

**REMEMBER
TO DREAM**

**A HISTORY OF JEWISH
RADICALISM**

By Robert Wolfe

Introduction

The purpose of this book is to help promote a new upsurge of Jewish radicalism. It is written from the point of view of a Jewish radical.

Jewish radicalism is an elusive concept. Everyone knows that it exists, and yet it is something that many people try hard not to notice. Anti-Semites like to talk about Jewish radicalism, and what they have to say about it is so malicious and wrong-headed that it makes people avoid the subject. Good liberals blandly maintain that there are Jews and there are radicals, and any connection between the two must be purely coincidental.

The facts suggest otherwise. For example, Arthur Liebman in *Jews And The Left* presents sufficient evidence to prove, as he puts it on page 69:

In fact, since the beginning of the mass arrival of Russian and Eastern European Jews in the 1880s, they and their progeny have been the mainstay of the left in America.

Among other things, Liebman shows that Jews in the United States formed a good quarter to a third of the membership first of the Socialist Labor Party, then of the Socialist Party and then of the Communist Party, forming the backbone of each of these major radical organizations in succession. As for the 1960s, Liebman brings out on page 67 that at the 1966 convention of the radical student group SDS, “46% of the delegates who identified themselves as having a particular religious background were Jewish.”

Liebman’s book is one of a small handful that have been written on the subject of Jewish radicalism. The existing literature on the subject is essentially of two kinds. In the first place, there are a number of historical studies of the upsurge of radicalism in the Jewish communities of Europe, the Middle East and the New World during the period 1880-1920. *Prophecy and Politics* by Jonathan Frankel and *While Messiah Tarried* by Nora Levin are probably the leading works of this type. And in the second place, there are some books and articles in a sociological vein which are intended to probe the relationship between Jewishness and radicalism in general terms. Percy Cohen’s *Jewish Radicals And Radical Jews* would be an example of this genre. There is no book that attempts to depict the full sweep of Jewish radicalism viewed as a movement in history. That is what this book is intended to do.

Considered as a movement in history, Jewish radicalism would have to embrace a wide range of tendencies which are usually not grouped together. For example, it would have to include both Marxism and Zionism. Karl Marx was but the first in a long line of prominent Marxist theoreticians of Jewish descent. Leon Trotsky, Rosa Luxemburg, Edouard Bernstein, Daniel DeLeon, George Lukacs, Herbert Marcuse and Isaac Deutscher would be some of the others. As for Zionism, it is an undeniable fact that Israel was founded by socialists and ruled for nearly 30 years, from 1948 to 1977, by socialist governments. Even today, 40% of the Israeli economy is still state owned, with another 20% run by cooperatives affiliated with the Histadrut, the Israeli trade union organization. Were it not for the weight of anti-Semitism on the left, Israel would undoubtedly be viewed as a model of democratic socialist development.

Along with Marxism and Zionism the Jewish radical movement would have to include the cultural radicals - the Jewish Freudians, feminists, anarchists, Bohemians and free lovers who did so much to create the radical counter-culture of the 1960s. And of course at the heart of the Jewish radical movement of modern times were the Jewish revolutionaries of the Pale of Settlement in Russia, the Bundists and Territorialists, who led the upsurge of the Jewish people against the Czar. Nor can we ignore the academic exponents of Jewish radicalism, the Jewish sociologists, anthropologists, psychologists, literary critics and scholars of every kind who played such an important part in the creation of the modern left academic establishment. And what of the atomic scientists with unruly hair, the social workers with a radical agenda, the trade unionists, community organizers and protest demonstrators? Jewish radicalism seen as a movement would have to embrace a wide range of radical thought and deed.

But why has Jewish radicalism not been studied as a movement before? For two reasons. In the first place, in reaction against the anti-Semitic myth of a Jewish plot to rule the world, most historians and writers have been extremely reluctant to connect up seemingly unrelated expressions of Jewish radicalism or to emphasize the Jewishness of any controversial radical doctrine. And in the second place, the pressure

of anti-Semitism has caused most Jewish radicals themselves to deny their kinship with other Jewish radicals and to present their version of Jewish radicalism as the only legitimate one. If Jewish radicalism is a movement, it is a movement of a very unusual type, one of whose main characteristics is a refusal to recognize itself as a movement.

It is the premise of this book that this refusal is a source of weakness rather than strength. Denying our kinship with one another has not prevented the anti-Semites from perceiving us as a movement or from holding us responsible for the actions of others. For example, more than 100,000 Jews were murdered by the anti-Semitic White armies during the Civil War in Russia in 1918-20 because the Russian, Ukrainian and Polish anti-Semites held the Jews responsible for the Russian Revolution. Yet in standard academic studies of the Russian Revolution, the role of Jewish radicals in the uprisings of 1905 and 1917 is barely mentioned. In *Trotsky and the Jews*, Joseph Nedava shows that Jews made up some 25% of the membership of all the revolutionary parties in Russia during this period. Of 4500 political prisoners deported to Siberia after the defeat of the Revolution of 1905, 37% were Jews. Seeing that we have already received more than our share of the blame for the Russian Revolution, is it not time that we took some of the credit as well?

Understanding Jewish radicalism as a movement means understanding it as an expression of Jewishness. It is surprising to what extent the existing literature on Jewish radicalism tends to fudge over this point and to present Jewish radicalism as the expression of some temporary or accidental condition rather than as a natural outgrowth of Jewish principles and beliefs. On the one hand, historians of the Jewish radical movement of the period 1880-1920 tend to view it primarily as the result of the proletarianization of the Jewish people in the Pale of Settlement and the immigrant slums of the New World at that time. And on the other hand, writers of the sociological school almost unanimously view Jewish radicalism as the product of what they call "marginalization", the relegation of assimilated Jews to a position of outsiders in relation to Christian society. Were it not for proletarianization or discrimination, the existing literature suggests, there would be no Jewish radicalism. But this conclusion is refuted by the whole of Jewish history, which reflects a radical tradition stretching over a period of at least 3000 years, and probably more.

Refusal to worship idols, belief in one law for rich and poor alike and insistence on a rough equality in land tenure were some of the radical features of the Jewish society of 3000 years ago. Since that time, Jewish history has witnessed a long series of Messianic movements which sought to transform the world in line with the traditional radical ideals of the Jewish people. Viewed in the context of Jewish history, the Jewish radical movement of modern times appears as only the most recent of such Messianic movements. Gerald Sorin brings out this point in *The Prophetic Minority*, a study of Jewish radicals in the United States during the period 1880-1920. On page 3, Sorin states:

The evidence strongly suggests that the Jewish socialists were a prophetic minority, responding to biblical norms of social justice, interpreted in a modern context. They were men and women who had been deeply immersed in the moral commandments of Torah and Talmud, in messianic belief systems, traditions of *tsedaka* (not mere charity, but righteousness and justice toward others), mutual aid, and communal responsibility.

Of course, the experience of proletarianization or discrimination certainly tended to heighten such radical attitudes and to transform latent convictions into active beliefs. But at the root of the Jewish radical movement of modern times was a set of traditional Jewish values which were considered radical 3000 years ago and are still considered radical today.

The major difference between the Jewish radical movement of modern times and most earlier Jewish radical movements is that the modern movement entailed a much higher degree of interaction between Jewish and non-Jewish radicals. Modern Jewish radicalism grew out of a historical context in which a number of countries, led by England, France and the United States, decided to admit Jews to full rights of citizenship. The advent of "Jewish Emancipation", as it was called in the 19th century, brought Jewish and non-Jewish radicals into close contact with one another. Out of this interaction emerged doctrines and beliefs reflecting both Jewish and non-Jewish influence. Marxism would be a classical example of such a doctrine. It is true that in some areas, such as the Pale of Settlement in Russia, Jewish Emancipation did not take place until the 20th century. But even in the Pale, Jewish radicals such as the Bundists or Territorialists were still strongly influenced by non-Jewish radicals. In general, therefore, it was the interaction between Jewish and non-Jewish radicalism which gave the Jewish radical movement of modern times its unique character.

The hallmark of this interaction is secularism. However secular and prosaic their underlying goals may have been, most earlier Jewish radical movements cloaked themselves in the language and ideology of religious belief. They had little choice, for religious belief was expected not only of Jews but of all subjects of pre-modern kingdoms and empires. But once the need for religious belief was called into question by the modern secular state, secularism rapidly became the distinguishing feature of modern Jewish radicalism. This was true not only of the Marxists but also of the Zionists, not only of the political radicals but also of the cultural radicals. Secularism became more or less universal within the modern Jewish radical movement because it provided and still provides the only possible way out of the permanent ghettoization and persecution of the Jewish people.

Characteristic of all forms of modern Jewish radicalism therefore is the attempt to translate the traditional radical ideals of the Jewish people into the language of secular thought. Socialism is one such translation, Zionism another, and there are others. In short, modern Jewish radicalism is a secularized expression of traditional Jewish Messianism. In an interview with Moshe Pearlman published under the title, *Ben Gurion Looks Back*, David Ben-Gurion, the founder of the state of Israel, was asked how the Jewish people had survived over the centuries. He replied, on page 225, by offering a secular statement of the Messianic ideal, which he described as the central theme of Jewish history. Ben-Gurion put it this way:

I am convinced that its preservation was due to the constant and all-pervasive awareness of Jews throughout the centuries of something I can only express in a seemingly archaic phrase - the *vision of Messianic redemption*, national and all-human. By this I mean their own redemption, their restoration as a sovereign people in their old land and their moral elevation to model nationhood, and the redemption of all humanity, the triumph of peace, righteousness and equality in the world and the conquest of tyranny and wickedness. This twin idea of the Messianic vision informs the whole of Jewish history and the Jewish faith. It is the core of the religious, moral and national consciousness of the Jewish people.

These ideals of “model nationhood” and of “peace, righteousness and equality” formed the basis both of traditional Jewish Messianism and of modern Jewish radicalism.

As a movement, modern Jewish radicalism is now about 200 years old. It was born during the era of the French and American Revolutions of the late 18th century, the era of the rise of the secular state. During the past 200 years, it has achieved unprecedented victories and experienced terrible defeats. The point of this book is that a new upsurge of Jewish radicalism will require a greater self-awareness of Jewish radicalism as a movement in its own right than has previously existed. The only path to such a self-awareness is by studying the history of Jewish radicalism and learning just who we have been over the course of the past 200 years. No one can arbitrarily define or invent Jewish radicalism just as they please. The only correct definition of Jewish radicalism is the definition supplied by our own history, the sum total of all we have been and done.

The main weakness of existing studies of Jewish radicalism is that, for the most part, they are based on a restricted selection of just who is a Jewish radical. Writers of historical works focus almost exclusively on the Yiddish speaking Jews originating in the Pale of Settlement, while writers of the sociological school are solely concerned with assimilated European and American Jews. No one studies both groups or also includes the cultural radicals, people like Sigmund Freud, Emma Goldman or Wilhelm Reich. The resulting definitions of Jewish radicalism are one-sided and partial, reflecting the author’s own political preferences and priorities.

For example, perhaps the best known treatment of Jewish radicalism is Isaac Deutscher’s *The Non-Jewish Jew*. As the title indicates, Deutscher is only interested in Jewish radicals such as himself, Jewish radicals who adopted a fundamentally negative attitude towards Jewish identity and commitment. When it comes to explaining the source of their radicalism, Deutscher is eager to find some explanation external to Jewish tradition. He ends up with the theory, on page 27, that as Jews they had to live “on the margins” of European society, to be “in society and yet not in it, of it and yet not of it.” He continues:

It was this that enabled them to rise in thought above their societies, above their nations, above their times and generations, and to strike out mentally into wide new horizons and far into the future.

This leads in turn to the view that the essence of Jewish radicalism is the need “to strive for a universal *Weltanschauung*”, as Deutscher puts it on page 30, as opposed to a narrow, nationalist point of view. So in the end, the true Jewish radical turns out to be a Marxist internationalist, just like Deutscher himself. As he

puts it on page 33:

Like Marx, Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky strove, together with their non-Jewish comrades, for the universal, as against the particularist, and for the internationalist, as against the nationalist, solutions to the problems of their time.

As for the Zionists, they merely, on page 98, “came to Palestine with the crumbs from the table of the Russian revolution”, so Deutscher hardly considers them radicals at all. Another well known study of Jewish radicalism is *The Ordeal of Civility* by John Cuddihy. Cuddihy, like Deutscher and the other writers of the sociological school, equates Jewish radicalism with the radicalism of assimilated Jewish intellectuals like Marx or Freud. Cuddihy’s contribution to this literature is to blame the Jews for their own “marginalization”. Thus, on page 176, we learn that the Jews of Eastern Europe “were, on the whole, a ‘backward’ and ‘barbarous’ people, in the unembarrassed language of the early nineteenth century”. When these Jews had to assimilate to the “higher” (page 46) civilization of Europe, they found its alleged “civility” an “ordeal” and reacted by inventing radical ideologies critical of European culture. Or as Cuddihy puts it in his snide manner on page 64:

The very ‘backwardness’ of *shtetl Yiddishkeit* gave its sons a kind of perspective from behind, *a rebours*, on the civilization of Europe. If you will, a ‘lead of the retarded’ took the form of the ‘punitive objectivity’ of the nonmember.

Cuddihy’s image of Jewish radicalism is as insulting as Deutscher’s is flattering, but both treatments are essentially identical in their equation of Jewish radicalism with the struggle of assimilated Jews to find a place for themselves in European society.

Yet another variation on this same theme is Hannah Arendt’s *The Jew As Pariah*. On page 71, Arendt advances an ingenious theory of how discrimination and exclusion led middle class Jews to develop a sense of identity with the European masses:

For the pariah, excluded from formal society and with no desire to be embraced within it, turns naturally to that which entertains and delights the common people. Sharing their social ostracism, he also shares their joys and sorrows, their pleasures and their tribulations.

Arendt’s view of the Jewish radical as a downwardly mobile “pariah” is illuminating but narrow; like the others, she is solely concerned with assimilated European Jews. Had she included the Yiddish speaking Jews of Eastern Europe in her study of pariahs, she would have noticed that the majority of them were themselves part of the common people.

A correct definition of Jewish radicalism requires an approach that is comprehensive and also historical. Just as there are different types of Jewish radicals, so there are different phases in the history of Jewish radicalism. The Jewish radicalism of today cannot be the same as the Jewish radicalism of the period before the Holocaust. Time enhances some possibilities and destroys others; to understand Jewish radicalism as a movement, it has to be understood as a movement in time. Understood this way, Jewish radicalism turns out to be a significant factor in the history of the modern world. The goals for which generations of Jewish radicals struggled have already been realized to a considerable extent. Insofar as these goals have not been realized, and insofar as there exists a danger of losing what we have already achieved, we will find the path to the future in an understanding of how we arrived at the present. What I am essentially saying is that Jewish radicals need to unite. There exists a deep-seated need for us to come together as Jewish radicals on the basis of a common program and vision. The best way to understand this need is to understand our history. In a word: remember to dream, for past and future are one.

Chapter One: Frank

Existing accounts of the origins of modern Jewish radicalism focus almost exclusively on the German Jewish community of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. There are good reasons for this approach, which is nonetheless highly misleading.

The first secular states in the modern world arose in what is called the West, meaning the countries of the North Atlantic seaboard, particularly England, France and the United States. Few Jews lived in the West at that time; the great majority of the Jewish people were then settled in Eastern Europe and the Middle East. Between Eastern Europe and the West stood Germany, home of a relatively small but significant Jewish community of perhaps 100,000 people. As the example of the secular state spread from West to East, the German Jewish community therefore became the first Jewish community of any size to be exposed to the new secular ideas. As a result, most of the first Jews to adopt a secular point of view were German Jews.

The advent of secular thinking among German Jews is often dated from the publication of *Jerusalem* by Moses Mendelssohn in 1783. Mendelssohn was a German Jewish intellectual of humble origins who had acquired a German audience for his philosophical writings. In *Jerusalem* he argued for the separation of church and state and the extension of the rights of citizenship in a secular German state to German Jews. By the early 1800s, these views had become the basis for a growing movement among middle class German Jews. The leaders of this movement were eager to assimilate to German culture, to speak German instead of Yiddish, dress in the German fashion and steep themselves in German literature and philosophy.

They were secularists but not really radicals. Their goal was not to revolutionize German society but merely to be accepted within it on the basis of their cultural and political allegiance to an idealized conception of German life. However, they were perceived to some extent as radicals by the Germans because their secular ideals necessarily placed them at odds with the German Christian religious establishment.

Significantly, probably the most radical member of this movement was not a German Jew but an immigrant from Eastern Europe. This was Solomon Maimon, who was born in 1754 into an orthodox Jewish family in Poland. Maimon was a child prodigy who was proclaimed a “full rabbi” at the age of 11, married and a father by the age of 14. But Maimon hungered for “Enlightenment”, as the secular learning of the West was called, and about the age of 25 he left Poland and tried to settle in Germany. Hounded by the police and forced to live for a time as a beggar, Maimon finally attracted the attention of Moses Mendelssohn with an article in Hebrew “in which I questioned the foundations of Revealed as well as of Natural Theology”, as he put it on page 75 of *An Autobiography*. Maimon completed his autobiography in 1793, by which time he was beginning to become known in German Jewish circles as a radical critic of religion and philosophy.

Maimon thought he was making it, but as it turned out he wasn't. As he notes on page 81 of *An Autobiography*, he began to acquire a reputation in Germany for “trying to spread dangerous opinions and systems” and “leading a loose life”. He also intimates in his autobiography that he spoke German with a heavy Yiddish accent, which evidently did not improve his social standing with the Enlightened German Jewish crowd. Despite the respect shown his writings, he found himself increasingly isolated and ended up drinking himself to death, dying in 1800 at the age of 46. Moses Hadas, on page xiii of his Introduction to *An Autobiography*, describes Maimon as follows:

In renouncing, one after the other, Jewish ghetto life in the East, Jewish society in the West, and Gentile respectability, Maimon staked out the path that a succession of great Jews were to follow.

This was the path, Hadas adds, of “Bohemians who lived outside the limits of Jewish society and still refused to become members of any other well-defined community”. In time, a little world of such radical Jews would emerge, but in Maimon's day the path of a secular Jewish radical led directly to isolation and death.

Most of the Enlightened German Jews avoided this path by hedging on their secularism in some way. Either they retained a formal allegiance to the Jewish religion or, in many cases, they ended up converting to Christianity. Heinrich Heine, the first prominent Jewish radical to emerge from these circles, converted to Christianity, as did Karl Marx's father. For the most part, the early German Jewish secularists also tried to impress the Germans with their virtue by appearing as bourgeois as possible. Their radicalism, such as

it was, was exclusively in the realm of ideas. There they were in some respects very radical indeed. For example, in 1819 a group of Jewish students at the University of Berlin formed an organization called the “Science of Judaism”, which was intended to sponsor studies of Jewish tradition from a strictly secular point of view. Heine belonged for a time to this group, who initiated the modern academic study of Jewish history. But however radical their ideas, the early German Jewish secularists were to all outward appearances respectable members of the bourgeoisie whose main ambition in life was to be accepted as such by the German middle class.

To picture Mendelssohn and his followers as the founders of modern Jewish radicalism is highly misleading. Radical movements are founded by radicals, and these people were not radicals by temperament or conviction. They did play a key role in formulating the secular language in which modern Jewish radicalism came to be expressed, but the radicalism itself did not come from them. It came, like Solomon Maimon, from Eastern Europe. At the same time as the Enlightened German Jews were beginning to redefine Judaism in secular terms, a far more radical redefinition of Judaism was being offered to the Jewish masses of Eastern Europe by the followers of Jacob Frank. This redefinition was not explicitly secular but rather couched in the traditional language of Jewish Messianism. But despite its religious trappings, the Messianic movement led by Jacob Frank was undoubtedly the real starting point of the modern Jewish radical movement.

Frank was in most respects the very antithesis of all that the Enlightened German Jews were striving for. Their main concern was to prove to the Christian Germans that Judaism provided a suitable basis for citizenship in a modern secular state. Frank would not have been considered a suitable citizen of any state: he was a former gang leader turned Messianic pretender who preached a doctrine of “salvation through sin” and was rumored to conduct orgies. Imprisoned by the Catholic church for 13 years in the fortified monastery of the Black Madonna in Poland, he eventually acquired a castle in Offenbach in Germany where he ended his days in 1791 surrounded by his faithful followers. Nonetheless, it was Jacob Frank and not Moses Mendelssohn who was considered the quintessential Jewish radical of 200 years ago. Obviously the Jewish radical movement of modern times did not begin with any one individual, but if it did, that individual was Jacob Frank.

Salvation Through Sin

Jacob Frank was born in 1726 in a region of Eastern Europe then known as Podolia. Various claimed at one time or another by the Russians, Ukrainians and Turks, Podolia at the time of Frank’s birth was considered a part of southern Poland. It was a predominantly agricultural area with few large cities and no well established tradition of central authority of any kind. The Jewish community there was impoverished but fiercely independent, making Podolia one of the main 18th century hotbeds of Jewish radicalism. Its proximity to the Turkish border also made it a natural point of entry for Messianic teachings reaching the Jewish communities of Eastern Europe from the Jewish communities of the Middle East.

Frank spent his boyhood in a small town in Podolia. His background is obscure; all that is known for sure is that from an early age he showed criminal tendencies. According to Arthur Mandel in *The Militant Messiah*, the only biography of Frank in English, by the age of 12 Frank had become the leader of a large gang of perhaps 100 boys who committed various petty crimes in the area. When Frank was 13 his father moved to Bucharest in Rumania, but there too he became a gang leader. At some point in his mid-teens he left Rumania and began wandering through the Turkish empire, eventually learning to speak Ladino, the language of the Spanish Jews who had settled in large numbers in Turkey and the Balkans after their expulsion from Spain in the 15th century. To the end of his life, the only languages which Frank could speak were his native Yiddish and Ladino. In 1753, Frank arrived in Salonica, a Greek port town which was at that time the home of the largest Jewish community in the world.

In Salonica, Frank became involved with a Messianic sect known as the Donmeh. The Donmeh were followers of the 17th century “false Messiah”, Shabtai Tsvi. Shabtai Tsvi had led a mass movement of Jews in the 1650s to return to the land of Israel, but after his arrest by the Turks, he had converted to Islam under threat of execution. The Donmeh was formed by Jews who had converted to Islam along with Shabtai Tsvi. They became nominal Muslims but continued to believe in the Messianic vocation of Shabtai Tsvi and retained many Jewish beliefs and practices. In Salonica, Frank joined the Donmeh, whose members

mainly spoke Ladino, and after a time began to assert a claim to leadership of the group. Frank's claims were rejected, tension ensued and in 1755 Frank left Salonica convinced that he had a Messianic vocation to spread his version of the teachings of the Donmeh back in his native Podolia.

The doctrine which Frank brought back to Podolia from his travels was called "salvation through sin". All law, both Jewish and non-Jewish, was to be abrogated; people were to be free to do just as they pleased. Frank had obviously practiced this doctrine long before he preached it, and in Podolia it was his practice, even more than his theory, which attracted widespread attention. Mandel describes the religious activities of Frank and his followers on page 41 of *The Militant Messiah* as follows:

The religious rites of the Frankists consisted of ecstatic songs and dances accompanied by wild clapping of hands, similar to the Hassidic dances, but with female participation and ending in an orgiastic ritual.

Bernard Weinryb, on page 245 of *The Jews of Poland*, adopts a more sceptical tone. "Did the group actually dance around naked women (or a naked woman)", he wonders, "kissing their breasts?" Whatever the exact details, there can be no doubt that Frank's teachings evoked wild excitement among the Jewish masses of Podolia. He quickly acquired a large following and just as quickly was banned from the Jewish community of Podolia by the rabbinical authorities.

Frank responded to the rabbinical ban on his movement by turning to the Catholic church. He appealed to the bishop of Kamieniec, the leading town in Podolia, declaring that he was being unjustly persecuted by the rabbinical authorities. There ensued a sinister comedy in which the bishop, named Dembowski, agreed to formally exonerate Frank of all charges against him in return for his agreement to join in a public denunciation of the Talmud. Frank and his followers were dubbed "anti-Talmudists" by Dembowski and with their participation a public burning of the Talmud was organized. Almost immediately thereafter, however, Dembowski suddenly dropped dead, causing Frank to flee back across the Turkish border. There followed several years of complex negotiations between Frank's emissaries and the Polish authorities of both church and state, which ended in 1758 with Frank's return to Poland as a certified "anti-Talmudist".

Frank's original teachings of "salvation through sin" now took on new meaning due to the unprincipled opportunism which he displayed in his dealings with the Poles. Frank's goal at this time was to win Polish approval for the establishment of a Jewish state under his rule in the area of Podolia. To this end, he and his followers established themselves in a "camp" near Kamieniec, described by Weinryb on page 248 as follows:

Life at the 'camp', as it became known, was based on communal principles, with one treasury for all run by Frank's lieutenant.

For some reason, Frank imagined that the Poles would permit a group of orgiastic Jewish communists to rule Podolia, simply because they were willing to lend themselves to Catholic anti-Semitic propaganda. This grossly unrealistic expectation led Frank and his followers to commit a sin far greater than any they had actually intended.

In 1759, Frank was summoned by the Catholic church to appear at a cathedral in Lvov, a large city, and take part in yet another public condemnation of the Talmud. But this time a new wrinkle was added: the Frankists were required to submit 7 "theses", prepared for them in advance by the Catholic authorities, testifying to their "anti-Talmudic" beliefs. The seventh thesis was the kicker; as Weinryb notes on page 250:

The seventh thesis concerned the Talmud, holding it teaches about the need for Christian blood and that anyone who believes in the Talmud is obliged to use such blood.

This was the infamous Blood Libel, in the name of which many thousands of Jews had been publicly executed during the Middle Ages. Frank bit the bullet and showed up at the cathedral in Lvov to endorse the 7 theses. There followed a strange scene in which Frank harangued the assembled Poles in Yiddish, a language they could not understand, and created sufficient confusion that the assembled Catholic theologians pronounced themselves unable to reach a verdict on the validity of the seventh thesis. Nonetheless, Frank had gone on record as endorsing the Blood Libel, an act of betrayal which could legitimately be called the original sin of modern Jewish radicalism.

Frank soon paid for his sin, in a manner he perhaps had not expected. Having no further use for Frank as

a Jewish “anti-Talmudist”, the Catholic church now informed him that he would be required to convert to Christianity. Mandel, on page 62, cites Frank declaring around this time:

People say my way is crooked, and even I have often asked myself whether it could not be simpler. But when I consider the goal, how plain and clear it is, I keep going step by step, no matter how.

The next step, in the fall of 1759, was a public conversion to Christianity in a church with about 1000 of his followers. But once a Christian, Frank was expected to submit to Christian authority, something he had no intention of doing. Only a few months later, he was brought before the Inquisition in Warsaw and charged with holding wild parties and presenting himself as the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. At the beginning of 1760, the betrayer was betrayed and sentenced to life imprisonment in the famous monastery of the Black Madonna at Czestochowa in Poland. “Let him seek his salvation through sin in a monastery”, his Catholic judges must have chuckled to themselves.

The heavy part is that he did. After some time, Frank prevailed on his jailers to permit his wife and a number of his followers to join him. He refused to attend Catholic services and conducted his own, private rituals, presumably along the time-tested lines which had already won him such notoriety. Moreover, he succeeded in entering into correspondence with the Russians, who were then preparing for an invasion of Poland, offering to convert to Greek Orthodoxy if they would free him from Czestochowa. When the Russians took Czestochowa in 1773, they did release Frank and permitted him to leave Polish territory. Frank and his followers moved to the Austrian empire, where Frank already had a number of supporters, and within a few years Frank had emerged as a well known celebrity. He and his followers dressed themselves in opulent costumes in the Turkish style, adopted aristocratic titles and wooed wealthy backers with lofty Messianic visions and more prosaic promises of contacts with the Austrian court. Eventually Frank acquired enough money to buy a castle in Offenbach, where he retired with a number of his followers in 1788 to spend his last years in mysterious seclusion.

By this time, a strong emphasis on military training had become an important part of Frank’s teachings. Weinryb, on page 241, speaks of Frank’s aim of “making his group into a militarily disciplined and trained unit, maintaining guards dressed like cavalry or the cossacks, and requiring everyone (even the girls) to undergo a sort of military training”. Mandel, on page 70, notes that Frank’s officers “wore predominantly red uniforms”. This was because Frank dreamed of standing “at the head of an army of ten million Jews and one million gentiles, the officers acknowledging no religion, all dressed in red, the color of revenge”. Orgies, male and female soldiers dressed in red, communal living arrangements and repudiation of religion - if this was not radicalism, what was?

But Frank was a survivor, and his radicalism was somewhat concealed behind a facade of aristocratic social climbing and public compliance with Christian belief. He instructed his followers to remain together, marry only other members of the sect and keep their mouths shut when questioned concerning their beliefs. Since he spoke neither Polish nor German, he communicated with outsiders through intermediaries and projected an image of himself as a kind of Messianic guru, remote and inaccessible. Gershom Scholem, in *The Messianic Idea In Judaism*, cites some of Frank’s sayings which Scholem regards, on page 128, as “not very different in form from those of many Hasidic Zaddikim” and expressive of “a hidden poetic impulse”. On page 130, Scholem describes Frank as declaring to his followers, “and I say to you, all who would be warriors must be without religion, which means that they must reach freedom under their own power and seize hold of the Tree of Life.” Although not precisely a secularist, since there was as of yet no secular state, Frank was clearly at heart no less an atheist than Karl Marx or any other Jewish radical of modern times. And as is sometimes forgotten, Marx too was a nominal Christian.

Frank differed from most later Jewish radicals in that after Podolia he made little attempt to disseminate his teachings outside of the narrow circle of his close followers. As he told his associates, cited by Scholem on page 131:

Just as a man who wishes to conquer a fortress does not do it by means of making a speech, but must go there himself with all his forces, so we too must go our way in silence.

The fortress Frank conquered turned out to be the castle in Offenbach, where he died peacefully in his bed at the age of 65, a “false Messiah” in every sense of the term, both false and Messiah. Frank had a saying for

that too, cited by Scholem on page 130:

No man can climb a mountain until he has first descended to its foot. Therefore we must descend and be cast down to the bottom rung, for only then can we climb to the infinite.

Frank did in fact achieve a kind of salvation through sin; he transformed himself from a petty criminal into a wealthy guru by believing in nothing except for the loyal band of followers who shared in his rise to fame and fortune. Whether he was an appropriate role model for modern Jewish radicals is very doubtful, but for better or worse, he was the first Jewish radical to become known as such in the modern world.

Frank was perceived as a radical in his own day because he was too cynical and secular to be accepted by many as a religious leader. Frank was not a typical “false Messiah” in any case; his criminal background was unusual, as was his lack of a formal religious education. Yet in order to understand Frank, it is necessary to situate him within the context of the Jewish Messianic movement of his day. Atypical as he may have been, Frank was nonetheless a product of that movement, and in some ways even a typical product.

Messianism

What many people seem to have forgotten or never learned is that belief in the coming of the Messiah was an integral component of traditional orthodox Judaism. In *Messianism, Mysticism, and Magic*, a study of the Messianic tradition in Judaism, Stephen Sharot puts it this way, on page 45:

For the majority of Jews in the medieval and early modern periods, it was an article of faith to hope constantly for the advent of the messiah. The twelfth principle of the best-known formulation of Jewish religious doctrines, Maimonides' 'Thirteen Principles of the Jewish Faith', reads: 'I believe with complete faith in the coming of the Messiah, and even though he should tarry, nevertheless, I shall wait for his coming every day.' The affirmation of this belief was a persistent theme in Jewish prayers: in a number of daily benedictions, in the prayers after meals, during the wedding ceremony, and on festivals and fast days.

Strictly speaking, Messianism was not a radical form of Judaism but, prior to the modern era, the only form. Of course

there was a significant difference in practice between those who merely paid lip service to the Messianic hope and those who stood ready to believe that this or that individual was in fact the Messiah. For the most part, this difference corresponded to a class line between rich and poor. People who had something to lose normally regarded Messianic movements with considerable scepticism, while people without property were by and large much more eager to believe that a radical change was about to take place. But so long as they remained within the bounds of Jewish tradition, most Messianic movements could count on a certain amount of support from every level of Jewish society.

Shabtai Tsvi, the 17th century “false Messiah” whose followers had founded the Donmeh in Salonica, had at one time commanded the allegiance of a large minority, perhaps a majority of Jews in the entire Mediterranean region. Gershom Scholem shows in his biography of Shabtai Tsvi, *Sabbatai Sevi*, that Shabtai Tsvi had numerous supporters from the ranks of the Jewish middle class and rabbinical establishment. Nonetheless, most of his followers were poor people. Scholem, on page 391, cites a contemporary description of Shabtai Tsvi's followers in the city of Smyrna in Turkey; they were said to be “fishermen, vendors of eggs and poultry, oarsmen in the port, and servants, and more of this sort of noblemen, even the richest of whom had nothing to lose.” Other accounts speak of his followers as “the frenzied rabble”, “the miserable beggars” or “the poorest of the land”. Yet at the same time, Shabtai Tsvi also won the support of many leading rabbis and scholars, led by Nathan of Gaza.

After the collapse of his movement, only a small minority of Shabtai Tsvi's followers joined him in converting to Islam. Most either temporarily abandoned the Messianic hope or, in many instances, continued to uphold some or all of Shabtai Tsvi's teachings within a Jewish context in a semi-secret form. References to the “sect of Shabtai Tsvi” appear in numerous rabbinical edicts from 17th and 18th century Poland, including a formal decree banning the “sect” in 1671. Sharot, on page 124 of *Messianism, Mysticism, and Magic*, describes the teachings of Abraham Cardozo, a Jewish physician and scholar who remained an admirer of Shabtai Tsvi despite the latter's conversion to Islam. Cardozo taught that there were

really two Torahs, corresponding to the two trees in the Garden of Paradise, the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil and the Tree of Life. Sharot summarizes Cardozo's doctrine as follows:

The dominion of the Torah of the Tree of Knowledge is the unredeemed world in which distinctions between good and evil, commandment and prohibition, holy and profane, pure and impure are necessary. The Torah of the Tree of Life was hitherto unrealizable because of the sin of Adam, and only redemption would restore it as the Torah of the messianic age.

Simply put, this meant that the Messiah had the right to break the rules in the name of the Torah of the Tree of Life. Jacob Frank may not have read Cardozo's works, but those who had were all the more likely to accept Frank as a Messianic leader, particularly since he made frequent use of Cardozo's metaphor of the Tree of Life.

Shabtai Tsvi had been a very different kind of man from Jacob Frank. A devoted scholar from a middle class background, Shabtai Tsvi was well versed in Kabbalah and Jewish tradition. He won the admiration of his followers through the ecstatic manner in which he enacted familiar Jewish rituals. He once said of Yitzhak Loria, a 16th century Kabbalist with Messianic inclinations: "Yitzhak Loria built a beautiful chariot in his day, but he forgot to say who was riding in it." Pushed forward by Nathan of Gaza, Shabtai Tsvi stepped into the chariot and openly proclaimed himself the Messiah everyone had been waiting for. He was the expected Messiah, the beautiful Messiah, who had been born on the 9th of Av, the very day the Messiah was supposed to be born.

He failed miserably in all but one respect: he survived. He survived by breaking the rules. During the period of his Messianic ascendancy, he had broken the rules by decreeing minor reversals of Jewish law as symbols of his Messianic status. And during the period of his collapse under Turkish pressure, he had broken the rules by agreeing to convert to Islam. The "Sabbatians", those who continued to believe in Shabtai Tsvi even after his conversion, concluded that breaking the rules was a necessary feature of Messianic politics. But after Shabtai Tsvi, beautiful Messiahs were much less plausible. It was therefore no coincidence that the next major Messianic leader to come along was not a beautiful Messiah but just the opposite, a professional rule violator, a criminal.

Frank was naturally drawn to the most extreme form of Sabbatianism, that upheld by the faction of Baruchiah Russo within the Donmeh of Salonica. Sharot, on page 127, brings out that among Russo's followers, "the transgression of sexual prohibitions was used as an initiation rite". Sharot adds:

Ceremonies of ritual fornication took place mainly during the ritual of the 'extinguishing of the lights', celebrating the Festival of the Lamb at the beginning of spring.

Russo's faction came mainly "from artisans and the proletariat", notes Sharot on page 128. In general, the Donmeh were inclined to an intense spirit of group solidarity, created by the fact that they were somewhat cut off from both Jews and Muslims. Nominal Muslims speaking Ladino, they normally married only among themselves and were in many respects the obvious model for Frank's band of nominal Christians speaking Yiddish.

Frank's movement could also be seen as an extreme form of Hasidism. Frankism and Hasidism grew out of a similar milieu and competed for the support of essentially the same constituency. Like Frankism, Hasidism was rooted in Sabbatianism; as Scholem notes on page 330 of *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, the early Hasidim were "active among the same people whom Sabbatianism had tried and partly succeeded in converting". This was particularly true in Podolia, the birthplace of the founder of the Hasidic movement, Israel ben Eliezer. Podolia had been a major center of Sabbatianism. Still on page 330, Scholem states:

It can hardly be called an accident that the Hasidic movement made its first appearance in the regions where Sabbatianism had taken strongest root, Podolia and Volhynia.

Sabbatianism, Hasidism and Frankism all resembled one another in their orientation towards ecstatic religious ceremonies, their popularity among the poor and their stress on emotion over dogma. But unlike the Frankists, the Hasidim never actually repudiated Jewish law or condoned sexual promiscuity. Although frequently accused of Frankist tendencies by the rabbinical establishment, the Hasidim prevented their wild dances from spilling over into orgiastic gatherings by maintaining a fairly strict separation of the sexes.

Sharot, on page 144, describes the common social base of Frankism and Hasidism:

The main social carrier of Frankism and early Hasidism in Podolia and Volhynia was the impoverished, lower-middle class of rural and small-town Jews: the arrendators and their employees, innkeepers, bartenders, small shopkeepers, peddlers, hawkers, and the unemployed.

But as Sharot brings out, most of the early leaders of the Hasidic movement were low level religious functionaries - wandering preachers, ritual slaughterers, cantors and school teachers. This element was largely absent from the Frankist ranks. Among the Frankists, on the other hand, there can be little doubt that a number of the early leaders came from backgrounds not unlike that of Frank himself - criminals, beggars and prostitutes. In short, although the Hasidim and Frankists appealed to the same social class, the one group was accustomed to meet in the synagogue, while the other felt more at home in the tavern.

The really important common feature of both Hasidism and Frankism is that both movements largely turned their backs on the traditional goal of Jewish Messianism, the return to the land of Israel. Frank explicitly renounced any expectation of a return and aimed rather at a transformation of Jewish life in Europe. His initial plan was to create an autonomous Jewish state in Podolia under his rule; when this fell through, he began to intimate to his close followers that one day he would become the ruler of all of Europe. The Hasidim were less explicit in their renunciation of a return, but the whole point of their doctrine of the sanctification of daily life was to reconcile the Jewish masses of Eastern Europe to their condition as exiles. In their abandonment of any serious intent to return to the land of Israel, both Hasidism and Frankism reflected the general disillusionment with traditional Messianic ideology which had resulted from the abject failure of the movement led by Shabtai Tsvi.

Frank in particular was responsible for a conception of Jewish Messianism which formed the real starting point of the modern Jewish radical movement. By proclaiming to the Jewish masses that their future lay in Europe, Frank initiated a trend towards the redefinition of Jewish Messianism as a movement to revolutionize European society. This trend had always been latent in the Jewish Messianic tradition, with its vision of a future world of equality and justice, but earlier Messianic leaders, including Shabtai Tsvi, had usually put their main emphasis on the hope of a return to the land of Israel. When Frank abandoned this hope, his need to survive in Europe had to lead him in the direction of attempting to recruit non-Jews to his conception of the good life. Frank himself resisted this tendency and made great efforts to insulate himself and his group from excessive contact with the Christian world. After Frank's death, however, the logic of their situation did lead the Frankists to become increasingly involved as radical activists within non-Jewish society.

Frankism

To read conventional histories of the era of the French Revolution in Europe, you would think that Jacob Frank had never lived. His name does not appear, nor is there any mention of his influence or of the existence of a Frankist movement. Yet such a movement most certainly did exist, and was portrayed as such at the time.

Frank died in 1791, as the French Revolution was entering its most radical phase. Some 45 years later, in 1835, a Polish writer named Zygmunt Krasinski published an anti-Semitic play entitled *The Undivine Comedy*, which was intended as a sensational revelation of a Frankist plot to overthrow the European social order. Abraham Duker, in an article for *The Polish Review* in 1962, on page 53, characterizes *The Undivine Comedy* as follows:

Published in 1835, the drama portrays a revolutionary plot against Christendom and the social order to be executed by a secret cabal of Jewish converts to Christianity. Their aim was world rule by the Jews and their method - a proletarian revolution against the remnants of aristocracy.

Krasinski's accusations were a reaction to the growing influence of Frankists and their descendants within Polish society. Beginning in the 1790s, the Frankists played an important part in the movement for Polish independence, and by the 1830s they also formed a well defined faction in Polish emigre circles in Paris,

where Krasinski's play first appeared.

At the time of Frank's death, the Frankist movement had already expanded far beyond its original base in Podolia into Jewish communities elsewhere in Poland and also in the Austrian empire. As it moved west, Frankism moved up, gaining middle class and even wealthy adherents, mainly from Sabbatian families. It seems likely that many of these later supporters were women. Mandel, on page 103 of *The Militant Messiah*, states:

In Prague, like everywhere else, Frank found his most eager supporters among women, a cause of marital conflicts and fistfights in the women's section of the Prague synagogue.

Frank's inclusion of women in his program of military training and the obvious attraction of his secret rituals were undoubtedly among the factors which induced many middle class Jewish women to manifest sympathy for his cause. It is probably also significant that during the 1780s Frank named his daughter, Eva Frank, to be his successor as leader of the sect.

One of the first and most influential of Frank's middle class female backers was his cousin, Sheindel Hirschel. She was married to Salomon Dobrushka, a wealthy tobacco merchant. After Frank was released from Czestochowa by the Russians, she prevailed on her husband to invite Frank to come and stay with them in their home in Austrian Moravia. Mandel describes her as follows, on page 80:

An excellent businesswoman in her own right, she took over her husband's business after his death and in addition managed to become the sole tenant of the Austrian potash monopoly and collector of the head-tax paid by traveling Jews. She was a great admirer of Frank and supported him with substantial amounts of money.

The Dobrushkas also provided Frank with his first contacts with the Austrian court, which he gradually developed into a major source of prestige and basis for influence peddling. Moreover, one of their sons, Moses Dobrushka, became a member of Frank's inner circle and was for a time touted by Frank as his chief lieutenant and potential successor.

Moses Dobrushka was one of the first Frankists to become involved in political activities within European Christian society. In 1775 he converted to Christianity and three years later received the aristocratic title of von Schoenfeld in recognition of the services of his family to the Austrian court. Under the name of Franz Schoenfeld he became involved with the Masonic movement in Germany. Together with two impoverished German barons, he founded a Masonic order known as the "Knights of the True Light", or more commonly as the "Asiatic Brethren". The Asiatic Brethren was the first Masonic lodge in Germany to admit Jews, and during the 1780s it became a fashionable meeting place for "Enlightened" German Jews and German aristocrats, including the future king of Prussia, Frederick Wilhelm 2. Schoenfeld also developed close relations with the Austrian royal family, wrote numerous poems and plays in German for appropriate occasions and in general conducted himself as an Enlightened man about town in upper class German and Austrian society.

Suddenly, in the fall of 1791, he turned up in Strasbourg in France under the name of Junius Frey. The French Revolution had already begun, and Frey introduced himself to the local Jacobins as a supporter of the Revolution. He made a speech, cited by Mandel on page 121, in which he stated:

As to myself, it would be needless to tell you my name; may it suffice to say that I belong to that numerous army which, on the other side of the Rhine, stands ready to fight for your constitution, your principles, your freedom.

Incredibly, by 1792 Frey was in Paris taking part in the storming of the Tuileries and cultivating contacts with the leading Jacobins. His sister, who had accompanied him, married Francois Chabot, the head of the secret police under Robespierre, and Frey was commissioned by the Jacobins to write pro-Jacobin political propaganda. He did in fact publish a revolutionary treatise, *Philosophie sociale*, in 1793. Some 20 years after meeting Jacob Frank at his parents' home in Austrian Moravia, Moses Dobrushka had become part of the entourage of the leaders of the French Revolution.

But easy come, easy go. Rumors began to circulate concerning Frey's previous incarnations as Dobrushka and Schoenfeld, leading to his expulsion from the Jacobin club. In an effort to distance himself from his new brother-in-law, the police chief Chabot went to Robespierre with a story that Frey had tried to bribe

him to help Frey buy up shares in a shipping company at bargain rates. Robespierre had Frey arrested and decided to use him as a way of discrediting his rival, Danton, whom Robespierre now accused of conspiring with Frey as part of an alleged “Foreign Plot”. On April 5, 1794, Junius Frey was sent to the guillotine together with Danton. Mandel, on page 150, cites Scholem’s characterization of Frey as “an unusual personality and true Frankist: half Jew and half Christian; half Cabbalist and half reformer; half Jacobin and half spy, who got entangled in his own ropes and took his secret with him to the grave.” Perhaps the secret was simply that Dobrushka had entered the Christian world without really believing in the possibility of his acceptance, leading him to adopt various identities as the occasion demanded rather than just play himself.

Other Frankists were also beginning to play a part in radical politics at this time. One of the main leaders of the Polish uprising against the Russians in 1794 was a Frankist named Jacob Jasinski, who was killed during the siege of Warsaw. A number of Frankist refugees from Poland later fought in Napoleon’s armies, including George Alexander Matuszewitz, the son of one of Frank’s closest associates, who rose to become the commander of the Dutch artillery under Napoleon. The Frankists who came to the fore during this period were much more assimilated to European culture than Frank had been. They were supporters of the French Revolution, which in Poland was allied with the cause of Polish independence. Groping their way towards a cultural style capable of reconciling their Jewish past with their European future, they played a significant part in the development of the early 19th century cult of revolutionary Romanticism.

A key role in this process was played by a poet named Adam Mickiewicz. Today revered as Poland’s national poet, subject of countless biographies and literary tributes, Mickiewicz concealed from all but his closest friends that he was of Frankist descent on his mother’s side. Among the Polish exiles in Paris in the 1830s, Mickiewicz found himself at the center of the controversy over Frankism highlighted by the publication of Krasinski’s attack on the Frankists, *The Undivine Comedy*, in 1835. Himself a secret Frankist, Mickiewicz publicly criticized Krasinski for his anti-Semitic stance; yet at the same time, Mickiewicz also wrote polemics against Jan Czynski and Tadeusz Krempowiecki, the Frankist leaders who were the main targets of Krasinski’s play. Abraham Duker, on page 315 of his article, “Polish Frankism’s Duration”, appearing in *Jewish Social Studies* in 1963, cites a satiric verse which Mickiewicz wrote around this time against one of the Frankist leaders:

One half Jew, half a Pole,
One half Jacobin, half a tramp
One half martial, half in civilian’s role
But to match it, fully a scamp.

Ironically, the poem was not a bad description of Mickiewicz himself, whose wife, Celina, was also a secret Frankist, the daughter of the noted pianist Maria Syzmanowska, whose family had converted to Christianity in Frank’s time.

The real issue in the Frankist controversy among the Polish exiles in Paris was political. Czynski and Krempowiecki were the leaders of a faction among the exiles which argued that the movement for Polish independence had to enlist the support of the Polish masses with a program of democratic reforms, including the breakup of the large feudal estates of the Polish nobility. Krasinski’s *The Undivine Comedy* was a characteristic attempt on the part of the pro-aristocratic faction among the exiles to shift the issue from the question of land tenure to that of Catholicism versus Judaism. Mickiewicz attempted to straddle the controversy by loudly proclaiming his Catholic faith, but in a radical form.

Mickiewicz was the main author of a doctrine that eventually became quite popular in Poland known as “Polish Messianism”. In his writings, Mickiewicz put forward in dramatic style the notion that Poland was the Christ of the nations, destined to suffer from materialism and greed until finally all of Europe would be redeemed by Poland’s faith in the Messianic future. Redemption was pictured in a Romantic vein: simple virtues would prevail, and there was the implication of sex. Poland would bring forth a Redeemer, a Messianic “man of dread”, whom Duker, in another of his articles appearing in Damian Wandycz’s *Studies in Polish Civilization*, describes as modeled on the example of Jacob Frank. As time went on, Mickiewicz came to see himself more and more as the Redeemer he had pictured in his writings, and as he did so, he began to come out as a Jew.

During the 1840s he began to visit Paris synagogues and to cultivate friendships with people from Jewish backgrounds. He took on as a secretary and companion a young man named Armand Levy, whose

grandfather had converted to Christianity and who was also seeking a way back to Jewishness. In yet another article appearing in Manfred Kridl's anthology, *Adam Mickiewicz*, Duker cites Mickiewicz, on page 109, telling Levy:

I would not want the Jews to leave Poland because, just as the Union of Poland with Lithuania, differing by origin and religion, brought our Polish state to its greatness and happiness, so I am certain that the union of Poland and Israel will assure our spiritual and moral strength.

Following the outbreak of the Crimean War in 1853, Mickiewicz then persuaded Levy to accompany him to Turkey, where a group of Polish volunteers was being formed to fight against Russia. On the way, they stopped in Smyrna to take part in services at the local synagogue. When they arrived at the Polish camp in Turkey, they found about 200 Jewish volunteers among the Polish exiles gathered there, and on the spot Mickiewicz conceived a plan to organize a "Jewish Legion" to take part in the war against Russia and the liberation of Poland.

Most of the standard biographies of Mickiewicz are silent on the subject of his Frankist background and Jewish ties, but his plan to form a Jewish Legion became so well known that it has to be mentioned, if only in passing. Thus we read on page 78 of *Adam Mickiewicz* by Mieczyslaw Jastrun:

Faithful to his mystical theory of history, that a union with Israel would strengthen Poland, Mickiewicz began to recruit a Jewish regiment.

But after two months of feverish preparations, Mickiewicz suddenly took sick and died. Like Frank before him, Mickiewicz had obviously long dreamed of the day when he would stand at the head of an army of Jews. His desire to form a Jewish Legion was not popular with the other Polish exiles, but after his death it came to be viewed as just another example of his Romantic and "mystical" temperament. His Jewish background was forgotten or denied, and Mickiewicz became in Polish eyes the quintessential Romantic patriot, a mystic Catholic and ethnic Pole.

The Invisible Legacy

Mickiewicz died in 1855, by which time Frankism as an organized movement had just about disappeared. Nonetheless, Frank's followers and their descendants had made enough of an impact on the European scene during the first half of the 19th century to create an enduring but invisible legacy.

The invisibility of the Frankists in the historical literature is beyond belief. Save for an occasional reference to Frey's Jewish birth or Mickiewicz's desire to form a Jewish Legion, you will search in vain in standard works for even a hint that a Frankist movement ever existed. It was not as if the Frankists had been invisible in their own day. The castle at Offenbach remained in Frankist hands until Eva Frank's death in 1816. The Frankists there remained somewhat to themselves, but they did appear in town dressed in outlandish Turkish costumes. In his article appearing in *Jewish Social Studies* in 1963, Duker brings out that a Frankist "congress" was convened in Karlsbad in 1823, but attendance was considered disappointing and the effort was not repeated. All the same, anti-Semites like Krasinski found Frankism sufficiently real in the 1830s to parody and attack. Duker, who has written perhaps a dozen scholarly articles in various journals on this subject, feels that Frankism remained an organized force on some level until the 1850s or 1860s.

Even thereafter, Duker has shown, Frank's memory was still cherished by some. In his 1963 article, on page 295, Duker states:

I was told by the martyr historians, Emanuel Ringelblum and Isaac (Ignacy) Schipper, in 1933 and 1934, that they had come across or heard of Christian Poles who carried miniatures of Jacob or Eva Frank in their watchcases.

Eva Frank too became something of a legend. After her father's death, she seems to have instituted a new regime in the castle. Mandel, on page 162 of *The Militant Messiah*, cites the following account by a would-be convert of his stay at Offenbach during the late 1790s:

There was, in general, a moral tone, but they did not take it too seriously. Sexual intercourse or marriage was strictly forbidden. One morning, it was announced that, according to a vision, anyone desiring a female was to be given ten strokes with a rod, and, lo and behold, almost all the young men submitted to it.

It seems that the years at the monastery of the Black Madonna had not been without effect. Whatever the real deal may have been, Eva Frank in her later years projected an image of herself to the world as the Frankist Holy Mother, subject of a cult deliberately modeled after that of the so-called Virgin Mary. Her activities must have been the subject of considerable gossip and speculation in her own day, but of all this not a trace has survived in the standard accounts.

But invisible as they may have become, the Frankists left their mark. One aspect of the Frankist legacy was an intensification of the trend towards secular radicalism in the Jewish communities of Europe. Most of Frank's Jewish admirers, particularly those attracted to the movement after the early days, did not convert to Christianity but remained part of the Jewish community, where they continued to be known as Sabbatians. Scholem, on page 141 of *The Messianic Idea In Judaism*, brings out that in many areas, these Sabbatians were the first Jews to be drawn to the new secular doctrines disseminated by the followers of Moses Mendelssohn in Germany. Scholem puts it this way:

The leaders of the 'School of Mendelssohn', who were neither Sabbatians themselves, of course, nor under the influence of mysticism at all, to say nothing of mystical heresy, found ready recruits for their cause in Sabbatian circles, where the world of rabbinic Judaism had already been completely destroyed from within, quite independently of the efforts of secularist criticism.

Scholem also notes, on page 140, with reference to the Jewish Sabbatians, that "when the flame of their faith finally flickered out they soon reappeared as leaders of Reform Judaism, secular intellectuals, or simply complete and indifferent sceptics."

Another aspect of the Frankist legacy was, paradoxically, the injection of a Jewish component into the 19th century revolutionary nationalist movement in Europe. Although Frank had led a movement away from Judaism, he had always tried to keep his followers together as a group, which gave his entourage a distinct Jewish character. Speaking Yiddish among themselves, dressing differently from the Christian Europeans, training as soldiers, the early Frankists could easily be perceived as Jewish nationalists. And as the example of Mickiewicz shows, a subterranean Jewish nationalist feeling remained an important part of Frankism until well into the 19th century. The significance of this feeling for the revolutionary nationalist movement in Europe is well illustrated by the later career of Armand Levy.

After bringing the body of Mickiewicz back to Paris for burial in 1855, Levy vowed to devote his life to the cause of all oppressed peoples, including the Jewish people. He became a revolutionary nationalist, cultivating ties with leading Polish, Hungarian and Italian nationalists, among them Mazzini, Garibaldi and Kossuth. At the same time, Levy championed the cause of Jewish nationalism, to the point where his biographer Samuel Scheps calls him a "Zionist before the letter" on page 43 of *Armand Levy*. Levy became a close friend of Moses Hess, the author of *Rome and Jerusalem*, the first Zionist work from a secular point of view, published in 1862. Levy encouraged Hess to write for *l'Esperance*, a journal which Levy edited, and also played a major role in organizing an international campaign on behalf of the Jews of Rumania, who were then being subjected to systematic persecution by the Rumanian government. Levy took part in the uprising of the Paris Commune in 1871, spent 10 years in exile in Italy and remained until his death in 1891 one of the leading advocates of a European-wide alliance of revolutionary nationalists which would also include Jewish nationalists.

Yet another aspect of the Frankist legacy was the creation of a tradition of revolutionary Romanticism with a strong appeal to later Jewish radicals. The writings of Mickiewicz in particular played a key role in the radicalization of many Jewish Marxists from Polish speaking backgrounds. For example, in *Rosa Luxemburg*, Elzbieta Ettinger suggests that it was the poetry of Mickiewicz that first launched Rosa Luxemburg on the road to revolution. On page 17, Ettinger gives the following description of the influence of Mickiewicz on young students in late 19th century Poland:

In dimly lit rooms, behind closely guarded doors, girls and boys gathered in clandestine meetings and hungrily listened to the outlawed verses of Mickiewicz. The mystery of the poetry, the conspiracy, and the secrecy fueled the feverish excitement of the young audiences. Erotic and spiritual, the poems told them about ideal love, the meeting of two souls that become one.

And on page 19, Ettinger states, with reference to Luxemburg:

Her belief in the moral obligation to fight for a more humane system, in the ethical dimension of social change - the essence of Luxemburg's philosophy - derived from the poet's vision. His faith in the healthy instincts of the common people underlay Luxemburg's famous theory of the spontaneity of revolution.

Needless to say, neither Ettinger nor Luxemburg herself had any idea of the real source from which Mickiewicz derived his Romantic vision.

Another Jewish Marxist who was swept away in his youth by the poetry of Mickiewicz was Karl Radek. Radek was one of the main leaders of the Communist International during the 1920s. On page 4 of *Karl Radek*, Warren Lerner describes the impact of Mickiewicz on the young Radek:

He read with enthusiasm Adam Mickiewicz's great epic *Pan Tadeusz*, in which the Jewish musician Jankiel composes a paean to Polish liberation while the onlookers thunder: 'Poland has not yet perished! March Dabrowski! March to Poland!' Jankiel, a Polish Jew, was more real than Moses Mendelssohn to the romantic youngster. Karl was so carried away by Mickiewicz's work that he briefly considered converting to Roman Catholicism if that would make it easier for him to involve himself in the cause of Polish nationalism.

And on page 19 of *The Non-Jewish Jew*, Isaac Deutscher reveals that he too was a youthful fan of Mickiewicz:

I did not share my father's partiality for German poetry. I was a Polish patriot. Mickiewicz and Slovacki were incomparably dearer and closer to me.

Needless to say, all these Jewish Marxists believed that in responding to Mickiewicz, they were only reciprocating the generosity of a Catholic mystic who was kind enough to find a place for the Jewish people in his vision of a reborn Poland.

The tragic climax to the underground history of the cult of Mickiewicz among Jewish Marxists in Poland was reached during the so-called "March events" in the spring of 1968. The March events were triggered by a production of Mickiewicz's play, "The Forefathers", in Warsaw. The production was considered a great event in Poland at the time because the play contained passages expressing hostility to Russian rule. After a number of performances before overflow audiences, the Polish government suddenly ordered the play to close. At the last performance, an incident took place, described by Josef Banas on page 99 of *The Scapegoats* as follows:

As the performance drew to its end, and a small group of students started to protest against the ban, the police with unusual toughness went after some students, obviously singled out in advance, most of them Jewish. In flagrant violation of all the rules then in force, they were subsequently suspended from the university - an action which was bound to provoke the student community to resistance.

There followed a wave of student demonstrations against the suspension of the Jewish students, which led in turn to a government campaign against alleged Zionist influence in Poland. As a direct result of this campaign, some 25,000 Jews were forced to emigrate from Poland during the years 1969 and 1970. These Jews, the great majority of them Communists or Communist sympathizers, constituted all but a handful of the surviving Jewish community of Poland.

That the Jewish community of Poland should have made its last stand in the name of Mickiewicz has to be seen as a bitter commentary on the invisible legacy of Frankism. From the start, Frankism was sustained by a belief in the possibility that Jews could find acceptance within European society in general and Polish society in particular. In pursuit of this acceptance, Frank endorsed the Blood Libel, accommodated himself to Christian anti-Semitism and encouraged his followers to conceal their true beliefs behind a facade of assimilation. But as time went on, it was the facade that became the reality, while the Jewishness of Frankism was all but forgotten. The result was a tragic misunderstanding on the part of later Jewish radicals in Poland that in responding to the verses of Mickiewicz, they were responding to something other than just another Jewish radical. Whatever the temporary advantages which Frank and his followers gained from

their policy of concealment, in the long run it would probably have been better from a Jewish point of view if the legacy of Frankism had not been so invisible. Frank would probably have been less successful if he had been more honest, but he would also have been better understood.

Jacob The European

Perhaps the best way of understanding Frank is to understand his name. Frank was not born Frank. He received the name Frank during his sojourn in the Turkish empire, as a kind of nickname. Throughout the Middle East, the word Frank in an Arabic or Turkish form had long been used as a term for Europeans. This usage was derived from the fact that the early European Crusaders during the Middle Ages had been called Franks. So when Jacob from Podolia came to be known as Frank to the Ladino speaking Jews of the Turkish empire, it was as if they were calling him “Jacob the European”. The name stuck, and with good reason: it was an appropriate summary of his career.

Frank’s whole ambition was to become a European. Not a Pole, not a German, but a European. Although many of his followers became Polish nationalists, Frank himself could not have cared less about the fate of the Polish nation. It was the Poles, after all, who imprisoned him for 13 years in the fortified monastery of Czestochowa. Having grown up in an overwhelmingly Jewish milieu, unable to speak a European language, Frank was not attracted to any particular national culture in Europe. It was the European thing in general which attracted him: the power, the prestige, the possibility of doing what he wanted. In European social circles, he felt most at home among the aristocrats, who were likewise largely indifferent to their respective national traditions and proud of their European-wide culture. Deep in his heart, Frank cherished the ambition that one day he would somehow become the ruler of Europe and institute a Messianic regime of “salvation through sin”.

It was not to be, but to the Jewish radical movement Frank bequeathed the habit of thinking in European-wide terms. To the Europeans, accustomed to thinking in terms of their individual national traditions, this approach seemed radical and “internationalist”. But from a Jewish point of view, it represented in some ways a shrinking of horizons. The Jewish milieu from which Frank emerged was far less European-identified than Frank later became. The Yiddish speaking Jews of Podolia thought of themselves as members of a Jewish nation in exile, while the Ladino speaking Jews of the Turkish empire not only thought the same way but were for the most part loyal supporters of a Turkish government that had traditionally been at war with all of Europe. After Jacob became Frank, he returned to Europe and turned his back on the Middle Eastern Jewish world from which he had derived key portions of his Messianic message. The resulting definition of Jewish radicalism as a European-wide movement for the social transformation of Europe looked extremely radical from a European perspective but perhaps less so from a Jewish point of view.

In order to become Europeans, the Frankists were prepared to jettison the greater part of the religious and cultural traditions which were associated with membership in the Jewish nation. There was, however, one aspect of Jewish tradition to which the Frankists clung tenaciously well into the 19th century. This aspect was Kabbalah. Both Frank and his followers sincerely regarded themselves as Kabbalists, and they continued to identify as such even after they became Christians and would-be Europeans. In order to fully understand the roots of modern Jewish radicalism, it is therefore necessary to explore the hidden world of Kabbalah.

Chapter Two: Hidden

A revealing insight into the role of Kabbalah in Frankism is provided by an account written by a would-be convert, Moses Porges, of his stay at the castle in Offenbach during the late 1790s. It is reproduced in Mandel's *The Militant Messiah*. On page 161, Porges describes an encounter with "three long-bearded men in Polish dress" who addressed him as follows:

One of the three addressed me thus: "My son, the Shekina is in trouble, held captive by Edom and Ishmael. Her children have to deliver her by sharing in her trouble. As soon as three Sephirot unite in trinity, salvation will come. Two of them have already appeared in human form, we wait for the third one. Hail the man chosen to unite with Tiferet, for he will bring forth the savior of the world. As for you, serve well in order to be one of the chosen."

Terms like "Shekina", "Sephirot" and "Tiferet" were Kabbalistic references, which Porges was evidently expected to understand. And in fact, when Porges was then shown a chart containing a list of the 10 Sephirot of Kabbalah, he did recognize them as "ten names I knew from the holiday prayers".

Another indication of the role of Kabbalah in Frankism appears on page 90 of *The Militant Messiah*. There Mandel explains why two impoverished Germans would go into partnership with a person of Jewish origin in order to found a new Masonic order. Mandel states:

These two brothers tried it first with the Rosicrucians and alchemists, but since these did not yield any gold, they hit upon a better idea and founded the order of the 'Asiatic Brothers', claiming to be in possession of all the secrets of the Cabbala. But here they needed a 'Cabbalist', and they found him in the person of Schoenfeld-Dobrushka. He managed to sell them a bill of goods, a hodgepodge of Jewish-Christian symbols which turned the Cabbala into a secret science for the forecasting of eclipses of the sun or moon and other natural phenomena.

Frank too claimed to be a Kabbalist, as is brought out by Gershom Scholem on page 54 of an article on Frankism appearing in the *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* in 1953. There Scholem notes that among the conditions for a mass conversion to Christianity advanced by Frank during his negotiations with the Catholic church was a demand for permission to continue to study the *Zohar*, the great classic of Kabbalah. Among the other conditions, by the way, was the right to abstain from eating pork and for the men to retain their beards and earlocks.

Kabbalah was the one aspect of Jewish tradition which the Frankists continued to regard in a positive light even after their conversion to Christianity. They were not alone in this attitude. Beginning in the early 16th century, a growing number of European Christian intellectuals began to delve into Kabbalah while at the same time maintaining their opposition or indifference to all other aspects of Judaism. By the time of the rise of Frankism in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, Kabbalah had become almost fashionable in certain European intellectual circles. The alleged expertise of the Frankists in Kabbalah was one of their main selling points in their efforts to develop aristocratic social contacts. Kabbalah was regarded by the Europeans as the occult science of the Jews, which might perhaps be utilized by others without any need to study or accept Judaism itself.

This attitude has persisted into the modern era. There now exist literally dozens of works on Kabbalah by non-Jewish occultists, each of which claims to explain the true meaning of Kabbalistic doctrine without any reference whatsoever to Jewish history or tradition. Undoubtedly the most popular of these works is *The Holy Kabbalah* by A.E. Waite. Waite was an English occultist prominent during the early 20th century. Like the others, he viewed Kabbalah as something quite apart from Judaism, explaining on page 16 that it was given to Adam in the form of "a secret and Supreme Book" whose contents were handed down over the ages. So secret was Kabbalah, according to Waite, that most Jews were unaware of it, or as Waite put it on page 80, "so far as it is possible to ascertain, the Kabbalah has exercised only a very subsidiary influence upon the Children of the Exile". Waite went on to state, with reference to Kabbalah:

So far as its operation was intellectual, there is tolerable ground for thinking that its field was the Christian rather than the Jewish mind.

These assertions, unbelievable in their arrogance, grew out of Waite's need to separate Kabbalah from Judaism

and present it as a “Secret Doctrine” known only to a few occultists, such as himself.

It might be thought that Waite’s attitude is a relic of a bygone era, but such is not the case. In *School of Kabbalah*, published in 1985 by Warren Kenton under the name of Z’ev ben Shimon Halevi, we find the identical effort to separate Kabbalah from the Jews in order to claim it for the occultists. Kenton does admit that the Jews might know something about Kabbalah, but he suggests that their version is archaic and lifeless, while his is deeply spiritual. Thus on page 266 he states, with reference to the Hasidim:

Spirituality is not generated by wearing the costume of another time or place. This can be escapism or the pursuit of a cultural identity. The cut of a coat may remain, but Kabbalah always moves with the present.

It is apparent from the text that Kenton does not know more than a few words of Hebrew, the language in which most Kabbalistic works were originally written, but this does not prevent him from billing himself as “one of the foremost authorities in Kabbalah in Britain”. He achieves this status by dismissing the Jewish Kabbalists, still on page 266, as “no more than dried out blossoms preserved between the pages of old customs”.

In reality, far from constituting a “Secret Doctrine” known only to a select few, Kabbalah was for many centuries an integral part of orthodox Judaism. As Scholem points out on page 156 of *Major Trends In Jewish Mysticism*, the Kabbalistic work the *Zohar*, “alone among the whole of post-Talmudic rabbinical literature”, became “a canonical text, which for a period of several centuries actually ranked with the Bible and the Talmud”. Kabbalistic doctrine not only formed a part of the normal orthodox course of study but was disseminated on a mass level in the form of prayers, songs and folklore of Kabbalistic origin.

Yet although it was far from hidden, Kabbalah in Jewish tradition was treated as something potentially dangerous and subversive of the established order. In many areas it was considered improper for anyone to study Kabbalah before the age of 40, for fear of being carried away by its mystic charms. The reputation for magic power attached to Kabbalah was not an invention of the Frankists; they merely emphasized this element above all others in order to impress the Europeans. Like Messianism, to which it was closely related, Kabbalah constituted an element of Jewish tradition which was orthodox yet radical. In fact, Kabbalah constituted the intellectual dimension of Jewish Messianism, the ideological superstructure which surrounded and enhanced the Messianic tradition in Jewish life. It was primarily for this reason that the Frankists attempted to preserve Kabbalah when they made the transition from the Jewish to the Christian world. And in general, the mentality of modern Jewish radicalism owes more than is generally recognized to Kabbalistic tradition. But in order to understand this connection, it is first necessary to penetrate the magical smokescreen behind which Kabbalah has been hidden by the European occultists.

Revealed Kabbalah

Like the character in Poe’s story about the purloined letter, the occultists have hidden Kabbalah by revealing it. From the start, the European Christian literature on the subject of Kabbalah presented itself as a sensational revelation of an otherwise secret tradition. The very first book on Kabbalah to become popular in European intellectual circles was a 17th century work, *Kabbala Denudata*, meaning “Kabbalah Revealed” in Latin. “Revealed Kabbalah” would be an apt term for the version of Kabbalah which has since become established in occultist literature.

According to the occultists, Kabbalah is based on the concept of the 10 Sephirot. The Hebrew term “Sephirot” is usually translated as “Emanations” because the Kabbalists viewed the 10 Sephirot as emanations of divinity. In many works by Jewish Kabbalists, the idea was indeed set forth that the universe was composed of 10 Sephirot or emanations of what the Kabbalists called “Ein Sof”, meaning “Infinite”. The 10 Sephirot were eventually given names, not always the same but generally listed in Hebrew as: Keter, Hochmah, Binah, Hesed, Gevurah, Tiferet, Netzach, Hod, Yesod and Malchut. In English, these terms are usually translated as: Crown, Wisdom, Intelligence, Mercy, Power, Beauty, Victory, Glory, Foundation and Kingdom. The entire universe is supposed to be composed of these 10 emanations or qualities of divinity, knowledge of which is said to be the key to opening the Kabbalistic bag of magic tricks.

The doctrine of the 10 Sephirot did in fact form a part of traditional Jewish Kabbalistic lore, but in Jewish tradition it occupied a place quite different from that assigned to it by the occultists. Far from constituting the basis of Kabbalah, it is not even mentioned in many Jewish Kabbalistic works. In particular, there is almost no reference at all to the 10 Sephirot in the *Zohar*, the acknowledged classic of Jewish Kabbalah. This is no

coincidence, for according to Scholem on page 197 of *Major Trends In Jewish Mysticism*, the author of the *Zohar* actually felt an “aversion” to the concept of the 10 Sephirot, which hardly appears in any of his writings. Like other Kabbalists, he did view the visible universe as an emanation of divinity, but he had little interest in enumerating emanations or assigning them names, qualities and attributes.

The concept of the 10 Sephirot first entered Jewish tradition through a work known as *The Book of Creation*, which most authorities date from the period of the 4th or 5th century CE. It was not at first a specifically Kabbalistic concept, nor did the term Sephirot originally have the meaning of emanations. In *The Book of Creation*, the term Sephirot, which is derived from a Hebrew root meaning to count, is used to mean “Numbers”. It refers to the 10 primary numbers, which together with the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet are said to form the basis of creation. Only much later did the term Sephirot begin to take on the meaning of emanations following the appearance of the first Kabbalistic works in the 12th and 13th centuries. Once the early Kabbalists developed the concept of the universe as an emanation of divinity, then those Kabbalists who were inclined to number mysticism began to enumerate emanations along the lines suggested by *The Book of Creation*. As a rule, the later the Jewish Kabbalistic work, the more prominent the doctrine of the 10 Sephirot within it.

Furthermore, although the concept of the universe as an emanation of divinity is certainly present in the *Zohar*, it is far from obvious that this concept forms the main theme of the *Zohar* or is central to an understanding of it. First written in Aramaic, later translated into Hebrew and Yiddish, it is only recently that the text of the *Zohar* has become available in English, thanks to a 5 volume edition translated by Harry Sperling and Maurice Simon and published in London in 1984. Despite its reputation as a compendium of occult lore, the *Zohar* is actually written in the form of a commentary on the Torah, which does not greatly differ in its outward form from many other such commentaries. The concept of the universe as an emanation of divinity is introduced through a commentary on the opening passages of the book of *Genesis*; but when the *Zohar* moves on to deal with the rest of the Torah, the theme of the universe as emanation is dropped and only occasionally alluded to thereafter. It might conceivably be argued that this theme is nonetheless central to the entire *Zohar*, but it would be hard to prove this on the basis of the actual text.

But if the *Zohar* is not really about emanations, then what is it about? It is about its hero, Shimon bar Yochai. As modern Jewish scholars have shown in great detail, the *Zohar* was written sometime around 1280 in Spain by a Kabbalist named Moses de Leon. It was written in Aramaic, a language known to Jewish rabbis and scholars because much of the Talmud was written in Aramaic. De Leon wrote it in Aramaic, a major intellectual feat, because he wanted to pass it off as an ancient work that had only recently come into his possession. In the *Zohar*, de Leon’s own commentary on the Torah was presented as the work of the school of Shimon bar Yochai. Shimon bar Yochai was a Jewish rabbi who lived in the land of Israel during the 2nd century CE, around the time of the uprising against the Romans led by Simon bar Kochba. Prior to the composition of the *Zohar*, the main thing that was known about Shimon bar Yochai was that after the defeat and death of bar Kochba, he had refused to submit to Roman authority and had hidden from the Romans in a cave in Galilee for 13 years. All of the commentary on the Torah in the *Zohar* is attributed either to Shimon bar Yochai himself, or to one of his disciples, or occasionally to mysterious strangers whom they encounter.

That Shimon bar Yochai is the central figure of the *Zohar* is shown not only by the actual text but also by the cult that grew up around him in later Jewish history. The area where he was supposed to have hidden from the Romans, around the town of Meron in northern Galilee, eventually became a center of pilgrimage for Kabbalists. To this day, many tens of thousands of Hasidim flock to Meron each year in honor of the memory of Shimon bar Yochai, a memory which is almost entirely derived from the *Zohar*. This latter-day cult of Shimon bar Yochai faithfully reflects the intentions of the author of the *Zohar*, who employed a whole range of literary devices to create the impression that no one before or since had ever understood Torah like Shimon bar Yochai. For example, on page 16 of Volume 1 of the *Zohar*, we learn that after his death, Shimon bar Yochai was raised to the rank of head of the “heavenly academy” of Torah sages, who conduct discussions of Torah in the presence of the “Holy One” himself. That Moses de Leon should have chosen a rabbi who was known for his opposition to Rome for the role of the intellectual hero of the *Zohar* was obviously no coincidence but rather a reflection of his underlying purpose, which was to promote a Messianic version of orthodox Judaism.

From a Messianic point of view, it is highly significant that the discussions of Shimon bar Yochai and his disciples are conducted in Aramaic on the soil of the land of Israel. The actual effect of the *Zohar* on its original audience of Jewish rabbis and scholars was to promote in them a burning desire to return to the land of

Israel and stand on the ground where Shimon bar Yochai had once stood. Not only did Meron become a center of pilgrimage, but the town of Safed, located only a few miles from Meron, became from the 16th century onwards a major center of Kabbalist settlement and activity. From the 16th through the 18th centuries, many thousands of Kabbalists settled in Safed and also in Jerusalem, Tiberias and Hebron. This entire movement was in large part a response to the sentiment, generated more by the *Zohar* than by any other single work, that only in the land of Israel could true Jewish scholarship flourish and develop.

The Messianic bent of the *Zohar* is also reflected in passages such as the following, from page 249 of Volume 4:

At the time when the dead will be awakened and be in readiness for the resurrection in the Holy Land, legions upon legions will arise on the soil of Galilee, as it is there that the Messiah is destined to reveal himself.

A similar spirit is reflected in the following lines, from page 108 of Volume 5:

'God', he said, 'will one day put on garments of vengeance to chastise Edom for having destroyed His house and burnt his Temple and driven the Community of Israel into exile among the nations.'

Edom was a well known term for Rome, whose rule the real life Shimon bar Yochai had in fact defied. In the *Zohar*, Moses de Leon invoked his authority in order to promote a version of orthodox Judaism that was aggressively Messianic and specifically Zionist in its political implications. It was this version of Judaism that eventually gave rise to the Messianic movement led by Shabtai Tsvi.

Revealed Kabbalah only came into its own after the failure of Shabtai Tsvi. After his time, most Kabbalists began to lose faith in the belief that a group of unarmed rabbis could somehow reestablish Jewish rule in the land of Israel. It was at this stage that the *Zohar* lost its "canonical" status and became just another Kabbalistic text. Those who remained fascinated with Kabbalah after this point treated it more and more as a kind of intellectual pastime, which did not necessarily entail any dramatic political consequences. This was the version of Kabbalah that was picked up by the European occultists, with Frankist assistance, and redefined by them as a "Secret Doctrine" based on the magic of the 10 Sephirot.

Characteristic of the Jewish Kabbalistic works from which Revealed Kabbalah was derived is an early 18th century treatise, *General Principles of the Kabbalah*, by Moses Luzzatto. Luzzatto set out in this work to present a systematic summary of Kabbalistic doctrine, something few earlier Kabbalists had done, and he did indeed assign a large place to the doctrine of the 10 Sephirot in his presentation. Yet for Luzzatto himself, Kabbalah nonetheless had the same meaning as it did for earlier Jewish Kabbalists. Born in Padua in 1707, he emigrated to the land of Israel in 1743, dying there 4 years later. Moreover, in his exposition of the doctrine of the 10 Sephirot, Luzzatto's main concern was not with magic but with the theological issue of how an emanation of divinity could become matter. Following the lead of earlier texts, Luzzatto tried to answer this question by identifying the Sephirot with light, arguing on page 2 that "existence is nothing but a succession of condensations of light essence". Luzzatto's view of matter as condensed light may well have some scientific validity and is far removed in spirit and intent from the tendency of the occultists to personify the Sephirot and invoke them for magical purposes.

Having perhaps originated as light, the 10 Sephirot today have condensed to the point where they conceal more than they reveal. Hidden behind the intricacies of Revealed Kabbalah is the fact that for many centuries Kabbalah was the ideology of the overtly Messianic faction within orthodox Judaism. The *Zohar* is filled with references to the coming of the Messiah, and throughout the period from the 13th to the 18th century, most outstanding Kabbalistic leaders sought to promote a return to the land of Israel, often settling there themselves and encouraging others to do likewise. The history of their struggle has been reconstructed largely through the efforts of Gershom Scholem, the leading modern scholar of Kabbalah and himself a Zionist who emigrated to the land of Israel from Germany in the early 1920s. As Scholem and others have shown, Kabbalah provided the Jewish Messianic movement of the pre-modern period with an ideological superstructure, which in various ways stimulated a desire to "force the end", meaning to deliberately and consciously strive to bring about the conditions for the ingathering of the exiles and the restoration of Jewish rule in the land of Israel. In Kabbalistic lore, this tendency to "force the end" was generally known under the name of "Practical Kabbalah".

The term, “Practical Kabbalah”, also appears in occultist handbooks, where it is used as an expression for the use of Kabbalah for magical purposes. And in fact, Practical Kabbalah did have magical connotations in Jewish tradition, but of a very different kind from that imagined by the occultists. The best way of understanding the original meaning of Practical Kabbalah is by examining the career of the early Kabbalist, Abraham Abulafia.

Abulafia was born around 1240 in Spain; he was a contemporary of Moses de Leon. In *Major Trends In Jewish Mysticism*, Scholem brings out on page 128 that Abulafia began to develop “Messianic ideas” during the 1270s. He travelled widely through Italy, Greece and the Middle East seeking inspiration. Abulafia was strongly influenced by a statement which the Spanish rabbi Nachmanides had made in 1263, cited by Scholem on page 128:

When the time of the end will have come, the Messiah will at God’s command come to the Pope and ask of him the liberation of his people, and only then will the Messiah be considered really to have come, but not before that.

In 1280, Abulafia suddenly announced that he intended to go to Rome and confer with the Pope, Nicholas 3, “in the name of Jewry”. In the context of what Nachmanides had said, this was equivalent to declaring himself the Messiah.

There ensued a dramatic sequence of events that was long remembered in Jewish tradition. When Nicholas 3 learned of Abulafia’s intention to visit him, he gave orders that Abulafia was to be arrested at the gates of Rome and immediately burnt at the stake. Abulafia showed up anyhow at the gates of Rome, only to learn that the Pope had died suddenly during the night. Abulafia was arrested and held for about a month, but finally he was released. He lived for at least another 10 years, mainly in Italy and Sicily, but nothing is known of him after the year 1291. He was the author of at least 20 Kabbalistic treatises which remain in existence in manuscript form, but not one of them has ever been published, even in Hebrew. Scholem suggests that this is probably because they contain specific guides to various mystical and magical practices.

Abulafia himself called his system “Prophetic Kabbalism”, while Scholem describes it as “ecstatic Kabbalism” or “practical mysticism”. It seems clear that Abulafia was the founder of the tradition that later became known as Practical Kabbalah. On page 143 of *Major Trends In Jewish Mysticism*, Scholem observes that Abulafia specifically contrasted his system with what he called “The Path of the Sefiroth”, declaring that his method was “The Path of the Names”. It entailed meditation, breathing exercises and other practices which Scholem describes as a “Judaized version” of Yoga. The purpose of his system was, in Abulafia’s words, cited by Scholem on page 131, “to unseal the soul, to untie the knots which bind it”. Scholem also cites Abulafia, on page 130, as follows:

He who gains the deepest knowledge of the true essentials of reality - so he says in one place - at the same time acquires the deepest humility and modesty.

And in fact, Abulafia was a modest man whose teachings might easily have been forgotten were it not for his dramatic visit to Rome in 1280.

As it was, Abulafia’s example served to crystallize a belief in Kabbalistic circles that it might prove possible to “force the end” by magical or mystical techniques. Belief in the efficacy of such techniques became an unspoken article of faith among Kabbalists. In *Joseph Caro*, R.J. Zevi Werblowsky brings out that Joseph Caro, the leading light of orthodox Judaism in the 16th century, was not only a Kabbalist but an ardent practitioner of Practical Kabbalah. Caro was the author of a diary, known as the *Sefer ha-Maggid*, which he claimed was dictated through him by a “Maggid”, an angelic being who took possession of him from time to time. With reference to the methods used by the Kabbalists of Caro’s day to achieve such results, Werblowsky states on page 48:

The kabbalistic methods are frankly magical in the sense that they assume ‘scientific’, albeit esoteric, causal laws regulating our connexions with the ‘higher’ spheres.

But the purpose of these methods remained overwhelmingly the accomplishment of the Messianic goals of the Kabbalists. Caro himself settled in the land of Israel in 1536, where he played a major role in building up the Kabbalist community in Safed.

Caro is now remembered mainly as the author of the *Shulchan Aruch*, which the *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Judaica* describes in its entry under Joseph Caro as “the basis of Jewish law today”. Impeccably orthodox in his religious practices and teachings, Caro was involved in an attempt by the Kabbalists of Safed in the 1530s to gain the right to ordain all future Jewish rabbis as part of their effort to build up a Messianic center in Safed. The claims of the Kabbalists of Safed were eventually rejected, but Caro remained in Safed until his death in 1575, promoting Kabbalist settlement there. Like most of the other settlers, Caro was a refugee from Spain (or possibly Portugal), where he had been born in 1488. Commenting on the effects of the expulsion from Spain on the Kabbalists, Werblowsky states on page 94:

Under the impact of the events, kabbalism, hitherto the esoteric preoccupation of a spiritual aristocracy, developed new forms in which it became the dominant pattern of popular religiosity. Messianic expectations suddenly sprang to life and in combination with the new Kabbalah created a ‘universe of discourse’ in which extreme halakhic piety, ascetic mysticism, and a mystico-magical discipline for hastening the advent of redemption merged.

The “new Kabbalah” to which Werblowsky refers was based on the teachings of Yitzhak Loria, who arrived in Safed in 1569.

Loria was a charismatic personality, who wrote little but whose teachings were eventually disseminated by his disciples in Safed throughout the Jewish world. His version of Kabbalah, often described as “Lurianic Kabbalah”, pictured the coming of the Messiah as a long cosmic process in which each individual Jew had an important role to play in hastening the advent of redemption. Loria himself clearly had Messianic ambitions but hesitated to declare himself openly. His characteristic stance is reflected in an anecdote described on page 14 of *Legends of Safed* by Dov Silverman. Shortly before sunset on the eve of the Sabbath, Loria was standing in silence on a hill in Safed with his followers, called “cubs”, meaning lion cubs, because Loria was known as the “Lion of the Kabbalah”. Finally he spoke:

He called to his cubs, ‘Come follow me to Jerusalem. We will greet the Sabbath there.’

As he stepped forward, all were prepared to follow but one, who called out, ‘How can we be there in time when it is only a few minutes to the Sabbath?’

The great man stopped. The golden aura faded, and the sky purpled in darkness. ‘Had we all been of one mind and one will we could have been in Jerusalem in time, and the Messiah would have been with us.’

Surrounded by Messianic expectations, believed to wield all kinds of magical powers, Loria finally broke under the strain and died suddenly of a fever in 1572. His death coincided with an Arab attack on the Kabbalist community in Tiberias, and from the 1570s onwards Kabbalist settlement in the land of Israel proceeded at a somewhat slower pace.

The culmination of the underground history of Practical Kabbalah as a Messianic technique was reached in the attempt of Shabtai Tsvi to force the Turkish sultan to permit the Jews to return to the land of Israel. There can be little doubt that both Shabtai Tsvi and his followers were firmly convinced that Shabtai Tsvi would somehow impose his will upon the sultan through his command of Practical Kabbalah. When events led to the direct opposite result, faith in Practical Kabbalah suffered a shattering blow. From the beginning, this faith had been nurtured by the lack of a realistic alternative. Kabbalah was essentially a movement of rabbis and scholars, whose goal was to gain control of a specific territory, a goal which ultimately implied the use of armed force. This force the Kabbalists simply did not possess, and faced with a choice between abandoning their goal or believing in magic, they chose to believe in magic. To their credit, they had the courage to test this belief in practice, knowing full well the risks they were running. Caro’s diary is filled with apprehensions that he would be burnt at the stake for his Messianic convictions. He nonetheless persevered, but after the shocking collapse of the movement led by Shabtai Tsvi, Practical Kabbalah had to be regarded as an experiment that had failed.

Its legacy to the world was the legend of the Golem. In *Golem*, Moshe Idel brings out that the first extensive discussion of the concept of a Golem in rabbinical literature appears in the writings of Abraham Abulafia. A Golem was a humanoid creature who was supposed to be shaped from clay or earth and brought to life by magical means. In the Talmud there is a passage to the effect that a certain rabbi named Rava had created a man out of clay; according to the Talmud, cited by Idel on page 27, this was supposed to be proof that: “If the righteous wished, they could create a world.” Abulafia seized on this story and initiated a long discussion in Kabbalistic circles as to just how a Golem could be created and what the consequences might be. The

Kabbalists became convinced that creation of a Golem was possible, or as Idel puts it on page 242:

Though there were several versions regarding the precise manner to create the Golem by means of combinations of letters, there is no evidence for views that considered these techniques to be fruitless attempts; even sceptical attitudes with respect to the effectiveness of these techniques are not extant.

The idea that the Golem could be created by combining certain Hebrew letters was based on Abulafia's "Path of the Names", which entailed the use of various divine names in Hebrew for magical purposes.

In its final form, which did not take shape until the 18th or 19th century, the legend of the Golem came to center around the 16th century rabbi Loew of Prague, who was said to have created a Golem who subsequently worked for him. In this version of the story, the Golem eventually became a kind of Messianic figure who aided the rabbi in his efforts to thwart attacks on the Jewish community of Prague by local anti-Semites. The legend of the Golem of Prague also inspired a number of non-Jewish literary efforts, including the story of Frankenstein. Somewhere at the heart of this entire tradition was a kind of suppressed awareness on the part of the Kabbalists that if they wished to realize their Messianic goals, they would indeed require the services of a Golem, a powerful figure who would be able to translate their ideals into physical reality. It was no doubt this suppressed awareness which accounted in part for the sympathetic response accorded Jacob Frank in Sabbatian circles. The Golem became a kind of symbol of the physical force which the Kabbalists themselves lacked but whose necessity they were eventually compelled to recognize. Ultimately, in modern times, this realization would translate itself into the appearance of the first armed Jews on the soil of the land of Israel.

Theoretical Kabbalah

But in order to fully appreciate the impact of Kabbalah on modern Jewish radicalism, it is necessary to venture into the world of Theoretical Kabbalah. Although it had definite political implications, Kabbalah was always first and foremost an intellectual system whose main appeal was to rabbis, scholars and educated people generally. Little known outside the Jewish world, this system shaped Jewish thought for many centuries, and it would be surprising if it did not leave at least some trace on the thought patterns and mental attitudes of later, secular Jews.

As an intellectual system, Kabbalah was centered around the idea that the visible universe was an emanation of divinity. Gradually the doctrine of the 10 Sefirot became the standard way of expressing this concept, but however it was expressed, the point of Kabbalah as an intellectual system was to assert the identity of spirit and matter. In conscious opposition to the theologians who asserted that God had created the universe "out of nothing", the Kabbalists maintained that creation had taken place by a process of emanation of light or energy, which gradually condensed into matter.

In the *Zohar*, this process is depicted without any reference to the Sefirot. "Spirit" simply developed a series of increasingly dense "coverings" or "shells", described as follows on page 84 of Volume 1:

The whole world is constructed on this principle, upper and lower, from the first mystic point up to the furthest removed of all the stages. They are all coverings one to another, brain within brain and spirit within spirit, so that one is a shell to another.

In Luzzatto's *General Principles of the Kabbalah*, on the other hand, this same process is depicted in terms of the Sefirot, as in the following passage, from page 5:

The ten *Sefirot* are united with the Creator Himself, just as the flame is annexed to the live coal. Although manifold hues are visible in the flame, close examination reveals that there is but one flame attached to the coal. So it is with the *Sefirot*, they are irrevocably bound to the Creator and cannot be severed from Him. He is en clothed in them, as in garments.

This metaphor of the universe as the "garment" of divinity appears in many Kabbalistic works. Typical metaphors for divinity include "light", "fire" and "brightness".

So much emphasis has been placed on the "mystical" and "theosophical" bent of Kabbalah that it is easy to overlook the fact that the Kabbalistic doctrine of the unity of matter and energy has a surprisingly modern ring. Most scientists today are convinced that our planet originated as a piece of the sun that broke off and cooled in orbit, giving rise to the familiar world of earth, water and air in which we live. Indeed, were it not

for the religious “garment” in which Kabbalah is enclosed, it might well be argued that the underlying spirit of Kabbalah as an intellectual system is scientific and empirical. Is this a coincidence?

Scholem thought not. In a cryptic aphorism appearing on page 100 of Harold Bloom’s anthology, *Gershom Scholem*, Scholem argued that “the conception of the Kabbalists as mystical materialists with a dialectical tendency would certainly be thoroughly unhistorical, yet anything but meaningless”. And on page 88 of *Kabbalah*, Scholem brought out that the Kabbalistic term for divinity, “Ein Sof” or “Infinite”, was a “neutral impersonal concept” that could also be used as an expression for the visible universe itself. As Scholem put it: “At first it was not clear whether the term *Ein-Sof* referred to ‘Him who has no end’ or to ‘that which has no end’.” Nor could it be clear, because according to the Kabbalists divinity and the visible universe were ultimately one and the same thing. In order to translate this view into “materialist” terms, it is merely necessary to eliminate the concept of divinity and replace it with the very expressions which the Kabbalists used as metaphors for divinity, fire, light or energy.

From where did the Kabbalists derive their concept of the underlying unity of spirit and matter? To some extent no doubt from other “mystical” systems, particularly Sufism, with whose teachings the Spanish Kabbalists were familiar through their contacts with Muslim theologians in Spain. But a strong case could be made, and was made by the Kabbalists themselves, that their view of divinity was rooted in orthodox Judaism and in particular in the traditional holy name, YHWH, which the Kabbalists understood as a code word for the expression, “Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh”, “I am that I am”. “Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh” is the response which Moses receives when he asks for the name of God in Chapter 3 of the book of *Exodus*. As interpreted by the Kabbalists, the expression “Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh” came to be seen as an assertion of the identity of divinity and the material universe. For example, we read on page 56 of Volume 5 of the *Zohar*:

R. Eleazar then asked his father to explain to him the name, EHYEH ASHER EHYEH (I am that I am). He said “This name is all comprehensive. The first *Ehyeh* (I shall be) is the comprehensive framework of all when the paths are still obscure, and not yet marked out, and all is still undisclosed. When a beginning has been made and the Stream has started on its course, then it is called *Asher Ehyeh* (That which I shall be), meaning: Now I am ready to draw forth into being and create all, now I am the sum total of all individual things. ‘That I am’: to wit, the Mother is pregnant and is ready to produce individual things and to reveal the supreme Name.”

Under the guise of an explication of the traditional holy name, this passage not only equates divinity with “the sum total of all individual things” but introduces an entirely new character, “the Mother”, as yet another aspect of divinity. In the eyes of the Kabbalists, however, all these innovations were seen as authentic expressions of the real old time religion of the Torah, which had been preserved intact by the school of Shimon bar Yochai.

The Kabbalists adopted this position in conscious opposition to the school of Maimonides, which was becoming increasingly popular in orthodox Jewish circles during the 13th century. Maimonides and his followers are often characterized as “rationalists” because they drew on the works of the pagan philosopher Aristotle in order to concoct so-called rational proofs of the existence of God. But the favorite “proof” of the Aristotelians, that the universe must have been created by someone for how else could it have come into existence, hardly deserves the title of “rational”. Why could not the universe be infinite in time and space, just as it appears to be? Under the guise of “rationalism”, the Aristotelians were actually pushing a strongly theistic conception of religion, which the Kabbalists stubbornly opposed in the name of “tradition”.

Kabbalah means tradition, or more precisely, something which has been received from the past. In their controversy with the Aristotelians, the Kabbalists assumed the stance of traditionalists, the better to depict the followers of Maimonides as reckless innovators who were bringing alien conceptions into Judaism. This stance was no doubt sincere to a large extent, yet it could not have been entirely so. Moses de Leon, for one, had to be well aware that it was he and not Shimon bar Yochai who was the real author of the crypto-materialist doctrines contained in the *Zohar*. Just as the Aristotelians cloaked their theism in a “rationalist” package, so the Kabbalists concealed their anti-theism in a “traditionalist” package. Their hidden opposition to theism was expressed not only in their tendency to identify divinity with the visible universe but also in a number of other ways.

For one thing, the Kabbalists frequently described divinity as female as well as male. The use of the expression, “the Mother is pregnant”, as a metaphor for creation is only one example out of many of this practice. The Hebrew word “Shekinah”, which originated as a term for the tangible presence of divinity

on earth, eventually became personified in Kabbalah as a kind of female deity who was thought to have accompanied the Jewish people into exile. The 10 Sephirot too were divided equally into male and female entities, and all kinds of complicated theories were developed on the basis of this distinction. To some extent, this practice was rooted in Hebrew grammar: all nouns in Hebrew are either male or female, and for the most part the Kabbalists regarded as female those entities which were described by female nouns. But the Kabbalists carried this practice far beyond the point required by grammar, endowing even male nouns such as “Shabbat” (Sabbath) with female characteristics and titles such as “Princess Sabbath” and “Queen Sabbath”. Moreover, they explicitly described divinity as a “Mother” as well as a “Father”, making very clear their discomfort with the traditional theist conception of divinity as a supreme “He”.

For another thing, the Kabbalists also tended to see divinity as expressed in evil as well as good. In sharp contrast to the traditional theist view of spirit as good and matter as at least potentially evil, the Kabbalists viewed both good and evil as dialectically intertwined. For example, on page 35 of Alan Unterman’s anthology, *The Wisdom of the Jewish Mystics*, there appears the following passage:

The Zohar teaches: At the time when the Holy One created the world and wanted to reveal deep matters from their hidden recesses, and light from within darkness, they were intertwined with one another. Because of this, that out of darkness came light and from out of the hidden recesses were revealed deep matters, that one came from the other, it also is the other way round: out of the good emerges evil, and out of love emerges strict justice, since they are intertwined.

In general, the Kabbalists did not hesitate to attribute the existence of evil in the world to the will of the “Holy One”, whose capacity for destruction was routinely described as embodied in the attributes of the “Left side”. This view could be regarded as a logical outgrowth of the doctrine of the identity of spirit and matter, or it could also be regarded as a subtle way of challenging the traditional theist conception of a benevolent Creator ruling over a far from benevolent universe.

Whatever the conscious intentions of the Kabbalists may have been, the cumulative effect of their teachings was to transform the traditional theist view of divinity as a supreme and benevolent He into little more than an empty shell. The Kabbalists never challenged this view directly, yet the whole tendency of their doctrine was to substitute for it a very different view of divinity as the energizing force of an infinite universe whose governing principles were essentially dialectical in nature. Matter and energy, good and evil, male and female complemented, opposed and interacted with one another in Kabbalah not according to the arbitrary will of a “Supreme Being” but in line with a quasi-scientific, quasi-mythical conception of how the universe was actually structured. From this mental universe to Marx’s doctrine of “dialectical materialism” was but a step, and in some ways not a very large step either.

Dialectics

In 1843, right around the time that Karl Marx was developing his theory of dialectical materialism, a French scholar of Jewish origin named Adolphe Franck published a book in Paris entitled *The Kabbalah*. Franck’s book was the first reasonably accurate treatment of Kabbalah in a European language, and it contained a number of insights worth repeating even today.

Unlike the occultists, Franck was very conscious of the radical implications of Kabbalah. He argued on page 117 that the Kabbalists “made use of the dogma of Creation to teach the contrary” and “made use of the words of the scriptural text to raise themselves above the divine word and religious authority”. On page 140, he added:

By taking all the facts and words of Scripture as symbols, the Kabbalah teaches man to have confidence in himself; it substitutes reason for authority and creates a philosophy in the very bosom and under the protection of religion.

And again, on page 149, he characterized Kabbalah as “a philosophy which, springing from the bosom of an eminently religious people, dares not own up to its own audacity, and for its own peace of mind seeks refuge in authority.” Franck viewed Kabbalah as a concealed radical “philosophy” whose central tenet was the identity of “Absolute Being and visible nature”.

Having identified Kabbalah as a “philosophy”, Franck then proceeded to comment on its resemblance to the teachings of the German philosopher Hegel. As he put it on page 77:

Far be it from us to pretend to discover among the ancient Hebrews the philosophical doctrine which practically dominates Germany today; but we maintain, and hope to demonstrate, that the principle of that doctrine, and even the expressions appropriated by the school of Hegel, are to be found in the forgotten traditions we are endeavoring to bring to light.

And Franck went on to point out a number of parallels between Kabbalah and Hegelian philosophy, concluding on page 99, with reference to the Kabbalists: “They taught a doctrine very similar to that which the metaphysicians of Germany now regard as the glory of our time.”

Franck’s perception of a resemblance between Kabbalah and Hegelian philosophy is particularly significant because Marx always maintained that his philosophy of “dialectical materialism” was based on Hegel. Over and over again, Marx and the Marxists explained that Marx had “stood Hegel on his head” and transformed his dialectical idealism into dialectical materialism. There exists a large literature, much of it by Jewish Marxists, on the famous “transition from Hegel to Marx”. Yet although Franck in 1843 saw Hegel’s philosophy and Kabbalah as virtually identical, Kabbalah is hardly ever even mentioned in the literature on the origins of Marxism. This oversight is all the more striking in view of the fact that Marx was a descendant of a long line of rabbis on both sides of his family. Are we really to believe that Marx had to learn dialectics from Hegel, who in turn independently invented a dialectical philosophy which by sheer coincidence bore a striking resemblance to the doctrines which Marx’s ancestors had studied for hundreds of years? Certain essential details seem to be missing from this story, which has nonetheless been repeated so often in Marxist literature as to acquire the character of a sacred creed.

How much Hegel knew about Kabbalah is today difficult to ascertain, but there can be no doubt that he was influenced by it indirectly through his study of the works of Spinoza. Spinoza was a 17th century Jewish philosopher who wrote in Latin and exercised a considerable influence on the development of 18th and early 19th century European philosophy. From Kabbalah, Spinoza derived the idea of the identity of divinity and the visible universe, an idea which became the main thesis of his philosophy. In *Marxism and Hegel*, Lucio Colletti brings out that Spinoza was Hegel’s favorite philosopher. On page 28, Colletti cites Hegel praising Spinoza in his characteristic convoluted style: “The fact is that Spinoza is made a testing-pointing in modern philosophy, so that it may really be said: You are either a Spinozist or not a philosopher at all.” And on page 30, Colletti cites the following summary of Spinoza’s teachings by Hegel: “Spinoza maintains that there is no such thing as what is known as the world; it is merely a form of God, and in and for itself it is nothing.” Literally dozens of similar statements could easily be culled from Kabbalist literature.

Hegel’s admiration for Spinoza developed in the context of a general fascination with “Enlightened” Jewish thought on the part of late 18th and early 19th century German intellectuals. Kant, Hegel’s predecessor as the leading philosopher of Germany, was greatly taken with the work of Moses Mendelssohn. In a letter to Mendelssohn, cited on page 23 of Nathan Rotenstreich’s *Jews and German Philosophy*, Kant brought out some of the reasons for this attitude:

You have managed to unite with your religion a degree of freedom of thought that one would hardly have thought possible and of which no other religion can boast. You have at the same time thoroughly and clearly shown it necessary that every religion have unrestricted freedom of thought, so that finally even the church will have to consider how to rid itself of everything that burdens and oppresses man’s conscience, and mankind will finally be united with regard to the essential point of religion.

Probably neither Kant nor Hegel was aware to what extent the “freedom of thought” manifested by “Enlightened” Jewish philosophers like Spinoza or Mendelssohn was rooted in the hidden radicalism of Kabbalah. All the same they were attracted to this freedom and quietly drew on “Enlightened” Jewish sources for many of their own doctrines and theories.

Yet at the same time, intellectuals like Kant or Hegel had little or no desire to publicly challenge the massive anti-Semitism which had been a permanent feature of German culture since the early Middle Ages. To the contrary, they took great pains to make sure that everyone understood that their admiration for “Enlightened” Jewish thought did not prevent them from adopting an attitude of contempt towards the Jewish people as a whole. Rotenstreich, on page 50 of another of his books, *The Recurring Pattern*, cites the following remarks by Hegel on the subject of Jesus and the Jews:

The Jewish multitude was bound to wreck his attempt to give them the consciousness of something divine, for faith in something divine, something great, cannot make its home in a dunghill. The lion has no room in a nest, the infinite spirit none in the prison

of a Jewish soul, the whole of life none in a withering leaf.

Given this stance, it was unthinkable for someone like Hegel to exhibit an excessive familiarity with Kabbalah. Kabbalah was not considered “Enlightened”; it was associated with the despised Hasidim of Eastern Europe and viewed with horror even by “Enlightened” Jews like Mendelssohn. Above all, Kabbalah was known to be linked to Frankism, to the point where Frank was often called a “Kabbalist” in contemporary descriptions of his movement. Franck, on page 193 of *The Kabbalah*, described Frank as follows:

In more recent times, toward the end of the eighteenth century, another Kabbalist, the Polish Jew Jacob Frank, passed into the bosom of Catholicism with several thousand of his adherents, after founding the sect of the Zoharites.

If Hegel did know something about Kabbalah, therefore, he was not likely to reveal it, nor to admit to what extent his own philosophy resembled it.

When Marx “stood Hegel on his head”, what he essentially did was to bring out the radical implications which had been present all along in the intellectual tradition rooted in Kabbalah and developed in “Enlightened” form by Spinoza and Hegel. It is highly unlikely that Marx was totally unaware of the real source of his radical mode of thought. For one thing, the hidden materialist bent of Kabbalah had already been discussed by a number of European Jewish writers, including Franck in 1843 and also Solomon Maimon back in 1793. On page 39 of *An Autobiography*, Maimon revealed that as a youth in Poland he had studied Kabbalah day and night “till I believed that I had mastered the whole of the Kabbalah”. He continued as follows on page 40:

Unsatisfied with the literary knowledge of the science, I sought to penetrate into its spirit; and as I perceived that the whole science, if it deserves to be called such, can contain nothing but the secrets of nature concealed in fables and allegories, I labored to discover these secrets, and so raise my merely literary knowledge to a rational knowledge.

Maimon went on to suggest that it was precisely his study of Kabbalah which first inspired him with a desire to learn more about European science and thus set him on the road to “Enlightenment”. But Marx, as a nominal Christian and avowed disciple of Hegel, could not be so candid concerning Kabbalah, which in any case was undoubtedly far less familiar to him than it was to Maimon. Yet however limited his sources of information on Kabbalah, they must have nonetheless been more extensive than the total silence which he maintained on the subject in his published writings.

Marx’s theory of dialectical materialism was expressed in the form of three “laws”: the identity and mutual interpenetration of opposites, the transformation of quantity into quality, and the negation of the negation. The first of these “laws”, that of the identity and mutual interpenetration of opposites, could easily serve as a summary of Kabbalist doctrine. The Kabbalist universe was constructed of opposites - spirit and matter, good and evil, male and female, even left and right - whose identity and interpenetration was the main topic of Kabbalist discourse. Consider for example the following passage, from page 178 of Volume 3 of the *Zohar*:

Just as man was divided physically, in order that he should receive a wife and both together form one body, so the Right Hand was divided, as it were, in order that it might take unto itself the Left and both become one, and therefore it is that God smites and heals with one and the same Hand.

Similar illustrations of Marx’s other “laws” of dialectics could also be found in Kabbalist literature. Dialectics was the hallmark of Kabbalah, and whether Marx knew this or not, it cannot have been a complete coincidence that his own thought patterns should have so closely resembled those of his ancestors.

Dialectics has also proved a typical feature of modern Jewish radical thought in general. Einstein’s thought was also dialectical, as was Freud’s. More often than not, it was precisely the dialectical cast of their thought which created that aura of brilliance that surrounded famous Jewish radical intellectuals. This cult of brilliance too had its roots in Kabbalah, and specifically in the *Zohar*: “Zohar” means “Brilliance”. However reflected or distorted, the light of Kabbalah has suffused modern Jewish thought to an extent that is only now beginning to be recognized.

Science

When Solomon Maimon back in 1793 had to describe Kabbalah in the language of European thought, he decided to call it a “science”, adding only the qualifying phrase, “if it deserves to be called such”. And when Karl Marx developed the doctrine of dialectical materialism, he too called it a “science”. Einstein and Freud also viewed themselves as scientists, and Einstein for one has been acclaimed as a great scientist by almost the entire scientific world. All this raises the question: to what extent is the universe in fact composed of identical and interpenetrating opposites?

A long line of Marxist writers, beginning with Engels in *The Dialectics of Nature*, have attempted to prove the scientific validity of Marx’s “laws” of dialectics. It cannot be said in retrospect that they have succeeded. The “laws” of dialectics are similar to the ancient Greek doctrine that the universe was composed of fire, water, earth and air. Everything in the universe can in fact be defined as consisting of at least one of these four “elements”, but having said this, we still know no more than we did before. Likewise, any number of natural phenomena can be described as illustrating one of Marx’s dialectical “laws”, but this still does not enable us to understand these phenomena any better than we did before. Heat and cold, positive and negative, matter and energy can be described as opposites, but they can equally well be described as distant points on a single continuum. The important point is what results flow from a given description; and the results of Marx’s dialectical “laws”, in the form of actual scientific discoveries, have been almost nil.

Yet on the other hand, as Einstein showed, dialectical thought can have significant scientific implications. The universe may or may not be composed of opposites, but insofar as opposites do exist, it makes good sense to understand them dialectically. Understanding opposites dialectically means understanding them as part of some larger whole, rather than as entirely separate and distinct. Good and evil, for example, in traditional theist thought were always viewed as completely different qualities. Good came from God and the spirit; evil came from the Devil and the flesh. The Kabbalists went to great lengths to break down these distinctions and to subsume both good and evil under some larger heading, which ultimately boiled down to “Ein Sof” or “Infinite”.

Recognition of the universe as infinite in time and space is the fundamental point of contact between the “science” of Kabbalah and modern secular thought. It should make no difference whether infinity is experienced “mystically” or understood “scientifically”: it is still infinity either way. But most so-called “mystics”, including the Kabbalists, could not resist the temptation to identify infinity with an imaginary entity, called by some name such as God, who was alleged to be in charge of the universe. And so long as belief in God was required, under pain of death, by the kingdoms and empires of the pre-modern world, Kabbalistic “science” necessarily had to be packaged in a religious format. Only with the advent of the American and French Revolutions of the late 18th century did it become possible to dispense with this format and attempt to portray the universe just as it is. But old habits die hard. In place of a science in a religious format, the early Jewish radicals of the 19th century ended by creating a religion in a scientific format.

Chapter Three: Social

Probably the last Jewish radical to emerge directly out of the world of Kabbalah was Nachman of Bratslav. Born in 1772, Nachman was a great grandson of Israel ben Eliezer, the founder of the Hasidic movement. A restless soul, Nachman left his family in 1798 to travel to the land of Israel, where he visited the very cave where Shimon bar Yochai was said to have hidden from the Romans. He returned to Europe in 1799 filled with Messianic hopes.

For the next 11 years, until his death in 1810, Nachman groped for a path which continually eluded him. He built up a following among Hasidic Jews in the Ukraine but was too restless and demanding to establish himself as a “Rebbe” with a sumptuous “court” as other Hasidic “masters” were doing at this time. His teachings stressed the need for asceticism and self-denial, to the point where he undermined his own health and probably contributed to his early death. Strictly orthodox in his beliefs, he nonetheless sought out the company of Jewish Sabbatians and free-thinkers in order to engage them in debate. He became a skilled story teller, whose wildly imaginative fables were later circulated in written form. Defeated in his Messianic hopes, he eventually emerged as a kind of folk hero in Jewish Eastern Europe, a tribute to the deep sympathy for the Jewish people which is expressed in his stories and sayings.

Typical of his teachings is the following statement, which appears on page 247 of Nathan of Nemirov’s anthology, *Rabbi Nachman’s Wisdom*:

This is how you must love your fellow man. You should want him to attain his true goal in life as ordained by G-d’s goodness.

This is true Jewish love.

But Nachman himself was unable to attain his goals, and he had no successor. From his time onwards, those Jews who were as alienated from conventional Jewish society as he was no longer had sufficient faith in orthodox Judaism to express their alienation in religious terms. They became free-thinkers, secularists, atheists - the very type of people to whom Nachman of Bratslav had been attracted in his later years and with whom he had spent a large part of his time.

During the 1830s and 1840s, people of this type became sufficiently numerous, particularly in Western Europe, to give rise to the first overtly secular manifestations of Jewish radicalism. The hallmark of this new trend was the concept of social. Not only social as in socialism, but also social as in social studies, social work, socialization, sociology and all the other expressions of social consciousness which came to loom so large in modern Jewish thought. Whole academic departments and even entire schools staffed mainly by Jewish intellectuals have been built on this foundation. Even Junius Frey, when he had to write a tract for the Jacobins back in 1793, could think of no better title than *Philosophie sociale*. If there is any one concept that is central to every manifestation of modern Jewish radicalism, that concept is social.

Evidently the concept of social must have deep roots in Jewish tradition. One reason is probably because Judaism is based to such a large extent on the actual way of life of the ancient Hebrews. So much of Jewish tradition is bound up with remembering the laws, language, history and customs of the Hebrews that it comes naturally to Jews to think in social terms. At the same time, the ancient Hebrews also furnished modern Jewish radicals with a model of egalitarian social organization which made the concept of socialism appear familiar and reasonable. Moreover, the exigencies of survival in a hostile world forced Jews in every generation to be social minded, to place the needs of the group ahead of the needs of the individual. And this tendency was characteristic not only of later Jewish history but also of Hebrew society, so that social mindedness appeared both as a present day necessity and an ancient virtue. These were some of the factors which induced modern Jewish radicals from the very start to gravitate towards the concept of social.

There was, however, an additional reason why 19th century Jewish radicals seized on the word, “social”. There are, after all, any number of words, such as community, nation, people, class and so forth, through which the concept of group mindedness can be expressed. The word “social” was not just plucked out of the air; it was a word with a history, and it was this history which proved decisive in inducing modern Jewish radicals to adopt it as their banner.

The first people to use the word “social” in a way that had radical connotations were the 17th and 18th century European theorists of the “social contract”. According to these writers, such as Locke and Rousseau,

the existing European nations had come into being as a result of a primordial “social contract” between the European peoples and their respective kings. This doctrine was a thinly veiled rationalization for demanding a written constitution, and the term “social” therefore became associated with constitutionalism, democracy and the concept of human rights. This was particularly true in France, where Rousseau’s tract, *The Social Contract*, played a major role in preparing the political climate for the French Revolution of 1789. And it was in the name of constitutionalism, democracy and human rights that the leaders of the French Revolution, in 1791, formally voted to extend citizenship rights to Jews. During the era of the French Revolution, the concept of “social” thus became closely linked to a political camp that was known for, among other things, its support for “Jewish Emancipation”.

During this same era, however, the concept of “social” also underwent a certain metamorphosis. The theorists of the “social contract” had been primarily concerned with the political organization of society, but from the start they had realized that questions of political organization could not be entirely separated from questions of social organization. As time went on, as the French adopted one constitution after another, there was a definite tendency for issues of social organization to come to the fore and become the main content of political debate. Having begun by attempting to devise the perfect constitution, French political theorists gradually shifted over to devising the perfect society. This was the context in which the word “socialism” first came into vogue during the 1830s.

For the Jewish radicals of that era, the term “social” therefore recommended itself as an implicitly pro-Jewish but historically European way of expressing the traditional Jewish ideals of group mindedness and equality. The term also had an inherent meaning which made it preferable, from a Jewish point of view, to words like “nation”, “people” or “commune”, words which were also in vogue at that time in European radical circles. Nation, people and commune were all actual historic entities which in Europe had traditionally excluded and persecuted Jews. Social, on the other hand, went with “society”, which was a much more abstract and also inclusive concept. It was much easier to think of Jews as part of “society” than as members of a specific European nation, people or commune. The term “society” also had vaguely aristocratic connotations, as in “high society”, which were not necessarily unwelcome to many early Jewish radicals, as shown by the example of the Frankists. For all of these reasons, the concept of social quickly became a central theme in virtually every manifestation of modern Jewish radical thought.

Of all the variations on the theme of social, the one with the most powerful impact was undoubtedly the concept of socialism. As Marx said, it was one thing to theorize about society, quite another to set out to completely transform it. The question therefore naturally arises: what was the role of Jewish radicals in the origins of the concept of socialism? But this is a question which is rarely asked, because it is supposed to have already been answered.

According to the established view, the concept of socialism was the creation of a group of early 19th century social theorists known as “utopian socialists”. Centered in France, this group is usually said to include Fourier, Cabet, Proudhon, Saint-Simon, Owen and Louis Blanc. These people, none of whom were Jewish, are said to have been “utopians” because they believed in establishing model agricultural communes or industrial workshops which would demonstrate in practice the superiority of the socialist way of life. As a rule, these pilot projects proved short lived because they were rarely able to acquire good land or modern equipment. Eventually, utopian socialism therefore gave way to Marxism which was, depending on your point of view, either more scientific or more ruthless in its approach.

If this version of history is accurate, then the only Jewish radical who had anything to do with the origins of socialism was Marx. Prior to the rise of Marxism, socialism appears as the creation of a group of people who were not only non-Jewish but, to a certain extent, anti-Jewish. Many of the so-called utopian socialists, and Fourier and Proudhon in particular, made a big point of emphasizing their Christian sympathies and disdain for the Jews. It was a disciple of Fourier, Alphonse Toussenel, who was the author of one of the first anti-Semitic tracts of modern times, *Les Juifs rois de l’époque*, which appeared in 1845. For that matter Marx too, although of Jewish origin, was well known for his refusal to identify as Jewish in any way. Indeed, it was precisely the socialists of the 1840s, including Marx, who first began to introduce an anti-Semitic note into the literature of social theory, which had previously been so closely linked to the cause of “Jewish Emancipation”. So although it might be argued that Marx’s Jewish background did influence him to some degree, it would seem that socialism originated in Europe in an essentially non-Jewish or even anti-Jewish milieu.

To a surprising degree, this version of history is based on a little tract originally written by Marx’s friend

Engels as part of a book and later widely circulated in pamphlet form under the title, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*. Although later critics of Marxism may have questioned Engels' characterization of Marxism as "scientific socialism", they did not seriously take issue with his version of socialist history, according to which socialism had evolved from its "utopian" origins into a later, Marxist phase. In his bluff, hearty manner, Engels gave full credit to the "utopians" in *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* for having developed many of the concepts which Marx later reformulated in a more "scientific" manner. Engels' account sounds reasonable and objective, and so it is in many respects. Nonetheless, as a description of the origins of the European socialist movement it is grossly misleading, and what it conceals is precisely the role of Jewish radicals in France and Germany in the birth of socialism in Europe.

The Saint-Simonians

The concealed polemical thrust of *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* comes out most clearly in Engels' treatment of the figure of Saint-Simon. He is introduced on page 33 as one of the "three great Utopians", the others being Fourier and Owen. On page 36 we learn that he was "a son of the great French Revolution, at the outbreak of which he was not yet thirty". There follows a laudatory description of Saint-Simon's views, which Engels concludes on page 38 with the remark that in Saint-Simon "we find a comprehensive breadth of view, by virtue of which almost all the ideas of later socialists, that are not strictly economic, are found in him in embryo."

Nothing could be more misleading than this seemingly straightforward account. In the first place, Saint-Simon was not at all a "utopian socialist" in the same sense as Fourier or Owen. He did not advocate the establishment of model communes but rather hoped to promote his concept of the good society in much the same way as the later Marxists, by means of political propaganda and agitation. Moreover, to call him "a son of the great French Revolution" was almost a joke, for Saint-Simon in reality was a descendant of one of the oldest aristocratic families in France. Above all, Engels' account is misleading because it omits any mention whatsoever of the Saint-Simonians, who were far more radical and also more influential than Saint-Simon himself. It is for this reason that Engels tried to conceal Saint-Simon's class background, for otherwise he would have been forced to explain just how and why a jaded aristocrat could have given his name to the first socialist movement in European history.

As Frank Manuel brings out on page 9 of *The New World of Henri Saint-Simon*, Saint-Simon came from a French aristocratic family that traced its lineage all the way back to Charlemagne. Manuel questions this claim but states that Saint-Simon's family had become a prominent part of the French aristocracy by the 14th century at the latest. One of Saint-Simon's ancestors, the duc de Saint-Simon, was the author of a famous set of memoirs describing life at the court of the 17th century French monarch, Louis 14. The memoirs are famous because the duc de Saint-Simon actually managed to look down on the entourage of Louis 14, treating his pompous courtiers as just so many bourgeois upstarts. As for Henri Saint-Simon, he occupied himself during the era of the French Revolution mainly with high finance, emerging as "one of the great speculators of the revolutionary period", as Manuel characterizes him on page 33. He was imprisoned by the Jacobins in 1793 for his shady dealings but managed to escape execution and was released a year later after the fall of Robespierre. During this period, Saint-Simon was best known for his wild supper parties, described by contemporary observers paraphrased by Manuel on page 48 as follows:

They report that in his excesses he made a studied attempt to outstrip the famous regent and his cardinal, that he reproduced better than they the pagan saturnalia, the mysteries of the *Bonne-Mere*, and their imitations of the orgies of the ancients.

Such were the activities of this "son of the great French Revolution" throughout the revolutionary era itself.

With the advent of Napoleon, Saint-Simon fell on hard times. Out of favor with the Bonapartist regime, Saint-Simon found that he had frittered away his vast fortune and had no way of regaining it. For a time he was actually reduced to working for a living. It was at this point that Saint-Simon discovered the consolations of philosophy. He became a social theorist, and beginning in the early 1800s, a steady stream of discourses on the future of European society began to flow from his pen. Or from someone's pen, for Saint-Simon soon formed the practice of attracting bright young men with the magic of his name to act as his secretary and collaborator. One of these young men was Auguste Comte, later acclaimed as the founder of sociology, who became involved in a bitter public feud with Saint-Simon over who had stolen whose precious ideas.

Depressed by his feud with Comte, unable to win much of a following for his teachings, Saint-Simon tried to kill himself in 1823, but only succeeded in shooting out one of his eyes.

It was at this point in his life, when he was already in his early 60s and had little left to lose, that Saint-Simon took the bold step of accepting as his secretary and collaborator a young man from a wealthy Jewish family named Olinde Rodrigues. For someone from Saint-Simon's background to accept a Jew as a kind of partner was unheard of, but Saint-Simon had obviously reached the point where he no longer cared what others thought of him. Together with Rodrigues, Saint-Simon wrote his last book, a work entitled *Nouveau Christianisme*, "The New Christianity". It was completed in 1825, and almost immediately thereafter Saint-Simon died.

Manuel, on page 353, calls *Nouveau Christianisme* Saint-Simon's "dullest and most turgid work" but is forced to admit:

Unfortunately for his reputation as a theorist, his name has been identified with this work above all others. It is the one most frequently translated.

In fact, *Nouveau Christianisme* made Saint-Simon's reputation as a social theorist. Whatever their intrinsic merit, Saint-Simon's earlier works had been largely ignored by the French reading public. Only after his death did Saint-Simon become famous for anything other than his name, and the man who made him famous was Olinde Rodrigues. Not only did Rodrigues co-author Saint-Simon's best known book, but after Saint-Simon's death Rodrigues was primarily responsible for creating a kind of cult around his teachings. At Saint-Simon's funeral, Rodrigues stood up and made an impassioned speech, declaring that Saint-Simon had been a great man and those present would have to carry on his work. Many of the mourners at the funeral were friends of Rodrigues, and they agreed on the spot to start a periodical, *Le Producteur*, to disseminate Saint-Simon's teachings.

Something like half of the young men who joined with Rodrigues to found the Saint-Simonian movement were Jews. Among this number were Olinde's brother Eugene Rodrigues, the brothers Emile and Isaac Pereire, Gustave d'Eichthal, Leon Halevy and Felicien David. Although completely ignored by later historians of socialism in Europe, Jewish participation in the Saint-Simonian movement was so conspicuous at the time that it became the subject of malicious rumors and gossip. Zosa Szajkowski explores this topic in an article, "The Jewish Saint-Simonians and Socialist Antisemites in France", appearing in *Jewish Social Studies* in 1947. On page 38, Szajkowski states: "Various wits used to call the Saint-Simonians 'new Christians' or even 'new Jews'." Szajkowski goes on to describe a joke popular at the time:

A Frenchman wanted to open a store; his friend, however, tried to dissuade him from this plan, as the would-be shopkeeper did not have a Jewish partner. The former answered: 'Never mind, I have two Saint-Simonians'.

Szajkowski also reports, on page 49, the opinion of the French anti-Semite Edouard Drumont that the Saint-Simonian

movement "was merely an attempt on the part of the Jews to extricate themselves from their moral ghetto; since the Jews refused to adopt Christianity, they found it necessary to create the Saint-Simonist religion."

At the core of the movement launched by Rodrigues and his friends in 1825 were the ideas which Rodrigues and Saint-Simon had jointly set forth in *Nouveau Christianisme*. The main theme of this book and the idea which brought it instant notoriety was that the time had come to found a new religion to replace Christianity as the ethical basis of European society. This new religion would be founded on the principle that the main goal of social activity should be "to ameliorate as promptly and completely as possible the physical and moral existence of the most numerous class", as they put it on page 11 of the 1832 edition. This principle was repeated over and over throughout the book, to the point where it emerged as a political slogan. For later socialists, this principle became perhaps so self-evident that it did not have to be stated; but nonetheless, the urge to improve the lot of the masses certainly remained the primary motive behind all subsequent versions of socialist theory.

Where the Saint-Simonians differed most from later socialists was in their view that the implementation of this principle should be the work of a "church" rather than a political party. However, the entire basis of the Saint-Simonian "church" was supposed to be the principle of the amelioration of the lot of the masses. As they put it on page 21:

Those who must found the new Christianity and appoint themselves leaders of the new church, they are the men most capable of contributing by their labors to increasing the well being of the poorest class.

In his earlier works, Saint-Simon had set forth the view that the Europe of the future should be ruled by “producers”, by which he meant not so much industrial workers as industrialists, scientists and of course social theorists such as himself. The Saint-Simonians retained these earlier views but incorporated them into the framework of a self-styled “religion” oriented around an ethical imperative to improve the the lot of the poor. It was this ethical fervor which had been lacking in Saint-Simon’s earlier works and which gave the Saint-Simonian movement a much more radical tone than anything Saint-Simon had been associated with in his own lifetime.

For example, following the outbreak of the Revolution of 1830 in France, the Saint-Simonians issued a proclamation which they pasted up all over the walls of Paris. Its concluding lines, cited by Arthur Booth on page 117 of *Saint-Simon and Saint-Simonism*, were as follows:

Feudalism will be finally extinguished, when all the privileges of birth are, without exception, abolished, and when every one shall be placed according to his capacity and rewarded according to his works. And when this new religion shall have realized upon earth the reign of God, the reign of peace and of liberty, which the Christians have placed in heaven alone, then the Catholic Church will have lost its power, it will have ceased to exist.

There followed several years of feverish activity in which the Saint-Simonians made a conscious effort to recruit young workers to their cause. Booth describes some of their activities during this period on page 130:

But from the year 1830 the propaganda proceeded upon an increasing scale: they acquired the ‘Globe’ newspaper, which was very far from being commercially prosperous, and they distributed vast numbers of copies gratuitously; they hired a large hotel in Paris, in the Rue Monsigny, besides the various halls used for their lectures; they dispatched expensive missions to Belgium, and to various districts in France; they inundated the country with volumes of expositions and pamphlets, and finally they endeavoured to organize workmen into communities, and to employ them in industrial pursuits.

Whatever the Saint-Simonians may have called themselves, these were the activities of a socialist political party seeking to establish itself on a mass base in much the same manner as later Marxist parties.

However, the Saint-Simonians did take their self-definition as a religion seriously, to the ultimate detriment of their cause. As the movement grew, an internal split developed between the followers of Olinde Rodrigues and those of Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin, a young man from a Christian background who aspired to become the “Supreme Father” of the new religion. Rodrigues, it seems, had succeeded too well in using the name of religion to justify what amounted to radical political activities. For Enfantin and his supporters, religion meant religion, complete with ritual, hierarchy, special costumes and of course a “Supreme Father”, just like the Pope. Moreover, it was Enfantin’s view that the best way to transform society was to begin with relations between the sexes, an area in which he was inclined to specialize. As Booth puts it on page 155, with reference to the decision of Rodrigues to break with Enfantin in 1832:

The cause of his separation was the view the Pere Supreme entertained respecting women, which daily became more and more remarkable. Rodrigue was ready to admit great freedom for divorce in the event of ill-assorted unions, and to afford every facility for the formation of new engagements; but this was not sufficient to satisfy Enfantin. He denied that he advocated promiscuous relations, but, with every desire to be impartial, it is not easy to acquit him of the charge.

After the split with Rodrigues, Enfantin and his followers initiated a series of actions which brought the movement even greater publicity but also made it appear increasingly ridiculous.

Particularly notorious at the time was the search for the “Female Messiah”. Having declared himself the “Supreme Father” of the new religion, Enfantin came to feel the need for a “Female Messiah” to aid him in his work, and after some debate, it was decided that the “Female Messiah” had to be Jewish. Barrie Ratcliffe, in an article appearing in *Jewish Social Studies* in 1975, sees this decision as pro-Jewish and pro-feminist. Ratcliffe notes that the idea to search for a Jewish “Female Messiah” came from Gustave d’Eichthal, one of the Jewish Saint-Simonians who continued to support Enfantin after the split with Rodrigues. Ratcliffe states on page 129:

It was d'Eichthal who first put forward the notion that the female messiah would not be a gentile but a Jewess. And if he was in the forefront of those in the sect who advocated women's liberation, he was so partly because of his experience of Jewish family life, or so he claimed.

Whether Enfantin and his followers could really be described as advocates of "women's liberation" is open to question, but they certainly favored a more independent role for women in social relations, with particular emphasis on independence in sexual relations.

Early in 1833, 13 Saint-Simonians, including d'Eichthal, set sail for the Turkish empire in search of a suitable "Female Messiah" for Enfantin. Sebastien Charlety, on page 212 of *Histoire du Saint-Simonisme*, reproduces the text of a proclamation addressed "to Jewish women" which the Saint-Simonians carried with them on their talent hunt. It concluded as follows:

Daughter of Abraham, pure blood of David, realization of prophecy, arch of the definitive alliance, redeemer of women and workers, incorruptible source of glory and voluptuousness, tender Shulamith, beloved companion, holy spouse, appear, appear!

But she didn't appear, the Turkish authorities became increasingly suspicious and on orders from Enfantin the Saint-Simonian delegation "to Jewish women" finally gave up their search. Weakened by the internal split and by police repression in Paris, the Saint-Simonian movement proved unable to survive the atmosphere of ridicule in which it became engulfed after the failure of the search for the "Female Messiah". By 1835 it had collapsed; its members went their separate ways, some to fame and fortune, others to obscurity and defeat.

It is impossible not to notice the Frankist overtones of the tendency headed by Enfantin within the Saint-Simonian movement. Not only were the rumors of sexual promiscuity associated with Enfantin reminiscent of the Frankists, but Eva Frank had also been billed as a "Female Messiah". To some extent, this resemblance must have been deliberate, for the Saint-Simonians had to know something about the Frankists, whose members were still active among the Polish exiles in Paris during the 1830s. Indeed, it is tempting to speculate that Saint-Simon himself may have been influenced by the Frankists in the person of Junius Frey, who was in prison in Paris at the same time as Saint-Simon. Yet ironically, if there was a Jewish faction among the Saint-Simonians, it was the faction headed by Rodrigues, who tended to play down the religious and sexual side of the movement and to stress social and economic issues instead. Most of the Jewish Saint-Simonians broke with Enfantin around the same time as Rodrigues did, and it is very likely that the search for a Jewish "Female Messiah" was intended by Enfantin to compensate for the disappearance of a majority of the Jewish Saint-Simonians from his "church".

In one form or another, Jewish radicalism was clearly central to the Saint-Simonian movement. Even Saint-Simon had paid tribute to the Jewish Messianic tradition. On page 17 of *Nouveau Christianisme*, he and Rodrigues had declared:

The people of God, the one which received revelations before the appearance of Jesus, the one which is the most completely spread out across the entire surface of the globe, has always sensed that Christian doctrine, founded by the Fathers of the church, was incomplete; it has always proclaimed that there will arrive a great epoch, to which it has given the name of Messianic, an epoch in which religious doctrine will be presented in the most general possible form; that it will regulate equally the action of the temporal power and that of the spiritual power, and that then the human race will have but one religion and one organization.

It was but a step from these lines to the famous refrain of the Internationale, "and the International will be the human race". In a word, the hidden history of the Saint-Simonians reveals that European socialism in its origins had an overtly Messianic character, a character which it derived from the simple fact that a considerable percentage of its early leaders were Jewish.

The Jewish Saint-Simonians were for the most part idealistic young men from well-to-do Jewish families who were trying to find some entry into the closed world of French Christian society. Unable to win acceptance as Jews, they joined with like-minded radicals from Christian backgrounds to found a quasi-secular religion of humanity. The degree to which anti-Semitism was a factor in the origins of the Saint-Simonian movement is brought out by Barrie Ratcliffe in another article, "Some Jewish Problems in the Early Careers of Emile and Isaac Pereire", appearing in *Jewish Social Studies* in 1972. On page 205, Ratcliffe states:

It is interesting to note that d'Eichthal was later to claim that the persecution he had suffered because of his race was one reason - perhaps the main reason - why he joined the Saint-Simonian sect, and that persecution because of colour had encouraged Ismayl

Urbain, a Negro, to join too.

Feeling downtrodden themselves, despite their wealth, the Jewish Saint-Simonians found refuge in a great dream of raising up all the downtrodden to the status of equal members of the human race. This dream of equality was and is the great socialist dream, which the Saint-Simonians were the first to dream in a form that commanded widespread public attention.

What was later called “utopian socialism” by Engels was in large part an explicitly Christian response to the emergence of the Saint-Simonian movement. Only after the Saint-Simonians had popularized the concept of socialism did there emerge, in the late 1830s and 1840s, a significant socialist trend among avowedly Christian radicals. “Utopian socialism” was a clever term for this tendency, for of course the original author of the concept of “Utopia” was Thomas More, a defender of the Catholic church. In conscious opposition to the Saint-Simonians, the “utopian socialists” offered a path to socialism without class conflict or political agitation, a path which Marx and Engels rightly regarded as grossly unrealistic. But by the 1840s, there had also emerged a new form of Saint-Simonism, a form with which Marx and Engels were intimately familiar, for they themselves were first drawn to socialism by their participation in this new movement.

The Young Hegelians

Among the spectators at the public meetings which the Saint-Simonians organized in Paris in the early 1830s was a young German Jewish writer named Heinrich Heine. According to E.M. Butler on page 95 of *The Saint-Simonian Religion In Germany*, Heine had moved to Paris from Germany in 1831 with the specific intention of becoming involved with the Saint-Simonian movement. Butler points out that in later life Heine tried to conceal his Saint-Simonian past, but as Butler puts it on page 93:

Yet we know from his own casual allusions, as well from the testimony of eye-witnesses, that he was a constant attendant at the open meetings, at the *soirees*, and at the sermons. Although he was not a member in the strict sense of the word, he seems to have been more intimate with the leaders of the new church, with Enfantin, Rodrigues and Michel Chevalier who indeed remained his friend until death, than most of the visitors and spectators.

As late as 1845, long after the collapse of the Saint-Simonian movement, Heine still characterized Enfantin as “the foremost mind of the age”, according to Butler on page 113. And Jeffrey Sammons, on page 163 of *Heinrich Heine*, sees Heine as deriving from the Saint-Simonians his key ideas of “the replacement of repressive Christian doctrine by a humanistic pantheism and attention to the material suffering of mankind in consequence of archaic patterns of exploitation”.

Heine remained in Paris after the collapse of the Saint-Simonian movement because he could no longer adjust to the repressive atmosphere of Germany, where his works had been banned in 1835. Nonetheless, Heine continued to exercise a powerful influence on the development of radical thought in Germany both through his writings and through personal contacts with German intellectuals in Paris. Heine was the oldest member of an emerging group of German Jewish radicals of the mid-19th century which also included Moses Hess, Karl Marx and Ferdinand Lassalle. These people all knew each other, shared similar ideas and for a time formed part of the same movement. This movement reached its peak during the early 1840s and was generally known under the name, the Young Hegelians. The Young Hegelians closely resembled the Saint-Simonians in that they included both Jews and non-Jews, came from middle class backgrounds and sought to replace Christianity with a new humanist ideology. Although Engels said not a word about the Young Hegelians in *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, he could have described them very well, for he too participated in this movement.

The Young Hegelians did differ from the Saint-Simonians in certain respects. There was no equivalent in Germany to Paris as a political and cultural center, and therefore the Young Hegelians were not centered in any one place. They were probably strongest in Berlin but many of their leading lights lived elsewhere in Germany or, like Heine, in exile in Paris. Partly for this reason but mainly because political conditions in Germany were so repressive, they never reached the point of constituting themselves into a political party, much less a church, and always remained essentially a literary coterie. On the other hand, perhaps due to their separation from politics, they were much more radical and thoroughgoing in their critique of Christianity than the Saint-Simonians had been. Most of the Young Hegelians defined themselves as atheists or pantheists who

intended to replace Christianity not with another religion but with what they usually termed a “philosophy”. The main topic of their endless debates was the question of just what the precise content of this philosophy should be.

They called themselves Young Hegelians because it was Hegel who in Germany had popularized the idea that it was the destiny of philosophy to replace religion as the ethical basis of modern society. Hegel had put this idea across in such an abstract and conservative format that he became what amounted to the official philosopher of the Prussian court. Only after his death in 1831 did it occur to anyone that his teachings might have radical implications. According to Georg Lukacs, the 20th century Marxist scholar, it was Heine who was primarily responsible for developing the Young Hegelian tactic of invoking Hegel’s authority for radical purposes. Sammons, on page 76 of his biography of Heine, summarizes Lukacs’ views as follows:

In 1952 Georg Lukacs began what has become a series of quite elaborate efforts to present Heine as the historical intermediate term between Hegel and Marx. In this scheme Heine is seen as the quintessential Young Hegelian, operating the crucial disjunction of the progressive from the conservative elements in Hegel’s thought, and more than any of his contemporaries carrying them forward into a new radicality of dialectical analysis and revolutionary vision that anticipates and may possibly even have in some degree influenced the young Marx.

And on page 35 of *Heine*, Ritchie Robertson suggests that it was none other than Hegel himself who gave Heine the idea of giving Hegel’s teachings a radical twist. Heine had actually studied with the great Hegel in Berlin and was fond of telling stories about him:

And in one of his anecdotes about his acquaintance with Hegel, he relates how Hegel told him, with a strange smile, that the famous statement ‘Whatever exists is rational’ could also run: ‘What is rational must exist’. The revolutionary implications of this version - that the world must and will be changed in accordance with the demands of reason - did not dawn on Heine until much later.

To put it another way, Heine used the name of Hegel much as the Saint-Simonians had used the name of Saint-Simon, as a non-Jewish authority figure with impeccable conservative credentials whose teachings could be claimed as a basis for the radical views they wished to set forth.

During the late 1830s and early 1840s, this tactic was taken up by a number of German intellectuals, who collectively came to be known as the Young Hegelians. William Brazill in *The Young Hegelians* sees *The Life of Jesus* by David Friedrich Strauss and *The Essence of Christianity* by Ludwig Feuerbach as the two most important works produced by the Young Hegelians. Both of these books sought to debunk Christian doctrine as a necessary first step towards the development of the humanist philosophy in which all the Young Hegelians believed. But they could not agree on what humanism meant in practice, and by the mid-1840s they had begun to split into contending factions. One group, led by Hess and Marx, wanted to equate humanism with socialism, while another, which included most of the non-Jewish Young Hegelians, was opposed to this approach. Engels, who was non-Jewish, sided with Hess and Marx; according to rumors current at the time, he was also sleeping with Hess’s wife.

Although you could never guess it from *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, both Engels and Marx credited Moses Hess in the 1840s as the person who had first converted them to a socialist point of view. Hess, who was born in 1812, published in 1837 a book entitled *Holy History of Mankind* in which, as Shlomo Avineri notes on page 23 of *Moses Hess*, he “suggested for the first time in Germany a model of a socialist society”. On page 34, Avineri cites the following passage from *Holy History of Mankind*:

We maintain that the concept of the community of property expresses the concept of equality in its most precise and pure form. Wherever there exists common property in all goods, internal as well as external, wherever the treasures of society are open to all, and nothing is tied to any individual as his exclusive property - there and only there, does full equality exist.

These socialist views were clearly presented by Hess as the logical outgrowth of Jewish tradition. He published *Holy History of Mankind* under the ironic pseudonym, “A Young Spinozist”, and he concluded the book with a positive description of the ancient Hebrew state as the real model for the socialist “New Jerusalem” which he wished to found. In the very last paragraph, cited by Avineri on page 44, he wrote of the Jewish people:

This people has been destined from the beginning of time to conquer the world - not like Rome with its force of *arms*, but through

the inner virtue of its *spirit*.

In 1841, Hess also published another book, *The European Triarchy*, which Avineri characterizes on page 47 as “the foundation for the synthesis of German philosophy, French politics, and English economics which eventually became the theoretical foundation of Marxism.”

Why did Marx and Engels in their later published writings fail to acknowledge Moses Hess as their original mentor in socialist thought? In order to understand the peculiar manner in which Marx and Engels came to relate to Hess, it is necessary to recognize the profound impact of anti-Semitism in Germany on the Young Hegelian movement. Whereas “Jewish Emancipation” had been formally proclaimed in France in 1791, it was still being debated in Germany in the 1840s. German Jews were still under intense pressure to convert to Christianity, and the fact that both Heine and Marx had been baptized made them tend to lord it over Jews who were still Jews like Hess and Lassalle. Theoretically none of them believed in any religion, but in practice formal membership in the Christian community made a big difference. Jews were still barred from most professions in Germany unless they converted; as Heine said, conversion, however insincere, was still the “entry ticket” to European civilization. Under these circumstances, it was unthinkable for Marx or Engels to defer too much to Hess or to refrain from cracking jokes about the “communist rabbi”, which is what they called him in their private correspondence.

These tensions were further exacerbated by the publication of several anti-Semitic articles in the early 1840s by a Young Hegelian writer, Bruno Bauer. Bauer was a former Christian theologian who had turned violently against Christianity and written a book, *Christianity Exposed*, which was considered so inflammatory that it was seized by the German censors in 1843 and not published until 1927. Perhaps by way of compensation, Bauer then turned on the Jews; in particular, in an 1843 article entitled “The Jewish Question”, he argued that Jews should be denied civil rights in Germany unless they all agreed to become atheists. It was in response to this article by Bauer that Marx wrote his famous essay, *On The Jewish Question*, which appeared early in 1844.

Pressured by Bauer into taking a stand on the “Jewish question”, Marx tried to straddle the issue. He attacked Bauer’s position that the Jews should be denied civil rights, declaring that they were no different from the Christians. But the reason they were no different, according to Marx, was that under capitalism the Christians had become just like the Jews, greedy and commercially oriented. Only socialism could rid mankind of these undesirable characteristics. In order to fully appreciate this argument, it is necessary to realize that Marx’s father was a fairly wealthy man who supported his spendthrift son all through his student days with large sums of money, making it unnecessary for Marx to concern himself with financial matters in the manner Marx thought typical of the Jews. As a nominal Christian Marx had little contact with the German Jewish community, so that his image of the Jewish people was based mainly on Christian propaganda. Just how ill-informed he was is brought out by Saul Padover on page 169 of *Karl Marx*:

Marx’s slander of Jews as hagglers and money-men by nature was factually as well as theologically inaccurate, and reflected nearly total ignorance, possibly willful, of the lives and faith of the people from whom he descended. In his time, the vast majority of Europe’s Jews were neither capitalists nor merchants, but were poor, often pitifully exploited working people. Of the 10,000 Jews in Bavaria when ‘Zur Judenfrage’ was published, well over half made their living as craftsmen, on the land, or in some pursuit other than retail trade or the professions. In that same year, according to the historian Simon Dubnow, of some 5,000 Jews in two typical German cities, Breslau and Oppeln, only 20 percent lived by trade. Among the rest were 1,160 innkeepers; 669 mechanics, craftsmen, or artists; 625 domestic servants; 344 horse dealers; 270 doctors and teachers; 152 farmers; and 81 wage laborers. There were also 233 beggars and 484 inmates of poorhouses and infirmaries.

Marx ignored all this because his main purpose in *On The Jewish Question* was not to provide an accurate image of the Jewish people but merely to prove to the other Young Hegelians that he had no Jewish sympathies and therefore could not be considered a Jew.

Marx’s condemnation of the Jewish people in *On The Jewish Question* in 1844 was the moral equivalent of Frank’s endorsement of the Blood Libel back in 1759. Indeed, Marx’s action was if anything less excusable, for Frank was fighting for his life while Marx was just trying to advance his career. But in this he succeeded brilliantly, for the position he adopted in *On The Jewish Question* situated him right in the center of the emerging controversy between Jewish and anti-Semitic tendencies in the European socialist movement. Marx came out sounding like an anti-Semite, yet at the same time he had also condemned Bauer for his opposition to “Jewish Emancipation”. Both in Germany and later in Eastern Europe, the Marxist parties were generally

to adopt a similar position, endorsing civil rights for Jews while simultaneously projecting a negative image of Jewish culture and tradition. Marx had “solved the Jewish question”: he had invented a position that both Jewish and anti-Semitic socialists could live with.

At the same time, he had clearly separated himself from Hess and the other Jewish Young Hegelians. Much of what later came to be called Marxism was in its origins the shared ideology of the Young Hegelians in general and the Jewish Young Hegelians in particular. Marx’s dislike for Christianity, his socialism and communism, his dialectical philosophy, his great triarchical synthesis of German, French and English thought - all this grew out of the Young Hegelian milieu of the 1840s. But in large part because of the impact of German anti-Semitism on the Young Hegelians, Marx and his friend Engels began from the mid-1840s onwards to treat Marx’s version of Young Hegelian ideology as unique, while all other versions were denounced as sadly lacking in some essential thought. This tendency was further heightened by the disintegration of the Young Hegelian movement in the late 1840s and the failure of the German Revolution of 1848, which forced Marx and Engels into exile in England. By common consent, Marx and Engels began to treat the work of Marx as the creation of a genius, faithfully assisted by the correct thoughts of his loyal comrade Engels. Marx’s debt to Hess and the Young Hegelians was forgotten or denied, and in its place emerged that cult of the writings of Marx and Engels which came to be known as Marxism.

Marxism

Karl Marx was undoubtedly a dedicated revolutionary who devoted his entire life to the socialist cause and became the leader of the First International of European socialist organizations during the 1860s. Marx’s position within the First International provided a kind of objective confirmation of the exalted status which the Marxists claimed for his works. At the same time, Marx did everything in his power to set himself apart from the other leading socialists of his day by either attacking them bitterly or passing over their achievements in silence. Marx was not only a talented writer and scholar but also a skilled practical politician who was a master of tactical in-fighting and polemics within a socialist organizational framework. He utilized his considerable abilities both to advance the socialist movement and also to enhance his own personal position within it. It was this unusual combination of great dedication, great talent and great ambition which provided a basis for treating Marx as a unique genius and made it appear justified and plausible.

From Moses Hess, Marx took over the practice of identifying himself not only as a socialist but also as a communist. This term went back to the era of the French Revolution and the “Society of the Equals” led by Gracchus Babeuf in the 1790s. Babeuf and his followers had constantly used the expressions, “commune” and “in common”, to the point where they eventually became known as communists. Then as now, communism sounded even more radical than socialism because it was associated with the idea of an armed uprising and the seizure of power by force. Babeuf had planned such an uprising, as did his disciple Auguste Blanqui, far and away the best known “communist” during Marx’s lifetime. True to form, Marx had never a good word to say about Blanqui, but nonetheless by calling himself a communist he was tacitly siding with the Blanquists, who were known to favor the idea of a revolutionary dictatorship as the only realistic path to power. When the Blanquists did in fact help to initiate an armed uprising in Paris which resulted in the formation of the Paris Commune of 1871, Marx supported them in his capacity as leader of the First International. Throughout his career, Marx was thus identified not only with socialism but with a revolutionary form of socialism that explicitly endorsed the use of armed force as a means of establishing what Marx, speaking of the Paris Commune, was eventually to call “the dictatorship of the proletariat”.

In later Marxist literature, the term “Blanquism” was often used in a negative sense to refer to people who were always trying to stage uprisings and neglected the difficult task of organizing the masses. This usage was unjust, for the original Blanquists had devoted considerable attention to organizing workers, and factory workers in particular. In practice although not in theory, the Blanquists supplied Marx with a model of a revolutionary party on which he based most of his ideas of just what such a party should look like. Generalizing from the Blanquist experience, Marx saw the formation of such a party as a gradual process in which revolutionary intellectuals would organize workers, involve them in trade union activity and other struggles for immediate gains and eventually lay the groundwork for a mass uprising which would lead to the creation of a revolutionary dictatorship that would institute a socialist system. These ideas may or may not have been “scientific”, but they were not unrealistic; implemented over time, the Marxist strategy for

revolution had a real chance of success.

Whether or not it did in fact succeed depended to a large extent, as Marx realized, on the evolution of capitalist society. For a Marxist party to come to power in the way that Marx anticipated, capitalist society had to evolve in such a way that it created an ever larger working class without at the same time meeting any of the demands of the workers for democratic rights, economic benefits and political power. The major weakness of Marxism as an ideology is that from the 1850s onwards, Marx became increasingly obsessed with a desire to prove that capitalist society would indeed evolve in just this way. There was no real need to do this, for however capitalism evolved, the socialist demand for full equality would still retain its validity. But Marx was not only concerned with achieving socialism; he was also concerned with proving the superiority of his version of socialist theory over all others. Marx and Engels had stated over and over again that unlike other socialists, they were not moralists. They did not favor socialism because it was equitable, or so they claimed, but because it was inevitable. In order for socialism to be inevitable, capitalism had to be not only unjust but completely irrational, and therefore Marx devoted the greater part of the last 30 years of his life to proving something that simply wasn't so. In this manner was born *Das Kapital*, the Marxist equivalent of Kabbalah.

Available in English in 3 volumes published in Moscow in 1954, *Capital* undoubtedly contains many valid insights. Particularly compelling are the passages in which Marx tried to show that socialism was already inherent in capitalism, a theme which he had first developed in *The Communist Manifesto*. It would be hard to take issue with the following statement, from page 356 of Volume I:

The same bourgeois mind which praises division of labour in the workshop, life-long annexation of the labourer to a partial operation, and his complete subjection to capital, as being an organisation of labour that increases its productiveness - that same bourgeois mind denounces with equal vigour every conscious attempt to socially control and regulate the process of production, as an inroad upon such sacred things as the rights of property, freedom and unrestricted play for the bent of the individual capitalist. It is very characteristic that the enthusiastic apologists of the factory system have nothing more damning to urge against a general organisation of the labour of society, than that it would turn all society into one immense factory.

Just so. But as soon as Marx in *Capital* set out to prove that socialism was not only inherent in capitalism but an inevitable consequence of the immutable laws of capitalist development, he soon drifted off into a phantasy world no less abstract or complex than that of the Kabbalists from whom he was descended.

The Marxist equivalent of the doctrine of emanations was the famous "labor theory of value". This theory, whose "discovery", on page 74 of Volume 1, was said to mark "an epoch in the history of the development of the human race", was appropriated by Marx from David Ricardo, a British economist of Jewish descent. According to Marx, commodities did not merely have a price; they had a "value", which was solely derived from the amount of labor that went into their production. By means of complicated and lengthy arguments, Marx then tried to show that no matter what wages they might receive, workers could never get back from the capitalists the full "value" of what they had produced. Marx could simply have said what everyone knows, that capitalists are always trying to lower wages and raise prices, since their profits are derived from the differential between production costs and selling price. But Marx was not satisfied to show that there existed a conflict of interest between worker and capitalist; he had to depict this conflict as totally irreconcilable due to the mysterious workings of the laws of "value". Despite more than 100 years of debate in socialist circles on this point, no one has ever been able to prove that there is any such thing as "value", as opposed to mere price, inherent in commodities. It could be said that commodities have a value to those who use them, but Marx made a big point of distinguishing between "use value" and pure "value", an invisible attribute not unlike the Sefirot of Kabbalah.

On page 83 of Volume 1 Marx has commodities themselves make this distinction:

Could commodities themselves speak, they would say: Our use-value may be a thing that interests men. It is no part of us as objects. What, however, does belong to us as objects, is our value.

Having endowed commodities with a "value", Marx began to personify them. By page 107 of Volume I, they are not only speaking but experiencing emotions:

We see then, commodities are in love with money, but 'the course of true love never did run smooth'.

But strangest of all, by page 154 of Volume I, commodities have been brought to life and become, of all things, Jewish:

The capitalist knows that all commodities, however scurvy they may look, or however badly they may smell, are in faith and in truth money, inwardly circumcised Jews, and what is more, a wonderful means whereby out of money to make more money.

This passage has to be characterized as not only grossly anti-Semitic but somewhat deranged. Incredibly, Marxist theorists, including many Jewish Marxists, have created a whole literature devoted to Marx's concept of the "fetishism of commodities" without ever noticing that in *Capital* it was Marx himself who not only made a fetish of commodities but actually brought them to life, and all to prove what a unique, non-Jewish genius he was.

Marx's obsessive need to deny his Jewishness led him to sprinkle anti-Semitic comments throughout his works, including *Capital*. On page 163 of Volume I, we read:

The sum of the values in circulation can clearly not be augmented by any change in their distribution, any more than the quantity of the precious metals in a country by a Jew selling a Queen Anne's farthing for a guinea.

Or again, on page 288 of Volume I, Marx complained about "this Shylock-clinging to the letter of the law of 1844". In most of these passages, Marx is not even concerned with the Jews; he simply drags them in in order to display his anti-Semitism. If Marx did have occasion to refer directly to someone of Jewish descent, he felt free to engage in the most vulgar abuse. On page 327 of *Karl Marx*, Saul Padover cites the following excerpts from a polemic which Marx wrote against Joseph Moses Levy, publisher of the London Daily Telegraph:

Levy wants to be an Anglo-Saxon. Hence at least once a month, he attacks the un-British policies of Disraeli...But of what use is it for Levy to attack Mr. Disraeli...so long as Mother Nature has inscribed, with the wildest black letters, his family tree in the middle of his face...Levy's nose constitutes a year's talk in the City of London...The great art of Levy's nose in reality consists of cozying up to foul odor, to smell it out hundreds of miles away and to bring it forth. Thus Levy's nose serves *The Daily Telegraph* as an elephant snout, insect palp, lighthouse and telegraph. One can therefore say without exaggeration that Levy writes his newspaper with his nose.

Padover, on page 171, also cites anti-Semitic expressions from Marx's private letters which are even more offensive than his public remarks.

Although profound and obsessive, Marx's anti-Semitism was by no means considered unusual in his day. To the contrary, Marx himself was subjected to anti-Semitic attacks by his factional opponents within the European socialist movement, particularly the followers of Proudhon and Bakunin, to say nothing of avowed anti-Semites like Bauer and Dühring in Germany. The increasingly anti-Semitic tone of the European socialist movement from the 1840s onwards was in turn related to the general climate of racism in which Europe became engulfed during the course of the 19th century as a consequence of its growing domination over Africa and Asia. Marx was not immune to this racist influence either, as may be seen by consulting *On Colonialism*, a collection of his writings and those of Engels on the subject of European colonialism published in Moscow. For example, on page 16 we read:

It is almost needless to observe that, in the same measure in which opium has obtained the sovereignty over the Chinese, the Emperor and his staff of pedantic mandarins have become dispossessed of their own sovereignty. It would seem as though history had first to make this people drunk before it could rouse them out of their hereditary stupidity.

Or again, on page 83:

India, then, could not escape the fate of being conquered, and the whole of her past history, if it be anything, is the history of the successive conquests she has undergone. Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history.

Or at least not known to Marx. Yet unlike most European thinkers of his day, Marx was sharply critical of European colonialism and supportive of movements in China and India to throw off the colonial yoke.

Marx's problem was Frank's problem: he wanted to be a European. Marx believed in equality, in the brotherhood of peoples, in socialism: but deep down, if it wasn't European, he didn't take it seriously. Marx's entire analysis

of capitalism was flawed by this bias. He saw the main contradiction within the capitalist system as the antagonism between European capitalists and European workers, whereas history has shown that European capitalists and European workers were perfectly capable of joining together to exploit the labor and resources of other nations. Moreover, in his analysis of the inner workings of the capitalist system, Marx tended to blame everything on the power of money, which he associated with the Jews, and to play down the element of armed force, an area in which the Europeans as a group had long excelled. It is true that Marx did comment in a few well known passages on the role of force in the origins of capitalism, but he nonetheless ignored the fact that European capitalist expansion was predicated from the start on the intensive use of iron and steel by the Europeans to forge guns, cannons and other weapons of mass destruction. The industrial machinery on which the European capitalist system was based also came from iron and steel and not simply from money, as Marx implied. In short, although he was a powerful critic of European capitalism, Marx was reluctant to recognize the extent to which this entire system was ultimately but a means whereby Europeans as a group utilized their skill in metallurgy to dominate and exploit others. Marx preferred to view capitalism as a system whereby some Europeans exploited other Europeans, the better to identify himself with the exploited Europeans and thereby become a European too.

Moses Hess was not so optimistic about his future as a European. After 25 years of experiencing what it meant to be a Jewish socialist in Europe, Hess published his masterpiece, *Rome and Jerusalem*, in 1862. In it, Hess argued that anti-Semitism was so deeply rooted in Europe in general and Germany in particular that “Jewish Emancipation” would never be realized until the Jews returned to their ancient homeland and built up a socialist state on its soil. On page 52, Hess stated:

Even conversion itself does not relieve the Jew from the enormous pressure of German Anti-Semitism. The German hates the Jewish religion less than the race; he objects less to the Jews’ peculiar beliefs than to their peculiar noses.

Marx might well have taken these remarks to heart. But he was just then about to become famous as the leader of the First International, while Hess, the real founder of the German socialist movement, had been relegated to the periphery of the socialist world due to his refusal to turn his back on the Jewish people. It took nearly a century for Hess’s prophecies to come true, and in the meanwhile, Marxism became the dominant ideology of the European socialist movement.

The New Christianity

The irony of the story is that Marx ended up founding the New Christianity that Saint-Simon and Rodrigues had called for. Despite the fact that Marx sincerely detested religion in any form, Marxism in practice did not remain a mere philosophy but evolved into a full fledged religion, complete with an official creed, heresy hunts and a Pope in Moscow. It had what the Saint-Simonians lacked: holy books.

During his own lifetime, Marx’s following consisted almost entirely of a network of socialist militants active in various organizations in Germany, France and England. Marx never led a mass party; he was not good at organizing workers, and as a German exile in England his contacts were almost exclusively with other exiles or with the leaders of English working class organizations. During Marx’s lifetime, the only major socialist organizations in Europe were those founded by Proudhon and Blanqui in France and by Lassalle in Germany. Lassalle was the youngest of the Jewish Young Hegelians; born in 1825, he only became prominent in Germany during the 1850s, when Marx and Hess were already in exile. In 1863 he founded the General Union of German Workers, but a year later he was killed in a duel. For decades thereafter his name remained a legend in European socialist circles; but like Proudhon and Blanqui, he failed to create a body of written work even remotely comparable in depth and scope to the combined output of Marx and Engels.

Saint-Simon had been a prolific writer, but he didn’t really have that much to say. Marx and Engels read as well as wrote; they were well informed, commented on virtually every aspect of the political, social and economic life of their day and organized their thoughts into a coherent system whose superiority to all other systems they were continually striving to demonstrate. Their main base of support was always in Germany, but as German exiles in England noted for their pro-French sympathies, they were able to project an image of themselves as “internationalists” whose ideas were relevant to all capitalist countries. Marx died in 1883, Engels in 1895, but their books lived on. Translated already during their lifetime into a number of different languages, their written works were gradually accepted by socialist parties everywhere as the most authoritative statement of

the socialist point of view. However, it was in Germany that Marxism took deepest root, and it was there that the groundwork was laid for its transformation into the New Christianity.

A decisive step in this direction was taken as a result of the “Revisionist controversy”, which broke out in Germany a few years after the death of Engels. In 1899 a German Jewish socialist named Edouard Bernstein, who had been close to Engels, published a critique of Marxist theory later translated into English under the title, *Evolutionary Socialism*. Bernstein had helped Engels to edit the unfinished portions of *Capital* after Marx’s death and was a real expert in Marxism. Just for this reason, he felt that the time had come to take note of the fact that capitalism in Europe was not evolving in quite the way that Marx had said it would. Bernstein was particularly critical of the labor theory of value, which he accurately characterized on page 38 of *Evolutionary Socialism* as “nothing more than a key, an abstract image, like the philosophical atom endowed with a soul”. Bernstein’s comments were reasonable, constructive and enormously respectful of the work of Marx and Engels, but they nonetheless touched off a storm of controversy in which he was labeled a “Revisionist” for daring to tamper with the imposing edifice of Marxist thought.

Leading the charge against him was Rosa Luxemburg, who made her reputation in German Marxist circles by her impassioned attack on Bernstein. Luxemburg argued that Bernstein did not really understand Marx, which was far from the truth, but her real point was that the practical effect of Bernstein’s critique would be to weaken the revolutionary spirit of the German Social Democratic Party and lead it in the direction of an accommodation with the existing regime. This accommodation Luxemburg opposed, in reality because the regime was so militaristic and anti-Semitic, but in theory because of the sacred labor theory of value. As it turned out, after the outbreak of World War I, both Luxemburg and Bernstein became opponents of the German war effort, although Luxemburg considerably more so. In the meanwhile, the net effect of the “Revisionist controversy” was to make it impossible for anyone after Bernstein to question any aspect of the work of Marx and Engels while still laying claim to the title of Marxist. During the first decade of the 1900s in Germany, Marxism came to be viewed as a closed system which, like any religion, had either to be accepted or rejected in its entirety.

This view clearly had its roots in the efforts of Marx and Engels to present themselves as the only correct socialist thinkers of all time. At the same time, the hardening of Marxism into a dogma was also promoted by the intense competition between the growing European socialist movement and the various Christian churches. Accustomed to a dogmatic and authoritarian style of leadership within the church, particularly in Germany, former Christian workers drawn to socialism were not necessarily repelled by a certain amount of dogmatism on the part of the socialists as well. To the contrary, dogmatism made Marxism appear serious, almost respectable, in the eyes of the German working class. In short, the more Marxism and Christianity came into direct competition, the more they began to resemble one another.

One indication of this trend was an article by Engels, “On the History of Early Christianity”, which was first published in 1895. It appears in Lewis Feuer’s anthology, *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings On Politics And Philosophy*. In this article, Engels completely abandoned his former Young Hegelian stance of contempt for Christianity and instead dwelt at length on the alleged resemblance between early Christianity and the socialist movement. As he put it on page 168:

The history of early Christianity has notable points of resemblance with the modern working-class movement. Like the latter, Christianity was originally a movement of oppressed people: it first appeared as the religion of slaves and emancipated slaves, of poor people deprived of all rights, of peoples subjugated or dispersed by Rome.

Engels’ view of early Christianity as a proletarian religion was far from accurate; in reality, most of the early Christians came from middle class backgrounds. Equally far fetched was a remark by Renan which Engels cited with approval on page 170: “If I wanted to give you an idea of the early Christian communities I would tell you to look at a local section of the International Workingmen’s Association.”

All this was a far cry from the letter as well as the spirit of Marx’s celebrated denunciation of religion as “the opium of the people”. But buttressed by the authority of Engels, European Marxists in the early 1900s began to revert to the “utopian socialist” tactic of claiming Christianity for socialism. No one was more adept at this practice than Rosa Luxemburg, as is shown by a little known pamphlet she published in 1905 entitled *Socialism and the Churches*. As she put it on page 21:

And, if Christ were to appear on earth today he would surely attack the priests, the bishops and archbishops who defend the rich and live by exploiting the unfortunate, as formerly he attacked the merchants whom he drove from the temple so that their ignoble

presence should not defile the House of God.

And on page 18 she stated:

The class-conscious workers, organized in the Social-Democratic Party, fight to bring into reality the idea of social equality and of fraternity among men, the object which was formerly that of the Christian church.

Like Engels, she painted early Christianity in glowing colors, summing it all up on page 8 with the statement: "Thus the Christians of the First and Second Centuries were fervent supporters of communism."

The crypto-Christian character of early 20th century German Marxism became particularly evident around Christmas time. Celebration of Christmas by German socialist leaders was obligatory; there were no exceptions. Rosa Luxemburg spent Christmas with the Kautskys, who were of Christian origin. Ettinger on page 99 of *Rosa Luxemburg* cites Luise Kautsky declaring, "Christmas without Rosa was unthinkable and it was a pleasure to observe her wonderful way with the children." Ettinger also reports on page 94 how Luxemburg and her boy friend, Leo Jogiches, who was also Jewish, exchanged Christmas presents one year. He gave her a comedy by Moliere, she reciprocated with a copy of Strauss's *The Life of Jesus*. Here too Engels had set the tone. Bernstein on page 197 of his memoirs, *My Years of Exile*, notes that Engels loved Christmas and spent weeks before it distributing Christmas puddings to his neighbors. Bernstein adds:

Christmas was kept by Engels after the English fashion, as Charles Dickens has so delightfully described it in *The Pickwick Papers*. The room is decorated with green boughs of every kind, between which, in suitable places, the perfidious mistletoe peeps forth, which gives every man the right to kiss any person of the opposite sex who is standing beneath it or whom he can catch in passing.

And even Marx, dread foe of religion, had kept Christmas, as is shown by the reference to "making the Christmas pudding" in the Marx household which appears on page 87 of Volume I of *Eleanor Marx* by Yvonne Kapp.

In the final analysis, the tendency of Marxism to turn into the New Christianity was merely a function of the powerful hold which Christianity had already acquired on all classes of European society. Why, after all, had Saint-Simon and Rodrigues spoken of a "New Christianity" in the first place? Neither of them, and Saint-Simon in particular, seems to have had much use for the old Christianity, which the greater part of *Nouveau Christianisme* was devoted to attacking. If they did not simply call for a new religion but specifically for a "New Christianity", it was for essentially opportunist reasons, as a way of saying that they did not reject Christianity altogether but only wanted to improve on it. It was this same opportunist desire to conciliate Christian opinion which led Marx and Engels to keep Christmas and the German Marxists to make a big point of their alleged resemblance to the early Christians. Above all, it was Marx's need to prove that he was in some sense a legitimate member of the European Christian community that was responsible for the dogmatic, anti-Semitic and megalomaniacal spirit that gradually seeped into his version of Young Hegelian thought after the publication of *On The Jewish Question*. This spirit in turn provided the basis for the gradual transformation of Marxism into a religion.

Whether Marxism could have acquired the tremendous influence on a world scale that it did had it not become a religion is very doubtful. On the other hand, Marxism today stands in danger of being discredited altogether precisely because of the dogmatism and rigidity that came to be associated with it. Perhaps the day will come when Marx the Jewish radical will be appreciated for his great contribution to human thought while Marx the anti-Semite will be repudiated for his vicious slanders and stupid lies. But Marxism without anti-Semitism would no longer be Marxism, but just another manifestation of the Jewish radical tradition.

Chapter Four: Anti-Social

Throughout the 19th century, the main trend among Jewish radicals was away from religion and towards a secular restatement of the Jewish Messianic tradition. Even if this secularism was not always thoroughgoing or complete, nonetheless it was the intent of most 19th century Jewish radicals to dispense as much as possible with religious ideology and adopt a “scientific”, “materialist” or “rationalist” point of view. This was as true of the Zionism of Moses Hess in *Rome and Jerusalem* as it was of the communism of Karl Marx in *The Communist Manifesto*. Conversely, those Jews who continued to adhere to the Jewish religion, whether orthodox or “reformed”, during this period rarely if ever were identified as radicals. The Frankists, or possibly the Saint-Simonians, seem to have been the last Jews during the 19th century to adopt a religious framework for their radical ideas.

However, at precisely the same time that radicalism in a religious garb was losing its appeal for Jews, a growing number of European Christians found themselves drawn to just this form of Jewish radicalism. This tendency was already apparent among the Saint-Simonians, where it was the former Christians, led by Enfantin, who were the most eager to constitute themselves as a “church”. And in the wake of the collapse of the Saint-Simonian movement, Christian adaptations of Jewish radicalism in a religious guise began to proliferate. The less interest the Jews themselves showed in this field, the greater the inclination of the Christians to claim it as their own. Of these Christian would-be Jewish radicals, the most influential was an individual named Alphonse Constant.

Constant was born in 1810 in Paris; his father was a shoemaker. At the age of 15, Alphonse decided to become a Catholic priest; he continued on this path for about 10 years but left the priesthood in 1836. His break with the church coincided with the growing vogue of “utopian socialist” ideas in French working class circles. Edward Berenson, on page 39 of *Populist Religion and Left-Wing Politics in France*, comments on the crypto-Christian aspects of this trend:

Following Saint-Simon’s lead, intellectuals who considered themselves republicans, democrats, socialists, communists, or some combination of the four labels set out to rejuvenate Christianity by resurrecting an original doctrine that they believed had been perverted by the established Church.

Constant became a true believer in a radical form of Christianity. In 1841 he was sentenced to 8 months in prison for publishing an allegedly inflammatory tract, *The Bible of Liberty*; and in 1847 he was sentenced to another 6 months for writing *The Voice of Famine*. He also published during this period a book entitled *The Mother of God* which Thomas Williams, on page 22 of *Eliphas Levi*, describes as expressing Constant’s “cult of woman”. Constant was friendly at this time with Flora Tristan, a French feminist and working class activist whom he had met in prison. But as a result of the defeat of the radical forces in the French Revolution of 1848, Constant became disillusioned with his former views and began groping for an alternative.

The answer came to him around 1852 as a result of what he later described as a profound spiritual crisis. He decided to change his name to Eliphas Levi and become a magician. As a student in a Catholic seminary, Constant had picked up a smattering of Hebrew, which was sufficient in his eyes to qualify him as a Kabbalist. In 1856, he published *Dogma and Ritual of High Magic*, which soon established his reputation as the foremost occultist in Europe. Levi’s doctrine was simple and straightforward: magic was the key to happiness, and Kabbalah was the key to magic. His working class background, his radical past, his new, Jewish-sounding name - all this set Levi apart from the other occultists of his day and made him appear powerful and sincere. Levi died in 1875, but throughout the second half of the 19th century, he remained in European eyes the foremost symbol of a new, magical form of Jewish radicalism.

Illustrative of Levi’s teachings is a well known engraving, entitled “The Goat of Mendes”, which he first circulated as an alleged representation of the alleged ancient Egyptian god who was allegedly worshipped by the alleged witches of the Middle Ages. It portrays a seated human figure with a goat’s head and horns, wings and a 5 pointed star on its forehead. The creature has breasts like a woman and a kind of phallic symbol emerging from its discreetly cloaked lower body. The creature is sitting on a globe of the earth on which are inscribed the words, “Eliphas Levi Del”. The engraving is clearly intended to represent a Satanic creature, but not a malevolent one. Unlike the conventional Satan of European mythology, the so-called goat of Mendes is

portrayed as androgynous, no doubt an echo of Levi's earlier incarnation as the author of *The Mother of God*. In occultist circles, the goat of Mendes came to be seen as an image of Levi himself; it often appears on the cover or frontispiece of occultist works, such as *The Black Arts* by Richard Cavendish.

It is evident that in Levi's mind, there was a concealed connection between a Satanic and a Jewish identity. This connection was in no sense original with Levi: accusations of Satanism had been a standard feature of Christian anti-Semitic propaganda for more than 1000 years before Levi's time. Levi undoubtedly developed these mental associations during his days as a Catholic seminarian and Christian socialist. But he gave this tradition a novel twist by treating both Jewishness and Satanism as something positive rather than negative. At the same time, he also presented himself as an expert in Kabbalah, thereby identifying himself with a long line of Christian Kabbalists who had sought to detach Kabbalah from Judaism and appropriate it for themselves as a magical "Secret Doctrine". In short, Levi developed a form of Jewish radicalism which, although at bottom neither Jewish nor radical, nonetheless was accepted as such in the occultist circles in which he became famous. This was a mixture with explosive possibilities, which were to be fully realized in the course of time. But due to the secretive nature of the occultist movement and the disinclination of most historians to deal with this theme, few people to this day have any idea of the full extent of Levi's influence or of the ultimate fate of the tradition which he founded. Occult means hidden, and in this case well hidden. And since the secret is in the details, it is necessary to enter into the origins, content and consequences of Levi's teachings in a depth of detail which might otherwise seem excessive.

Hoene-Wronski

Historians of European occultism are agreed that the person who brought about the sudden transformation of Alphonse Constant into Eliphas Levi was a man variously described in occultist literature as Hoene, Wronski or Hoene-Wronski. Christopher McIntosh, in *Eliphas Levi and the French Occult Revival*, states that Constant met Hoene-Wronski in 1852 and immediately came under his spell. On page 98, McIntosh describes Hoene-Wronski's influence on Constant as follows:

The effect of Wronski's influence was to reconcile a number of opposing elements in Constant's thinking. Hitherto the staunch Christian in him had conflicted with the socialist, the rationalist with the mystic. Wronski's writings were to show him the possibility of a glorious synthesis of rationalism, religion and a belief in human progress.

Williams in *Eliphas Levi* stresses a different point. He also sees Hoene-Wronski as the key, but argues on page 67 that this was because he "knew the Cabala and had studied the traditions of the magi. It seems likely that Wronski guided Constant's first steps in his all-important study of Cabalism." Levi himself seems to have been somewhat vague on this point, stressing only that it was Hoene-Wronski who first opened his eyes to the wonderful world of magic.

The closest thing to a biographical sketch of Hoene-Wronski is the chapter devoted to him in *Three Chapters From The History of Polish Messianism* by N.O. Lossky. Lossky states that Hoene-Wronski was born in Posen in 1778. His father was a Czech named Hoene, but the son took over the name Wronski from a friend, evidently as a way of asserting a Polish identity. He fought with the Polish rebels against Russia in 1794 but was captured by the Russians and for a time served in the Russian army. Eventually he ended up in Paris, where he lived in relative poverty from about 1810 until his death in 1853. He formed a part of the Polish exile community in Paris but was held at arm's length by most of the other exiles, who suspected him of being a Russian agent. He held a "high opinion", as Lossky puts it on page 9, of Russia, but was also a big fan of Napoleon. Lossky adds: "Sorrows and trials that dealt many a blow to his pride somewhat affected Hoene-Wronski's mind." This seems to be putting it mildly, for Lossky also notes that he showed "inordinate conceit" and was convinced that "diabolical mystical sects" were conspiring to thwart him in his work.

The important point is that Hoene-Wronski was a Polish Messianist. He was a part of that same circle of Polish Messianists which also included Adam Mickiewicz and a close friend of Mickiewicz named Andrey Towianski. In these circles, Hoene-Wronski's little quirks did not appear all that unusual. Lossky, on page 16, notes that Towianski "considered himself to be God's messenger in immediate succession to Napoleon". Hoene-Wronski too was concerned with the succession to Napoleon. In his article, "The Mystery of the Jews in Mickiewicz's Towianist Lectures on Slav Literature", appearing in *The Polish Review* in 1962, Abraham Duker brings out on page 57 that Mickiewicz in a lecture delivered at the College de France in the early

1840s described Hoene-Wronski as the author of the theory “that Napoleon’s mission could be carried out by a descendant in spirit rather than in the flesh”. And then Mickiewicz went on to state that Hoene-Wronski had derived this theory from “a numerous Israelite sect, half Christian, half Jewish”, an obvious reference to the Frankists. Duker concluded, still on page 57, that Mickiewicz’s remarks “can safely be interpreted as implying that this Christian-Jewish sect influenced Hoene-Wronski’s messianist concepts.” That Mickiewicz, himself a secret Frankist, should have accused Hoene-Wronski of Frankist tendencies speaks volumes about the atmosphere of petty intrigue in which all the Polish Messianists functioned. But Hoene-Wronski’s Frankism, if that is what it was, was of a very different character from that of Mickiewicz and Towianski. Towianski, by the way, was the author of the theory of the “three Israels”, according to which the Jews, the French and the Slavs were together destined to redeem the human race.

Hoene-Wronski’s Messianic views are set forth in a “Bulletin of the Antinomian Union” published in Paris in 1839 and entitled *Messianisme*. The “Antinomian Union” was a shadowy organization of which Hoene-Wronski was the founder and possibly sole member. *Messianisme* was subtitled, “Final union of philosophy and religion, constituting absolute philosophy”, and featured a cryptic saying in Hebrew on the title page, “Seek and you will find”. Inside, Hoene-Wronski portrayed a European world divided into two camps, one conservative and religious, the other radical and rationalist. He argued that both camps were right and wrong at the same time; the antagonism between them could be overcome only by a dialectical synthesis of philosophy and religion, which Hoene-Wronski equated with “Messianism”. As to the actual content and meaning of this Messianic synthesis, not a word. Unlike Mickiewicz and Towianski, whose Messianic teachings were addressed to the masses, Hoene-Wronski sent his “antinomian” bulletins to high government officials in France, whom he was trying to induce to adopt a more favorable policy towards Russia. Translated into the language of diplomacy, Hoene-Wronski’s “final union of philosophy and religion” meant a Franco-Russian alliance, uniting the radical French with the most reactionary state in all of Europe. “Messianism” in this context meant Bonapartism, which was still a powerful force in French politics at this time.

It was widely believed in Polish emigre circles that Hoene-Wronski was paid by the Russians to uphold these views, which were generally unpopular among the violently anti-Russian emigres. But in any case, Hoene-Wronski’s ideas were expressed in such a cryptic, abstract form - he was also a mathematician and a student of Hegel - that they had little influence on anyone save for Alphonse Constant.

What exactly did Constant learn from Hoene-Wronski? According to *The Random House Dictionary*, an “antinomian” is “a person who maintains that Christians are freed from the moral law”. Jacob Frank is frequently called an “antinomian” by Jewish historians, such as Scholem on page 316 of *Major Trends In Jewish Mysticism*, where reference is made to “the resolute spirit of the gospel of antinomianism preached by Jacob Frank”. Whether Hoene-Wronski had to learn antinomianism from the Frankists is far from clear, but he was undoubtedly familiar with their teachings. An opportunist without opportunities, Hoene-Wronski presented the disillusioned true believer Constant with the spectacle of cynicism raised to the level of an art form. Whatever bits and pieces of Kabbalah, Hegelianism and Polish Messianism Constant may have picked up from Hoene-Wronski, the main message seems to have been: believe in nothing. And Constant, who had all his life sincerely believed in lies, emerged from his encounter with Hoene-Wronski a sincere liar.

Even A.E. Waite, who was not precisely a meticulous scholar, was offended by how little Eliphas Levi actually knew about Kabbalah. On page 30 of *The Holy Kabbalah*, Waite indignantly refuted Levi’s assertion that the Talmud was a Kabbalistic work. Levi, Waite said, “misstated so much and knew so little of post-Christian Jewish literature”. But all the same, as Waite also pointed out, Levi was “the one Kabbalistic expositor whose influence with certain groups of students in France and England was once so paramount”. And this was not the half of it, for Levi’s *Dogma and Ritual of High Magic* was translated into English and published under the title, *Transcendental Magic*, by none other than Waite himself. And on page xi of his Introduction to *Transcendental Magic*, Waite wrote:

No modern expositor of occult claims can bear any comparison with Eliphas Levi, and among ancient expositors, though many stand higher in authority and are assuredly more sincere, all yield to him in living interest, for he is actually the spirit of modern thought forcing an answer for the times from the old oracles.

Waite’s view that Levi, although a fraud and a liar, was the greatest occultist of modern times must be taken as a profound commentary both on Levi and on occultism.

Levi had what the other frauds lacked: daring. To present himself not only as a Kabbalist but also a Jew and

a Satanist at one and the same time took daring. Unfortunately, Levi did not display this same daring in the realm of ideas. At heart, he had become no less an atheist and materialist than the secular Jewish radicals, as Waite pointed out on page xvi of his Introduction to *Transcendental Magic*:

For Eliphas Levi, more especially at the period of his initial occult enterprise, was fundamentally a materialist - a materialist, moreover, who at times approached perilously towards atheism, as when he stated that God is a hypothesis which is 'very probably necessary'; he was, further, a disbeliever in any real communication with the world of spirits.

Waite also noted, on page xiii, Levi's view that "the dogmas of so-called revealed religion are nurse-tales for children". But Levi allowed very little of this sceptical attitude to appear in print. His public stance was one of acceptance of Christian dogma, the better to invent his own, magical dogmas.

Levi's main dogma was the supremacy of Kabbalah. As he put it on page 25 of *Transcendental Magic*:

Whatsoever is grand or scientific in the religious dreams of the illuminated, of Jacob Bohme, Swedenborg, Saint-Martin and the rest, is borrowed from the Kabbalah; all Masonic Associations owe to it their secrets and their symbols. The Kabbalah alone consecrates the alliance of universal reason and the Divine Word; it establishes, by the counterpoise of two forces in apparent opposition, the eternal balance of being; it alone reconciles reason with faith, power with liberty, science with mystery: it has the keys of the present, past and future.

And needless to say, the keys to Kabbalah were in Levi's possession, derived, on page 118, from "a primitive book, written in hieroglyphs by the sages of the earliest epoch of the world". In the world of the occult, Levi's ignorance of Kabbalah actually proved an advantage, for it enabled him to say whatever he liked about it, buttressed by the fragments of actual information which he had derived from Hoene-Wronski or other sources. Particularly reminiscent of Hoene-Wronski's teachings was Levi's image of Kabbalah as being based on "the counterpoise of two forces in apparent opposition", a theme which was indeed Kabbalistic and also Hegelian.

Two forces in more than apparent opposition were also at work in shaping Levi's attitude towards the Jewish people. On the one hand, Levi was clearly fascinated by the Jews and attracted by Jewish Messianism. As he put it on page 23:

How strange is the destiny of the Jews, those scapegoats, martyrs and saviours of the world, a people full of vitality, a bold and hardy race, which persecutions have preserved intact, because it has not yet accomplished its mission! Do not our apostolical traditions declare that after the decline of faith among the Gentiles salvation shall again come forth out of the House of Jacob, and that then the crucified Jew Who is adored by the Christians will give the empire of the world into the hands of God His Father.

Yet on the other hand, as shown by his reference to "our apostolical traditions", Levi continued to view the Jews through

Christian eyes. He does not seem to have had much contact with actual Jews and formed his image of Jews and Jewishness in the heavily Christian milieu in which he lived prior to his transformation into a magician. From this milieu Levi derived an image of the Jews which emphasized above all their alleged financial power.

Thus, on page 146, he argued that while the medieval Christians were involved in mystical reveries, "the proscribed Israelite, Judas of the Christian civilisation, worked, sold, intrigued, became rich, possessed himself of this life's realities, till he became in a position to advance the means of existence to those very forms of worship which had so long outlawed him." And he concluded:

The ancient worshippers of the ark remained true to the cultus of the strong-box; the Exchange is now their temple, and thence they govern the Christian world.

By the 1850s, the assertion that the Jews ruled Europe through their financial power had already become a standard feature of anti-Semitic propaganda. It was the main theme of Toussenel's 1845 work, *Les Juifs rois de l'epoque*. Levi obviously did not question this belief; indeed, it is entirely possible that his faith in the financial power of the Jews was one factor in his decision to assume a pseudo-Jewish identity. So while Levi may have admired the Jews from a distance, he did not take them seriously enough to try to understand them or to learn what the Jews themselves thought constituted Jewishness. Levi felt that he could invent a Jewish identity just as he pleased, and the one which he invented was based on a profound misunderstanding of just what Jewish radicalism was all about.

Underneath all the rhetoric about ancient books, it seems apparent that what Levi was really trying to do was to play Jacob Frank. But the Frank which Levi played was not the real Frank but a Kabbalist, magician and horny goat who longed to rule the world. The real Frank, who had endured 13 years in prison and gave his followers military training, was a revolutionary - an unprincipled revolutionary to be sure, but a revolutionary all the same. Levi was at best a theatrical Frank, and his radicalism was at best a theatrical radicalism. Like all occultists, he worked his magic only in a controlled setting and avoided the rough and tumble of real battles for real stakes. Despite his own radical past, Levi therefore did not found a radical movement but just the opposite - a reactionary movement in a theatrical guise. The leader of this movement was a man named Papus, and the secret of Levi's legacy was his secret.

Papus

The heyday of the occult in Europe came during the period of roughly 40 years between the time of Levi's death in 1875 and the outbreak of World War 1 in 1914. As faith in traditional Christian dogma declined, all those former believers who were opposed to the democratic and socialist ideas of the secularists gravitated instead into the camp of the occultists. This tendency was particularly marked in upper class circles, where occult beliefs of every kind became all the rage. Levi's teachings remained extremely popular but were increasingly rivaled by the doctrines of the Theosophical Society founded by Helena Blavatsky in 1875. In a stunning display of occult time travel, Blavatsky had discovered that Kabbalah, although undoubtedly very ancient, was actually derived from the even more ancient lore of the Aryan "White Masters" of the Himalayas. This lore was only available through the Theosophical Society, which was much more highly organized than the scattered groups of disciples which Levi had established. At some point in the 1880s, one of Levi's admirers, named Papus, therefore formed an organization called the Martinist Order with the intent of beating the Theosophists at their own game.

Although the Theosophists spoke well of Levi and Kabbalah, their emphasis on the primacy of the "Secret Doctrine" of the Aryans had the practical effect of establishing a clearly non-Jewish alternative to Levi's teachings. Blavatsky, who had close ties to aristocratic Czarist circles, had the reputation of being something of an anti-Semite, and few if any Jews were to be found among the Theosophists. One of their major symbols, by the way, was the swastika; it was they who were primarily responsible for popularizing this image, which they associated with the ancient Aryans, among European occultists. Due to their Aryan orientation, the Theosophists were in a position to benefit from the wave of anti-Semitism which swept over Europe in the wake of the outbreak of the pogroms in Russia in 1881. Occultists who did not wish to be associated with anything Jewish turned to the Theosophists in large numbers, while the followers of Levi found themselves stuck with an increasingly unpopular Jewish image. This was the situation which Papus sought to rectify with the establishment of the Martinist Order.

Papus was originally named Gerard Encausse; he was born in 1865 in Spain but grew up in France. He became a doctor and continued to practice medicine all his life, eventually dying of a disease he contracted while serving as a doctor in a French military hospital during World War I. His main interest in life, however, was occult organization. He was a member at different times of the Masons, the Rosicrucians and the Theosophists as well as his own Martinist Order, which he founded as a young man in his early 20s. Papus was an organization man; he was not a charismatic figure and preferred to operate behind the scenes, building up a complex network of organizational ties with himself at the center. On page 191 of the Appendix to a book he published in 1894 entitled *The Book of Splendours*, he described himself as follows:

President of the Independent Group for Esoteric Studies, President of the Supreme Council of the Martinist Order, General Delegate of the Qabalistic Order of the Rosicrucians.

His self-image as an organization man was also reflected in the name he chose for himself, Papus, which was clearly derived from "pape", the French word for Pope.

The Martinist order derived its name from Louis Claude de Saint-Martin, a French occultist of the late 18th century. Saint-Martin had been a member of a Masonic group called the "Order of the Elect Cohens", founded by Martines de Pasqually, one of the many Christian Kabbalists who longed to rescue Kabbalah from the

Jews. McIntosh, on page 25 of *Eliphas Levi and the French Occult Revival*, describes Pasqually's teachings as follows:

The choice of the name 'Elect Cohens' reveals the Jewish inspiration of much of Pasqually's doctrine. Pasqually believed that the Jewish tradition had been perverted by its orthodox practitioners, but that certain 'true Jews' had preserved it in its purity. Clearly he believed that his order was in some sense helping to restore the true Judaism, by which he may have meant the Cabala as his theory of spirits corresponds closely to cabalistic doctrine.

These views were in turn transmitted by Saint-Martin to a number of 19th century French occultists, who described themselves as "Martinists".

Papus told his son, Philippe Encausse, that he had been inducted into the Martinist Order in 1882, but according to Waite, there was no such thing as a Martinist Order until Papus founded it. On page 72 of *Saint-Martin*, Waite states that Papus got the idea of forming the Martinist Order from a certain Henri Delaage, a "litterateur" who was in possession of some documents relating to Martinism. Papus used these documents to establish a Martinist pedigree for his new organization; as for his later claim that the Martinist Order had been founded by Saint-Martin himself, Waite states on page 75 that "Papus was reading in a glass of vision when he saw the mystic at the head of an Order propagated like his own." Waite added:

I leave it at this, though it is difficult to understand how he could have deceived himself. He has not escaped criticism of a rougher kind, but to me it seems that he had a constitutional incapacity for pronouncing validly on questions of evidence, and that anything passed for proof in respect of his own bias.

This was a diplomatic way of saying that Papus was a liar; and since a certain degree of deception or exaggeration is an essential feature of all occult ideology, Waite's remarks imply that Papus was a bigger liar than most.

Papus, however, was not only a big liar but a successful one. In his obituary for Papus appearing in *The Occult Review* in 1917, Waite stated on page 105:

The Martinist Order was extremely successful and the Supreme Council of France, with Papus as its president, had branches over the whole world - in Italy, Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, England, Belgium, Spain, Denmark, Holland, Austria, even in Russia and Rumania, Egypt and Indo-China. There was also a vast membership in America, both North and South, but the Lodges of the Northern Jurisdiction broke away from the Paris Supreme Council, partly over questions of Masonic procedure and partly on other grounds which are too complex and controversial for enumeration here.

Waite's cryptic reference to some controversy involving the Masons is echoed on page 73 of *Papus* by Philippe Encausse, where Philippe reveals that his father tried to form a link with the Masons in the late 1890s but was finally rebuffed by them in 1899. But even without the Masonic connection, the Martinist Order was extremely popular in those same upper class circles from which the Theosophists drew the majority of their recruits.

The key to their success was that they too excluded Jews by making belief in Christianity a precondition for membership. Philippe Encausse brings out in his biography of Papus that his father was critical of the Theosophists for being insufficiently pro-Christian; Papus, his son notes on page 36, believed in "the power of Christianity, largely understood, to regenerate our West". And Waite, on page 74 of *Saint-Martin*, includes the explicit Christianity of the Martinist Order in a list of reasons for its success:

The reasons are not far to seek: it was a form of initiation and it made no claim on Masonry; it received both sexes; it had a distinct religious side apart from dogma; and - outside all sectarianism - it was in some sense a Christian thing.

Indeed, the very name of the organization, the Martinist Order, made it sound like a Catholic order. Probably most of its members came from Catholic backgrounds, while the Theosophists had their greatest success among Protestants in the United States, England and Germany.

Exclusion of Jews from the Martinist Order was right in the tradition of Martinism, whose roots went back to Martines de Pasqually's "Order of the Elect Cohens". The Elect Cohens had also excluded Jews, on the grounds that they were the "true Jews", while the actual Jews had deviated from the Kabbalistic path. By the same token, Papus presented himself as an expert in Kabbalah and the spiritual heir of Eliphas Levi. To this end, Papus published in 1894 a book now available in English as *The Book of Splendours* by Eliphas Levi.

In his Appendix, Papus explained that the manuscript he was publishing was actually a translation by Levi of a portion of the *Zohar*, the “Idra Suta” or “Great Synod”. Papus let it be understood that he had acquired this manuscript, along with several other unpublished manuscripts by Levi, in his capacity as Levi’s greatest disciple and heir.

Even the occultists who published this book in English realized that this picture might require a little touching up. In his introduction to the English translation, R.A. Gilbert admitted on page 12 that the text of *The Book of Splendours* was not quite what Papus said it was:

Admittedly, the text is mislabelled (for he was translating the *Idra Rabba*, not the *Idra Zuta* as he claimed), arbitrarily abridged and outrageously explained; but it remains a delight, for he crystallized in it not the true meaning of the Qabalah but the essence of the occultist’s *interpretation* of it.

To put it more simply, the text was a complete fabrication, nor is there the slightest reason to believe that this fabrication was the work of Levi, who had been dead for almost 20 years when the book was published. Levi, who knew almost no Hebrew, let alone Aramaic, was not well positioned to claim to be a translator of the *Zohar*, and in any case he never pretended to translate anything, much preferring to present himself as the ultimate source of authority on Kabbalah.

Papus, however, was another story. It was his method to remain in the background, letting others take the credit, while he pulled the occult strings behind the scenes. According to Papus, Levi was the great man, Papus a mere executor of his will. Here is how he described his relationship with Levi on page 144 of *The Book of Splendours*:

For it is our humble person who was chosen by the occult influences of the invisible as depositary of a large number of the celebrated Qabalist’s favourite objects. At present we possess the magic sword of Eliphas Levi, together with the extract from the will bequeathing this precious object to the friend most faithful in his assistance to the master until the end.

You could never guess from this passage that Papus was 10 years old at the time of Levi’s death, had never even met Levi and therefore could not be the faithful friend described in the will, assuming there was a will. Papus may well have got his hands on Levi’s sword, but the manuscript he published in Levi’s name was undoubtedly either his own creation or the work of one of his occult associates.

Also characteristic of Papus was the subject of the manuscript, which purported to describe a “Great Synod” convoked by none other than “Simeon Ben-Jochai” himself to explain the “Book of Mystery” to the assembled rabbis. There was nothing Papus liked better than convoking meetings. His equivalent of the mythical “Great Synod” of *The Book of Splendours* was the “Supreme Council” of the Martinist Order, which Papus sought to promote as a gathering place for the intellectual elite of

France. Among its members, notes Philippe Encausse on page 126 of *Papus*, was Paul Adam, the husband of Juliette Adam, the publisher of *La Nouvelle Revue*, one of the leading French intellectual journals of the time. Paul Adam was also an author in his own right, who had published several popular novels noted for their anti-Semitic bias. And both Paul and Juliette Adam were key figures in “that Catholic revival which was to be the dominant note of French intellectual society in the early twentieth century”, as Winifred Stephens puts it on page 221 of *Madame Adam*.

Along with the Catholic revival came a wave of anti-Semitism associated in France with the Dreyfus Affair, which began in 1894 with the arrest of Alfred Dreyfus, a French Jewish army officer, on trumped up charges of treason. Juliette Adam in *La Nouvelle Revue* came out against Dreyfus, for reasons described as follows by Stephens on page 220:

Mme. Adam’s nationalism involved antagonism to the Jews, whom she believed incapable of espousing the cause of any race but their own. It involved also a belief that the army can do no wrong. Hence she regarded as final the court-martial’s condemnation of Alfred Dreyfus.

Papus too aligned himself with the anti-Dreyfusards, as is brought out by James Webb on page 249 of *The Occult Establishment*. There Webb reveals that Papus was responsible for the publication of a series of anti-Semitic articles in the *Echo de Paris* in 1901. Webb also shows that Papus had close ties to a number of leading French anti-Semites; but for the most part, he remained in the background and did not play a prominent part in the campaign against Dreyfus.

Papus had bigger fish to fry. Also in 1901, notes Webb on page 168, Papus visited Russia and met with the Czar and high Czarist officials. The ostensible purpose of his visit was to facilitate the establishment of a branch of the Martinist Order in Russia. Such a branch was in fact formed, and became quite popular in Russian aristocratic circles. But in the background of his visit was also the efforts of the people around La Nouvelle Revue to create closer ties between France and Russia. La Nouvelle Revue had been pushing for an alliance with Russia ever since it was founded in 1879 on the grounds that only in this way could France hope to defeat Germany in the next war. Such an alliance had in fact been signed in 1892 but it was not popular on the French left, which viewed Russia as the main bastion of autocracy in Europe. Papus, on the other hand, who had paid tribute to Hoene-Wronski on page 145 of *The Book of Splendours* as the main influence on Eliphaz Levi, was naturally an enthusiastic supporter of the Franco-Russian alliance. The union of opposites advocated by Hoene-Wronski had at last come true, and Papus had every reason to work to cement it.

One thing which the Czarist government, La Nouvelle Revue and Papus all had in common was anti-Semitism. The visit of Papus to Russia in 1901 came at a time when the anti-Semitic agitation in France over the Dreyfus affair was at its peak and when a new wave of pogroms was in the offing in Russia. And when this wave of pogroms did begin in 1903, it was touched off by the publication of a book, translated from French, in which a group of Jewish rabbis were portrayed as meeting together to plan world domination. The book eventually became known as *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. It was first published shortly before the Kishinev pogrom in 1903, which attracted worldwide attention because it was so violent. In their efforts to justify this violence, the Czarist government placed even greater emphasis on *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, which supposedly provided documentary proof of the evil plans of the Jews. The book was widely circulated in Russia prior to World War I, and thanks to its subsequent use by the Nazis and the Arabs, it eventually became the best known and most influential piece of anti-Semitic propaganda in modern history. If we put all these details together, a picture emerges in which shortly after Papus visited Russia, a manuscript is suddenly discovered not unlike *The Book of Splendours* - a fabricated account of a "Great Synod" of Jewish leaders. Did the Czarist authorities get this manuscript from Papus?

The Protocols

Probably the most complete and reliable study of the Protocols is *Warrant For Genocide* by Norman Cohn, first published in 1967. Cohn explains on page 13 that he decided to undertake this study as a result of his experiences as an American soldier in 1945 helping to interrogate captured SS officers in Germany:

I began to suspect that the deadliest form of antisemitism, the kind that results in massacre and attempted genocide, has little to do with real conflicts of interest between living people, or even with racial prejudice as such. What I kept coming across was, rather, a conviction that Jews - all Jews everywhere in the world - form a conspiratorial body set on ruining and then dominating the rest of mankind.

Cohn therefore set out to investigate the origins of the Protocols, which he describes as "the supreme expression and vehicle of the myth of the Jewish world-conspiracy".

Little known outside Russia prior to World War I, the Protocols were widely publicized throughout Europe right after the war by Czarist elements fleeing the Russian Revolution. At first the Protocols were taken at face value by a wide spectrum of European opinion. Cohn, on page 71, cites the Times of London declaring in May of 1920, with reference to the Protocols: "Have we, by straining every fibre of our national body, escaped a 'Pax Germanica' only to fall into a 'Pax Judaica'?" But in 1921, it was revealed that a considerable portion of the text of the Protocols had been lifted almost verbatim from a little known book, *Dialogue in Hell Between Montesquieu and Machiavelli*, published in French in 1864 by a writer named Maurice Joly. This revelation had the effect of destroying the credibility of the Protocols for everyone except the anti-Semites, who continued to believe what they wished to believe. But since it had become obvious that the Protocols had been fabricated, the question of who had done the fabricating came to appear academic, and little attention was subsequently directed to this point.

In *Warrant For Genocide*, Cohn nonetheless did attempt to figure out just who might have concocted the Protocols. Since the Protocols had been originally written in French but distributed by Czarist police agents, Cohn's suspicions fell on the chief of the Czarist secret police in Paris, a man named Rachkovsky. Rachkovsky had a long history of forging documents in order to discredit enemies of the Czar, and Cohn concluded that

he had fabricated the Protocols based on some documents that were stolen from the home of a certain Elie de Cyon. This Elie de Cyon was a Russian expatriate of Jewish origin living in France. He had ties with the Czarist government, but as Cohn admits, with a faction hostile to Rachkovsky. Cohn thought that was why Rachkovsky had to steal the documents. Cohn himself was not too happy with this theory and did not even attempt to speculate what documents were stolen and where they came from.

As it so happens, this Elie de Cyon was part of the circle of Juliette Adam and had served for a time as one of the editors of *La Nouvelle Revue*. James Webb in *The Occult Establishment* also draws attention to the people around *La Nouvelle Revue* as probably implicated in the fabrication of the Protocols in some way. Webb thought that the Protocols must have been concocted by an occultist, but he was more inclined to suspect the Theosophists than Papus and the Martinists. However, just because the Theosophists were pseudo-Aryans rather than pseudo-Jews, they were less likely to produce a pseudo-Jewish document than Papus, who had built his whole career on being an anti-Semitic “true Jew”. Papus may well have had ties with Rachkovsky; the two men obviously had much in common, and Rachkovsky liked to socialize in French high society. This much is clear: the Protocols came out of a milieu in which Papus was a central figure, and Papus himself visited Russia only a short time before the Protocols first surfaced there.

To get any closer to the author of the Protocols it is necessary to examine the text itself. It is available in English in an edition published in London in 1933 under the title, *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. The most striking feature of this book, and undoubtedly one of the main reasons for its acceptance by the anti-Semites, is that it does not appear to be intended to make Jewish world rule look bad. Once the Jews rule the world, nothing terrible will happen; to the contrary, there will be enlightened reforms. On page 67 we learn that governments will stop borrowing money from the banks “so that there will be no payment of interest to leeches that suck all the strength out of the State”. Production of “articles of luxury” will be reduced, on page 72, and “small master production” will be revived; drunkenness “will be prohibited by law”. Perhaps some might object to a “progressive tax on property”, envisaged on page 63, but none of this sounds like the end of the world.

Even more revealing is the tone which is adopted when talking about the future “King of the Jews”, the Messianic figure who will come to power once the Jews get control of the world. The book is filled with all kinds of good advice on just how the King of the Jews should conduct himself. Thus on page 75 we are told:

The King of the Jews must not be at the mercy of his passions, and especially of sensuality: on no side of his character must he give brute instincts power over his mind.

And on page 74 appears another piece of advice almost poetic in its tone:

In the person of the king who with unbending will is master of himself and of humanity all will discern as it were fate with its mysterious ways. None will know what the king wishes to attain by his dispositions, and therefore none will dare to stand across an unknown path.

It seems apparent that the author of these lines had devoted considerable thought to the subject of how to play the part of the King of the Jews. These thoughts stressed the ceremonial aspect of the job, a point which is brought out with particular clarity by a remark on page 58: “The King of the Jews will be the real Pope of the Universe, the patriarch of an international Church.”

These lines constitute a precise description of the person Papus thought himself to be. Papus thought of himself as Pope to the point where he adopted a name that meant Pope. As the self-proclaimed President of the Supreme Council of the Martinist Order, with its far flung branches all over the world, Papus had every reason to view himself as “the patriarch of an international Church”. And as for the role of King of the Jews, Papus had already concocted, or had concocted, a document centered around the person of Shimon bar Yochai, the supreme authority in the world of Kabbalah which all the occultists viewed as the source of Jewish power. Moreover, Papus consciously viewed himself as part of a long tradition, stretching back through Eliphaz Levi and the Martinists to the 18th century Christian Kabbalists, of Christians who had appropriated the secret of Jewish power and made it their own. The dream of ruling the world in the name of the Jews was his dream, and the new world order envisaged in the Protocols was his conception of how the world should be run. He made it sound good because he really believed in it.

In the spirit of Hoene-Wronski, Papus in the Protocols portrayed the Europe of his day as sharply divided

into two evenly balanced camps, the camp of monarchy and the camp of revolution. The dialectical synthesis of the two camps, which Hoene-Wronski had identified with “Messianism”, Papus identified with the Jews. According to Papus in the Protocols, the Jews did not really believe in the camp of revolution, with which they were generally associated at that time. They only supported the revolutionaries as a way of overthrowing the Czar, whom Papus had the Jews praise on page 50 as “the one and only serious foe we had in the world, without counting the Papacy”. Once the Czar and the camp of monarchy had been defeated, then Europe would degenerate into anarchy, for the camp of revolution was incapable of instituting a stable government. As Papus put it on page 14: “The moment the mob seizes freedom in its hands, it quickly turns to anarchy, which in itself is the highest degree of savagery.” It would be at this point, with all of Europe immersed in chaos, that the Jews would step forward and institute their enlightened monarchy.

That Papus was here enunciating one of his pet theories is shown by the following passage, from page 169 of his Appendix to *The Book of Splendours*:

Republics are not governments, but social crises. When power, like the stone of Sisyphus, falls from the arms which seek to push it too far, it *rolls down again* to the bottom of the mountain: this is what is called a *revolution*. A thousand arms take hold of this stone to move it, this is the republic; a stronger one comes and picks it up, this is the empire; and he who succeeds in bringing it securely to rest at the mountain’s summit establishes a kingdom.

In the Protocols, the only variation on this theme was that the Jews were credited with stirring up the revolutionaries as well as preparing to establish the monarchy at the end of the process.

In view of the fact that the Protocols were first published shortly before the Kishinev pogrom of 1903, it would appear that someone in the Czarist government asked Papus to provide them with a document that could be used as a pretext for attacking the Jews. This request could not have come out of the blue; it must have followed discussions in which Papus indicated that he was ready, willing and able to come up with such a document. Perhaps Rachkovsky was involved in these negotiations, perhaps not. Rachkovsky’s involvement was not absolutely essential, for Papus could easily have been drawn into discussions with the Czarist government through his ties with the people around *La Nouvelle Revue*. What Papus received for his work is hard to say; most likely it included Czarist backing for his efforts to build up the Martinist Order in Russia. A hardened anti-Semite and habitual liar who had made a career of fabricating documentary support for his occult ambitions, Papus probably did not need much inducement. He obviously derived considerable satisfaction from his little tricks, to the point where he confided in no one and took his secret with him to the grave.

Revolution

On page 5 of the 1933 London edition of the Protocols, there appears a quote from Henry Ford in 1921 explaining why he believed in the authenticity of the Protocols. Ford stated:

The only statement I care to make about the Protocols is that they fit in with what is going on. They are sixteen years old, and they have fitted the world situation up to this time. They fit it now.

Ford was not alone in these views. The tremendous vogue of the Protocols after World War 1 was due above all to the fact that the predictions of Jewish world rule which Papus had made seemed to many to have come true. In the span of only a few years, between 1917 and 1919, there had taken place a series of events without precedent in world history. The British had issued a statement in 1917, the Balfour Declaration, announcing their intention to support the establishment of a “Jewish National Home” in the land of Israel. By the end of 1918, not only the Czar of Russia but also the Kaisers of Germany and Austria had been overthrown, bringing an end to 2000 years of rule by would-be Caesars in Europe. And at the same time, Marxist governments had come to power in many parts of Europe, including Russia, where the former empire of the Czars had been replaced by a self-proclaimed Communist dictatorship.

Since many of the Marxist leaders were Jewish, and since the Czars and Kaisers had traditionally been among the leading anti-Semites in Europe, the events of the years 1917-19 clearly represented a stunning reversal in the balance of forces between pro-Jewish and anti-Jewish elements in European society. Jews had occupied positions of power, the enemies

of the Jews were crushed and the mighty British empire had aligned itself with the cause of Jewish nationhood. As if to symbolize the hidden interconnection between these events, the Balfour Declaration was issued only a few days before the Bolsheviks, led by a Jew named Leon Trotsky, took power in Russia. Of course, from an objective standpoint, none of these events, dramatic as they were, can be even remotely described as inaugurating an era of Jewish world rule. But some kind of significant change had in fact taken place, and those who were disposed to believe in theories of Jewish conspiracy naturally assumed that they were witnessing the very events which had been predicted in the Protocols.

What enabled Papus to assume, anonymously, the mantle of a prophet is that he believed in Jewish power. Most anti-Semites like to talk about the Jews ruling the world, but deep down they don't really believe it. If they did, they wouldn't treat the Jewish people with such contempt. But Papus came out of a tradition in which Jewish power was not only exaggerated but also emulated. The whole point of Christian Kabbalah was to steal the thunder of the Jews, which implied that there really was a thunder to be stolen. Needless to say, the Christians Kabbalists had a distorted and inaccurate view of what Jewish power was all about, but at least they had sufficient respect for the Jews to pretend to be them. It was this quality of grudging respect for the Jews which appeared between the lines of the Protocols and convinced so many anti-Semites around the world that the Protocols reflected an actual Jewish conspiracy.

In reality, however, not only was the conspiracy an invention of the anti-Semites, but even the strategy which Papus ascribed to the Jews was not a Jewish strategy. When the Jewish people finally achieved sovereignty over one tiny corner of the globe, the land of Israel, in 1948, they did not institute a monarchy but a democracy based on proportional representation, universal suffrage and a multi-party political system. As for the idea of instituting a Jewish kingdom over the entire world, it would be difficult to find a single Jewish radical in the last 200 years who even dreamed of such a thing. The last Jewish radical who might legitimately be described as thinking along these lines was Jacob Frank, and even Frank was too much of a realist to put much stock in such phantasies. The notion of world rule was not a Jewish but a Christian idea, and even the concept of "King of the Jews" was essentially a Christian idea, derived from the New Testament and not the Old. Jewish culture was and is far more egalitarian, democratic and pragmatic than Christian culture; so that when people like Papus wanted to ascribe dictatorial ambitions to the Jews, they had to derive their image of these ambitions from their own theory and practice.

All the same, something did happen at the end of World War I that needs to be understood. Unfortunately, the anti-Semitic myth of a Jewish plot to rule the world assumed such murderous proportions under the Nazis that all discussion of Jewish influence in European politics became virtually taboo. Even if they did not act as an organized group, Jews in general and Jewish radicals in particular could not help but exercise a certain influence on the people around them. The dramatic events of the years 1917-19 were but the culmination of a rapid increase in Jewish influence in Europe and also the Middle East and North America which can be traced back to the late 19th century. Although it did not result from a plot, this influence was nonetheless significant and real. Indeed, it assumed such proportions for a time that it becomes possible to speak of a Jewish Revolution. This revolution really did take place, and if the truth be told, it is still continuing to this day.

Chapter Five: The Jewish Revolution

Like all revolutions, the Jewish Revolution can be understood both as an event and as a process. Understood as a process, the Jewish Revolution can be described as the ongoing impact of Jewish radicalism on the modern world. Understood as an event, the Jewish Revolution may be said to have begun in the late 19th century, reached its height during the years 1917-19 and achieved its most enduring success with the birth of the state of Israel in 1948. The Holocaust can be understood in this context as an attempt to drown the Jewish Revolution in blood, an attempt that was partially successful.

Understood as an event, the Jewish Revolution can be broken down into two distinct phases. During the first phase, from around 1897 to 1922, the revolution was on the offensive, leading up to the Russian Revolution and the Balfour Declaration. But during the second phase, from roughly 1923 to 1948, the revolution was placed on the defensive. It was during this phase that the Holocaust took place. Nonetheless, this second phase ended with the greatest Jewish victory of all, the establishment of the state of Israel.

Whether understood as an event or as a process, the Jewish Revolution was caused, just like other revolutions, by the political and cultural activity of masses of people. By the end of the 19th century, there were well over 5 million Jews living in the "Pale of Settlement", the area to which the Czarist government had restricted the Jews living under its rule. The Jews of the Pale of Settlement formed far and away the largest and also one of the most impoverished and oppressed Jewish communities anywhere in the world at that time. Forbidden to live outside the Pale, forbidden to own land, subjected to all kinds of special taxes and levies, they were also confronted from 1881 onwards with a growing threat of mass murder arising from the Czarist pogroms. The Jewish Revolution was first and foremost a direct response to these conditions. This response took many forms, ranging from socialist agitation and Zionist organization to mass emigration, but as a result literally millions of people were drawn into some type of radical activity. This was true both within the Pale and also elsewhere in the world, due to the heavy impact of the mass Jewish emigration which began after 1881.

About 4 million Jews emigrated from the Pale or from other parts of Eastern Europe between 1881 and the early 1920s. As a result of this great flight, there came into being by the early 20th century large communities of predominantly Yiddish speaking Jews in many of the major cities of Europe and the New World. Uprooted and proletarianized, the Jews of these communities were drawn in large numbers into trade union and socialist activity. This tendency was particularly marked in the United States, to whose shores close to 3 million Jews emigrated during the years from 1881 to 1920. By the time of World War 1, there were over 1 million Jews in New York City alone, and also sizable Jewish communities in such major European cities as London, Paris, Vienna, Berlin, Budapest, Warsaw and Odessa. These communities formed centers of radical agitation which inevitably affected the general political climate in the world around them, including the attitudes of Jews already living in the countries to which the refugees had fled.

Emma Lazarus, for example, was a genteel poet from an old American Jewish family that had been established in the United States since the time of the American Revolution. In 1882, after meeting for the first time Jewish refugees from the Pale of Settlement, she sat down and wrote a poem entitled, "The Banner of the Jew". It appears on page 35 of *Emma Lazarus: Selections from her Poetry and Prose*. The last two stanzas run as follows:

O deem not dead that martial fire,
Say not the mystic flame is spent!
With Moses' law and David's lyre,
Your ancient strength remains unbent.
Let but an Ezra rise anew,
To lift the *Banner of the Jew!*

A rag, a mock at first - erelong,
When men have bled and women wept,
To guard its precious folds from wrong,
Even they who shrunk, even they who slept,
Shall leap to bless it, and to save.
Strike! for the brave revere the brave!

For the rest of her life, Emma Lazarus devoted a large part of her poetry and prose to Jewish themes. She was one of many assimilated Jews who were moved by the influence of the Jewish refugees to a much more overt and proud expression of Jewishness. And this was true not only among assimilated Jews in the West but also in the Jewish communities of the Middle East, where the first socialist and Zionist groups of a modern type began to form during the early 20th century in response to the radical agitation emanating from Eastern Europe.

Indicative of the new climate of opinion was an essay published in 1898 by Nachman Syrkin entitled “The Jewish Problem and the Jewish Socialist State”. It appears in English in a collection of Syrkin’s essays entitled *Essays on socialist Zionism*. Syrkin was one of the founders of the emerging socialist Zionist movement of the early 20th century. On page 16 of his essay, Syrkin wrote:

Impelled by their Judaism towards the path of revolution, the Socialists erred in that they did not guard the purity of their revolt. Instead of emphasizing, in their revolutionary opposition to the class society, their kinship with the most suppressed people of the world, and designating their protest in the first place as specifically Jewish and later raising it to a higher, universal out-cry, they acted contrary-wise. What is more, they robbed the protest of its Jewish character. They suppressed all reference to their Jewish origin, and thus became merely another type of Jewish assimilationists.

This kind of public criticism of the Jewish Marxists for failing to identify as Jews would have been unthinkable a few decades earlier. Syrkin went on to argue that the time had come for Jewish socialists to raise Jewish issues, or as he put it on page 20:

Jewish Socialism will, sooner or later, remove all assimilatory tendencies from its ranks, and will loyally and publicly declare itself a huge protest movement of Jews.

And in the coming decades, such a “huge protest movement of Jews” did in fact emerge. It was this movement that constituted the driving force behind the Jewish Revolution.

During the period prior to World War I, the two major organizational expressions of the radical trend in the Jewish community were the Bund and the Zionist Organization. Both groups were founded in the same year, 1897, which can be taken as a kind of symbolic starting point for the Jewish Revolution. The Bund was the first mass socialist party in Russia. Formed by Jewish socialists in Vilna, it had grown by 1905 into a mass organization with some 30,000 members and branches in every major Jewish community in the Pale of Settlement. Herzl’s Zionist Organization, founded at a congress in Switzerland, had an even larger membership on a world scale by the early 20th century. Alongside the Bundists and the Zionists, there also emerged during this period a wide range of other groups which adhered to some kind of overtly Jewish radical doctrine. Jewish radicalism, previously concealed behind a semi-Christian facade, suddenly came out into the open in its own name and with its own program.

The Jewish radical movement that took shape after 1897 was oriented around a whole set of diverse and often contradictory demands. Some favored the creation of an autonomous Jewish nation in Russia, while others dreamed of a Jewish state in the land of Israel. Some saw the Jewish nation of the future becoming a part of a vast federation of free nations, while others believed that differences of language and nationality would gradually die out. Some called themselves socialists, others communists, anarchists, trade unionists, populists or mutualists. What they all had in common was a negative attitude towards religion, a commitment to some kind of communal social structure and a positive attitude towards Jewish culture and identity. By the time of World War I, radical views of this kind had come to rival orthodox Judaism as the mass ideology of Jews everywhere in the world.

This radical trend within the Jewish community was reflected in a similar trend among assimilated Jews. In the eyes of the world, the most visible Jewish radicals were the Marxists, Freudians, free thinkers and Bohemians who formed a part of the larger radical movement in the major cities of Europe and the New World. Although many of these assimilated Jews were of Yiddish speaking descent, they typically thought of themselves as Europeans or Americans. They viewed themselves as improving their adopted culture by introducing some new and progressive concept into it, such as socialism or free love. During the period from 1897 to 1922, Jewish radicals of this type suddenly moved from the shadows into the spotlight of European and world consciousness. Figures such as Leon Trotsky, Rosa Luxemburg, Sigmund Freud, Emma Goldman and Albert Einstein became household names. And in the universities, cafes and theatres of Europe and America,

assimilated Jewish radicals became an increasingly influential part of the radical counter-culture of the period.

What shocked the world in 1917 was that by some mysterious process, the ideas and attitudes of the Jewish radicals had suddenly become the ideology not only of millions of Jews but also of tens of millions of Europeans and Americans. In particular, the spread of Marxism represented the most visible and highly organized manifestation of what was a general trend towards the mass dissemination of Jewish radical thought. It was this trend which the anti-Semites caricatured as a Jewish plot as part of their attempt to combat it at any price. Obviously there was no plot, but what was there? How did it happen that Jewish radicalism should have proved so influential at just this time? The only way to answer this question is to treat the Jewish Revolution as a real event and trace its progress the same as any other revolution.

1905

The first major revolutionary event of the period 1897-1922 was the Russian Revolution of 1905. During the course of the year 1905, a series of protest demonstrations, strikes and mutinies in Russia forced the Czar to grant a limited form of representation to the Russian people. The Revolution of 1905 failed to overthrow the Czarist regime, but it did provide a powerful impetus to the radical movement both in Russia and elsewhere in the world. It touched off mass strikes in Germany and inspired a new and more militant tone in trade union agitation in the United States. In historical literature, it is often called a “dress rehearsal” for the Russian Revolution of 1917.

Since no one doubts the importance of the Revolution of 1905, you would think there must exist a large number of scholarly works on this topic, but such is not the case. Abraham Ascher, on page 1 of Volume I of *The Revolution of 1905*, published in 1988, states:

Although the Revolution of 1905 was a turning point in modern Russian history, there is still no scholarly and comprehensive account of the event in any language.

Ascher’s book was the first such account to appear, and Ascher was motivated to write this account by his earlier studies of the Russian Mensheviks, who played a leading role in the events of 1905. As Ascher notes on page 187 of Volume I of *The Revolution of 1905*, of the 17 delegates to the 1903 congress of Russian socialists who formed the original core of the Menshevik faction, no less than 15 were Jews. It was Ascher’s interest in Jewish socialism which led him to study the Revolution of 1905, and even Ascher ended up playing down the full extent of Jewish participation in and leadership of the strikes and protest demonstrations of 1905.

For example, the Revolution of 1905 began with a wave of strikes called to protest the massacre of peaceful demonstrators by Czarist troops on “Bloody Sunday” in January of 1905. Here is how Ascher describes this wave of strikes, on page 94 of Volume I:

In Lodz and Warsaw, more than 100,000 workers laid down their tools, crippling industrial production in both cities. Soldiers in Warsaw fired at peaceful crowds, killing at least 60 and wounding 79. In Vilna a majority of the industrial work force was on strike by January 11, and in Kovno the strike movement spread to ‘all factories and all artisanal establishments’. In the latter city, too, trams and power plants were not functioning and shops were closed.

Missing from this picture is the key detail that Lodz, Warsaw, Vilna and Kovno were all cities within the Pale of Settlement which contained a large Jewish working class and were the major centers of Bund activity. It was the Bund which initiated the strike movement described by Ascher, drawing the Russian and Polish workers in its wake. This was only natural, for in January of 1905 the Bund was far and away the largest and most influential working class organization anywhere in the Czarist empire.

The power of the Bund stemmed from the fact that the Jews of the Pale of Settlement were among the first people in Eastern Europe to be drawn into the industrial labor force in large numbers. Already by 1886, notes Nora Levin on page 38 of *While Messiah Tarried*, there were some 300,000 Jewish industrial workers in the Pale, employed mainly in tanneries, textile factories and the tobacco industry. It was around this time that the forerunner of the Bund, the Jewish Social Democratic Group, was organized in Vilna. It was composed of Jewish activists from the Russian revolutionary movement who felt that they should concentrate on organizing the Jewish working class. By the time that the Bund was formed in 1897, notes Henry Tobias on page 37 of *The Jewish Bund in Russia*, Jewish workers from some 25 different trades had already

been organized into labor unions. The leading figure in the Bund at this time was Arkady Kremer, but he remained almost unknown due to the Bund's stress on collective leadership and the need for secrecy in order to avoid arrest.

At the time the Bund was formed, there was still no organized socialist movement among Russian workers. The very first meeting of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party (RSDWP) was held in Minsk in 1898, and as Tobias notes on page 76, it was actually organized by the Bund. In March of 1898, Kremer held discussions with Russian socialists in Saint Petersburg and Kiev. "It was also then", states Tobias, "that technical arrangements were made for the meeting, which the Bund agreed to host." Tobias adds: "The Bund also contributed machinery and type for the press of the designated central organ of the party, *Rabochaia gazeta*." The Bund already had about 5000 members by this time, while the Russian socialist movement consisted only of a few isolated cells in various cities loosely connected to a small nucleus of Russian exiles in Western Europe headed by Georgi Plekhanov.

Even Plekhanov's group was half Jewish. Plekhanov himself came from an aristocratic Russian background, but many of his close associates in exile were Jewish. Among this number were Pavel Axelrod and Lev Deutsch, who joined with Plekhanov to found the Emancipation of Labor group in 1883. Plekhanov, Axelrod and Deutsch had met in Saint-Petersburg in the mid-1870s while Plekhanov was a student there. Axelrod and Deutsch were already fugitives from the police, and Plekhanov got to know them because he agreed to shelter first one and then the other in his apartment. Samuel Baron suggests on page 16 of *Plekhanov* that it was Axelrod's "supreme loyalty to the revolution" which first inspired Plekhanov with revolutionary ideals. Nonetheless, both Axelrod and Deutsch deferred to Plekhanov in later years as the unquestioned leader of their little group. In return, as Levin notes on page 226 of *While Messiah Tarried*, Plekhanov was kind enough to publicly observe at the 1896 London Congress of the Second International that "the Jewish workers may be considered the vanguard of the labor army in Russia".

But within a few years, Plekhanov was singing a different tune. Jonathan Frankel, on page 229 of *Prophecy and Politics*, cites the following description by Lenin of a conversation he had with Plekhanov in Switzerland in 1900:

He felt that our goal is to kick the Bund out of the Party, that the Jews are all chauvinists and nationalists, that a Russian party must be Russian and not 'give itself into captivity to the tribe of God', etc.

Plekhanov's intense hostility to the Bund was motivated not so much by a dislike of Jews as such but rather a total inability to accept any kind of Jewish leadership or authority. And since the Bund could not help but play a leading role in the Russian socialist movement by virtue of its mass base, Plekhanov's need to reject Jewish leadership took the form of a campaign to exclude the Bund from the tiny RSDWP. Lenin initially resisted Plekhanov's overtures, but by 1903 he had adopted Plekhanov's strategy as his own, in the process supplanting Plekhanov as the dominant figure in the RSDWP.

Like Plekhanov, Lenin had taken his first steps on the road to revolution under Jewish tutelage. Lenin, whose original name was Vladimir Ulyanov, first became prominent in the Russian socialist movement as one of the leaders of the Union of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class, a group in Saint Petersburg which organized strikes at several factories in 1895. But as Israel Getzler brings out on page 29 of *Martov*, the founder of the Union of Struggle group was Julius Martov, originally Tserdabaum, the grandson of Alexander Tserdabaum, one of the leading Jewish liberal intellectuals of 19th century Russia. Moreover, Martov in his turn had derived the program of the Union of Struggle group from a statement known as the Vilna Program, which Arkady Kremer of the Bund had drawn up in the early 1890s. Martov incorporated the principles of the Vilna Program into a Russian language pamphlet entitled *On Agitation* which he wrote in 1894. Martov's *On Agitation* stressed the need to draw workers into strikes and political struggles and not merely organize them into study groups, as the Russian socialists had done up to this time. Lenin accepted this program as the basis of the Union of Struggle group and for a time became a close personal friend of Martov. But as Lenin's standing in the Russian socialist movement grew, so too did his need to rid himself of Jewish tutelage and assume the place which he felt to be rightfully his by virtue of his class and ethnic background.

Although Lenin's father had been a school teacher, he was eventually promoted to the rank of "Inspector" in the Czarist educational hierarchy, a position which officially entitled him to noble status. As Louis Fischer notes on page 19 of *The Life of Lenin*, Lenin was still signing his name, "Nobleman Vladimir Ulyanov", as of 1892. After Lenin went into exile in 1900, he soon supplanted Plekhanov as the dominant figure among the

Russian revolutionaries outside Russia. For that matter, Plekhanov himself had supplanted another Russian exile of noble birth, Peter Lavrov, as the leader of the Russian exile community in the 1880s. And Lavrov too had surrounded himself with Jewish assistants and supporters, including Aaron Lieberman, one of the very first Jewish socialists from Russia. Likewise, Lenin after 1900 developed a lifelong practice of utilizing Jewish socialists as his secretaries and assistants, while at the same time insisting on his own supremacy within the framework of the Russian socialist movement. Lenin's main assistants prior to 1917 were Grigori Zinoviev and Lev Kamenev, both of Jewish descent, who for a time rose to leading positions in the world Communist movement largely as a result of their association with Lenin.

In 1903, after several years of careful preparation, Lenin convoked the Second Congress of the RSDWP. The congress was held abroad rather than in Russia and the Bund was limited to 5 delegates despite the fact that it already had about 30,000

members as compared to at most a few thousand non-Bundist members of the RSDWP. And of this few thousand, a considerable percentage must have been Russian speaking Jews, for when the 1903 congress convened, it transpired that no less than 25 out of the 57 delegates were Jewish. But Lenin had prepared the ground well, conducting both a public and a private campaign against the Bund since 1901. Frankel on page 238 of *Prophecy and Politics* cites the following passage from a letter which Lenin wrote in April of 1903 to one of his supporters in preparation for the congress:

It is essential to drive each and everyone mad, to ram it into their heads that it is essential to prepare for war against the Bund if one wants peace. War with the Bund at the congress, right up to a split whatever happens.

And in fact, the first order of business at the congress was a resolution, introduced by Martov at Lenin's behest, declaring that the Bund was subject to the leadership and direction of the RSDWP. All of the Jewish delegates with the exception of the 5 delegates from the Bund supported Martov's resolution, which Lenin knew would be unacceptable to the Bund, since it required the Bund to accept dictation from a small and inexperienced group which it itself had founded. After the resolution was passed, the Bund delegates withdrew from the congress.

The congress continued, but much to his surprise, Martov suddenly found himself embroiled in a controversy with Lenin over the formulation of the party statutes. Almost all of the Jewish delegates supported Martov, while most of the non-Jewish delegates sided with Lenin. Due to the withdrawal of the 5 Bund delegates, Lenin was able to muster a small majority for his proposals, so that when the two groups finally decided to split at the end of the congress, Lenin's faction claimed the title of Majority, or Bolshevik in Russian, as opposed to Menshevik, or Minority, the name they assigned to Martov's faction. Needless to say, the terms Majority and Minority also functioned as code words for non-Jewish and Jewish. These events took place only a few months after the Kishinev pogrom, which as Tobias notes on page 220, "was almost totally ignored at the Second Congress". Instead, adds Tobias on page 242, the delegates had attacked the Bund "for days on end", with Plekhanov in the chair, "in a mounting ecstasy of indignation". It was in this atmosphere of barely suppressed anti-Semitism that the bitter quarrel between Bolsheviks and Mensheviks ensued.

By January of 1905, there were thus three distinct socialist organizations in Russia: the Bund, the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks. Of these, one was entirely Jewish, the second Jewish-led with a substantial Jewish membership and the third largely non-Jewish. The main difference between the Bund and the Mensheviks was simply that the Bund conducted its agitation and proceedings in Yiddish, while the Mensheviks were Russian speaking and oriented towards organizing Russian rather than Jewish workers. As of 1905, the Bund was the largest of these three groups, the Bolsheviks the smallest. During the early stages of the Revolution of 1905, the Bund played the leading role, but by the fall of 1905, the Mensheviks had become more prominent, due to the success of their program calling for the formation of revolutionary councils or "Soviets" in the major Russian cities. In October of 1905, a revolutionary Soviet was organized in the capital, Saint Petersburg, by the Mensheviks, and it became the focal point of a general strike that led up to the October 17 decree of the Czar granting a constitutional government to Russia.

Ascher, on page 220 of Volume I of *The Revolution of 1905*, notes that the Bolsheviks were initially lukewarm towards the Soviet concept. He adds:

On the other hand, the Mensheviks enthusiastically supported the Soviets, whose origins can in fact be traced to several ideas they had formulated in 1905. For some months before the general strike, the Mensheviks had advocated the creation of organs of

'revolutionary self-government'. In the summer of 1905 the Menshevik leader P.B. Axelrod had proposed the convocation of a 'workers congress', which was to be based on working-class elections in factories and local districts. On October 10, it was the Mensheviks who issued the call for the election of deputies to a Soviet. All these proposals and activities were part of the larger plan to create a broad proletarian political party.

It was thus no coincidence that in November of 1905, Leon Trotsky, a Jewish socialist who had sided with Martov at the 1903 congress, became the leader of the Saint Petersburg Soviet. Arrested after the dissolution of the Soviets by the Czar at the end of 1905, Trotsky led the defense of the Soviet members at a public trial in 1906 and emerged from these events as the best known and most popular revolutionary leader in Russia.

Although ignored by most historians, the role of the Jewish socialists in the Russian Revolution of 1905 was not ignored by the Czarist authorities at the time. The very next day after the Czar issued the "October Manifesto" granting a constitutional government, a wave of pogroms far more destructive than any single previous attack was unleashed against the Jewish communities of the Pale of Settlement. Czarist troops as well as organized fascist gangs were utilized in these attacks. Ascher, on page 255, notes:

For several days attacks on Jews occurred with such frequency that newspapers carried special sections entitled 'Jewish pogroms'; in fact, they told only part of the story.

Ascher estimates that some 690 separate attacks on the Jewish communities of the Pale of Settlement took place at this time, with close to 1000 dead and some 8000 wounded. In the light of what was to come, these figures may not sound like much, but they made a big impression at the time.

The Bundists and Mensheviks were not the only Jewish participants in the Revolution of 1905. Jews also played an important role in the leadership of the Social Revolutionary party, an influential populist organization, and a number of new Jewish radical parties were formed during the course of the year 1905. Levin, on page 408 of *While Messiah Tarried*, suggests a total membership of about 100,000 in the various Jewish radical groups during the Revolution of 1905, including about 16,000 Labor Zionists, 27,000 Socialist Zionists and 13,000 members of the Jewish Socialist Workers party. Most of the remainder belonged to the Bund, whose armed self-defense groups alone had about 10,000 members by 1905. On both a mass level and a leadership level, Jewish radicals played a central role in the Revolution of 1905, and it is just for this reason that scholars have shunned the topic ever since. It is impossible to write knowledgeably about the Revolution of 1905 without perceiving it as Jewish led, but saying so would violate the taboo against appearing to side with the anti-Semites by noticing Jewish influence at work.

Jewish Socialism

Yet even though the central role of the Jewish socialists in the Revolution of 1905 was not openly recognized by anyone but the anti-Semites, it nonetheless had a major impact on the way in which Jewish radicals were seen at the time. After 1905, Jewish radicalism was taken more seriously by friend and foe alike. Within the Jewish community, this reaction took the form of a rapid spread of all forms of Jewish radicalism. While the Bund had been the only important Jewish socialist organization in Russia prior to 1905, after 1905 it was joined by the Labor Zionists and Territorialists. At the same time, Jewish radical groups also proliferated outside of Russia in the Yiddish speaking Diaspora, which was greatly augmented by a wave of refugees uprooted by the events of 1905. And within the Second International of socialist parties, the Jewish socialists were treated with new respect after 1905. The open expression of anti-Semitic views by socialists, which had been so common in the days of Marx and Engels, now came to be considered incorrect.

An important step in this direction had already been taken during the 1890s under the influence of Eleanor Marx, the daughter of Karl Marx. Drawn to the Yiddish speaking immigrants in London's East End, Eleanor Marx gradually became something of a Jewish activist. Yvonne Kapp on page 520 of Volume 2 of *Eleanor Marx* cites the following remarks by an acquaintance of hers:

But Eleanor explained to me that she was active among the Jewish working women in Whitechapel, and that in the interests of socialist propaganda it was more sensible for her to learn Yiddish than to wait for the ignorant masses of immigrants from Eastern Europe to become Anglicised. 'Besides, the Jewish language is akin to my blood,' she said. 'In our family it is thought that I am like my paternal grandmother, who was the wife of a learned Rabbi'.

Kapp also cites, on page 510 of Volume 2, her reply to an invitation to speak at a meeting called to protest against the pogroms in Russia: "I shall be very glad to speak at the meeting of Novbr. 1st, the more glad, that my Father was a Jew."

After the founding of the Second International in 1889, Eleanor Marx came to play a key role in its proceedings due both to her family background and her skills as a translator. Kapp notes on page 524 of Volume 2 that she utilized her prominent position at the 1893 Zurich congress of the Second International to introduce Morris Winchevsky to the delegates. Winchevsky was a representative of the Jewish socialists of London. In his memoirs, *Stories of the Struggle*, Winchevsky recounts on page 153 how Eleanor Marx then approached him during a parade of the socialists through the streets of Zurich and invited him to march with her. She said:

Say. Edward and Will Thorne are to bring up the rear as marshals. Let us two march between them. We Jews ought to stick together.

Winchevsky, by the way, had been drawn to Jewish socialism by Aaron Lieberman, one of the Russian Jewish socialist

emigres in London who acted as an assistant to the emigre Russian revolutionary leader Peter Lavrov in the 1870s. As for Eleanor Marx, she found little support for her Jewish activism among her former friends and comrades in the English socialist movement. Treated with increasing contempt by her long time companion, Edward Aveling, she finally committed suicide in 1898.

Despite her efforts, Jewish socialists still had a hard time at gatherings of the Second International during the 1890s. When Abraham Cahan, a delegate of the United Hebrew Trades of New York, raised the issue of the pogroms at the 1891 congress of the Second International, he was shocked by the hostility with which he was received and by the refusal of the congress to condemn the pogroms. But after 1905, overt expressions of anti-Semitism at socialist gatherings became rare. The Bund and other Jewish socialist groups were accepted as legitimate socialist organizations, and assimilated Jewish Marxists within the various European and American socialist parties became increasingly prominent and influential at international socialist conferences. Jewish socialism was never fully accepted by the Marxists, due to Marx's intense anti-Semitism, but at least it came to be regarded as a fact that had to be taken into consideration.

The leading spokesman for the Bund during this period was Vladimir Medem. Like many of the early Bund leaders, Medem came from an assimilated background and had to learn Yiddish later in life in order to communicate with Jewish workers. In his *Memoirs*, on page 260, Medem describes how the Bund helped to establish not only the RSDWP but also the PPS, the Polish Socialist Party, whose leader Pilsudski later became the ruler of Poland. Medem is speaking about his contacts with PPS leaders in 1902:

These gentlemen were rather genial toward us at that time, a time when the PPS had renewed its activities after a lapse of several years. It was quite feeble; the Bund in Russia gave it substantial support and assistance. Later on, after they had come to stand on their own feet, they began to fight the very same Bund. How wise was the man who observed that a favor is never forgiven.

On the other hand, Medem also describes, on page 420, how Trotsky after 1905 tried to court the Bund:

He wished to form a faction of his own in the party and evidently counted on the support of the Bund; thus he began a rather strong flirtation with the Bund and the 'Bundovtses' (Bundists) which continued for years. In earlier years he had been a bitter opponent of the Bund; at the congress in 1903 Trotsky had engaged in the sharpest clashes with Liber. But the situation had changed and he endeavored to establish a relationship with us of some considerable intimacy.

If "the situation had changed", it was less because the Bund had become more powerful than because Jewish socialism in general had become more acceptable in Marxist circles.

Outside of Poland, the Bund if anything lost ground after 1905. The Jewish socialist movement in Russia of the period 1905-1917 was much broader and less closely tied to the Bund than it had previously been. This was mainly because the pogroms of October 1905 had revealed a serious weakness in the Bund's strategy for revolution in Russia. The Bund's self defense units, which were very active between 1903 and 1905, could deal fairly well with the fascist gangs but not with regular Czarist troops. Both the strength and the weakness of the Bund were rooted in its urban character. Due to the Czarist prohibition against Jews owning land, the Jewish population of the Pale was overwhelmingly urban. In Bielorussia, the part of the Pale where the Bund was strongest, Jews formed close to 60% of the entire urban population. Strikes and demonstrations in the

cities were an effective protest tactic, but the surrounding countryside always remained in the hands of the enemy. After 1905, the Jewish socialist organizations which grew most rapidly in Russia were therefore those which advocated some kind of Jewish settlement on the land as the only secure basis for Jewish survival.

These socialists were known collectively under the name of Territorialists. Territorialism embraced a wide range of groups and tendencies, including advocates of the formation of Jewish agricultural communes, Zionists and those who wanted to establish an independent Jewish state in Bielorussia, the Ukraine or the Crimea. The leading Territorialist theoretician was Chaim Zhitlovsky, who had first raised the demand for Jewish settlement on the land in an essay published in 1892 entitled *A Jew to the Jews*. Like most Territorialists, Zhitlovsky was also an ardent Yiddishist, who viewed the Yiddish language as the natural vehicle for the establishment of a secular Jewish culture. After Zhitlovsky emigrated to the United States in the early 1900s, he became “the mentor and recognized leader of the secularists”, as Saul Goodman describes him on page 8 of *The Faith of Secular Jews*. As Goodman notes on page 11, for Zhitlovsky secularism did not mean assimilation:

In Zhitlovsky’s opinion, a secular Jew may celebrate most Jewish holidays, resting on the Sabbath; observance of the holidays should be mandatory for him.

But as suggested by the fact that Zhitlovsky ended up in New York, Territorialism remained more a yearning than a reality in Russia prior to 1917 due to the continuing Czarist prohibition against Jews owning land in any form.

Both Nachman Syrkin and Ber Borochov, the leading socialist Zionist theoreticians in Russia, also turned up in New York after the failure of the Revolution of 1905. Borochov’s decision to emigrate to the United States was particularly embarrassing in that he was the author of the theory that an inevitable “styctic process” would cause most Jews fleeing Russia to settle in the land of Israel. After the outbreak of the Revolution of 1917 Borochov returned to Russia but died shortly after receiving a hero’s welcome upon his return. Although a Zionist in theory, Borochov had always remained strongly identified with the Jewish revolutionary movement in Russia. In one of his last essays, Borochov argued that it was no coincidence that the Russian Revolution of 1917 had abolished the Czarist discriminatory legislation against the Jews. He put it this way, on page 19 of his *Essays On Nationalism, Class Struggle and the Jewish People*:

For fifty years, Jewish emancipation movements were active in Russia. Hence, the Russian Revolution immediately broke the chains of the Jewish people. The Russian Jews, however, were almost as instrumental in bringing about their freedom as was the Revolution. If our hearts are filled with gratitude to the Russian nation and the Russian working class for our emancipation, we must also give the same wholehearted thanks and recognition to the Jewish Maskilim of the 60’s and 70’s, to the Jewish Socialist Bund, and to the Socialist-Zionists, through whose struggles the result was made possible.

And he concluded that one and the same struggle had led both to “the recognition of our national-political rights in Palestine and our autonomous national rights in the Galut”.

Many socialist Zionists did emigrate to the land of Israel after 1905, constituting a “Second Wave” of Jewish settlers comparable to the “First Wave” that had come in the immediate aftermath of the outbreak of the pogroms in 1881. Shabtai Teveth, on page 30 of *Ben-Gurion*, describes the young David Gruen, “a gun stuck in his belt”, commanding the Jewish self-defense group in his home town of Plonsk during the Revolution of 1905. But after the failure of the revolution, Gruen emigrated to the land of Israel, changed his name to Ben-Gurion and took part in the formation of the first Jewish agricultural communes in 1908-09. Although the idea of Jews forming communes on the land had originated in Russia, it proved easier to implement in the land of Israel or even in the United States than it did in Bielorussia or the Ukraine. Only after the Revolution of 1917, during the 1920s, did Jews achieve some success in establishing agricultural cooperatives in Russia.

Despite its diversity, the Jewish socialist movement of the period 1905-1917 did have certain characteristic features. One was the emergence of women in leading roles. Among the women who became prominent in Jewish socialist circles at this

time were Esther Frumkin of the Bund and Manya Shochat of the Labor Zionists. Their emergence as leaders reflected the fact that a considerable percentage of the Jewish workers in the textile factories and clothing industry were women. Another characteristic of the Jewish socialist movement of this period was its relative freedom from dogmatism. Although most Jewish socialists were influenced by Marxism to some degree, the Marxist attitude towards Jewish nationality was too hostile to permit its complete acceptance by self-

consciously Jewish socialists. Particularly among the Territorialists, there emerged instead all kinds of eclectic socialist views, drawing on anarchist and Tolstoyan sources as well as the various 19th century socialist theorists.

Perhaps the most characteristic feature of the Jewish socialism of this period was its intense intellectualism. Jewish socialists originating in the Pale of Settlement were normally well read, fluent in at least two or three languages and accustomed to spending long hours in political debate. No sooner did a thought appear than it became an “ism”, buttressed by a whole body of supporting arguments and carefully distinguished from all the previous “isms”. This tendency to constantly define and redefine political positions reflected the fact that the legitimacy of Jewish socialism was always being called into question by its foes both on the left and on the right. This same pressure also generated a spirit of polemical factionalism, a point which was stressed by the Zionist leader Jabotinsky in a sardonic description of the Jewish socialist parties in Russia cited by Frankel on page 168 of *Prophecy and Politics*. Jabotinsky wrote in 1905:

The complexity of the Jewish question has forced each of these parties to violate the Social Democratic program with heretical points of a more or less national character, and the greater the extent of the heresy in a given party the more it feels a kind of spiritual depression...Each party tries to justify itself before that which is less heretical but at the same time lords it over that which is more heretical and here it willingly goes in for exaggeration, as the result of a simple and innocent calculation - the more you abuse your lowly neighbor for his heresy, the more you demonstrate to your superiors your own orthodoxy.

And in fact there did exist a kind of hierarchy of legitimacy within the Jewish socialist movement, with the Mensheviks striving to justify themselves to the Bolsheviks, the Bundists to the Mensheviks, the Territorialists to the Bundists and the Zionists to everyone else. Yet despite the endless debates and fine distinctions, they were really all saying the same thing: that the Jewish people had a right to live in peace in a future socialist world.

The Turkish Revolution

Jewish radicalism became increasingly influential after 1905 not only in Europe and the United States but also in the Middle East. A key factor in the emergence of the first secular and radical groups among Jews in the Middle East was the Turkish Revolution of 1908. Just as the Czarist government was the main bastion of autocracy in Europe, so the empire of the Turkish Sultan was the main bastion of autocracy in the Middle East. But in 1908, the power of the Sultan was gravely weakened by the start of a revolution in the Turkish empire. An organization called the Committee for Union and Progress came to power and instituted a constitutional government. The leaders of the Committee, who were known as the “Young Turks”, held out for a time the promise of the transformation of the Turkish empire into a multi-national federation organized along democratic lines. This promise failed to materialize due to the start of World War I and the transformation of the government of the Committee into a military dictatorship. All the same, the Turkish Revolution of 1908 did inaugurate a new and more radical phase in the politics of the Middle East, including Jewish politics.

The main base of the Committee for Union and Progress was the city of Salonica, which in 1908 was still a part of the

Turkish empire. This was the same Salonica, now a part of Greece, in which Jacob Frank had learned of the teachings of the Donmeh in the 18th century. It had been at that time the home of the largest single Jewish community in the entire world, and in 1908 it was still a predominantly Jewish city. Varnik Volkan and Norman Itzkowitz note on page 13 of *The Immortal Ataturk* that in 1908 Jews formed “the major ethnic group in the city of Salonika”. According to the census of 1881, Jews constituted approximately 35,000 of Salonica’s 70,000 inhabitants; some 18,000 were Turks, most of the rest Greeks. Moreover, a considerable percentage of the Turks were actually members of the Donmeh, who were of Jewish descent. The British ambassador to the Turkish empire, cited on page 94 of an article by Elie Kedourie appearing in *Middle Eastern Studies* in 1971, estimated in 1910 that Salonica had a population of 140,000, “of whom 80,000 are Spanish Jews, and 20,000 of the sect of Sabetai Levi”, meaning the Donmeh. Was there not some significance in the fact that the Turkish Revolution of 1908 was centered in a predominantly Jewish city, and one with a long tradition of Messianic radicalism at that?

The British ambassador certainly thought so. A large part of Kedourie’s article, entitled “Young Turks, Freemasons and Jews”, is devoted to reproducing the text of a long letter which the British ambassador, one

Gerard Lowther, sent to London in 1910 claiming that the Committee for Union and Progress was controlled by Jews and Freemasons. On page 94, Lowther specifically stated that “the inspiration of the movement in Salonica would seem to have been mainly Jewish”. Lowther was particularly suspicious of Emanuel Carosso, elected as the representative of Salonica to the Ottoman parliament convoked by the Young Turks, who was not only Jewish but a member of the Masons as well. Djavid Bey, a member of the Young Turk government, also caught Lowther’s eye; he belonged to the Donmeh. On page 99, Lowther complained that “the Young Turk seems to have allied himself solely with the Jew, Ottoman and foreign”, and he continued as follows:

The latter seems to have entangled the pre-economic-minded Turk in his toils, and as Turkey happens to contain the places sacred to Israel, it is but natural that the Jew should strive to maintain a position of exclusive influence and utilize it for the furtherance of his ideals, viz. the ultimate creation of an autonomous Jewish state in Palestine or Babylonia, as explained by Israel Zangwill in his article in the ‘Fortnightly Review’ of April.

And Lowther concluded that the chief goal of the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy was “unrestricted immigration of Jews into Turkey”.

Typically, modern scholars have tended to ignore or reject the view, expressed at the time by Lowther and others, that the Young Turks were influenced by the Jews. Bernard Lewis, a prominent Jewish historian of the Middle East, dismisses this view in a footnote on page 207 of *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. After noting that the theme of a Judeo-Masonic conspiracy behind the Turkish Revolution of 1908 was “taken up in some British circles” at the time, Lewis asserts:

There seems, however, to be no evidence at all, in the voluminous Turkish literature on the Young Turks, that Jews ever played a part of any significance in their councils, either before or after the Revolution, or that the Masonic lodges were ever more than an occasional cover for their secret meetings.

But why was the Committee for Union and Progress based in Salonica? Why did it continue to meet there even after it came to power, as Lewis himself reports on page 216, noting that the Committee held its 1911 party congress there? Lewis does not ask these questions, nor does he even mention that Salonica was a predominantly Jewish city.

A more balanced analysis of the situation was presented by Mim Kemal Oke in an article, “Young Turks, Freemasons, Jews and the Question of Zionism in the Ottoman Empire (1908-1913)”, appearing in *Studies In Zionism* in 1986. Oke argues that there was in fact cooperation between Turkish Jews and the Young Turks but that Lowther greatly exaggerated the extent of Jewish influence on the Young Turks for his own purposes. Lowther perceived the Young Turks as a threat to British interests and hoped to discredit them in the eyes of the British Foreign Office by presenting them as puppets of the Jews. Ironically, Lowther’s views found ready acceptance among the internal opponents of the Young Turks, including the Arab nationalists, as Oke notes on page 212:

The Judeo-Masonic conspiracy with the Young Turks at its center was happily seized upon by the Turkish Liberals of the Sabaheddin school and by the Arab nationalists alike.

And in 1913, Lowther organized a real conspiracy of his own together with an Arab nationalist group to assassinate the leaders of the Committee and overthrow their government. One Young Turk leader was in fact killed, but the conspirators were then rounded up and executed, whereupon Lowther was hastily recalled to London by the British Foreign Office.

According to Oke, the reason why Lowther wanted to overthrow the Young Turks is because they were attempting to enlist both Jews and Arabs in a Middle Eastern alliance against European imperialism. Oke put it this way, on page 214:

Much to the dismay of the British, the Young Turks seemed to establish a rapprochement between the Arabs and Zionists within the framework of what Talaat Bey called ‘the Muslim-Jewish Alliance’. Such an alliance, as envisaged by the Committee, was to construct a united front of Oriental Jews, Arabs and Turks against the encroachments of Christianity in Asia. In practical terms, this meant fighting the imperialist policies of the British.

However, in view of the emerging Arab opposition to Jewish settlement in the land of Israel, it is hard to see

how the Young Turks could in fact have brought the Arab nationalists and Zionists together. Moreover, the Young Turks themselves were not particularly sympathetic to Jewish settlement in the land of Israel and did little to aid the Jewish cause in this area. If there was nonetheless a close relationship between the Committee and the Jewish community of the Turkish empire, it was because there existed a strong tendency within both groups in favor of a more secular world view than that associated with the empire of the Sultan.

Lewis, on page 227 of *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*, brings out that the Young Turks were great admirers of Auguste Comte, Saint-Simon's one time secretary and the founder of sociology. Lewis also notes that the Young Turks were strongly influenced by another sociologist, Emile Durkheim, who was of Jewish origin, and goes on to discuss what sociologists like Comte and Durkheim had in common:

A common feature of all these schools is their tendency to treat sociology as a kind of philosophy, even of religion, and as a source of quasi-revealed authority on moral, social, political, and even religious problems.

This same tendency towards the substitution of philosophy for religion was also present in the Freemasons, who clearly played a larger role in the thinking of the Young Turks than Lewis admits. Oke states that after the Young Turks came to power, they centralized all the Masonic lodges in Turkey under Talaat Bey as Grand Master and began forming new lodges in Egypt, Syria and elsewhere. Oke adds on page 210:

It seems that Talaat had in mind the establishment of an 'Islamic Freemasonry' as an underground network providing a channel for fostering solidarity among the Muslim people in their anti-imperialist struggle.

But Jews were also active in the Freemasons, including Emanuel Carosso, whom Lowther thought to be the leader of the Judeo-Masonic conspiracy. As it so happens, Carosso was also the founder of the Ottoman Zionist club. And as shown by the fact that he was elected as the representative of Salonica to the new Ottoman parliament, his quasi-secular views had many supporters within the Jewish community. Secularism, whether linked to sociology, the Masons, Zionism or for that matter the Donmeh, was the common thread which bound Young Turks and Jews together in the Turkish Revolution of 1908.

Among the strongest supporters of the Revolution of 1908 were the young Jewish radicals who had just emigrated to the land of Israel from Russia. In her memoirs, *Coming Home*, Rahel Yanait Ben-Zvi describes on page 84 the reaction of her circle of Jewish socialists from Russia to the news of the outbreak of the revolution. Their immediate response was to set out for Jerusalem:

Among a mass of people we hurried there with our friends, for the first time carrying our national flag in public, side by side with the Ottoman colors. Avner was among the speakers. He climbed the steps leading into the Tower of David and spoke of the brotherhood of peoples, of Jewish national revival, of the aspiration of the working class for emancipation. He was applauded as were the other speakers.

Avner was the pseudonym of her husband, Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, who was to become the second President of the state of Israel. Another member of their circle was David Ben-Gurion, the future founder of the state of Israel. On page 85, Rahel Ben-Zvi gives the following description of the way these people viewed the revolution, which they referred to as "Hurriya", an Arabic word meaning freedom:

We wanted to believe that *Hurriya* meant the abolition of immigration restrictions, the end of the 'red card', and freedom to acquire land. It meant, we thought, that our movement could come out into the open, instead of operating underground.

So seriously did they take the promise of the Revolution of 1908 that within a short time, both Yitzhak Ben-Zvi and David Ben-Gurion left for Istanbul to study Turkish and enroll in law school with the intention of eventually becoming representatives of the Jewish community of the land of Israel in the Ottoman parliament.

At the same time, both Ben-Zvi and Ben-Gurion began to cultivate contacts with the Jewish community of the Turkish community, and in particular with the Jews of Salonica. On page 139 of *Coming Home*, Rahel Ben-Zvi notes that at the 1909 World Conference of the Labor Zionists, her husband "revealed his bold plan, which was quite new to the delegates, to spread Zionist activities among the Jews of the Ottoman Empire". She continues:

He spoke of his visits to Izmir, Constantinople and Saloniki. He had found in Saloniki a flourishing Jewish community of some

80,000 souls, a Jewish working class, Jewish stevedores in the port, and a Jewish atmosphere in the city. The port closed down for the Sabbath and Festivals. Avner had met the leaders of the community and came away deeply moved by their sincere love of Zion.

And on page 78 of *Ben-Gurion*, Teveth brings out that Ben-Gurion actually lived in Salonica for 10 months in 1911-12 while studying Turkish. Teveth states:

Ben-Gurion asserted that it was there he realized that Jews were capable of all types of work, describing it as 'a Hebrew labor town, the only one in the world'.

These contacts between the Jews of Salonica and the leaders of the Labor Zionists in the land of Israel had the effect of radicalizing both parties, further intensifying that secular trend in the Jewish community of the Turkish empire which had been partially responsible for the revolution in the first place.

Unfortunately, a series of events - the capture of Salonica by the Greeks in 1912, Lowther's conspiracy of 1913 and the outbreak of World War I in 1914 - led the Young Turks to abandon all thought of a democratic and constitutional government and revert to the more traditional pattern of a military dictatorship instead. During World War I, this dictatorship proved increasingly hostile to both Jewish and Arab national aspirations, as well as harshly repressive on a genocidal scale towards the Armenians. Yet enough remained of the spirit of the Revolution of 1908 that when the Turkish Republic was founded in 1923, it was established as a secular state, the first and to this day one of the only secular states anywhere in the Middle East. The decision to separate church and state in the newly established Turkish Republic was taken largely on the initiative of its founder, Mustafa Kemal, who was born and raised in Salonica.

Culture

However understood, the fact that Jews had played such a key role in both the Russian Revolution of 1905 and the Turkish Revolution of 1908 inevitably enhanced the prestige of Jewish radicals everywhere. This trend was clearly visible not only in the world of radical politics but also in the cultural domain. Sigmund Freud, Emma Goldman and Albert Einstein were the leading lights in a galaxy of Jewish culture stars who became famous at just this time. These culture stars were radicals in the sense that they rejected organized religion, tended to the left in politics and were associated with some kind of radical new idea in their respective fields of interest. Indeed, it was precisely by espousing daring new ideas that Jews were able to become prominent at this time in the cultural sphere. The new ideas proved popular, creating a kind of cult or mystique around the Jewish radicals who had first proposed them.

The emergence of Jews as culture stars at this time was particularly noticeable in Bohemian circles. Frederic Grunfeld brings out on page 68 of *Prophets Without Honour* that in Munich, of all places, the "uncrowned king" of the pre-war Bohemian community was a Jewish symbolist poet named Karl Wolfskehl. By the way, many of the leaders of the Bavarian Soviet Republic that was formed for a short time in 1919 were Jewish writers and artists who had also belonged to the Bohemian community of Munich. Likewise, the Jewish anarchist Emma Goldman was the leading personality of the pre-war Bohemian community of New York, as well as an internationally known lecturer and writer. Whereas Jews in the academic world or the professions still had to make their way in the face of an entrenched anti-Semitic bureaucracy, Jews in Bohemia were a little more readily accepted. People who thought of themselves as Bohemians generally favored free love, artistic innovation and radical politics. They were Romantics, people who still believed in the religion of humanity espoused by the early socialists. Always Jewish on some level, this tradition became much more openly so during the years just before World War I.

Symptomatic of the growing acceptance of Jewishness in pre-war Bohemian circles was the career of Naphtali Herz Imber, the author of "Hatikvah", the Israeli national anthem. Born in Eastern Europe, Imber spent some time in the land of Israel in the early 1880s but eventually settled in the United States in 1891. A heavy drinker, he became a familiar figure in American Bohemian circles and made a living as a professional writer in English for American literary magazines. On page 14 of Imber's *Selected Writings*, the editor, Jacob Kabakoff, notes that in the early 1890s Imber published a brochure entitled "The Fall of Jerusalem" which "presents a critique of capitalism in the spirit of the then prevalent Populist movement". Imber also advertised himself to the public as a "Cabbalistic scholar", an attribute which Kabakoff questions, and wrote on Jewish

themes for a predominantly non-Jewish American audience.

In 1905 in the *New Era Illustrated Magazine*, Imber published a story entitled “How I Became a Heretic”. In it, Imber described with tongue in cheek how he was driven from his home town in Eastern Europe by the rabbis as a “heretic” at the age of 15 because he had refused to believe in an “Olam Hatohu”, a “World of Confusion” to which certain souls were supposedly sent after their death. Imber left his home “determined to be guided by common sense alone”, but continues in the following vein on page 81 of his *Selected Writings*:

Thirty-five years ago, I left my native land because I refused to believe in the *Olam Hatohu*. But I must confess that I have become a strong believer in it. Reb Moshe was a wise man in his generation. For thirty-five years I was a rolling stone (and I am still), and I have not yet gathered the moss of wisdom. I have held converse with the unspeakable Turk, as well as with the talkative Arab. I have wandered through the tents of Shem, and through the shanties of the Sons of Ham. I have mingled with the gay children of France, as well as with the phlegmatic Sons of Albion. I have seen different nations and have sojourned in many countries - and what have I seen? An *Olam Hatohu*, a World of Confusion, where shadowlike beings are shifting and drifting, jostling each other without aim or purpose.

Imber was a disillusioned Romantic, whose belief in a religion of humanity had led him down a path which ended in Zionism. As he put it on page 152:

I am a Zionist because I am an expression of my nation and knowing what I lack and need, I know what my nation lacks and needs. I lack a resting place. I need a home, for during my forty years of wandering, I lost many valuable things as well as my reputation and so did my nation, too.

That Imber was able to win an American audience for the expression of such sentiments was indicative of the enhanced prestige of Jewish radicalism during this period.

Another sign of the times was the growing prominence in Paris of Jewish painters like Marc Chagall. Chagall came to Paris from Russia in 1910 and became part of a circle of Jewish painters that also included Soutine, Zadkine and Lipchitz. On page 122 of *Marc Chagall*, Sidney Alexander brings out that this group tried to start a journal, to be called “Makhmadim”, intended to “contribute toward determining in the plastic realm a style specifically Jewish, for such a style had not yet been sharply defined”. Chagall returned to Russia just before World War I and emerged in 1918 as the Bolshevik “Commissar for Art” in the city of Vitebsk. Chagall founded an art school in Vitebsk, which came to be known as the “College of New Art”, and also designed sets for the Jewish theatre of Moscow before returning to Paris in 1923. He was the first painter of modern times to achieve fame by the presentation of Jewish themes.

Among intellectuals in Paris and elsewhere, this was the era of the vogue of the French Jewish sociologist, as personified by Emile Durkheim, Marcel Mauss and Lucien Levy-Bruhl. Durkheim in particular had a strong influence not only on the Young Turks but also on the academic world of France, England and the United States. All of the French Jewish sociologists were associated with a trend towards the study of non-European peoples, a trend which played a major role in the rise of anthropology as an academic discipline. At the same time, they were closely linked to leftist circles in French politics. Jean Lacouture, on page 67 of *Leon Blum*, brings out that the money to found *l'Humanité*, the French socialist newspaper, was raised by Leon Blum, a French Jewish socialist leader, with the aid of Levy-Bruhl. Mauss, who was Durkheim's nephew, is described as follows in the entry under his name in the *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Judaica*: “Active in support of Dreyfus and in socialist and cooperative movements.” And all three were associated with a radical bookstore established in the Latin Quarter of Paris by Charles Peguy in 1898, as noted by Lacouture on page 61 of his biography of Leon Blum.

Franz Kafka in the world of literature, Arnold Schoenberg in classical music, Gertrude Stein in poetry, Arthur Schnitzler in the theatre, Harry Houdini in the music hall - these were but a few of the avant-garde Jewish artistic personalities who achieved fame at this time as daring innovators. Houdini, who was born Eric Weiss in 1874, became famous for escaping from sealed compartments not only on the stage but in real life. At one point in his career he toured Germany challenging the German police to come up with a jail cell whose lock he could not pick. None succeeded. Houdini's ability to break out of an enclosed space was an appropriate symbol of the revolutionary energy of the Jewish people breaking out of the enclosed space of the ghetto and erupting with explosive force into the larger world of European and American culture. But at the same time, profound changes were also taking place in the cultural sphere within the Jewish community. This was the era of the emergence of both Yiddish and Hebrew as literary languages and of the creation of a large body

of written work in both languages expressing a Jewish radical point of view. And since nothing happened in the world of Jewish radicalism without extensive discussion and debate, this was also the era of the rise of Yiddishism and Hebraism.

Yiddishism was formally launched as a cultural movement at a conference held in the city of Czernowitz in Austrian Galicia in 1908. The Yiddishists believed that Yiddish should not be regarded as a mere dialect but recognized as a written language the equal of any other. To this end they sought to publish in Yiddish not only their own works but also translations of the classics of world literature. They regarded Yiddish as the language of the Jewish masses, in sharp contrast to Hebrew, which they tended to portray as the language of the Jewish bourgeoisie. From the start, the Yiddishist movement was therefore associated with a negative attitude towards Hebrew. On page 216 of *Architects of Yiddishism*, Emanuel Goldsmith cites Esther Frumkin, the Bund delegate to the Czernowitz conference, declaring: "If the Conference is fated to achieve anything it can only be to the detriment of the Hebraists and can only bury Hebrew." There was a strong feminist undercurrent behind this point of view, since education in the Hebrew language had been traditionally reserved primarily for Jewish males, while Yiddish was known as the "Mamaloschen", the mother tongue. Many Jewish women could read Yiddish, and a considerable proportion of the first books published in Yiddish had been primarily intended for a female audience.

By 1908 there already existed a large Yiddish language popular press and also many literary works in Yiddish. The Yiddish press was particularly successful in New York since it was possible to publish there without much interference from the authorities. The Jewish Daily Forward, published in New York starting in 1897, soon became the most popular Yiddish language newspaper in the world. By the early 1920s it had a daily circulation of well over 200,000. It carried selections from the literary works of the Yiddishists as well as news and views from a socialist standpoint. Its editor was Abraham Cahan, for many years the leading figure in the New York Yiddish world. On page 145 of his memoirs, *The Education of Abraham Cahan*, Cahan describes how he was converted to socialism as a young student in Vilna by Russian socialists who were friendly to him:

They talked to me as an equal! As if I were one of their own! No distinction between Jew and gentile! In the spirit of true equality and brotherhood!

But after the start of the pogroms, with his own arrest imminent, Cahan decided to emigrate to America, where he arrived in 1882. Although he was best known as the editor of the Forward, he also wrote fiction in English and longed for recognition as an English language writer and thinker.

Hebraism, as the Yiddishists said, was rooted in Jewish religious tradition. But during the 19th century, a movement had developed among "Enlightened" Jews in Eastern Europe to develop a secular Hebrew language literary culture. Known as "Maskilim", meaning "enlightened ones" in Hebrew, the secular Hebraists played a key role in the birth of the modern Zionist movement. It was by reading and discussing the works of the Maskilim that the late 19th and early 20th century Jewish immigrants to the land of Israel gradually developed Hebrew as a spoken language. The leading Hebraist of the era of the Jewish Revolution was Eliezer Ben Yehudah, who emigrated to the land of Israel in 1881 and lived in Jerusalem until his death in 1922. In 1908 Ben Yehudah began publication of the first modern Hebrew dictionary; he had completed 5 volumes by the time of his death. Robert St. John on page 312 of *Tongue Of The Prophets* cites the following prediction made by Ben Yehudah in 1910:

Someday the Jews will be a nation. No one can stop it. The day will come when the importance and power of the Jews will be taken into consideration in the meeting places of the mighty. When the hour arrives for the last judgment of the nations, we shall be among them.

Ben Yehudah was also familiar with Arabic and as St. John notes on page 319, gave a lecture to the Arabic Academy of Science in Cairo shortly before World War I, "pleasing his Arab hosts by telling them of the close relationship between their language and his and how many words of their own, which they thought purely Arabic, had been 'borrowed' from Hebrew."

On page 48 of his biography of Ben Yehudah, St. John brings out the significant detail that Ben Yehudah first heard "Sephardic" Hebrew spoken in Algiers around 1880 and became convinced that it was closer to ancient Hebrew than the Hebrew spoken in Eastern Europe. Ben Yehudah himself began to speak Hebrew in the

“Sephardic” manner, as did the great majority of other Jewish immigrants to the land of Israel from Eastern Europe. The term “Sephardic”, meaning Spanish, originally referred to the Ladino speaking Jews from Spain who settled in large numbers in the Turkish empire. However, by extension it came to be used as a term for any Jew from the Middle East, including many who were in no sense Spanish and whose ancestors had lived in the Middle East even prior to the rise of Islam. It is therefore hard to know to what extent the “Sephardic” Hebrew that Ben Yehudah heard was influenced by Spanish and to what extent by Arabic and other Middle Eastern languages. In any case, it was a Middle Eastern form of Hebrew, and it is significant that it eventually became the official Hebrew of Israel, endorsed as such by Ben Yehudah and the Hebraist institutions which he helped to establish.

Despite their bitter factional disputes, both Yiddishists and Hebraists shared a common commitment to the development of a secular literary culture in a Jewish language that could serve as the basis for the rebirth of the Jewish nation. Indeed, a considerable percentage of the original leaders of each faction were fluent in both languages and had stressed first one and then the other at different phases in their career. The Yiddishists were clearly correct in their view that Yiddish was the more proletarian language, the language of the masses in Eastern Europe; but the Hebraists also had a valid point in that Hebrew was the language of the entire Jewish people, not just European Jews but also Jews from the Middle East. There was no inherent reason to reject either language, but both sides were spurred on by political considerations, the Hebraists by their need to create an official Jewish language for the land of Israel, the Yiddishists by the pressure to justify themselves in the eyes of the anti-Zionist Marxist establishment. Both sides therefore tended to disparage the other, while simultaneously emulating one another and developing in tandem during the exact same period of time.

The more status that came to attach to both Yiddish and Hebrew at this time, the more assimilated Jews felt free to express their Jewishness within a European or American cultural framework. Gone were the days when Jewish radicals had to convert to Christianity in order to reach a mass audience. The great Jewish culture stars of this period, people like Freud, Goldman and Einstein, made no secret of their Jewish background and associations. Einstein in particular was well known for his Zionist views and frequently lent his name to Zionist fund drives and other activities. Emma Goldman spoke Yiddish and often appeared before Yiddish speaking audiences, while Sigmund Freud was a member of the Vienna chapter of the Jewish fraternal order Bnai Brith. Jewishness had not precisely become fashionable, but at least it no longer constituted an insuperable obstacle to popularity in a European or American cultural context. And then suddenly in 1914, just as Jewish radicalism seemed to be becoming established as a force in the world, all of these gains were thrown into question by the outbreak of World War I. Were Jewish radicals inclined to think like our enemies, this entire war could easily be portrayed as a vast imperialist conspiracy against the Jewish people, since its immediate effect was to convert the Pale of Settlement into a war zone.

War

Whether intended as such or not, the outbreak of World War I represented an unmitigated disaster from a Jewish point of view. Not only was the Pale of Settlement occupied by contending German and Russian armies, but Jews everywhere were adversely affected. In the land of Israel, the Turkish government came down hard on the Jewish settlers, deporting many and subjecting the entire community to severe harassment. Both in Europe and the United States, Jewish radicals were threatened with arrest or deportation if they did not appear sufficiently supportive of the war effort. International conferences became impossible, radical organizations were forced to suspend their activities, Jews were drafted to fight one another in a war in which few believed or identified with in any way. In every country the war gave the imperialists the upper hand, while the radical movement found itself divided and confused.

Almost all Jewish radicals were opposed to the war from the very start, but at first only a few dared to express their opposition openly and actively. It is true that overt opposition to the war among Jewish radicals in the United States was initially widespread, but this was because the United States did not actually enter the war until 1917. Once American soldiers began fighting, only a minority continued to oppose the war. In Russia it was almost impossible for Jewish radicals to oppose the war in any way since virtually the entire Pale of Settlement had come under military occupation. In countries like Germany, Austria and France, there was intense pressure on Jewish radicals to go along with the war in which so many soldiers were fighting and dying. Nonetheless there were those who openly opposed the war from the beginning, most notably Rosa

Luxemburg in Germany and Friedrich Adler in Austria.

In 1914, Rosa Luxemburg was a prominent figure in the German socialist movement, much in demand at socialist gatherings as a public speaker. Almost alone among German socialist leaders she opposed the war from the very start and was sentenced to a year in prison in 1915 as a result. Not long after her release she was again arrested and placed in “protective custody” until the end of the war. From prison she helped to organize the German socialist opponents of the war into a group called the Spartacus League, the forerunner of the German Communist Party. In 1916 she published an anti-war tract now known as *The Junius Pamphlet* because she published it under the pseudonym Junius. Her last major work, it is also the only one of her writings in which she gave at least some hint of identification with the Jewish people. On page 9, speaking of the German socialists, she wrote:

We are like the Jews whom Moses led through the desert. But we are not lost, and we will be victorious if we have not forgotten how to learn.

Ettinger, on page 218 of *Rosa Luxemburg*, also notes that Luxemburg’s attitude towards Jewishness became “more complex”, meaning less hostile, while in prison. No doubt the seriousness of her situation contributed to her change of heart. Her courageous stand against the war won her many enemies, and she was murdered by German fascists only a few months after the end of the war.

In Austria the opposition to the war was led by Friedrich Adler, the son of Victor Adler, one of the founders of the Austrian Social Democratic Party. Friedrich’s grandfather had converted to Christianity, but when Friedrich reached the age of 18, he had himself legally registered as an “atheist” and subsequently married a Jewish woman from Russia in an orthodox Jewish wedding ceremony. In 1915, Friedrich organized a group called the Karl Marx Association for the purpose of agitating against the war. When these efforts did not prove sufficiently effective, he walked into a fashionable Viennese restaurant in October of 1916 and assassinated the head of the Austrian war government, Count Sturgkh, who was eating lunch. According to Ronald Florence on page 180 of *Fritz*, Adler cried out, “Down with tyranny! We want peace!”, as he shot Sturgkh. Mass demonstrations on his behalf broke out at the time of his trial, and although he was sentenced to death, his sentence was subsequently commuted to 18 years in prison. He ended up serving only some 2 years in prison because he was freed by the revolutionary socialist government composed of his former comrades who came to power in Austria at the end of the war.

Spearheaded by individuals like Luxemburg and Adler, the anti-war movement in Europe began to reach massive proportions by the start of 1917. Within the international socialist movement, the opponents of the war organized themselves into groups such as the Spartacus League in Germany or the Karl Marx Association in Austria. However, an internal division soon developed within the ranks of the anti-war activists. The Russian Bolsheviks, who had also opposed the war from the start, advanced the slogan: “Turn the imperialist war into a revolutionary war.” They saw the growth of the anti-war movement as creating the conditions for a revolutionary seizure of power along the lines that Karl Marx had originally envisaged. On the other hand, many opponents of the war were hostile to military force as such and hoped that the end of the war would inaugurate an era of peaceful change by democratic means. Most Jewish radicals, including Luxemburg and Adler, were typically torn between these two tendencies, distrusting the dictatorial tendencies of the Bolsheviks yet doubtful of the chances for real change by peaceful means. After the end of the war, Adler helped to form an international organization commonly known as the “Two and a half International” because it adhered to a position intermediate between the reformist policies of the old Second International and the program of class war advocated by Lenin’s new Third International. Probably a majority of the pre-war Jewish socialists, including the Bund, adopted a position similar to Adler’s and joined the “Two and a half International”, whose leadership was heavily Jewish.

There was, however, an influential minority of Jewish socialist activists who supported Lenin’s position and became Communists along with the Bolsheviks. Among this number was Leon Trotsky, the closest thing to a leader which the Russian Revolution of 1905 had put forward, who made up his quarrel with Lenin and joined the Bolshevik party together with his personal following in the summer of 1917. Trotsky was the main organizer of the Bolshevik seizure of power on November 7, 1917, which as it just so happened was his birthday. And following the outbreak of the Russian Civil War in 1918 between the Communists and Czarists, Trotsky also took responsibility for organizing the Soviet Red Army, which he led to victory in the civil war. Together with Lenin, Trotsky was the featured speaker at gatherings of the Communist International from the

time of its formation in 1919 until around 1923. In the eyes of both Russia and the world, Trotsky ranked with Lenin during this period as one of the two top leaders of the international Communist movement.

Trotsky was a tall, heavyset man who was born Bronstein, the son of one of the few Jewish farmers in the whole of the Ukraine. A charismatic leader who could hold crowds of thousands spellbound, Trotsky was also a prolific writer and dedicated activist who retained a strong personal following right up to the time of his assassination in 1940. Together with Zinoviev, Kamenev and Sverdlov, he formed a part of what came close to a Jewish majority in the Russian Communist leadership during the early years of Bolshevik rule. Other countries where Jewish Communists led revolutions during this period included Hungary, whose Soviet Republic formed in 1919 was headed by Bela Kun, and Bavaria, where the 1919 Soviet Republic was led by Eugene Leviné. Both in Hungary and Bavaria, a large proportion of the Soviet leaders were Jewish. Rudolf Tokas, on page 193 of *Bela Kun And The Hungarian Soviet Republic*, states:

The new elite also provided a very plausible target for anti-Semitic sentiments. Since most of the communist and some of the socialist leaders were Jewish, as were members of the 'Red bureaucracy', political commissars in the army, judges and prosecutors of revolutionary courts, journalists, writers of propaganda pamphlets, and the leaders of communist youth and women's auxiliaries, charges of 'Jewish conspiracy' fell on fertile soil among the strongly anti-Semitic Hungarians.

Among the Jewish leaders of the Bavarian Soviet Republic, in addition to Leviné, were Ernst Toller, Gustav Landauer and Erich Muhsam.

Perhaps the quintessential Jewish Communist of this era was Karl Radek. Born in Austrian Galicia, the son of a post office worker named Sobelsohn, Radek was active before World War 1 in both the Polish and the German socialist movements. In Switzerland during World War 1 Radek got to know Lenin and became a Bolshevik. After 1919 Radek became a key figure in the Communist International; journalists and foreign Communists in Moscow frequently sought him out because of his facility with languages and witty, gossipy style. Warren Lerner, on page 174 of *Karl Radek*, notes that although Radek made no more of his Jewish background than other Communists, "except by telling an occasional coarse Yiddish joke", he was nonetheless "always" described as a Jew by others. A United States State Department memorandum of 1922 describes him as a "typical Jewish type". Lerner speculates:

What special quality did Radek have that called attention to his Jewishness? True, his appearance and mannerisms certainly fit the Jewish stereotype so popular among anti-Semites; but more importantly, it was his peculiar lack of allegiance to any national group that set him apart from others of similar origins.

Of slight build, with thick glasses and sallow skin, Radek looked and acted like a Bohemian cafe intellectual; and yet he braved many dangerous situations for the Bolsheviks, including a year in prison in Germany in 1919, where he helped to organize the German Communist Party from his prison cell. The Bolsheviks valued his services so highly that they seized German hostages to prevent the Germans from executing him.

The Bolshevik party, which had originated in 1903 as the more or less explicitly non-Jewish faction of Russian socialism, had few Jewish members prior to 1917. However, during the period from 1917 to 1920, many Jews joined the Bolsheviks, above all because they were perceived as the most effective foes of the anti-Semitic Czarist White armies. Nora Levin, on page 49 of Volume 1 of *The Jews in the Soviet Union since 1917*, states that at Russian Communist Party congresses between 1917 and 1922, "between 15 and 20 percent of the delegates were of Jewish origin". Levin also points out on page 61 that in May of 1919 Trotsky authorized the formation of Jewish combat units in the Red Army. And Zvi Gitelman, on page 117 of *Jewish Nationality and Soviet Politics*, notes that Jews were particularly prominent at this time in the Cheka, the Bolshevik secret police, because "since Jews could hardly be suspected of devotion to the czarist regime, they would be considered reliable opponents of the Whites". Gitelman also states on page 115:

Jews were especially welcomed by the Bolshevik government because a large part of the old bureaucracy and intelligentsia refused to serve it.

Lenin took note of this fact, declaring that the Jewish intelligentsia had "sabotaged the saboteurs".

The Jewish community of the Pale of Settlement paid a heavy price for its opposition to Czarist rule. In addition to the devastation and famine caused by the transformation of the Pale into a war zone, some 500,000 Jews were deported from the Pale on forced marches by the Czarist government in 1914-15. Levin on page 29

of Volume I of *The Jews in the Soviet Union since 1917* estimates that 100,000 Jews died during these forced marches. On page 43, Levin adds the following description of the consequences of the pogroms carried out by the White armies in the Ukraine during the Russian Civil War of 1918-20:

Between 1918 and the early months of 1921, when Soviet control was established in the Ukraine, it is estimated that pogroms took place in 700 communities. Between 50,000 and 60,000 Jews were killed. Another 100,000 were maimed or died of wounds; 200,000 were orphaned.

And she also notes on page 44 that an additional 30,000 Jews were murdered by the Polish troops who invaded the Ukraine in 1920. It is in these cold statistics, rather than plots and protocols, that the secret of the Jewish Revolution is to be found.

To put it simply, Jews were both the most conspicuous victims and the most conspicuous opponents of the Czarist regime. When the European masses, grown weary of bleeding to death in a senseless imperialist war, turned against their rulers in the years 1917-19, it was only natural for them to look for Jewish leadership in this struggle. They had already been conditioned to do so by the growth of the socialist movement, by the Russian Revolution of 1905 and the Turkish Revolution of 1908, by the emergence of Jews as radical culture stars and by the role of Jewish radicals in initiating the anti-war movement after 1914. And once Jewish radicalism had become a mass force, then the plotters and planners in London also decided to pay homage to the Jews by issuing the Balfour Declaration. The very same British Foreign Office that in 1913 had tried to overthrow the Young Turks on charges of aiding the Zionists now turned around and proclaimed to all the world its devotion to the Zionist cause. It was not so much the British who had changed but the world. For a few brief years, the "Banner of the Jew" was raised on high; but this great victory, purchased at a great price, proved but the prelude to a far more bloody and decisive struggle.

Chapter Six: The Popular Front

It did not take long for a reaction to set in against the astonishing changes which the Jewish Revolution had brought about. Already in 1919, the Hungarian and Bavarian Soviet Republics were crushed by right wing forces, with heavy loss of life, particularly in Bavaria. In the United States, the Palmer raids of 1919 resulted in the arrest, imprisonment and deportation of thousands of foreign born radicals, a considerable percentage of whom were Jewish. These raids marked the start of a right wing offensive against Jewish radicalism in the United States which was to continue throughout the 1920s. All the same, despite casualties and setbacks, Jewish radicalism still appeared to be gaining ground on a world scale until some point in the early 1920s.

Indicative of the prestige of Jewish radicals in the Soviet Union at the end of the Civil War was an agreement reached in 1921 whereby a large number of former Bundists and Territorialists joined the Russian Communist Party as members of a semi-autonomous "Jewish section". The "Jewish section", known as the "Yevseksia" in Russian, had actually been formed back in 1919 on the initiative of the Communist leadership. Its function, notes Gitelman on page 249 of *Jewish Nationality and Soviet Politics*, was "to publish Communist literature in Yiddish, found Yiddish Communist clubs, Party schools and libraries, and to recruit Jewish members for the Party". However, since there had been almost no Yiddish speaking Bolsheviks prior to 1917, the Communist leadership was compelled to reach out to the Bundists and Territorialists in order to staff the Yevseksia. The Bund in Russia had split in 1919 between supporters and opponents of the victorious Bolsheviks. The pro-Bolshevik faction, which was led by Esther Frumkin, included about half of the pre-war Bundist leadership, including 7 out of the 15 members of the Central Committee as of 1917. Frumkin and her faction joined the Yevseksia in 1921; at the 1921 conference of the Yevseksia held after they joined, 116 out of the 144 delegates proved to be former Bundists or Territorialists. Although the Bundists were now under Lenin's authority, as he had demanded back in 1903, they too had gained something, as control of the Yevseksia gave them control of the political organization and education of the entire Yiddish speaking population of the Soviet Union. Moreover, Lenin's acceptance of Bundist control of the Yevseksia constituted an implicit admission of the legitimacy of Jewish national aspirations in the Soviet Union, something that the Bolsheviks had long resisted.

Lenin's published writings are filled with anti-Bundist remarks, but he nonetheless had great respect for the Bund, which was in many ways the original model for his own organizational conceptions. In particular, Lenin's famous concept of "democratic centralism" seems to have owed much to the example of the Bund, which was a highly centralized, disciplined organization. Tobias, on page 194 of *The Jewish Bund in Russia*, cites a Bundist writer who declared in 1903: "Lenin came to the thought of 'an organization of revolutionaries' looking at Bund activity." On page 265 Tobias also cites a Bolshevik activist speaking in 1905 of the tight discipline maintained by the Bund:

Nowhere is there such discipline as in the Bund. The Bund has a solid periphery, which has developed such a passionate organizational patriotism that Bundists rise to defend the views of the Bund simply because they are Bund decisions, even if they personally disagree with the decisions.

It is also significant that the Bund was the first socialist organization in Russia to take up arms against the Czarist regime. The Bund's self-defense squads of the period 1903-05 were the direct forerunner and inspiration for the similar groups which the Bolsheviks formed during the period 1905-07.

Among the organizers of one of the early Bolshevik armed groups was Stalin, whose attitude towards the Jewish people was far more hostile and negative than Lenin's. Lenin's death in 1924 touched off a struggle for power between Stalin and Trotsky, a struggle which ended in 1927 with Trotsky's defeat and subsequent exile. Trotsky's fall from power in the mid-20s was symbolic of a general trend that set in around 1923 towards the erosion of the gains previously won by the Jewish Revolution. In 1924 legislation was passed by the United States Congress establishing immigration quotas that drastically reduced the flood of Jewish immigrants to the United States. In the land of Israel, the British administration that had been installed after World War I became increasingly pro-Arab and anti-Jewish from the early 1920s onwards, leading to a split in 1924 within the World Zionist Organization between supporters and opponents of continued cooperation with the British. And in Germany, the defeat of the revolutionary forces was followed in 1923 by an attempt of the Nazis to

seize power in Bavaria. Although the Nazi coup was thwarted, it was indicative of how far the pendulum had swung back in the other direction. Also in 1923, Friedrich Adler's "Two and a half International" was dissolved, with most of its members joining the reformist Second International for lack of a better alternative.

The growing weakness of the Jewish radical movement after 1923 was a reflection not only of a right wing counter-offensive but also of the negative impact of World War I on Jewish life in the former Pale of Settlement. In 1920 the former Pale was divided between the Soviet Union and newly independent Poland. Some 2½ million Jews remained in the Soviet Union while 3½ million became Poles or citizens of the Baltic states. After suffering through war, famine and pogroms, both Soviet and Polish Jews were confronted with postwar regimes that were no less inclined to a dictatorial style of rule than the former Czarist government. Formal discrimination against Jews had been abolished, but the industrial and artisanal economy of the former Pale had been so devastated between 1914 and 1920 that it could no longer provide employment for more than a fraction of the Jewish working class. Divided, impoverished and disillusioned, the Jewish community of the former Pale of Settlement was not able to generate the same revolutionary energy after World War I as it had previously. The great dream of the Pale had been to become a nation, but after 1920 it became increasingly clear that this dream was simply not going to come true.

The dream died hardest in the Soviet Union, for it was there that it came closest to realization. Gitelman on page 410 brings out that by the mid-1920s the leadership of the Yevseksia had adopted a position regarding Jewish agricultural settlements that "if Jewish settlement were compact enough and on a sufficiently large scale, a Jewish territory might be established, removing all obstacles to the creation of a Jewish nation". At a 1926 conference called by the Yevseksia, this position was formally endorsed by Kalinin, the President of the Soviet Union. In the Soviet Union during the 1920s there were formed such organizations as the Commission for the Settlement of Jewish Toilers on the Land and the Society for the Agricultural Organization of Working Class Jews. By 1930, notes Levin on page 142, these groups had settled some 170,000 Jews on the land in the Ukraine, 47,000 in Bielorussia and 21,000 in the Crimea. But in 1928, this entire Territorialist movement was undercut by the announcement that henceforth the Soviet government wanted all Jewish colonists to settle in Birobidjan, a swampy, malaria infested region near the Chinese border in Central Asia. Trumpeted abroad as proof of Soviet support for Jewish national aspirations, the conversion of Birobidjan into a so-called Jewish territory actually sounded the death knell for the Jewish Territorialist movement in the Soviet Union. By 1937, only 20,000 Jews had settled in Birobidjan; in 1959, the entire Jewish population of Birobidjan was 14,000.

The defeat of the Territorialist movement in the former Pale of Settlement was accompanied by heightened assimilationist pressures on Jews in Western Europe and the United States. Yiddishism in the West had been fueled by the constant stream of new immigrants arriving from the Pale of Settlement. When this stream turned to a trickle in the United States due to the immigration quotas established in 1924, the American Yiddish language press entered a period of slow but steady decline. Both in the United States and Europe, Jews now came under heavy pressure to demonstrate their loyalty to their respective adopted countries by conforming to all its ways. Yet strangely enough, the more Jews conformed, the more intense became the anti-Semitic agitation of the Nazis and related groups. The decline of Yiddishism in the West from the 1920s onwards was interpreted as a sign of weakness, an indication that the Jewish Revolution was running out of steam. Far from appeasing the anti-Semites, Jewish assimilation merely increased their confidence and furnished them with new material for their beloved conspiracy theories.

Trotskyism

In the eyes of the world, the clearest sign of the dwindling prestige of Jewish radicalism after 1923 was the defeat of what came to be called Trotskyism in the Soviet Union. Trotsky himself always rejected the Trotskyist label, declaring himself after 1917 to be a Leninist pure and simple. He was overly modest, for even during his heyday as a Communist between 1917 and 1923, Trotsky had related to Lenin as an equal, not as a follower. The most popular figure among the Russian masses both in 1905 and in 1917, the founder of the Red Army, Trotsky had every reason to regard himself as the legitimate leader of the Soviet Union after Lenin's death. Yet he failed miserably in his struggle for power with Stalin, losing all of his positions of power within a few years.

Trotsky's problem was that he could only rule the Soviet Union through the Communist Party, and the Communist Party had originated in 1903 as a non-Jewish organization. So long as Trotsky could be regarded

as Lenin's lieutenant, he was accepted in Bolshevik ranks; but once he put forward his own claims to leadership, he was almost unanimously rejected by the party veterans, the "Old Bolsheviks". Even Zinoviev and Kamenev opposed him at first, only switching sides after Stalin's campaign against Trotskyism began to take on a clear anti-Semitic coloration. Isaac Deutscher on page 257 of *The Prophet Unarmed* describes the atmosphere within the Russian Communist Party by the start of 1927 as follows:

Official agitators ceased to distinguish between Trotskyists and Zinovievists, incited the rank and file against both, and hinted darkly that it was no matter of chance that the leaders of both were Jews - this was, they suggested, a struggle between native and genuine Russian socialism and aliens who sought to pervert it.

In March of 1927, adds Deutscher, Trotsky lodged an official protest against "anti-Semitic agitation" in the party cells, to no avail.

Trotsky himself, on page 361 of *My Life*, offered the following analysis of the anti-Semitic campaign against him conducted by Stalin in the mid-20s:

The question of my Jewish origin acquired importance only after I had become a subject for political baiting. Anti-Semitism raised its head with that of anti-Trotskyism. They both derived from the same source, the petty bourgeois reaction against October.

"October" in this context was a reference to the Revolution of 1917, whose proletarian spirit Trotsky thought to have been later diluted by the loss of working class cadres in the Civil War. But Stalin himself came from a working class background, as did most of his close associates and followers. Neither in 1927 nor afterwards was Trotsky able to face the fact that the Bolshevik faction had originated in an attempt to exclude Jews from the leadership of the Russian socialist movement, with the result that his own subsequent claims to lead the Russian Communist Party inevitably appeared strange and unnatural in the eyes of party veterans.

Trotsky's fall from power was accompanied by the demotion and disgrace of other prominent Russian Jewish Communists, including Zinoviev, Kamenev and Radek, and by the sudden elimination of most Jews from leadership positions everywhere in the world Communist movement. At the same time, the concessions which the Communist leadership had made to Jewish nationalism in the Soviet Union in the early 1920s were rapidly rescinded. In 1928, along with the announcement that Jewish farmers had henceforth to settle in Birobidjan, came the banning of the Labor Zionist party, the last independent Jewish organization still operating on Soviet soil. This was followed by the start of a campaign against the Yevsektsia, which was accused of "Jewish chauvinism", and in 1930 the Yevsektsia was formally disbanded. Its former members were allowed to continue to promote Soviet Yiddish culture until the mid-30s, when they began to fall under suspicion of Trotskyism. In the late 1930s almost the entire former leadership of the Yevsektsia was arrested on charges of Trotskyism and executed.

Trotsky himself was banished to Alma Ata in Kazakhstan in 1927 and then expelled from the Soviet Union altogether in 1929. Starting around this time, he began to attempt to organize his supporters in the world Communist movement into a coherent force. Although Trotsky always tried to play down his Jewish background, naturally many of his followers were Jewish. In the United States a Trotskyist organization was formed in 1928; it was headed by James Cannon and Max Schachtman. Cannon came from a non-Jewish working class background, while Schachtman, who was born in Poland in 1904, grew up in the Bronx in a Jewish socialist environment. In the 1930s, Cannon built up a considerable following among truck drivers in Minneapolis and Detroit, while Schachtman became almost a cult figure among young Jewish radicals in New York, particularly at City College. But in 1940, Cannon and Schachtman split, and Trotsky characteristically supported Cannon, the authentic working class leader, against Schachtman, the mere Jewish radical.

Constance Myers, on page 157 of *The Prophet's Army*, states that Trotsky attacked Schachtman at this time in a way "that further revealed his anti-intellectualism and anti-Semitism". She continues:

He cast 'Jew', 'petty bourgeois' and 'city intellectual' in one hat and pleaded that 'the Jewish petty-bourgeois elements be shifted from their habitual conservative milieu and dissolved in the real movement', a persistent theme in the debate lending credence to subsequent accusations of anti-Semitism.

Yet needless to say, Trotsky himself had been attacked for years in just this way by the Stalinists. For his part, Schachtman, interviewed by Myers shortly before his death in 1972, told her that he had come to the conclusion

that Stalin was right in his dispute with Trotsky. “Stalin was no reactionary”, Myers cites Schachtman telling her on page 199, “he was for the permanent revolution, but he was just cooler, playing for time.” Having internalized the values of their enemies, Trotsky and the Jewish Trotskyists were always in the strange position of denouncing in others the same traits which others perceived in them.

The extremes to which Trotsky was capable of carrying this practice are demonstrated by a passage on page 261 of Volume 3 of his *The History of the Russian Revolution*. Trotsky is talking about why a Cossack regiment, assigned by Kerensky to defend the Winter Palace against the Bolsheviks, decided to defect. It seems that the Cossacks felt uncomfortable fighting alongside the other defenders of the Winter Palace, who included a number of “junkers” or officers and a regiment of women. Trotsky puts it this way, speaking in the name of the Cossacks:

There was nobody but strangers around: junkers - among them a number of Jews - invalid officers - yes, and then these female shock troops. With angry and frowning faces the Cossacks gathered up their saddle bags. No further arguments could move them. Who remained to defend Kerensky? `Yids and wenchens...but the Russian people has stayed over there with Lenin.’

Trotsky’s tragedy lay in his inability to understand that in the eyes of the Russian people, to say nothing of the Cossacks, he too would always remain a “yid”. Like Marx, whom he idolized, Trotsky thought that he could escape the Jewish condition by becoming a revolutionary; but all the same, he rose as a Jew and he fell as a Jew.

Trotsky and the Trotskyists were far from unique in their tendency to internalize the anti-Semitic attitudes of their enemies. Even the Yiddishists of the Yevsektzia, who made a big point of their Jewish identity, adopted a ruthless attitude towards competing Jewish factions. In the early 1920s they successfully lobbied the Communist leadership for a decision to ban the use of the Hebrew language in the Soviet Union. Gitelman, on page 279, states that “it is certain that the campaign against Hebrew was initiated by the *Evsektzia* and not by the Soviet government or Communist Party.” On page 280 he cites Lunacharsky, a high ranking Soviet official, apologizing to a Zionist spokesman for the ban on Hebrew:

I do not know who would doubt the value of Hebrew, except for the Jewish Communists. And they, after all, are our allies and we can hardly disbelieve them when they say that Hebrew is the language of the bourgeoisie and not of the people.

It was incidents like this that led Kamenev to declare, as cited by Gitelman on page 287, that “the specialty of the *Evsektzia* is the destruction of all the other Jews.”

But the real specialists in destroying Jewish Communists were the Stalinists. Hardly a single Jewish Communist of any prominence survived the 1930s in the Soviet Union. Regardless of their past affiliations, whether they had been Yiddishists, Mensheviks, followers of Zinoviev or of Trotsky, they were all branded as Trotskyists and executed during the purges of the late 30s. These purges were in a sense the logical outgrowth of the policy which Lenin had initiated back in 1903, the policy of organizing to prevent Jewish leadership of the Russian socialist movement. Jewish leadership was inherent in the situation, due to the high proportion of Jews within the Russian socialist movement and to the fact that most of the Jewish socialists were well educated and articulate. It was not the Jews but Lenin and later Stalin who had to plot and conspire in order to make sure that the leadership remained non-Jewish. And the Jewish socialists played into the hands of their enemies by refusing to unite against them precisely because they too were terrified by the thought of seeing the Russian socialist movement portrayed as Jewish dominated. The Bund practically handed the Russian party to Lenin in 1903, and in 1924 the Jewish Communists simply did not dare to unite against Stalin but rather spent much of their time accusing one another of failing to sufficiently resemble him.

Trotskyism was Stalin’s word for the Jewish conspiracy against him that should have been but wasn’t. However, Stalin’s need to purge and kill his potential Jewish rivals was not just a function of his personality but also reflected the tremendous increase in the level of anti-Semitism in Europe that resulted from the victory of the Nazis in Germany in 1933. The counter-revolutionary offensive that had begun during the 1920s was accelerated under Nazi leadership during the 1930s. This offensive had the effect of discrediting all forms of Jewish radicalism, of making it virtually impossible for anyone identified as a Jewish radical to win a popular audience. Throughout the entire period from the 1920s through the 1950s, hardly a single Jewish radical was

able to achieve the kind of popularity that was possible during the previous decades. Persecuted, despised and ultimately slaughtered, the Jewish radicals of the 1930s and 1940s fought a valiant rear-guard action. And yet although they lost almost all the battles, they won the war.

The banner under which the foes of the Nazis eventually marched to victory originated as the banner of the Popular Front. The concept of the Popular Front was developed during the mid-30s as a way of uniting bourgeois democrats, socialists and communists in a broad anti-Nazi coalition. This same concept eventually provided the ideological basis for the “Grand Alliance” of anti-Nazi forces which finally defeated the Nazis in World War 2. And from the start, Jewish radicals played a key role in developing this concept and putting it into practice. Among the originators of the Popular Front concept was Trotsky, who was already advocating that socialists and communists unite in Germany prior to the triumph of the Nazis. Even earlier, Friedrich Adler and the “Two and a half International” had adopted a similar position. And when the first Popular Front coalitions were actually organized in the mid-30s, the most influential and best known Popular Front leader proved to be a Jewish socialist, Leon Blum.

Blum

Blum’s rise to power came as a direct response to the issuing of the Nuremberg decrees by the Nazi government in the fall of 1935. These decrees formally deprived Jews in Germany of all civil rights, thereby reversing 150 years of progress towards “Jewish Emancipation” in Europe. From a Jewish point of view, even more shocking than the decrees was the absence of any serious protest against them by other governments. David Weinberg, on page 108 of *A Community on Trial*, puts it this way:

The failure of the democracies to protest against the Nuremberg Decrees of September 1935 sent profound shock waves through the entire eastern European Jewish community. The decrees had been viewed as an acid test of government sympathy.

As if to underline their wish to make amends after the fact, the victorious allies after World War 2 chose Nuremberg as the site at which to judge the Nazi war criminals for their actions. But at the time, the message they sent to Hitler is that they did not regard legalized anti-Semitism as a major obstacle to good relations with Germany. The only serious response to the Nuremberg decrees came from France, where early in 1936 the French people voted into power a Popular Front government headed by Leon Blum.

It was no accident that Blum came to power in France, the country that had first proclaimed Jewish Emancipation in Europe. Yet as of 1935, there were still only 260,000 Jews in all of France, indicating that 150 years of Jewish Emancipation had not resulted in any great change in the wall of prejudice which had already surrounded the emancipated French Jews back in the days of Saint-Simon. However, of these 260,000 Jews, approximately 150,000 lived in Paris, constituting the third largest urban community of Jews in the world, after New York and Warsaw. Jews formed a small but visible and somewhat influential minority in French life, one whose status was irrevocably bound up with the fact that Jewish Emancipation had been proclaimed by the leaders of the French Revolution, whose armies subsequently swept over the greater part of Europe.

These factors combined to generate a form of Jewish radicalism which was in some ways unique to France. It was the radicalism of highly assimilated French Jews who were nonetheless proud of their Jewish origin and played the role of conscience of the French left, constantly reminding French radicals that Jewish Emancipation had been an integral part of the victorious program of the French Revolution. Leon Blum came out of this tradition, whose original exponent was Bernard Lazare. A young French Jewish socialist at the time of the Dreyfus affair, Lazare was converted into a Jewish nationalist by the outburst of anti-Semitism triggered by the charges against Dreyfus. He was one of the first individuals to become involved in trying to exonerate Dreyfus; Leon Blum later called him “the first of the Dreyfusards”. Jean-Denis Bredin, on page 139 of *The Affair*, cites the following statement made by Lazare shortly before his death in 1903 at the age of 38:

I wish that it be said that I was the first to speak, that the first one to rise on behalf of the Jewish martyr was a Jew, a Jew who has suffered in his blood and in his flesh the suffering borne by the innocent man, a Jew who knew to what people of pariahs, of the disinherited, of unfortunates he belonged and who derived from that awareness the will to fight for justice and truth.

These sentiments were considered a little too outspoken even by the other Dreyfusards, who held Lazare at arm’s length even as they followed in his footsteps.

Lazare's equally outspoken writings on the subject of Jewish nationalism are available in English under the title, *Job's Dungheap*. Almost alone among modern Jewish radicals, Lazare openly condemned Christianity as the real root and source of European anti-Semitism. As he put it on page 68:

As long as Christianity exists, the Jews, scattered among the peoples, will arouse hatred and wrath, and the position created for them will be either materially or morally inferior; whether they are unable to enjoy their rights as citizens or men, or whether they are exposed to some variety of scorn, the result is the same.

This analysis led him to conclude, on page 69, that "it is in the development of Jewish nationalism that I see the solution of the Jewish question". But Lazare was too highly assimilated to become a Zionist or Yiddishist; his concept of Jewish nationalism was somewhat abstract. He put it this way, on page 73:

For a Jew, the word nationalism should mean freedom. A Jew who today may declare, 'I am a nationalist', will not be saying in any special, precise or clear-cut way, I am a man who seeks to rebuild a Jewish state in Palestine and who dreams of conquering Jerusalem. He will be saying, 'I want to be a man fully free, I want to enjoy the sunshine, I want to have a right to my dignity as a man, I want to escape the scorn with which men seek to overwhelm me.' At certain moments in history, nationalism is for human groups the manifestation of the spirit of freedom.

As translated into practice by numerous French Jewish radicals in the 20th century, these views implied a program of Jews uniting as Jews for the purpose of defending the rights which the French Revolution had granted them.

This was the tradition which inspired the formation of the International League Against Antisemitism by Bernard Lecache in 1928. Weinberg, on page 28 of *A Community on Trial*, notes that the League, known by its French initials as LICA, had a policy of "direct confrontation with anti-Semites, a policy which often led to scuffles between LICA supporters and Fascist bands on the streets of Paris". LICA was primarily composed of Jews but was open to non-Jews and sought to forge an alliance with the French left against anti-Semitism. The policy of direct confrontation was also in the tradition of Lazare, who had fought a duel in 1896 with the French anti-Semite Drumont. Paula Hyman, on page 205 of *From Dreyfus To Vichy*, speaks as follows of the rapid growth of LICA during the 1930s:

The key to LICA's success was this identification of the struggle against anti-Semitism with the universalist goal of combatting fascism. As Lecache proclaimed in a propaganda pamphlet, by fighting anti-Semitism one fought for all the oppressed and for peace as well. Lecache was thus able to tie his nonsectarian organization to one of the major themes of French politics of the Left in the 1930s and to appeal to young Jews who might otherwise have considered defense against anti-Semitism as too particularistic for their sensibilities.

Impressed by the popularity of LICA, the French Communist Party in 1935 formed a similar group, known as the Jewish Popular Movement, which was intended to organize French Jews to fight against fascism and on behalf of the Popular Front. On page 128, Weinberg brings out that the Jewish Popular Movement then organized "the so-called Bottwin Battalion, a ragtag company of Jewish volunteers recruited from various countries in Europe", which was sent to fight the fascists in Spain.

Largely due to Jewish initiative, the struggle against anti-Semitism became an important component of the program of the Popular Front in France. The elevation of Leon Blum to the position of leader of the Popular Front was an appropriate symbol of this fact; but Blum was an appropriate choice on many levels due to his earlier activity on behalf of Dreyfus and long history of trying to achieve unity on the French left. Born in 1872 into a well-to-do Alsatian Jewish family, Blum was already a lawyer with a good job in the French civil service when the Dreyfus affair began. Drawn into the defense of Dreyfus, Blum became a socialist under the influence of Jean Jaures, the most prominent socialist Dreyfusard. More polite, diplomatic and polished than Lazare, Blum gradually made himself indispensable to the French socialist movement through his efforts as a fund raiser and a kind of honest broker between the numerous feuding factions on the French left. After the split between Socialists and Communists in France in 1920, Blum remained with the Socialists but characteristically tried to maintain good relations with the Communists, who for some time did not reciprocate. Lacouture, on page 179 of *Leon Blum*, notes that the French Communists were particularly critical of Blum for "very clearly assuming his identity as a Jew, rather than attempting to blend his Jewishness totally into revolutionary fraternity".

Blum's overt Jewishness was most clearly expressed in his support for Zionism, which began in the early 1920s and continued for the rest of his life. On page 529, Lacouture cites the following statement which Blum made at the time of the birth of the state of Israel:

A French Jew, born in France from a long line of French ancestors, speaking only the language of my country, nourished chiefly by its culture, having refused to leave it at the very moment when I was in the greatest danger, I nevertheless participate with all my heart in the admirable effort - miraculously transported from the realm of dreams to that of historical reality - which henceforth guarantees a dignified, equal and a free nation for all Jews who have not had, as I did, the good fortune to find it in their native country.

Blum's reference to his "good fortune" was on the diplomatic side; Lacouture, on page 180, says that by the 1920s he had become "the most insulted man in France". Not only was he a Jewish socialist and Zionist with an elegant, refined manner, but in 1907 he had written a book, *On Marriage*, in which he wrote, as cited by Lacouture on page 81:

Considering it obvious that marriage, or legal monogamy, is a badly functioning institution, I wondered if it should be radically abandoned in favor of modern forms of polygamy.

Violently condemned by the entire French right, *On Marriage* was nonetheless reprinted by Blum in 1937 while he was still the head of the French government. Repeatedly threatened with physical attack during the 1930s, Blum persisted in his efforts to achieve left wing unity, and was rewarded in 1936 when a coalition of Radicals, Socialists and Communists which he had personally put together was swept to victory in the French elections.

The victory of the Popular Front in France was achieved in the context of an international movement in favor of Popular Front coalitions, a movement that had gained considerable impetus from a decision of Stalin and the Communists to adopt a Popular Front strategy in 1935. In Spain, a Popular Front government was elected only a short time before the victory of the Popular Front in France. Following an attempted fascist coup against the Popular Front government in Spain, a civil war broke out, and Blum on assuming office was confronted with the question of whether to come to the aid of the Popular Front in Spain. The German and Italian fascists were already aiding the Spanish fascists, but the British, the main ally of France in World War 1, were strongly opposed to any intervention on behalf of the Spanish left. The French military hierarchy, whose views were primarily right wing, was also opposed to French intervention. Blum did provide some covert aid to the Spanish Popular Front government, but he adopted an official policy of non-intervention, for which he was condemned by the Communists. As the military position of the Popular Front in Spain declined, so too did the morale of the Popular Front in France, which finally broke up in the midst of bitter recriminations during the course of 1937.

The failure of Blum to come to the aid of the Popular Front in Spain had a negative effect not only in France and Spain but also in the Soviet Union. Almost immediately after Blum announced his support for "Non-Intervention", Stalin began his purge of the Jewish Communists and their allies in Russia. Among the prominent Jewish Communists who were arrested and executed between 1936 and 1938 were Zinoviev, Kamenev and Radek. Stalin did provide aid to the Popular Front in Spain, but at the same time he started to prepare the ground for a possible deal with Hitler. When Russian Communists who had served with the anti-fascist forces in Spain returned to Russia, a large proportion were executed. In the spring of 1938, as Deutscher notes on page 418 of *The Prophet Outcast*, the great majority of the actual followers of Trotsky who had been arrested and sentenced earlier in the 1930s were also killed in mass executions in the prison camps of the Vorkuta region. The effect of these actions was to create a situation where most potential opponents of a deal with Hitler, whether Jewish or anti-fascist, had already been eliminated by the time the deal was actually concluded in the summer of 1939.

In France, the Jewish Popular Movement was dissolved by the Communist Party early in 1937, and even the Jewish "section" of the Communist Party bureaucracy was abolished. Weinberg, on page 148, sees a "turning inwards of all segments of Paris Jewry" in 1937-38 following the collapse of the French Popular Front and the fall of the Blum government. The crisis brought on by the Spanish Civil War had revealed once again the major weakness of the Jewish socialists: their lack of armed force. There was no Socialist army on which Blum could rely: war with Germany and Italy over Spain, which was a strong possibility, would have

placed him in a position of complete dependence relative to the Communists, who were the only people on the left capable of mobilizing a serious military force. The officers of the French regular army hated Blum and might well have staged a coup of their own if he had tried to intervene in Spain. Like the Jewish Communists in Russia, Blum was ultimately intimidated by the logic of his own situation and refused to run the risk of involving France in a bloody war with dubious prospects of success that would have been viewed by many as a war on behalf of the Jewish people.

The collapse of the Popular Front movement of the 1930s did not mean the end of the Popular Front concept, but it did insure that when a new version of the Popular Front was developed by the wartime Allies, it was without any visible Jewish leadership or identity. This enabled the Allies to indignantly refute Nazi charges that they were fighting a “Jewish war”, but it also had the effect of removing Jewish survival from the agenda of the Allied forces. Since there were few Jews in positions of power in any of the Allied wartime governments, individuals like Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin could follow their natural bent, which was to pay virtually no attention whatsoever to the fact, well known to them, that the Nazis were systematically murdering all the Jews in the greater part of Europe. Whereas opposition to anti-Semitism had formed an integral part of the program of the Popular Front of the 1930s, hardly a word was uttered on this subject by the organizers of what amounted to the Popular Front of the 1940s. And yet so deeply embedded was Jewish radicalism in the very concept of the Popular Front that when the smoke had cleared, it transpired that the victory of the Allied forces had paved the way for the greatest Jewish victory of all, the birth of the state of Israel.

The New Deal

Of the Allied governments, the one in which Jews were probably most influential was the Roosevelt administration in the United States. Elected in 1933 in the midst of the Great Depression, Roosevelt initiated a series of reforms known as the New Deal which bore a close resemblance to the policies advocated by the Popular Front forces in Europe. Government control over the economy was greatly enhanced, trade unionism was encouraged, high taxes were levied on the rich and a rhetoric of equal rights was adopted. Jewish radicals played an important role both in organizing the popular agitation which led to these reforms and in implementing the policies of the New Deal within the Roosevelt administration. Yet when it came to raising the issue of Jewish survival within the Allied coalition, the Roosevelt administration proved no more concerned with the fate of the Jews than the Soviet or British governments. Roosevelt ignored this issue because the Jewish community in the United States permitted him to do so. The silence which in the Soviet Union was achieved through terror was in the United States brought about by assimilation.

Indicative of the assimilationist pressures on Jewish radicals in the United States was the career of Daniel DeLeon. DeLeon was for many years the head of the Socialist Labor Party, the first major socialist organization in American history. Although of Jewish descent, DeLeon actually denied this fact after he became a socialist leader in the 1890s and tried to give out the impression that he came from a Christian background. As early as 1879, while he was still known as a Jew, DeLeon wrote a letter to the periodical, the Reformer and Jewish Times, urging Jews to celebrate Christmas. Cited on page 8 of *Daniel DeLeon* by L. Glen Seretan, DeLeon wrote that he longed to see “the advance guards of the Jews and Gentiles join hands together”; while affirming “the sublimity of the character of Jesus”, they would also “both repudiate the idea of his Jehovahship”. Even more than the Marxists in Germany, DeLeon in his later career as a socialist made a practice of holding up Jesus Christ as an alleged example of a great revolutionary. Seretan, on page 100, cites the following typical passage from his writings:

As a final result of this, Socialism, with the Nazarene, spurns as futile, if not wicked, the method of cajolery and seduction, or the crying of ‘Peace, peace, where there is no peace’, and cuts a clean swath, while reform is eternally entangled in its course of charming, luring, decoying.

Yet strangely enough, notes Seretan on page 217, DeLeon “found his largest and most loyal following among Jewish workers”.

Liebman, on page 44 of *Jews And The Left*, notes that DeLeon’s Socialist Labor Party was initially dominated by German immigrants, but that by 1900 it had become heavily Jewish:

By the end of the century, when the SLP was at its peak, it was quite clear that the Jews in the leadership had come to rival the

Germans in terms of members and influence.

Jews also soon became a major force in the Socialist Party, which was founded in 1901 and rapidly became the largest socialist organization in the United States. Of the two candidates whom the Socialist Party eventually elected to Congress, Victor Berger from Milwaukee and Meyer London from New York, both were Jewish. Another prominent Jewish leader of the Socialist Party was Morris Hillquit, who got about 20% of the vote in the 1917 elections for mayor of New York. Hillquit was one of the founders of the United Hebrew Trades, a Jewish trade union organization formed in New York in 1888, but in later years he came to focus his activity within the English language socialist movement.

Conscious of representing large numbers of immigrant Jewish workers, the Jewish leaders of the Socialist Party could not be so coy about their Jewish background as DeLeon. All the same, they were prone to the same pseudo-Christian stance. Hillquit, on page 50 of his memoirs, *Loose Leaves From A Busy Life*, praised Eugene Debs in the following terms:

Like the gentle Nazarene, Gene Debs was ever ready to chase the Pharisees and money changers from the temple by physical force.

This was followed, on page 51, by a comparison between Victor Berger and Saint Paul. The comparison was all too apt, for Berger, like Paul, was adept at anti-Semitic rhetoric. Ira Kipnis, on page 92 of *The American Socialist Movement*, cites an attack by Berger in his newspaper around 1900 on none other than Hillquit himself as a “Polish apple Jew”, “Moses Hilkowitz from Warsaw” and a “rabbinical candidate”. These attitudes fit in well with the efforts of the Socialist Party to attract Protestant ministers to its cause, a policy which culminated in 1906 with the formation of the closely allied Christian Socialist Fellowship.

Jews also played a leading role in the American Communist Party during the 1920s. At the 1925 Communist Party convention, a faction headed by Ruthenberg, Lovestone and Wolfe, all of whom were Jewish, gained control of the party due to the support of the Comintern representative, Gusev, who was also Jewish. Bertram Wolfe, on page 384 of his memoirs, *A Life In Two Centuries*, describes the atmosphere in the Ruthenberg faction following their victory:

The Ruthenberg caucus was a joyous affair. The diminutive and pudgy Gusev sat at the front table among the caucus leaders as if he were one of them and a member of our group. He had a satisfied look on his face, a look of benevolent well-being, like a man who had done his duty and done it well. He had always seemed more at home in our caucus anyway. We seemed to speak a language in politics closer to his than was the talk of Foster and Cannon and Dunne and Browder.

All of the factional opponents listed by Wolfe were non-Jewish, yet although Wolfe is clearly describing a contest between Jews and non-Jews for control of the American Communist Party, he appears oblivious of this fact, so deeply engrained had become the practice in American radical circles of Jews not noticing that they were Jewish.

Others noticed, however, and in 1929 the remnants of the Ruthenberg faction, including Wolfe, Lovestone and Benjamin Gitlow, were expelled from the American Communist Party on charges of “American exceptionalism”. Yet although the top leadership of the party became almost entirely non-Jewish, Liebman cites several sources on page 59 of *Jews And The Left* suggesting that some 40-50% of the membership of the American Communist Party in the 1930s was Jewish. Jews were attracted to the party in large numbers because of its support for the New Deal and also due to the prominent role played by the Communists in the war against fascism in Spain. Even the arrest and execution of the leading Jewish Communists in the Soviet Union did not greatly reduce the extent of Jewish participation in the American Communist Party, which continued at a high level until the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact in the summer of 1939.

Jewish radicals also played a prominent role in the organization of the American trade union movement. The founder and long time leader of the American Federation of Labor was Samuel Gompers, whose father was Jewish. Likewise, among the founders of the Congress of Industrial Organizations was Sidney Hillman, the leader of the predominantly Jewish union, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Hillman was a lifelong socialist, as were most Jewish trade unionists. Hillman was also an early supporter of the New Deal and was appointed by Roosevelt to a number of positions within his administration between 1933 and 1945. He was one of many Jewish radicals who occupied important posts within the various New Deal agencies, yet when

it came to formulating American policy towards the Jews of Europe, their influence proved to be minimal or non-existent. Hillman was more Jewish identified than most American Jewish radicals, but even he did not dare to jeopardize his standing within the Roosevelt administration by openly protesting against the harsh implications of American policy.

Roosevelt's indifference to the fate of the Jews of Europe was most clearly manifested in his refusal to even attempt to modify the restrictions on Jewish immigration to the United States established in 1924. Not only were the immigration quotas maintained, but during World War 2 the United States actually placed new obstacles in the way of Jewish immigration. David Wyman, on page xiv of his Introduction to *The Abandonment of the Jews*, states with reference to Jewish refugees:

Because of State Department administrative policies, only 21,000 refugees were allowed to enter the United States during the three and one-half years the nation was at war with Germany. That amounted to 10 percent of the number who could have been legally admitted under the immigration quotas during that period.

Wyman also brings out, on page 83, that when the Rumanian government during the war offered to ship 70,000 Jews out of Rumania in return for shipping costs, about \$130 per person, the United States State Department "rejected the proposition out of hand". Roosevelt's State Department was not so much indifferent as actively hostile to the whole idea of rescuing Jews. Wyman cites, on page 99, a statement by Robert Alexander, an official in the State Department's Visa Division, opposing the admission of Jewish refugees to the United States on the grounds that it would "take the burden and the curse off Hitler".

Despite requests from Jewish groups, the Roosevelt administration also refused to bomb the rail lines leading to Auschwitz or Auschwitz itself. It adopted this position despite the fact that United States planes repeatedly bombed targets near Auschwitz, including an industrial plant right next to Auschwitz that utilized slave labor from Auschwitz in its operations. As Wyman puts it on page 307:

From July through November 1944, more than 2,800 bombers struck Blechhammer and other targets close to Auschwitz. The industrial area of Auschwitz itself was hit twice. Yet the War Department persisted in rejecting each new proposal to bomb the railroads or the camp on the basis of its initial, perfunctory answer - that the plan was 'impracticable' because it would require 'diversion of considerable air support'.

Wyman also notes, on page 339, the sharp contrast between the treatment of Jewish refugees and non-Jewish refugees by the Roosevelt administration:

In all, Britain and the United States rescued 100,000 Yugoslav, Polish and Greek refugees from disastrous conditions. Most of them traveled by military transport to camps where the Allies maintained them at considerable cost in funds, supplies and even military staff. In contrast, the United States (with minimal cooperation from the British) evacuated fewer than 2,000 Jews to the three camps open to *them*, the ones at Fedala, Philippeville, and Osevego.

And Wyman concluded, on page 189: "By far the most important cause for State Department inaction was fear that sizable numbers of Jews might actually get out of Axis territory."

How was it possible that the Roosevelt administration should have proved so open to Jewish radical influence within the framework of the New Deal yet so closed to any concern for Jewish survival in Europe? No doubt part of the answer has to do with the attitude of the other Allies, particularly England and the Soviet Union, who were equally indifferent to Jewish survival. So extreme was this attitude that several major Allied declarations on the subject of German war crimes deliberately omitted any mention of crimes against the Jews on the ostensible grounds that mentioning the Jews would feed into Nazi propaganda that the Allies were conducting a "Jewish war". Wyman notes on page 256:

The failure to mention atrocities against Jews was especially glaring in the important war-crimes declarations proclaimed at the Quebec Conference of August 1943 and the Moscow Conference two months later.

The Moscow Declaration, notes Ben Hecht on page 579 of *A Child of the Century*, "identified sixty-two different categories of German victims", but left out the Jews. Yet British and Soviet indifference alone cannot account for the American attitude, since the United States could easily have aided Jewish refugees without Allied approval and was in any case in a dominant position within the Allied coalition since it was not under

direct attack.

Somewhere at the heart of the strangely ambivalent attitude of the Roosevelt administration towards Jewish radicalism was the issue of Christianity. American Jewish radicals had made their way in American life by adopting an accommodating attitude towards the Christian religion. There are few if any examples in the history of American Jewish radicalism of the kind of overt anti-Christian stance associated with such figures as Bernard Lazare or even Karl Marx. Even if they did not adopt a pseudo-Christian identity like Daniel DeLeon, American Jewish radicals almost without exception strove to find something positive in Christianity that they could affirm and connect up with. European Jews, on the other hand, were viewed by the American public as outside the Christian world. And Christianity, even if tolerant and non-denominational, was and is extremely important as a unifying force in the nation of immigrants that is the United States. Jewish immigrants to the United States had quickly discovered this fact and made their peace with it, but the more Jews that came here, the greater the perceived threat to America's Christian identity. This concern, and not just the fear of socialist agitation, had been an important factor in the passage of the 1924 quotas restricting Jewish immigration, and it remained an important factor in the attitude of the Roosevelt administration towards Jewish survival in Europe.

Virtually the only Jewish radical of any prominence to publicly protest against this attitude was Ben Hecht. A well known Hollywood writer of plays and movie scripts, Hecht had grown up in a Jewish immigrant neighborhood in New York. As news of the Holocaust began to appear in the American press during World War 2, Hecht was shocked by the indifference of the American public to what was happening. As he puts it on page 519 of his autobiography, *A Child of the Century*:

It contained for me an anti-Semitism more sinister than the massacre. I felt the most deeply shamed by the silence of the American Jews.

Hecht began writing a column in the left wing New York newspaper, PM, describing the Holocaust and calling for United States government action on behalf of the Jews of Europe. He also produced a theatrical pageant entitled "We Will Never Die" on the theme of the Holocaust and the need for action. It played before audiences in the tens of thousands in stadiums around the country. In addition, Hecht published a book in 1944 entitled *A Guide for the Bedevilled* dealing with the subject of anti-Semitism.

A significant aspect of *A Guide for the Bedevilled* is that it attacked Christianity for its long history of anti-Semitic teachings. Although Hecht clearly distinguished between Christian and Nazi anti-Semitism, he had few illusions concerning Christian compassion for the Jews. As he put it on page 25: "Burn the Jew, but cherish the soul he has given us - is the cry of the pre-Nazi pogroms." Yet prior to the 1940s, Hecht had shown little interest in Jewish themes. He tried to account for his pro-Jewish stance during the Holocaust on page 109 of his autobiography as follows: "Although I never lived 'as a Jew' or even among Jews, my family remained like a homeland in my heart." And he added, on page 588, that "the compelling thing that had thrown me into the Jewish fight was that I loved Jews." But Hecht found few allies in his "Jewish fight" among American Jews. The only significant organizational support he received was from a group of Zionists from Europe, and Hecht himself became a Zionist during the course of the war. Later in the 1940s, he wrote and produced a pro-Israeli theatrical pageant entitled, "A Flag Is Born".

For the most part, the only Jews living in the United States who even attempted to make an issue of the Holocaust while it was actually happening were Zionists or Yiddishists. The assimilationist majority of American Jews adopted the position that any Jewish protest against the policies of the Roosevelt administration would only endanger American support for the war effort. The most effective way of aiding the Jews of Europe, they argued, was simply by winning the war. But when the American armies arrived in Europe, they found few Jews left to rescue. Close to half a million Jews from Hungary had been shipped to Auschwitz during the last year of the war along the rail lines which the Allies had refused to destroy. And in the United States itself, Jewish radicalism did not fare well during the period from the end of World War 2 to the 1960s. The triumph of American democracy over the Nazis was not followed by a new wave of radicalism in the United States but just the reverse, a period of reaction and retrenchment. The main beneficiary of the American victory proved to be the American capitalist system, which was enabled to expand both into Europe and into many other areas around the world formerly controlled by the European colonial powers. One thing is for sure: the postwar betrayal of the Popular Front was rooted in the wartime betrayal of the Jews.

Anti-fascism

Ironically, it was Stalin, not Roosevelt, who ended up making the connection between opposition to fascism and concern for Jewish survival. In August of 1941, shortly after the Nazis attacked the Soviet Union, a Jewish “anti-fascist” rally was held in Moscow with official government approval and support. Speakers included Solomon Mikhoels, director of the Moscow Jewish Theatre, and Ilya Ehrenburg, a leading Soviet novelist of Jewish descent. The rally was followed up in April of 1942 by the formation of the Jewish Antifascist Committee, headed by Mikhoels. The Committee was assigned the task of organizing Jews both in the Soviet Union and abroad to take part in the fight against Hitler. Levin, on page 383 of Volume I of *The Jews in the Soviet Union since 1917*, notes that the Committee was given a large building in Moscow for its headquarters, had about 80 employees and put out a regular weekly publication in Yiddish, *Einikayt*, until near the end of the war. She comments:

For the first time since the Revolution, Jews abroad were linked with Soviet Jewry in an officially sanctioned cause that had a high priority.

Particularly close links were formed with Jews in the United States. In the summer of 1943, Mikhoels and Itzik Feffer, a Yiddish poet, toured the United States, Mexico, Canada and England on behalf of the Committee. In the United States, they addressed a total of some 500,000 Jews in a speaking tour that covered 46 cities. With official Soviet approval, they sought to organize American as well as Soviet Jews into a worldwide Jewish anti-fascist network.

How was it that Stalin, the man who was primarily responsible for the murder of virtually every prominent Jewish Communist in the Soviet Union in the late 1930s, could turn around in 1942 and sanction the formation of the Jewish Antifascist Committee? The simple answer is that for the Soviet Union, the war with Hitler was a war for survival. Fully 80% of the German army was engaged in fighting the Soviet Union, with the remaining 20% considered sufficient to hold off the British and Americans. Some 25 million Soviet citizens were killed by the Nazis during the course of the war, which also resulted in widespread destruction of farms, factories and cities. Stalin needed all the help he could get, and thus he sought to organize Jewish support for the Soviet war effort along the lines he thought most likely to succeed. Having opposed Jewish nationalism for much of his career, he was well aware of the strength of national feeling in the Jewish community, and therefore sought to cultivate the very same force which he had previously tried to eradicate.

An obvious model for the Jewish Antifascist Committee was Bernard Lecache’s International League Against Antisemitism. Lecache’s LICA had inspired the French Communists to form a similar type of organization, and it is significant that the French Communist party in 1942 again authorized the formation of specifically Jewish Communist cells after having dissolved all such groups back in 1937. Also in the background was the figure of Lazar Kaganovich, the last surviving Jewish Communist leader of any importance in the Soviet Union. Director of Soviet war production during World War 2, Kaganovich - who came from a working class background and had no pre-revolutionary Trotskyist or Bundist ties - was a close associate of Stalin. He was of course officially hostile to Jewish nationalism, but evidently there was another side to the story. Nahma Sandrow on page 242 of *Vagabond Stars* tells how Kaganovich showed up one night in the mid-30s at a performance of the Jewish Theatre in Moscow. He harangued the company afterwards:

Why show these old, dirty, crippled, benighted Jews? he demanded. Where on their stage were the new Soviet Jews, building new lives? And where were the Maccabees? Where was Bar Kochba?

The company was astonished but dutifully put together a play about Bar Kochba, the Messianic hero of the great Jewish uprising against Rome in the second century CE. It was performed in 1937, at the height of the purges.

Mikhoels, the head of the Jewish Antifascist Committee, was a famous actor who performed as well as directed for the Moscow Jewish Theatre. Most of the leading figures on the Committee were writers or artists of some kind, since they were the only prominent Jewish personalities to have survived the purges of the 1930s. Probably the best known member of the Committee was Ilya Ehrenburg, who had written a number of popular novels in Russian in a satiric vein. Ehrenburg had joined the Bolsheviks at the time of the Revolution of 1905 but, fortunately for him, became disillusioned with politics and spent most of the period prior to 1940

living in France. He therefore had few Trotskyist, Menshevik or Bundist connections and following his return to Russia in 1940 became a staff writer for the Red Army. Anatol Goldberg on page 190 of *Ilya Ehrenburg* states that he “became the soldiers’ favourite writer, and when they opened their copies of the Red Army newspaper, *Red Star*, the first things they looked for were the articles of Ilya Ehrenburg.”

Ehrenburg did not hesitate to introduce the theme of revenge for the Holocaust into his articles for the Red Army, as shown by the following passage cited by Goldberg on page 204:

We have reached the German frontier. It is now the dead - all those who were asphyxiated in the gas chambers and the children of Babi Yar - who are knocking at the gates of Prussia. Woe to this land of evil-doers! Woe to Germany!

And in reply to complaints from England and the United States that his articles were too vindictive, Ehrenburg responded as follows, as cited on page 205:

And so the dawn of victory is already being darkened by uncertainty: will these murderers of our children go unpunished? I respect American honesty and British justice. But when I think of justice, I do not associate it with a judge’s wig or a diplomat’s dress suit, but with the discoloured shirt and parched lips of the Russian soldier; and it is with our men that justice is marching westwards.

But in April of 1945, with the war almost over, Pravda ran an article, “Comrade Ehrenburg Oversimplifies”, criticizing his articles, which were soon suspended. Ehrenburg nonetheless managed to survive the purges of the postwar period and emerged in the late 1950s as the leading advocate of the liberalization of Soviet cultural life under Khrushchev.

Many of the readers of Ehrenburg’s articles for the Red Army were themselves Jewish. As is noted on page 287 of *The Jews in Soviet Russia since 1917*, edited by Lionel Kochan, of the 650,000 Jewish men in the Soviet Union outside Nazi-occupied territory, no less than 500,000 served in the Soviet armed forces. Levin, on page 432, states:

Of the half a million Jews who fought in the Soviet armed forces, about 200,000 were killed in action. Another million and a half Soviet Jews were murdered or died of starvation, disease, and torture at the hands of the Nazis, yet scarcely any official acknowledgment of this immense suffering was made at the end of the war or later.

At Ehrenburg’s initiative, a *Black Book* detailing Nazi atrocities against the Jews of the Soviet Union was compiled at the end of the war, but the Soviet authorities prevented its publication. Even during the war, the Soviet press and radio had generally played down the facts of the Holocaust in its propaganda directed to the Soviet public at large, even as the Jewish Antifascist Committee was stressing this theme in its propaganda directed to the Jewish people both in Russia and abroad.

Jewish participation in the Soviet war effort was particularly significant in the partisan bands operating behind Nazi lines. On page 293 of Kochan’s anthology it is estimated that there were some 20,000 Jews in the Soviet partisan groups, mainly in the forests of Bielorussia. Among this number was Yitzhak Arad, who received a medal from the Soviet government in 1945 for derailing 13 Nazi troop trains in the Vilna area. Arad nonetheless emigrated to the land of Israel after the war, where he rose to become a Brigadier General in the Israeli army, and following his retirement from the army, the director of Yad Vashem, the Holocaust memorial center in Jerusalem. In *The Partisan*, an account of his wartime experiences, Arad notes that it was Soviet policy to break up Jewish partisan bands, which had formed on their own initiative, and disperse their members among other units. On page 150, Arad comments dryly:

The forest, the dream of thousands of Jews in the ghettos, did not extend them a cordial welcome; there too they were forced to struggle for survival in the face of the hostility of other forest dwellers.

These experiences led him to conclude, on page 179: “The prime lesson we had learned was that we must not permit ourselves to be weak and at the mercy of the people among whom we lived.”

Jewish participation in Communist-led resistance to the Nazis was significant not only in Russia but also in France, the original center of the Jewish anti-fascist movement. In *The Jews of Paris and the Final Solution*, Jacques Adler brings out on page 182 that “on 24 August 1941, Radio Moscow had broadcast an appeal to world Jewry from a Soviet Yiddish poet, David Bergelson, not only pleading for support for the Soviet Union,

but above all warning world Jewry of the danger of the extermination of Polish and Russian Jewry". The French Communist Party "transcribed the appeal and distributed copies by the thousands". This was followed in the spring of 1942 by the formation of Jewish combat units by the French Communists. Adler comments on page 192:

The decision to constitute specific Jewish units represented a fundamental change in former policy...Without any doubt, the formulation of the problem represented by Bergelson in his dramatic appeal to world Jewry, had been a major factor. Such an appeal coming from the Soviet Union, the fountainhead of Communism, had been the justification for the emergence of what formerly the Communist movement would have considered a nationalist deviation.

The units were generally commanded by Jewish veterans of the International Brigades that had fought in the Civil War in Spain. Adler states on page 201 that by January of 1943 the Jewish combat units were "carrying out half of all the partisans' operations conducted in Paris". But in the spring of 1943, the Jewish units, which had suffered severe casualties, were broken up and dispersed to other groups, in line with overall Soviet policy. Adler reports on page 217 that the Jewish combat units took part in 459 separate actions, including the blowing up of 10 military trains, the bombing of hotels housing German personnel and the assassination of Julius Ritter, a high ranking Nazi official in France.

Soviet support for the Jewish Antifascist Committee was not immediately withdrawn at the end of the war but continued on a limited basis between 1945 and 1948. In his article, "Yiddish Literature in the U.S.S.R.," on page 272 of Kochan's anthology, C. Shmeruk points out that throughout the period from 1941 to 1948, Jewish writers in the Soviet Union "were given the right to express their national feelings with almost complete freedom". He adds:

Yiddish literature during the war and afterwards was full of national Jewish feeling the like of which had hardly been seen in this literature in earlier years.

Then suddenly, in January of 1948, Mikhoels was killed in a mysterious "accident" staged by the Soviet secret police. This was followed in November of 1948 by the dissolution of the Jewish Antifascist Committee and the arrest of its leading members, most of whom were executed in the next few years. Yet although the casualties on all levels of the Communist-sponsored Jewish anti-fascist movement proved to be extremely heavy, the members of this movement did play an important part not only in fighting the Nazis but in creating an awareness among Jews of the Holocaust while it was actually going on. However, since their propaganda efforts were deliberately restricted almost entirely to Yiddish, they were not able to make much of an impression on either the Soviet or American people, to say nothing of their respective governments.

Resistance

Voluntarily concealed in the United States, ruthlessly exploited in the Soviet Union, Jewish national feeling naturally was strongest during the time of the Holocaust in the Jewish ghettos of Nazi-occupied Europe. Trapped in walled areas, surrounded by a hostile or indifferent population, armed at most with a few pistols and rifles, the Jews in Nazi-occupied Europe had no way of preventing the Nazis from killing them more or less at will. Even the most heroic and best organized attempts at resistance could at best prolong the struggle and inflict some casualties on the Nazis; there was no possibility of saving the lives of more than a tiny minority of the Jews trapped in the ghettos. These were the circumstances which induced many of the prewar leaders of the Jewish community in these areas to participate in the "Judenrats" or Jewish councils established by the Nazis for the purpose of managing the ghetto population prior to its extermination. Reliance on the good will of the Nazis, however futile this may have appeared, still seemed a more hopeful tactic than active resistance, which was clearly doomed to defeat. And yet in most ghettos active resistance was finally attempted, not so much to survive as to set an example for others.

The largest and best known ghetto uprising against the Nazis took place in Warsaw, where several thousand Jewish fighters held off SS troops for a few weeks in April of 1943, inflicting significant casualties on the Nazis. Reuben Ainszstein on page 168 of *The Warsaw Ghetto Revolt* states that Polish spectators of the fighting estimated that from 400 to 700 Germans were killed in the battle. When the Warsaw ghetto was first established by the Nazis it had confined some 500,000 Jews, but only 70,000 remained when the revolt

began, the others having been sent to the death camps or died of starvation. Of these 70,000, perhaps a few hundred managed to escape during the course of the fighting. A similar pattern emerged in other ghettos of initial deportations to the death camps followed by a decision to resist on the part of some of the survivors. Uprisings took place in Vilna, Bialystok and a number of other ghettos; several uprisings even took place in the death camps, notably at Sobibor.

In order to put these events into perspective, it is brought out on page 501 of *Jewish Resistance During The Holocaust*, issued by Yad Vashem in 1971, that of 5 million Soviet prisoners of war in Nazi hands during World War 2, only 400,000 survived. The rest starved to death or were killed in the German prison camps, yet throughout the war only one rebellion was attempted in the camps where the Soviet prisoners were held. And in this one rebellion, a number of the leaders were Jewish Soviet soldiers. In other words, the Jews fought the Nazis more, not less, than other people placed in a similar position. Speaking of the Jewish survivors of the Holocaust, Isaiah Trunk puts it this way, on page x of his Introduction to *Jewish Responses To Nazi Persecution*:

To understand the true feelings of outrage of these survivors, one must ask: Why isn't there one recorded instance of armed insurrection by Gentile inmates of a concentration camp, when the conditions for such were more favorable than for the Jews, who rose many times? Why were the children and youth of the Warsaw Ghetto, the pathetically armed remnants of a decimated nation, the first to rise against the Nazis anywhere in Europe?

Part of the answer to this question no doubt lies in the fact that the Jews had even less reason than others to expect mercy from the Nazis; but the main reason seems to be that the Jews were motivated by stronger feelings of pride, solidarity and mutual love.

Nor were the Jewish uprisings without effect. Ainsztein, on page 171, cites a Polish general describing the impact of the Warsaw ghetto uprising on the Poles as follows:

Thus the military importance of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising is above all in its repercussions among the Polish people, in the fact that being an uncompromising armed deed it undermined the idea of 'enduring' and 'waiting' and thus contributed in a capital manner to the rise of an active struggle against the invader. The momentary successes of the insurgents toppled the Germans from their pedestal of omnipotence and proved to Poles the effectiveness of armed resistance. Thus the blood of the ghetto defenders was not shed in vain.

And Jean-Paul Sartre, on page 96 of *Anti-Semite and Jew*, speaks as follows of the role of the Jews in the French Resistance:

We know that the role of the Jews in the Resistance was admirable; it was they who formed the principal cadres before the Communists went into action; for four years they gave proof of a courage and a spirit of decision which it is a pleasure to acknowledge.

It should also be acknowledged that of the Jews who took part in active resistance against the Nazis, the great majority were Jewish radicals, particularly Zionists, Socialists and Communists.

In the coalitions of Jewish resistance organizations that formed in the larger ghettos, the pivotal group was usually the Labor Zionists. They stood at the center of a spectrum of organizations that generally stretched from the Communists at one end to Betar, a Zionist para-military organization, at the other end. A similar spectrum also emerged among Jewish Resistance fighters in France, where Jewish Communists were not the only Jews to engaged in armed struggle against the Nazis. Another active group was the Jewish Army, under Zionist leadership, which had about 2000 members. Anny Latour, on page 93 of *The Jewish Resistance in France*, reproduces the oath which she swore when she joined the Jewish Army:

I swear allegiance to the Jewish Army and obedience to its leaders. Let my people live again! Let Eretz Israel be born again!
Liberty or Death!

Whether Zionists, Socialists or Communists, the Jewish resistance fighters were radicals not only in the sense that they opposed the Nazis but in that they were for the most part atheists or agnostics who defined their Jewish identity in secular terms.

Chaika Grossman, in *The Underground Army*, argues that the more radical the prewar attitude, the more

likely it was to lead to participation in the wartime resistance. She puts it this way, on page 79:

Those who believed before the war, that it was possible to attain socialism peacefully, to 'grow into socialism', to bring workers to power by indirect means, without a direct clash, those who believed that it was possible to achieve complete national liberation without sacrifice, without pioneering action, without a deep, internal national revolution, were those who led our people astray and deluded them insisting that the Nazi occupation, the murders and oppression, could be evaded.

To put it another way, those who were best prepared to fight the Nazis during the war were those who believed least in the good will of European so-called civilization before the war. Another trait which the Jewish resistance fighters had in common was youth. Most of them were in their teens or twenties, energetic and strong enough to retain their vitality in the face of the starvation diet to which all Jews in the Nazi controlled ghettos and camps were subjected. A very considerable proportion of the resistance fighters were products of the various youth groups established in the prewar Jewish community by the Zionists, Socialists and Communists.

Mordecai Anielewicz, the commander of the Warsaw ghetto uprising, was 20 years old in 1939 and active in Hashomer Hatzair, the Young Guard, a Labor Zionist youth group. He had previously been active in Betar, where he received a certain amount of training in the use of weapons. On April 23, 1943, in the midst of the uprising, he wrote the following lines to a friend outside the ghetto, as cited on page 126 by Ainsztein:

Perhaps we shall meet again. But what really matters is that the dream of my life has come true. Jewish self-defense in the Warsaw ghetto has become a fact. Jewish armed resistance and retaliation have become a reality. I have been the witness of the magnificent heroic struggle of our Jewish fighters.

Anielewicz continued fighting until May 8, when he was killed in a Nazi attack on his headquarters. His spirit lived on not only in the 1944 Warsaw uprising against the Germans by the Poles but in the many parts of Europe where resistance activities were intensified as a result of the example set by the Jewish radicals in the ghettos.

World War 2 was a continuation of World War 1. But while World War 1 had a covert anti-Jewish thrust, World War 2 was openly directed against the Jewish people. This was true not only of the Nazis and their supporters but also to a certain extent of the Allied coalition that defeated the Nazis. Whether consciously or unconsciously, all of the major Allied powers encouraged the Nazis to continue with the Holocaust by refusing to accept Jewish refugees, by playing down or ignoring the facts of the Holocaust in their propaganda and by refusing to take any military action whatsoever whose primary purpose was to prevent the Nazis from killing Jews. Yet at the same time, all of the Allied governments upheld principles which they knew to be Jewish in inspiration. Whether it was a question of the New Deal in the United States or of Marxism in Russia or even of the notion of the rule of law in England, Jewish influence was clearly visible in the ideals for which the various Allies claimed to fight. Moreover, the idea of uniting capitalists and communists in a broad anti-Nazi coalition had been advocated since the 1920s by many Jewish radicals and was particularly associated with the Popular Front of the 1930s headed by Leon Blum. And during the war itself, Jews in all the Allied countries played an important role not only in fighting the Nazis but also in promoting continued cooperation and solidarity between the various Allied powers. Finally, the heroic struggle of the Jewish resistance fighters in Nazi-occupied Europe was a key element in the emergence of anti-Nazi Resistance movements in a number of European countries. For all of these reasons, it was only natural for most of the Allies to adopt an essentially favorable attitude towards Jewish national aspirations once the war was over. This was all the more true in that the Holocaust had already taken place, eliminating any possibility of direct Jewish influence in the greater part of Europe for a long time to come.

Postwar Allied support for Jewish national aspirations was further enhanced by the establishment of Popular Front governments in many European countries between 1945 and 1948. Both in Soviet-occupied Eastern Europe and American-occupied Western Europe, the end of the war witnessed the emergence of coalition governments based on the same alliance of communists, socialists and bourgeois democrats that had characterized the Popular Front of 1930s. Indeed, in France several of the postwar coalition governments were headed by none other than Leon Blum, who had managed to survive the war as a prisoner of the Nazis in Buchenwald. Like the Popular Front of the 1930s, the postwar Popular Front governments were not only hostile to fascism but sympathetic to the Jews. Their presence helped to perpetuate for a time the wartime alliance of the Soviet Union and the United States and also to give this alliance a somewhat more pro-Jewish

tone than it had displayed during the war itself. By the same token, the collapse of the European Popular Front governments due to the intensification of the Cold War after 1948 was accompanied by a shift towards a much more anti-Jewish policy on the part of both the Soviet Union and the United States.

In recent decades, the idea has taken hold in the most diverse circles that the establishment of the state of Israel after the war was essentially a kind of compensation handed to the Jewish people by the former Allies to make up for the Holocaust. But if the Holocaust had not taken place, the power and prestige of the Jewish people in the 1940s would have been much greater than it actually was. Israel was not established because of the Holocaust, but in spite of it. No doubt sympathy for Jewish suffering played a certain role in the events leading up to the birth of Israel; but under different circumstances, respect for Jewish power might have played an even greater role. As the Armenians, the Kurds, the American Indians and many other suppressed and slaughtered nationalities can testify, sympathy alone will not win you a state. It was not Jewish weakness but Jewish strength which proved decisive; and in the 1940s, Jewish strength was manifested most clearly in the defeat of the Nazis by the Allied coalition. Obviously the Jewish people was not solely or even primarily responsible for the defeat of the Nazis. Nonetheless, the fact remains that the Nazis declared war on the Jewish people and at the end of the war, it was the Jewish people and not the Nazis who remained standing. It was the existence of this fact, more than any other single factor, which made the birth of Israel possible.

Chapter Seven: Freedom

Victory over the Nazis made the birth of Israel possible, but what actually brought Israel into being was the War of Independence of 1948. Had the Israeli armed forces not been able to repel the invading Arab armies in the spring and summer of 1948, the newly proclaimed state of Israel would not have survived. From that time to the present, its continued existence has depended on its ability, repeatedly demonstrated on the field of battle, to defend itself against heavily armed Arab forces.

Even more than Israel itself, the Israeli armed forces are the creation of Jewish radicals. Religious Jews played almost no part whatsoever in the organization of the Israeli army that came into being during the course of the War of Independence in 1948. The bulk of the recruits for the new army came from the Haganah, a volunteer self-defense corps that had been built up by the Labor Zionists during the 1920s and 30s. In addition, recruits were drawn from three relatively small but active military formations that had taken shape during the early 1940s: the Palmach, Etzel and Lehi. The Palmach was affiliated with the Haganah but had a more leftist orientation. Etzel and Lehi were both offshoots of the Revisionist Zionist movement that had been founded by Ze'ev Jabotinsky in the 1920s. They are usually described as "right wing" groups, but they came out of a tradition of secular radicalism and anti-colonialism that led them to take up arms against the British empire even before the Nazis had been defeated.

The Jewish radicals that organized the Israeli army were representative of a broad majority of the Israeli people. This was shown by the results of the very first elections for the Israeli Knesset or Assembly, held in January of 1949. The Labor Zionist party Mapai, headed by David Ben-Gurion, won 46 seats out of 120, making it far and away the largest party in Israel. The pro-Soviet party, Mapam, which had been closely linked to the Palmach, won an additional 19 seats. Herut, the party formed by veterans of Etzel and Lehi, won 14 seats. Altogether therefore, 79 seats out of 120, or approximately two thirds, went to the Jewish radical parties affiliated with the various military organizations that had coalesced to form the Israeli army. The religious Zionists received 16 seats and the pro-capitalist General Zionists only 7.

The radical basis of the state of Israel was also reflected in the Israeli Declaration of Independence, issued at the time of the founding of the state in May of 1948. The text may be found in *Israel: A Personal History* by David Ben-Gurion. In it the word "God" does not even appear. The closest thing to it is a statement, "We trust in the Rock of Israel", inserted in the last paragraph, and even this one phrase was only included after prolonged debate. There is no attempt of any kind to justify the birth of Israel on religious grounds; Zionism is defended solely on the basis of the right of the Jewish people to return to the land from which we were exiled by force. Israel is defined as a progressive state, on page 81, that "will maintain complete equality of social and political rights for all its citizens, without distinction of creed, race, or sex". And in fact, to this day the only requirements for becoming a citizen of the state of Israel are to obey its laws and learn the Hebrew language.

From the start, the Hebraist movement from which the state of Israel emerged had a strong radical component. Frankel, on page 31 of *Prophecy and Politics*, notes that a circle of "Hebrew socialists" formed around HaShahar, The Dawn, the first major Hebraist periodical. Edited by Perez Smolenskin, HaShahar came out between 1868 and 1884. Among the Hebrew socialists affiliated with HaShahar was Aaron Lieberman, who sought to conduct socialist propaganda in Hebrew among Jews in the Pale of Settlement. On page 33, Frankel cites the following affirmation of the Jewishness of socialism which Lieberman wrote in 1875:

Socialism is not alien to us. The community is our existence; the revolution - our tradition; the commune - the basis of our legislation as quite clearly indicated by the ordinances forbidding the sale of land, by those on the Jubilee and sabbatical years, on equal rights, fraternity, etc. Our ancient Jewish social structure - anarchy; the real link between us across the surface of the globe - internationalism. In the spirit of our people, the great prophets of our time such as Marx and Lassalle were educated and developed.

Lieberman also published his own Hebrew language periodical, HaEmet, The Truth, in 1877. In one article, notes Frankel on page 42, "written in the language and style of a classic kabbalistic work", he compared the modern Jewish socialists to the 36 just men of Jewish tradition. But after being imprisoned for about a year in Austria and Germany for his radical activities, he went to the United States, where he committed suicide in 1880.

Neither Lieberman nor most of the other Hebrew socialists linked to HaShahar were Zionists. The original goal of the Hebraists was to create a secular Hebrew language culture in Europe; but the outbreak of the pogroms in 1881 had the effect of rapidly turning most Hebraists into Zionists. Smolenskin, the editor of HaShahar, responded to the pogroms with an article, "How to Bring the Redemption", calling for mass Jewish emigration to the land of Israel. By 1884, an organization called the Lovers of Zion had been formed by the Hebraists for the specific purpose of organizing and funding Jewish settlement in the land of Israel. Centered in Odessa, the Lovers of Zion was composed almost entirely of Russian Jews. Its central figure was Ahad HaAm, meaning "One of the people", the pen name of Asher Ginzburg. Although best known for his elegant Hebrew language essays, Ahad HaAm was also the leader of a secret society called the B'nei Moshe or Sons of Moses, which was closely linked to the Lovers of Zion. Members were required to learn Hebrew and were responsible for the establishment of the first secular Hebrew language school in the land of Israel, at Jaffa. According to Leon Simon on page 77 of *Ahad Ha-Am*, the original oath sworn by new members of the B'nei Moshe began with the words, "In the name of the God of Israel", but due to a "tendency to secularization", the formula, "With heartfelt conviction and in the name of all that I hold precious and sacred", was substituted. At its height the B'nei Moshe had about 200 members, mainly in Russia but also in Jaffa.

Due to the influence of the Hebraists and groups like the B'nei Moshe, Hebrew rapidly became the spoken language of most Jewish settlers in the land of Israel. And since spoken Hebrew was regarded as blasphemous by almost the entire Jewish religious establishment at that time, the Jewish settlement in the land of Israel inevitably took on a radical tone. This tone was further heightened by the establishment of the first agricultural collectives by Jewish radicals who came to the land of Israel after the collapse of the Russian Revolution of 1905. Because settlers, even if they came from middle class backgrounds, generally had to become farmers or laborers in order to survive, socialist and communal views rapidly became predominant among them. These views were all the more appropriate in that private developmental capital in the land of Israel was almost non-existent. Funds came primarily from the various Zionist organizations and were doled out to groups, not individuals. For all of these reasons, a secularist, collectivist mentality became even more characteristic of the Jewish settlers in the land of Israel than it was of Jewish communities elsewhere.

But also to a greater extent than elsewhere, this secularist, collectivist mentality remained rooted in Jewish tradition. Speaking the same language as the original Hebrews, living in the same land, the Jewish settlers could not help but be conscious of the links that bound them to the past. It was this consciousness that had brought them to the land of Israel in the first place, for few settlers came there for primarily material reasons. Those who simply wanted to get out of the Pale of Settlement and find a better life elsewhere usually went to the United States. Only a small minority of the emigrants from the Pale settled in the land of Israel, and those who did so were almost invariably motivated by some kind of Jewish national feeling. Of those who settled, moreover, only a small minority permanently remained; the great majority left after a few years due to the harsh conditions which they encountered. Grown accustomed to hard physical labor, bound together by strong ties of political conviction and national sentiment, outcasts and rebels in the eyes of the entire world, the Jews of the land of Israel formed by the 1940s a revolutionary constituency such as the world has rarely seen. However modern and secular their outlook, the most accurate term for the society which they brought into being is Messianic.

But when Messianism is redefined in secular terms, it becomes obvious that at the core of the Messianic tradition is the idea of armed struggle. The Kabbalists had evaded this realization by believing in magic, but to the modern Messianists of the land of Israel, it was clear that only a Jewish army could bring a Jewish state into being. However, a sharp division gradually developed among them as to just how this army was to be established. The Labor Zionists believed in building the army from the ground up, from the self-defense organizations which had been formed by the agricultural collectives and trade unions. Jabotinsky and his followers advocated building the army from the top down, creating first a command structure and combat units. Jabotinsky also shocked Jewish public opinion in the 1930s by publishing an article, "Oif'n Pripetchek", in which he argued that learning to shoot a rifle was the highest moral imperative for the Jewish youth of his day. Only in retrospect did the validity of his views become clear. Alone among the Jewish leaders of the 1930s, Jabotinsky saw the Holocaust coming. Joseph Schechtman on page 214 of Volume 2 of *The Vladimir Jabotinsky Story* brings out that as soon as Hitler came to power, Jabotinsky began to speak of an impending "German-Jewish War" and wrote: "If Hitler's regime is destined to stay, world Jewry is doomed."

Unfortunately, during the course of the 1930s a spirit of bitterness and hostility came to separate the Labor

Zionists from Jabotinsky and his followers. Both sides portrayed the other in grossly unrealistic terms, creating stereotypes which survived long after the course of events had shown them to be false. Jabotinsky came to be seen as a fascist, despite the fact that both he and his followers were firm believers in electoral democracy. And the Labor Zionists were painted as weak and wishy-washy, although it was they who subsequently proclaimed the Jewish state and led Israel in 4 victorious wars. In Israeli histories of the events leading up to the birth of Israel, one side or the other was given the credit for the achievements of this period, but hardly ever both. Yet in reality both sides shared the same commitment to the creation of a secular, democratic Jewish nation and the same readiness to take up arms on its behalf. What mainly poisoned the relations between them was the intensely anti-Semitic atmosphere of the 1930s, in which even Jewish nationalists became overly critical and intolerant in their relations with other Jews. Since the contending factions finally did unite to form the Israeli army, they are probably best understood as having constituted all along disparate strands of the same Messianic movement.

Jabotinsky

Prior to his death in 1940, Ze'ev Jabotinsky was undoubtedly the leading proponent of armed struggle both in Zionist circles and also in the world Jewish community at large. Jabotinsky was born in Odessa in 1880; his father died when he was six and he was reared in genteel poverty by his mother in the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Odessa, a port city on the Black Sea noted for its multi-national character. Jabotinsky eventually became an accomplished linguist who was fluent in Yiddish, Hebrew and a number of European languages as well as his native Russian. As a young man, he became first a socialist and then a Zionist. Although he never joined the Labor Zionists, he continued to hold quasi-Marxist views for a long time. Schechtman, on page 51 of Volume I of *The Vladimir Jabotinsky Story*, cites the following lines which Jabotinsky wrote in 1906, when he was already a prominent Zionist leader in Russia:

I belong to those who believe that there is an irreconcilable and steadily growing contradiction between the interests of the employer and the worker; that the only possible and inevitable solution of this contradiction is the socialization of the means of production; that the natural instrument of this upheaval is the industrial proletariat; and that the way to this upheaval is class struggle and seizure of political power.

In later years, Jabotinsky took to describing himself as an advocate of “psycho-Marxism” or “psycho-historical materialism”. He prided himself on viewing politics and society in the same “scientific” and objective spirit as the Marxists, but gradually came to view the Marxist emphasis on class struggle as a divisive force in the Jewish community.

Jabotinsky in later years also moderated his early hostility to organized religion, but throughout his life he remained a free thinker whose writings were couched in strictly secular terms. He was a self-proclaimed individualist, whose deepest convictions were expressed as follows in poetic form in 1902, as cited on page 66 of Volume I by Schechtman:

There is no duty. Thou art free. Then light thy candle
Before Desire - Desire shall be thy law.
Wherever it might lead, to altar high or low,
To sweet home or dark tavern, or black night
Of suicide, or service to the nation:
No lesson is my deed, no task of Errant Knight,
Nor God's command - but only my own fashion,
My own desire, my Sovereign Desire.

Jabotinsky chose the path of “service to the nation” and became the leading speaker and public personality in the Zionist movement in Russia during the period immediately before World War I. He was also active at this time in Russian literary circles but saw little future for himself in this field, stating in 1909, as Schechtman puts it on page 142 of Volume I, that “the Jews who had made their way into the Russian literature, press, theater, and publishing business, would sooner or later have to face a gradual dismissal.”

Jabotinsky was a Romantic realist, an individualist who understood the limits of individualism. He eventually tried to spell out his credo in a novel, *Samson*, which he wrote in 1927. He speaks of his hero, Samson, the

famous Biblical strong man and warrior, as follows on page 192:

The strongest power of all is a solitary man. The angel who came to his mother had known that. Nazirite meant anchorite: a man whose very birth was unlike that of others, who lived in his own manner, sat in judgment by the light of his own wisdom, amused himself like a foreigner, fought alone and died a strange death.

Samson the individualist is portrayed by Jabotinsky as a typical product of a nation of individualists. Samson speaks both of his own tribe of Dan and of the Hebrews in general on page 306 as follows:

In Dan there is neither order nor rank; it is a chaos of towns, altars, and ideas. The husbandmen hate the shepherds, Benjamin hates Judah, and the prophets hate them all. But beyond all that they have one thing in common - the hungry heart. A greed for all things, visible or invisible. Every soul is in revolt against what is, and cries for something else.

But in his farewell message to the Hebrews, on page 331, Samson treats this individualism as a weakness, which he contrasts with the order and discipline of the Philistines:

A man will give them the signal and of a sudden thousands will lift up their hands. So it is with the Philistines, and therefore the Philistines are lords of Canaan.

The obvious moral of the story was that the Jews too would have to unite behind a strong leader if they wished to become "lords of Canaan". Jabotinsky was not fated to be that leader, but under the leadership of Ben-Gurion his analysis was eventually proved correct.

Jabotinsky's claims to lead the Jewish people in the 1920s and 30s were based primarily on his success in organizing the Jewish Legion during World War 1. In 1917, Jabotinsky was able to persuade the British government to permit the inclusion of a Jewish Legion in the forces it was organizing for an invasion of the Middle East. British approval for Jabotinsky's Jewish Legion was closely linked to the new British policy of public support for Zionism as expressed in the Balfour Declaration. Jabotinsky organized and commanded the Jewish Legion, which participated in the British Middle East campaign of 1917-18. As a result, Jabotinsky was able to lead a Jewish military force into the land of Israel, an achievement which made him famous. Ben-Gurion, who served as a private in the Jewish Legion, once called Jabotinsky "the Zionist Trotsky", and in fact there was an astonishing similarity between the careers of the two men. Born within a year of one another, shaped by cosmopolitan Odessa, famous as Jewish military commanders, they both had their moment of glory in 1917, only to spend most of the rest of their lives in a long and seemingly unsuccessful struggle against heavy odds and to die in the same year, 1940, in the New World, where both had taken refuge from the anti-Semitism of the Old.

Jabotinsky's troubles began in 1920 when he was arrested by the British for attempting to arm the Jews of Jerusalem against Arab mobs participating in anti-Jewish riots in April of 1920. British policy had already shifted to a more pro-Arab line, and Jabotinsky was immediately sentenced to 15 years at hard labor for arms possession. A worldwide protest ensued and after 3 months Jabotinsky was pardoned by the British and released. Nonetheless, the British had made their point: no independent Jewish military force would be permitted in British Palestine. The Jewish Legion had been disbanded by the British even before 1920, and all subsequent attempts on the part of the Jewish settlers to arm themselves were treated by the British as acts of rebellion. But without a Jewish army, it was clear that there would be no Jewish state, and therefore Jabotinsky refused to accept British policy as legitimate. When the World Zionist Organization decided to cooperate with the British all the same, Jabotinsky formed his own New Zionist Organization. By the end of the 1920s, Jabotinsky thus found himself in the same position as Trotsky, in conflict with the organization which he had once led to victory.

In 1930, Jabotinsky was permanently banned by the British from entering the land of Israel. From this time forward, Jabotinsky began to prepare his followers for armed struggle with the British. However, the bulk of his supporters were not in the land of Israel but in Poland. Jewish immigration to the land of Israel was controlled by the British and the World Zionist Organization, both of which were hostile to Jabotinsky, and therefore few known members of his New Zionist Organization were able to obtain immigration certificates. They were forced to remain where they were, and in Poland Jabotinsky's supporters by the 1930s came to number in the hundreds of thousands. Many of them belonged to Betar, originally the youth group of the

New Zionist Organization, which by the 1930s had evolved into a mass para-military organization whose commander in Poland was Menachem Begin.

Betar in Poland had a strong appeal to young, unemployed Jews from the lower middle class; Begin and also Jabotinsky himself came from just such a background. Ned Temko, on page 36 of *To Win Or To Die*, argues that Betar drew its recruits from poorer strata of Jewish society than did the Labor Zionists:

Most of the recruits were poor, the children of Jews who were either unemployed or about to be. Wealthier youngsters tended to adopt a more genteel, 'Labor Zionism'.

Recruits were given uniforms, received military training and agitated for the right to leave Poland and settle in the land of Israel. In the late 1930s, Begin led a mass march of some 10,000 members of Betar to the Rumanian border, but they were turned back. Jabotinsky's critics within the Zionist movement regarded such activities as theatrical and futile. Yaacov Shavit, on page 40 of *Jabotinsky And The Revisionist Movement*, cites one Zionist opponent of Jabotinsky comparing him to Jacob Frank:

A new Shabbetai Zeviism has appeared in the world, or more accurately - a new Frankism (the later Polish form of this delusion) in the form of the conspiracy and its attributes which capture young hearts by means of militaristic mystery and its superior, inferior, and ultra-superior beings, and its discipline, which starts off in the form and dress of sport and ends in what looks more and more like a comic army.

But comic or not, an army was just what the Jews of Poland were soon to find themselves in need of. During World War 2, local units of Betar played an important part in the coalitions of Jewish resistance groups which formed in the Polish ghettos.

Due to immigration restrictions, neither the New Zionist Organization nor Betar was able to establish much of an organizational presence in the land of Israel. Jabotinsky had many followers there, but particularly after the British banned him from coming there in 1930, his supporters began to evolve their own independent line. Under the leadership of Abba Achimeir, they formed a group in the early 1930s known as the Brit HaBiryonim, meaning roughly "League of the Hoodlums". Moshe Svorai, on page 47 of his memoirs in Hebrew, *From Etzel To Lehi*, recalls Achimeir advocating what he called "revolutionary Zionism", Zionism understood as a clandestine armed movement for national liberation patterned after such groups as the Sinn Fein in Ireland. Achimeir and the Brit HaBiryonim were critical of Jabotinsky and the New Zionist Organization for not moving quickly enough in the direction of an armed confrontation with the British. They shared the same general outlook as Jabotinsky's other followers but regarded themselves as more militant and organizationally independent.

As a result of a series of events in 1939-40 - a British ban on further Jewish immigration to the land of Israel, the outbreak of World War 2 and Jabotinsky's death - some of the members of the Brit HaBiryonim, headed by Avraham Stern, decided to begin the armed struggle against the British. Stern had ties to Betar in Poland but acted independently. He founded an organization called the Fighters for the Freedom of Israel, whose initials in Hebrew gave it the name Lehi. Stern was killed by the British after they arrested him early in 1942, but Lehi fought on. It was joined in 1943 by a second clandestine group, Etzel, the Hebrew initials for National Military Organization, also sometimes called the Irgun, meaning simply the Organization. Etzel had been formed in the 1930s by followers of Jabotinsky in the land of Israel but was relatively inactive until the arrival of Begin in 1943. Begin, who had fled the Nazis only to be imprisoned by the Communists, finally made his way to the land of Israel and immediately assumed command of Etzel and directed it to join the armed struggle against the British. A kind of division of labor evolved between Etzel and Lehi, with Etzel raiding British military bases and installations while Lehi concentrated on attacking British security personnel and police. Etzel was responsible for the most spectacular action carried out by the two groups, the blowing up of a large part of the British headquarters in Jerusalem housed in the King David hotel.

Both Lehi and Etzel came under heavy criticism from the rest of the Zionist movement for attacking the British while the British were fighting the Nazis. They justified their policy mainly on the grounds that by closing the land of Israel to Jewish immigration in 1939, the British had become accomplices to the Holocaust and had to be overthrown so that Jewish refugees fleeing the Nazis could come to the land of Israel. However justified these arguments may have been, neither Lehi nor Etzel enjoyed the support of more than a minority of the Jewish people in the land of Israel prior to the end of World War 2. Both groups were small, Lehi consisting

of only a few hundred members, Etzel of perhaps several thousand. They fought alone, like Jabotinsky's Samson, without praise, without recognition, without much chance of success. And yet it was they who initiated the armed struggle that ended in 1948 with the withdrawal of the British forces and the proclamation of the state of Israel.

Jabotinsky died of a heart attack at a Betar camp in upstate New York in 1940 but his spirit lived on in the armed struggle of Betar in Europe and Lehi and Etzel in the land of Israel. It was exemplified in the proud challenge laid down by a member of Etzel, Meir Feinstein, to the British court about to sentence him to be hanged in 1947 for taking part in an attack on British personnel:

Indeed, you are stricken by blindness. Are you really unaware whom you are going to encounter in this strife, which has no precedent in the history of nations? Do you really think that your gallows will affright us? Do you mean to scare us, who have for years been hearing the clickety-clack of wheels carrying our brothers and parents and our finest people to the chambers of death. Us - who have been repeatedly asking ourselves why did fate treat us differently than the millions of our brothers? How come that we did not share their days of fear and moments of agony?

To this we had only one reply: we have remained alive not in order to live and hope in thralldom and repression for a new Treblinka. We have remained alive in order to make certain that life, freedom and honor will be our lot and the lot of our nation and the lot of our generations unborn. We have remained alive in order to make impossible a recurrence of what happened there, and what is likely to happen under your rule of deceit, your regime of blood.

The entire speech of Feinstein to the British court is reproduced on the wall of the cell of the prison in Jerusalem where he was held prior to sentencing. The prison has been converted into a museum, maintained by the state of Israel. Feinstein killed himself in prison just before he was to be hung.

Ben-Gurion

Jabotinsky began the war, but it was Ben-Gurion who finished it. Slowly over the years, without any dramatic deeds or accomplishments, David Ben-Gurion took command of the world Zionist movement. By the early 1920s, he had become the leading figure among the Labor Zionists, basing himself on a complex network of interconnecting organizational ties that included the Histadrut, the Labor Zionist trade union, and the Haganah, the Labor Zionist self-defense corps. By the 1930s, the Labor Zionists had become the dominant party within the World Zionist Organization, enabling Ben-Gurion to take control of this organization as well. At no point during this period did Ben-Gurion put himself forward as an individual, basing his claims to leadership on his personal talents or abilities. He always spoke as the representative of some group, and yet as time passed even his enemies grew accustomed to thinking of him as the leader of the Zionist movement. When the time came to proclaim the birth of Israel, there was never any doubt that he would be the one to do it and go on to become the head of the first Israeli government.

Indicative of Ben-Gurion's impersonal leadership style is the fact that no "ism" was ever attached to his name. Jabotinsky's followers were known as "Revisionists" but until late in his career Ben-Gurion never led a separate faction associated with him personally. He was not viewed as the advocate of a particular form of Labor Zionism but simply as a member of a clique of Labor Zionist veterans who had come to the land of Israel after 1905 and helped to found the kibbutzim, the Histadrut and the Haganah. The absence of fanfare surrounding Ben-Gurion as an individual is all the more striking in that he did what the Messiah was supposed to do. It was under his leadership that the ingathering of the exiles was accomplished and the Jewish state reborn, and yet references to him as a Messianic figure are rare or non-existent. Ben-Gurion continued his winning ways after 1948 too, serving as the elected leader of the Israeli government for the better part of 15 years and then retiring to a kibbutz in the Negev desert where he lived to the age of 87. He was the most successful Jewish radical and Jewish leader of any kind for the past 2000 years, yet to this day there is barely a hint of a cult of personality developing around him.

According to Jewish folklore, when the time of the Messiah arrived, there would be two Messiahs, the Messiah of the House of Joseph and the Messiah of the House of David. The first would unfurl the Messianic banner but be defeated; the second would prevail. And with this thought in so many minds, it was perhaps no coincidence that Jabotinsky and Ben-Gurion ended up playing these roles. But while Jabotinsky invited Messianic comparisons, Ben-Gurion shunned them. It was as if the closer he came to actually playing the role of the Messiah, the less he wished to be perceived as doing so. So guarded did he become that Golda Meir, on page 40 of *My Life*, calls him "one of the least approachable men I ever knew". She adds, on page 121:

Either you had something specific to talk about, some business to conduct with him, or you didn't go to him. He didn't need people the way the rest of us did.

She also states that "he found it so difficult to talk to people. He had no small talk at all."

Shimon Peres, cited on page 12 of *Shimon Peres* by Matti Golan, tells a similar story. As a youthful activist in Mapai, he rode in a car with Ben-Gurion for hours in 1943 without Ben-Gurion saying a word:

Only as we were approaching Haifa did he turn to me and out of the blue, say: 'You know, Trotski was no statesman.' To this day I have no idea what brought Lev Trotski into Ben-Gurion's mind at just that moment. But being eager to continue the conversation, I asked, 'Why not?' Now he began to warm up a bit and said: 'What kind of policy is that, no peace and no war? It's a Jewish gimmick. Either peace, and then you reconcile yourself to the heavy price it may cost, or war, and you take the terrible risk it entails. Lenin understood that.'

Ben-Gurion was referring to the slogan, "No war and no peace", which Trotsky advanced during the controversy in Russia over whether to sign the disastrous Brest-Litovsk peace treaty with the Germans in 1918. But in 1943, Ben-Gurion was involved in a similar controversy over whether to remain at peace with the British or join the Revisionists in forcibly challenging the British policy of excluding Jewish refugees from the land of Israel. And at the start of World War 2, after the British policy had been announced in a "White Paper", Ben-Gurion had coined a slogan almost identical to Trotsky's: "Fight the war as if there were no White Paper and fight the White Paper as if there were no war." This slogan too was a "Jewish gimmick", for in reality there was no way of fighting the White Paper without attacking the British, which Ben-Gurion had resolved not to do until the war was over. Like the tip of the proverbial iceberg, only a hint of Ben-Gurion's real concerns was contained in the cryptic remarks which he finally directed at Peres.

Even as he spoke, Ben-Gurion was preparing for war with the British. In the spring of 1942, he had succeeded in persuading the World Zionist Organization, meeting at the Biltmore Hotel in New York, to endorse his proposal for the establishment of a Jewish "Commonwealth" in the land of Israel after the war. This proposal placed Ben-Gurion and the world Zionist movement on a collision course with the British, given the high probability of a British refusal to surrender sovereignty over what they called Palestine at the end of the war. So controversial was the "Biltmore Program" considered that it split Mapai, Ben-Gurion's own party, leading to the formation of Mapam in 1944 by a left-wing faction that regarded the establishment of a Jewish state as premature and unjustified. Characteristically, Ben-Gurion sold the "Biltmore Program" to Mapai in the name of the World Zionist Organization, and then sold it to the rest of the Jewish public in the land of Israel in the name of Mapai. But all along it had been his proposal, and as Shabtai Teveth brings out on page 668 of *Ben-Gurion*, a proposal that he had been planning since 1939, when he wrote in his diary:

We are faced, with the age of Hitler, with the necessity of 'combative Zionism'. Palestine will be ours if we want it and can take it by force.

These thoughts Ben-Gurion kept to himself while he slowly persuaded the rest of the Zionist movement of the inevitability of a clash with the British at the end of the war.

When the clash did come, Ben-Gurion orchestrated it in such a way as to seize the moral high ground while taking full advantage of the "terrorist" activities of the despised Revisionists. Attacks by the Haganah and the Palmach - the elite volunteer corps of the Haganah - on the British were confined exclusively to British installations and personnel connected in some way with British efforts to prevent Jewish survivors of the Holocaust from coming to the land of Israel after the war. Secretly Ben-Gurion formed an on-again, off-again alliance with Lehi and Etzel to coordinate attacks on the British, but publicly he disavowed their actions, as he had done throughout the war. Yet Lehi and Etzel had to play along with Ben-Gurion, for he had appropriated their program of establishing a Jewish state by force of arms and was clearly the only person in the Zionist movement capable of carrying this program through to a victorious conclusion. Needless to say, Ben-Gurion gave no credit whatsoever to the Revisionists for carrying the banner of a Jewish state for 20 years before he picked it up; to the contrary, he had the Haganah inform on them to the British from time to time and nearly killed Begin while shelling an Irgun arms ship to demonstrate his authority during the Altalena affair.

Moreover, during the course of the year 1948 Ben-Gurion created the Israeli army by forcing not only Lehi and Etzel but also the Palmach to disband as independent organizations and submit to his personal authority as the supreme commander of the Israeli armed forces. And all three organizations, which were factionally

opposed to Ben-Gurion, nonetheless did as he wished because they recognized that they had no other choice if the retreating British and invading Arabs were to be defeated. Most incredibly of all, in playing the role of Defense Minister as well as Premier in the newly formed Israeli government, Ben-Gurion was but living up to his name, for as Teveth reveals on page 73 of *Ben-Gurion*, David Gruen adopted the name Ben-Gurion in 1910 in honor of Joseph Ben-Gurion, the “renowned defense minister in Jerusalem at the time of the great Jewish rebellion against the Romans” in 66 CE. Small wonder that Ben-Gurion went to such lengths to conceal his personality. His deeds spoke loudly enough.

How did he do it? David Ben-Gurion was one of those rare individuals, a principled revolutionary who was a past master at diplomatic intrigue and factional in-fighting. Before becoming a paid functionary in the Labor Zionist movement, he worked for a number of years as a common laborer. At his insistence, officials of the Histadrut and Mapai received the same salary as ordinary workers. He also came to Jewish self-defense by way of personal experience, first in self-defense groups in Plonsk and Warsaw in 1905, then in the legendary HaShomer in Sejera in 1909, then as a private in the Jewish Legion in 1918. Ben-Gurion practiced what he preached but he did not always preach what he practiced. He was repeatedly but discreetly unfaithful to his wife, pursued grudges with a vindictiveness considered excessive even by his followers and drove everyone around him crazy as they tried to guess what he wanted while he sat in stony silence. Yet over and over again, his judgment was confirmed, events went as he had predicted, his tactics and strategy proved successful. In 1937 he wrote in a letter, cited by Teveth on page 643:

I do not hold the superficial theory that history is made by outstanding men. But I do believe that outstanding individuals are the intermediaries of the collective might of the peoples and classes playing a role in history.

Ben-Gurion consciously attempted to mold himself into the instrument of the collective might of the Jewish people, and over the course of many years he succeeded.

As he would have been the first to admit, his personal qualities were above all the qualities of the Labor Zionist movement. Contrary to the pacific image which the Labor Zionists tried to cultivate in their polemics with the Revisionists, the Labor Zionists had already begun to form the nucleus of a Jewish army even before Jabotinsky organized the Jewish Legion. Rahel Yanait Ben-Zvi, on page 264 of *Coming Home*, offers the following description of a secret meeting of HaShomer, the first Labor Zionist self-defense organization, held in 1915:

Now at Yavneel we were to accept new haverim. Each had first to undergo a period of probation. After the general meeting voted for him, he was led into the hall between two rows of veterans holding rifles. He would then take the solemn oath of Hashomer - 'In blood and fire Judea fell, in blood and fire Judea shall arise'.

But the Labor Zionists did not see the building of a Jewish army as their primary task. Before there could be a Jewish army and a Jewish state, there had first to be a Jewish economy, and of necessity this economy had to be based on collective principles. Neither the Turkish nor the British governments were interested in creating a viable infrastructure for a Jewish state, nor were there more than a few private Jewish entrepreneurs to do the job. If farms, roads, cities and factories were to be built, Jews had to build them, and the Jews who did so were organized into a whole series of interlocking collective entities primarily by the Labor Zionists. And since these collective entities were not formed by government decree but by the Jewish farmers and laborers themselves, they were on the whole organized along highly democratic and egalitarian lines.

Indicative of the egalitarian tone of Labor Zionist society was the high degree of participation by women in most aspects of the movement. Women worked in the fields, took part in the self-defense groups, had an equal voice in the decisions of collective bodies. When Jewish representatives were elected to deal with the British after World War I, women received the vote as a matter of course, without fanfare or prolonged debate. By the 1930s there was a highly organized Labor Zionist women's movement, as reflected in *The Plough Woman*, a collection of articles by women active in Labor Zionist circles put together by Rachel Katznelson Shazar and first published in English in 1932. The lead article was by Manya Shochat, who helped to found the first agricultural collectives in 1908 and was also, together with her husband, one of the founders of HaShomer. Rahel Yanait Ben-Zvi, on page 137, states that when some men would not accept women as co-workers in the fields, there was formed “a special women's *kvutzah* or commune, a *kvutzah* without a home, a wandering *kvutzah* which had neither soil nor plan nor budget”. Eventually the men gave in, but there were

still independent women's work groups in the 1920s and 1930s.

Life in the Labor Zionist collectives was hard and disciplined, but there were also Bohemian tendencies. Particularly noted in this category was a kibbutz near the Kinneret, or Sea of Galilee, to which belonged a number of outstanding poets and writers, including Berl Katzenelson, later the editor of the Labor Zionist newspaper Davar. Anita Shapira, on page 71 of *Berl*, states:

The way of life adopted by Berl and his comrades had anarchistic origins - vagabondage, non-conformism, rebellion against bourgeois morality.

They dressed casually, had complicated love affairs, were drawn to poetry and music, yet they too worked in the fields and lived very simply. Secular and religious traditions were strangely mingled in their culture. Shapira states on page 13 that Berl Katzenelson believed in "faith without religion" and "messianism without a god". She adds:

Berl was enamored of traditional Jewish eschatological concepts: redemption, suffering, visions, messengers of good tidings, the Return to Zion, Divine revelation are all expressions which recur in his speeches. But this redemption was to be secular.

On page 61, Shapira summarizes the quality of life in the Kinneret kibbutz as follows:

Life in the Kinneret enclosure was marked by sharp contrasts: the enclosed valley and the open courtyard; the members were highly individualistic, but were nonetheless eager to abandon all self-interest and to live within and for a community. They were, like the great Russian thinkers, in love with self-denial.

Katzenelson remained throughout his career the spokesman for what might be called the Romantic component in Labor Zionism. He was greatly beloved and also one of the few people who was personally close to Ben-Gurion.

A similar mixture of secular and religious themes was also characteristic of the Romantics of the Revisionist movement, the fighters of Lehi. Shavit, on page 139 of *Jabotinsky And The Revisionist Movement*, describes Lehi doctrine as "national Messianism", oriented around a vision of "redemption combining elements of restoration (modelled on the Golden Era of the Kingdom of David) with futuristic utopian elements". Stern and his followers were also "in love with self-denial", but for them self-denial meant not the difficult routine of life on a kibbutz but the dangerous path of an underground fighter. The following lines are part of a poem by Stern which appears at the beginning of Svorai's memoirs:

This is my path and no other
Prison, warfare and the underground.
I am a son of a generation in revolt,
A generation to force the end.

The expression, "to force the end", was derived from Jewish religious literature, where it had the meaning of attempting to bring about the coming of the Messiah. Stern did just what he said, following his path to death at the hands of the British police but in the process initiating the armed struggle which ended in the birth of the state of Israel. The only recognition which he ever received for "forcing the end" was to become known as the founder of the "Stern gang" in the international press.

Whether openly expressed or tacitly assumed, Jewish Messianism was the unifying force which bound together the Revisionists and Labor Zionists and caused them to unite in the Israeli army under the leadership of David Ben-Gurion. The mass base of this army was formed by the Haganah, which had perhaps 50,000 members at the start of 1948. To this were added the former members of Lehi, Etzel and the Palmach, who already had considerable military experience, but who together did not number much more than 10,000. From these ingredients and new recruits Ben-Gurion had to put together an army to repel the armies of 5 Arab states, plus the Palestinian Arab forces, who had declared war on the Jews of the land of Israel even before the state of Israel came into being. The avowed aim of the Arab forces, repeatedly and publicly proclaimed, was to "drive the Jews into the sea". After they failed in this effort, everyone began to feel sorry for them; but at the time, it was generally thought that they were sure to succeed.

Dayan

Expectations of Arab victory were based on the fact that the Arab forces not only outnumbered the Israeli troops but were much better armed and equipped. The Arab forces included regular army units from Jordan, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq, many of them equipped with planes and tanks as well as artillery and small arms. They were supplied with heavy weapons by the British, and British officers also served in the Arab Legion from Jordan. For several months, the Arab forces remained on the offensive, but they proved unable to gain much ground. They suffered from the lack of a centralized command structure and also from the fact that, expecting an easy victory, their troops tended to lose heart when confronted with sustained resistance. Nonetheless, in order to defeat the Arab forces it was necessary for the Israelis to assume the offensive, and for this military formations had to be organized that were capable of attack as well as defense. A number of such units were therefore formed, including a force called the 89th Commando Battalion, headed by Moshe Dayan. Dayan's unit was only one of many that took part in the successful Israeli offensive, but its performance was such that Ben-Gurion immediately promoted Dayan to the position of commander of the Jewish forces in Jerusalem. In 1953, Dayan was appointed Chief of Staff of the Israeli army, and for the next 20 years he was the guiding spirit behind the process that transformed the Israeli army into a force known throughout the world for its ability to carry the war to the enemy.

Moshe Dayan was born in 1915 in Deganiah, a Jewish agricultural settlement in southern Galilee. As a child he was something of a loner, not very popular with his peers, who spent a good deal of time in neighboring Arab villages, eventually becoming fluent in Arabic. On page 59 of *Story of My Life*, Dayan describes the friendly relations which he helped to promote between Jewish and Arab political prisoners at Acre, where he was imprisoned for over a year by the British in 1940 for taking part in the military preparations of the Haganah:

Relations between us were friendly and were marked by mutual respect. After all, there was a common background to our imprisonment. Neither we nor they had been sentenced for acts of common crime, like murder or burglary. We had both been moved by national ideals and had risked our freedom and our lives for our people. On Moslem festivals they invited us to their cells to share their choice Oriental meals, and we returned the hospitality on Jewish festivals.

Yet among the Arab prisoners were several members of an Arab nationalist group that had killed two members of Dayan's own agricultural settlement in the early 1930s. And Dayan himself had received the name Moshe in honor of Moshe Barsky, a member of the settlement at Deganiah who had been killed by Arabs about a year before Dayan was born.

Dayan was released from prison by the British early in 1941 because the war with the Nazis was going badly and they had decided to accept Ben-Gurion's offer of Haganah volunteers to serve with the British forces. Dayan was assigned by the British to take part in a British attack on pro-Nazi French troops in Syria, an operation in which Dayan lost an eye. More of a loner than ever as a result of his injury, Dayan was nonetheless given the command of the 89th Battalion in 1948 because he had some experience of offensive operations. Shabtai Teveth, on page 145 of *Moshe Dayan*, describes Dayan at that time as follows:

Moshe looked like a member of a terrorist gang or at best a partisan - disheveled clothes, rumpled trousers far too big for him, socks sagging about his ankles. His manner of speech, although direct and very much to the point, was devoid of military terminology, and his thinking lacked discipline.

Even in the early 1950s, adds Teveth on page 195, when he was already being groomed by Ben-Gurion to become Chief of Staff, Dayan had the reputation of being a "lone wolf" and "an unruly, insubordinate troublemaker". Yet he acquired a tremendous influence over his troops, due above all, according to Teveth, to "his fantastic courage".

Dayan's nickname in the 89th Battalion, notes Teveth on page 215, was "Arabber", Yiddish for Arab. On Dayan's orders, no badges of rank were used in the unit and officers were required to lead their men into battle. One of the 4 companies of the 89th Battalion was personally recruited by Dayan from the membership of Lehi, despite the fact that Dayan himself came from a Haganah background. In July of 1948, Dayan's methods proved their worth when his unit played a key role in the capture of the Arab towns of Lydda and Ramle in the vicinity of Tel-Aviv. The tactics employed by the 89th Battalion - carrying the war to the enemy, officers

leading the charge, minimum attention to rank and protocol - were later applied on a larger scale by the Israeli army under Dayan's command. These tactics were characteristic of many of the units formed by Ben-Gurion to conduct offensive operations in 1948; Dayan's methods attracted attention only because they were a little more extreme and a little more effective.

Much like Jabotinsky, Dayan combined the qualities of selfless devotion to the Jewish cause with a strong individualist tendency. His "indiscriminate womanizing", notes Teveth on page 192, led to his divorce in 1971. And on page 321, Teveth characterizes Dayan as follows:

To a great extent, he was the image of what many men would like to be - a person capable of leading his life according to his real wishes, unmindful of the conventions, circumstances and obligations that society imposed on him.

Yet Dayan also spent his entire life functioning within collective structures and was a strong believer in social equality. He wrote on page 397 of his memoirs:

We are an open and classless society, a nation that considers all men to be equal in status and entitled to equality of opportunity.

Perhaps the key to Dayan's character is contained in the following lines cited by Teveth on page 358 from a speech which Dayan delivered in 1971:

Most of my years have been spent in one way or another, in the company of fighters. These men lived in the shadow of death, yet it did not darken their lives or brand them with a stamp of grief. The opposite was true: these men were driven by an immense *life force*, and it is this *life force* that makes them *fighters*.

Dayan too was driven by such a life force, which he harnessed to the service of the Israeli nation yet expressed in his personal relations in an unruly and individualistic way.

Throughout much of his later career, Dayan was vilified by the enemies of Israel as a "fascist" because the military forces under his command did not confine themselves to strictly defensive operations but carried out reprisals and preemptive strikes against Arab troops. In order to put Dayan's tactics and strategy into perspective, it is essential to realize that the Arabs in and around the land of Israel had a long history of attempting to kill the Jews there. Large scale attacks by Arab mobs on Jewish settlers had taken place in 1919-20, again in 1929 and yet again in 1936-38. Yet prior to the late 1930s, there had been no Jewish attacks on Arabs, whether in reprisal or otherwise. The Arab attacks were not triggered by anything the Jews had actually done but were simply intended to force the Jews to leave so that they would not be able to take control of the country. This was also the motivation behind the Arab invasion of 1948, which was accompanied by widespread attacks on Jewish civilians and by rape, torture and mutilation of captured Jews. Moreover, even after 1948 attacks on Jewish civilians in Israel were carried out on a regular basis by Arab guerillas based outside the borders of Israel.

In the light of this history, Dayan and the Israeli military eventually decided to embark on a policy of reprisals. The Revisionists had already begun reprisal attacks in the late 1930s, but their methods were unpopular because they were directed against Arab civilians. The most notorious such attack was the massacre of several hundred Arab villagers by units of Lehi and Etzel at Deir Yassein in April of 1948. To avoid the unfavorable publicity connected with such attacks, Dayan adopted a policy of directing reprisals solely against military targets. After a number of attacks on Israeli civilians by Arab guerillas operating out of Egypt or Jordan, the Israelis would launch a massive strike against an Egyptian or Jordanian military installation. The Israeli invasions of Egypt in 1956 and 1967 also had a retaliatory character; they were undertaken in response not only to guerilla raids but also an Egyptian blockade of Israeli shipping and in 1967 an Egyptian troop buildup on the Israeli borders. Given the huge disparity in size between the Arabs and the Israelis in terms of both population and territory, Dayan and the Israeli military concluded that they had no alternative but to carry the war to the enemy rather than wait for the Arabs to invade Israel. This policy was bitterly condemned by the enemies of Israel, but when the Arabs did strike first, in 1973, Israel was still condemned for failing to lose the war.

Yael Dayan, Moshe's daughter, on page 137 of *My Father, His Daughter*, says of her father:

The basis of his attitude toward people was never love or hate, but respect. Respect of courage and respect of professional

knowledge, whatever the field.

Also in his relations with the Arabs, Dayan's policies were motivated less by love or hate than by a sober and realistic assessment of Arab intentions. After so many Arab attempts to kill the Jews, Dayan based his strategic thinking on the assumption that Israel would face a serious threat of annihilation for a long time to come. Forfeiting the dubious political advantages to be gained from always appearing in the role of the injured party, Dayan set out to force the Arabs to pay a price for their continued hostility. At the same time, he also set out to win their respect as a dangerous but principled opponent who did not slaughter civilians or despise the Arabs as a people. Indeed, in view of his evident attraction to Arab culture, it would appear that Dayan hoped for acceptance by the Arabs, on Arab terms, as a proud and successful man of war.

Such hopes were not uncommon among Israeli soldiers coming out of Labor Zionist ranks. Members of the early Labor Zionist self-defense groups often dressed like Arabs and tried to assimilate to Arab culture in various ways. In her biography of Manya Shochat, *Before Golda*, Rachel Yanait Ben-Zvi tells a revealing anecdote on page 125. In 1911 a parley was held between a group of Bedouin sheiks and the leaders of HaShomer. The men of HaShomer came to meeting wearing "all their finery, plus ammunition belts from which were protruding shining revolvers". The reaction of the Bedouin leader was to question whether they were Jews:

He knew Jews in Jaffa and in Rehovot and in Jerusalem - all sorts of Jews - but these before him were not like them, therefore they were not Jews.

After some time the Bedouin leader finally decided who they were. He said:

I will tell you who you are: You are the children of the children of the ancient nation that lived in this land. Our fathers have told us about a powerful nation that was in this land, witness to which are their scattered grave sites. We were told that one day, a mighty army came from across the sea, which battled with the inhabitants of the land, who defended themselves valiantly. But the attackers were many and conquered the dwellers of the land, took them and scattered them over many lands. We have all heard from our fathers that one day they would return. And you are the sons of this returning nation.

Almost too good to be true, the story in any case faithfully mirrors the psychology of many Israelis, who longed to prove their legitimacy to the Arabs precisely by assimilating to the militarist virtues which loom so large in traditional Arab and Muslim culture.

Begin

But there was also another dimension to the modern Israeli military tradition, a dimension that was exemplified by the figure of Menachem Begin. Unlike Jabotinsky, Ben-Gurion or Dayan, Begin was not a radical in the conventional sense of the term. He never regarded himself as a socialist, believed in God and was sufficiently familiar with traditional Jewish religious practice to pass as a bearded member of an orthodox synagogue in Tel-Aviv during his days as a fugitive from the British police. In his own eyes he was, as he repeatedly proclaimed, just an ordinary Jew. Yet alone among Israeli leaders from Europe, Begin was tremendously popular among Israelis from Arab lands. The Herut party, founded by Begin in 1948, came to depend by the 1960s primarily on the votes of Israelis from Middle Eastern backgrounds, who by that time made up the bulk of the Israeli working class. This trend went back to the 1940s, when both Lehi and Etzel drew a considerable proportion of their recruits from Arabic speaking Jews, in sharp contrast to the Haganah, whose membership was almost exclusively of European descent. Begin's popularity among Jews from the Middle East was perhaps not unrelated to the fact that he was also the only Israeli leader to inflict significant casualties on Europeans, specifically the British. He is almost invariably portrayed as a "right wing" figure, yet it was he who led the anti-colonial struggle in the Middle East in the 1940s, while the "left wing" Labor Zionists collaborated with the British throughout the period prior to 1946.

Begin was born in 1913 in the town of Brest-Litovsk, now on the border between Poland and Russia. His father had been a timber merchant but lost his business during World War I and worked as a clerk for the local Jewish community. Begin joined Betar in 1929 at the age of 16 and gradually became known as an orator with a rough, earthy style. Temko, on page 43 of *To Win Or To Die*, states: "The poor idolized

Jabotinsky. But in Begin, they saw a piece of themselves.” Also later in Israel, Begin was noted as an orator; his opponents frequently referred to him as a “demagogue” because of his ability to move large crowds. What Begin expressed in his speeches was above all a sense of Jewish patriotism and a spirit of uncompromising resistance to the enemies of the Jewish people. His stance was not exclusively rhetorical either, for although he did not take part in the actual military operations of Etzel, he was an extremely effective military strategist. His main contribution to the Israeli military tradition, however, was as a spokesman for military values, a role which he consciously inherited from Jabotinsky.

Temko, on page 189, describes a 1974 political gathering in Israel at which were present both Moshe Dayan and Ariel Sharon, Dayan’s protege and successor as Israel’s leading general. Begin spoke as follows:

Gesturing toward Sharon and a surprise visitor, Dayan, in the audience, Begin declared: ‘Beware of the Fighting Jew - he who commands the few against the many.’ He is, said Begin, ‘a human being - the son of a Jewish mother, that most marvelous of all God’s creatures, with all the softness of her love and the heavy burden of her concern. The Fighting Jew loves all children - Arab children too. He loves books, loves liberty, and hates war: like Garibaldi. But he is prepared to *fight* for liberty. And,’ Begin warned, ‘if you ever raise a hand against this people, know this: The Fighting Jew is fearless, his heart is of steel, his hands are trained for war and his fingers for battle’.

Begin’s rhetoric would have to be characterized as shameless, but his words reflected not only the experience of decades of Arab hatred but also the Holocaust. Unlike most Israeli leaders, Begin personally experienced the Holocaust and lost not only his entire family but also the close to 100,000 members of Betar in prewar Poland who perished at the hands of the Nazis.

As a result of this history, retaliation for Begin was not merely a strategy, as it was for Ben-Gurion and Dayan, but a sacred principle. He said as much in an official message, cited by Temko on page 278, which he sent to Reagan in Washington at the time of the 1982 Israeli invasion of Lebanon:

My generation, dear Ron, swore on the altar of God that whoever proclaims his intent to destroy the Jewish State or the Jewish People, or both, seals his fate.

It was this attitude which led Begin in 1943 to declare war on the British empire because of British complicity in the Holocaust. And when the British began hanging Etzel prisoners, Begin ordered two British sergeants kidnapped and hanged them in return. His comment on the hangings, cited by Temko on page 106, was also characteristic; it was, said Begin, “the first time in the history of the British Empire that the sons of the ‘Master Race’ have been hanged in this country”. Small wonder that Begin has enjoyed such a bad press in the West or been so admired by non-European Jews.

Begin’s analysis of British policy during World War 2 is summed up on page 28 of *The Revolt* where he states:

One cannot say that those who shaped British Middle East policy at that time did not want to save the Jews. It would be more correct to say that they very eagerly wanted the Jews not to be saved.

The Revolt, a history of Etzel which Begin published in the early 1950s, was as pro-Soviet as it was anti-British. Despite his “right wing” image, Begin praised the Soviet Union on page 13, stating that “thanks to the Soviet Union, hundreds of thousands of Jews were saved from Nazi hands”. He also declared that the Soviet Union “helped us to achieve the first steps of our independence” and on page 17 defended the Russians against charges of anti-Semitism:

The truth is that the Soviet government is anti-antisemitic, regards anti-semitism not only as a manifestation of racial or nationalistic emotion but also - and perhaps especially - as a dangerous weapon in the hands of the enemies of the Soviet regime.

These statements were all the more astonishing in view of the fact that the Russians had imprisoned Begin for more than a year in 1940 as a Zionist and only released him because he was a Polish citizen and therefore liable for service in a Polish army that was being formed in Russia to oppose the Nazis. But Begin saw everything in relation to the Holocaust, and as he was well aware, it was the Russians who had done most of the fighting against the Nazis.

Begin’s attitude towards the Soviet Union at this time echoed that of Jabotinsky, who had been hostile to Communism as a social system but acutely aware of the inherent antagonism between the Russians and the

Nazis. In *The Jewish War Front*, published in 1940 while the Nazi-Soviet pact was still in effect, Jabotinsky too had defended the Soviets against charges of anti-Semitism, stating on page 95:

What is certain is that so far the Soviet regime has proved a very efficient preservative against all the conscious forms of antisemitism. The Jews under Soviet rule fear neither a general 'ousting' nor pogroms, and the principle of equal rights and equal opportunity seems to be applied without any trace of racial discrimination.

Also like Jabotinsky, Begin in the 1940s did not adopt a doctrinaire "right wing" stance on social policy. In *The Revolt*, on page 13, he stressed the need "to combine and reconcile the urge for individual freedom with the striving for social justice", and on page 178 he reproduced a statement he had issued in 1945 calling for a united front with the Labor Zionists against the British. Begin saw a basis for unity in the following points:

There is no doubt that such a basis exists both in the political field (Jewish Government, mass repatriation, a free, democratic regime, equality of right for all inhabitants of the country) and in the social field (raising the standard of living of the workers and of all strata and communities lacking adequate means of existence; social insurance, agrarian reform, distribution of agricultural land among its workers, public ownership of public services, etc.).

This was not very different from the program which Ben-Gurion actually implemented in 1948; if he rejected it in 1945, it was not because it was too "right wing" but because he was not yet ready to break with the British.

Although certainly not a socialist, Begin was open to state control of the economy to a degree that in the United States would have identified him as a "left wing" radical. On page 126, Temko describes his first public statement on economic matters after emerging from the underground in 1947 as follows:

His economic program was vague, utopian. He wanted state control of key industries, but promised to protect 'little people' from big business.

In later years, Begin did form a coalition between Herut and the pro-capitalist General Zionists; but after his coalition came to power in 1977, most state-owned industries were left in government hands. Only within the context of the heavily pro-socialist, anti-capitalist spectrum of Israeli politics might Begin legitimately be described as a right-winger. Within any other context his political history would identify him as a revolutionary nationalist; but Jewish nationalists, no matter how radical, are automatically branded as "right wing" and "fascist" because Jewish nationalism is feared and hated by Christians, Muslims and Marxists alike.

Were it not for the wall of prejudice and disdain which surrounds Jewish nationalism, it would be obvious to the whole world that it was the revolutionary nationalists of Lehi and Etzel who initiated the chain of events that drove the British out of the Middle East. It was certainly obvious to the British, who played a major role in promoting the 1948 Arab attack on Israel for fear of the political implications of an independent Jewish state at the very heart of their Middle East empire. These implications had been brought home to the British in a dramatic fashion in November of 1944 when two members of Lehi gunned down the British High Commissioner for the Middle East, Lord Moyne, in front of his home in Cairo. Moyne's assassins, Eliahu Bet Zouri and Eliahu Hakim, were captured by the British and tried in public. Both came from Arabic speaking backgrounds, and Bet Zouri created a sensation in Cairo with his passionate indictment of British rule at the trial. Gerold Frank, on page 268 of *The Deed*, states: "Bet Zouri's speech was quoted everywhere, though not a word of it appeared in the world's press." After the trial, adds Frank on page 278, mass demonstrations broke out in support of the Jewish assassins:

In the streets of Cairo, the incredible took place. Egyptian students marched in demonstrations, chanting, 'Free the Moyne slayers'.

Bet Zouri and Hakim were nonetheless hung; they sang "Hatikvah" on their way to the gallows. Churchill in London declared that they were "just like the Nazis": this was perhaps the first time that this expression was used, which has since become the standard way of describing any violent act by any Jew anywhere.

Because they openly espoused the legitimacy of Jewish violence, the Revisionists in general and Begin in particular came in for more than their share of this type of criticism. In order to evaluate such criticism at its true worth, it is only necessary to count the corpses and see who has killed whom and how often. It is precisely because Jews have usually been the recipients of the violence of others that the thought of Jewish violence is

so disturbing to so many. Indeed, it would seem that a whole religion, called Christianity, was invented for no other purpose than to caution Jews against violence and to extol the virtues of Jewish suffering. It is above all because he defied this entire tradition of glorification of Jewish defeat that Begin can legitimately be described as a Jewish radical.

In Begin's terminology, Jewish self-determination was called "Freedom". Herut, the name of Begin's party, means Freedom in Hebrew, and on page 12 of *The Revolt* Begin referred to "my own ideology, the be-all and end-all of which is Freedom - the freedom and happiness of the individual". Begin, like Jabotinsky, like Dayan, perhaps even like Ben-Gurion was an individualist at heart, but one who well understood the limitations of individualism and the need for collective structures. On page 311 of *The Revolt*, Begin spoke as follows about "the paradox in the life of every man who fights in a just cause":

He puts on a heavy, sometimes too heavy, yoke, in order to throw off a yoke. He makes war so that there should be peace. He punishes himself so that there should be no suffering. He employs physical force and believes in moral force. He sheds blood so that there should be no more bloodshed. He accepts enslavement - in prison or concentration camp - for the sake of freedom.

And he concluded:

That is the way of the world. A very tragic way beset with terrors. There is no other.

In other words, freedom means self-determination. No one is free to do just as they please, but we do have the power to define our own goals and realize them as best we can.

Self-Determination

When the members of the United Nations voted in November of 1947 in favor of according the Jewish people the right of national self-determination, few if any believed at the time that the Jewish people would actually be able to exercise this right. It was widely thought that once the British evacuated what they called Palestine, the Arabs would soon kill or expel the majority of the Jews who lived there. Their failure to do so, and the emergence of a powerful, victorious Jewish army of some 120,000 soldiers by the fall of 1948, created a situation without precedent in world history. Led by socialists, aligned with Popular Front governments around the world, armed mainly with weapons supplied by the Communists, created in the face of mass murder and 2000 years of exile, the newly born Jewish state represented a truly revolutionary force in world politics. It had the potential to inspire, and did in fact inspire, movements for national self-determination and social justice everywhere in the world. But just for this reason, the birth of Israel was also the signal for the start of an anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish counter-offensive, a counter-offensive which was not limited to any one country or creed but operated simultaneously on a number of fronts on a world scale.

The most shocking and sudden negative reaction to the Israeli victory came from the Russians, who had been the main backers of the Zionist cause during the period leading up to the War of Independence. The Soviet Union was the first country in the world to extend official, "de jure" recognition to the state of Israel following the Israeli Declaration of Independence in the spring of 1948; and with Soviet approval, large quantities of weapons from Czechoslovakia were sold to the Israelis at the start of the War of Independence. The Russians at this point saw the Israelis primarily as a thorn in the side of the British, with whom the Russians were already at odds over a whole range of issues. But once it became clear that Israel would actually defeat the Arabs, Soviet policy changed almost overnight. The incident that precipitated the sudden shift was the warm welcome accorded Golda Meir, the first Israeli ambassador to the Soviet Union, by the Jews of Moscow in September of 1948. On page 209 of *My Life*, Meir describes the Soviet reaction to her triumphant arrival in Russia as follows:

But by January 1949 it was apparent that Russian Jewry was going to pay a heavy price for the welcome it had given us, for the 'treachery' to Communist ideals that was - in the eyes of the Soviet government - implicit in the joy with which we had been greeted. The Yiddish theatre in Moscow was closed. The Yiddish newspaper *Enigkeit* was closed. The Yiddish publishing house Emes was closed... Within five months there was practically no single Jewish organization left in Russia, and the Jews kept their distance from us.

At the same time, some 500 Jewish writers, artists and cultural figures were arrested; the great majority of

these were subsequently executed.

The suppression of Yiddish cultural life in the Soviet Union in the winter of 1948-49 was followed by the onset of an anti-Semitic campaign without precedent in the Communist world. An offensive was launched in the Soviet press against “rootless cosmopolitans”, who were accused of spying for the West and sabotaging the Soviet economy. As noted by Yehoshua Gilboa on page 159 of *The Black Years Of Soviet Jewry*, most of these “rootless cosmopolitans” were Jewish:

According to a cautious estimate made in 1949, intellectuals with Jewish names constituted some 60 percent of those condemned in Soviet publications for fawning on the West and showing other deviationist cosmopolitan tendencies.

A series of show trials followed, in which a number of Jews were tried and executed on charges of economic sabotage and of plotting to detach the Crimea from the Soviet Union and make it a Jewish state. Finally, early in 1953, came the arrest of a group of Jewish doctors, who were charged with plotting to poison Stalin and other Soviet officials. Rumors began to spread that all Jews would be deported to Siberia, but the anti-Semitic campaign came to a sudden end with Stalin’s death in March of 1953. This campaign was accompanied by a major Soviet propaganda assault on the Israelis, who had no sooner driven out the British than they were portrayed as agents of Western imperialism.

The Soviet anti-Semitic campaign of the period 1949-53 was not confined to the Soviet Union but was also implemented on a wide scale in Eastern Europe, where most surviving Jewish Communist activists were purged at this time. Particular attention was given to the show trials associated with the names of Rajk in Hungary in 1949 and Slansky in Czechoslovakia in 1952. Paul Lendvai, on page 244 of *Anti-Semitism Without Jews*, describes the Slansky trial as follows:

What distinguished the purge trial in Czechoslovakia was its openly anti-Semitic character and its scope and violence. Of the fourteen defendants, eleven were Jews. While Clementis, the Foreign Minister, and two others were described as ‘Slovak’ or ‘Czech’, the indictment added the words ‘of Jewish origin’ to the name of each Jewish defendant. The anti-Semitic overtones were evident on every page of the indictment and the trial protocols. These lifelong Communists whose only link with Judaism was their Jewish birth were denounced as Zionists, active agents of a conspiracy to seize power.

And Heda Margolius Kovaly, the widow of one of the defendants, speaks on page 150 of *Under A Cruel Star* of the “resurgence of anti-Semitism” in Czechoslovakia which she experienced as a result of the trials. She adds, on page 256:

The Slansky affair was accompanied by the wholesale dismissal, if not always the imprisonment, of Jewish officials, journalists and administrators in all walks of life.

A similar pattern appeared in Russia, where Jews were almost entirely eliminated from the Soviet diplomatic corps, military command and academic establishment at this time.

The anti-Semitic campaign of 1949-53 completed the process of the de-Judaization of Soviet Communism which had been initiated by the anti-Trotskyist campaign of the 1920s and 1930s. And just as the purges of the late 1930s had been touched off by the collapse of the Popular Front in 1936, so the purges of the early 1950s were undoubtedly facilitated by the collapse of the European Popular Front governments and the start of the Cold War in 1948. But by 1948, Jews no longer occupied positions of real power in the Soviet Union. They were purged from the few secondary posts which they still held mainly out of fear of Israeli influence on Soviet society. Like the Trotskyists, the Israelis held out the model of a competing version of socialist development, a version more democratic and less dogmatic than that associated with Stalin and his followers. The Israeli model was of particular interest to the many Soviet nationalities seeking a greater measure of national self-determination and independence than was possible under Stalin’s rule. As soon as Israel was established, Stalin therefore proceeded to demonize the Israelis and eliminate even the slightest trace of Jewish political or cultural influence in the Soviet Union, all for fear of the revolutionary potential of the Jewish state which he himself had helped to bring into being.

One of the main ways in which Stalin tried to discredit both Jews and Israel was to depict them as agents of Western imperialism. Ironically, this identical tactic was just then being employed in reverse by the foes of Jewish influence in the United States. In particular the Jewish Communists Julius and Ethel Rosenberg were convicted of espionage on behalf of the Soviet Union in 1951 and executed. The entire case against the

Rosenbergs was fabricated by the FBI, and their trial and execution served the same purpose of discrediting Jewish radicals in the United States as did the various show trials of the period in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The major difference was that in the United States only 2 people were executed, while in the Soviet Union the number of victims ran into the hundreds. However, many thousands of Jewish radicals lost their jobs or were otherwise harassed during the “Red scare” of the late 1940s and early 1950s, and dozens of Communists or alleged Communists, many of them Jewish, were imprisoned. The anti-Semitic overtones of the “Red scare” in the United States were not so overt as in the campaign against “rootless cosmopolitans” in the Soviet Union, but it was no coincidence that the Rosenbergs were Jewish, as were a high proportion of those who were persecuted in some way during this period.

The most violent reaction to the birth of Israel occurred in the Arab world, where the local Jewish communities in almost every Arab country came under heavy attack by way of revenge for the Israeli victory over the Arabs. Hundreds of Jews were killed in these attacks, which were followed by a mass exodus of Jews from the Arab world. There were over 850,000 Jews living in Arab countries in 1948; by the 1980s, notes Joan Peters on page 33 of *From Time Immemorial*, there were “fewer than 29,000”. Most Jews from Arab lands emigrated to Israel during the 1950s; a considerable number of Jews living in the French colonies of Tunisia and Algeria also fled to France. Shlomo Hillel in *Operation Babylon* describes the Jewish exodus from Iraq, where the birth of Israel was followed by a series of arrests, trials and executions of prominent Jews. By the start of 1950, 1000 Jews were leaving Iraq secretly every month by way of the Iranian border. In response to this clandestine flight, the Iraqi government passed a law permitting Jews to leave if they would give up their property. By 1952 over 120,000 Jews had left after surrendering everything they owned; only 6000 remained.

Largely in response to Arab and Muslim pressure, there also began a diplomatic boycott of Israel by many of the countries of the “Third World” at this time. Ron Kochan in his article, “Israel In Third World Forums”, appearing in *Israel in the Third World* edited by Michael Curtis and Susan Gitelson, shows that Israel was eager to participate in conferences of the “non-aligned countries” after World War 2. A Zionist representative attended the very first such conference, held at New Delhi in India in 1947. Arab representatives were also invited but only Egypt came. But at the second New Delhi conference, held in 1949, a large Arab delegation attended and Israel was excluded at their behest. However, in 1953 an Asian Socialist Conference was held in Burma, and Israel, which had close ties with the Burmese socialist government, was permitted to attend. Kochan notes on page 249:

The conference, the first of its kind in Asian history, was well attended by delegates from socialist parties in Japan (Right and Left), Indonesia, Malaya, Burma, Pakistan, India, Lebanon, Egypt and Israel.

Israel also sought to attend the Bandung Conference of “non-aligned” countries in 1954, but in order to exclude Israel the Arab League submitted the following statement to the organizers of the conference, cited by Kochan on page 251:

It has been the policy of the Arab states not to participate in any regional conference where Israel is represented. The Arab states do not have any doubt that Israel will not be invited to this conference and will not participate therein.

And in fact Israel was excluded, while Haj Amin, then the leader of the Palestinians, who had spent World War 2 living in Berlin making broadcasts on Nazi radio calling for the extermination of the entire Jewish people, was permitted to address the conference.

By 1954, even before it had attacked any Arab state, Israel therefore found itself excluded from the “Third World”, condemned as a tool of Western imperialism by the Communists and viewed with intense suspicion by the Eisenhower administration in the United States, which gave no aid to Israel whatsoever and forced it to withdraw its troops after the 1956 Israeli attack on Egypt. Such was the political and diplomatic price which Israel had to pay for actually exercising the right of national self-determination. And this price was paid not only by Israel but by Jews everywhere, who were forced to flee their homes or withdraw completely from any form of radical political activity in response to the worldwide hue and cry that went up in the wake of the Israeli victory. This massive anti-Semitic counter-offensive, coming as it did only a few years after the Holocaust, may be said to mark the end of the Jewish Revolution as an event in history. But the course of history is shaped not only by political events but also by cultural trends. Restricted as a political force to its one great achievement and refuge, the state of Israel, Jewish radicalism has nonetheless continued to function as a cultural force on a world scale unto the present day.

Chapter Eight: Sex And Sympathy

The clearest indication of the continued vitality of Jewish radicalism as a cultural force since the 1940s was the influential Jewish component within the cultural rebellion of the 1960s in the United States. Prominent individuals such as Bob Dylan, Betty Friedan, Lenny Bruce, Abbie Hoffman and Jerry Rubin were symbolic of the widespread participation by Jewish radicals in the youth culture, protest movements and feminist upsurge of this period. Moreover, the Movement of the Sixties also reflected the influence of previous generations of Jewish radicals, who first developed many of the themes which were then popularized on a mass level during the Sixties. For the most part, the Movement of the Sixties was but a continuation and expansion of a cultural revolution which had already begun during the 19th century and was throughout its history strongly influenced by Jewish radicals.

If there is any one theme that may be said to be characteristic of the Jewish contribution to modern culture, it is the merging of sex and sympathy. Christian culture is founded on the strict separation of sex and sympathy. All the Christian embodiments of sympathy and compassion, such as Jesus Christ and the so-called Virgin Mary, are defined as entirely without sexual urges or sexual attractiveness. And conversely, sexuality in Christian tradition is normally associated with Satanism and witchcraft, with the absence of sympathy. Christian culture offers a choice between sex and sympathy, but it is systematically horrified by any attempt to combine the two. Much of the excitement generated by Jewish radicalism as a cultural trend derives not so much from its affirmation of sexuality, which also has its advocates in the Christian world, as from its association of sex with sympathy and compassion, something which many Christians find strange, exotic and attractive.

At the root of the typical Jewish radical attitude towards sexuality lies the fact that in traditional Jewish religious culture, sexual affection between husband and wife was actively encouraged. In Kabbalah, it became a tradition that husbands and wives were to have sex every Friday night as a normal part of the festivities surrounding the arrival of "Princess Sabbath". It is also significant that among the 10 Sephirot of Kabbalah were 2 explicitly associated with sex and sympathy: Yesod or Foundation, identified with sex, and Hesed or Mercy, which symbolized compassion. Since the Sephirot were regarded as divine qualities, the implication was that both sex and sympathy were inherently positive components of human life. When this tradition was translated into secular terms, it first emerged in the form of the early 19th century cultural trend generally known as Romanticism.

The great Jewish exponent of the Romantic world view was Heinrich Heine. Heine's Romantic poetry became so popular in Germany that it continued to appear even under the Nazis but with the attribution, "Poet unknown". In his prose writings, Heine argued in favor both of greater compassion in social relations and a freer attitude towards human sexuality. Robertson on page 13 of *Heine* cites the following remarks by Heine on the subject of social equality:

Our age is warmed by the idea of human equality, and the poets, who as high priests do homage to this divine sun, can be certain that thousands kneel down beside them, and that thousands weep and rejoice with them.

Heine's support for sexual liberation is brought out in the following passage, cited by Robertson on page 47:

Happier and more beautiful generations, conceived in freely chosen embraces, who grow up in a religion of joy, will smile sorrowfully at their poor ancestors, who gloomily abstained from all the pleasures of this fair earth, and, by deadening their warm and colourful senses, were reduced almost to chilly spectres.

Heine's affirmation of sexual love was all the more remarkable in that he was only 5 feet 2 inches in height and rarely in a position to practice what he preached. His poetry is filled with themes of longing and rejection, but instead of becoming embittered by his personal situation, he derived from it the capacity to sympathize with the sufferings of others and yearn for a kinder, freer world of tomorrow.

The attitudes which Heine expressed in literary form were also played out on the stage and in real life by the American Jewish actress Adah Isaacs Menken. Forgotten today, Menken was one of the first internationally renowned actresses of the 19th century. She was best known for her interpretation of the role of Mazeppa in a play by the English Romantic poet Byron. According to Bernard Falk in *The Naked Lady*, she scandalized

theatre audiences both in Europe and the United States by appearing in one scene dressed in pink silk tights, which made her look naked, while tied to the back of a horse. Her private life was no less spectacular: her four husbands included the noted boxer John Heenan, and she also found time for love affairs with such literary figures as Alexandre Dumas and Swinburne. Her own poetry was filled with forebodings of her early death and despite her fame she never lost touch with her Jewish roots. She wrote for the Cincinnati Israelite, lit candles on Friday night and fasted on Yom Kippur. She was buried in the Jewish section of the cemetery of Montparnasse in Paris, where she died in 1868 at the age of 33.

Romantic attitudes and values were also characteristic of the 19th century Jewish socialists, including even Marx, who wrote Romantic poetry in his student days. The Saint-Simonians had openly advocated a freer attitude towards sexuality, and although the Marxists were much more guarded in their public position on “free love”, their actual practice was on the radical side. Rosa Luxemburg, for example, never married and formed a series of “free unions” with prominent socialist men of her day, starting with Leo Jogiches, who remained her close friend and associate throughout both their lives. He was murdered by German fascists only a short time after she was. The Jewish Marxists were also animated by the same spirit of sympathy for the oppressed as the Saint-Simonians, but here too they preferred to conceal their Romantic tendencies behind a facade of scientific objectivity. In theory they were drawn to the proletarian cause because it was the wave of the future, but in reality most of them, beginning with Marx himself, were middle class intellectuals who sympathized with the proletariat because of their own experience of discrimination and oppression.

However, the more rooted in the working class Marxism became, the less Romantic the Marxists tended to be. The individualist spirit of the early 19th century Romantic movement was perpetuated in the late 19th century chiefly by the anarchists. Anarchism elevated individualism to the level of a principle, repudiating all forms of social constraint in the name of a dubious belief in human goodness. Anarchism became popular where Marxism was not, particularly in countries with strong Catholic traditions such as Spain and Italy. It owed little or nothing to Jewish influence. The concept of the rule of law was too deeply rooted in Jewish tradition for the extreme individualism of the anarchists to have much appeal for most Jews. Nonetheless there did emerge in the late 19th century groups of Jewish anarchists, who found in anarchism a way of continuing the Romantic revolt against bourgeois morality and sexual repression. Although these groups constituted only a small minority relative to the Jewish socialists and Marxists, they did play an important role in the development of the tradition of cultural rebellion which was eventually to culminate in the Movement of the Sixties.

The Jewish Anarchists

The main centers of Jewish anarchism were London and New York. Small groups of Jewish anarchists could be found elsewhere, but only in England and the United States did they become a significant force. Both countries prided themselves on their tradition of respect for individual rights, and it was obviously the strength of the individualist tradition in the English speaking countries that called forth an individualist response from a certain proportion of Jewish immigrants. However this individualism was conditioned by the fact that the Jewish anarchists were predominantly Yiddish speaking workers who depended heavily on one another for emotional and material support. In practice they formed tightly knit groups, whose theoretical individualism could only fully express itself as their members became sufficiently assimilated to make their way alone into the larger English speaking world around them.

In London, the Jewish anarchists were more successful than the socialists in attracting Jewish working class support during the late 19th and early 20th century. William Fishman in *Jewish Radicals* argues that this was because in England the socialists pushed a heavy handed assimilationist line on the Jewish workers while the Jewish anarchists had a positive attitude towards Yiddish language and culture. Fishman also saw a certain basis for anarchist individualism in the life of the Pale of Settlement, stating on page 302:

The Jews of the *stetl* were forced into narrow egoism by Tsarist restrictions which meant a competitive, cut-throat existence. It was the paradox of stress on individual freedom within the context of a close-knit community reminiscent of the *stetl*, that drew the immigrant towards Libertarian associations.

However, after several decades of intense activity in the immigrant slums of London, Jewish anarchism

rapidly declined as an organized force in England after 1914 due to the impact of World War I and the gradual assimilation of the Yiddish speaking workers.

At its height the Jewish anarchist movement in London was centered around the Anarchist club, which was open to visitors of all political persuasions. Fishman on page 267 cites one activist recalling how “discussion would go on far into the night between Bundists, Zionists, Anarchists and Social Democrats, who argued excitedly together. We anarchists were very tolerant. All workers were our comrades.” Dances and social events were also held at the club, followed by gatherings described by one participant on page 250 as follows:

We younger ones never went home. Up to two dozen young men and women would troop off to one of our homes and there recline on cushions placed on the floor to talk throughout the night or pair off to embrace in the corners.

These activities were in line with the principle of “free love” upheld by the entire anarchist movement.

“Free love” Jewish style was evidently so attractive that it induced a German anarchist, Rudolf Rocker, to learn Yiddish in order to become a member of the London Anarchist club. So tolerant were the Jewish anarchists that they allowed Rocker to become the leading spokesman for the club, a position which he retained from the late 1890s until 1914. In his memoirs Rocker frankly admitted that it was the Jewish women who had drawn him to the Jewish anarchists. The following passage from Rocker’s memoirs is cited by Fishman on page 232:

One could talk with these women, and forget that they were women. Yet they were no blue-stockings, nor were they the kind of feminists who aped mannishness. They were womanly, and motherly, but were conscious of their own equality, and of their human self-respect. It added to their charm.

Rocker probably also enjoyed the fact that the Jewish anarchists made a big point of their hostility to the Jewish religion. Dances were held at the club on Yom Kippur preceded by visits to a local synagogue where the anarchists would taunt the members, as Fishman notes on page 259, by “smoking or brandishing ham sandwiches as gestures of defiance and rejection of their creed.” Sad to say, the Jewish anarchists did not prove equally defiant of the Christian religion; indeed, one meeting called to denounce Yom Kippur, described by Fishman on page 158, was held in London’s Christ Church Hall.

Anarchist organizations similar to the London Anarchist club were also formed in New York during this same period. Although not so influential among Jewish trade unionists as the Jewish anarchists in England, the Jewish anarchist movement in the United States did produce one of the leading anarchists of modern times, Emma Goldman. Through her publication, *Mother Earth*, and her lecture tours, Goldman became an internationally known celebrity who was able to attract audiences in the thousands in lecture halls all across the United States. Although she had close ties to Yiddish speaking anarchist groups in New York, she was sufficiently fluent in English and assimilated to European and American culture to command attention in the larger world of the American radical movement. A dedicated anarchist, Goldman used her position of individual prominence in order to promote the traditional cultural values of Jewish radicalism, respect for sex and sympathy for the oppressed.

Emma Goldman was born in 1869 in Russia; she came from an assimilated Jewish background and learned Russian and German in her youth as well as Yiddish. Her family emigrated to the United States in 1885, and by the age of 20 Goldman had become active in Jewish anarchist circles in New York. Alice Wexler, on page xv of *Emma Goldman*, notes that she “first attracted national attention as the lover of Alexander Berkman”. Berkman, who came from a similar Russian Jewish background, made headlines by attempting to kill the wealthy industrialist Frick in retaliation for Frick’s role in the violent suppression of a strike by steel workers at Carnegie’s Homestead plant in 1892. Berkman was sentenced to 22 years in prison for his unsuccessful assassination attempt but was released in 1906. Goldman publicly defended Berkman’s actions and maintained a lifelong friendship with him. She too was sentenced to prison for 1 year in 1893 for telling the unemployed at a demonstration in Union Square to go and demand food from the rich.

Already something of a celebrity in the 1890s, Goldman became famous in 1901 as a result of a brief meeting with an anarchist named Leon Czolgosz. Shortly after meeting Goldman, Czolgosz shot and killed McKinley, the President of the United States. Goldman denied that she had urged Czolgosz to shoot McKinley but she did defend him. On page 312 of Volume 1 of her autobiography, *Living My Life*, she cites the following passage from an article which she wrote in defense of Czolgosz:

Leon Czolgosz and other men of his type, far from being depraved creatures of low instincts are in reality super-sensitive beings unable to bear up under too great social stress. They are driven to some violent expression, even at the sacrifice of their own lives, because they cannot supinely witness the misery and suffering of their fellows. The blame for such acts must be laid at the door of those who are responsible for the injustice and inhumanity which dominate the world.

From this time forward, Goldman had a public image as an “exponent of free love and bombs” and the “murderer of McKinley”, as Wexler puts it on page 166. She exploited her fame with a series of highly publicized lecture tours and also began publishing *Mother Earth* in 1906.

At the same time, Goldman became involved in an intense love affair with an American Jewish anarchist, Ben Reitman. Goldman’s letters to Reitman, reproduced at length in *Love, Anarchy, And Emma Goldman* by Candace Falk, verged on the pornographic, testifying to an overt appreciation and enjoyment of sex rare at this time. But Goldman and Reitman eventually drew apart, in part because of a sadistic beating which Reitman received from right wing vigilantes in San Diego in 1912 while acting as the manager of Goldman’s lecture tour. Both Reitman and Goldman also received short prison terms in 1916 for publicly distributing birth control information. Following the United States entry into World War I in 1917, additional charges were brought against Goldman for her opposition to the draft, and in 1919 both she and Berkman were deported. Goldman died in 1940 in Canada, just across the border from Rochester, the city to which she had first come when she arrived in the United States in 1885.

Goldman’s advocacy of loving sex led her to adopt a critical attitude towards both the male and female camps in the battle of the sexes. On page 93 of Volume I of *Living My Life* she offered the following assessment of the men she met in the anarchist movement:

I had met two categories of men: vulgarians and idealists. The former would never let an opportunity pass to possess a woman and they would give her no other thought save sexual desire. The idealists stoutly defended the equality of the sexes, at least in theory, but the only men among them who practised what they preached were the Russian and Jewish radicals.

On the other hand, on page 225 of *Anarchism And Other Essays*, she offered the following critique of the feminist movement of her day:

True, the movement for woman’s rights has broken many old fetters, but it has also forged new ones. The great movement of true emancipation has not met with a great race of women who could look liberty in the face. Their narrow, Puritanical vision banished man, as a disturber and doubtful character, out of their emotional life.

And she concluded on page 230:

Indeed, if partial emancipation is to become a complete and true emancipation of woman, it will have to do away with the ridiculous notion that to be loved, to be sweetheart and mother, is synonymous with being slave or subordinate. It will have to do away with the absurd notion of the dualism of the sexes, or that man and woman represent two antagonistic worlds.

Goldman’s vision of true love and true equality between men and women remains unfulfilled to this day, and her criticisms of the proponents of hostility between the sexes remain as valid as before.

Goldman’s attitude towards her Jewish background was complex and ambivalent. Gerald Sorin, on page 8 of *The Prophetic Minority*, notes that “the pages of the magazine *Mother Earth* that Emma Goldman edited from 1906 to 1917 are filled with Yiddish stories, tales from the Talmud, and translations of Morris Rosenfeld’s poetry.” Rosenfeld was a Yiddish labor poet. Sorin adds:

Moreover, her commitment to anarchism did not divert her from speaking and writing, openly and frequently, about the particular burdens Jews faced in a world in which anti-semitism was a living enemy.

However, Goldman was extremely hostile to the Jewish religion and to most manifestations of Jewish nationalism. Falk, on page 281 of *Love, Anarchy, And Emma Goldman*, states:

She often held meetings expressly on the most solemn of all Jewish holidays, Yom Kippur, and she took a strong position against the formation of a Jewish state. She believed that the Jews had a special character because they were bound by an idea, not because they were a nation.

Moreover Goldman's writings contain the same type of crypto-Christian imagery then in vogue among American Jewish socialists. She frequently condemned "Phariseeism" or "Judas" and made favorable references to Christ. For example, on page 86 of *Anarchism And Other Essays*, she compares the anarchists with Christ "because they believe, as truly as Christ did, that their martyrdom will redeem humanity". And her dislike of religion did not extend to Christmas, which she celebrated regularly.

Goldman was sufficiently Jewish identified to feel guilty about her ambivalence, and on page 370 of Volume I of her autobiography she attempted to justify herself by describing the following exchange with the noted Yiddishist and Territorialist leader Chaim Zhitlovsky:

He never tired of urging upon me that as a Jewish daughter I should devote myself to the cause of the Jews. I would say to him that I had been told the same thing before. A young scientist I had met in Chicago, a friend of Max Baginski, had pleaded with me to take up the Jewish cause. I repeated to Zhitlovsky what I had related to the other: that at the age of eight I used to dream of becoming a Judith and visioned myself in the act of cutting off Holofernes' head to avenge the wrongs of my people. But since I had become aware that social injustice is not confined to my own race, I had decided that there were too many heads for one Judith to cut off.

Goldman was evidently proud of her retort, and yet it does not really explain her position. One thing is for sure: had she been even more Jewish identified she could never have attained the kind of international renown that came her way as a self-defined spokesperson for the whole of suffering humanity. All the same, as compared with the leading Jewish Marxists of her day such as Luxemburg or Trotsky, Goldman had a much stronger sense of solidarity with the Jewish working class and awareness of herself as a product of Jewish tradition and Jewish values.

The Freudians

Goldman's impact on American culture is difficult to measure since it was exercised less through anarchism as a movement than through her own individual prominence. Anarchism as a movement collapsed in the United States as in England after World War I, but Goldman's example as an uncompromising radical critic of American society was long remembered by many who were hostile or indifferent to anarchist theory. However, during the period from World War I to the 1960s, advocacy of sexual liberation both in the United States and Europe came to be primarily associated with the teachings of Sigmund Freud and his followers. Goldman herself paid tribute to Freud, on page 113 of Volume I of *Living My Life*, for his role in the development of her own thinking on sexual matters:

Greater clarity in these matters came to me later on when I heard Sigmund Freud. His simplicity and earnestness and the brilliance of his mind combined to give one the feeling of being led out of a dark cellar into broad daylight. For the first time I grasped the full significance of sex repression and its effect on human thought and action. He helped me to understand myself, my own needs; and I also realized that only people of depraved minds could impugn the motives or find 'impure' so great and fine a personality as Freud.

As Goldman suggests, Freud's great achievement was to present sexual repression in a negative light. Freud was not really an advocate either of sex or of sympathy, and yet the clear effect of his teachings was to imbue several generations of Europeans and Americans with an intense desire for greater sexual freedom and satisfaction. If any one individual may be said to have prepared the way for the "sexual revolution" of the 1960s, that individual was Sigmund Freud.

Freud legitimized sex by treating it as essential to mental health. In volume after volume of quasi-scientific musings, Freud sought to prove that sexual repression was responsible for a whole range of sadistic, neurotic and anti-social traits. It had long been apparent to many people that the Christian advocates of sexual repression were animated by a spirit of sadistic rage generated by their own sexual frustration; but Freud was the first to state this point in such a way that it came to be regarded as a scientific fact. Treating sex as a channel for energy, Freud argued convincingly that when this energy is dammed up, it does not disappear but flows into different channels, some perhaps socially useful but for the most part aggressive and anti-social in nature. The obvious implication, which Freud himself hesitated to spell out in so many words, was that sexual satisfaction was necessary for mental health. Freud's own sex life, as he intimated more than once, was far from ideal; but it is almost impossible to read his work without coming away with a strong desire for more and better sex.

Almost all of Freud's early followers were Jewish, and although Freud's teachings were eventually disseminated on a world scale, the majority of Freudians has continued to be Jewish right up to the present day. Freud went to great lengths to give "psychoanalysis" a scientific image but he was well aware that many people perceived it as a Jewish movement. He once jokingly remarked to a Jewish colleague, as cited on page 205 of *Freud* by Peter Gay:

Our Aryan comrades are, after all, quite indispensable to us; otherwise, psychoanalysis would fall victim to anti-Semitism.

Freud was a resolute assimilationist who celebrated Christmas and even Easter, but in line with his scientific image, he never spoke well of the Christian religion in his writings. He made no attempt to conceal his Jewish background, commenting on it a number of times while analyzing his own dreams in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. He regarded himself as Jewish identified, but in a complicated, abstract way, in keeping with the strong assimilationist bent which he shared with most German speaking Jews.

Freud expressed his attitude towards being Jewish in his preface to the Hebrew edition of *Totem and Taboo*, cited on page 39 of *Judaism In Sigmund Freud's World* by Earl Grollman. Grollman writes:

Were someone to ask him: 'What is still Jewish in you after you abandoned all those things common to your people?' Freud could only respond: 'Still very much, perhaps, the main part of my personality.' He admitted that he would be unable to put this thought into clear words, and added: 'It will certainly some day become accessible to scientific investigation.'

Gay, on page 601 of *Freud*, cites a similar passage from a letter which Freud sent to his B'nai B'rith lodge in Vienna in 1926 explaining why he still regarded himself as Jewish despite being an atheist:

But enough else remained to make the attraction of Judaism and of Jews so irresistible, many dark emotional powers, all the mightier the less they let themselves be grasped in words, as well as the clear consciousness of inner identity, the secrecy of the same mental construction.

In other words, Freud loved Jews but was afraid to admit it.

Clear evidence of Freud's secret love for other Jews is to be found in one of his dreams which he described beginning on page 170 of *The Interpretation of Dreams*. In this dream, Freud said that he experienced a "great feeling of affection" for a Jewish colleague of his, who was having the same difficulty as Freud in trying to break into the violently anti-Semitic Austrian medical and scientific establishment. But no sooner did Freud admit to a feeling of sympathy for other Jews than he immediately tried to deny it by entering into a lengthy and unconvincing discussion of why his affection for his Jewish colleague was actually but a mask for competitive, hostile feelings - feelings which were the direct opposite of those which Freud actually experienced in the dream. Freud would not have been so successful as a psychoanalyst if he did not have a great capacity for sympathy, but he was forced to conceal this side of his personality, which was also the Jewish side, in order to maintain an image as a detached scientific observer. In real life he spent most of his waking hours listening carefully to the complaints of his Jewish patients and socializing amiably with his Jewish colleagues; but in the world of his imagination he was a great European scientist, laying bare the secrets of the human mind for the benefit of posterity.

One advantage of Freud's scientific image was that it enabled him to openly reject religion. As Gay notes on page 525, Freud was a lifelong atheist:

He had been a consistent militant atheist since his school days, mocking God and religion, nor sparing the God and the religion of his family.

But instead of presenting himself an atheist in his published writings, something that would have aroused controversy, Freud merely put religion under a microscope, treating it as just another symptom of mental disorder. In his detached, scientific, bourgeois manner, Freud thus championed many of the same positions which the anarchists had espoused openly and passionately. He too was a Jewish radical who took the radical program of human happiness as a social ideal and translated it into a highly popular medical, scientific and academic ideal of mental health.

The latent radicalism inherent in Freud's teachings was brought out into the open by one of his disciples,

Wilhelm Reich. Freud himself had steered clear of politics, but Reich became a socialist during the 1920s and in 1929 in Germany he founded the Socialist Association for Sex Hygiene and Sexological Research. Working in close association with the German Communist Party, Reich spent the next few years distributing information on birth control to German working class youth and demanding a freer sex life for the German working class. At the same time, Reich developed a theoretical framework for his activities by expanding Freud's analysis of the negative effects of sexual repression into a full fledged critique of German fascism. As Reich put it succinctly on page 192 of *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*: "Sadism originates from ungratified orgiastic yearnings." Reich also devoted far more attention than Freud not just to sex but specifically to sexual orgasm, which Reich saw as constricted or blocked in many individuals by a rigid "body armor" developed as a result of years of repression.

Myron Sharaf argues on page 10 of his biography of Reich, *Fury On Earth*, that Reich was a great revolutionary who "disturbed the sleep of the world more fundamentally even than Freud or Marx had done". Sharaf became a follower of Reich in the 1940s; on page 18 he sums up Reich's teachings as follows:

His whole syndrome of ideas appealed strongly to me: the concept of a deeper, more joyous sensuality; the affirmation of adolescent love life; the linking of sexual freedom with a nonauthoritarian social order; the relationship between emotion suppression and economic exploitation of submissive, 'unalive' workers; the sense that 'unarmored' man could experience a moral vital existence; a psychiatric therapy that dealt not only with psychological complexes but also with bodily rigidities; even the notion of a universal energy identical to the energy that moved in sexual excitation. I found it all intoxicating.

Reich was forced to flee Germany in 1933 as a result of the Nazis coming to power, and he ended up in the United States, where he found himself increasingly isolated from the rest of the psychoanalytical profession. He became obsessed with a desire to prove the scientific validity of his theories of universal energy and began producing a so-called "orgone box" intended to accumulate invisible energy for therapeutic purposes. These activities provided the United States government with a pretext to prosecute him for mail fraud, and he was eventually sent to jail, dying in a federal prison in 1957.

Although Reich was of Jewish descent, he did not identify as a Jew in any way and disliked being reminded of his Jewish origin. He had served as an officer in the Austrian army during World War 1 and was so good at looking and acting German that he was able to travel incognito on a camping trip through Nazi Germany in 1934 with his Aryan girl friend en route to a psychoanalytic conference in Switzerland. But as a result of denying the Jewish side of his character, Reich in later life began to exhibit clear signs of megalomania and paranoia. He thought himself a greater scientist than Einstein, and when his "orgone box" got him in trouble, he began comparing himself to Jesus Christ, whom he came to regard as a paragon of mental health. Sharaf, on page 396, cites his description of Christ as "the supreme example of the unarmored life". Reich was indeed a great revolutionary, but he was also a great fool, who did not have the common sense to notice that he was neither a German nor a scientist nor a sacrificial lamb but just another Jewish radical.

In the United States, the teachings of Freud and Reich were popularized in a somewhat watered down form by a whole array of Jewish experts on mental health, including Theodore Adorno, Alexander Lowen, Fritz Perls, Erich Fromm and Arthur Janov. The writings of the Jewish Freudians became especially popular during the 1950s, partially filling the vacuum on the left created by the postwar "Red scare". They did not have a political program, but their teachings carried an implicit political message, perhaps best summed up by Reich on page 141 of *The Mass Psychology of Fascism* as follows:

Why shouldn't we have happiness on earth? Why shouldn't pleasure be the substance of life? Let the masses vote on this question! No reactionary conception of life would stand the test.

During the Sixties, these ideas were to surface as the ideology of millions, as exemplified in the slogan: "Make love, not war!"

A good example of the direct connection between Freudian thought and the counter-culture of the Sixties is provided by the career of Abraham Maslow. Maslow was an American born Jewish psychologist who taught at Brooklyn College and Brandeis after World War 2 and developed his own version of Freudian theory known as "humanistic psychology". Like Reich and also Erich Fromm, Maslow was a socialist in his youth and even in later years retained a "proud atheism", as Edward Hoffman puts it on page 2 of *The Right*

To Be Human, deriving from his “intense mistrust of religion”. Maslow was also strongly Jewish identified, teaching at predominantly Jewish colleges and becoming an early supporter of the state of Israel. Hoffman on page 48 cites the following passage from Maslow’s diary written in response to the anti-Semitism which he encountered as a college student in the 1930s:

The Jewish problem? I had almost made up my mind to dodge it. To change my name - to be a ‘white Jew’, a ‘good Jew’. But then I read Ludwig Lewisohn’s *Island Within*...he changed my mind for me. I wouldn’t dream of it now. If I’m a Jew, I’m a Jew, and I’ll stuff it down your throat if you don’t like it.

Maslow also came to the conclusion, notes Hoffman on page 16, that his youthful socialism had been “a secular parallel to the age-old prophetic thundering within the Jewish tradition for law and social justice.”

Maslow had a direct influence on at least two of the leading Jewish radicals of the Sixties, Betty Friedan and Abbie Hoffman. In *The Feminine Mystique*, Friedan devoted almost an entire chapter to summarizing Maslow’s views on the subject of female sexuality. Maslow’s academic reputation was initially based on studies which he conducted which attempted to show that female sexuality was enhanced rather than diminished by greater independence and self-esteem. Friedan seized on these studies as proof that women should have careers outside the home. As for Abbie Hoffman, he was a student at Brandeis in the 1950s and later described Maslow as his favorite teacher. Like most of the Jewish radicals of the Sixties, he took over the program of the Freudians, but transformed it from an individual to a collective aspiration. Instead of merely seeking “self-actualization”, as Maslow put it, within the framework of existing social norms, the Jewish radicals of the Sixties dreamed of creating entirely new communal structures within which human happiness would at last be possible. They failed in this endeavor, not because their program was faulty but because it required a political as well as a cultural revolution.

The Sixties

Both the strength and the weakness of the Movement of the Sixties lay in its tendency to sidestep politics in favor of culture. Politics in the Sixties was defined as protest: protest against the Vietnam war, against racial discrimination and segregation, against bureaucratic educational policies. Only a small minority of radicals in the Sixties aspired to politics in the conventional sense of a movement for political power. Many reasons were given for this distrust of politics, but the true reason was one which was rarely stated, namely that most Americans had been frightened away from radical politics by the effects of the “Red scare” and the Cold War. This fear of politics ultimately turned out to be a weakness, but it also proved a strength in that it made possible a cultural radicalism which the various Marxist parties had always avoided for fear of offending the working class. Only the anarchists among earlier radical movements had espoused a similar cultural radicalism, but for the most part the radicals of the Sixties were too apolitical to be anarchists. They had no clear vision of a future society of any kind, only a strong aversion to the existing society and a willingness to challenge its cultural values in the most dramatic possible way.

If there was anything distinctive about the Jewish component of this challenge, it was as before the mingling of sex and sympathy. The Jewish radicals of the Sixties not only demanded a freer sex life but also expressed sympathy and support for the aspirations of others, particularly the Vietnamese victims of American aggression and also the blacks in the United States itself. In the language of the Sixties, they were more “political”, not in the sense of aiming at political power, but in that they tended to be more active in organizing protest demonstrations or communal groups than did the non-Jewish radicals. The majority of them came from left wing backgrounds, and even if they did not themselves espouse a socialist point of view, they were nonetheless influenced by socialist tradition to seek collective solutions to social problems. At the same time, however, they were also in the forefront of the movement for sexual liberation, which was equally rooted in the traditional values of Jewish radicalism.

Probably the best known exponent of sexual liberation in the Sixties was a Jewish radical, Lenny Bruce. Jack Porter on page 114 of *The Jew As Outsider* characterizes Bruce as the “cultural rebel *par excellent*” of the 1960s. Porter also states, on page 116: “The death of Lenny Bruce may have been the beginning of the end for Jewish prominence in American culture.” Be that as it may, the immediate effect of Bruce’s meteoric career was to clear the way for other Jewish radicals to express the same type of controversial opinions for which he was hounded to death. Bruce was a real iconoclast, who not only championed sex but ridiculed the enemies

of sex, particularly the Catholic church. He was also one of the few American Jewish radicals who had the nerve to raise the issue of Christian anti-Semitism. He did it in a humorous way, which he described on page 196 of his autobiography, *How To Talk Dirty And Influence People*, as follows:

In the dictionary, a Jew is one who is descended from the ancient tribe of Judea, but - I'll say to an audience - you and I know what a Jew is: one who killed our Lord. Now there's dead silence there after that.

Bruce would then break the silence with the following routine:

Yes, we did it. I did it. My family. I found a note in my basement: 'We killed him - signed, Morty'.
Why did you kill Christ, Jew?
We killed him because he didn't want to become a doctor, that's why.

And the audience would laugh, relieved that Bruce could treat their prejudice as a joke.

Lenny Bruce came from a working class Jewish background and got his start in show business as a comedian in burlesque houses. He was married for a time to a striptease dancer and seems to have had good reason for the passionate defense of sex against religion which he presented to nightclub audiences. A characteristic sample of his patter appears on page 91 of his autobiography:

Why don't religious institutions use their influence to relieve human suffering instead of sponsoring such things as the Legion of Decency, which dares to say it's indecent that men should watch some heavy-titted Italian starlet because to *them* breasts are dirty? Beautiful, sweet, tender womanly breasts that I love to kiss; pink nipples that I love to feel against my clean-shaven face. They're clean!

Public expression of such views led to numerous arrests and prosecutions of Bruce for obscenity, which in turn contributed to his early death. The Catholic church played a major role in orchestrating the campaign against Bruce. At his trial for obscenity in Chicago in 1962, notes Bruce on page 186, the judge, both prosecutors and the entire jury were all Catholics. Variety magazine, cited by Bruce on page 122, reported that at this trial "the prosecutor is at least equally concerned with Bruce's indictments of organized religion as he is with the more obvious sexual content of the comic's act".

Less daring but more successful was the cultural radicalism of Bob Dylan, probably the most famous of the Jewish radicals of the Sixties. Bruce, by the way, was born Leonard Schneider on Long Island, while Dylan began life as Robert Zimmerman in Hibbing, Minnesota. One of Dylan's early role models was the folk singer, Jack Elliott; he was born Elliott Adnopaz in Brooklyn. Folk singers were expected to come from old American families, whether white or black, but the folk music crowd was heavily Jewish. Dylan's first contact with folk music was through the Minnesota Folk Music Society, characterized by a friend of his on page 66 of *No Direction Home* by Robert Shelton as "about eighty percent Jewish, mostly university people". The folk music crowd was also strongly left wing, and it was in this milieu that Dylan wrote his early protest songs such as "Blowing in the Wind" or "Masters of War". However, Dylan achieved his greatest popularity as the voice of generational rebellion, attacking official American culture in songs that were less "political" but more strident than his earlier music. Heavily American identified, Dylan never came to terms with his Jewish background, and although the "political" component in his music was of Jewish origin, the overt Jewish content in his songs is almost non-existent.

Once Dylan had demonstrated the explosive potential of the youth rebellion, other Jewish radicals who were even more "political" began to identify themselves with this trend with the conscious intent of using it to put across an anti-war, pro-integrationist message. Jerry Rubin, one of the founders of the Yippies, reveals on page 74 of *Growing (Up) at Thirty-Seven* that he "considered myself a Marxist" when he arrived at Berkeley in 1964. Rubin came from Cincinnati, from a Jewish working class background, and was radicalized by living in Israel for over a year in the early 1960s. Together with Abbie Hoffman, who had been active in the civil rights movement, Rubin founded the Yippies mainly in order to organize radical youth to protest against the war in Vietnam. The Yippies adopted a cultural style that was as outrageous as possible, but as Rubin admits on page 7, "The fact is, I was always more sane and middle class than my yippie image." The Yippies were mainly Jewish, as were the Weathermen, a militant offshoot of the radical student group SDS, who also sought to project an image of cultural rebellion in order to attract young people to protest against injustice.

Central to the youth revolt of the Sixties was the search for community. Groups like the Yippies or Weathermen

were distinguished not only by their radical cultural style but by their efforts to organize “collectives” of like minded people who would treat one another as members of the same family. Some collectives bought land and formed communes in rural areas; others remained in the cities and tried to live together or go to demonstrations together or work together or sleep together. Unfortunately, not many of these collectives lasted more than a few years. They were broken up by internal conflicts generated in large part by the external pressures to which they were subject. Usually harassed to one degree or another by the police, regarded with suspicion by their neighbors, constantly at odds with the larger society around them, they found themselves unable to perpetuate a communal way of life in the midst of a society dedicated to possessive individualism.

As the youthful collectives began to break up at the end of the Sixties, many of their female members gravitated to the emerging feminist movement of the late 1960s and 1970s. Jewish radicals also played a key role in the feminist upsurge, most notably Betty Friedan, founder of the National Organization of Women. Friedan’s book, *The Feminine Mystique*, first published in 1963, proved to be one of the most popular and influential feminist works ever written. In it Friedan argued that American women had been trapped into empty lives as housewives by a “feminine mystique” that had been foisted on them after World War 2 by male publicists and psychologists. According to Friedan, if women dedicated themselves to careers instead of remaining housewives, they would become more, not less loving in their relationships with the men around them. Directed mainly at college educated women who had some real chance of pursuing successful professional careers, *The Feminine Mystique* helped to motivate a whole generation of women to demand entry into job categories previously reserved almost exclusively for men.

However, Friedan’s prediction that professional women would form loving relationships with men was not, on the whole, borne out in practice. A spirit of hostility to men became characteristic of the feminist movement which Friedan helped to inspire, and at least part of the responsibility for this trend must be assigned to Friedan herself. Although she spoke well of a few men in *The Feminine Mystique*, her general tendency was to blame not only men in general but Jewish men in particular for the real or imagined sufferings of American women. Her chief scapegoat was Sigmund Freud, whom Friedan stigmatized as the one person ultimately responsible for driving American women out of the workplace and into the home. As she put it on page 95:

The feminine mystique derived its power from Freudian thought; for it was an idea born of Freud, which led women, and those who studied them, to misinterpret their mothers’ frustrations, and their fathers’ and brothers’ resentments and inadequacies, and their own emotions and possible choices in life. It is a Freudian idea, hardened into apparent fact, that has trapped so many American women today.

And just in case someone might not know that Freud was Jewish, Friedan on page 100 blamed Freud’s alleged male chauvinism on Judaism:

Freud grew up with this attitude built in by his culture - not only the culture of Victorian Europe, but that Jewish culture in which men said the daily prayer: ‘I thank Thee, Lord, that Thou has not created me a woman,’ and women prayed in submission: ‘I thank Thee, Lord, that Thou has created me according to Thy will.’

That Friedan herself was a product of Jewish culture was however nowhere mentioned in *The Feminine Mystique*.

To the contrary, Friedan not only concealed her own Jewish background but managed to stigmatize even the Jewish victims of the Holocaust as responsible for their own destruction. On page 293, she stated:

In a sense that is not as far-fetched as it sounds, the women who ‘adjust’ as housewives, who grow up wanting to be ‘just a housewife’, are in as much danger as the millions who walked to their own death in the concentration camps - and the millions more who refused to believe that the concentration camps existed.

This comparison is not so much “far-fetched” as it is insulting to the victims of the Holocaust, whose situation Friedan clearly did not wish to understand. And when the male Jewish radical leaders of the anti-war movement began to come under heavy government attack at the end of the Sixties, feminists reared under Friedan’s influence were ready with a whole analysis blaming Jewish “patriarchy” for all of the problems of the Movement. By the time that he published *Growing (up) at Thirty-Seven* in 1976, Jerry Rubin had accepted this analysis, declaring on page 155: “I am a male victim of male chauvinism.” Rubin also described the impact of feminism on the Movement of the Sixties on page 89 as follows:

Women abandoned the male-dominated New Left movement, leaving men without a work force...Without women, the movement was over.

But instead of blaming the women for deserting the cause, Rubin blamed himself for having been a male chauvinist.

The rise of feminism undoubtedly accelerated the disintegration of the Movement, but the main causes of the collapse of the Movement of the Sixties were, on the one hand, government repression, and on the other, its own success. Rubin, on page 90, also alluded to the effects of government repression, stating: "I felt that I was being set up for martyrdom by death or jail." Many activists, particularly from the Black Panthers, were in fact killed, many others arrested and student demonstrators frightened off by the killings at Kent State. At the same time, the Movement was undermined by its own success. By the beginning of the 1970s it was clear that the war in Vietnam was winding down. A whole body of civil rights legislation had been enacted into law, bureaucratic dress codes and restrictions had been greatly relaxed and the youth culture was turning into a major source of commercial profit for record companies, drug dealers and enterprising gurus. In order to have continued, the Movement would have had to broaden its goals, aiming at a political as well as a cultural revolution; but it was precisely in order to avoid the need for socialist politics that the Movement had focused so exclusively on culture in the first place.

Culture

Culture is a notoriously indefinable term, embracing everything you want it to embrace except for politics. Politics is about power; culture is about customs. Customs can be changed by changing your clothes, but the lesson of the Sixties is that without power, cultural changes are rarely permanent or profound. The loving, collective social institutions which the radicals of the Sixties sought to found did not survive; instead there ensued during the 1970s what Marcuse in the Sixties had called "repressive desublimation", the legitimization of hedonism within an individualist framework. And by the 1980s, even this individualist hedonist culture had come under attack from the government in the name of religion and the "war on drugs". Because the Movement did not aim at, much less achieve, political power, most of the cultural changes which it brought about were gradually either reversed or else stripped of their original radical content and transformed into adornments of the status quo.

Central to this process was the systematic repudiation of the specifically Jewish component of the radicalism of the Sixties. Whatever their limitations, the Jewish radicals of the Sixties had been in the forefront of the struggle for peace, equal rights and a communal way of life. Just for this reason, by the 1970s anti-Semitism had become a pervasive feature of what remained of left-wing culture in the United States. The self-proclaimed heirs of the Sixties, the feminist careerists, black ministers and homosexual culture vultures, sought to legitimize their own accommodation to the capitalist system by heaping scorn on everything associated with Jews and Jewish radicalism. Characteristic of the tone adopted by these people was the remark by Merlin Stone, on page 127 of her popular *When God Was A Woman*, that it was "ironic" that Hitler should have killed so many Jews, considering that the Jews, who were really Aryans, had invented "patriarchy". And for her part, the presumably Jewish would-be witch Marion Weinstein insisted on page 84 of *Positive Magic* that "NINE MILLION PEOPLE" had been killed as witches in the Middle Ages. This figure, which had no basis in fact, was obviously obtained by reversing the number 6 from the 6 million Jewish victims of the Holocaust.

So intense had become the anti-Semitic atmosphere within the American feminist movement by the 1970s that many Jewish feminists were forced to organize separate Jewish women's groups. A collection of articles by such women was published by Susannah Heschel in 1983 under the title, *On Being A Jewish Feminist*. Although understandably critical of Judaism as an almost entirely male-defined religious tradition, most of the authors represented in this volume were well aware of the strong egalitarian thrust of traditional Jewish culture. As Rachel Adler put it on page 16:

Make no mistake; for centuries, the lot of the Jewish woman was infinitely better than that of her non-Jewish counterpart. She had rights which other women lacked until a century ago.

And Paula Hyman added on page 24: "How fortunate for both Jewish women and men that the `macho

mystique' was not a Jewish cultural value." However, in the light of the Holocaust, it is not so clear that Hyman's judgment is correct. Moreover, Jewish men who assert themselves, whether Israeli soldiers or Sixties radicals, are sure to be accused of "macho" behavior, regardless of the facts of the case.

The clearest proof of the fundamental dishonesty of the feminist theory of patriarchy as a Jewish invention is that at precisely the same time as this theory was being popularized, a Jewish woman, Golda Meir, became the head of the Israeli government. Meir was the first woman in modern times to play a prominent role in world affairs not because she was someone else's mother, wife or daughter but because of her own achievements. And Meir herself was a feminist, who on page 68 of *My Life* characterized "kibbutz women" as "among the world's first and most successful fighters for true equality". Marie Syrkin, on page 74 of *Golda Meir*, analyzes the roots of Israeli feminism as follows:

The good society, free of exploitation and discrimination, liberated women of their age-old restrictions. In the struggle for social and national equality, women were to be equal comrades. In the early period, before experience and maturity had softened the youthful dogmatism of the halutzim, equality was interpreted uncritically and mechanically. The high-spirited girls were the first to shriek 'discrimination' if the men comrades relegated them to dishwashing, cooking or other domestic tasks in the kibbutz instead of giving them their due share of the more arduous work in the field. Women fought fanatically for the dubious privilege of hewing roads and breaking rock. The annals of the Second *Aliyah* are full of such instances.

But precisely because her feminism was rooted in her socialist convictions, Meir, as she said on page 89 of *My Life*, was "not a great admirer of the kind of feminism that gives rise to bra-burning, hatred of men or a campaign against motherhood". For their part, American feminists almost entirely ignored her achievements, preferring to proclaim their solidarity with the Arab foes of Israel, whose leaders were for the most active polygamists and bitter opponents of even the most elementary rights for women.

Another symptom of the anti-Semitic trend within the American left during the 1970s and 1980s was the resurgence of anarchist theory. Although many of the radicals of the Sixties had acted much like anarchists, they had little interest in anarchist tradition, which was thoroughly permeated with anti-Semitism. But no sooner had the limitations of a purely cultural rebellion been demonstrated in practice than all the old anarchist classics were dusted off and brought to light. Partly responsible for this trend was the leading European Jewish radical of the Sixties, Daniel Cohn-Bendit. Cohn-Bendit was one of the main leaders of the French student revolt of 1968, but in Europe everyone had to have an ideology, and he picked anarchism as the closest thing to his own practice. In *Obsolete Communism, The Left-Wing Alternative* he spoke glowingly of such violently anti-Semitic anarchists as Bakunin while discreetly ignoring his own Jewish background and values. He did let drop, on page 148, that a right wing French newspaper had attacked him as a "German Jew", someone that he clearly had no wish to be.

Sigmund Freud, who was not ashamed of being a German Jew, once offered the following piece of advice to a Jewish friend who did not wish to raise his young son as a Jew:

'If you do not let your son grow up as a Jew,' he said, 'you will deprive him of those sources of energy which cannot be replaced by anything else. He will have to struggle as a Jew, and you ought to develop in him all the energy he will need for that struggle. Do not deprive him of that advantage.'

Freud's remarks are cited on page 47 of *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition* by David Bakan. By the way, Bakan brings out on page xviii that Freud's library included "a number of books on Kabbala in German, and, most importantly, a copy of the French translation of the *Zohar!*" But in post-Holocaust Europe, the few Jews who did dare to involve themselves in European radical movements generally avoided even the slightest hint of Jewish identity. Even in the United States, where the impact of the Holocaust was obviously much less severe, most of the Jewish radicals of the Sixties took good care to keep their Jewish background and associations out of the spotlight. But as has been repeatedly demonstrated in practice, masking Jewishness in no way prevents anti-Semites from making an issue of it. To the contrary, the lack of overt Jewish content in the Movement of the Sixties only facilitated the subsequent efforts of American left wing anti-Semites to stigmatize Jewish culture as "patriarchal", "racist" and reactionary.

Of course, it could also be argued that had the Jewish radicals of the Sixties not masked their Jewishness, they would not have been able to achieve the prominence that they did. It is a striking fact that of the leading Jewish radicals of this period, including Lenny Bruce, Bob Dylan, Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin and Betty Friedan, not one grew up in a large Jewish community. They all came from relatively small towns or cities where Jews

had to be thoroughly assimilated to American culture in order to survive. They were influenced by traditional Jewish culture, but that culture was for the most part already alien to them. It was part of a vanished world, the world of the Pale of Settlement and the immigrant slums. In that world, the presence of large numbers of working class and lower middle class Jews had given rise to a Jewish popular culture that was the real heart and soul of the Jewish radical movement of modern times. When massacre or assimilation eliminated most large Jewish communities, the culture that had once sustained large numbers of Jewish radicals was reduced to a thing of the past. It was still a significant factor in shaping the Jewish radicalism of the Sixties, but new forms of Jewish radicalism will have to emanate from new Jewish communities, whether in Israel or elsewhere.

Sex and sympathy as Jewish cultural values will nonetheless survive so long as Jews survive, for these are the values that have kept the Jewish people alive. Sexual love between men and women is the basis of the Jewish family, and the Jewish family is the basis of the Jewish community. Sexual love between men and women presupposes relations of equality, for love cannot flourish when one side exploits or oppresses the other. But equality between men and women is difficult to maintain in a world where nations and social classes are still sharply divided between rich and poor. It was for this reason that most of the Jewish advocates of sex and sympathy as cultural values were also advocates of equality in all spheres of social relations. But how is this equality to be achieved? Culture can define values, but wealth and poverty are ultimately determined by the development of science and technology. Is Jewish radicalism also relevant in this sphere?

Chapter Nine: Science And Technology

Lenin's famous dictum that "imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism" should really be reversed to read: capitalism is the highest stage of imperialism. The system which Marxists are accustomed to call capitalism grew mainly out of imperialism, which is much older and more pervasive than capitalism.

Imperialism, or the striving after conquest and empire, usually results from a military advantage which one nation acquires over its neighbors. Until about 500 years ago, the main basis of imperialism was the use of iron and steel weapons, such as swords, shields and body armor, together with horses or ships for transportation. Those who utilized these weapons most effectively, such as the Greeks and Romans in the West or the Arabs and Chinese in Asia, established the greatest empires. But about 500 years ago, a new basis for imperialism emerged in the form of cannons and guns. Cannons were developed by the Mongols and Turks, but due to their skill in metallurgy, the European nations were the first to use guns on a large scale. The military advantage which the Europeans derived from their near monopoly on the use of the gun set in motion a complicated dynamic which eventually resulted in the rise of the European world empire. The emergence of European capitalism was but one aspect of this dynamic.

Capitalism as an economic system is characterized by large, privately owned companies engaged in both the production and distribution of goods for sale. But as a rule, capitalism as an economic system has been established as the result of the previous establishment of an empire by military means. Capitalist methods of production and distribution require large markets in order to be effective, and in practice such markets have generally been created by conquest. The Greek, Roman, Arab and Chinese empires all generated capitalist systems on a large scale. Within these and other pre-modern empires, many essential goods were manufactured in large, capitalist-owned workshops or factories and distributed by capitalist merchants to markets everywhere in the empire. These pre-modern capitalist systems differed from modern, European-style capitalism in only one important respect: the technology utilized in their workshops or factories did not greatly differ from the technology utilized by local artisans. There were few machines; goods were mainly manufactured by hand, using simple tools; artificial power sources were confined to windmills or waterwheels.

After the conquest of the New World by Europeans using guns, the Europeans too began to manufacture goods for export in large workshops or factories using simple tools. But because the European empire was so much larger than previous empires, a demand developed for production on such a scale that the Europeans began to experiment with machines. And once machines and artificial power sources were developed, the technology utilized in industrial production proved to have military applications as well. By the end of the 19th century, the Europeans had added explosive shells, rapid fire weapons, ironclad ships and self-propelled vehicles to their arsenal. Better weapons in turn resulted in further conquests, which meant even larger markets, which resulted in yet additional technological advances in the sphere of industrial production. Electricity replaced steam as a power source, methods of synthesizing new materials were developed, sound, light and images were artificially reproduced. Starting essentially with guns, the European nations gradually acquired a tremendous scientific, technological and military advantage over the rest of the world.

With regard to the history of Jewish radicalism, the important point about this process is that it legitimized scientific thought in European culture. Once the Europeans became aware of the awesome economic and military implications of a correct scientific understanding of natural processes, European scientists were soon exempted from the requirement that they view the universe in terms of the dogmas of the Christian religion. Scientists, and scientists alone, were permitted to demand conclusive proof for all assertions concerning the nature of the universe and the forces which shaped it. In practice, this meant that scientists had the right to be atheists. As a result, the scientific world view became enormously attractive to Jewish radicals. Much of the influence and prestige of both Marx and Freud derived from their ability to present themselves to the world as scientists. But neither they nor the other Jewish devotees of the "social sciences" and "behavioral sciences" were actually scientists in the commonly understood sense of the word. Their conclusions were not irrefutable, nor did they result in great economic or military advantages. It is true that much of what they had to say was based on fact, but there was also an element of wishful thinking and ideologically motivated distortion in their teachings. In truth, only the most trivial studies in the "social sciences" or "behavioral sciences" can really be scientific, for as soon as major issues of human life are dealt with, a certain amount of polemicizing becomes inevitable.

There were, however, quite a few Jewish radicals who really did become scientists in the commonly accepted sense of the term. They studied science at European or American universities, conducted research projects in the approved manner and came up with results that had economic, military or medical implications. Among this number was the most famous and influential scientist of the 20th century, Albert Einstein. Einstein was a Jewish radical both in the world of science, where his theories were initially viewed as revolutionary, and in the world of human relations, where he was identified as an advocate of socialism, Zionism and world government. Yet although Einstein was a focus of controversy for many decades after his scientific findings were first published, today he is the one prominent Jewish radical of modern times whose reputation remains undiminished. His scientific teachings have been fully accepted by the international scientific community, and he is remembered by the general public as a great genius and kindly old man.

Einstein's positive public image is all the more astonishing in that the main result of his theories so far has been the development of atomic weapons. Many people are distressed by the threatening implications of atomic weapons for the future of the human race, yet little or none of this distress has rubbed off on Einstein. To the contrary, it was only prior to the development of the first atomic weapons that Einstein and his theories were a focus of controversy and debate. As soon as the first atom bombs were exploded, all criticism of Einstein was either halted or, if continued, expressed in a much more discreet and polite manner than previously. The development of atomic weapons proved that Einstein was a real scientist in the European tradition and not a mere ideologist, as many had previously suspected. The fact that atomic weapons were so destructive was not held against Einstein, for all along the prestige of European science had rested in large part upon its military implications. That Einstein should have won the respect of the world by threatening it with mass destruction speaks volumes about the true values and priorities of European so-called civilization.

Thanks to the achievements of Einstein and other Jewish radical scientists, the world of science remains the one sphere where Jewish radicals can still express themselves without encountering a massive wall of anti-Semitic prejudice and rejection. Even in the Soviet Union, Jews were still permitted to pursue scientific careers long after they had been almost completely excluded from virtually every other professional and academic field. Jewish radicalism has been shown to produce scientific results, and in science results are all that matter. But was there a relationship between Einstein's radicalism and his results? Does Jewish radicalism actually have scientific implications, or was it merely a coincidence that Einstein's radical scientific theories should have been developed by someone who also upheld radical social and political theories?

Atoms

Einstein's first scientific papers were published in the context of a great debate among European physicists on the validity and content of atomic theory. The concept of the atom in European science goes back at least 2500 years to certain Greek philosophers who asserted that everything that existed was actually composed of tiny little particles called atoms. This idea when first advanced was in no sense a scientific discovery but a mere hypothesis without any supporting evidence whatsoever. Nonetheless the view that the universe was composed of atoms gradually gained ground in European science until it came to be accepted as self evident. When the various elements, such as hydrogen, oxygen, carbon and so forth, were discovered by European scientists in the 18th and 19th centuries, each one was assigned an "atomic weight" and an "atomic number", even though the existence of atoms had still not yet been empirically verified. It was simply assumed that there was such a thing as an atom of hydrogen, oxygen or carbon, just as it had previously been assumed that there was such a thing as an atom of fire, water, earth or air, the original "elements" of Greek science.

Towards the end of the 19th century, the validity of European atomic theory was questioned by a group of scientists led by the Austrian physicist Ernst Mach. Lewis Feuer, on page 38 of *Einstein And The Generations Of Science*, summarizes Mach's views as follows:

Mach nourished a tremendous emotional aversion to any theory that proposed the existence of atoms. The atomic hypothesis, in his view, was a 'mechanical mythology'; to regard 'molecules and atoms' as 'realities behind phenomena', he wrote, was to substitute 'a mechanical mythology for the old animistic or metaphysical scheme'. As physical science matures, Mach wrote, '[it] will give up its mosaic play with stones and will seek out the boundaries and forms of the bed in which the living stream of phenomena flows'.

Mach's critique of atomic theory seems to have been related to his leftist political views; he was a member

of a “Viennese Fabian Socialist group”, notes Feuer on page 27, and his theories were widely discussed in European Marxist circles at that time. Feuer sees him as “the teacher, precursor, and guide of Einstein’s generation of 1905”.

Mach’s views were popular in left wing circles because Mach criticized atomic theory as insufficiently “materialist” on the grounds that there was no physical evidence for the existence of atoms. But his notion of “mosaic play with stones” as the model for atoms was peculiar; it would be more accurate to trace the idea of atoms to the Greek preoccupation with mathematics. The more the Greeks sought to quantify everything, the more it seemed to them that reality must be composed of little miniature entities. Then again, in *The Crisis In Physics*, the English Marxist Christopher Caudwell argued that there was an inherent tendency in what he called “bourgeois physics” to turn reality into numbers. He put it this way, on page 46:

Since Nature is to be apprehended as it were by a kind of divine apprehension on the part of the observer, in which he stands in no mutually determining relation to Nature, it is necessary to strip matter of all the qualities in which the observer is concerned. Colour, for example. Here the colour involves a subjective element: it is not the thing in itself, but the thing as seen. At first matter is only stripped of colour, sound, ‘pushiness’, heat, which all prove to be modes of motion. Motion, length, mass and shape are however believed to be absolutely objective qualities, independent of the observer. However they prove one after the other to be relative to the observer. Thus matter is left finally with no real i.e. nonsubjective qualities, except those of number. But number is ideal, and hence objective reality vanishes.

However it did not occur to Caudwell, writing in the 1930s, to treat atoms as nothing more than objectified numbers. Although there was still no physical evidence for the existence of atoms, Mach’s criticisms of atomic theory had gone out of style, in large part due to the influence of Einstein.

From the very start of his scientific career, Einstein came down heavily on the side of the defenders of atomic theory. As Ronald Clark brings out on page 52 of *Einstein*, the goal of Einstein’s first scientific papers, written when Mach’s influence was at its height, was “to find facts which guarantee as much as possible the existence of atoms of definite finite size”. Moreover, Einstein’s first major scientific treatise, published in 1905, sought to prove that light, previously thought to be composed of electro-magnetic waves, was actually composed of tiny particles similar to atoms, particles which eventually became known as photons. Far from challenging the established European view of atoms as the “building blocks of matter”, Einstein throughout his career sought to extend this view to aspects of reality, such as light, which had previously stood outside the realm of atomic theory. His teachings were welcomed by the conservative opponents of Mach’s views, who offered him a series of prestigious academic positions, beginning in 1913 with the chair of the Department of Physics at the newly established Kaiser Wilhelm science institute in Berlin.

But although he embraced atomic theory, Einstein also transformed it. Atoms were supposed to have a mass, but Einstein showed that the mass of a particle was proportional to its speed. Atoms were supposed to occupy space, but Einstein showed that the concept of space was meaningless apart from the concept of time. Einstein’s atoms occupied space-time, had a variable mass and could take the form of light or energy as well as matter. Einstein did not call his atoms numbers, but it was only as numbers that they could be visualized or understood. Einstein’s strong point as a scientist was his grasp of mathematics, and in his hands the tiny little particles of Greek atomic theory were transformed into points on a mathematical grid. Einstein’s ambition was to develop what he called a “unified field theory” in which all aspects of existence could be redefined as numbers. He did not achieve this goal, but he came close enough to stand atomic theory on its head. In place of numbers masquerading as particles, Einstein created a universe of particles defined as numbers. Everything about a particle was variable except for its position on Einstein’s mathematical grid, and this position was ultimately determined by its relationship to the one constant in Einstein’s universe, the speed of light.

Why did Einstein choose the speed of light as the basis for his mathematical calculations? He himself tried to explain his choice as follows, on page 28 of *The Meaning Of Relativity*:

The theory of relativity is often criticized for giving, without justification, a central theoretical role to the propagation of light, in that it founds the concept of time upon the law of the propagation of light. The situation, however, is somewhat as follows. In order to give physical significance to the concept of time, processes of some kind are required which enable relations to be established between different places. It is immaterial what kind of processes one chooses for such a definition of time. It is advantageous, however, for the theory, to choose only those processes concerning which we know something certain. This holds for the propagation of light *in vacuo* in a higher degree than for any other process which could be considered, thanks to the investigations of Maxwell and H.A. Lorentz.

Einstein's point here was that the speed of light had been shown to be constant at roughly 186,000 miles per second regardless of the nature or velocity of the light source. However, as Einstein implied, there were other constants he might also have chosen. In this context, it cannot be viewed as completely irrelevant that the traditional Jewish "science" of Kabbalah had also treated light as the basis of matter. Even if Einstein did not derive his ideas from Kabbalah, nonetheless the fact that the Kabbalists had based everything on light must have subtly encouraged Einstein to do the same. It was just this aspect of his thought which many European scientists initially found bewildering and controversial, with the result that a very considerable percentage of the early converts to Einstein's world view consisted of Jewish scientists like himself. Only after Einstein's theories had been confirmed by the development of the first atomic bombs did his views win general acceptance by the international scientific community and cease to be suspected of covert Jewish ideological affinities.

Even then some controversy persisted, as reflected in Clifford Will's study, *Was Einstein Right?*, published in 1986. Will concluded on page 206:

During the two decades that closed on the centenary of Einstein's birth [1879], his theory was put on the firing line, confronted by experimenters determined to test it, attacked by theorists proposing alternatives to it, and grabbed by astronomers wanting to use it. The theory passed all its tests with flying colors, with the only remaining enigma being the oblateness of the Sun.

In other words, mathematical calculations based on Einstein's system have proved more accurate than those based on the Newtonian system. Whether this means that the universe is really composed of numbers is open to serious doubt. Unlike Mach, Einstein was less interested in describing reality than in achieving results, and his results were achieved through mathematics. In *The Meaning Of Relativity*, he stated that he preferred to think of the universe as finite rather than infinite because he got better mathematical results that way. As he put it on page 103, "the possibility seems to be particularly satisfying that the universe is spatially bounded" because "the boundary conditions at infinity" are "so inconvenient from the standpoint of the general theory of relativity".

This mode of thought puzzled everyone because it did not fit into the on-going controversy between "idealist" conservatives and "materialist" radicals. In many ways Einstein came across as an "idealist" and was viewed as such by friend and foe alike. As he himself stated on page 55 of *Relativity: The Special and the General Theory*: "The non-mathematician is seized by a mysterious shuddering when he hears of 'four-dimensional' things, by a feeling not unlike that awakened by thoughts of the occult." But unlike most "idealists", Einstein did not revere his abstractions; he treated them as just plain numbers, which is what they were. Likewise, Einstein was fond of using terms like "God" or "the Lord" in his everyday speech, but as he made clear in his writings, he did not actually believe in God in the common sense of the term. On page 29 of *Out Of My Later Years* he characterized the notion of a "personal God" as "anthropomorphic". Clark on page 19 of *Einstein* tried to summarize Einstein's religious views as follows:

But much of Einstein's writing gives the impression of belief in a God even more intangible and impersonal than a celestial machine minder, running the universe with undisputable authority and expert touch. Instead, Einstein's God appears as the physical world itself, with its infinitely marvelous structure operating at atomic level with the beauty of a craftsman's wristwatch, and at stellar level with the majesty of a massive cyclotron.

Needless to say, the Kabbalists had also identified God with "the physical world itself". Like them, Einstein seems to have been a "materialist" at heart who liked to be perceived as an "idealist" both for diplomatic reasons and also because he was genuinely fascinated by complicated abstractions.

The clearest indication of the affinity between Einstein's thought and Kabbalah may be found in Einstein's concept of "cosmic religion". Rejecting conventional religious beliefs, Einstein nonetheless declared himself a believer in "cosmic religion", a mystical faith much like Kabbalah. On page 48 of *Cosmic Religion* Einstein described his faith as follows:

This is hard to make clear to those who do not experience it, since it does not involve an anthropomorphic idea of God: the individual feels the vanity of human desires and aims, and the nobility and marvellous order which are revealed in nature and in the world of thought. He feels the individual destiny as an imprisonment and seeks to experience the totality of existence as a unity full of significance.

And Einstein went on to argue, on page 49, that rejection of conventional religion was actually a precondition for the experience of cosmic religion:

It comes about, therefore, that precisely among the heretics of all ages we find men who were inspired by the highest religious experience; often they appeared to their contemporaries as atheists, but sometimes also as saints.

Einstein, however, was so good at reconciling contradictions that he appeared to his contemporaries neither as an atheist nor as a saint but simply as a genius.

What Einstein accomplished in the world of science was to bridge the contradiction between atomic theory and its critics by shifting the basis of physics from matter to light. Although Einstein defended atomic theory against Mach, he also accepted many of Mach's ideas, including the concept of "relativity". Feuer, on page 43 of *Einstein And The Generations Of Science*, notes that Mach called himself a "relativist" and wrote in 1904 that "the number of decided relativists who deny the barely intelligible hypothesis of absolute space and time is growing rapidly and soon there will not be one prominent partisan of the contrary position". In his papers on "relativity", published not long after Mach wrote these words, Einstein also rejected the concept of "absolute space and time" but replaced it with a new absolute in the form of the speed of light. That this choice was in no sense arbitrary is shown by Einstein's subsequent remark, cited by Clark on page 200 of his biography of Einstein: "For the rest of my life I want to reflect on what light is." Einstein never did decide what light was, but translated into numbers, it became the basis of modern atomic physics as reflected in the famous equation, $E=mc^2$.

The Relativity Revolution

Einstein's radical scientific ideas were developed in the context of a radical political and social environment. Most of

Einstein's key scientific papers were written in Switzerland, where he lived as a student and young scientist for a period of almost 20 years prior to his move to Berlin in 1913. Switzerland at that time was a hotbed of Jewish radicalism due to the presence there of large numbers of Russian Jewish students who were still barred from universities in Russia. Some German Jews also studied in Switzerland, such as Einstein and his friend Friedrich Adler. Adler was at that time a student of physics; in fact, he helped Einstein to get his first major academic position, at the University of Zurich, by recommending him for a job which had initially been offered to Adler. Later, when Adler was in prison awaiting trial for the assassination of Count Sturgkh, Einstein sent him a postcard offering to appear as a character witness on his behalf at the trial. Einstein also wrote on the card, cited by Florence on page 200 of *Fritz*:

How much I would like to discuss the theory of relativity with you! Hopefully this can take place afterward!

Other friends of Einstein in Switzerland were Maurice Solovine, like Adler a socialist, and Michele Besso.

Feuer, on page 3 of *Einstein And The Generations Of Science*, states that "Einstein's high period of original thought was sustained by a curious circle of young intellectuals who were filled with emotions of social and scientific generational rebellion." He adds on page 51 that this "Zurich-Berne circle was predominantly composed of students of Jewish origin - Einstein, Adler, Besso, Solovine". Most of the members of this circle, and Adler in particular, were followers of Mach, and it was in discussions with them that Einstein developed his own dialectical synthesis of conventional atomic theory and Mach's "relativism". According to Feuer, Einstein was an outright atheist at this time but later became a believer in "cosmic religion" when he decided that the revolutionary movement in Europe was doomed to failure. But although Einstein was a great diplomat, he never abandoned his youthful socialist opinions. In 1949 he contributed an article, "Why Socialism?", to the American Marxist periodical, *Monthly Review*. It was later reprinted in a collection of his essays, *Ideas And Opinions*. After listing the flaws of the capitalist system, he concluded on page 158 that "there is only *one* way to eliminate these grave evils, namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals."

Einstein was also a lifelong supporter of the Zionist movement and visited the land of Israel in 1923. In a speech he gave there, cited by Clark on page 393, Einstein said:

Hitherto I have always found something to regret in the Jewish soul, and that is the forgetfulness of its own people - forgetfulness of its being almost. Today I have been made happy by the sight of the Jewish people learning to recognize themselves and to make themselves recognized as a force in the world. This is a great age, the age of the liberation of the Jewish soul; and it has been accomplished through the Zionist movement, so that no one in the world will be able to destroy it.

Another controversial opinion upheld by Einstein was belief in world government. As Clark notes on page 587, after the United States exploded the first atom bombs in 1945, Einstein called on the United States government to voluntarily hand over the secret of the atom bomb to a world government which would be jointly established together with the Soviet Union. Einstein's socialist, Zionist and internationalist views were naturally condemned by many, but such was his stature in the world of science that his radical opinions came to be seen as just another facet of his eccentric genius.

In fact, in the decades following Einstein's death in 1955, there emerged a whole literature praising him as the author of a great "revolution in science". Most of this literature was inspired by a book published in 1962 by Thomas Kuhn entitled *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Kuhn, who was Jewish, used the example of Einstein to argue that science progressed mainly through revolutions, or as he put it on page 12, "the successive transition from one paradigm to another via revolution is the usual developmental pattern of mature science". Kuhn went to some lengths to prove that Einstein did not merely improve on Newtonian physics but actually overthrew Newton. He concluded on page 98: "Einstein's theory can be accepted only with the recognition that Newton's was wrong." Kuhn added on page 102:

This need to change the meaning of established and familiar concepts is central to the revolutionary impact of Einstein's theory. Though subtler than the changes from geocentrism to heliocentrism, from phlogiston to oxygen, or from corpuscles to waves, the resulting conceptual transformation is no less decisively destructive of a previously established paradigm. We may even come to see it as a prototype for revolutionary reorientations in the sciences.

In short, Kuhn not only portrayed Einstein as a scientific revolutionary but argued that the typical, normal and desirable mode of progress in science was through the impact of such scientific revolutionaries.

These arguments were subsequently taken up by a number of other writers, including I. Bernard Cohen in *Revolution In Science*. Cohen asserted on page 19 that in science, "revolutionary activity has been institutionalized", adding:

It is a curious paradox that conservative societies (and all highly organized and institutionalized societies must be essentially conservative in the sense of being self-preserving) not only tolerate revolutionary activity in the sciences to a degree that is simply not the case for any other form of intellectual or artistic creative effort, but even encourage it.

On page 20, Cohen noted that the reason for the encouragement of "revolutionary activity" in the sciences was "the constant expectation of practical benefits". Like Kuhn, Cohen saw Einstein as the leading example of a scientific revolutionary,

stating on page 435 that "the relativity revolution has become the archetypical revolution in science for many historians, philosophers, sociologists and scientists". But if Einstein had not also been a Jewish radical, would his theories still be considered quite so revolutionary? It would seem that it was the combination of Einstein's radical social and political views with his innovative scientific approach which made him appear in retrospect as the author of the "relativity revolution".

Moreover, if there really was a "relativity revolution", then it began at the end of July in 1939 when Einstein, at the urging of a close friend of his named Leo Szilard, agreed to send a letter to Roosevelt recommending that the United States government fund a project to develop an atom bomb. According to Richard Rhodes on page 28 of *The Making Of The Atomic Bomb*, Szilard had been conscious since the early 1930s of the explosive possibilities of nuclear fission. He had stated in 1933:

In certain circumstances it might be possible to set up a nuclear chain reaction, liberate energy on an industrial scale and construct atomic bombs.

Szilard too was a Jewish radical who was placed under constant surveillance by US military intelligence during World War 2. Rhodes, on page 506, cites the following revealing passage from the US Army's secret file on Szilard:

The surveillance reports indicate that subject is of Jewish extraction, has a fondness for delicacies and frequently makes purchases in delicatessen stores, usually eats his breakfast in drug stores and other meals in restaurants, walks a great deal when he cannot secure a taxi, usually is shaved in a barber shop, speaks occasionally in a foreign tongue, and associates mostly with people of Jewish extraction.

Among Szilard's Jewish associates were many of the scientists who built the atom bomb for the United States during World War 2. Szilard himself was considered so radical that he was eventually barred from working on the project. Rhodes on page 304 cites the military overseer of the atom bomb project, General Groves, describing Szilard as "the kind of man that any employer would have fired as a troublemaker". As for Einstein, he was denied security clearance by the United States government right from the start. Nonetheless the bomb was built by the friends, students and colleagues of Einstein and Szilard.

Just how radical was the clique of largely Jewish scientists who built the first atom bombs is shown by the political background of the man whom Groves finally chose to head the project, J. Robert Oppenheimer. As Rhodes notes on page 448, Oppenheimer was appointed by Groves despite the fact that US military intelligence had "adamantly refused to clear someone whose former fiancée, wife, brother and sister-in-law had all been members of the Communist Party". Denise Royal, on page 70 of *The Story of J. Robert Oppenheimer*, admits that Oppenheimer had been a "fellow traveler" in Communist circles during the 1930s. He was "sympathetic to the Communist cause", Royal states, mainly because he saw the Communists as the main foes of the Nazis. It was with the openly avowed intention of making the atom bomb available for use on the Nazis that Jewish radical scientists like Einstein, Szilard and Oppenheimer sought the backing of the United States government for an atom bomb project. In fact, as Robert Jungk brings out on page 194 of *Brighter Than A Thousand Suns*, the man who devised the mechanism that actually caused the bomb to explode was a Jewish scientist named Louis Slotin, who had fought in the Spanish Civil War and then volunteered for the British air force just in order to fight the Nazis.

From the moment that it became clear that the bomb would not be ready in time to use against the Nazis, Szilard and his friends mounted an organized campaign to prevent its use against Japan. But it was just at this point that the "relativity revolution" came up against the inherent limits of radicalism in science. In order to build the bomb, it was necessary to gain the support of the United States government; but once the bomb was built, the scientists who had created it immediately lost control over it. Their subsequent attempts to influence United States government policy concerning atomic weapons proved almost completely ineffective. Indeed, when Oppenheimer in the late 1940s did not appear sufficiently enthusiastic about plans to build an even more destructive hydrogen bomb, he was punished by having his security clearance revoked at the end of 1953. By that time, the United States government had succeeded in finding a Jewish scientist, in the person of Edward Teller, who did not hold left wing political opinions and was eager to build a hydrogen bomb to intimidate the Communists. In short, although Jewish radicals basically invented the atom bomb, they were not able to maintain control over either the subsequent development of atomic weaponry or the political decisions regarding how such weapons were to be used.

In retrospect it would seem that the main accomplishment of the Jewish radicals who built the bomb was to open the way for a massive movement of Jews into the scientific profession, particularly in the United States. However, the clique of atomic physicists around Einstein and Szilard was not the only group of Jewish radical scientists who contributed to the United States war effort during World War 2. Another such group was assembled by Isidor Rabi, who was in charge of the development of radar. John Rigden, on page 160 of *Rabi: Scientist and Citizen*, states that the radar equipment developed by Rabi's team "had broken the back of the German submarine offensive" during the war. Rabi became a socialist and an atheist while in high school in Brooklyn; he gave his Bar Mitzvah speech in Yiddish on the topic, "How The Electric Light Works". Although he later moderated his socialist views, he remained strongly Jewish identified throughout his career. Rigden cites him on page 21 as follows:

There's no question that basically, somewhere way down, I'm an Orthodox Jew. In fact, to this very day, if you ask for my religion, I say 'Orthodox Hebrew' - in the sense that the church I'm not attending is that one.

In 1954 at the height of the "red scare", Rabi testified on Oppenheimer's behalf at hearings held to review the latter's security clearance. He dared to do so because by this time the position of Jewish radicals in the

American scientific profession had become relatively secure. They had produced results, and their employers understood if they did not that control of these results was not likely to remain in their hands.

The Open Conspiracy

But many Jewish radicals in the sciences were not willing to surrender control over the fruits of their labors without a struggle. They reasoned that if the scientific community could organize itself sufficiently, it would be able to force the government or private employers to listen to them. The main advocate of this point of view was Leo Szilard, who was the moving spirit behind the formation of an organization called the Federation of Atomic Scientists after World War 2. In private, Szilard referred to the clique of scientists who had built the bomb as “the Bund”, and in public he called upon them to stick together and not let the government push them around. Rhodes, on page 21 of *The Making Of The Atomic Bomb*, cites a “document” which Szilard once wrote defining “the Bund” as “a closely knit group of people whose inner bond is pervaded by a religious and scientific spirit”. Szilard speculated that “the Bund” might “take over a more direct influence on public affairs as part of the political system, next to government and parliament, or in the place of government and parliament”.

These remarks read like a passage from *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, and in fact Szilard himself was fond of using the term, “the open conspiracy”, to describe his notion of how scientists should function as a group. According to Rhodes on page 14, Szilard appropriated this term from a book by H.G. Wells which described “a public collusion of science-minded industrialists and financiers to establish a world republic”. Szilard too was a believer in world government, as was Einstein. And Einstein also favored organizing scientists to fight for radical political objectives. On page 180 of *Out of My Later Years*, he called for the formation of “an organization of intellectual workers” to “fight for the establishment of a supranational political force as a protection against fresh wars of aggression.” The Federation of Atomic Scientists was intended to be such a group, but its actual achievements fell far short of the grandiose ambitions of Szilard and Einstein. However, it could be argued that “the Bund” did play a certain role in consolidating United States support for the formation of the United Nations, which did constitute a world government of sorts.

In England, efforts by Jewish radical scientists to organize scientists as a group went back to the 1920s. The initiative for these efforts came primarily from a relatively obscure mathematician and physicist named Hyman Levy. Levy came from a working class background and grew up in the Jewish immigrant slums of Edinburgh. His parents spoke Yiddish and were active Zionists; Levy experienced “intermittent persecution” from “young ruffians” as “a Jew of foreign parentage”, notes Gary Wersky on page 45 of *The Visible College*. Through scholarships, Levy was able to become a scientist, and during World War 1 he did aerodynamic research for the British air force. But at the same time he became a socialist, and due in large part to his working class background, began a lifelong struggle to unionize his fellow scientists.

In the 1920s Levy helped to organize the National Union of Scientific Workers and also formed a Science Advisory Group for the British Labor Party. Wersky on page 124 cites the following description by Levy of the goals of his advisory committee:

The objective the committee had in mind was the creation of new industries directly under government aegis and control, from which elements of private profits had to be eliminated from the start, except in so far as they depended on subsidiary undertakings already established.

Presumably the technology for the new, socialized industries was to be provided by the scientists whom Levy had unionized. But in 1930, Levy lost patience with the cautious attitude of the Labor Party and became a member of the British Communist Party. At the same time, notes Wersky on page 127, “he inched his way towards the view that social needs might enter into the very construction of scientific theories”. This perception fit in with the growing popularity of Marxism in British scientific circles in the 1930s. A number of prestigious British scientists, including J.D. Bernal, J.B.S. Haldane and Joseph Needham, began to write at this time on the history and development of science from a Marxist perspective. Levy was not viewed as an original thinker in this field, but rather as “the scientific Left’s prototypical activist”, as Wersky describes him on page 172. He created the organizational framework within which the British Marxist scientists worked. During the 1930s, this took the form of the Association of Scientific Workers, which was linked to the British Communist Party but nonetheless had attracted a membership of some 11,000 scientists and technicians by

the time of World War 2.

Levy remained an influential figure in British scientific circles after the war but was increasingly troubled by reports of growing anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Levy's reaction to the revelations of the Khrushchev era is described by Wersky on page 310 as follows:

Levy was especially shocked by the admission of a widespread persecution of Soviet Jewry between 1948 and 1952. Leaving aside his own Jewish origins, he took this crime personally to heart because of the many times he had mounted a Communist platform to attack anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany and deny its existence in the U.S.S.R. Levy made his feelings known to the British party's leadership, who in turn authorized him to investigate these charges as part of a wider inquiry into the cult of the individual.

Levy visited the Soviet Union in 1956 and then issued a report in 1957 stating that crimes against Soviet Jews had in fact been committed by the Soviet leadership. But although Levy's report had been requested by the British Communist Party, he was violently attacked for issuing it and expelled from the party in 1958. By this point, Marxism had gone out of fashion in British scientific circles, due at least in part to the dogmatic and unscientific attitudes foisted upon the Soviet scientific establishment by Stalin in his later years.

Yet another approach to the politics of science was attempted by the American Jewish mathematician, Norbert Wiener, who played a key role in the development of the computer. Wiener was friendly with Levy and the British Marxist scientists, as Wersky brings out on page 48, but he was not attracted by Communism. On page 220 of his autobiography, *I Am A Mathematician*, Wiener explained that he was hostile to dogmatism in any form:

From the very beginning I had been repelled by the totalitarianism of the Communists, even as I have always been repelled by the whole apparatus of orthodoxy and conversion in whatever religion it might occur.

All the same, during the 1930s Wiener supported the cause of the Spanish Republic and publicly lobbied for United States aid to the Communists in China, a country where he had studied for a year in 1935. Moreover, although Wiener published his autobiography in 1956 at the height of the Cold War, he nonetheless argued on page 219 that for many "young men" of his generation, support for Communism in the 1930s "was an important stage in their moral growing up". He added:

It taught them not to take out their grievances against the world in mere sulking but to try to do something of public benefit. This habit of active participation in moral issues has long outlived the period when they believed in Communism.

Although perhaps not precisely a radical, Wiener was an atheist and internationalist who was equally repelled by Communism and anti-Communism.

His feelings about being Jewish were also complicated and ambivalent. On page 20 of *I Am A Mathematician*, he revealed that his mother, "unlike my father", bitterly "resented being a Jew". She "made many uncomplimentary remarks concerning the Jews" and viewed being Jewish as "a source of shame". Wiener felt that his mother's attitude created in him "a sense of inferiority". He later married a non-Jewish German woman but retained a sentimental feeling for Jewishness. On page 215 he wrote:

There are passages from Heine, especially in his *Disputations* and his *Prinzessin Sabbath*, that relate and express the religious exaltation of the Jew, which I cannot recite without tears.

Wiener's suppressed but powerful sense of Jewishness was perhaps reflected in his internationalist outlook. He was unusual among Western scientists in that he made extended visits to a number of non-European countries, including China, Mexico and India. On page 207, he offered the following assessment of the impact of their stay in China on his children:

They were starting their lives with the enormous moral advantage of seeing the world as a whole and not merely as an interplay of master races and servant races.

Wiener also credited a Chinese mathematician named Lee for helping him to devise the binary system on which the first computers were based.

Wiener worked on developing an electronic binary computing machine during the 1930s and 1940s, laying the foundations for the development of the modern computer. Convinced by the late 1940s that computers were the wave of the future, Wiener began at that time to concern himself with the question of how they would be used. To this end he invented the concept of “cybernetics”, a term which he coined, which is now defined by *The Random House Dictionary* as “the study of human-control functions and of mechanical and electric systems designed to replace them”. Wiener’s idea was to create public awareness of the need for a planned transition from human to mechanical control functions. His book, *Cybernetics*, became a scientific bestseller, making Wiener “something of a public figure”, as he described himself on page 332 of his autobiography. At the same time, Wiener approached the United Automobile Workers, one of the more radical CIO unions, and asked them to help him work out a plan for the phased introduction of automatation into the auto industry so that layoffs of auto workers could be avoided. These efforts on Wiener’s part did help to make many people aware of the potential impact of computers on American industry and society, but their practical effect in terms of government or corporate policy was not very great.

Contrary to the opinion of the conspiracy theorists, whether Jewish or non-Jewish, a small group of people, however erudite, can do little to shape the course of history unless they are already in power. The only successful conspiracies are those launched by government, corporate or military leaders, who normally meet behind closed doors in any case and are in a position to implement secret decisions by giving orders to large numbers of people. Scientists can certainly have an impact on the course of events with their inventions and discoveries, but precisely how those inventions and discoveries will be used is rarely decided by the scientists themselves. Yet although the attempts of Jewish radical scientists to influence public policy have not proved very successful, this does not necessarily mean that such attempts are doomed to failure in the future. As experience has shown, everything depends on how wide an audience the scientists can reach with their views concerning the correct application of their discoveries. Past attempts to politicize scientific and technological issues have not succeeded very well primarily because of the great gap which now exists between modern scientific thought and the level of scientific understanding of the general public. This gap will not be closed through education alone, but only through a change in the social and organizational relations between scientists and ordinary workers. The best way of bringing about such a change, as many Jewish radical scientists have already recognized, is through the concept of the union.

The Union

Under the influence of Jewish radicals like Hyman Levy in England and Leo Szilard in the United States, unions of scientific workers have already demonstrated a certain capacity to politicize scientific and technological issues. However, in order to actually shape public policy, scientists will also need to break down the barriers which currently separate them from the rest of the labor force. This is not a question of diplomacy but of a radical redefinition of the relationship between science and the labor process in general. The Yiddish labor poet Yossef Bovshover, cited by Melech Epstein on page 294 of *Jewish Labor in U.S.A.*, pointed to such a redefinition in the following poem, first published in 1897:

When mankind shall wax more wise
And no more believe in lies;
When the weakling shall be strong
To avenge each galling wrong,
And the slave shall tear in twain
The degrading, loathsome chain;
When the mighty shall be just
And the hateful sword shall rust;
When the workman and the sage
Shall as equals serve their age;
When the false shall be despised
And the truth of nature prized:
Then the needy and forlorn
I will gladden with my horn;
And their woes I will efface
Blessing all the human race.

On the one hand, Bovshover advocated relations of equality between “the workman” and “the sage”; on

the other, he also commended to all concerned an attitude of respect for “the truth of nature”. Scientific understanding of “the truth of nature” contains a virtually unlimited potential for enhancing human life on this planet; but in order for this potential to be realized, scientific understanding has to be popularized and democratized. This requires not only mutual respect between scientists and production workers but also a recognition of the close relationship between science, technology and the labor process as a whole.

It was precisely among Jewish radical scientists that the links between science, technology and labor were most clearly recognized. Contrary to his image as a pure scientist, Einstein was constantly tinkering with inventions; he and Szilard applied for numerous patents on various processes they had invented. Indeed, before he became a famous scientist, Einstein worked in the Swiss Patent Office, reviewing applications for patents. And Szilard, as Rhodes reveals on page 214, actually filed for a patent on the chain reaction process with the British Patent Office in 1934, stating: “I can produce an explosion.” Likewise, Wiener on page 168 of *I Am A Mathematician* contrasts his own approach to mathematical problems with the “pure mathematics” favored by his British colleagues:

In many problems which we undertook, I saw, as was my habit, a physical and even an engineering application, and my sense of this often determined the images I formed and the tools by which I sought to solve my problems.

And Wersky, on page 119, sees a major reason for Levy’s decision to become a scientific trade unionist in the disdain with which his mathematical research was greeted by those same British advocates of “pure mathematics”:

Compared with this rarefied approach of the dominant Cambridge school, Levy’s own field of aerodynamics, as well as his emphasis on numerical methods, was distinctly mundane and unfashionable. Hence the likelihood of his being recognized as a *real* mathematician, as opposed to some kind of glorified accountant with scientific pretensions, was not great.

Needless to say, the British cult of “pure mathematics” reflected the upper class background of many British scientists, while Levy’s orientation towards technology and labor reflected his own working class background.

But Levy’s career also reflected the respect for science and scientific knowledge characteristic of Jewish working class circles. While many trade unionists have attempted to oppose the introduction of new technology on the grounds that it can cause unemployment, Jewish trade unionists have tended to accept technological progress as a basis for the reduction of the work week. For example, Sam Liptzin on page 272 of *Tales of a Tailor* argues that the work week could easily be cut to 4 hours a day on the basis of new technology:

But that day will not come of itself. Man’s hands must set the clock of time, wind it, and fix the alarm, so that it will properly sound the signal which will rouse humanity to the rising sun of our bright tomorrow.

Liptzin was a long time activist in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union. A similar position was adopted by the United Automobile Workers under the influence of Norbert Wiener. But in practice, efforts by union activists to introduce a shorter work week on the basis of new technology have been frustrated by the demands of the capitalist system, which finds it much more expedient to force some workers to work overtime while others stand on unemployment lines.

Mutual respect between Jewish scientists and Jewish workers was ultimately rooted in the central place of the skilled crafts in the history of Jewish society. Particularly in the Diaspora, Jewish artisans frequently specialized in crafts requiring a considerable degree of scientific and technical knowledge. One such craft was metal working; another was glass blowing. Many of the scientific instruments used by early European astronomers, explorers and scientists were built by Jewish craftsmen. In the craft tradition, there were no clear divisions between science, technology and the labor process. Likewise, the famous Jewish love of knowledge was not merely an intellectual attitude but had a craft basis in the form of the production of written material, first by hand and then by printing. Jews were among the first printers in early modern Europe and have continued to play a key role in the publishing industry to the present day.

It is within the framework of the trade union movement that the traditional Jewish amalgam of science, technology and labor is most likely to be perpetuated. Respect for labor is the central idea of trade unionism, but in order to survive, trade unions also need to compete with management in the sphere of scientific and

technical planning. Moreover, as experience has shown, it does little good to reduce the hours of labor in one industry if the rest of society is still running on a different schedule. Reforms introduced into one industry have either to be extended to other industries or else they will be gradually cut back and eliminated. Rational scientific and technical planning, in order to be effective, must ultimately be instituted on the level of society as a whole. As Jewish radical scientists like Einstein and Levy recognized, the logical outgrowth of efforts by scientists to influence public policy would be the institution of a system of democratically controlled centralized planning of scientific and technological progress - in a word, socialism.

However, as Einstein also recognized, even socialism in one country is not a realistic goal. A democratic, progressive socialist system is not likely to be instituted in the United States while the United States maintains an imperialistic, autocratic relationship with much of the rest of the world. Only in a predominantly socialist world would it be possible to extend the benefits of science and technology from a few wealthy nations to the entire human race. Politicization of scientific and technical issues therefore implies the ability to seek global solutions to global problems, to plan equitably for the future of all and to treat the human race as a single entity inhabiting a single place. As Einstein said, it implies world government, or more precisely, world socialism. It is in the direction of the advocacy of world socialism that the future of Jewish radicalism is to be found.

But it is at just this point that the Jewish radical movement of modern times has come up against a profound contradiction. During the past 50 years or so, Jewish radicalism has been prevented from exercising a significant influence on a world scale by the tremendous weight of hostility that has been directed against Israel. Jewish radicals have been placed in a position where in order to be heard at all on the international level, they have been compelled to disassociate themselves from the Jewish nation. Yet this Jewish nation is one of the few countries in the entire world that has maintained a democratic socialist system ever since it was founded. Jewish radicals should be able to point with pride to Israel as a shining example of the possibilities for economic and social development inherent in a democratic socialist system. Until we are able to do so, it is not likely that our voices will carry much weight as advocates of world socialism. What is it that has prevented us from championing Israeli socialism? Is it the fault of Israel, or the fault of the enemies of Israel? These enemies say they believe in justice: well then, let them have it.

Chapter Ten: Justice

Of all the secular reformulations of the Jewish Messianic tradition, the belief in justice is undoubtedly the one which is closest to remaining a religious ideal. In real life, justice is often hard to achieve. Sometimes the wicked prosper while the good die young. To continue to believe in justice in the face of injustice requires a certain degree of faith, which imbues even the most secular movement for justice with a distinct religious tone.

But although belief in justice may have its religious side, it also has a scientific side. Although individuals may frequently escape justice in their own lifetime, wrong actions consistently pursued over time do eventually generate a corrective reaction. Grievances build up, resentment accumulates and sooner or later a reaction sets in. Conversely, good deeds, even if not immediately rewarded, do create a foundation for future benefits. In general, the larger the time frame, the more real justice appears.

In the entire history of the human race, there is possibly no better example of justice over time than the rebirth of the state of Israel after 2000 years of exile and persecution. Throughout the centuries, the Jewish people was sustained by a belief in the justice of its cause, and in the fullness of time this belief was vindicated. But who wants to wait 2000 years for justice? To see the birth of Israel as a shining example of the triumph of justice is also to admit the possibility that justice, even if inevitable, may be long delayed. Reluctance to accept this possibility is undoubtedly one of the main reasons why so many oppressed peoples in the world today have found it difficult to recognize the cause of Israel as their own.

There are exceptions. Vine Deloria, a spokesman for the American Indian movement, stated on page 262 of *God Is Red*:

The closest parallel that we find in history to the present condition of Indians is the Diaspora of the Jews following the destruction of the temple.

But for the most part, oppressed peoples have found it easier to identify with the Arabs, a large and powerful group, whose victory over the dread Zionists can easily be imagined to be imminent. Would they still identify with the Arabs if they thought the Arabs would have to wait 2000 years for victory? Of course not. They begin by identifying with what they perceive as the likely winning side, and then proceed to rationalize this choice by depicting the Israelis as oppressors and the Arabs as oppressed.

Is this approach just? It is true that Israel has oppressed the Arabs in the occupied territories, but did not the Arabs oppress the Jews throughout the Middle East for many centuries prior to this time? Something like half of the population of Israel is descended from Jews who lived in Arab lands prior to the birth of Israel and who suffered from pogroms, ghettoization and constant humiliation at the hands of their Arab neighbors, not just for a few decades but for over 1000 years. Oppressed peoples around the world could easily identify with these Jews from Arab lands but for the most part they ignore their very existence simply because the Jews as a group are still perceived as likely losers. Far from reflecting a belief in justice, the tendency of oppressed peoples to identify with the Arabs reflects just the opposite, a faith in the numbers, wealth and power of the Arab majority in the Middle East.

That "Third World" hostility to Israel is not really caused by anything the Israelis have done to the Arabs is shown by the fact that this hostility already existed long before Israel was in a position to oppress anyone. For example, in the late 1930s, on the eve of the Holocaust, Gandhi, the leader of the movement for Indian independence, warned the Jews of Europe not to attempt to flee from Hitler to the land of Israel. Aubrey Hodes, on page 170 of *Martin Buber*, states:

On November 26, 1938, Gandhi published an article in his journal *Harijan* criticizing the Jewish reaction to Hitler's persecution and the Zionist attitude toward the Arabs. Gandhi urged the Jews of Germany to launch a campaign of passive resistance against the Nazis, rather than flee to Palestine and try to establish a Jewish homeland there against the will of the Arabs.

Gandhi also argued in his article that "Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English, or France to the French. It would be wrong and inhuman to impose the Jews on the Arabs." The issue for Gandhi was not so much that the Jews would oppress the Arabs but that their mere physical presence would be an imposition.

In order to rationalize his complete inability to identify with the situation of the Jews, Gandhi urged them to set an example of non-violent resistance to Hitler. He actually stated, with reference to the Jews of Europe, that “if someone of courage and vision can arise among them to lead them in nonviolent action”, then “what has today become a degrading manhunt can be turned into a calm and determined stand offered by unarmed men and women possessing the strength of suffering given to them by Jehovah.” Martin Buber, a Zionist admirer of Gandhi, was so embarrassed by this assault that he wrote a reply, which appears in *The Writings of Martin Buber*, edited by Will Herberg. Buber, on page 286, expressed his desire to live in peace with the Arabs:

The Jewish farmers have begun to teach their brothers, the Arab farmers, to cultivate the land more intensively; we desire to teach them further. Together with them, we want to cultivate the land - to `serve' it, as the Hebrew has it. The more fertile this soil becomes, the more space there will be for us and for them. We have no desire to dispossess them; we want to live with them.

And in fact, prior to 1948, there was not one single instance of the forcible appropriation of Arab land by Jewish settlers. The Jews in 1938 were still largely unarmed and helpless in the face of both Nazi and Arab attacks, but Gandhi cared nothing for their fate, not because of anything they had done, but because he cared more for the good will of the Arabs and Muslims.

Gandhi's attitude, like that of most “Third World” leaders both then and now, was ultimately a reflection of the bitter hostility of the Arabs to the Zionist movement. This hostility began long before the Israelis were in a position to make war on the Arabs and was motivated by the feeling that the Jews had no right to the land of Israel. Contrary to the impression created by anti-Zionist propagandists, most Zionist leaders were well aware of the Arab attitude and eager to negotiate some kind of compromise with the Arab leaders. David Ben-Gurion, in *My Talks With Arab Leaders*, provides a detailed picture of the unsuccessful negotiations he conducted during the 1930s with a view to developing an alliance with the Arabs against the British. On page 20, Ben-Gurion cites the offer which he made in 1934 to Auni Abdul Hadi, leader of the Arab nationalist group Istiqlal:

The goal of the Arab people was independence, and the unity of all Arab countries. If the Arabs agreed to our return to our land, we would help them with our political, financial and moral support to bring about the rebirth and unity of the Arab people.

But Ben-Gurion's offer was rejected, as were his other attempts at reaching some kind of understanding with the Arabs. On page 96, Ben-Gurion cites Musa Alami, another Arab leader, who responded to Ben-Gurion's proposals with the following sarcastic paraphrase of Ben-Gurion's position:

You give us all we ask for now and in return we shall at some future date, which might never arrive, help you in the matter of an Arab Confederation.

For Alami, the question of whether the Jews actually had a right to return to their ancient homeland did not even arise; the only question was whether the Arabs would permit them to do so, and the answer was no. When the Jews subsequently took by force what they had always claimed by right, the Arabs then responded by depicting them as ruthless oppressors.

Within the Zionist movement, there was always a substantial minority who favored what they called a “bi-national” solution to the dispute between Jews and Arabs. They rejected the idea of a Jewish state and called for the establishment of some kind of political entity that would recognize both Jewish and Arab nationality as legitimate. From the 1920s onwards, advocates of this position sought in vain for Arab partners who would recognize the legitimacy of Jewish settlement in the land of Israel in return for Jewish acceptance of a bi-national state. In fact, to this day it is difficult to find even a single Arab leader of any prominence who has actually come out and said that Jews have a right to live in the land of Israel. Some Arabs have been forced to recognize the existence of Israel as a fact, but not even a small minority openly admit the justice of the Jewish cause.

The Arab rejection of a Jewish right to the land of Israel is based on the fact that for over 1000 years, from the time of the Arab conquest to the 20th century, the Arabs constituted the dominant ethnic group in the territory which they now call Palestine. Their position, assumed more often than articulated, is that whatever rights the Jews may have once had to the land were abrogated during this long period of time. But since the Jews

never gave up their claim to the land, who is to judge whether the Arab stance is just? Since both claims are based on the right of national self-determination, how can the issue be settled except by force? The obvious answer is that control of the land of Israel is not necessary for the self-determination of the Arab nation, but it is necessary for the self-determination of the Jewish nation. A large, powerful and united Arab nation could easily arise in the Middle East even without control of the land of Israel, while long centuries of persecution and flight have shown that there is no future for a Jewish nation on any other territory save for the original homeland of the Jewish people. If the principle of national self-determination is to apply to small nations as well as large ones, then the large nations must be willing to accept the existence of small nations, even if they may have some kind of historic claim to their territory. Only in this way can the principle of national self-determination be extended to all nations, including small nations who live in the shadow of large and powerful neighbors.

So obvious is this principle that during the course of the 20th century, the Arab foes of Zionism more or less invented a small nation called Palestine in whose name their claims to the land of Israel came to be formulated. Although the Palestinians themselves have repeatedly proclaimed their devotion to the cause of Arab unity, their supporters around the world have grown accustomed to thinking of them of a small, weak nation whose right of national self-determination requires the destruction of Israel. This concept of Palestine as the negation of Israel is not new: it goes back to the 2nd century CE, when the Roman Caesar Hadrian officially proclaimed Palestine to be the new name of the territory which the Romans themselves had previously called Judea, meaning Judah. Hadrian issued this proclamation at the end of the Second Jewish War, during the course of which the Romans had massacred some 600,000 Jews by their own account. Hadrian took the name Palestine from the name Philistia, an expression which was sometimes used for the coast of the land of Israel in memory of the ancient Philistines who had once lived there. Since the Philistines were known to have been enemies of the Jews, Hadrian's decision to name the land of Israel after them had the same meaning as calling it Palestine today - it was and is a way of saying that it is not Jewish.

Prior to the 20th century, this usage was much more common among Christian Europeans than it was among Muslim Arabs. It was primarily the British who popularized the term Palestine among the Arabs by using it as their name for the land of Israel when they seized it from the Turks during World War I. In fact, so close was the link between the British and the Arab concept of Palestine that the British actually designed the flag from which the modern Palestinian flag is derived. This revealing detail is brought out on page 315 of *A Peace To End All Peace* by David Frumkin in the course of his description of the British general Allenby's efforts to enlist Arab support for his campaign against the Turks during World War I:

Allenby was an Allied commander, and his armies were prepared to advance under many flags. Among their banners was one designed by Sir Mark Sykes for Hussein and the Arab cause. Its colors - black, white, green, and red - were meant to symbolize the past glory of Moslem Arab empires and to suggest that Hussein was their contemporary champion. Hussein's only modification of the design was to change the hue of the red. Sykes had ordered flags to be made up by the British military supply offices in Egypt, and then had them delivered to the Hejaz forces.

The Arabs accepted the British concept of Palestine, despite its Roman and European origins, because it implied that the land was not Jewish. It also implied that the land was part of some larger empire, for at no time had there ever been an independent country named Palestine. The British saw it as part of their empire, the Arabs as part of theirs, but once the Jews got control of it the Arabs put more and more emphasis on the concept of an independent Palestine as a convenient antithesis to an independent Israel.

Even if this independent Arab Palestine were to come into being, the Palestinians themselves have often stated that it would be only a matter of time before it became a part of a larger Arab nation. Indeed, it is the position of both the Palestinians and their Arab backers that the destruction of Israel will provide just the impetus which is needed for the establishment of this larger Arab nation. This doctrine has long been accepted as an article of faith throughout the Arab world, and yet even from the Arab point of view it is open to serious question. It was not the Zionists but the European colonialists who divided up the Arab world into a number of small states, and it is the various imperialist powers around the world today who have the strongest vested interest in preventing the Arabs from unifying. No doubt a united Arab nation would constitute a great threat to Israel, but this did not prevent Ben-Gurion from offering to support the cause of Arab unity in the 1930s. Despite everything that has happened since, an Arab nation united on a democratic and secular foundation might still prove more accepting of Jewish nationality than the existing dictatorial or theocratic regimes. In

any case, mutual recognition of the legitimacy of Jewish and Arab national aspirations constitutes the only principled basis for the resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

After a long struggle, the principle of national self-determination has been generally recognized as a necessary component of a peaceful world. It is the one principle that is accepted by liberals, democrats, socialists and communists alike, that is enshrined in the concept of the United Nations, that made possible the wartime Grand Alliance against the Nazis. But although almost all nations today pay lip service to this ideal, it is far from having been realized in practice. There are many nations around the world today who still do not exercise sovereignty over their historic territory, whose very existence as a nation is constantly called into question. It is inherent in the nature of large nations to seek to absorb small nations, often in the name of some so-called “universalist” creed, such as Christianity, Islam or Marxism. Small nations will not be preserved by others; if they wish to survive, they themselves must determine to do so. That is the true meaning of national self-determination: surviving as a nation in the face of all odds. For all those nations in the world whose existence is still in doubt, there can be no more inspiring or positive example than the historic struggle of the Jewish people for national self-determination. Moreover, it is this struggle which created the basis for modern Jewish radicalism. It was the Jewish effort to survive as a nation which made it possible for individual Jews in modern times to adopt an independent, critical stance relative to European and American culture. Whether consciously or unconsciously, modern Jewish radicals sought to transform European and American society in line with the traditional values, laws and beliefs of the Jewish nation. But just because it has played such a revolutionary role in world history, the Jewish nation has been written out of the pages of most history books. In order to recognize the justice of the Israeli cause, it is first necessary to recognize the justice of the 3000 year long struggle of the Jewish people for national self-determination.

The Jewish Nation

In place of the Jewish nation, most history books have substituted an entity called “the Jews”, by which is usually meant a wandering tribe of some kind held together by religious beliefs. But the term, “Jews”, was in its origins merely a slang expression for “Judeans”, meaning the people of the nation of Judah. Judah was a nation for 1000 years prior to its overthrow by the Romans. Throughout the period from the establishment of the kingdom of Judah around 1000 BCE to Hadrian’s proclamation of Palestine in 135 CE, the land of Israel was commonly known to its neighbors by some variant of the Hebrew word “Yehudah”, meaning Judah. This was true not only when Judah was an independent kingdom but also when it formed a part of the Persian, Greek or Roman empires. The Persians called it “Yahud”, the Greeks “Ioudaia”, the Romans “Judea”. No one referred to the land of Israel as Palestine until Hadrian deliberately adopted this name as part of his genocidal assault upon the nation of Judah.

Judah was the creation of the Habiru. The Habiru were bands of fugitive slaves and other runaways who congregated on the outskirts of the cities and towns of the Middle East during the 2nd millennium BCE. They are frequently mentioned in clay inscriptions dating from that time. There are specific references to Habiru being seized by the Egyptians in Canaan and brought to Egypt to work as slaves. It is evident that the Torah contains the semi-mythical history of the successful uprising and escape of these slaves from Egypt and their return to Canaan to establish a Habiru state there. It differed from other states in the Middle East largely because the Habiru had been fugitive slaves. Because they had known oppression and exploitation, they sought to institute principles of equality and justice in their laws. But however unusual their legal doctrines may have appeared, the Habiru were of the same nationality as the other Canaanites. The Hebrew language was no different from the spoken language of Canaan and the surrounding region, which was mainly at that time Amorite.

During the 1st millennium BCE, Amorite was gradually supplanted by Aramaic as the spoken and written language of the region which now includes the states of Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Iraq. The people of Judah also became predominantly Aramaic speaking but preserved the knowledge of both spoken and written Hebrew because the Torah and other early works were written in that language. In their physical appearance, dress and spoken language, however, the people of Judah did not greatly differ from the other Aramaic speaking peoples. Only because they still attempted to adhere to the laws of the Hebrews did the Judeans come to be regarded as somewhat different from their neighbors. They called their neighbors “Arameans”, while they called themselves, in Hebrew, “Yehudim”, a term now translated as “Jews”, but which literally

means “Judeans”.

Like all the other Middle Eastern peoples, the Judeans were eventually subjected to Roman rule. The Romans treated all their subjects harshly, but they were particularly cruel and vindictive in their relations with the Judeans because they associated Hebrew law with slave revolts. The Romans relied heavily on slave labor and imported literally millions of slaves into Italy to work in the fields and mines. They were aware that Hebrew law was basically hostile to the institution of slavery, and therefore sought to suppress all manifestations of Hebrew culture in Judah. When the Judeans rebelled against these policies, the Romans put down the uprising in a genocidal manner, killing over 1 million Judeans in the First Jewish War alone, which ended in 73 CE. This unprecedented act of mass murder gave rise to a widespread movement of sympathy with the martyred Judeans. Within the Roman empire itself, this movement assumed the form of a strange, cannibalistic cult of a martyred Jew, whose flesh and blood was eaten in effigy by the contrite but still bloodthirsty Romans. This same movement of sympathy expressed itself in a more positive way outside the Roman world in the form of a number of new kingdoms which sought to pattern themselves after the laws and culture of Judah. Kingdoms of this type were established in Ethiopia, Yemen and the coast of North Africa during the period from the 3rd to the 7th centuries CE. These kingdoms called themselves Jewish and many of their subjects called themselves Jews. In Ethiopia they spoke Ge'ez, in Yemen Arabic and in North Africa Berber.

From these kingdoms there eventually emerged communities of Ethiopian, Yemenite and North African Jews. Meanwhile, refugees from Judah, or Judeans who had emigrated even prior to the Roman invasions, formed Jewish communities in many parts of the Middle East and Europe. Prior to modern times, the largest of these communities were those in the Middle East, particularly in Iraq and Iran. From an ethnic point of view, the Jews remained a predominantly Middle Eastern people throughout the period from the overthrow of Judah down to the 18th or 19th century, when European Jews began to outnumber Middle Eastern Jews due to the general population increase in Europe resulting from scientific and technological advances. As a result of conversion or intermarriage, Jews everywhere came to physically resemble their neighbors, but Jews in Europe were constantly made aware of their Middle Eastern origin by the inordinate amount of attention paid by their neighbors to such physical features as a hooked nose or swarthy skin or tightly curled hair. Many European Jews retained a distinct Middle Eastern appearance right down to modern times, a fact which was seized upon by the Nazis, who invariably made Jews look Middle Eastern in their malicious caricatures.

Predominantly Middle Eastern in appearance prior to the 19th century, the Jewish people also remained strongly Middle Eastern in culture throughout its history. Not only did virtually all Jewish communities preserve the knowledge of Hebrew as a written and to some degree spoken language, but most educated Jews also knew some Aramaic. Jews living in the Middle East also spoke a variety of other Middle Eastern languages, including Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Amharic. The preservation of the knowledge of Aramaic by the Jewish people was particularly significant, for Aramaic had been the spoken language of the millions martyred by Rome during the era of the Jewish Wars. Much of the Talmud was written in Aramaic, as was the *Zohar*. As for Hebrew, the fact that it is today the written and spoken language of the nation of Israel is clear proof of the devotion of the Jewish people to its roots in the ancient kingdom of Judah. Hebrew could not have been revived as a spoken language in modern times were it not for the way in which each generation of Jews for some 2500 years perpetuated its memory in prayers, scriptures and written works of all kinds.

At the heart of the traditional Hebrew and Aramaic language culture of the Jewish people was the longing to return to the land of Israel and restore the Jewish nation that had been overthrown by the Romans. This longing was constantly expressed both in prayers and also in attempts by Jews in every generation to actually settle in the land of Israel and establish Jewish communities there. Contrary to the impression fostered by the enemies of Israel, these attempts were not confined to European Jews but were also made by Middle Eastern Jews. Most Messianic movements prior to modern times originated among Middle Eastern Jews, and Middle Eastern Jews also played an important role in the modern Zionist movement even prior to the mass influx of Jews from Arab lands into Israel after 1948. David Ben Gurion begins his account of the origins of modern Israel, on page 12 of *Israel: A Personal History*, with a description of the movement of Jews from Yemen to settle in the land of Israel, a movement which Ben-Gurion traces back to the 15th and 16th centuries. On page 13 Ben-Gurion states:

After the Turkish conquest in 1872 communication between Yemen and the land of Israel was eased. From 1882, the year of the Russian 'Bilu' Aliya, to 1884, Yemenite Jews arrived in Palestine in great numbers. By mid-1884 there were four hundred Yemenite immigrants in Jerusalem.

The fact that both European and Yemenite Jews had a common knowledge of Hebrew was an important factor in encouraging the “first wave” of Zionists in the 1880s to adopt Hebrew as their official language.

As the modern Zionist movement spread among Jews in the Middle East, it also began to generate many of the same radical attitudes as were common among Zionists from Europe. Nissim Rejwan, on page 230 of *The Jews of Iraq*, describes the youthful Zionist self-defense groups which took shape in the Jewish community of Iraq following the pro-Nazi pogroms of 1941 in Baghdad, in which some 135 Jews were murdered by Arab mobs. Rejwan observes that “the driving force behind these young men and women was not solely or even mainly ‘national’ but also social and personal.” He continues:

The liberation of the Jewish woman and ‘personal self-fulfilment’ were, perhaps, as strong a motive for youth as was national resurgence and the settlement of Palestine by Jews. As a matter of fact, precisely by engaging in clandestine collective activities of the kind the movement was conducting - Hebrew classes, military training and illegal emigration - they were already attaining some measure of women’s liberation and self fulfilment at least for themselves, since in all these activities young women were as prominent as young men.

Rejwan also brings out that some Iraqi Jews turned to Marxism at this time as an antidote to Iraqi fascism. They played a prominent role in the founding of the Iraqi Communist Party during the 1940s.

During this same period, the Middle Eastern roots of Jewish nationality were brought into sharp focus by the Holocaust. According to many memoirs of the time, it was almost impossible for Jews of pronounced Middle Eastern appearance to survive in Nazi occupied Europe. They could not pass as “Aryans”, and for the most part Europeans were much less willing to help them than they were to aid other Jews who looked more European. And in general, Jews who looked Middle Eastern seem to have had a particularly difficult time in Europe. It is clearly no accident that so many European Jewish radicals had Middle Eastern features of one kind or another. Marx had a “swarthy” complexion; he was called “the Moor” by his friends. Schechtman, on page 35 of Volume I of his biography of Jabotinsky, states that Jabotinsky had “a negroid profile and lips”. Herzl was often described as “Assyrian” in appearance. These Jews and many others like them were undoubtedly subjected to even more harassment than usual due to their physical appearance, and they responded by adopting attitudes even more radical than usual.

If the Jewish nation is viewed in terms of our entire history, then Middle Eastern is probably the most accurate term for this nation. In its origins, the Jewish nation was composed of Semites, meaning people who spoke a Semitic language, first Hebrew and then Aramaic. Following the overthrow of Judah by the Romans, the Jewish nation came to include people from many different national backgrounds, but it still remained predominantly Middle Eastern in ethnic composition until the 19th century. Today about half of the Israelis are descended from European Jews and half from Middle Eastern Jews. They speak Hebrew, the original language of the Jewish nation, and live in the land of Israel, the original homeland of the Jewish nation. Is there anyone in the world who can seriously doubt that the Middle Eastern nation of Israel is the product of a 2000 year struggle on the part of the entire Jewish people to reverse the verdict of the Jewish Wars and recreate the nation of Judah on a new and more progressive foundation? No one familiar with the facts can doubt this; the question is, does anyone care?

The Third World

Since the Romans were European colonialists, and since Israel came into being as the result of an armed uprising against the British colonialists, it would seem as if Israel might legitimately be regarded as a Third World nation. And in fact the first person to popularize the concept of “Third World” in the United States was a Jewish radical, Irving Louis Horowitz, who did think of Israel as a Third World nation. On page 229 of *Three Worlds of Development*, which Horowitz published in 1966, Horowitz included Mapai of Israel in a survey of the dominant political parties of the Third World. But in 1974 Horowitz published a collection of articles entitled, *Israeli Ecstasies, Jewish Agonies*, in which he drew attention to the increasingly violent rejection of Israel by the nations of the Third World. On page 7 Horowitz called it a “tragic fact” that the most virulent enemies of Israel were to be found among “the governments of the Soviet Union, China, and left-of-center Third World nations”. All the same Horowitz still felt, as he said on page 51, that Israel was “very much a part of the Third World, although it is hypocritically denied member status by many of the nations who

themselves employ Israel as a model of success in a world of neo-colonialism.”

As proof of the Third World character of Israel, Horowitz stressed not so much its Middle Eastern roots as its revolutionary outlook. As he put it on page 38:

Israel has a seriousness and a high-minded purpose that one associates with revolutionary regimes, such as present-day Cuba, rather than with well-established European civilizations.

Horowitz also compared Israel to Cuba on page 45, stating: “Israel, like Cuba, is a society in which there is a democracy of the gun.” And on page 54, Horowitz argued that Israel was “a left wing society” for “fundamental economic reasons: the vast redistribution of wealth in the country and the absence of a financial oligarchy that carries any political weight.” Horowitz also noted on page 51 that the Israelis “are constantly going to Africa, India, and other parts of Asia and offering themselves as a model, at least to any of the parts of the developing world willing to listen.” Horowitz observed that many Third World countries had in fact been influenced and also aided by Israel, but that the Third World as a bloc was increasingly unwilling to recognize its kinship and affinity with Israel.

In the same year that this book was published, Yasser Arafat was invited to address the United Nations, and one year later in 1975 the United Nations passed a resolution equating Zionism with racism. The bulk of the support for this resolution came from the nations of the Third World. For the next 16 years, until the “Zionism is racism” resolution was officially rescinded by the United Nations in 1991, a steady stream of anti-Israeli, pro-Palestinian resolutions emanated from the United Nations. Israelis were systematically excluded from UN committees and staff, and in 1977 the UN formed a “Special Unit on Palestinian Rights”, assigned to put out anti-Israeli propaganda at UN expense. The fruits of this campaign may be seen in such events as the decision of Malaysia, reported by Harris Schoenberg on page 322 of *A Mandate For Terror*, to hold an “Anti-Jews Day” in 1986.

How did Israel and the Jewish people as a whole come to be viewed with such hatred and disdain by the nations of the Third World? Horowitz suggested an answer on page 4 of *Israeli Ecstasies, Jewish Agonies* when he stated:

Anti-Semitism was once, as August Bebel called it, the ‘socialism of fools’. Now anti-Zionism performs the same role.

Schoenberg, on page 320 of *A Mandate For Terror*, also stresses the irrationality of Third World anti-Zionism, stating:

To believe UN rhetoric since 1975 is to accept the idea that Zionism is a cosmic force responsible for most of the world’s ills.

Needless to say, it was also the practice of the European anti-Semites to depict the Jews as a “cosmic force” responsible for all kinds of calamities. That Third World anti-Zionism is in many ways a direct continuation of European anti-Semitism is shown by the popularity of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* among Third World enemies of Israel, the Muslims in particular. But in order to fully understand the logic behind Third World hatred of Israel, it is necessary to examine the concept of “Third World” itself.

Horowitz, on page 5 of *Three Worlds of Development*, describes the origins of this concept as follows:

It should be pointed out that the phrase ‘The Third World’ is generally attributed to the Algerian writer, Frantz Fanon. His book on Algeria is probably the first to use it as a colloquial expression for the newly emergent nations.

Fanon, who wrote in French, was a West Indian psychiatrist of African descent who came to identify with the movement for Algerian independence after moving to Algeria from France. His most influential work was *The Wretched of the Earth* in which he developed a model of Third World liberation based mainly on the example of the Algerian independence movement. Like the Algerian fighters against French rule, Fanon made a big point of refusing to identify with either capitalism or socialism. The whole purpose of his concept of “Third World” was to reinforce this point by depicting the peoples of the colonized nations as inhabiting an essentially different world from those of the capitalist “First World” or the socialist “Second World”.

It is significant that Fanon derived the concept of “Third World” from French political history. Fanon’s expression, “Third World”, was based on the French term, “Third Estate”, which was the name given to the

assembly of commoners under the French political system prior to 1789. The “First Estate” was composed of the nobility, the “Second Estate” of the clergy. The Third Estate launched the French Revolution in 1789 when its members decided to meet separately from the other two estates, declaring themselves to be the legitimate representatives of the entire nation. However, once the Third Estate came to power, they stopped calling themselves by this pre-revolutionary title and adopted the name, “National Assembly”, instead. They did so because implicit in the term, “Third Estate”, like “Third World”, was a suggestion of inferiority relative to the First and Second Estates.

Why did Fanon, who placed such a strong emphasis on the need for colonized peoples to free themselves from the shackles of European culture, choose to depict the colonized nations in such terms. He did so because although he was opposed to cultural dependence, he was not opposed to economic dependence. To the contrary, he believed that Third World nations should demand “reparations” from the wealthy nations. He developed this argument beginning on page 98 of *The Wretched of the Earth* in the context of a discussion of the competition between the capitalist First World and the socialist Second World. He began by stating:

It might have been generally thought that the time had come for the world, and particularly for the Third World, to choose between the capitalist and socialist systems.

But he went to argue, on page 99, that the Third World “should however refuse to become a factor in that competition”, adding:

The concrete problem we find ourselves up against is not that of a choice, cost what it may, between socialism and capitalism as they have been defined by men of other continents and of other ages.

Instead, Fanon continued, the capitalist world should be forced to pay reparations for the wealth it had plundered from the colonies. On page 103, Fanon advanced this concept as a slogan, with the words “*they must pay*” printed in italics. It was in order to emphasize the need of the former colonies for reparations that Fanon chose to define them in a way which implied an inferior status to the First and Second Worlds.

Whatever made Fanon believe that the capitalist nations would pay reparations to their former colonies? Incredible as it may seem, he based this idea on the fact that the Germans had paid reparations to Israel for the Holocaust. As he put it on page 101:

There was only one slogan in the mouths of Europeans on the morrow of the 1945 V-day: ‘Germany must pay.’ Herr Adenauer, it must be said, at the opening of the Eichmann trial, asked once more for forgiveness from the Jewish people. Herr Adenauer has renewed the promise of his people to go on paying to the state of Israel the enormous sums which are supposed to be compensation for the crimes of the Nazis.

Fanon’s point was that the colonial powers had treated the colonized peoples just as badly as the Nazis had treated the Jews, and therefore it was unjust that only the Jews should receive reparations. But even if it were true, which it is not, that colonization is identical to mass extermination, why did Fanon not identify with the Jews if he viewed their situation as analagous to his own? The simple and obvious answer is that Fanon was incapable of sympathizing with the Jews because at the heart of his notion of the Third World was the idea of an alliance between the Arab and African peoples. Since the Arabs in general and the Algerians in particular were bitterly hostile to the state of Israel, Fanon never even considered looking at things from the Jewish point of view.

Had he done so, he might have noticed that reparations from Germany, which were far from “enormous”, played a relatively minor role in the economic development of Israel. Far more important was the socialist organization of a large part of the Israeli economy, the high level of motivation of the Israeli people and the technical skills which Jewish immigrants to Israel had acquired in the Diaspora. Fanon ignored all this not only out of hostility to Israel but also because he did not wish to recognize any need for socialist economic planning in Third World economic development. But today, 30 years later, not only have there been no reparations forthcoming from the former colonial powers, but the poverty and exploitation of the Third World has if anything increased. Meanwhile Israel has continued to progress on the basis of an economic structure in which some 60% of the economy is collectively owned and managed. The Israeli road to development might well have served as a model for the entire Third World, were it not for the ostracism and exclusion of Israel

by Third World governments still striving to find a non-existent third way to development which is neither capitalist nor socialist.

Although it was certainly not Fanon's intention, an invariable concomitant of Third World ideology has been a tendency towards the imposition of harsh and undemocratic military regimes. Nowhere has this trend been more apparent than in the Arab world, where military dictatorship has been the normal form of government since the 1950s. Yosef Gottlieb, in *Self-Determination In The Middle East*, brings out the close connection between Arab militarism and Arab anti-Zionism. Gottlieb shows that the Jews are not the only national minority in the Middle East whose claims to statehood have been violently rejected by Arab militarists. Among the others are the Kurds, who cannot be accused of emigrating from anywhere. Descended from the Medes of antiquity, they have inhabited the same territory for thousands of years, yet they were slaughtered in the tens of thousands by the government of Iraq in order to suppress their movement for cultural autonomy and political independence. On page 10 Gottlieb analyzes the motives of the Arab opposition to Zionism as follows:

Given the ramifications of the anti-Zionist campaign, a critical understanding of the significance of Zionism to the Moslem ruling elites is imperative. This significance is found in the success of one Middle Eastern, non-Arab people, the Jews, to achieve independence. This independence threatens the region's governing elites, since it sets a precedent that is dangerous to the totalitarian system of government now entrenched in the Middle East. The danger of Zionism lies in the possibility that other submerged nationalities in the Middle East may be encouraged to struggle for their own self-determination.

Gottlieb also notes that the Arab military regimes, despite their anti-imperialist rhetoric, are ultimately dependent on the imperialist system, from which they derive the billions in oil revenues which they use to maintain their military rule.

Of course, it could also be argued that movements for national independence on the part of small nations have often been used by imperialist powers as a way of splitting and dividing the anti-imperialist forces. No doubt one of the reasons why sincere anti-imperialists like Gandhi or Fanon were so hostile to Zionism is because they viewed the many small nations of India or Africa as a source of weakness rather than strength. In practice, however, attempts to submerge the small nations of India or Africa in some larger political entity have been based almost exclusively on assimilation to English or French language culture. The more democratic the anti-imperialist movement, the more it will be compelled to preserve the various so-called "tribal" languages, which are after all the spoken language of the great majority of ordinary people in both India and Africa. And the more the legitimacy of so-called "tribal" culture is recognized, the more the legitimacy of Zionism will also be recognized.

As for the dream of a Third World that is neither capitalist nor socialist, in practice this dream has merely served as a cloak for the neo-colonial exploitation of the former colonies. Militarist regimes employing nationalist rhetoric have allied themselves in reality with the former colonial powers, from whom they receive the military hardware which keeps them in power. Meanwhile Israel has developed the capacity to manufacture its own weapons, and to this day maintains an essentially socialist system of public ownership of the land, state or cooperative ownership of major industries and comprehensive health, education and welfare services for all citizens. Private enterprise is accepted, even encouraged, but the underlying principle of public ownership of land and resources has never been seriously questioned since the start of the modern Zionist movement. And since Israel has a democratic political system, this means that the fundamental issues concerning how land and resources are used are ultimately decided by the voters. No one, not even the enemies of Israel, denies that this system has resulted in economic progress and even prosperity for the Israeli people. Whether it would produce similar results elsewhere remains to be seen, but it is hard to avoid the implication that the main reason for Third World anti-Zionism is to prevent other nations from following the Israeli example.

Democracy

While it was the socialist character of the Israeli example that was especially feared in some quarters, in others it was Israeli democracy that was the main stumbling block. This was particularly true in the Communist world. Obviously countries like the Soviet Union, China and Cuba could accept the socialist orientation of the Israeli economy, but they had a problem with the Israeli multi-party political system. If Israel was right, then perhaps they were wrong to have suppressed all opposition parties and established the Communist party as the sole legitimate political organization. In its origins, Communist hostility to Israel was in large

part an outgrowth of the traditional Communist hostility to the Social Democratic program of attempting to combine public ownership with electoral democracy. But over the course of the Cold War, this hostility was compounded by a growing convergence between trends in the Communist world and the rise of Third World ideology. In particular, attempts of Third World ideologists to sidestep the issue of capitalism versus socialism fit in nicely with a trend in the Communist world, and especially in the Soviet Union, towards rule by a hereditary bureaucratic elite. The more the Communist bureaucracy tended to evolve into a privileged social class, the more the Communists themselves began to sidestep the issue of capitalism versus socialism. Communist bureaucratic elites and Third World military elites increasingly resembled one another, and anti-Semitism became the badge of their evolving alliance.

Significantly, the ones who resisted this trend the longest were the Cubans. During the 1960s, the Cuban Communist government headed by Fidel Castro had maintained a somewhat friendly attitude towards Israel. Schoenberg, on page 334 of *A Mandate For Terror*, notes:

In April 1963 Premier Castro declared an official three day mourning period upon the death of Israel's President Itzhak Ben Zvi. Cuban flags on public buildings were flown at half-mast. When Algerian Premier Ahmed Ben Bella responded to this courtesy with the rebuke: 'Whoever respects a dead Israeli in that way has no right to come to an Arab land', Castro cancelled a scheduled visit to Algeria, his first important ally in Africa.

During this period Castro's attention was still focused on the revolutionary movement in Latin America and he evidently felt that he could do without Arab support. Schoenberg also notes, on page 350:

As late as 1967 Castro declared that he was 'shocked' by the 'lack of revolutionary principles' disclosed in Arab propaganda. 'True revolutionaries', he noted, 'never threaten a whole country with extinction. We have spoken out clearly against Israel's policy, but we do not deny her right to exist.'

Schoenberg added that "until the early 1970s, an unofficial flow of Israeli technical experts to Cuba continued", while a certain number of Cubans were sent to study in Israel. In fact, according to Schoenberg, Castro even told the Cuban ambassador to Israel, who was Jewish, that he believed that some of his own ancestors may have been Marranos, meaning Spanish Jews who had converted to Christianity. Be that as it may, as the leader of a small and independent minded Communist country, Castro evidently felt a certain affinity for the Israelis, which he acted on as long as he was able to do so. When the Russians told him to break diplomatic relations with Israel after the Israeli victory in the 1967 Six Day War, Castro flatly refused.

However, by the end of the 1960s Cuban hopes for revolution in Latin America had begun to fade, leading the Cubans to become increasingly involved in the international Third World movement. Within this context the Arabs were a powerful force whom the Cubans could no longer afford to defy. The turning point in Cuban policy towards Israel came in dramatic fashion at an international conference of "Non-Aligned" countries in Algeria in September of 1973. At the start of the conference Castro was attacked violently by Qadafi of Libya as a Soviet puppet, unworthy of inclusion in the "Non-Aligned" movement. Two days later Cuba announced that it was breaking relations with Israel, whereupon Castro was publicly embraced in Algiers by Qadafi and also Yasser Arafat. From this time forward, Cuba became one of the leading representatives of the "Non-Aligned" nations in a wide variety of international forums. At the same time, the Cubans completely accepted the virulent anti-Zionism of the Third World movement, to the point where Cuba was one of the few non-Arab nations to vote against rescinding the "Zionism is racism" resolution of the United Nations in 1991.

Throughout the Cold War period, the main source of Communist anti-Zionism remained the Soviet Union and also the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe, particularly Poland and East Germany. Soviet and Eastern European Communist anti-Zionism was above all a legacy of the Stalin era, during which the Communist bureaucratic elite of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe had come to power in the context of a systematic purge of almost all Jewish Communists. Inevitably the bureaucrats who had come to power in this context had an anti-Semitic outlook, which they were quick to express when it appeared convenient without any prompting whatsoever from the Arabs or anyone else. Israel's defeat of Egypt and Syria, who had been armed and encouraged by the Soviet Union, in the 1967 Six Day War, provided the Soviet and Eastern European Communist bureaucracy with the stimulus for a massive anti-Zionist campaign. Although less murderous than the purges of the Stalin era, this campaign was unprecedented in its overt anti-Semitism and public incitement of hatred against the surviving Jews of Eastern Europe.

Paul Lendvai, on page 7 of *Anti-Semitism Without Jews*, notes that the terms “Jew” and “Zionist” became more or less interchangeable in the Soviet anti-Zionist literature of this period:

The Jews now appear - in the guise of ‘Zionists’ - as the carriers of both financial conspiracy and imperialist encirclement, as the incarnation of the foreign enemy, made more powerful by their international connections: in short as a world danger.

In *Beware: Zionism* by Yuri Ivanov, 275,000 copies of which were distributed in the Soviet Union in 1969-70, the Jewish Rothschilds were accused of financing not only “Israeli militarism” but also “the Czechoslovak counterrevolutionaries”, “West German neo-fascists” and even “the Vatican”. And this was mild stuff compared to an “anti-Zionist” novel of Ivan Shevtsov, published in 200,000 copies in 1970, in which, as Lendvai notes on page 12, the villain is a Jew “who is a rapist and dope peddler who murdered his own mother, disemboweled her and wound her intestines around her head”.

In countries like Poland and East Germany, this campaign represented a continuation not only of Stalinist anti-Semitism but also of pre-1945 Nazi propaganda. Lendvai notes on page 144 that the anti-Zionist campaign in Poland, which resulted in the expulsion of almost all surviving Jews from Poland in 1969-70, was marked by the widespread distribution of *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. A Polish edition of this work was distributed by the Polish Communist government to “students at the Military Academies, regular Army officers, and some Party activists”. It was marked “for internal use only”. Moreover, one of the leaders of the Polish anti-Zionist campaign was a former Nazi sympathizer named Boleslaw Piasecki. Lendvai states on page 197:

The same Boleslaw Piasecki who in 1937, as leader of the fascist Falanga, declared that ‘the Jews were to be expelled from Poland’ and until their expulsion ‘were to be refused all civil rights, and their fortunes confiscated’, who called ‘for a systematic and radical elimination of Jews from Poland’, warned in the Polish Parliament on April 11, 1968, that the utmost vigilance was needed against the Zionists who are linked with the German revanchists.

A similar pattern appeared elsewhere in Eastern Europe, where those who had been the most deeply implicated in earlier crimes against the Jewish people now became the most ardent supporters of the “anti-Zionist” campaign.

The ultimate symbol of this trend was the elevation of Kurt Waldheim to the position of Secretary General of the United Nations in 1971. Although Waldheim’s Nazi past and possible participation in war crimes against Jews were not publicly known at that time, it cannot be viewed as a complete coincidence that the individual who presided over the ostracism of Israel at the United Nations was a former Nazi. Nor was it a coincidence that many Nazis, including Eichmann’s deputy Alois Brunner, found refuge in the Arab world after 1945. Brunner still lives to this day in Syria, where his whereabouts are sufficiently well known for him to have received a letter bomb which blew off part of his hand. Nor was it a coincidence that many of the founders of the PLO had been students in Germany, or that the PLO has received substantial assistance from both West German and East German “anti-Zionists”, or that West German companies have played a leading role in providing the Arab states with chemical and bacteriological weapons. More often than not, those who speak the loudest about how the Israelis are “just like the Nazis” turn out on closer examination to have direct ties to actual Nazis, ex-Nazis or descendants of Nazis.

What all these people have in common is a tendency to view themselves as constituting an elite who are called upon to rule over others without too much attention to the niceties of democratic procedure. To be sure, both Communist and Third World elites have shown themselves to be considerably more progressive, rational and even humane than the Nazis. It could even be argued that under certain historical circumstances, a dictatorship of one kind or another is the only way of escaping still greater calamities. But however valid they might appear at a given moment, dictatorships have a well known tendency to outlive their usefulness and slide over into arbitrary, reactionary regimes of bureaucrats and militarists whose sole goal in life is to perpetuate their own power. It was precisely regimes of this kind which united during the period of the Cold War to condemn democratic Israel as a menace to the entire world.

Of course, it would be hard to deny that the capitalists of countries like the United States and France, who were the main backers of Israel during this period, also constitute an undemocratic elite. However, both in the United States and France the democratic tradition is so strong that the capitalist class had adapted itself to ruling within the framework of the electoral process. Since Israeli socialism, thanks to the efforts of Third World and Communist ideologists, has had relatively little impact in the former colonies, imperialist countries

like the United States and France felt free to treat Israel as a kind of adornment for their efforts to promote the cause of parliamentary democracy around the world. The fact that both the United States and France were the original sponsors of Jewish Emancipation was also a factor in this equation. To be sure, the United States has never hesitated to abandon its democratic principles when its economic interests abroad seemed threatened by a democratically elected left wing government. All the same, the United States and France have played a leading role in popularizing the democratic concept on a world scale, and Israel has provided them with a kind of democratic equivalent of Cuba, a small, radical country which can be held up as proof of revolutionary sincerity by essentially insincere, counter-revolutionary governments.

This policy has proved a great success, as shown by the collapse of the Soviet Union and the emergence of a powerful movement for national self-determination and formal democracy throughout Eastern Europe. The ability of Israel to maintain its independence and increase its prosperity with American aid has proved a model for the nationalities of Eastern Europe, each one of which now aspires to a similar status. Yet at the same time, the anti-Semitic forces which were unleashed in Eastern Europe during the Cold War era have now become even more virulent than before. This trend coincides with German reunification and renewed opportunities for the German economic penetration and domination of Eastern Europe. Here as elsewhere, the only clear path to Jewish survival lies through consistent support for the traditional Jewish radical principles of democracy, socialism and national self-determination.

Principles

It was Moses, so they say, who declared: "Justice, justice shalt thou follow." The principles of democracy, socialism and national self-determination are the most widely recognized embodiment of the concept of justice that has yet been developed. These principles cannot ultimately be separated from one another but must be realized together if they are to be fully realized.

The clear lesson of world history is that the only realistic path to the full realization of these principles is through the creation of a world government, based on the democratic representation of all nations, and responsible for the rational, equitable and humane utilization and distribution of the world's resources. The most obvious path to the creation of such a world government lies through the gradual transformation of the United Nations into a truly representative institution, in part through the inclusion of oppressed nations not yet represented, in part through the development of some mechanism whereby nations might also be represented on the basis of population. As the United Nations became more representative, it would also become more effective, gradually assuming responsibility for economic planning and allocation of resources on a world scale.

The only real obstacle to the rapid establishment of a democratic, socialist world government is force. It is part of the nature of human beings to kill, to eat other animals, to develop weapons. All those who propose to build a human future on banning the use of force are truly utopians. Force will remain, and after so many nations have gone to so much trouble to develop their own means of self-defense, force will long be divided along national lines. But force, due in part to the efforts of Jewish radicals, has been raised to such a level of destructiveness in the modern world that only the most short-sighted can view it as the ultimate arbiter of right and wrong. Right and wrong can only be decided on the basis of principles, on the basis of who is in fact right and who is in fact wrong. Principles make possible the inclusion of force, growing out of national self-determination, in a democratic, socialist world. Force will remain, but truth and justice can still be established as the standard whereby issues of global policy are decided. If this is religion, so be it.

Chapter Eleven: Victory

Over the course of the past 100 years or so, the world has witnessed both the partial realization of the Jewish radical program and the partial destruction of the Jewish radical movement. On the one hand, Israel has been established, and in many parts of the world, ideals of socialism, sexual love and rational thought have become a major cultural force. On the other hand, millions of Jews have been murdered and Jewish radical activity everywhere is at a low ebb. Outside of Israel, most of the organizations founded by Jewish radicals in the past have either lost their Jewish character or disappeared. As might have been expected, the Messiah came, but much remains to be accomplished.

The main reason for the partial destruction of the modern Jewish radical movement is obviously the force of anti-Semitism. Anti-Semitism was responsible not only for the death of millions of Jews but also for the tendency of so many Jewish radicals to deny their Jewish identity and adopt a negative attitude towards Jewish tradition and culture. As experience has shown, this negative attitude can eventually provide the basis for new forms of anti-Semitism. The history of the Marxist parties of Eastern Europe is a classical example of just such a development. The stronger the force of anti-Semitism in the world, the greater the tendency of Jewish radicals to internalize anti-Semitic stereotypes and perpetuate them in a new guise.

Christianity must be viewed as an earlier product of this same dynamic. The Christian religion was founded by Jews, yet it became the main cause of anti-Semitism on a world scale for nearly 2000 years. Not only are the Jews blamed for the death of Jesus, not only is Jesus depicted in constant conflict with other Jews, but it is hard to imagine a more vicious display of contempt for the Jewish people than the Christian ritual of pretending to eat the flesh and drink the blood of a male Jew. From the four so-called “gospels” to the letters of Paul to the writings of the so-called “fathers” of the Christian church, early Christian literature is filled with accusations and slanders directed against the Jewish people and the Jewish religion. Christian anti-Semitism can only be understood as a product of the era of the Jewish Wars, an era in which anti-Semitic stereotypes were internalized even by Jewish radicals and non-Jewish sympathizers with the martyred Jewish people. By the same token, Marxist anti-Semitism should be understood as a product of the Jewish Wars of modern times, the major difference being that this time the Jews won.

The lesson of that victory is that only an overtly pro-Jewish form of Jewish radicalism can avoid gradual transformation into an instrument of anti-Semitism. Zionism is the only form of modern Jewish radicalism which continues to flourish today because it is the only form which adopted a fundamentally positive attitude towards Jewish history, tradition and culture. Even the Yiddishists, who were Jewish nationalists in many respects, undermined the validity of their cause by their hostile attitude towards the Hebrew language and towards Zionism. In practice, Yiddishism proved but a way station on the road to assimilation, while Hebrew provided the basis for an entire national culture, including departments of Yiddish studies at Israeli universities. But despite its continuing vitality, Zionism alone cannot give rise to a renewed Jewish radical movement in the Diaspora. Such a movement should certainly adopt a positive attitude towards Israel, but it is neither possible nor desirable for the majority of the close to 10 million Jews now living in the Diaspora to emigrate to Israel. What is needed is a pro-Jewish form of Jewish radicalism which supports Israel but also offers solutions to the problems and concerns of Jews in the Diaspora.

The great illusion which sustained most forms of Jewish radicalism for the past 200 years was the belief that once society became more equitable and humane, then anti-Semitism would disappear of its own accord. As shown by the history of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the 20th century, this belief was not well founded. Experience has shown that anti-Semitism will not disappear unless it is made to disappear. The elimination of anti-Semitism is the great unfinished task of the modern Jewish radical movement. A second unfinished task is the realization of the dream of a more equitable and humane society on a world scale. And a third unfinished task is the creation of a new, secular form of Jewish culture, a form which can be transmitted to future generations in much the same way as existing religious forms are now transmitted. None of these tasks can be accomplished by a movement which masks or denies its Jewish roots.

To the contrary, the first step towards realizing these goals is for Jewish radicals to unite as Jewish radicals. Tsvi Bisk makes this point well in his article, “A Radical-Zionist Strategy for the 1970’s”, which appeared in *Jewish Radicalism*, edited by Jack Porter and Peter Dreier. Bisk, on page 88, defined “Radical-Zionism” as “fighting Jewish causes in a radical way”. On page 87, Bisk stated:

The Radical-Zionist faces a dilemma. Ethically he belongs on the left but emotionally he belongs with all Jews (reactionary or radical) because he knows that if in the end he is attacked as a Jew, *only* the Jews will fight and die side by side with him (all the liberal, heart-rending *goyische* protestations notwithstanding.) So who can the Radical-Zionist align with? The self-righteous ass-kissing assimilationist Jewish leftists or the overweening assimilationist schmucks of the Jewish Establishment? The answer is - neither. We must define our own course - outline our aims and hopes, state a strategy and develop tactical and contingency plans for each phase of operations.

Just so. The only way for Jewish radicals to preserve both their radicalism and their Jewishness is to unite as Jewish radicals and build a movement on this basis.

Fighting Anti-Semitism

The main weakness of earlier attempts by Jewish radicals to eliminate anti-Semitism is that they failed to confront Christian and Muslim anti-Semitism. For understandable reasons, most Jewish radicals, particularly during the era of the Holocaust, preferred to concentrate their fire on the Nazis and similar groups, while adopting a more conciliatory approach in relation to the Christian and Muslim religions. However, the fact remains that both the Christian and Muslim religions are permeated with anti-Semitic attitudes and traditions, which continually generate new forms of anti-Semitism, including Nazism. It was basically for this reason that past generations of Jewish radicals were so critical of religion in general, hoping to undermine Muslim and especially Christian anti-Semitism by attacking the very idea of religion as irrational and outmoded. In the long run, however, these attacks proved ineffective because they did not go to the root of the problem. The belief in an invisible ruling entity may be reactionary and unfounded, but those who uphold this belief can legitimately maintain that they have a right to their opinion. But every time Christians or Muslims distribute a copy of the New Testament or Koran, they are preaching hatred of the Jewish people, and this they have no right to do. However well established Christian and Muslim anti-Semitism might be, it is nonetheless morally indefensible, and therefore ultimately more vulnerable to attack than the belief in an invisible ruling entity, which is undoubtedly false but historically a source of moral strength for many decent people, including Jews.

A few Jewish radicals in the past did criticize Christianity for its anti-Semitism, but as a rule these criticisms were expressed in the most diplomatic possible way. A typical approach was adopted by Maurice Hindus on page 377 of his article, "The Jew as a Radical", appearing in *The Menorah Journal* in 1927. In the context of a discussion of why Jews are attracted to radicalism, Hindus made the following remarks:

In fact there is no other movement in existence, not even religion, which so audaciously attacks racial ill-feeling as does modern radicalism. In the parliaments of Europe it is usually the socialists and laborites who launch the most vehement attacks on anti-Semitic functionaries. Liberal ministers of the Christian churches may in their sermons battle heroically for racial tolerance, but as long as in the Sunday schools of these same churches children hear again and again the story of the crucifixion as it is commonly told, a story in which the Jew plays the part of the villain, a hideous, wretched villain, the seed of ill-feeling is sowed, sinks deep into the consciousness of the young, and the word Jew assumes for them a meaning of reproach which in later years seldom wears off. The Christian gospel, in spite of itself, is a prolific source of enmity toward the Jew.

But how did it come about that the Jews were cast in the role of the villain in the New Testament? Was this really something that Christianity did "in spite of itself", or was it the result of a deliberate and systematic effort to stigmatize the Jews so as to justify their defeat and martyrdom in the Jewish Wars? Is not the whole point of Christianity to glorify Jewish martyrdom and vilify Jewish success? Hindus was undoubtedly capable of thinking such thoughts, but he did not dare put them into print for fear of the Christian reaction.

Ironically, the Christians reacted anyhow. Anti-Semitic literature is filled with accusations against Jewish radicalism as a Jewish plot to subvert the Christian religion. John Cuddihy in *The Ordeal of Civility* presents this accusation in a form which makes it sound almost like a compliment. He puts it this way, on page 231:

To learn the nature of the civilization of the West we must go, not to the assimilators, not to our Chagalls and our Malamuds, not to our Niebuhrs and our Neuhauses, but to the great unassimilated, implacable Jews of the West, to a Marx, to a Freud, to a Levi-Strauss, to a Harry Wolfson, to those who exhibit a principled and stubborn resistance to the whole Western 'thing'. These proud pariahs

experience Western civilization as an incognito or secularized form of Christianity, and they therefore openly resist it *as such*.

Most anti-Semites present the same accusation in a far less elegant manner. They know very well that

Christianity is an anti-Semitic religion, and therefore they automatically assume that if Jewish radicals criticize Christianity, it must be because they are Jewish. In the long run, the only effective response to this accusation is for Jewish radicals to come right out and admit that it is primarily because Christianity is so anti-Semitic that we dislike it. We have every right to adopt this position in view of the long history of persecution and murder which Christian anti-Semitism has unleashed against the Jewish people.

It is also instructive that in his list of the “implacable Jews of the West” Cuddihy failed to include Emelian Yaroslavsky, born Gubelman, the leader of the “Society of the Godless” in the Soviet Union during the 1920s and 1930s. Yaroslavsky really was implacable towards Christianity and probably did more to suppress the Christian religion in Europe than any other single individual since the days of the Jacobin “de-Christianization” campaign of 1793. Another Jewish critic of Christianity missing from Cuddihy’s list was Jules Isaac, author of *The Teaching of Contempt*, perhaps the first book by any author to document the anti-Semitic teachings and traditions of the Christian churches. The moral of the story is that when Jews attack Christianity frontally and directly, Christian anti-Semites are not so eager to draw attention to this fact. They do not like to see the issue framed in terms of Christian anti-Semitism, but rather in terms of the duplicity of the Jews. Concealing our true motives merely plays into their hands, while raising the issue of Christian anti-Semitism puts them in a position where they themselves sense that they are on shaky ground.

Christians as a group are particularly worried by the possibility that Christian anti-Semitism will be blamed for the Holocaust. It was the Holocaust that prompted Jules Isaac to write *The Teaching of Contempt*, and it was clearly in order to prevent the appearance of other such books that the Christian churches in the 1950s and 1960s began to eliminate some of the more overt and offensive anti-Semitic elements from their liturgy and literature. At the same time, many Christians began to speak of a “Judeo-Christian tradition”, inviting Jews to think of themselves as participants in an “inter-faith dialogue” with a closely related religion. The fruits of this campaign may be witnessed in a book such as *Why The Jews?*, a study of the causes of anti-Semitism by Dennis Prager and Joseph Telushkin. The authors, who are Jewish, are fully aware of the central role played by Christianity in the history of anti-Semitism. They speak on page 91 of “Christian hatred of the Jews, the most enduring Jew-hatred in history”, and state on page 104: “Without Christian antisemitism, the Holocaust would have been inconceivable.” Yet far from condemning Christianity on this account, they conclude on page 108 that “the ideals of both religions demand that Jews and Christians forge an alliance to ‘perfect the world under the rule of God’.”

The present day willingness of many Christians to enter into such an alliance is merely a reflection of the depth of Christian guilt for the Holocaust. Not only did Christian anti-Semitism lay the groundwork for the rise of Nazism, but the Christians continued to attack the Jews even after the Nazis came to power. As Isaac pointed out on page 113 of *The Teaching of Contempt*, the Pope himself spoke of “Christ, who received his human nature from a people which was to crucify him” in a 1937 encyclical, “Mit brennender Sorge”, which was ostensibly intended to express concern about the rise of Nazism. And even after the Nazi mass murders had become widely known at the end of World War 2, the Roman Catholic church still helped many Nazis to escape from Europe to South America in 1945-46 on the grounds that they were Catholic fugitives from Communism. Simon Wiesenthal documents this charge on page 73 of *Justice Not Vengeance*, stating:

The fugitives had no papers, and provisional identity cards were therefore issued to them with the aid of the Vatican and the Red Cross. Next, the Vatican arranged South American visas for them, especially for Argentina. Until their departure these fugitives from justice were mostly accommodated in religious houses, such as the Franciscan monastery on Via Sicilia in Rome. Embarkation was from Bari or Genoa. Frequently there were refugee passports ready for them, obtained from the Red Cross by a secretary of Archbishop Giuseppe Siri.

Most of the SS guards in the extermination camps came from Catholic backgrounds, and as shown by the aid extended to them by the Roman Catholic church after the war, they remained Catholics in the eyes of the church even after their bloody crimes. Deleting a sentence here or a phrase there from some obscure text would seem a small price for the Roman Catholic church to pay for Jewish forgetfulness of these events.

Such forgetfulness may be comforting but it is unwise. As the memory of the Holocaust gradually fades, so too does the Christian eagerness for a genuine “inter-faith dialogue” gradually diminish. Jews would do well to remember that the normal form of “inter-faith dialogue” traditionally practiced by all Christian churches consisted almost exclusively of Christians exhorting Jews to convert to Christianity. Rather than allying with our traditional enemies in the name of some mythical invisible entity, would we not be better advised to ally

with all those groups both in the United States and around the world that share with us a common interest in halting the further spread of Christian influence? It is no coincidence, for example, that Vine Deloria, who compared the American Indians to the Jews in *God Is Red*, devoted a large part of the book to an effort to demonstrate the superiority of “Indian tribal religions” over Christianity. Deloria’s book was a product of the Movement of the Sixties, which encouraged the expression of a critical attitude towards Christianity on the part of people from several different ethnic groups. But we cannot expect others to reject Christianity if we ourselves do not come forward and protest against Christian anti-Semitism. As Hillel said, “If I am not for myself, who will be for me?” Anti-Semitism will never be eliminated from the world until Christians and also Muslims are prevented from inciting hatred of Jews under the guise of religious belief. This may sound like an ambitious goal, but there is no other way of preventing the constant resurgence of the violent anti-Semitism which is engendered by religious anti-Semitism.

Upholding Socialism

However, fighting anti-Semitism necessarily implies fighting imperialism. As the traditional ideology of European imperialism, Christianity ultimately depends for its prestige on the success of the imperialist system. Islam too is an imperialist doctrine, which was traditionally the ideological vehicle of the Arab and Turkish empires. And Nazism arose as the ideology of a would-be German empire, which aspired to rule the world through terror and genocide. Even back in the days of the Greek and Roman empires, there was a direct connection between imperialist ambitions and violent anti-Semitism. Imperialism naturally promotes a tendency towards violence, authoritarianism and irrationality, and in the past this tendency has invariably assumed an anti-Jewish form whenever significant numbers of Jews were present.

For more than 2000 years, the Jewish people has been perceived by imperialists as a mortal threat due to the long tradition of Jewish support for the ideals of national self-determination, social equality and rational thought. Due in part to Jewish influence, the right of national self-determination was generally recognized in the wake of the defeat of the Nazis in World War 2 as the only enduring basis for a peaceful world. Since that time, the European colonial empires of the past have been overthrown and the former colonies accepted into the United Nations as independent states. But although imperialism on the political plane has been discredited, economic and cultural imperialism remains a fact of international life. As is well known, the United States today plays a key role in the maintenance of a system of international economic and cultural domination which is also supported by the former imperialist powers of Europe and Japan. At the same time, the United States is the home of the largest Jewish community in the world, one which is thoroughly integrated into all facets of American life. There thus exists an inherent contradiction between American imperialist ambitions and American Jewish values, a contradiction which will inevitably become more acute the more the United States comes to depend on foreign resources and labor for its material prosperity.

There are basically only two ways in which the American Jewish community can deal with this contradiction. One is to attempt to reformulate Jewish values in such a way that they become compatible with American imperialist ambitions. This is the line of thinking which underlies the attempts of some American Jews to assimilate to the “Judeo-Christian tradition” and stress the theistic and dogmatic aspects of Judaism. The other way is for American Jews to openly oppose the imperialist trend in American life as contrary to Jewish values and also to common sense. The empires of the past, no matter how successful they may have been at any given moment, did not ultimately survive. The feelings of resentment engendered by long years of exploitation eventually reached the boiling point and the empire was overthrown. There is every reason to assume that the American empire will experience a similar fate. The more dependent on overseas resources the United States becomes, the harder it fights to retain those resources, the more catastrophic will be the ultimate loss of empire. Jewish radicals should therefore be in the forefront of the movement to oppose American imperialism and uphold socialism.

Socialism is the only realistic alternative to imperialism for the United States today. The great weakness of the anti-imperialist movement of the Sixties in the United States is that it did not present a viable alternative to imperialism. It played an important role in forcing the United States to withdraw from Vietnam, but once the Vietnam war was over, it was unable to prevent the resurgence of American imperialism on a world scale. If the United States today would suddenly cease to appropriate far more than its share of the world’s resources and labor, it would be faced with a major economic crisis. The only way of avoiding such a crisis would be

to institute a program of socialist economic planning and management of available resources. Without such a program, all efforts to oppose American imperialism within the United States will tend to be half-hearted and ineffective, for the United States today is much more dependent on foreign resources than it was at the time of the Vietnam war. The greater this dependence becomes, the more urgent becomes the need for a socialist alternative.

The connection between opposing imperialism and upholding socialism was already apparent to earlier generations of American Jewish radicals. A considerable percentage of the Jewish members of the American Socialist and Communist parties were drawn to socialism by their opposition to American imperialism. In *A Life In Two Centuries*, Bertram Wolfe describes how his opposition to American entry into World War 1 led him to join the American Socialist Party in 1917. At that time Wolfe was engaged in putting out his own anti-war publication entitled, "Facts: The People's Peace Paper". In 1918-19 Wolfe then became one of the founders of the American Communist Party, mainly because he felt that the Socialist Party was not sufficiently anti-war. On page 189 he notes that he was particularly shocked when the Socialist unions began selling war bonds:

That did more than any other single event, except the Bolshevik seizure of power, to bring into being a strong left wing, and to convince me that the official leadership of the Socialist Party had been caught up by the war fever that already possessed the majority of our countrymen.

Many of the other founders of the American Communist Party had also previously played leading roles in opposing United States involvement in World War 1.

In *American Testament* Joseph Freeman describes the process which led him to become one of the editors of the pro-Communist literary magazine, *New Masses*, in the 1920s. During World War 1 he was still a liberal and belonged to an organization called the People's Council of America, headed by Scott Nearing, which called for an early end to World War 1 based on the principle of "no annexations or indemnities". Freeman was then drawn to Communism while lecturing on literary topics at the radical Rand School. On page 210 Freeman describes an incident which made a great impression on him. He was trying to impress his leftist students with his radicalism by quoting to them Whitman's lines:

I accept reality, and dare not question it:
Materialism first and last imbuing.
Hurrah for positive science! long live exact demonstration!

He waited for a reaction:

But the comrade in back of the hall, the pale-faced, unshaven, stooped old tailor who had fought in many strikes, had followed De Leon and Debs and now followed Lenin, rose to his feet dissatisfied. Imagine, he tries to heckle Whitman. Comrade, will positive science, will exact demonstration *by itself* bring the masses of humanity freedom? What about science in the recent war, comrade? What about poison gas, submarines, high explosives - instruments of death which science fashioned? And what about science in modern industry? What about the speed-up, the conveyor, all those efficiency tricks that convert the workers into an automaton and throw him out of his job? O.K., comrade, long live exact demonstration, if you like, but get down to brass tacks: would not science be more beneficial to mankind in a socialist society?

In short, imperialist science versus socialist science: that is the issue. We may safely assume that the "pale-faced, unshaven, stooped old tailor" was Jewish, as was Freeman. Freeman was born in the Ukraine; on page 19 he tells about a pogrom that

took place in a nearby Ukrainian town initiated by a Christian priest at the head of a religious procession.

Although they saw the need for a socialist alternative to American imperialism, earlier generations of Jewish radicals were not able to build an enduring movement on this basis because American imperialism was still in an ascendant phase. Ironically it was the American victory in World War 2 in a just war against unjust enemies that laid the foundations for the present day American exploitation of the world's labor and resources. But the more intensive this exploitation becomes, the more precarious it also becomes. Sooner or later the system will cease to expand and begin to contract, and at this point the need for a socialist alternative will become clear. The best thing that American socialists can do at the present time is to unite. Regardless of who was right and who was wrong in past disputes, the continuing fragmentation of the American socialist movement into

a number of tiny, contentious sects should be a source of embarrassment to all concerned. A movement that aspires to unite millions of people in a common cause should be capable of uniting the thousands of present day socialists in a single party.

Unity can be achieved on the basis of a socialist program for American renewal. Such a program would call for the public ownership of all industries involved in producing the basic necessities of life, such as food, clothing, housing, transportation, communications and so forth. Less essential industries could be left in private hands or organized on a cooperative basis. The entire infrastructure of American society could be rebuilt on a new basis stressing fast, effective mass transportation and the interspersing of residential, recreational and industrial areas. All this could be accomplished within the framework of the existing electoral system while preserving existing democratic rights and a multi-party political system. A decent standard of living would be guaranteed for all and available resources utilized in the most rational possible way. Only through a program of this kind would it be possible to free the American economy from its present day dependence on foreign oil, foreign raw materials, foreign labor and foreign markets.

In the past it was the normal strategy of the socialist movement in countries such as the United States to look to the working class as the most likely source of support for socialist ideals. This strategy was well founded, for the working class is the main group in capitalist society that has some understanding of modern science and technology yet good reason to reject the way in which science and technology are used under the existing system. But for many Jewish radicals, the emphasis placed on organizing the working class also became a subtle source of assimilationist ideology. For example, in *A Long View From The Left*, Al Richmond lets drop that his mother's maiden name was Genya Gorelick and that she was active in the Bund in Russia. Richmond, the former editor of the Communist newspaper, Peoples World, neglects to mention his own original name, which was certainly not Al Richmond. The bulk of the book is devoted to long anecdotes about the supposedly fascinating and invariably non-Jewish working class characters whom Richmond met as a Communist organizer. Richmond never refers to Jews or Jewishness unless he can do so in a disparaging way. Thus, on page 115, he dismisses the Communist party organization in Washington DC during the 1930s as being composed of "mostly daughters of Jewish middle-class families". On page 302 he feels a "little pang" when he discovers that the judge and prosecutor at his 1951 trial on Smith Act charges are Jewish. Yet at the end of the 1960s Richmond was fired from his job at the Peoples World for displaying too much sympathy for the Communist reform movement in Czechoslovakia, which had a distinct pro-Jewish tone. Richmond himself remained blissfully oblivious to the irony of a lifetime spent in suppressing his Jewishness in the name of organizing the working class only to be condemned in the end for a trivial expression of latent Jewish sympathies.

Most American Jews today form part of the middle class and would have to suppress both their class and ethnic background in order to become effective working class organizers. Under these circumstances, it would seem that the natural constituency of American Jewish radicals is the technical and professional middle class. Complicated arguments have already been developed by American Jewish radical theorists justifying an orientation towards this constituency on the grounds that it constitutes a "new working class" of "intellectual workers". Be that as it may, technical and professional workers certainly do have an interest in a shift from an imperialist to a socialist system. Their services would remain as necessary as before, and their opportunities for functioning in a more humane and rational way would be vastly enhanced. It would be only natural for Jewish radicals to play a leading role in building a socialist movement among technical and professional workers in view of the large numbers of Jews in this category, the prestige of Jewish thought in the academic, scientific and professional spheres and the underlying rationalism of the scientific tradition. It was among young people preparing for technical and professional careers that Jewish radicals had the greatest success in the 1960s and there is every reason to assume that we will enjoy even greater success with this constituency in the future.

Affirming Jewishness

The question remains: how can Jewish radicals fight anti-Semitism and uphold socialism as Jews, affirming a positive rather than a negative view of Jewish culture, history and tradition? In the past the main way in which Jewish radicals sought to affirm their Jewishness was through the medium of a Jewish language, usually Yiddish or Hebrew. In the United States, where the Zionist movement was never very strong, most Jewish

radicals who wished to affirm a Jewish identity were Yiddishists. A leading spokesman for this tradition was Melech Epstein, who published his autobiography, *Pages From A Colourful Life*, in 1971. Epstein was born in 1889 in Bielorussia and was active in the Territorialist movement in the Pale of Settlement until his departure for the United States in 1913. In the United States Epstein first joined the newly formed Jewish Socialist Federation, and then became active in pro-Communist Yiddishist circles, serving off and on as one of the editors of *Freiheit*, the American Communist Yiddish language newspaper, in the 1920s and 1930s. He broke with the American Communist Party after the Nazi-Soviet pact in 1939 and in 1943 joined the staff of the Jewish Labor Committee, which had a Social Democratic orientation.

After a lifetime of shifting factional allegiances within a Yiddishist framework, Epstein summed up his experiences on page 167, where he stated:

The uniqueness of my generation was the overriding importance of ideology. We were yearning for freedom and human equality, and pursuing, though unaware, messianic goals.

Epstein also published a book entitled *The Jew And Communism* at the end of the 1950s in which he attempted to draw a balance sheet of the pro-Jewish and anti-Jewish components of American Communist policy. Epstein was particularly critical of Communist hostility to Zionism, which he saw as the main reason for the failure of Yiddish speaking Communists to win mass support among Jewish workers. On the other hand he felt that the Jewish Communists were the most militant anti-fascist group within the American Jewish community during the 1930s. He observed on page 294 that the pro-Communist Jewish Peoples Committee was “the only one to call for street demonstrations against the Nazi November pogroms” in 1938. And on page 319 he brought out that in 1936 the Jewish Bureau of the American Communist Party published a pamphlet in Yiddish subtitled, “Communist Party Demands that Anti-Semitism in the United States Should be Considered a Crime”. The author of the pamphlet was Moissay Olgin, whom Epstein characterized on page 382 as “the most influential Jewish Communist in the 20’s and 30’s”.

The most popular American Jewish Communist was Ben Gold, for many years the leader of the Fur and Leather Workers union. Gold’s *Memoirs*, published in the 1980s, were written in Yiddish and then translated into English. Gold was not a Yiddishist ideologist, but his *Memoirs* reflect a deep sense of identity with Jews and Jewishness. His enemies in the trade union movement are “pogromists”; attacks on him are a “pogrom”. On page 107 he paid tribute to a group of workers who had defended the entrance to the union hall against gangsters in the following terms:

Those workers who had blocked the entrance to the union building were designated the ‘Koysl-Maarov’ (the west wall of the temple in Jerusalem), and Jack Schneider was given the title, ‘Miracle Worker’ for building the wall of workers which had accomplished miracles and for getting it done in only a few minutes.

Gold was also much given to a flowery but sincere Yiddish rhetorical style. On page 5 he introduces his memoirs as follows:

In my memoirs, I intend to briefly jot down my connections with the historic struggle of the heroic fur workers who, in spite of terrible difficulties, persecutions and indescribable suffering, refused to give up their righteous battle until their victory over their conscienceless enemies was assured.

Gold was subjected to many physical attacks and legal proceedings throughout his career but boasted on page 197 that due to the “well-known fact that I have something that is called ‘luck’,” he was never jailed or seriously injured.

The leading Jewish trade unionist in New York during the heyday of the Jewish unions was David Dubinsky, the head of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Gus Tyler, on page 168 of the anthology, *Creators And Disturbers*, edited by Rosenberg and Goldstein, characterizes Dubinsky as follows:

He was a totally integrated man, which doesn’t mean that he never felt internal anguish or a measure of doubt, but there simply was no rift within him. He knew he was Jewish, working class, a Socialist, an anticommunist, and a democrat. In his life work he knew that an organization had to have a strong leader. Dubinsky knew he was not the Messiah, but he also felt that, for the moment, he was not a bad substitute.

Tyler, who was a member of the staff of Dubinsky's ILGWU, tried to sum up his own political identity on page 175 in these terms:

The question remains - what kind of Socialist am I? About that it's very difficult for me to be objective. As the years go by, I redefine what I am. First I said, 'I'm a universalist and a Socialist.' Then, someplace along the line, I said, 'Well, there is a Jewish breed and I belong to it.' Then I came to the conclusion that Sephardim (Jews of Spanish or Portuguese origin) lived in another world. So I was really an Ashkenazi Jew. Then when I met the Hasidim, I decided they also lived in another world. So I'm a Misnagdic Ashkenazic Jewish Socialist rooted in the working class - who's still a universalist.

But Tyler concluded his reminiscences, published in 1982, by expressing fears of another Holocaust.

Today, after 100 years of secular Yiddishism in the United States, virtually the only American Jews who still speak Yiddish to their children are the ultra-orthodox Hasidim. It is apparent that if the secular Jewish identity which flourished in Yiddish is to be preserved and extended, it will have to be done in an English language context. The difficulty of accomplishing such a task is illustrated by Saul Goodman's anthology, *The Faith of Secular Jews*. Goodman tried to put together a representative sampling of different secular conceptions of Jewishness, but the great majority of articles in his anthology are by Yiddishists. The non-Yiddishist descriptions of Jewishness included by Goodman are for the most part extremely vague. Perhaps the most perceptive is an article by Albert Einstein, "Just What Is A Jew?". On page 113, Einstein states:

The bond which unites the Jews in the course of thousands of years, and unites them also today, is, first of all, the democratic ideal of social justice, with the addition of the ideal of mutual help and tolerance among all human beings.

But even if struggling for social justice can be seen as affirming Jewishness, it still does not provide any definite guide to establishing an English language secular Jewish community. Perhaps the only suggestion put forward in Goodman's anthology that clearly does lead in this direction is Zhitlovsky's statement that secular Jews should celebrate the Jewish holidays and observe the Jewish Sabbath.

There are many Jewish groups in the United States today who do celebrate the Jewish holidays in a secular spirit. This trend will undoubtedly continue, for it is the logical extension of the Reform and Reconstructionist movements. If you are going to tinker with the liturgy anyhow, why not go all the way and write an entirely new liturgy more in keeping with your true beliefs? But just what ideas, principles and values should this new liturgy reflect? There is no agreement on this point, nor can there be in the absence of a Jewish radical movement. In order for new ways of celebrating the Jewish holidays to have real meaning, they must grow organically out of the struggles and activities of an entire movement. Yiddishist celebrations, for example, derived their content not just from the fact that they were conducted in Yiddish but from the close connection between the Yiddishists and the trade union and socialist movements. New ways of affirming Jewishness in an English language context will only arise on a similar basis.

The best way of forging links between radical political activity and secular Jewish observance is through the establishment of secular Jewish centers. Such centers could function as a meeting place for Jewish radicals of every description, who would be able to discover their common identity in the process of working together for common goals. Secular Jewish centers could conduct celebrations for the Jewish holidays and Sabbath; offer courses in Jewish language, history and culture; organize political activity around Jewish issues; give Jewish radicals a place to meet and coalesce as a group. Such centers should be avowedly secular in the same way that Jewish religious centers are avowedly religious. They should treat the Jewish religion in the same way that religious Jews now treat secularism, as an opposing tendency to be understood but resisted. Needless to say, they should also be prepared to unite with Jewish religious groups around issues of common Jewish concern.

Over time, a network of secular Jewish centers would undoubtedly give rise to a standard version of secular Jewish observance. The great weakness of secular Jewishness is its highly individualistic, fragmented, anarchic character. Secular Jews find it difficult to transmit their beliefs to their children for lack of a commonly accepted version of just what constitutes secular Jewishness. Such a version cannot be simply invented; but once certain beliefs and practices become standard, they should be transmitted to future generations in much the same way as religious tradition is now transmitted. Standardization is a strength, not a weakness, so long as it does not degenerate into rigid orthodoxy or heresy hunting. Standardization might be expressed in the form of a standard liturgy for Jewish holidays or a standard curriculum for educating children in Jewish

tradition.

Abraham Golomb in an article in Goodman's anthology points out that the Torah itself grew out of just such a process. On page 221 of "From Secular To Integral Jewishness", Golomb states:

The way of life becomes tradition, and the tradition becomes religion. All the commandments of the Torah were originally customs, mores, purely secular traditions.

On the other hand, Y.L. Peretz in his article, "What Is This Jewish Heritage?", calls on secular Jews to adopt a more overtly Messianic stance. As he puts it on page 132:

The flag of Jewish renaissance must be raised again, the banner of Messiah, world-judgment, and world-liberation, the symbol of a future free humanity.

In different ways, they are both saying the same thing: the time has come for the proclamation of the Torah of the Tree of Life.

The Tree of Life

A good image of what a secular Jewish center might look like is contained in *Joe Rapoport: The Life of a Jewish Radical* by Kenneth Kann. Rapoport was an activist in the Jewish unions who eventually settled in California in a community of left wing Jewish chicken farmers north of San Francisco. In the 1920s he was a member of the Pitkin Avenue Jewish Cultural Club in Brooklyn, which included Jewish socialists from various factions who were united, as Rapoport puts it, "by our appreciation for Yiddish culture". On page 72 Rapoport describes the club as follows:

We had schools, lecture series, theatrical groups, literary groups, folk choruses and mandolin orchestras. There were special summer camps where we could take a vacation and spend time together. There were weekend excursions for camping and hiking. There was the visiting with friends in the evenings. All these things were a binder for trade union and political struggles. It caught my imagination and encouraged my participation in the movement.

The task of the present generation of Jewish radicals is the establishment of such centers within an English language context. Only on soil like this can the Torah of the Tree of Life sprout and grow.

To plant trees for the benefit of future generations requires dedication. To understand what is meant by dedication, we have only to look at the Hasidim, at the orthodox, at those who uphold the banner of Jewish religious tradition in the face of the entire world. Such people have devoted their entire lives to the cause of Jewish survival. Even if our conception of Jewishness differs somewhat from theirs, we can hardly presume to criticize their approach unless we are prepared to show equal or greater dedication on behalf of our own ideals. If they study ancient Hebrew, should we not study modern Hebrew? If they raise Jewish children according to their beliefs, should we not raise Jewish children according to ours? If they stand up for their version of Jewishness, should we not stand up for ours? For many Jewish radicals of the past 200 years, dedication to the cause of humanity acted as a kind of unspoken substitute for dedication to the cause of Jewish survival. Unfortunately, Jewish radicals of this kind often injected an anti-Semitic element into their conception of human progress. Jews who do not love other Jews cannot be trusted to love the entire human race. To Jewish radicals who continue to deny their own Jewish identity, the advice of Y.L. Peretz still applies. In his article, "Advice To The Estranged", on page 173 of Goodman's anthology, he put it this way:

If you do not want to suffer with our people, you need not do so. If you cannot love our people, it can get along without your love. But don't fail to respect it!

Bow your frivolous heads before the eternal warrior, the eternal people.

Bow your heads deep, deep, to the very ground!

Love of the Jewish people is the deep spring from which the Tree of Life is watered. It is by the depth of their love, as well as by the strength of their ideas, that all varieties of Jewish thought, whether orthodox or radical, are best judged.

The Tree of Life that grows in the garden of Eden is a metaphor for the beauty and continuity of life. Life

grows from the ocean, assumes innumerable forms and propagates itself from one generation to the next. In real space-time there are no individuals: we are all buds on the tree of life. The stronger our sense of the unity of all life, the greater our respect for ourselves, for others and for the world around us. Jewish radicalism and love of humanity are not conflicting alternatives but different words for the same thing. Only those who truly love themselves can truly love others as well. Love flows from the particular to the general, just as water flows from the river to the sea. Those who would love life had best begin by loving their own form of life. Later, when all the earth is a garden, then will the Torah of the Tree of Life stand revealed.