAH WEINER

The 'Jung Juda' Youth Group in Berlin and Gershom Scholem's
Polemics against the Movement (1913–1918) 157

RUTH KERK

Land Acquisition and New Agricultural Settlements in Palestine
during the Tyomkin Period, 1890–1892 179

JACOB M. LANDAU

Some Comments on the Young Turks' Attitude toward Zionism 195

NACHUM T. GROSS

The Jewish Economy in Palestine during the Interim Years:
1928–1932 207

YEHOASHUA PORATH

The 'Philby Episode' 221

DINA PORAT

The Zionist Leadership in Palestine and the 'Transnistria Plan,'
1942–1943 259

DANIEL CARPI

The Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin el-Husseini, and his Diplomatic
Activity during World War II (October 1941 – July 1943) 285

ZVI GANIN

Activists versus Moderates – the Wise-Silver Controversy in the
1940's 317

YA'AKOV SHAVIT

The Return to Zion in the Hibbat Zion Movement 359

English Summaries

373

THE AFFLICTIONS OF THE JEWS AND THE AFFLICTIONS OF ZIONISM

by David Vital

The article seeks to examine the frame of mind and the fundamental perspective in which the dominant strain within the Zionist movement, from its inception, tended to view the world and the place of Jewry within it. Thus it is not concerned with policy directly, but with what the Zionists, in their time, conceived to be the proper order of priorities which should inform them in their formulation of policy. The argument, briefly stated, is that the matter was settled – i.e., the perspective was set – at a very early stage in the history of the movement.

The debate on the ultimate purpose of the movement – whether it was to concern itself primarily with the Jews as living *individuals*, men, women and children, or with the Jewish people as a *collectivity* and with Judaism (whatever that might be taken to mean) as a culture – was held very early and was settled firmly in favor of the latter. And this fixing of the frame of mind and determination of priorities had two crucial, interconnected and long-lasting results. In practice (although never in explicit theory) Zionism as a rescue operation was diminished in favor of Zionism as national reconstruction; and national reconstruction was defined in a particular way and put in a particular place. What under one dispensation were seen – or could be seen – as tactical purposes took on the aspect of absolute purposes under the other.

TWO APPROACHES TO THE ‘NEGATION OF THE DIASPORA’ IN ZIONIST IDEOLOGY

by Eliezer Schweid

The idea of ‘Negation of the Diaspora’ is central to Zionism as a Jewish national movement. Ignoring this concept in Zionist education damages the realization of the Zionist idea. There are two main approaches to the ‘Negation of the Diaspora.’ The first approach is

represented by M. Y. Berdichevsky, Y. H. Brenner, Y. Klatzkin, and Y. Kaufman, which sees the fabric of Jewish life and creativity in the Diaspora as totally negative. The second school, represented by Ahad Ha'am, H. N. Bialik, and A. D. Gordon, is conscious of the positive value of Jewish tradition and cultural heritage created within the negative circumstances of the Diaspora.

The difference between the two approaches derives from differing conceptions of nationalism – political as opposed to organic, social nationalism.

Secular Zionist education in Israel is based mainly on the approach of Y. H. Brenner with its negative impact on Jewish and Zionist identity. We have to revise our approach to the 'Negation of the Diaspora' and revive the identification with Jewish cultural tradition.

THE UTOPIAN FEATURES IN ZIONIST THOUGHT

by Yosef Gorni

This article attempts to characterize the utopian features in Zionist thought. We do not presume to equate Zionist and utopian thought, but only to identify some similarities between them.

Our presumption is that utopian seeds were *a priori* inherent in Zionist ideology because of its revolutionary striving and constructive deeds. In this context, we discuss the ideas of Karl Mannheim and Martin Buber, and attempt a synthesis of them.

The article examines utopian expressions from the beginning of the Zionist movement up to the founding of Israel as a Jewish State. From the sociological aspect, most of the Zionist social groups are included here: the Liberals, like Herzl, Ahad Ha'am and Jabotinsky; the Socialists in the Diaspora, such as Syrkin, and the Labor movement in Palestine; and lastly, the youth movements of Jewish youngsters born in Palestine on the eve of the Independence War.

Zionist utopian thought through all generations had four main features. The first – the *ambivalent* approach toward any utopian idea. Each thinker or social group was torn between the attraction of its idealistic power and the fear of its unrealistic fantasy. The second – the *process of reduction and limitation* of its social dimensions, from

Herzl who planned the life of the whole society on utopian lines, to the implementation of utopian ideas in the kibbutz – a small part of society. The third feature was its *concrete or topical* character – from identifying Eretz Israel as the future land, to the building of social organizations on some utopian bases, like the collective settlements and the 'Histadrut,' which was different from any other trade union in western society. The fourth and last feature was the *collective meaning* of this thought. Social justice and public efforts were its foundations, from the pre-Herzlian 'Zionist utopian' to the leaders of the labor movement in Palestine.

JEWISH ORTHODOXY AND ZIONISM

by Eliezer Don-Yehia

Jewish Orthodoxy has perceived Zionism in three different though related ways, each of which evoked a distinctive set of attitudes: (a) Zionism as the practical effort at populating and settling the Land of Israel, and the development of the economic and political infrastructure for this settlement; (b) Zionism as an organized movement encompassing religious and secular Jews in a cooperative effort to establish and support a Jewish state (from the Orthodox point of view the problematical aspect is the cooperation of non-religious Jews under the same organizational roof); (c) The third perception of Zionism sees it as an ideology defining the meaning of Judaism, emphasizing the solidarity and mutual interdependence of the Jewish people on the basis of their national identity, their common ethnic origins, language, culture, territory and political allegiance.

Within non-Zionist Orthodoxy, there were those who opposed Zionism both as a secular idea and movement, and as an enterprise which implied human redemption in contrast with the traditional view which accepted the edict of Galut and awaited patiently for heavenly redemption. On the other hand, there were others who were favorably inclined toward the Zionist enterprise in itself and yet they opposed Zionism as a movement, most of whose leaders and members were non-religious Jews.

The opposition to Zionism amongst Orthodox Jews was directed mainly toward its ideology, which, they felt, was destined to replace traditional Judaism by modern secular nationalism. The secular aspect of Zionist ideology was a serious problem for many religious Zionists. In order to overcome this problem, they resorted to three different alternatives.

The first, represented by Rabbi Reines, was to deny any ideological content to Zionism. The second, represented by Rabbi Amiel, was to acknowledge the ideological antagonism and encourage joint efforts in practical Zionist activity despite this antagonism. The third, represented by Rabbi Kook, was the reinterpretation of Zionist ideology in the spirit of the religious tradition. In fact, this also involved reinterpreting the religious tradition by expanding its scope to areas heretofore considered as secular.

The first two options meant that cooperation between religious and non-religious Zionists would be based on purely pragmatic grounds. The third option involves far deeper levels of cooperation and is associated with messianic interpretations of Zionism.

AMERICAN REFORM JUDAISM AND ZIONISM: EARLY EFFORTS AT IDEOLOGICAL RAPPROCHEMENT

by Michael A. Meyer

The first years of the twentieth century are usually seen as a period in which Reform Judaism and Zionism were generally thought to be incompatible and during which the two movements struggled with one another to win over American Jewry. This article argues that, despite mutual animosity by the majority in both camps, already at this time the ideological groundwork was laid for a rapprochement between the two movements. Not only were some of the leading Reform rabbis Zionists before 1920, but they transformed such classical Reform ideas as the Mission of Israel into doctrines compatible with Zionist ideology. They stressed that the state to be established in Palestine would embody American as well as Jewish ideals, and that it need not be regarded as the *sole* homeland of the Jewish people. They were able to support Cultural Zionism by reading a religious element into

it, which was liberal rather than orthodox in character. The Land of Israel was assigned a role in the Reform mission.

David Neumark, a Reform Jew and associate of Ahad Ha'am, represents an extraordinary example of the desire to go beyond reconciliation almost to the point of equation. For Neumark, nearly all of the leading Zionists, excepting only the militantly anti-religious, were in the broadest sense Reform Jews. However, when he tried to include Ahad Ha'am in the Reform camp, the latter replied in a manner which sheds light on his own quite different view of the relationship.

By 1920 even a hitherto anti-Zionist Reformer like Kaufmann Kohler had spoken favorably of a Jewish "commonwealth" in Palestine. He insisted only that the Diaspora be not utterly negated. Few Reformers went as far as Max Heller, who stated his conviction that a full Jewish life could be lived only where Jews were a majority. But many were moving toward the position which saw Reform Judaism and Zionism as playing complementary roles in modern Jewish history. A reform Zionist identity had already come into being.

A NATIONAL SOCIETY AND NATIONAL HEBREW CULTURE

by Ya'akov Shavit

The article deals with the ideology of Hebrew culture in the light of two historical perspectives that reflect aliya during two different periods. The first perspective is that of the early 1920's when the ideology of Hebrew culture was intentionally radical, and even Messianic, in the belief that the Zionist revolution would bring about a far-reaching and extensive revolution in Hebrew culture. The second perspective is that of the 1940's when it was possible to test the ideology of Hebraism in actual practice. The most radical and cutting test was that of the 'Canaanite' group. They claimed that the ideology of Hebraism had not failed, but rather had faltered, because it represented a continuation of Zionist ideology which was incapable of and unable to carry out a revolution for national existence and Hebrew culture.

The 'Canaanite' group proposed a 'Hebrew vision' of its own. From a historical point of view, however, it was only one milestone on the path of the Hebrew revolution and represents a critical stance toward Hebrew culture as ideology and as reality.

THE LITERARY CENTER IN ERETZ ISRAEL, 1910–1920

by Zohar Shavit

The article discusses the development of the literary center in Eretz Israel, especially during the first stages of its development in the period 1910–1920, and concentrates on the following three problems:

The question of the motivation and the legitimization accorded the founding of a literary center in Eretz Israel even before the center was transferred from Europe; the patterns which crystallized during the first stages of its establishment; the affinity between the patterns which characterized the early and the later stages of the center's development.

The article explains, mainly on an ideological level, how the belief that "there is no alternative" – that there is no chance for a center of Hebrew culture and literature other than in Eretz Israel – and how the perception of the "imperative" – that it is impossible to establish a national society without there being intensive literary activity and without there being literary consensus – were the basis for the establishment of a literary center in Eretz Israel. In spite of the fact that, objectively, circumstances were against the establishment of the center and that it had a good chance of failing, the article describes how Eretz Israel advanced from being a small and dependent center to becoming the largest and most dominant center of Hebrew literature in the world.

FROM 'MUSCULAR JEWRY' TO THE 'RELIGION OF LABOR'

by Shmuel Almog

The article discusses the Zionist revolt against Jewish intellectualism and traces its development at the start of the century.

Speaking at the Second Zionist Congress (1898), Max Nordau, Herzl's closest collaborator, coined the slogan 'Muscular Jewry,' referring to sports and physical exercise. He called upon the younger generation to restore an ancient Jewish heroism, which seemed forgotten throughout eighteen centuries of exile. Time and again Nordau mentioned Bar-Kochba, the leader of the last Judean revolt against Rome, as the symbol of 'Muscular Jewry.' In the same year, a Bar-Kochba sports club was founded in Berlin, in order to combat a 'lop-sided spiritual Judaism.' Jewish intellectualism and spiritual Judaism were regarded as a Diaspora aberration, thus responding to the criticism of Judaism by non-Jews. This criticism stems from a long-standing tradition that attributes to Jews soulless calculation and cunning and is directed against traditional Judaism as well as against Jewish influence in modern society.

Such criticism was not alien to the Second Aliya generation, which absorbed Nietzsche's influence through the writings of M. Y. Berdichevsky, in addition to Russian revolutionary ideas. The Second Aliya linked physical courage with physical labor and strove to cleanse the Jews of the stigma of helplessness. The encounter with the preceding Aliya and the sense of alienation played an important role in the forming of a new identity. This identity was symbolized by physical exertion as the saving grace and the rejection, as it were, of shallow intellectualism. Behind loomed the fear of relapse, proving that Jews were inherently incapable of a change for the better.

A turnabout came when the Second Aliya started to settle the land, adopting at the same time a new philosophy of work. The 'Religion of Labor,' inspired by Aharon David Gordon (who abhorred the term himself), provided the pioneers with a strong emotive force. Work was no longer regarded as a means, but became a creative act, moral, spiritual and even aesthetic. A generation estranged from religion, yet strongly aware of its absence, thus elevated labor to the rank of a substitute religion, attaching spiritual value to work itself.

THE UPBUILDING OF ERETZ ISRAEL AND WORK IN THE
PRESENT – A CONCEPT OF UNITY VERSUS THE
ACTUALITY OF CONTRADICTION

by Matityahu Mintz

Ever since the establishment of the Zionist movement there has been inner tension between two principles: upbuilding Eretz Israel and work of the present (*Gegenwartsarbeit*). From the very beginning, the work of the present was adopted as a secondary ideological adaptation, the result of the pressures of coping with other trends among the Jewish public. Difficulties in the realization of pioneer settlement in Eretz Israel mounted. They originated not only in faulty planning but were also due to external factors: sociopolitical (in Eretz Israel itself) and competitive (America). This was accompanied by re-evaluations among the Zionist organizations as to the mode of realizing the Zionist ideal. There was an increasing tendency to emphasize the work of the present in the Diaspora. Aliya to Eretz Israel turned from being an immediate commandment to one of the future, whereas “present work” became a means of preserving the patterns of Jewish life in the Diaspora. This holds true today as well, at a time when, for several Zionist factions, activity in the Diaspora amounts to a unifying cause of the Jewish people, and it continually postpones the Zionist commandment – aliya. The article reviews the historical development of this dilemma and the confrontations between various factions of the movement.

THE ‘JUNG JUDA’ YOUTH GROUP IN BERLIN AND
GERSHOM SCHOLEM’S POLEMICS AGAINST THE
MOVEMENT (1913–1918)

by Hannah Weiner

In 1913 a small Zionist group of high school students, Jung Juda (Young Judea), was organized and devoted itself to the study of the Hebrew language and the sources of Judaism. After the outbreak of World War I, they criticized the Zionists for being swept along in the

overall patriotic enthusiasm and they were among the first to call for radical Zionism and aliya. After the war, some of them trained themselves in agriculture in preparation for aliya, emigrated to Palestine, and were among the founders of Kibbutz Beit-Zera.

The outstanding spokesman of this group was Gerhard (Gershon) Scholem who, in the years 1917–1918, critically attacked Germany's first Zionist youth movement, Blau-Weiss. He denounced the imitation of the external trappings of the German Youth movement by a movement which sought to educate assimilated Jewish youth toward Judaism and Zionism. Instead of emphasizing nature outings, emotional experiences and group solidarity, he demanded seclusion in order to foster study and upbuild consciousness. Instead of searching for synthesis of Jewishness and Germanism, he demanded one-sidedness, dogma, struggle and conclusions. He denied the youth movement the right to educate since, in its eagerness to win over the masses, it did not have the courage to press demands and Jewry's spiritual heritage remained inaccessible to its youth. At the same time he also criticized the superficial compromise in Buber's lectures on Judaism and called for turning away from emotional intoxication, from the deceptive concept of Jewish experience and from vague mysticism.

Blau-Weiss claimed that Scholem was undermining the very existence of the youth movement by negating group education and emotional experience. They said he did not recognize the possibility of development and the need for human enrichment and did not understand the problems of youth with divided loyalties having to cope with the surrounding culture. His way was suitable for the select, for soldiers and monks. His opponents demanded recognition of the youths' prerogative to be perplexed and of their to struggle to find their way.

Scholem's extreme criticism set limits to its effectiveness. The youth movement denounced him as a narrow-minded rationalist, devoid of sensitivity, and as an individualist. There were also some points of agreement: Blau-Weiss at that time had thrown off the principle of aimlessness which prevailed among the German youth movement and demanded professional education of its members in preparation for emigration to Eretz Israel. Scholem attacked the movement at a time

when many of its members were still seeking a means of combining Jewish elements with movement activity. Toward the end of the war and after, when the activist trend prevailed among the youth, the movement was dominated by a leadership that attached no importance to Jewish tradition and to the concept of Zionist realization of a cultural revival.

LAND ACQUISITION AND NEW AGRICULTURAL
SETTLEMENT IN PALESTINE DURING THE
TYOMKIN PERIOD, 1890–1892

by Ruth Kerk

This paper examines an interim period in the history of the Yishuv (1890–1892), which was short in duration but might have served as a turning point in land acquisition and agricultural settlement. This period should be known as the Second Aliya. It was then that the opportunity to purchase about 500,000 dunams of available land and to establish numerous colonies was missed.

These developments came as a result of policy changes in Russia and in the Ottoman Empire which legitimized Jewish settlement in Palestine. There was tremendous organized and unorganized activity of various committees, associations and individuals aspiring to settle in Palestine.

The paper briefly reviews the political and ideological background of the period and describes the active institutions and the human resources. Essentially it deals with two subjects: the land and settlement in Palestine. Insofar as land is concerned, it dwells on a reconstruction and analysis of the available land resources, their geographical features, legal status, the nature of the sellers and the buyers, their considerations (from the point of view of location, topography, size and cost), their activity and the extent of their short- and long-term success. Following this, both the actual and the potential settlement, the nature of the numerous plans that evolved and the initial stages of settlement of the few colonies that were actually established during those years are mentioned.

Most of the material was gathered from archival sources and from

the press of the period (*Hatzfira*, *Hahavatzet*, etc.). The material is summarized in map form.

Finally, consideration is given to the question why the Tyomkin Period, which began with what appeared to be such favorable settlement prospects, eventually terminated with so large a gap between the conception and the realization.

The reasons for the failure to realize the favorable settlement prospects of the Tyomkin Period are also discussed.

SOME COMMENTS ON THE YOUNG TURKS' ATTITUDE TOWARD ZIONISM

by Jacob M. Landau

The attitude of the Young Turks or, to be more precise, the Committee of Union and Progress which governed the Ottoman Empire during the years 1908–1918, toward Zionism has not been critically examined. Until now there have been two main schools of thought in dealing with this topic. There were those who contended that the Committee was pro-Zionist since the Jews had organized the Young Turks' revolution against the Sultan, Abdul Hamid II. The others maintained that the Committee was blatantly anti-Zionist throughout its course. Since there is support for both arguments – particularly, the second one – it would be worthwhile to reexamine the main points in the Committee's attitude toward the Zionist movement, with special emphasis on the Ottoman stand itself and the Ottoman interests during that decade, as perceived by the Turkish leaders.

During that period, due to the waning of its military power, the worsening of its economic situation and the deterioration of its international connections, the central problem of the Empire was its survival. There was mounting suspicion among the rulers with regard to the separatist movements, the various groups within the Empire which strove to establish their own national states. The changing ideology practised by the rulers in the realms of politics, economics and culture were aimed, in particular, at preserving the Empire as an entity.

The Pan-Islamism, Ottomanism and, finally, Pan-Turkism were solutions aimed at survival. These ideologies were not in the Jewish interest and, furthermore, were detrimental to Zionism. Since the Jews were neither Muslims nor Turks, they did not fit in with these trends. The Zionists, on the other hand, aroused the Committee's apprehension by their political demands. It was the public activity of the Zionist movement which made the Turks increasingly suspect that the Zionists too intended to establish a separate political unit.

Influential Jews, who could have allayed these fears, did not intervene. This was in direct contrast to the Arabs, some of whose notables tried to sway the Turkish regime in favor of their national goals. Emanuel Carassa was a Turkish nationalist who was interested in economics and freemasonry, but not in Zionism. Moise Cohen participated in the Zionist Congress in Hamburg but then removed himself from Zionism and became an extreme Turkish nationalist. The Chief Rabbi, Nahum, kept his distance from the Zionist movement in order to ensure his special status. The nonintervention of these three Jews, and others, on behalf of Zionism accounts for the anti-Zionist attitude of the Ottoman regime whose interest was the survival of the Empire.

THE JEWISH ECONOMY IN PALESTINE DURING THE INTERIM YEARS: 1928–1932

by Nachum T. Gross

The five years between 1928 and 1932 no longer belong to the immigration and business cycle of the Fourth Aliya, nor can they correctly be classified with the Fifth Aliya. Moreover, this short period was not homogeneous: until mid-1930 the trend of recovery, slow but steady growth (both demographic and economic), and business optimism predominated, fed particularly by the citrus-planting boom. Even the Disturbances of August 1929 and the onset of the worldwide Great Depression had no immediate depressing effect on the Yishuv's economy – except for the sharp decline in the revenues of Zionist funds. On the contrary, the depression in general encouraged aliya and capital imports. By 1931, however, the economy

had clearly declined again, because of the indirect (and less immediate) effects of developments both in Palestine politics and in the income of the region's agricultural population.

Government budgets during these years were, on the whole, expansionist, largely due to the final approval of the Palestine Loan. Public works (including Haifa Harbor) benefitted mainly the Arab sector, while the Jewish sector was encouraged by the beginning of (modest) customs protection for industry. By contrast, the Zionist budget for Palestine contracted drastically from 1927, because of declining contributions. However, before the inability of Zionist funds to counteract the economic decline could lead to severe problems, the immigration boom of 1932 – which included a high proportion of 'capitalists' – set in. Still, this boom year does not fully belong to the Fifth Aliya cycle, at least with respect to countries of origin.

This interim period, with all its contradictions, highlights the interaction between the various factors, particularly aliya, which determined growth in the Yishuv's economy (and particularly the mutual influences between aliya and the economic trend).

THE 'PHILBY EPISODE'

by Yehoshua Porath

The Philby Episode was one of many diplomatic attempts to solve the Palestine question by peaceful means with the assumption that if the country were to be incorporated within the framework of an Arab federation or confederation, the Arabs would come to terms with its becoming a totally or partially Jewish state.

The plan was conceived following endeavors made since 1937 by the leaders of the Zionist movement to establish direct contact with Ibn Saud in order to sound out this possibility. St. John Philby served as the intermediary in some of these contacts. Nothing came of these efforts but after World War II broke out, Philby was convinced that there was a chance that Ibn Saud would agree to this plan if he were assured of becoming the supreme Arab leader and provided that he received adequate financial compensation. At that time Ibn Saud was in great financial straits and when Philby proposed this plan to him in

1940 he did not arbitrarily turn it down. Later, however, his situation improved and with it disappeared the possibility of obtaining his agreement.

At the same time, Chaim Weizmann tried to gain the support of Britain and the United States for this plan. Churchill, the long-time champion of Zionism, became convinced of the righteousness of this approach (although Weizmann in his autobiography withheld the fact that he had fathered the plan), and until 1942 he spared no efforts in trying to convince his government to adopt the plan. In May 1941, Churchill tried to incorporate the Philby Plan in an overall solution to the question of rule in the Arab Middle East. He met, however, with the stubborn opposition of Anthony Eden who succeeded in thwarting his initiative. When Churchill, after several additional attempts, became convinced that he would not be able to sway his government, he encouraged Weizmann to appeal to President Roosevelt.

At first Weizmann informed the officials of the State Department of the plan but their response was negative after M. Shertok aided them in undermining the basis of the plan. Weizmann then turned to the President himself who decided, following Shertok's proposal which was eagerly accepted by the Department of State officials, to send Colonel Hoskins to Saudi Arabia in order to assess Ibn Saud's stand. Upon his return Hoskins presented an exaggerated and distorted report on the extent of Ibn Saud's opposition to the plan, and until Weizmann succeeded in showing the facts in their true light, Roosevelt adopted a negative attitude toward the plan in particular, and toward Weizmann and Zionism in general.

Roosevelt's negative attitude led Churchill to abandon attempts to gain his government's approval of the Philby plan. He therefore began to search for another alternative, involving Britain only, to the White Paper policy he so vehemently opposed.

THE ZIONIST LEADERSHIP IN PALESTINE AND THE
'TRANSNISTRIA PLAN,' 1942-1943

by Dina Porat

During the Holocaust various proposals were made to save Jews from extermination in exchange for money or goods. The best known proposal is that conveyed in 1944 by Adolf Eichmann through Joel Brand, offering to exchange one million Jews for trucks and other goods. Other offers came from Slovakia in 1942, and Rumania in 1943. This latter offer played a significant role in the formulation by the Jewish Agency leadership of the Yishuv's rescue policy and is discussed here. The article is based on the records of various Jewish institutions in the Yishuv, on the records of the Rumanian Jewish community and the Rumanian Government, as well as on German, British and American official records.

THE MUFTI OF JERUSALEM, AMIN EL-HUSSEINI, AND HIS
DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITY DURING WORLD WAR II
(OCTOBER 1941 - JULY 1943)

by Daniel Carpi

This article deals with the activities of the Mufti of Jerusalem, Amin el-Husseini, during World War II in the two Axis arenas, Rome and Berlin. The Mufti arrived in Rome from Teheran in October, 1941 and two weeks later had already met with Mussolini. The two statesmen agreed upon a mutual line of action according to which the Italians undertook to support the Mufti in his efforts to establish an independent Arab state which would include Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Trans-Jordan, to abolish the Jewish National Home in Eretz Israel and to impose bans on the Jews living in Arab countries, similar to the ones imposed on the Jews in Europe. In exchange, the Mufti was supposed to ensure that once established, the Arab State would have a fascist regime, would secure the rights of the Christians in Lebanon and would maintain the *status quo* of the holy places in Palestine. It was decided that the first stage would be a joint

declaration by the two Axis powers advocating independence for the Arab countries under British rule.

With these achievements in hand, the Mufti, on November 28, met with Hitler who, on the whole, consented to the agreement between the Mufti and Mussolini but was opposed to making the declaration public. He considered that the Middle East would be freed from the yoke of the British by the invasion of the German army from the north, by way of the Caucasus to Iran and Iraq. He felt that there was no need for publicising these political intentions as long as it was not yet possible to support the political moves by military means.

The article examines the Mufti's dealings with the two leaders during various stages of the war. It describes his attempts to join in the war effort by establishing an Arab unit which was supposed to participate in the battles in North Africa (and which, in fact, did not move from its encampment near Rome), and his connections with other Arab leaders, including Rashid Ali el-Kilani and Habib Bourgiba.

Actually, the Mufti's political activity was of no avail in furthering the Arab cause. His only achievements were his connections with the S.S. command, especially, Himmler, with whom he shared a blind and irrational hatred of all Jews.

ACTIVISTS VERSUS MODERATES – THE WISE-SILVER CONTROVERSY IN THE 1940's

by Zvi Ganin

The outbreak of World War II and the ensuing destruction of European Jewry shifted the center of world Jewry from Europe to America. Now, American Jewry was perceived by the leadership of the Zionist movement as the main source of financial and political support for the Biltmore program, which advocated the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. Thus the leaders of the American Zionist Emergency Council, the Zionist lobby, were urged by Weizmann and Ben-Gurion to transform American Jewry into an effective pro-Zionist pressure group.

A watershed in the transformation of American Jewry into a political force was the ascendancy of Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver to the leadership of AZEC, in the summer of 1943. Rabbi Silver's ascendancy represented the rise of activist Zionism. This line tended to be much more skeptical of the pro-Zionism of Churchill and Roosevelt, in contrast to Rabbi Stephen Wise (cochairman of the AZEC), Chaim Weizmann and Nahum Goldmann, who put great stock in the two Western leaders. Silver, and his close friend and ally Emanuel Neumann, maintained that instead of relying on the dubious goodwill of these leaders as a power base, creating the necessary public opinion pressure might force FDR and his administration to respond favorably to Zionist demands. Silver often expressed his approach in the biblical quotation, "put not your trust in princes."

In this article we will examine the central thesis which maintains that the Silver-Wise controversy was not just a power struggle for the leadership of American Zionism. It was rather a profound debate over the introduction of a novel idea in the political tradition of American Jewry: the creation of an ethnic and militant political approach whose point of departure was Zionist interest and which aimed at the ultimate creation of the Jewish state. The sources of this approach could be attributed to Neumann's Revisionist tendencies, to the impact of the Holocaust, and to Silver's and Neumann's innate self-confidence in their Americanism, and their readiness to fully exploit the American political lobbying system.

THE RETURN TO ZION IN THE HIBBAT ZION MOVEMENT

by Ya'akov Shavit

This article appears in conjunction with the publication of the first volume of *The History of Hibbat Zion* by Alter Druyanow, revised and edited by Shulamith Laskow. The article examines the central axis in the historical consciousness of the Hibbat Zion movement: the analogous status it conferred upon the period of the Return to Zion. This means, the use they made of this period and of its various elements in order to explain their principles and to confer their actions with historical significance.

תמצית המאמרים באנגלית