

Statement by Referee of Senior Thesis

---

The Senior dissertation entitled:

"Herzl's Zionist Ideology and its Relationship to the  
Near Eastern Question, 1890-1904"

written by Robert L. Lehman  
(name of student)

- 1) may (with revisions) be considered for publication: ( ☒ )  
cannot be considered for publication: (     )
- 2) may, on request, be loaned by the Library: ( ☒ )  
may not be loaned by the Library: (     )

Ellis Rivkin  
(signature of referee)

Ellis Rivkin  
(referee)

3/15/54  
(date)

**HERZL'S ZIONIST IDEOLOGY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP  
TO THE NEAR EASTERN QUESTION,  
1890 - 1904**

by

**Robert L. Lehman**

**submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for  
the Master of Hebrew Letters  
Degree and Ordination**

**Hebrew Union College-  
Jewish Institute of Religion  
Cincinnati, Ohio  
January, 1954**

**Referee:  
Professor Ellis Rivkin**

## HERZL'S ZIONIST IDEOLOGY AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE NEAR EASTERN QUESTION, 1890 - 1904

### Precis

It is the purpose of this thesis to examine the activities of Theodor Herzl in relation to his attempts to establish a Jewish State in Palestine. The sources have been examined, with attention placed in the field of international relations, focused toward the Near East, from 1890 to 1904.

The writer has found that although Herzl conceived of his plan in the spirit of nationalism which was sweeping the countries of Europe at that time, his plan, for several reasons, was unfeasable. Although Herzl dealt at length with the leaders of western, eastern and asiatic Europe, he was never more than a pawn in the hands of these skilled diplomats. His efforts to eliminate the debt of Turkey met with frustration at every turn. It was to the interest of the Powers to keep Turkey in financial difficulties for this allowed them to enter the country and invest large sums of money in her economy. This is a direct result of the other movement in existence at that time: economic imperialism. By investing huge sums in a given area, the Powers were able to control the policies of the dominated area and exploit her resources for their own use.

In a small measure Herzl sought to do the same with Turkey. By helping her with money, he expected large grants of land and other concessions for the Jews. This hope was never realized for the other nations had infinitely more resources and put all their energy into the construction of the Berlin to Bagdad Railroad. For

a variety of reasons this plan was acceptable to the Sultan but it permitted the European investors to realize huge profits at the expense of the Turkish economy. Herzl, attempting to compete with these forces was hopelessly outclassed; the times were against him.

It is the thesis of the writer that Herzl, living and working for his ideal during those years, had no possibility, at any time, of realizing his dream.

to

MY PARENTS

whose love, guidance, interest  
and friendship have sustained  
me and brought me to this day

## Table of Contents

	page
Preface . . . . .	
Chapter One . . . . .	1
Herzl: His Life and Thought	
Footnotes	
Chapter Two . . . . .	29
Imperialism	
Footnotes	
Chapter Three . . . . .	48
Herzl in the Crucible of Near Eastern Imperialistic	
Rivalry	
Footnotes	
Chapter Four . . . . .	87
Epilogue	
Footnotes	
Bibliography . . . . .	

## Preface

The choice of a thesis topic is not always an easy one. The writer, however, was fortunate in that the idea for this paper was given to him in a history class at Hebrew Union College over a year ago. Once some elementary research had been done, the choice was not so difficult for the subject of this paper was an extremely interesting and challenging individual.

Many biographies have been written about Theodor Herzl; he was, after all, one of the great Jewish men of recent times. In all of the research, however, I did not discover any valid reference to the international picture during the years of Herzl's activities. Herzl was always treated in a manner which excluded him from his times and from the spirit of the years in which he was active. It was the purpose of this writer to relate Herzl to his period in history and to show him not only in the light of his Zionist activities but in relationship to his dealings and activities with the Powers that ruled. As a result, we must discover whether this leader of men was indeed such a great figure or whether, all things being equal and an objective study being made, he was not merely another man on the scene of history who gave us an idea, worked for it and is remembered for his thought. Practical achievements had to be left for others.

The task of writing this paper was more difficult. It could never have been done were the writer not fortunate enough in having as his guide Dr. Ellis Rivkin, Associate Professor of History at the Hebrew Union College. A great debt is owed to him; in this

manner I seek to thank him for his guidance, kindness and friendship.

Chapter One

Robert L. Lehman

January 1954

WORLD HIS LIFE AND THOUGHT

Central Europe, throughout the nineteenth century, was in a state of constant turmoil. Due to the very changes in political conditions, in economic conditions and in the social milieu, there were coming to the fore which were new and, therefore, different. These changes were to affect the entire history of the European continent, particularly Central Europe. After 1815 the man of the hour was, unquestionably, Metternich and it was the system which he represented which was destined to decline. Metternich, the great idealist and realist alike, instrumental in the unification of Italy, characterized the age of Metternich by describing the man:

"In the nineteenth century there exists not one man in Europe. There was — the only man to comprehend the present European situation and its inherent dangers — is Metternich; and Metternich is inevitably paralyzing, the ultimate principle in his highest expression, the Federal One International. Metternich is a great man. He has penetrated and grasped the nature of the principle of internationalism, and from all his study he has derived a belief which is the basis of his entire political system. Metternich is logical."

That the struggle, however, made in the decline of all of the conservative forces in Europe, was the movement which we know this day as Nationalism. It was a spirit of the age, which united all types of people under a banner or slogan in an effort to join together in order to achieve certain ends. Thus, they united in France under Napoleon III, in Italy under Garibaldi and Cavour, in Germany under Bismarck, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, then one of the largest in

## Chapter One

### HERZL: HIS LIFE AND THOUGHT

Central Europe, throughout the nineteenth century, was in a state of constant turmoil. Due to the many changes in political policies, in economic endeavors and in the social milieu, forces were coming to the fore which were new and, therefore, different. These drives were to affect the entire history of the European continent, particularly Central Europe. After 1815 the man of the hour was, unquestionably, Metternich and it was the system which he represented which now started to decline. Mazzini, the great idealist and nationalist, instrumental in the unification of Italy, characterized the age of Metternich by describing the man:

"On the monarchist side there exists but one man in Europe. This man — the only one to comprehend the present European situation and its inherent dangers — is Metternich; and Metternich is Immobility personified, the Chinese principle in its highest expression, the Status Quo incarnate .... Metternich is a great man. He has penetrated and grasped the nature of the principle he represents, and from all his study he has derived an axiom which is the resume of his entire political science: Movement is fatal."<sup>1</sup>

What did emerge, however, much to the dislike of all of the conservative forces in Europe, was the movement which we know this day as Nationalism. It was a spirit of the age, which united all types of people under a banner or slogan in an effort to join together in order to achieve certain ends. Thus, they united in France under Bonaparte III, in Italy under Mazzini and Cavour, in Germany under Bismark. The Austro-Hungarian Empire, then one of the largest in

Europe, felt the stirrings of this movement as its many nationalities attempted to find or achieve recognition as distinct, national groups. There were the Hungarians, Croats, Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Rumanians and other less nationally-conscious groups. Each one of these tried to emulate the example set forth by Mazzini so that they, also, would attain a place in the sun. In the case of Mazzini and Italy,

"What actually did emerge was 'Young Italy.' That is to say, in that Savona cell, sometime between Nov. 1830 and the end of Jan. 1831, an apostolate was conceived which, in the fulness of time, and for a brief eternal hour, was to engage the absolutist Powers of Europe in the name of the Ideal, and bring the impossible to pass."<sup>2</sup>

Among all peoples, then, the urge was felt to form themselves into a union, with a representative government which would protect its interest in the face of the world situation. "If ever there was a 'spirit of the Age,' the spirit of the second half of the nineteenth century was political nationalism ..... The nationalist wars of the period from 1848 - 1878"<sup>3</sup> are indications of this trend and were only later followed by imperialistic conquests. Nationalism was the only ideal which suffered no eclipse during the reaction which set in following the revolutions of 1848; in fact, it might be said that if anything, this movement and ideal grew stronger. These people were interested not only in their nationalities for the sake of self-government, but also insofar as their particular language, customs, and literature were concerned.

" ..... a ferment of nationalist sentiment, manifesting itself among the weaker peoples not merely in a sturdy and heroic resistance against political absorption or territorial nationalism, but in a passionate revival of decaying customs, language, literature and art; while it bred in

more dominant peoples strange ambitions of nationalist, 'destiny' and an attendant spirit of Chauvinism."<sup>4</sup>

This feeling on the part of many peoples manifested itself in a variety of ways. All of a sudden, under the impetus of certain events which took place within a country, the attitude toward certain basic factors in the lives of the people changed. The country was the most important aspect of their existence, the individual was nothing; the King is the symbol, the Church is the true guide and tutor in matters relating to the spiritual development of all. The supreme good was to be able to fight and die for country, king and Church.

"This is not rationalism, not humanitarianism, not cosmopolitanism, not the 18th century. It is romanticism, it is the true religion of the present age, it is the one unfailing appeal to which conservatives have always been able to resort ever since the Revolution — it is modern Nationalism, the religion of irrational patriotism. De Maistre appealed to the Frenchmen to save France and her king; Burke called on Englishmen to defend England and her Constitution; and thus has every statesman called on his fellows to preserve the great traditions of their native land."<sup>5</sup>

The forces in command saw in this movement the one chance of uniting the various elements in their populations and of rallying a nation behind its government. The movement, as it grew and became more intense, then became a force which had to be reckoned with. Whole peoples were aflame with a new kind of zeal and it was the task of the ruling class of politicians to utilize this movement to their best possible advantage. All forces in public life were drawn into the ideological battle and "in the most remote places and among the most diverse peoples nationalism thrived; Ireland, Norway, Finland,

Poland, Greece, Latin America, India and Japan."<sup>6</sup>

"The years from 1848 - 1871 witnessed some striking achievement of national patriotism throughout Central Europe. Every popular literature was affected. Scholars came under the racial spell. Individuals were acutely conscious of their nationality. In the name of nationalism, an adventurer ruled France for 22 years; because of nationalism the Habsburg dominions were tumultuously shaken. Political independence was assured the Magyars, and political unification, after the aspirations of centuries, was secured to Germans and Italians."<sup>7</sup>

The new movement of idealism also created a furore among the diverse classes of peoples. The shape of a country was not only to be changed externally but internally as well. The conflict between the middle class, the factory hands and the entrenched minority was now to break into the open in all its fury. Each segment of society had a stake in the forces which would shape society for future years and each was desirous of attaining the best possible advantages under the new system which was bound to emerge.

"Back of the multiplicity and diversity of 19th century tendencies lies the ever-accelerated rate at which economic forces of social change have been proceeding. The triumphant middle class has itself split into a number of sections; the great body of industrial workers that emerged has been subdivided in a myriad of ways. Instead of a few simple classes among which an urban population was developing, for several generations we have had a society broken up into a great number of special groups, each with its own interests and ideals, and each conflicting with the others on important points. Nationalism too has entered to cut across all such economic lines and create new divisions among men and new groupings."<sup>8</sup>

The new middle class was sure to become the dominant force in the life of the state from this time onward. Although the other classes of society attempted, at times, to wrest authority from these business interests, it soon became evident that the most important development,

as a result of the nationalist sentiment, was the rise of the middle class to a position of dominance which it would not easily relinquish. It is due to this group that European civilization entered a new phase of prosperity, a phase in which business and industry played the dominant role. The three major characteristics, then, to be found in the Europe of post-1871 were as follows:<sup>9</sup>

- (1) politically speaking, the beginning in nearly every country of a new form of government which has lasted at least to 1914;
- (2) socially, a preeminence of the middle class, based directly upon the economic foundation of the Industrial Revolution and which modified the activities and ambitions of other classes; and
- (3) politically, exaltation under middle class auspices of three major principles of the French Revolution: (a) individual liberty, (b) constitutionalism, including representative government, and (c) nationalism.

The Jewish people residing in Central Europe were also caught up in this frenzied desire to attain a homeland for themselves. Although some nationalities or religious groups had long since been granted freedom of worship and the right of assembly, the Jews found themselves in a very peculiar position. Although the boon of equality was extended to many Jewish individuals, this right was not granted to the Jewish people in its corporate capacity. For the Jews, "the price of Emancipation was assimilation and the disappearance of the Jewish people as a distinct entity among the nations. None but a religious bond was to exist henceforth between Jews."<sup>10</sup>

Theodor Herzl, who was to become the representative of Jewry in the struggle to attain a national independence, was born into an era which was precisely afflicted by this contradiction. His whole environment was saturated with the nationalist sentiment current in

those times yet his people was relegated to an inferior position.

"The Jews of Budapest carried on a long struggle for social and civil rights. The emancipation voted by the Hungarian Reichstag in 1849 ..... did not take effect ..... It was only after the Ausgleich, the compromise arrangement according to which Hungary was to enjoy the broadest measure of autonomy within the framework of an Austro-Hungarian union, that the Constitution of 1867 completed the emancipation of the Jews."<sup>11</sup>

And this did not prevent the Mayor of Vienna from calling the Jews the most despicable names and he felt that it was all one whether one hangs or beheads them.

It is into such a world, and into a Jewish community thus situated, that Theodor Herzl was born on May 2, 1860. He led a comfortable life in his early years as his father was well situated financially and the difficulties of the years did not penetrate into the staid and well placed middle class family. It was not till the spring of 1873 that the outside world made its inroads into the family of Herzl as his father lost all of his financial holdings in the depression of that year. It was the time, also, of the beginning of political anti-semitism in Germany, Austria and Hungary and this factor, plus the economic situation, did much to intensify anti-Jewish feelings throughout the land. The stage was set so expertly, in fact, that the Tisza Eszlar ritual murder trial could take place a bare five years thereafter, in 1882. It was the custom in those days, and among the social class of which Herzl was a part, that upon reaching the proper age he entered the Realschule. It was there that he met his first anti-semitic incident. In later years he was to recall this as follows:

"Einer unserer Lehrer erklärte die Bedeutung des

Wortes 'Heiden' indem er sagte: 'Zu diesen gehören die Götzendiener, Muhammedaner und Juden.'<sup>12</sup>

Many of the writers delving into the background of Herzl have concluded that it was due to this remark, and perhaps other unrecorded incidents that he left the Realschule in 1875. It seems to the writer that this is an erroneous explanation for it was not till many years later that Herzl first became aware of the Jewish question and it was not till the time of the Dreyfuss affair that Herzl first began to deal with the problem of anti-semitism. The explanation of Josef Patai, although it also can not be proven concretely, seems much more valid in the light of Herzl's age and environment:

"In Feb. of 1875, he left the Realschule not because of the anti-semitic spirit that prevailed there, as was alleged in a humoristic auto-biography written in later years, but because of his intensive preoccupation with poetry which handicapped him even in his Jewish studies."

After much debate as to his future career and due to the fact that Herzl's beloved sister passed away at an early age, the family left their native Budapest and Herzl enrolled in the Fall of 1878 as a student in the law faculty of the University of Vienna. A very interesting and true fact is pointed out by Alex Bein in connection with his law studies:

"Among his studies was Roman law, which made the deepest impression on him. He himself has said so frequently, and traces of Roman law are visible in his Judenstaat; it is implicit in his contention that a small minority can exercise the right of acting on behalf of an entire people."<sup>14</sup>

This last observation by Bein, inadvertently points out how much of a product Herzl was of his day and of his class. The intellectual groups of all the minorities, including the Jews, were constantly pressing for the ideal of a state of their own never doubting for a

a moment their ability to govern themselves. This thought was found in the person of Herzl as well as in any other dynamic individual to be found among the Slavs, Czechs and the others. Herzl thought in terms with which he was familiar; in terms which were acceptable to his station and society.

Herzl, although continuing with his law studies, soon showed an inclination toward the literary. He competed for many prizes but failed to win any recognition; it was not until 1885 that he won his first prize and a job at a temporary position on the Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung. He then definitely decided to relinquish his law position and soon met initial success as a writer. In 1889 he married. Herzl then transferred his allegiance to the Neue Freie Presse, one of the most influential papers of his day. Throughout the stormy career which was to follow, Herzl never forsook the association with this paper and his dependence on this salary did much to make his future struggles even more bitter.

" ..... in Herzl's inability to rise above the mores of middle class Vienna .... he was compelled, he thought, to maintain his position on the paper. Why? Because, as he says again and again, he must on the one hand have the means to keep up his diplomatic front and on the other hand provide for his family 'in the way they are accustomed to live.' It is a little difficult to imagine a Mazzini .... answering so."<sup>15</sup>

It seems that during the time of his stay in Vienna and his later transfer to Paris as Parisian correspondent of the Neue Freie Presse, Herzl took on some of the characteristics of the anti-semitic himself. He, however, in a later piece of writing refers to himself as an assimilationist. In 1895 we read in his Tagebücher of his first visit to a Temple in Paris:

"Ich ging zum erstenmal in den Tempel der rue de la Victore, fand den Gottesdienst wieder feierlich und rührend. Vieles erinnerte mich an meine Jugend, den Temple in der Tabakgasse in Pest. Ich sah mir die hiesige Juden an und fand die Familienähnlichkeit ihrer Gesichter, kuhne verdrückte Nasen, scheue und listige Augen."<sup>16</sup>

From the above we can also deduce that Herzl must have had some pleasant memories of his Jewish home. It then only proves to us how far he had removed himself from such a religious atmosphere, later he makes special mention of the fact that he lit a Christmas tree for his children. Since one of his guests was not too happy with this act, Herzl was willing to placate the old man by calling it a "Chamuka-baum."<sup>17</sup> The irony toward his religion and its practices is unmistakable here.

In the course of his writings, Herzl also did a great deal of reading, even in his early years. One of the books which came into his hands was Dührings "Die Judenfrage als Frage der Rassenschädlichkeit für Existenz, Sitten und Kultur der Völker." His reaction to this volume was a very violent one in that he found himself a Jew all over again after he had already forgotten or conveniently misplaced his religious affiliation. In 1899, he writes in retrospect and with the experiences of his career in mind:

"..... Das Buch Dühring's wirkte auf mich, wie wenn ich einen Schlag auf den Kopf bekommen hätte. Und so ist es wohl manchen westlichen Juden ergangen der sein Volkstum schon völlig vergessen hatte....."<sup>18</sup>

Active anti-semitism did not appear to him until, walking in the streets of Mainz in 1888, he heard the infamous "HEP-HEP." It was at the second occurrence that he makes one of his first statements for now the call of the anti-semite affected him as a person:

"Das zweitemal wurde mir in Baden by Wien  
'Saujud' nachgerufen ..... Dieser Ruf traf  
mich stärker ..... weil er auf 'heimischem'  
Boden ertonte ..... Der Antisemitismus ist  
gewachsen, wächst weiter — und ich auch."<sup>19</sup>

It is interesting to see, however, how shallow his reaction really was and how little he resembled, at this time, the Herzl of the later years. The Zionist whom we hold in such high esteem did not emerge till very late. In the meantime, Herzl wrote the following sentiments in a book review of Dumas' "Femme de Claude" in 1894

"Good Jew Daniel wants to find again the home of his tribe and take home his scattered brethren. But he must know that the Jews would not be helped by regaining their historical home. It is childish to look for the geographical home of the Jews ..... and if the Jews should, indeed, return home, then the next day they would discover that they have not belonged together for many years. They have been rooted for centuries in their new homes, denationalized, different from each other, held together only through the pressure exerted everywhere against them."<sup>20</sup>

The only other anti-semitic matter which he records from his earlier years is an inscription to be found in a beach cabin at Zell am See:

"O Gott, schick doch den Moses wieder,  
Auf dass er seine Stammesbrüder  
Wegführe ins gelobte Land.  
Ist dann die ganze Judensippe  
Erst drinnen in des Meeres Mitte,  
Dann, Herr, O mach die Klappe zu,  
Und alle Christen haben Ruh."<sup>21</sup>

It is about this time that Herzl seriously began to think about the Jewish Question. At first, it was a negative attitude which showed itself insofar as he toys with the thought of converting to Christianity or, a later thought, to take the Catholic Church into his confidence and convert all the Jews into the Church. This thought was fully developed in 1893

"Vor ungefähr zwei Jahren wollte ich die Judenfrage mit Hilfe der katholischen Kirche wenigstens in Oesterreich lösen. Ich wollte Zutritt zum Papst verschaffen ..... und ihm sagen: Helfen Sie uns gegen die Antisemiten, und ich leite eine grosse Bewegung des freien und anständigen Übertritts der Juden zum Christentum ein. Frei und anständig dadurch, dass die Führer dieser Bewegung Juden bleiben und als Juden den Übertritt zur Mehrheitsreligion propagieren ..... Wir bleiben noch beim Glauben unserer Väter. Aber unsere jungen Söhne sollten wir zu Christen machen, bevor sie ins Alter der eigenen Entschliessung kamen, wo der Übertritt wie Feigheit oder Streberie aussieht."<sup>22</sup>

The Jewish Question then made inroads on his life, consciously. In writing of the development of this problem, as pertains to his own thinking, he says that the beginning of the question is unknown to him but probably he began to think about it after reading Dührings book. It went so far that at one time he considered the writing of a novel dealing with a Jewish theme but at the time — this was before he came to Paris — the question had not seized his imagination completely. He wanted to show the poor, sorrowing Jews in contrast to their wealthy coreligionists. He desired to illustrate how the latter feel nought of the prevalent antisemitism although it is their fault that such an attitude exists.<sup>23</sup> Herzl did not develop this trend of thought any further and does not delve into any of the basic reasons for anti-semitic outbursts. It was not till he actually began to work for his people that he began to form definite opinions as to the problem

"Ich begreife den Anti-Semitismus ..... Tatsächlich ist der Anti-Semitismus die Folge der Judenemanzipation ..... Der Anti-Semitismus ..... wird aber den Juden nicht schaden. Ich halte ihn für eine dem Judencharacter nützliche Bewegung. Er ist die Erziehung einer Gruppe durch die Massen und wird vielleicht zu ihrer Aufsaugung führen. Erzogen wird man nur durch Härten."<sup>24</sup>

Herzl, now thoroughly aware of the Jewish Question, or Problem, enters into the period of his life which is to make of him the Zionist. Having been transferred to Paris as a correspondent for his newspaper, he pursued the regular activities of his profession until he came into contact with the Dreyfuss affair, which rocked France during the 1890's. In a letter to Heinrich Teweles in Prague in May of 1895,<sup>25</sup> Herzl writes that he has discovered that there is no greater purpose for him in life than to busy himself with all aspects of the Jewish Question. However, he will do this in a freer, loftier and more unique way than has ever been attempted before. That it was the Dreyfuss trial which caused the transformation from a mere preoccupation with the Jewish Question to the future leader of Zionism is to be found in one of his articles, Zionismus, written in 1899

"Zum Zionisten hat mich nämlich der Prozess Dreyfuss gemacht. Nicht der jetzige in Rennes, sondern der ursprüngliche in Paris, dessen Zeuge ich in 1894 war."<sup>26</sup>

Herzl was to recall the different aspects of this trial throughout his life and on more than one occasion he referred back to these days when he first began to think of Zionism as a solution to the Jewish Problem. He calls attention to the fact that the Parisians did not yell "Down with Dreyfuss" but "Down with the Jews." That was the way the sentiment began and remained throughout France. It is the first time that he realized that there was a more to the trial than the conviction of an Army officer suspected of treason

"Aber der Fall Dreyfuss enthält mehr als einen Justizirrtum; er enthält den Wunsch der ungeheuren Mehrheit in Frankreich, einen Juden, und in diesem einen alle Juden zu verdammen. Tod der

Juden! heulte die Menge, als man dem Hauptmann seine Tressen vom Waffenrocke riss."<sup>27</sup>

And, finally, in a letter to Rabbi Moritz Gûdeman in June of 1895, he wrote the Chief Rabbi of Vienna the tremendous news:

"Ich habe die Lösung der Judenfrage. Ich weiss es klingt verrückt; man wird mich in der ersten Zeit noch oft verrückt halten, bis man die Wahrheit aller dessen, was ich sage, erschüttert einsieht. Ich habe die Lösung gefunden, und sie gehört nicht mehr mir. Sie gehört der Welt .... Auf 13 Jahre schätze ich die Zeit, in der dieser Gedanke sich in mir durcharbeitete. Denn aus dem Jahre 1882, wo ich Dührings Buch liess, stammen meine ersten Aufzeichnungen."<sup>28</sup>

It is extremely interesting to note that in the letter to Gûdemann, Herzl uses the word "Aufzeichnungen." This word might well be translated "Notes" but it must be pointed out that in no other place, in any of his writings, does he refer to making notes with reference to the solution of the Jewish problem as far back as 1882. It could be possible, however, that here Herzl was referring to the many plays and Feuilletons which he had written in previous years and in which he discusses the Jewish Problem at rare intervals. We know that his work was highly respected in Vienna and one of the most famous of his contemporaries, Stefan Zweig, heaps praise upon him in great quantity. Zweig calls his essays "the most cultivated in journalism" and "the delight of a city (Vienna) that had schooled itself to every subtlety."<sup>29</sup> In his play "Das Neue Ghetto," written originally in 1894, the following very suggestive dialogue takes place:

"Jacob: Ich sage nur, wir müssen hinaus!  
Friedheimer: Und ich antworte Ihnen, wir können nicht. Als das wirkliche Ghetto noch bestand, durften wir es nicht ohne Erlaubnis verlassen — bei schwerer Leibesgefahr. Jetzt sind die

Mauern und Schranken unsichtbar, wie Sie  
Sagen. Aber auch dieses moralische Ghetto  
ist unser vorgeschriebener Aufenthaltsort,  
Wehe dem, der hinaus will!"<sup>30</sup>

And, again, writing the only Feuilleton which deals with a Jewish  
theme:

"Herr: Mit Leuten, die man unterwegs begegnet,  
möchte ich nie in Berührung kommen.

Fürstin: Da haben Sie recht. Es gibt auf  
Reisen unmögliche Menschen, denen man kaum  
ausweichen kann. Geschäftsleute, Poebel,  
Juden .....

Herr: Was meinen Sie? .....

Fürstin: Wer sind Sie?

Herr: Ein Traümer, der vorübergeht.

Fürstin: Sie sprechen anders ..... Ich möchte  
wissen, wer sind sie? .....

Herr: Befehlen Sie mich nicht, mich zu  
nennen .....

Fürstin: Immer mehr will ich wissen, wer sie  
sind.

Herr: Sie werden mir zurnen, wenn ich es nach  
alledem sage.

Fürstin: Ich werde ihnen nur verzeihen, wenn  
sie es mir sagen.

Herr: (entschlossen) Nun, denn, — ich heiße  
Kohn.

Fürstin: (verduzt) So? ..... Das ist ..... Wo  
sind wir denn schon?

Kellner: Befehlen?

Fürstin: Meine Kammerfrau wird Ihre Rechnung  
bezahlen

Herr: Das war vorausszusehen .....<sup>31</sup>

We see, then, that the preoccupation with Zionism had definitely begun  
and that the Jewish theme was uppermost in his mind. He was to be the  
spark which ignites the fire and it was to be in his hands that the  
leadership was to rest for the struggle to come. The idea of the Jew-  
ish State was definitely born. Again, however, it must be stressed  
that such an idea was only a part of the times and that had Herzl  
lived in any other age, or sprung from a different kind of environ-  
ment, the development of his great thought and plan would have been  
left to another individual or would have taken a completely different

course.

"Men have built up civilization, men have patiently and laboriously found out every way of doing things and toilingly worked out every idea that is today a part of our heritage of the past — men working at every turn, to be sure, under the influence of their environment, and with the materials at hand ..... The complex of beliefs and ideals by which the modern world lives and with which it works is not a gift from the gods, as ancient myth had it, but an achievement of a long succession of generations."<sup>32</sup>

The idea was born and it could not be revoked. How is one able to measure the power and strength of an idea, Herzl asks. By the fact that no one is able to withdraw or destroy it, whether he be for or against the idea.<sup>33</sup> The Zionist revolution which was led by Herzl worked wonders for the Jewish people. The consciousness of positive solidarity made itself felt all over the world, as far as most of the people were concerned, and it might well be added that it marked the regeneration of progress toward survival.

"Mit einemal fuhr Herzl zusammen und hielt mitten in einer gewaltigen Seelenkrise, denn in seinem von Liebe gequälten Geist drang ein Ton, ein Wort, das in seinem Hirn und in seinem Herzen verdoppelt, verdreifacht widerholte: Judenstaat, Judenland, Selbsthilfe."<sup>34</sup>

Herzl first felt that his forthcoming solution to the Jewish Question should be printed in a small pamphlet which was to be shown privately to a few of his select friends. In his autobiographical sketch he notes, that he had never the intention of taking over the movement himself and the open publication of his essay occurred to him only much later. Somewhere along the line he changed his mind and in the year 1896, his now famous Judenstaat made its initial appearance. It was to rank with the great books and essays which have discussed the Jewish

question over the ages and the solution proposed by Herzl was in no way so radically different from many of his predecessors. Had Herzl not lived in an age ripe for nationalist sentiment his work would have met the same fate of ~~Obscurity~~ as did the books by Hess and, notably, Pinsker. In fact, as Herzl later admits quite freely in his Diaries, at the time of his writing Der Judenstaat he had never heard of either of these two men and, had he heard of them or read their writings, it is quite conceivable that he would never have written his own book. Herzl did not read Pinsker till four days before his first German edition came before the public, in 1896; he did not actually get to read all of Hess' volume till 1901.

Herzl not only did not know of Hess and Pinsker, but he had no idea of the many previous attempts made in the interest of the Jewish people. That Napoleon in 1799 toyed with the idea of a Jewish State in Palestine was unknown to him, as was the book by the Frenchman E. Laharanne, On the New Oriental Question, something of which he had no idea. He had never read the books on the subject by Benjamin Disraeli and George Elliot, and he was unfamiliar with Ferdinand Lasalles' attempt to lead the Jews in a conquest of Palestine in 1840. Aside from this, it is quite certain that he had never read, and his attention had never been called to, the petition of the Chovevei Zion to the Sultan of Turkey in 1893 nor the Bilu Manifesto of 1882. He did know of the Petah Tikvah colony in Palestine but there is reason to believe that he had no familiarity with the background of this colony and the movement which sponsored its founding. His complete ignorance of these matters is, perhaps, best illustrated in this extract of his Tagebücher

"Leven (member of Alliance Israelite) meinte dass ich besonders in Russland viel Anhänger finden würde. Dort habe auch in Odessa ein Mann namens Pinsker gelebt und für dieselbe Sache, nämlich die Wiederlangung einer eigenen Judenheimat, gestritten. Pinsker ist leider schon tot. Seine Schriften sollen merkwürdig sein. Werde sie lesen sowie ich Zeit habe. Ein anderer Jude in England, Oberst Goldsmid, sei auch ein begeisterter Zionist, habe Schiffe chartern wollen, um Palastina wieder zu erobern."<sup>35</sup>

Pinsker in his day and at the time of his writing, was undoubtedly one of the most sensitive of Jewish men to be found in his part of the world. Not only did he deal with the problem of anti-semitism and its psychology but he also dealt with the Jewish problem as a whole "while others deal only with fragments of it and always in an apologetic spirit."<sup>36</sup> Pinsker wrote in 1882 that a solution to the problem of the Jews in the realm of the "slow progress of humanity is impossible" and that we must "abandon the delusive idea that we are fulfilling a Providential mission ..... we must seek honor and our salvation ..... in the restoration of a national bond of unity." This was written at a time when Herzl had not even read Dührings book! Another point of contrast between Herzl and Pinsker is pointed out by Gottheil:

"The results are all the more strange when we consider that Pinsker intended to call forth a practical realization of his theories, while Herzl's pages were conceived and written as a sort of self-communing, not even destined for a large circle of friends."<sup>37</sup>

As for Hess, Herzl did not have the opportunity of reading his volume till 1901, although the book had been presented to him three years earlier. Upon completing the book, Herzl was moved to write

"Welch ein hoher, edler Geist. Alles, was wir versuchten, steht schon bei ihm ..... Seit Spinoza hat das Judenthum keinen grosseren Geist her-

vorgebracht als diesen vergessenen, verblas-  
ten Moses Hess!"<sup>38</sup>

Herzl found a great deal to his liking in the writings of Hess, of this there can be no doubt. Not only did Hess agree that the state should be founded in the Orient by depriving Turkey of her Palestinian possessions, but Hess also pointed out that the Jewish question could only be solved by the creation of a Jewish state, ruled and governed by Jews. The point of difference arose from the fact that Hess looked toward France as the protector and savior of the Jews, whereas Herzl after his experiences with the Dreyfuss trial, could scarcely conceive of France in this role. Also, Herzl and Hess agreed on the point that their scheme was not to be a revival of the religious unity of the Jews, primarily, but a secular, political state with all the consequences pertaining to such an act of statesmanship. Hess was thus moved to write:

"The Jewish nation, therefore, must not hesitate to follow France in all matters relating to the political and social regeneration of the nations on the one hand, and in everything which bears upon the revival of intellectual life in Germany on the other."<sup>39</sup>

An important distinction is drawn, however, between the efforts of Herzl and those of his predecessors. Although there had been organizations, clubs and other leading personalities dedicated to the Zionist ideal, Herzl was the one person who made of Zionism a movement which was to be influential in Jewish life from the time of the publication of the Judenstaat.<sup>40</sup>

Der Judenstaat, then, was published and reaction set in immediately. His theories were of such a "radical" nature, upset the prevailing sentiment for the status quo to such an extent that

from all corners of the world negative criticism made itself felt. Herzl truly believed that he had the answer and that he was chosen to lead the Jews to the promised land. The criticism that his plan was merely another Utopian dream he answered in a letter to Dr. Gudemann in August of 1895

"Wodurch unterscheidet sich nun ein Plan von einer Utopie? Ich will es ihnen jetzt mit definitiven Worten sagen: durch die Lebenskraft, die den Plan und nicht die Utopie innewohnt; durch die Lebenskraft, die nicht von allen erkannt zu werden braucht ..... Utopien hat es genug gegeben. Nie hat ein vernünftiger Mensch daran gedacht, sie zu erwirklichen. Sie amüsieren, aber sie ergreifen nicht."<sup>41</sup>

Of course, such a sentiment as

"Wir werden uns die Judenjargons, jüdischdeutsch, abgewöhnen, die nur Sinn und Entschuldigung als verstohlene Sprache von Haftlingen hatten."<sup>42</sup>

did not endear him at all to the eastern Jewish masses, with which he was to deal in later years. Right now, however, upon publication the reaction was mostly negative in that people considered him insane, a hopeless dreamer, a potential king of the Jews and one who was motivated solely by selfish motives. Anton Bettelheim, reviewing the Judenstaat in the Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung, did not hesitate to write that the pamphlet is

"poor in ideas, rich in imbecilities, the fantastic dream of mind which has been unhinged by Jewish enthusiasm ..... We do not for an instant hesitate to declare that we reject Herzl's Judenstaat with greater distaste than the meanest anti-semitic pamphlet."<sup>43</sup>

Again, when a Zionist worker approached an editor of one of the leading newspapers for a contribution to the Zionist cause, he received the following reply: Geben tue ich Ihnen nichts, aber wenn Herzl ins Irrenhaus geführt werden soll, stelle ich Ihnen meinen Wagen

zur Verfügung."<sup>44</sup> As one looks, then, over the situation which existed, one can readily see that Herzl had no hope of making real progress. He stood without money, prestige, land, army and certainly did not have a united people on which he could rely. "The Jews, it is true, had plenty of money, but not for him."<sup>45</sup>

"His monumental idea was wrecked through the pettiness of his contemporaries. And as the radical change in Jewish life, which had engaged Herzl's imagination, proved impossible there occurred, for the time being, no change at all."<sup>46</sup>

Not only was his idea under attack from the moment of publication but his opponents did not hesitate to ridicule him personally, some subtly and some quite openly. They considered him naive, and the men of the eastern countries, particularly, were appalled at the fact that he was looked upon almost as a monarch or priest by his own western people. Chaim Weizman goes so far as to say that "certain elements in his bearing invited such an attitude."<sup>47</sup> Also,

"I remember a characteristic incident at one of the early Congresses ..... We did not mind him (Sir Francis Montefiore) as a showpiece, but we were rather fed up with his sainted uncle (Sir Moses Montefiore), and we wanted this particular Vice-Presidency (of the Congress) to go to some real personality ..... When Herzl pressed his point (that he wanted Sir Francis) on me I said: 'But Dr. Herzl, that man's a fool.' To which Herzl replied, with immense solemnity 'Er öffnet mir königliche Pforten' — 'he opens the portals of royalty to me.' I could not help grinning at this stately remark and Herzl turned white. He was full of Western dignity which did not sit well with our Russian-Jewish realism ..."<sup>48</sup>

Herzl's love of pomp and ceremony was noticed by his devotees also.

When Stefan Zweig encountered him in his position as Feuilleton editor of the Neue Freie Presse and asked approval of one of his own writings, Zweig reminisces that Herzl raised "his handsome, dark

countenance towards me, and with deliberate dignity he said slowly: "I am happy to tell you that your fine piece is accepted ..... It was as if Napoleon had pinned the Knight's Cross of the Legion of Honor upon a young sergeant on the battlefield."<sup>49</sup> Many of his later biographers such as Stephen Wise, Sokolow, Zangwill, all felt compelled to call attention to his regal bearing and the similarity of his pronouncements to that of emperors and the highest statesmen. One biographer,<sup>50</sup> even states that Freud was a great admirer of his and "was psychologically attracted to him." Herzl was not completely unaware of his magnificent figure and his impressive personality. In the earliest days of the movement, when not yet beset by all the trials and tribulations which were to follow, he wrote

"Heute ein einzelner und einsamer Mann. Morgen vielleicht der geistige Führer von Hunderttausenden. Jedenfalls der Finder und Verkünder einer mächtigen Idee."<sup>51</sup>

Yet, despite all of the hardship encountered in the wake of the publication of his book, Herzl does not lose faith. In fact, heartened by the success of the publication of an extract of Der Judenstaat in England, he continues his plans to contact the reigning nobility of his day in order to attain help for his plans. It is interesting to note, at this point, that Herzl's idea of approaching the leading statesmen of the time antedated the publication of his book. While still thinking over the validity of his plan, he wrote in June of 1895 to Bismark

"nur der Mann, der mit seiner eisernen Nadel das zerissene Deutschland so wunderbar zusammengeknäht hat, dass es gar nicht mer aussieht wie geflickt -- nur der ist gross genug, mir entgültig zu sagen, ob mein plan ein wirklich erlösender Gedanke ist, oder eine schaeftsinnige

## Phantasie."52

Bismark, of course, never answered him. This, however, did not deter him from the ultimate publication of his idea and of his real and honest desire to bring his message to the world. For a while even he found it difficult to go on in the face of the sharp criticism which met his volume on every side. His condemnation of these Jews who absolutely refused to countenance his work is sharp and, at times, extremely bitter, he also realized the consequences which would ensue once the Gentile world would notice the differences which became manifest within the Jewish community. But, as to the Jews

"Was haben die Protestler, Socialisten, und Assimilanten, und wie die Gegner unseres politischen Zionismus sonst noch heissen, in den Jahren unserer vielgeschmähten Bewegung denn bewirkt? Welche Lösung der Judenfrage haben sie an die Stelle der unserigen durchgesetzt, ja auch nur proponiert? Nichts haben sie getan und nichts erreicht."53

As Herzl points out so correctly, the anti-Zionist forces in Europe did nothing but offer negative criticism. It devolved upon him, then, to carry on the work and to lead the great movement. One of his greatest problems, of course, was the country into which the Jews should immigrate. He thought of Palestine for a great length of time but finally decided against the land. He felt that Palestine, although having tremendous sentimental appeal for all Jews the world over, would not be suitable for the modern Jew. Jews, he believes, are not orientals anymore and therefore the country of their dreams is out of the question. He does realize, also, that the land, whichever one it is, will have to be removed from the social and economic upheavals of Europe. At least for the first twenty-five years of the the new state's existence, separation from Europe is an essential

factor for the development of the Jewish State.<sup>54</sup> In consequence of the above reasoning, he began to look more and more toward South America in general, and Argentina in particular. The colonies of Baron de Hirsch made a great impression on him although he was totally opposed to their purpose. As a result, when the early reactions of his friends to his brochure were negative, even before the official publication of Der Judenstaat, he attempted to contact Hirsch and discuss with him his own plans for the solution to the Jewish Question. False hopes were raised in him when Hirsch granted him the interview; for this talk only served to point out the fundamental differences of opinion between these two men.

"Zunächst ist da das Princip der Wohltätigkeit, das ich für durchaus falsch halte. Sie (Hirsch) suchten Schnorrer. Characteristisch ist, dass bei keinem Volke so viel Wohltätigkeit und so viel Bettel vorkommt, wie bei den Juden ..... vor Jahren hörte ich, dass ihre versuche mit den Juden in Argentinien keine oder schlechte Resultate ergeben ..... sie schleppen diese Ackerjuden hinüber. Die müssen glauben dass sie fernhin ein Recht auf Ihre Unterstützung haben und gerade die Arbeitslust wird dadurch nicht gefordert ..... Mit 20,000 Ihrer argentinischen Juden haben Sie noch nichts bewiesen, selbst wenn die Leute gut tun. Misslingt es aber, so liefern Sie einen furchtbaren Beweis gegen die Juden."<sup>55</sup>

Hirsch, was not interested in the schemes of Herzl. He felt that the Jews should remain in their present state of inertia and that the latent energies which Herzl wished to call on were really the cause of the anti-semitism which did already exist.

"Meine Absicht ist, die Juden von der Streberei abzuhalten. Sie sollen nicht so grosse Fortschritte machen. Aller Hass kommt daher."<sup>56</sup>

That Hirsch would give Herzl any money with which to further his program was, of course, out of the question. The fact that Herzl wished to

approach the Kaiser and his dream of obtaining ten million mark for his purposes only made the Baron laugh. He considered the scheme impossible and there seems no reason to doubt that he felt the same way about the originator of the proposed plan. It is also doubtful that Herzl knew of the petition of the Lovers of Zion to Baron de Hirsch. They, in 1891, had already attempted to persuade the Baron to aid them in their colonization work in Palestine but to no avail. It is interesting to note, however, that already in these early years Herzl attempted to solve the solution of the Jews on the same financial basis that he was later to attempt with Turkey. He realized that the South American Republics needed money for their various schemes and he was the one to give it to them, in exchange for the desired land. He was, however, always plagued by his inability to get the desired funds and, thus, his plans never came to fruition and the economic failure of his movement always confronted him. Although Hirsch was unapproachable to him later on, Herzl never lost sight of him and even considered offering him a Vice-Presidency of the new state. This honor was to be bestowed for services rendered previously "und weil er den Plan kennt."<sup>57</sup>

But it did not take too long till Herzl finally realized the uselessness of dealing with Hirsch. As his train of thought continued to run along the lines of work which were directly opposite to those of Hirsch, he began to gravitate more and more from Argentina toward Palestine. It was there that he noticed Jews working on their own fields and he feels that this was beneficial to the Jewish spirit.

"Der Jude will den Boden mit dem Blute und  
Schweiss seiner Arbeit dungen — allerdings  
nur einen einzigen Boden, den von Palästina-

na. Baron de Hirsch hatte dieses ideale Moment ausser acht gelassen, darum ist sein Versuch in Argentinien misslungen ....."<sup>58</sup>

This was not the only major difference between Hirsch and Herzl. He said to Hirsch at one time, "How many Jews can you transplant, fifteen to twenty thousand? More Jews than that reside in one street of the Jewish district of Vienna."<sup>59</sup> Gradually, then, he turned his hopes to the already established colonies in Palestine but this did not satisfy him either. As a result he came into conflict with one of the most important Jewish personalities of the age: Baron de Rothschild. His opinion of the Baron, as well as of his works, was negative in the extreme and the feeling was probably mutual. Although Herzl did request an interview with the great man this was never granted to him. Max Nordau, however, did attain an interview which lasted sixty-three minutes. Rothschild spoke for fifty-three of these minutes and told Nordau, in no uncertain terms, that his opinion of Herzl's scheme was negative. Nothing would come of it and he, in no way, would lend support to the Zionist movement. Herzl then wrote in his Diaries

"Edmund de Rothschild ist ein Mann der die ganze Sache nicht versteht und sie aufhalten möchte ....."  
 Ich glaube, er ist jetzt entsetzt darüber, dass er sich mit Palästina eingelassen hat, und wird vielleicht (sagen), 'Du hast recht gehabt; ich hätte lieber Pferde rennen als Juden wandern lassen sollen.' Und von solchen Menschen soll das Schicksal vieler Millionen abhängen."<sup>60</sup>

The refusal of both Hirsch and Rothschild to help him made matters extremely difficult. Since he could not get the open support of these two influential Jewish men, the lesser lights were most unwilling to help him. It appears, however, that the analysis of Hirsch's colonies was correct for Weizman, in evaluating the colonies in Palestine,

reaches the same conclusions as Herzl did in regard to the colonies in Palestine and Argentina. Weizman says that these pioneers who had once been so dynamic and full of energy had their incentive destroyed by the Barons' "dictatorial bureaucracy" and they had come to rely solely on his bounty.

"They had lost hope and they saw their children  
 ..... leaving the land and going to the cities or  
 ..... returning to the exile from which they themselves had once fled in order to build a homeland for the coming generations."<sup>61</sup>

Herzl, as late as 1900, still smarts under the refusal of the Rothschilds to have anything to do with his program. As late as that year, he points out in his essay on "Rothschilds Kolonien," it has been possible to transplant only four hundred seventy families unto the soil of Palestine. In short, it appears to him that with all of these four hundred seventy families, Rothschild could not even make his Colonists happy, let alone solve the Jewish Question with all of his efforts and good intentions. In a more sober, detailed analysis of the Rothschild regime in Palestine, we arrive at the following figures: (1) Rothschild invested the equivalent of £ 5,600,000 in Jewish settlements; (2) of this, £ 1,600,000 was spent between 1883 and 1889; and (3) during this time the total invested by the Lovers of Zion did not amount to more than £ 87,000.<sup>62</sup> We see, then, that the whole project was not and could not turn out to be a happy experience for those involved. Herzl realized the uselessness of these efforts but due to the snubbings, he could only write in exasperation, these bitter words:

"Für die vaterländischen Diplomaten existiere ich nicht. Sie behandeln mich als Luft, die Idioten, von deren Existenz kein Mensch mehr eine Ahnung haben wird, wenn mein Name noch

durch die Zeiten glänzen wird wie ein Stern."<sup>63</sup>

The road toward Zion was not an easy one for Herzl and so it is good to note that there was at least one bright personality in this early, disastrous venture. Max Nordau, whom he met at the very beginning of his Judenstaat, was to become a close friend and advisor who stuck to Herzl in all of the later turmoil, up to the very end. The ideas of the one found support in the thinking of the other and there was very little friction between these two men, ever. Herzl was the leader without question but it was not he alone that ran the movement. Nordau served him to an incalculable degree with counsel and encouragement. These two men complemented each other in their dream of helping the Jewish people:

"Quite as assimilated as Herzl in the highest sense of the word, that is, in the complete possession of European culture and of European ways at their best, he (Max Nordau) knew of the Jewish mentality better than his friend. After all, he had grown up as an orthodox Jew. He understood those who lived both spiritually and physically on the 'Jewish Street' .... by virtue of his upbringing, so different from Herzl's, he had a better grasp of the impulses and actions of the people."<sup>64</sup>

It was at this point, realizing the difficulties within the Jewish group and having the friendship of Nordau as his support, that Herzl set out to conquer the Gentile world in order to gain support for his theories. It was here that his real struggle was to begin as he attempted to obtain a portion of land from Turkey, which was then the ruler of the Near Eastern world. The politics of the Powers, Herzl's attempt to play one nation against the other and the stakes involved in his attempt to bring the plan to fruition are the major themes of the following chapters. The publication of Der Judenstaat

was to set off a reaction which was to involve every major power in Europe.

#### Chapter One

1. Griffiths, William G., Marshall's Progress of Modern Europe, Bodley and Blackman, London, 1897. pp. 11-2
2. Ibid., pp. 63-4
3. Mann, Francis T., Imperialism and World Politics, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1910. p. 21
4. Wilson, John H., Imperialism, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1913. p. 2
5. Smith, John H. Jr., The Making of the Modern Mind, (Harvard Edition), Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1940. p. 254
6. Lippert, Charles J. H., A Political and Social History of Modern Europe, Vol. II, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1911. p. 205
7. Ibid., p. 204-5
8. Russell, op. cit., p. 291
9. Meyer, op. cit., p. 203
10. Wilson, Francis, The Birth of Jewish Nationalism: The Story of Theodor Herzl's Effort, Greatest Organisations of America, New York, 1914 edition. pp. 5-6
11. Herzl, Theodor, Theodor Herzl (translated by Maurice Tancet), Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1902. p. 7
12. Herzl, Theodor, Diogenes' Definition, (Berlin, veränderter und erweiterte Auflage), Jewish Verlag G.m.b.H., Vol. I, 1911. p. 17. (Hereafter referred to as "Diogenes")
13. Herzl, Josef, Star over Jordan (The life of Theodor Herzl), Philo-sophical Library, New York, 1906. p. 1
14. Herzl, op. cit., p. 70
15. Lewental, Marvin, Herzl's Diaries, The National Journal, Vol. II, No. 51-July/Aug. 1911. p. 124
16. Herzl, Theodor, Tagebuch, 3 vols., Selbstverlag Berlin, 1909. Vol. I, p. 13. (Hereafter referred to as "Tagebuch")
17. Herzl, Tagebuch, Vol. I, p. 202

## Notes

### Chapter One

1. Griffith, Gwilyn O., Mazzini: Prophet of Modern Europe, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1932. pp. 115-6
2. *ibid*, pp. 63-4
3. Moon, Parker T., Imperialism and World Politics, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1930. p. 33
4. Hobson, John H., Imperialism, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1938. p. 3
5. Randall, John H. Jr., The Making of the Modern Mind, (Revised Edition), Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1940. p. 434
6. Hayes, Carlton J. H., A Political and Social History of Modern Europe, Vol. II, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1916. p. 205
7. *ibid*, p. 204-5
8. Randall, *op. cit.*, p. 391
9. Hayes, *op. cit.*, p. 208
10. Newman, Emanuel, The Birth of Jewish Statesmanship (The Story of Theodor Herzl's Life), Zionist Organization of America, New York, Date unknown. pp. 5-6
11. Bein, Alex, Theodor Herzl (translated by Maurice Samuel), Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1948. p. 9
12. Herzl, Theodor, Zionistische Schriften, (Dritte, veränderte und erweiterte Auflage), Hosaah Ivrit Co., Ltd., Tel Aviv, 1934. p. 11. (Hereafter referred to as "Schriften")
13. Patai, Josef, Star over Jordan (The Life of Theodor Herzl), Philosophical Library, New York, 1946. p. 4
14. Bein, *op. cit.*, p. 24
15. Lowenthal, Marvin, Herzl's Diaries, The Menorah Journal, Vol. X, No. 5, Nov./Dec. 1924. p. 458
16. Herzl, Theodor, Tagebücher, 3 vols., Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, 1922. Vol. I, p. 13. (Hereafter referred to as "Tagebücher")
17. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 328

18. Herzl, Schriften, p. 373
19. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. I, pp. 6-7
20. Patai, op. cit., p. 42
21. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 251
22. ibid, Vol. I, p. 7-8
23. ibid, Vol. I, pp. 5-6
24. ibid, Vol. I, pages 10, 12
25. Herzl, Theodor, Herzl Briefe (Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Manfred Georg), Brandussche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Berlin. Date unknown. p. 48 (Hereafter referred to as "Briefe.")
26. Herzl, Schriften, p. 374
27. ibid, pp. 375-6
28. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. I, pages 123, 122
29. Zweig, Stefan, The World of Yesterday (An Autobiography). The Viking Press, New York, 1943. p. 101
30. Herzl, Theodor, Das Neue Ghetto (A Play in Four Acts), Vienna 1903. p. 30
31. Herzl, Theodor, Feuilletons (2 vols.), Verlag Benjamin Herz, Berlin, 1919. Vol. I, pp. 121-2
32. Randall, op. cit., p. 9
33. Herzl, Schriften, p. 285
34. Winz, Leo (editor), Ost und West, Illustrierte Monatschrift für Modernes Judentum, Heft 8/9, Aug./Sept. 1904, IV Jahrgang, p. 539
35. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 278
36. Sokolow, Nahum, History of Zionism, 1600-1918 (2 volumes), Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1919. Vol. I, p. 226
37. Gottheil, Richard, Zionism, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1914. pp. 82-3
38. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 599
39. Hess, Moses, Rome and Jerusalem, (Translated by Meyer Waxman), Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1943. p. 224

40. Thon, Osias, Theodor Herzl, Zionistischen Zentralbureau, Berlin, 1914. pp. 27-8
41. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 269
42. *ibid*, Vol. I, p. 46
43. Bein, *op. cit.*, p. 180
44. Kellner, Leon, Theodor Herzls Lehrjahre (1860-1895), R. Lowit Verlag, Wien und Berlin, 1920. p. 124
45. Lowenthal, *op. cit.*, p. 358
46. Weltsch, Robert, Theodor Herzl and We, The Zionist Labor Party of America, 1929. p. 24
47. Weizman, Chaim, Trial and Error, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949. p. 44, 45
48. *ibid*, p. 45
49. Zweig, *op. cit.*, p. 106
50. Patai, *op. cit.*, p. 174-5
51. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 114
52. *ibid*, Vol. I, p. 134
53. Herzl, Schriften, p. 390
54. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 149, 150
55. *ibid*, Vol. I, p. 23-5
56. *ibid*, Vol. I, p. 26
57. *ibid*, Vol. I, p. 42
58. Herzl, Schriften, p. 378
59. de Haas, Jacob, Theodor Herzl, A Biographical Study (2 vols.) The Leonard Co., Chicago and New York, 1927. Vol. I, p. 74
60. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 494
61. Weizman, *op. cit.*, p. 127
62. Bein, Alex, The Return to the Soil, The Youth and Hechalutz Department of the Zionist Organization, Jerusalem, 1952. p. 6
63. Herzl, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 400

64. Nordau, Anna and Max, Max Nordau, (A Biography), Nordau Committee, New York, 1943. pp. 121-2

#### IMPERIALISM

The nineteenth century witnessed profound changes which vitally affected the destiny of modern society. The indication that a change was in the offing was evident to all those who were able to interpret the revolutions of 1776 and 1789 correctly. The century thereafter saw the impact on the world with some very remarkable achievements. If one would analyze the different events which occurred during these hundred years, one would be struck by three major phenomena: the Industrial Revolution, the rise of Germany and its unification under Bismarck in 1871, and the emergence of Imperialism. The ideas which were so unique to the world of those days were the construction of the Suez Canal and the building of railroads to all parts of the world. The great railway expansion of the United States and the construction of the first part of the Berlin to Baghdad railway were also factors in bringing people closer together and in uniting the world. Here one is struck by the fact that although the world was so united, the chief source of nineteenth century expansion, however, the chief world, perhaps, idea of economic imperialism for it was this movement which propagated the capitalist system and which gave rise to the building and construction fever which took hold in Europe as well as in the United States.

The greatest factor was, of course, in the forefront of this economic expansion.

\* ..... the all-pervading influence of the  
which existed from the national state in the

## Chapter Two

### IMPERIALISM

The nineteenth century witnessed profound changes which vitally affected the destiny of modern society. The indications that a change was in the offing was evident to all those who were able to interpret the revolutions of 1776 and 1789 correctly. The century thereafter made its imprint on the world with some very remarkable achievements. If one would analyse the different events which occurred during these hundred years, one would be struck by three major phenomena: the Industrial Revolution, the rise of Germany and its unification under Bismark in 1871, and the emergence of Imperialism. The links which were to unite ever more closely the world of those days were the construction of the Suez Canal and the building of railroads in all parts of the world. The great railway expansions of the United States and the construction of the first parts of the Berlin to Bagdad Railroad did more than anything else to bring peoples closer together and to unify societies of all kinds throughout the world. Were one to select the major source of nineteenth century expansion, however, the choice would, perhaps, fall on economic imperialism for it was this movement which propagated the capitalistic system and which gave rise to the building and construction frenzy which took hold in Europe as well as in the United States.

The business forces were, of course, in the forefront of this economic expansion.

" ..... the all-dominating business interests sought assistance from the national state in the

ever growing, bitter competition; they demanded that the state employ its improved naval and military power against both the weapons of the native peoples and against the other states."<sup>1</sup>

The middle class, which included many investors, did everything in its power to further these plans and to use its interests and power with the governments. It is this group which gains materially from the jobs with which the colonial empires were to provide them, when the system had reached an advanced state. It was an era when the business and industrial powers began to play the dominant role, a position of power which has not been relinquished to this day.

"It was the golden age of liberal capitalism, of expanding economics whose national rivalries had not yet broken out into imperialistic war, and whose control was not yet seriously challenged by working-class revolt."<sup>2</sup>

This imperialistic tendency on the part of this new powerful middle class was, however, not confined merely to this group of people. The European powers were hand-in-glove with the expansion advocated and they formed many different alliances and sealed many secret treaties in which the lesser nations and peoples were reduced to mere pawns in an international chess game.

"So far as European alignments were concerned, the situation remained as amorphous in 1899 as it had been in previous years ... International relations had become a matter of agreements between states with common or at least non-contradictory interests ... The old alliance, had pretty much disintegrated, and the day of the business deal had arrived."<sup>3</sup>

A close union, then, was formed between the governments and the international financiers. These men, who had accumulated huge wealth in the course of years were now in the forefront of the expansionist movement. Such men as J. P. Morgan, Cornelius Vanderbilt, John D.

Rockefeller, Edward de Hirsch and the Rothschild brothers were the instruments of power which allowed one government to make advances into the undeveloped regions of another country or continent.

"These great business-banking, broking firms form the ganglion of international capitalism. United by the strongest bonds of organization ..... situated in the very heart of the business capital of every state, controlled, so far as Europe was concerned, chiefly by men of a single and peculiar race, who have behind them many centuries of financial experience, they are in a unique position to manipulate the policy of nations ... Does anyone seriously suppose that a great war could be undertaken by any European State, or a great State loan subscribed, if the house of Rothschild and its connections set their face against it?"<sup>4</sup>

Aside from the obvious anti-semitic tone of the above statement by Hobson, the analysis is perfectly correct. It was not merely the Jew who became active in this field of finance but all who could afford to play the game of international intrigue. A perfect example of this type of business is found in a transaction which took place about 1860. A Brussels banking firm had received a concession from the Ottoman Empire to build a railway through the Balkans to Constantinople. This firm was unable to carry the project through and brought the plans to an internationally famous financier. He took up the challenge, went to Constantinople and succeeded in getting some of the conditions altered to his greater advantage. He then formed a company and made the arrangements for the building of the railway. "The success of this transaction gained him the recognition as one of the greatest financiers of Europe."<sup>5</sup> It was, then, an era which saw the deliberate and conscious effort on the part of several nations to divide the world between them; it was no accidental plan of action but a concentrated effort to supply markets for the home country at

any cost. The story of international relations in the 1890's is the story of the "assault of Russia and France upon the territorial position of Britain in Asia and Africa and the story of the great economic duel between England and her all-too-efficient German rival."<sup>6</sup>

Of all of the dark machinations which took place on the European continent perhaps the most intriguing were the dealings of the Russians with the western world. During the last decade of the nineteenth century it was the desire of Britain to come to an agreement with the Russians, and the most attractive terms were offered. These, however, were refused by the Czarist government, since the Russians felt that they had nothing to gain by such an arrangement, and that they would have to pay eventually all too dearly for any treaty which they would sign with the English. The attention of the Russians was turned more to the Balkan area, particularly Turkey, and it was not till the defeat of the Russians by Japan that they came to the point of being ready to bargain with England.

"The historical trend toward the open sea led to a well-defined intention on the part of the Russians, in one way or another, to take Constantinople from the Turks. The dynastic interests of Russia were reenforced by commercial considerations .... During the Turko-Italian war the closing of the Straits for a few days was said to have cost Russian shipping about eight million francs .... it was annoying to realize that, under German guidance, the Turks might experience an economic and military renaissance which would end once and for all the Russian hope of possessing ancient Byzantium."<sup>7</sup>

But the actions of Russia were not the only ones of interest to the European countries. One country particularly rose to such heights of economic development that it was natural to view it with distrust and apprehension. With the political coalition of 1871, Germany was on

the road to a level of development and prosperity the likes of which have seldom been seen among modern nationalities. In the fields of foreign trade, industrial development and the foreboding shadow of Germany's steadily growing army and navy, England, as well as the other Powers, saw a potential enemy. The collision of economic interests was inevitable as "Germany was virtually driven into colonial expansion and consequently into a big naval policy."<sup>8</sup> The fact that Germany was expanding so rapidly internally is a factor of utmost importance. With the internal market soon conquered, the output of Germany's factories and plants had to find another, outside market. One historian<sup>9</sup> feels that "this dilemma led to a progressive aggravation of foreign-political antagonisms and became the decisive factor which led to the outbreak of the first World War."

As each country, then, participated in the expansion brought about by the mechanical and industrial revolutions the scarcity of internal, or European, markets became most evident.

"The chief economic source of Imperialism has been found in the inequality of industrial opportunities by which a favored class accumulates superfluous elements of income which, in their search for profitable investments, press ever farther afield ....."<sup>10</sup>

The attitude of the times was simply that the world was marked out by Providence for exploitation. The white man, of course, was to be the exploiter and the native, wherever he was to be found, was ripe for brutal treatment and for the lowest possible wages, so that the investor, sitting in the mother country, could grow wealthier. It was in keeping with the Darwinian principle of the survival of the fittest; that every man was out for himself and the "basic problem

of international relations was who should cut up the victim."<sup>11</sup> An analysis of the situation showed that there were only five fertile areas into which the European powers could expand and advance:

"Latin America, Turkey and the Balkans, Persia and the Middle East, China and the Far East, North and Central Africa. The Monroe Doctrine of the United States prevented seizure of territory of the first field, advance into the second field was precluded by the Treaty of Berlin, Russia and England neutralized each other in the Middle East, and, in spite of the Suez Canal, China was still too far away. Africa accordingly became the first battle field of the new imperialism."<sup>12</sup>

The stage having been set for the conquest of Africa, and lesser areas, the plundering having begun, one could see six major reasons for the need of the newly acquired colonies. (It goes without saying that the oft-voiced reason for this conquest -- to bring civilization and Christianity to the natives -- was as false as it was blasphemous.) The home countries needed colonies for: (1) markets for selling their surplus goods; (2) food to be used in the mother country; (3) bringing all available raw materials under one flag; (4) the creation of new investment areas; (5) the colonies which were needed as bases or stop-overs along the trade routes and for the naval forces under construction; and (6) an outlet for the surplus population of the mother country. The validity of the above analysis may be proven by the English interests in Gibraltar and the Suez Canal Zone, the sponsoring of the Panama Canal by the United States, the building of the Bagdad Railway by the Germans and by the desire of the Russian government to dominate Constantinople.

The major reasons for Imperialism, in the most concise form, may be summed up as follows:<sup>13</sup> (1) the waning supremacy of the English

cotton mills and iron works, which had been achieved due to the Industrial Revolution; (2) the revolution in means of communications as was evidenced by the railways, steamships and telegraph; (3) the demand of the industrial nations for tropical and sub-tropical products such as cotton, rubber, coffee and sugar; and, (4) a superfluity of surplus capital too great for profitable reinvestment at home.

"The Politic of the High Finance Circles thus pursues a three-fold goal: first, establishment of an area of economy as large as possible, which, secondly, by establishment of tariff barriers against foreign competition becomes, thirdly, a territory for exploitation by the national monopolistic clique."<sup>14</sup> (translation mine)

It has been stated above that the banking interests were the real force behind these activities but they were, by no means, the only interested parties. Exporting as well as importing interests, combining their efforts with the shipping magnates, played a leading role in carrying out the program to which economic imperialism was dedicated. Furthermore, the "parasites of imperialism" such as the makers of armament, uniforms, producers of telegraph and railroad materials all profited heavily. Not to be outdone were the various military groups, diplomatic and career people and, of course, the missionaries. This latter group, presumably, went into the depths of the African jungles with every intention of converting the "heathen" and bringing western civilization to the "savage."

"If only the savages of .... could be inoculated with enough civilization to make them desire manufactured goods, markets would be created which would keep European factories busy for many years to come."<sup>15</sup>

The above, of course, written in bitter sarcasm, nevertheless expresses most ably the attitude of the people back home, but

"Out of regard for the feeling of the world, these invaded countries were rarely 'subjugated' or 'annexed'; they were 'protected' or became 'spheres of influence,' or even the 'allies' of their conquerors."<sup>16</sup>

There was a great deal of friction among the nations who had been unsuccessful in the scramble for colonies and they were quick to point out the ruthless methods used in the exploitation. But, almost every country which was a major power in the world took part in the highly skillful game of acquiring colonies. For example, the capital invested abroad, shown in milliards of francs, from 1862 to 1914 was as follows:<sup>17</sup>

<u>Year</u>	<u>Britain</u>	<u>France</u>	<u>Germany</u>
1862	3.6	-	-
1872	15.0	10 (1869)	-
1882	22.0	15 (1880)	?
1893	42.0	20 (1890)	?
1902	62.0	27.0-37.0	12.5
1914	75.0-100.0	60	44

With the drives of expansion by the Great Powers, and the huge sums of capital invested by the interests of the home countries, a similarly phenomenal growth also had to take place in the areas under the domination of these same nations. The colonial possessions of the Great Powers, in millions of square kilometers and in millions of inhabitants, was as follows from the period of 1876-1914:<sup>18</sup>

	<u>Colonies</u>			
	1876		1914	
	area	pop.	area	pop.
Britain	22.5	251.9	33.5	393.5
Russia	17.0	15.9	17.4	33.2
France	.9	6.0	10.6	55.5
Germany	—	—	2.9	12.3
United States	—	—	.3	9.7
Japan	—	—	.3	19.2
	<u>40.4</u>	<u>273.8</u>	<u>65.0</u>	<u>523.4</u>

	<u>Home</u>	
	1914	
	area	pop.
Britain	.3	46.5
Russia	5.4	136.2
France	.5	39.6
Germany	.5	64.9
United States	9.5	97.0
Japan	.4	53.0
	<u>16.5</u>	<u>437.2</u>

It can be seen at a glance that the economic expansion; as well as that of population and area, was only to the good of the mother country. The only difficulty with these schemes and advances was the fact that the money for this expansion fell on the taxable public. It is a certainty that the people, as a whole, derived a great many benefits from this imperialistic trend, that they derived a profit in the form

of a high standard of living, and that the prosperity of the small businessman was greatly enhanced, but it is a question whether this small, indirect profit to the taxpayer outweighed the direct cost to the whole body of the public.

"The great majority of the working people, not only in the United States but also in the leading industrial countries of Europe, obtained a standard of living from the 50's to the end of the 19th century which was often higher than that formerly enjoyed by the independent middle class at the beginning of that period of development ... this was the decisive factor which lengthened the life of capitalism and made the capitalistic elements ... so absolutely certain that their system was made to last."<sup>19</sup>

The above is doubtless true, for the man with the small shop was not capable of seeing the situation as a whole and in its broader aspects. Although he gained a measure of economic freedom with his small business and showed a profit in his small-time ventures, he was not able to realize that the tremendous taxes which were levied upon him were really the moneys which enabled his country to pursue its economic policies. He thus became a mere tool in the hands of the dominant interests and, often unknowingly, became a partner in the exploitations which took place overseas, far away from his little store on one of the better streets of his city.

The economic imperialism of the last part of the nineteenth century was a system which ruthlessly set out to conquer as much territory as possible. This is not a theory, but, as has been proven above, is a recognized fact and phenomenon. The other side of the argument, that this was an idealistic trend and that only a religious fervor motivated the expansion to all parts of the world is, of course, fallacious reasoning and the closing of ones eyes to

the pertinent facts and figures.

"It is often said that modern imperialism is primarily a quest for markets. Closer study, however, reveals that the most powerful motives for expansion were idealistic: the demand for colonies arose in newspaper offices, political rallies and beer halls more frequently than in banks and directors' meetings. The prevailing excitement then directed their attention to the colonies .... but their activities were the effect, not the cause, of imperialistic expansion."<sup>20</sup>

The writer is completely opposed to this point of view and feels that every piece of evidence points to the contrary. The roles in the imperialistic rivalries were exactly reversed.

Whereas most of the world turned its eyes on the African continent in the hope of attaining suitable areas for colonization and exploitation, another major area was also under surveillance. The "sick man of Europe," Turkey, was also an area greatly prized by a number of the Powers. Russia, as has previously been pointed out, was most desirous of a portion of this land in order that it would attain a major outlet to the sea and thus further its commercial enterprises and take part in the building program of naval forces sponsored by the various countries. The intention was to assign fragments of this area to England and Austria but all these plans came to naught due to the Crimean War of 1853-6. France and England checked Russian aggression and went even farther in containing the Russian forces through the Treaty of the Berlin Congress in 1878, concluded after the Russo-Turkish War in 1877-8. The result of this Congress was that Russia was contained by the Powers and that the Ottoman Empire was now wholly at the mercy of England and France. Also, it was left with only a few fragments of territory in Europe and these were a constant

bait for covetous neighbors. The only country which appeared friendly toward Turkey was Germany and they, as will shortly be seen, had an ulterior motive also.

"After the Congress of Berlin (1878), Abdul Hamid found his country on the verge of bankruptcy, his army disorganized, his civil administration in chaos, and his very life in danger. When Turkish credit was reestablished through the agency of the Public Debt Administration, he turned his attention to civil and military reforms. But Abdul Hamid realized that he could not do much without foreign advice, so he appealed to the German empire for assistance."<sup>21</sup>

The big question, then, on the horizon was the future action of Germany in regard to Turkey. With the accession of Kaiser Wilhelm II in 1888 the issue became one of paramount importance which saw the realigning of the Great Powers, friends as well as former enemies. Russia now joined France and England in opposition to German imperialism and these were abetted by Austria. However, a reading of the German foreign office documents in the early nineties "reveals the absence of imperialistic designs in the Near East, on the part of Germany."<sup>22</sup> That Germany had no real designs at this time could not be known, of course, to the other Powers. They were extremely concerned with the mineral resources of metals and fuels to be found in Asiatic Turkey, raw materials which were of an essential nature to modern industry as found in the western European countries. Also, the oil deposits of Asiatic Turkey were believed to be vast and oil was a commodity of the utmost importance and needed by all.

The finances of Turkey were extremely unstable. As a result, an organization called the Public Debt Administration took over the task of administering the finances of Turkey. This administration

was composed almost entirely of representatives of foreign bondholders and was responsible only to them.

"It controlled Ottoman financial policy and exercised its control in the interest of European bankers and investors .... almost all administrative and financial questions in Turkey were directly subject to the sanction of foreigners."<sup>23</sup>

The administration sought to establish some order in the domestic issues of the Ottoman Empire and to lessen the danger of constant foreign invasion. These investors of foreign lands were very powerful in their field and ruled Turkey with an iron hand. Only those policies which were favorable to the mother country were followed, even though the major concern of the Administration was supposed to be the rejuvenation of Turkey. The Deutsche Bank group, for example, comprised directly and indirectly, partially and totally "no less than eighty-seven banks; and the sum total of capital which it handles varies between two and three milliard marks."<sup>24</sup> As late as 1910, if the figures of Lenin may be considered to be reliable,

" ..... four countries (England, Germany, France and the United States) own 479 milliards of francs, that is nearly 80% of the world's finance-capital. Thus, by this means or otherwise, the whole world is more or less the debtor and vassal of these four international banker-countries, on which world finance-capital rests."<sup>25</sup>

One of the great projects which was now undertaken, with the blessing of the Public Debt Administration, was the building of a gigantic railroad link through Turkey. France, England and Germany, as well as Turkey, joined in this venture wholeheartedly, at least at the very beginning as each of these countries had a special interest in seeing the railway lines completed. This was a perfectly

acceptable building program to all concerned for in every country railroad tracks were being laid in order to further the consolidation of each nation. In the North American continent as well as in Europe it was the age of railroads and huge sums of money were appropriated for this purpose.

"It was proposed that French and German capital should each have 40% interest, the remainder being assigned to minor groups. As the British, however, felt strongly that they should have an equal share, von Gwinner (representative of the German syndicate) visited England in the spring of 1903 and an arrangement was drafted by which British, French and German syndicates would each take 25% of the stock, leaving 10% for the Anatolian Railway Co., (which was predominantly but not exclusively German), and 15% for other groups. On the board of directors: 8 Germans, French and British; 6 appointed by the Turkish government and Anatolian Railway Company."<sup>26</sup>

In the United States there was the greatest growth in railroading. In 1865 there were thirty-five thousand miles of steam railway, mostly east of the Mississippi. During the next eight years another thirty-five thousand were constructed and between the years of 1874-87 approximately eighty-seven thousand additional miles of track were laid. In 1900, two-hundred thousand miles were in operation, and "the United States had a greater mileage than all of Europe."<sup>27</sup>

"Congress granted the promoters of the Union Pacific system a right of way through the public domain, 20 sections of land on each side of each mile of the railway, and a loan of bonds of the United States to an amount of \$50 million. Between 1850 and 1873 alone, the Government transferred to the railways some 35 million acres of public lands."<sup>28</sup>

Not only did this phenomenal growth hold true for the United States but for the European countries as well. The reason for this type of expansion was obvious: it involved political as well as economic

interests and served to unify or contract the distant lands of the world. The English built the Cape-to-Cairo Railway, the Russians the Trans-Siberian and the Germans the Bagdad Railway. All this within the period of a few years but the ramifications of these acts were felt almost immediately as tension and conflict resulted. "The first of these (railroads) came into conflict with German, Belgian and French ambitions, the second was partly responsible for the Russo-Japanese War and the third caused endless friction between Germany and the Triple Entente."<sup>29</sup>

In Turkey, also, there was need of a railway system; in the eyes of the Sultan as well as in the eyes of the foreign powers. It served the purposes of the Sultan insofar as he would be able to centralize his sprawling domain and, also, so that he could build up an effective means of defense. With a functioning railway it would be possible for him to send troops to any part of his domain by a means of transportation which was faster than any other then in existence. It was for these reasons that he wished a railway to be constructed and that he was not averse to calling in foreign powers to help with the financing and construction of the project. The other powers, on the other hand, saw here an opportunity of investing some capital and gaining an economic foothold in Turkey.

"Abdul Hamid had seen for himself the tremendous value of railways for the transport of troops, and the need for communications if the Empire was to be held together .... his railroad policy was based almost entirely upon military and political considerations. The British government, too, was interested in maintaining the Ottoman Empire as a bulwark against Russia."<sup>30</sup>

And,

"For strategic reasons, also, he supplemented the Bagdad Railway system with the famous Hedjaz Railway, from Damascus to the holy cities of Medina and Mecca .... the completion of these two railways would have extended Turkish military power from the Black Sea to the Persian Gulf, from the Bosphorous to the Persian Gulf."<sup>31</sup>

When the Berlin to Bagdad railroad construction went on in earnest, approximately during the first few years of the twentieth century, Turkey was in one of the most favorable positions of any country in the world, and her railroad system did much to make her so important. The railways, as well as the natural outlets to the sea and her ability to move in any direction and attack any of the important links of communications made Turkey a power to be reckoned with and she was no longer considered to be the "sick man of Europe." Turkey held dominion over the Asiatic threshold of Europe, Anatolia and the European threshold of Asia, the Balkan Peninsula. Constantinople was the economic and strategic center of gravity for the Black Sea and eastern Mediterranean Basins. By possession of Northern Syria and Mesopotamia, the Sultan controlled the "central route" of Eastern trade throughout its entire length from the borders of Austria-Hungary to the shores of the Persian Gulf. The contiguity of Ottoman territory to the Sinai Peninsula and to Persia held out the possibility of a Turkish attack on the Suez and trans-Persian routes to India and the Far East. In fact, the Sultans dominions, from Macedonia to South Mesopotamia constituted a broad avenue of communication between the Occident and the Orient.<sup>32</sup>

As the countries began to realize the potential strength of Turkey and the immense value of the railway, all of them sought to become partners and share in the construction with labor and capital,

aside from the political and economic reasons mentioned above. As far back as 1899 the Deutsche Bank group was left in sole possession of the field and thus took this area as its great sphere of influence. Germany, from that time onward, was to play a most vital role in the internal as well as external affairs of Turkey.

"The Russian promoters had withdrawn because of lack of support at home, the French financiers had accepted a share in the German company in preference to sole responsibility for the enterprise, the British proposals had lost support when the Boer difficulty temporarily obscured all other issues."<sup>33</sup>

It can readily be seen that Germany was now a power of considerable stature. Theoretically, there were two possibilities for Germany to build herself an empire. "The first was to create for herself a colonial block somewhere or other and once obtained this would require a powerful German fleet and strong naval bases strategically placed. This navy was not to be an end in itself but to facilitate the expansion of German capitalism along imperialistic lines. The second possibility for the creation of a German Empire or a corresponding sphere of influence was via the overland route, across Austria-Hungary and the Balkan States to Turkey .... which was to insure the safety of communications between Germany and the area in which a very considerable part of her foreign capital exports were invested."<sup>34</sup>

The British also, of course, were involved in every little detail of these transactions. Whereas Britain first favored the construction of the railway, she later changed her mind, under Lord Balfour, and openly opposed the efforts to complete the project. Her imperial strategy always weighed heavily in the hidden scales of

judgement. "The Bagdad Railway might be a menace both to the Suez Canal, if from the trunk line a branch running south through Palestine were constructed, and to India, if the trunk line were to reach to the Persian Gulf."<sup>35</sup> It can be seen that here, as well as in other parts of the world, British interests were carefully upheld and were a vital factor throughout the years of bickering and tension.

France, also, was a hidden force insofar as she for a time actively supported the construction plans by herself and in league with Germany but later withdrew and did all she could to hold up completion of the final phases of the work. In 1878, France's economic and financial stakes in the Near Eastern area were considerable and increased during the latter part of the century. "French funds built the ports and railways for the Sultan, French bondholders held more than one-half of the Ottoman public debt."<sup>36</sup> At one point there was a powerful group of French financiers which urged the government to support the project or, at least, not to put obstacles in its way. These were men who had huge investments in Turkey and it is estimated that, in 1903, "French investors controlled  $1\frac{1}{2}$  billion francs of the public obligation of the Imperial Ottoman Treasury .... the total of all French investments in Turkey was more than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  billion francs."<sup>37</sup> However,

"The French government in October of 1903 adopted an attitude of hostility toward the project and excluded Bagdad Railway bonds from the French Bourse. Perhaps the action was due to propaganda, perhaps to economic interests not clearly revealed, perhaps for fear that German penetration of Turkey would deprive France of the predominant influence which French missionaries, merchants and Railroad builders had obtained in Syria. Perhaps, also, pressure was brought to bear by Russia."<sup>38</sup>

All in all, it is easy to see that the railway construction and resulting intrigues were not for the benefit of Turkey and her internal problems. The economic and political overtones are too evident and we must conclude that it was an imperialistic venture through which each country sought to dismember Turkey and use its resources for their own advantages.

For our study, one more fact is of great value:

"Appended to the Bagdad Railway Convention was a secret agreement binding the Company not to encourage or instal foreign settlements of colonies in the vicinity of the Anatolian or Bagdad Railways.

"Once beyond the mountains (Amanus Range) the railways could be carried quickly to Aleppo .... at this point connection were to be established with the important railways of Syria, providing direct communications with .... Beirut, Damascus, Jaffa and Jerusalem."<sup>39</sup>

Into this hot bed of intrigue, plots and counterplots, ruthlessness and exploitation stepped Theodor Herzl with his dream of founding a Jewish State in Palestine, with the help and cooperation of Sultan Abdul Hamid of Turkey.

## Notes

### Chapter Two

1. Townsend, Mary E., European Colonial Expansion Since 1871, J. B. Lippincott Co., New York, 1941. p. 590
2. Randall, John H. Jr., The Making of the Modern Mind (Revised Ed.), Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1940. p. 628
3. Langer, William L., The Diplomacy of Imperialism, 1890-1902, Vol. II, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1935. p. 592
4. Hobson, John A., Imperialism, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1938. pp. 56-7
5. Sokolow, Nathan, History of Zionism, 1600-1918, Vols. I and II, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1919. pp. 248-9
6. Langer, op. cit., p. 415
7. Earle, Edward M., Turkey, The Great Powers and the Bagdad Railway (A Study in Imperialism), The Macmillan Co., New York, 1923. pp. 151-2
8. Langer, op. cit., p. 794
9. Sternberg, Fritz, Capitalism and Socialism on Trial, (translated by Edward Fitzgerald), Victor Gollancz, Ltd., London, 1951. p. 122
10. Hobson, op. cit., p. 361
11. Langer, op. cit., p. 797
12. Swain, Joseph W., Beginning the Twentieth Century (A History of Europe from 1870 to the Present), W. W. Norton and Co., New York, 1938, p. 212
13. Moon, Parker T., Imperialism and World Politics, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1930. p. 30
14. Hilferding, Rudolf, Das Finanzkapital (Eine Studie über die jüngste Entwicklung des Kapitalismus), Vienna, 1910. p. 412
15. Swain, op. cit., p. 20
16. *ibid*, p. 20
17. Lenin, Nicolai, Imperialism: The Last Stage of Capitalism, London, 1916. p. 71
18. *ibid*, p. 92

19. Sternberg, op. cit., p. 96
20. Swain, op. cit., p. 211
21. Wolf, John B., The Diplomatic History of the Bagdad Railway, The University of Missouri Studies, A Quarterly of Research, Vol. XI, No. 2, April 1, 1936. p. 8
22. Moon, op. cit., p. 239
23. Earle, op. cit., p. 11
24. Lenin, op. cit., p. 33
25. ibid, p. 68
26. Moon, op. cit., p. 245
27. Morison, S. E. and Commager, H. S., The Growth of the American Republic, Vol. II, Oxford University Press, New York, 1942. p. 105
28. Earle, op. cit., p. 79
29. Fay, Sidney B., The Origins of the World War, (Second Edition, Revised), The Macmillan Co., New York, 1930. pp. 45-6
30. Langer, op. cit., p. 631
31. Earle, op. cit., p. 21
32. ibid, p. 4
33. ibid, p. 61
34. Sternberg, op. cit., pp. 129-130
35. Moon, op. cit., p. 246
36. Townsend, op. cit., p. 262
37. Earle, op. cit., pp. 154-5
38. Moon, op. cit., p. 247
39. Earle, op. cit., p. 72

### Chapter Three

#### HERZL IN THE CRUCIBLE OF NEAR EASTERN IMPERIALISTIC RIVALRY

Der Judenstaat had been written and published and the most amazing chain of events was set into motion. Reaction came to Herzl from all parts of the world, some favorable and others unfavorable. No matter, however, to which side these comments belonged a plan had irretrievably been set into motion and the results would only become known or more clear with the passage of the years. Had Herzl only known more of the history of his people, he might have envisioned the start of a movement. Whenever Jews were downtrodden and frustrated in their desires to be free and on an equal par with the other nations, a national feeling has always arisen. The sufferings of the Jews have always served as a stimulus: in 1860 the Mortara case gave rise to the Alliance Israelite Universelle, the persecutions which began in the 1880's fostered the early zion-minded movements in Russia, particularly the "Lovers of Zion" and the Dreyfuss affair in 1894, saw, through the medium of Der Judenstaat, the beginnings of modern political Zionism. With all of the interest and attention of world Jewry suddenly focused on Herzl, it was impossible for him to withdraw from an active participation in the new movement. His own creation forced him into public life

" ..... he was at a loss at explaining to himself how this his fiction developed into a real, practical task for him. Anyhow, that was the end of his vain attempt to solve a tremendous mission on a purely literary basis."<sup>1</sup> (translation mine)

Herzl envisioned a great country with Jews coming to it from all over the world. The Kaiser, as well as all other highly placed

politicians, would be called into the scheme and the state would soon be an actuality. As early as 1897 Herzl formulated his now famous definition of Zionism, as opposed to his definition of Nationalism. Zionism:

"Zionism attempts to establish a home-land which is publicly-legally secure for those Jews who at their present domiciles are unable to assimilate themselves or don't want to do so."<sup>2</sup> (translation mine)

This definition was formulated in the earliest stages of his zionistic thought and is to be found, already, in Der Judenstaat. At a later time, Herzl gave his definition of a nation, to which one would only have to add the word "Jewish"

"A nation is a historical group of men in a recognizable cohesion held together by a common enemy .... In this case, the common enemy is the anti-semite."<sup>3</sup>

Those who came to the Congress, in 1897, were enthusiastic. They streamed to Basel from all over the world, from all parties, from all religious groups and there were over two hundred official representatives. Herzl points out proudly that the delegates from Rumania brought over fifty thousand signatures with them, all approving of the action to be undertaken by this new organization.

At this first Congress the aims of Zionism were formulated and officially incorporated into the zionist platform. "The aim of Zionism is to create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law."<sup>4</sup> The Congress contemplated the attainment of this goal by the following means: the promotion of the colonization of Palestine by Jewish agricultural and industrial workers, the binding together of all Jewry through local and international institutions in accordance with the laws of each country, the

the fostering and strengthening of Jewish national sentiment and consciousness and obtaining government consent wherever necessary in regard to the aim of Zionism. This was the basis for all future action and in accordance with these definitions and formulations, particularly the last, Herzl strove to attain his dream. He wanted to make of "L'shono Habo'o Birushalajim" a reality.

It is interesting to speculate as to what type of government Herzl would ultimately have established. He seems to have favored an "aristocratic republic" and states quite frankly that he is a "staunch supporter of monarchical institutions, because these allow for a continuous policy, and represent the interests of a ..... family born and educated to rule ....."<sup>5</sup> He is definitely opposed to a democracy for, among other things, it gives rise to that "objectionable class of men — professional politicians." All the rest of his life, Herzl followed the policy of the "aristocratic republic" in that he dealt primarily with the upper classes in order to attain his goal. One has the feeling that these were dealings and proposals which he relished as it gave him the opportunity to consort with this type of man. He had absolutely no regard for democracy, for some very telling and interesting reasons:

"Faults of a Democracy: One has only the disadvantages of being principally under public scrutiny. Because, through this scrutiny, the needed respect for ruling is lost. The whole world learns that the rulers are only human beings too ....."<sup>6</sup> (translation mine)

And,

"Democracy is political nonsense which only in the excitement of a revolution is voted on by the mass of the people."<sup>7</sup> (translation mine)

A people, Herzl claims, can only be helped in a political way and by

no stretch of the imagination, in a philanthropic manner. It is to this dictum and belief that he orients all his later actions. He realizes that the claim of the Jewish people rests with the Biblical narrative and that all the peoples should acknowledge this right.

" ..... the solution of the Jewish difficulty is the recognition of Jews as a people, and the finding by them of a legally recognized home to which Jews in those parts of the world in which they are oppressed would naturally migrate, for they would arrive there as citizens just because they were Jews."<sup>8</sup>

As Herzl intended to speak to the higher powers of government for the Jews he also realized that he must become an accepted representative of the people, with honors bestowed upon him so that he would appeal to the upper class nobility. In 1895 he decided that he would first deal with the Kaiser, then with Austria and finally with the French government on account of the Algerian Jews. However,

"In order to win a reputation at the Courts (of Europe) I need the highest decorations. In the first place, English ones."<sup>9</sup> (translation mine)

We see then that throughout this early part of Herzl's thoughts, the preoccupation with nobility played a large part in his schemes and this, as will be shown, continued throughout his life. Herzl felt that dealing with nobility, and convincing them of the justice of his plan, would bring satisfaction to his people.

But, the Jews were a problem all by themselves. How was he to induce them to leave their homelands on a large scale and how would he convince them of the untenability of their position in their native countries? He felt that the answer, the motivating force, would be the power and force of the national idea. His analogy is

as follows:

"It is approximately as if one would want to lift up an Elephant in order to move him to another place; to accomplish this one would need a very big apparatus — but the elephant hunters tickle the animal with a spike and lead him to the place where they want him to be. This spike with which we want to direct the masses towards a better place, is the national idea."<sup>10</sup> (translation mine)

Connected with the thought of a mass migration of Jews to the promised land, was the problem as to what type of land would be suitable; how beneficial it would be for all involved. He did not want beggars but people who were healthy, eager, happy and free in their desire to work, and work hard. "The people should become better through the soil and the soil better through the people."<sup>11</sup> To show and demonstrate his dream of a perfect land he wrote his inspiring novel, Alt-Neuland, in which he describes the country as it would be after approximately twenty years of work and development. The Suez Canal was eliminated in his novel and the new route between Asia and Europe went by way of Palestine.<sup>12</sup> Great advancements have been made in railroad construction in the Utopian state as a railroad bridge is now extended over the Bosphorous and direct lines run from all the major capitals of Europe to Jerusalem.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, in a letter to the Sultan, Herzl proposes plans for a University, under Jewish sponsorship, for Jewish as well as Ottoman students and subjects. This is to obviate the desire of Turkish students to go abroad for their education and thus they would contribute to the culture of their own country.<sup>14</sup> That most of these proposed measures became dreams in the course of time is evidenced best of all by Herzl's proposal that Hebrew should become the national language, as put

forth in Alt-Neuland. In reality,

"The Hilfsverein der deutschen Juden, the German section of L'Alliance Isrealite Universelle, not only taught German in its schools, but made a strenuous effort to have German adopted as the official language of all Zionist schools in the Near East."<sup>15</sup>

As the work of Herzl was stymied by outside forces, so was there evidence of contention in the midst of the movement. From the saner forces of Zionism, under the leadership of Achad HaAm, came the movement for a cultural revival of Judaism as opposed to the purely political aspects of the movement. Achad HaAm believed that the political intrigues of Herzl were merely visions and illusions which receded further and further from the world of reality and action. This type of activity "could no longer bring about a practical fulfilment for the people."<sup>16</sup>

"..... we are not at liberty to neglect (in Palestine) the effort to create there a fixed and independent centre for our national culture for learning, art and literature."<sup>17</sup>

And, in a devastating condemnation of Herzl's political activity,

"To lay the foundation of a spiritual 'refuge' for our national culture demands perhaps preparations no less elaborate, and resources no less extensive than to lay the foundations of a material refuge for the persecuted Jews. And besides the work of preparation for the future, there is also a great deal of work to be done in the present."<sup>18</sup>

In spite of the writings of Achad HaAm, however, the work of Herzl continued. As he had previously indicated, his first efforts were directed toward obtaining an interview with the Kaiser. This man, who was the dominant personality of Europe at the time, would certainly listen to him, if Herzl could only get the desired inter-

view. He did not know, or did not realize, that German Jewry was at this time caught up in the frenzy of post-Bismarkian expansion and that they "exerted themselves frantically to efface their own identity to be accepted as German of the Germans."<sup>19</sup> He, unlike Weizman, did not feel that the German Jews were in the highest state of illusory security and were extremely proud of the fact that they were Germans. Their Jewishness played a very negligible part in their lives and most German Jews, at least the upper class element, did not particularly favor Herzl's proposals. Undaunted, Herzl addressed himself to one of the leading members of the German nobility, a relative and close advisor of the Kaiser, Gross Herzog von Baden. He obtained an interview with this kindly, old nobleman through the efforts of a Rev. Hechler, who was a Christian but inspired by the Herzlian idea of a Jewish State in the "Promised Land." When Herzl finally was allowed to see the Gross-Herzog, the interview went beautifully and the ruler of Baden showed himself very kindly toward him. Herzl, in his Tagebücher, describes the conversation as "grandiose" and "hochpolitisch" but, in reality, he attained nothing more than the interest of this man. In the eyes of Herzl, however, this was a momentous achievement for the Gross Herzog was the first person of importance to show a favorable disposition toward Herzl and his plan.

"He (the Gross Herzog von Baden) said that the German Government had inquired in Constantinople about their attitude towards Zionism and received the information that the Sultan would look favorably upon our project."<sup>20</sup> (translation mine)

When Herzl heard this rather favorable opinion from a person

of such high authority, he immediately pressed his point and requests that Germany become the protectorate of the future state. He realizes that such a project can not be undertaken without the help of a big Power, and he chooses Germany as this is the country of prestige in Europe at the time. The whole affair continues to progress, with the Gross Herzog a constant friend and advisor, until Herzl manages to see and discuss the problem with some of the highly placed ministers of State. Count Philip zu Eulenburg, German ambassador to Vienna, assures him that the Kaiser thinks highly of the idea, that he is familiar with it and even such a personality as Count von Bulow, the German minister for foreign affairs, would be interested in the project. All in all, Herzl was making a great deal of progress but never realized that he was playing into the hands of the power politicians of his day. If Herzl were ever to receive something from these people, they would certainly demand a great deal in return. This was intimated to Herzl, as early as 1898 but only in passing and was never to remain a major element in the thinking of the visionary. After the interview with Eulenburg, Herzl thanks him for his kind words and, as if in answer, the Count says:

"Perhaps there will also come a time when I will ask you for a favor."<sup>21</sup> (translation mine)

With these initial successes, Herzl was by no means satisfied. Although he knew that the favorable opinion of the Kaiser is all-important, he nevertheless has an interview with the ruler of Bulgaria, Furst Ferdinand. This noble openly admits his helplessness in furthering the plans of Herzl, admits that he was raised with Jews, is half-Jewish, is on intimate terms with Baron de Hirsch but, al-

though he is full of sympathy for the idea, it is impossible for him to further it. Herzl then asks him to use his influence in obtaining for him an interview with the Czar of Russia.

On the whole, however, Herzl at least in these early days of the movement still clings to the idea that the Kaiser, primarily, has the ability to further the movement; that the Kaiser must, at least, show himself to be favorably disposed toward the Zionists if the movement is to make any headway of consequence. Herzl realized all too well the powerful position of the Emperor.

"In Herzl's day the German Kaiser was by all odds the dominant political figure of Europe. When the Kaiser took snuff, the diplomats of the continent, down to the third undersecretary of the marines of Luxembourg, proceeded to sneeze ..... So from the outset Herzl turned toward the Kaiser as naturally as a child toward a candy shop. It was the general belief, if not the fact, that all political bon-bons were dispensed at Potsdam."<sup>22</sup>

It has already been demonstrated that Germany had tremendous influence and prestige in the Ottoman Empire. Her holdings were vast and her technicians and financiers were, for all intents and purposes, in control of all the important major agencies of Turkey. It was in the winter of 1898 that the Kaiser decided to come to Turkey and Palestine in order to discuss various matters with the Sultan. For public consumption, the Kaiser would come to visit the Ottoman Empire in order to dedicate the Evangelical Church of the Redeemer in Jerusalem and, also, would use the occasion to establish a protectorate over the German Catholics in Palestine. This, of course, caused a great stir as France felt that she was the protector of Christians in Asia Minor.<sup>23</sup> Herzl, however, printed leading articles

in his newspaper praising the "far sighted actions" of the Kaiser and for this, or some other reason, was informed that on this trip to Palestine, the Kaiser would receive him at the head of a Jewish delegation. The efforts of Herzl were thus rewarded. That there were deeper political and economic implications in the Kaiser's trip was realized by all, but Herzl did not heed these warning signals and went ahead with his preparations to meet the Kaiser.

The first interview took place on October 19, 1898. At this time the Kaiser intimated that Dreyfuss was not guilty and he listened fully to the plan as outlined by Herzl in regard to the founding of the Jewish State and the protectorate of Germany as envisioned by him. The Kaiser agreed with the scheme in principal and remarked that it would not be too difficult to obtain the consent of the Sultan if he, the Kaiser, would speak for the project. "After all, it will make an impression for I (the Kaiser) am the only one who still holds to him (the Sultan). Tell me, in one word, just what I am to ask of the Sultan." To this Herzl answers, "A Chartered Company, under German protection." "Good," says the Kaiser, "a chartered company," and with this remark the interview ended.<sup>24</sup>

The second interview with the Kaiser, also in Jerusalem, took place on November 2, 1898. At this time Herzl again spoke to the Kaiser as head of a Zionist delegation and said in essence, that

"We are convinced that carrying out the Zionist Plan will mean prosperity for the Turkish Empire too. We will bring energies and material means to the country; it is easy to foresee a magnificent fructuation of desolate territories. That will mean more happiness and civilization for mankind.

We plan a Jewish Land Company for Syria and Pal-

estine, which will undertake the great work, and for this Company we ask the protection of the German Emperor."<sup>25</sup>

With this favorable interview behind him, Herzl was now confident that his state was near the actual founding. It was, then, a terrible blow when the news communique, on which he had placed so much hope, was finally released to the world:

"The address of the leader of the Jewish deputation was answered by the Emperor, who pointed out that all aspirations toward furthering agriculture in Palestine, for the improvement of the prosperity of the Turkish Empire, respecting the sovereignty of the Sultan, would meet with his interest."<sup>26</sup>

What happened between the interview and the release of this communique can only be guessed at. It was known that the Sultan was not favorably disposed toward the project, perhaps this was only a personal whim of the Kaiser which proved untenable in the light of present international politics, perhaps it was the realization that the wealthy Jews would never back up Herzl's scheme and that Germany would be responsible, perhaps it was evident to the Kaiser that if he wanted his concessions in Turkey, he would not make a major issue of this demand of the Jews. At any rate, the interviews produced nothing more than prestige for Herzl and the movement, whereas, Herzl relates, in Vienna the joke of the day was that the Kaiser believed that the Zionistic idea was a worthwhile one, "only with the Jews it was impossible to make it a reality."<sup>27</sup> Herzl, then, went back to his planning and his writings and took comfort in the fact, as he told the Third Congress, that he and his friends were received by the Kaiser as a "delegation of the Zionist Actions

Committee."<sup>28</sup> He consoled himself with this and continued his work.

While Herzl was consoling himself in his work, the Germans were quite busy continuing their policy of quietly annexing the Ottoman Empire for their own use. Whereas Herzl may have thought that the Kaiser simply did not care anymore for his scheme and thus issued the damning communique, forces of much larger implications were at work in the Middle East which would forever cancel any of Herzl's ambitions. At first, under the rule of Bismark, the expansion of Germany in the Ottoman Empire was not looked upon with great favor. Bismark was primarily interested in continental affairs and wanted, at all costs, to avoid conflict in the east. He feared a clash with Russian interests in Constantinople and Bismark was against the visit of the Kaiser to Turkey in 1889.

"Failing to persuade the young Emperor to abandon his trip, the Chancellor did what he could to allay Russian suspicions of the purposes of the journey .... In 1890, however, Prince Bismark was dismissed and the chief obstacle to the Emperors' Turkish policy was removed."<sup>29</sup>

The Russian problem was always acute and Germany could not follow an active Turkish policy. She could, and did however strengthen Turkey in her ambitions so that Turkey would also, always, be strong enough to be used against Russia as an ally of Germany. This foresight, on the part of the Kaiser, became an actuality in 1914. At no point in this political scheme did the Germans seriously consider the colonization of Turkey with her own people. This was too difficult an undertaking and one which would not promise any tangible results. The European in Asiatic Turkey would encounter almost insurmountable difficulties, particularly in regard to the hot climate. "Palestine was a more suitable place of residence but

the country is not particularly alluring; a few German agricultural colonies, chiefly Jewish, were established there, but they were comparatively unimportant in size, wealth and political influence." So writes one of the foremost experts on the affairs of Turkey.<sup>30</sup>

Germany did, however, do all in her power to build up this country. Her position in regard to the Ottoman Empire was a unique one, at odds with all the other Powers.

"While most of the western Powers were openly discussing the impending partition of Turkey, Germany was openly set against it. In the diplomatic complications of the Armenian question, and in the Crete incident of 1896 which led to the Graeco-Turkish War, the attitude of Germany had been extremely helpful to the Turks. The German embassy in Constantinople was the most powerful center of foreign influence."<sup>31</sup>

When reaction became too strong against Germany for her support of the Ottoman Empire in the political spheres, Germany could always maintain that her interests were not political but economic. And this they could not deny and did not wish to do so. German officers took over the instruction of the Turkish army; Germany, rather than France sold Turkey all her munitions; German finance made possible the railroad construction, the building of locomotives and rails. Also, such important items for export as glassware, knives, razors, plows, textiles and leather goods began to pour into Turkey from Germany.

"The German statesmen and economists sought to build up in Central Europe a system of economic alliances .... thus might Germany and her allies become economically self-sufficient units, freed from dependence upon British sea power. And into this alliance could be incorporated the Near East. Beyond the Bosphorus lay a country rich in oils and metals, capable of supplying German textile mills with cotton, which used to be wealthy in agricultural products, which promised

to develop into a rich market for Western commodities. Communication to be established by a German-controlled Railroad upon which service would be maintained, in war and peace, without the aid of naval power ..... Turkey was destined to fall within the economic orbit of an industrialized Germany."<sup>32</sup>

E. M. Earle is quoted as saying that, in 1888, finance of Turkey was practically monopolized by Great Britain and France but the Germans, in 1900, were by far the most active group in Constantinople and in Asia Minor. Also, during this period of 1888-1900, Germany's imports from Turkey rose from 2,300,000 Marks to 28,900,000 Marks and Germany's exports from 11,700,000 Marks to 40,900,000 Marks.<sup>33</sup> As can readily be seen by these figures, the German industrialists in conjunction with the politicians and the military used their advantages to the fullest. They developed Turkey with brilliant success and the German ambassador to Turkey, Marshall von Bieberstein, became one of the most powerful men in that part of the world.

"At the time of von Bieberstein's death in 1912, Turkey was more valuable to Germany than all her colonies together."<sup>34</sup>

This then was the position of Germany during the time of Herzl's attempts to found a Jewish State in the midsts of the hotly contested Ottoman Empire. It can now be readily seen that the hopes and dreams of Herzl, as related to the Kaiser were without a chance of being realized. Whereas Herzl thought himself to be a power in his own right, he was merely another factor in the international intrigue of the times. His desire to take part in the imperialistic designs of the Powers proved to be worthless, as none of the Powers would seriously consider adding another competitor to the already large list of interested parties concerned with the partition of Turkey.

Although Herzl's main thoughts lay in the direction of Germany, he did not cast aside the prospect of English aid. The British government had always been interested in that part of the world, particularly since the building of the Suez Canal. British troops had been in this area for decades in order to protect the mother-country's investments. Herzl realized the strategic position of the Canal and also foresaw that England would attempt to build a western-type civilization in that part of the world. As a result, he felt that the establishment of a Jewish state, which would exist in harmony with the English government, might be of tremendous help to the British. He envisioned that a railroad would soon be built, which would provide easy access to India and that this railway would run through Palestine. "Whereas Russia would have a railway in the North which leads to Asia, England would have a neutral reserve-way to India, in case there would be difficulties in the area of the Suez Canal."<sup>35</sup> This proposal, and this analysis of the situation, was forwarded in a letter to Lord Salisbury, the Prime Minister, as early as 1896.

There was, however, another person within the English realm who could prove to be of great service to Herzl, and did accomplish a great deal in later negotiations. This man was Colonel Goldsmid. This officer, of the regular army, was the son of a baptized Jew, had grown up as a Christian and had then returned to Judaism. He entered into the project of building a Jewish State with great enthusiasm and was of invaluable service to Herzl in his dealings with English Jewry. Herzl went so far that in a public letter to the Colonel he refuted any desire on his part to become an active member of Parliament; three mandates had been offered him, in Jewish sections,

so that he would become an official member of the Parliament and could debate his dream from the floor of that noted body. Herzl definitely did not desire a political post of this type and wrote to Goldsmid, in 1897

"Give me your word of honor that you will finish what I started in Constantinople and I give you my word of honor that I will resign forever from the leadership of this Jewish project."<sup>36</sup> (translation mine)

Thus, whether through personalities on the English scene or through the government, Herzl attempted to gain his end by using Britain.

"From the beginning I was of the opinion that the diplomatic initiative had to come from England because England, looking towards India, cannot afford to overlook Palestine and because England still today has a certain serenity in her outlook towards the Jewish Question."<sup>37</sup> (translation mine)

Aside from Colonel Goldsmid there were, of course, other leading Zionist personalities to be found in England. Montague, Zangwill, and Rothschild were instrumental in furthering Herzl's desires. In fact, Cecil Rhodes was also brought into the picture but his advice in the matter, perhaps the most realistic, was too unromantic to be of use to Herzl; even if he could have followed the advice from this great financier. Herzl could come to see him at any time but, also, "If he wants any tip from me, I have only one word to say, and that is: let him put money in his purse."<sup>38</sup> This Herzl certainly attempted to accomplish and a couple of years later, he met with Lord Rothschild and put the case before him:

"Rothschild was very nice ..... I told him what I desired: that he obtain from the ICA three million pounds for the Jewish Eastern Company. The rest of the two million we will obtain through Subscriptions."<sup>39</sup> (translation mine)

And a few days later, at a second interview with the great man, Herzl offered that Rothschild should head the financial agencies of the new state. Rothschild, however, declined with thanks and maintained that he merely desired to be a co-worker with Herzl and was happy that it was in his power to help him. In other words, for all practical purposes, Rothschild washed his hands of all financial dealings regarding the new movement. Rothschild, incidentally, could not always have been entirely friendly to the movement; for when Herzl appeared before the London Immigration Committee in 1902, Rothschild posed the very embarrassing question of dual-loyalty. Was it possible for a Jew to be a part of the Zionist program and also to be a loyal citizen of the mother country? To this Herzl answered that the best illustration toward that attitude is the fact that during the last war of England, presumably the Boer Wars of 1899-1902, there were two Zionist societies in the British armies. This seemed to quiet the doubts of this important Britisher and Jew.

Although Herzl did not accomplish much in his negotiations with England or its leading citizens, he did not despair. For the Fourth Zionist Congress he chose London as the meeting place so that the people of the British Isles would be able to get a closer look at him and his organization, as well as to obtain the English moral and political support.<sup>40</sup> In great anticipation, therefore, of what might be obtained from these people he told the Fourth Congress in a burst of enthusiasm that

"England, mighty England, free England, with its world embracing outlook will understand our aspirations. With England as a starting point we may be sure that the Zionist idea will soar further and higher than ever before."<sup>41</sup>

This took place in the year 1900 and Herzl still speaks of "a starting point." While Herzl attempted to play politics with the Great Powers they hopelessly outclassed him, and the Zionist idea never had the slightest chance of succeeding. Great Britain, toward the end of the century, consolidated her possessions in Palestine; they built a railroad, at least they obtained the concession from the port of Haifa in two directions: one to Port Said, connecting Palestine with the Suez Canal and the other to Mesopotamia via Damascus. In this way England, as did Germany, became an active partner in the wholesale division of the Ottoman Empire; she differed from the other nations only insofar as her excuse was the Suez Canal. Historians have shown that British investments in the Near East date back to the Congress of Berlin in 1878 and that since that date Britain did everything in her power to maintain the status quo which would be in keeping with her interests. That she, then, would allow Herzl and his Jewish State to become a vital factor in this already vital sphere of influence was unimaginable when examined in the light of historical events.

"Some days before the Congress met (June 13, 1878), on June 4, a separate convention was concluded between Britain and Turkey, under which Great Britain agreed for all time to defend the Asiatic dominions of the Ottoman Empire 'by force of arms' and in return the Sultan ..... (was) to hand over Cyprus for occupation and administration by England at an annual tribute. This convention with Turkey is one of the most important measures of foreign policy which have ever been resolved upon by a British Government ..... Cyprus is the nearest island to the Suez Canal."<sup>42</sup>

Thus, the picture of England and her position in the Near East.

Herzl, being in close contact with the French due to his

early experiences as a Parisian correspondent, also attempted to interest the French government through various leading personalities in that country. The chief rabbi, Zadok, became a supporter of the movement and it was his task to interest the French branch of the house of Rothschild. In this, however, the Rabbi was not successful and Herzl believed that although Rothschild was interested in Zionism he did not dare admit this openly.<sup>43</sup> To have received this financier's open support would have meant a great deal, of course, but this was impossible due to the difficulties of the French government in the Ottoman Empire.

"The French were very much interested (in the Railway), They had an enormous investment in Turkey already and they controlled the Ottoman Bank, on which the Turkish government had to rely for financial aid. So strong, indeed, was their financial position that it had become irksome to the Sultan. He was determined not only not to grant them further concessions but if possible break their control. He therefore interested a German financier ..... who, in turn, managed to win Georg von Siemens, head of the Deutsche Bank."<sup>44</sup>

It will be appreciated, then, that the French had no desire to involve themselves further in the internal affairs of the Ottoman Empire, even had they the opportunity. Rothschild, who was certainly instrumental in the political and economic affairs of France would not endanger his position by advocating support of such a scheme as the Zionist plan for a State in that part of the world. France, then, contrary to the earlier visions of Hess, was completely out of the picture as far as Zionism was concerned.

Amid all of these intrigues, vested interests and political deals there was one country which was set apart from the Western Powers and yet played a dominant role in the history of Europe in the

last part of the nineteenth century. This country was Russia. She was in a unique position in that although never in direct contact with the big powers she was, nevertheless, a constant threat in areas of the world where the Western Powers had major investments. In regard to the Near Eastern situation, Russia was also a major factor. The building, or the granting of the concessions, for the Railway in Turkey affected her destiny as well as the destinies of France, Britain and Germany. Herzl, fully realizing the importance of such a link as a railway, also had the insight to realize that the two sections of Europe would be at odds regarding this construction. He knew that if the railway were built there might be serious repercussions throughout Europe, perhaps war. As a result, he wrote to Eulenburg in 1898, requesting his interview with the Kaiser and made the railroad one of his major arguing points. Since the Powers could not build the railway for fear of conflict, the task fell to the Jews!<sup>45</sup> They would be the neutral power in the Ottoman Empire and it would be easy for them to serve the nations in this manner. The reaction of the Kaiser to this proposal cannot be determined. Herzl very clearly saw the division of Europe into two opposing camps. Russia was interested in obtaining Constantinople for her own purposes and dreamed of a sea port into warm waters. As a result, she was as interested in obtaining a foothold in the Ottoman Empire as were the other nations and, thus, her opposition to the Railway project was clear and unmistakable.

"Russia opposed the project (of the Railway) from the beginning. On economic grounds influential Russian interests feared competition, but more important was the strategic problem. The German Railway would revive the sick man, and strengthen his grip on Constantinople and on Armenia, both

of which had long been coveted by Russian statesmen. Between Russian aims and the German Railway, there was an absolute clash .....<sup>46</sup>

Despite all of these facts, and realizing the dangerous position of Russia in view of the general world situation, Herzl did not hesitate in attempting to obtain an interview with top-level Russian statesmen in the first years of the twentieth century. When this plan became known to the Jews of the world, a violent reaction set in against Herzl. This was the time of the horrible anti-semitic persecutions of Eastern Europe, particularly Russia.

"The new repressions began with the famous 'Temporary Legislation Affecting the Jews' enacted in 1882, and known as the May Laws. Nothing in Czarist Russia was as enduring as 'Temporary Legislation.' This particular set of enactments, at any rate, was prolonged and broadened and extended until it came to cover every aspect of Jewish life."<sup>47</sup>

This, however, was the eastern-European view as expressed by Weizman. The Western Jews, of which Herzl was a part, although expressing their horror at the pogroms did not really want to see matters in their true light. In the West, after all, they were "emancipated" Jews who sought to minimize the danger by turning away from the problem. "They appealed to reason, preached sermons on the 'brotherhood of man,' by committees to combat anti-semitism, societies against intolerance and by exaggerated patriotism."<sup>48</sup> But no matter how much they desired to ignore the ominous cries of their Jewish brethren of Eastern Europe, the Kishineff massacre could not be ignored. Jews the world over, as well as men of every religious persuasion, cried out in protest at the inhumanity of the Russian pogrom. In one of the most effective essays ever written by Herzl, "Kishinev and the Sardines," he now speaks out with eloquence and power against the atrocities of

## Russia:

"Only when we shall be tired, crushed by the baseness of man, by the malice of the petty and the insignificant, then, so that our work may not suffer and tiredness not overcome us, shall we call to each other the fiery slogan — Kishinev."<sup>49</sup>

And yet, despite the Kishinev massacre of Easter, 1903, Herzl sought an interview with Van Plehwe and Witte during the same year. During the month of August, 1903, he met with Plehwe, the Minister of Interior, twice; and with Witte, the Minister of Finance, once. When these interviews were scheduled, the Zionist camp broke into two factions. Herzl, speaking for his position, maintained that any and all means should be used in order to further the goal of the Zionists and that such events as had transpired only served to point out the correctness of his thesis. The Jewish State must become an actuality and no stone must remain unturned in order to accomplish this. On the other hand, Weizman speaking for the opposition, maintained that

"..... there were some who believed that the Jewish leader could not pick and choose his contacts, but had to negotiate even with a murderer if some practical good would come of it. Others could not tolerate the thought of this final humiliation. But there were still others, I was among them, who believed that the step was not only humiliating, but utterly pointless."<sup>50</sup>

Be that as it may, Herzl did go to speak with Plehwe. During the discussion it became evident that the Minister not only knew a great deal about the movement but also knew of the leading personalities and was completely informed as to the Russian-Jewish attitude toward Zionism. Von Plehwe maintained that the Russian State seeks homogeneity, that it expects patriotism from its subjects and that there be only one

loyalty and that this was to be directed toward Russia. Furthermore, van Plehwe said that although there is a Ussishkin in the movement, the major portion of Russian Jews did not contribute to any great extent toward the furthering of the Zionist ideal. To the latter statement, particularly, Herzl reacted in amazement because he now realized that Plehwe has studied the situation completely and was familiar with the inner workings of the important Vienna Committee.<sup>51</sup> Aside from all these negative aspects of the conversation, it developed that Plehwe was really favorably disposed toward the Jews, had no special dislike for them and, in fact, grew up in a Jewish environment and spent his early youth surrounded by Jewish children.<sup>52</sup> Nothing positive, of course, came from these two interviews. Herzl has met an accomplished diplomat.

On the other hand, when Herzl met Witte, the case became quite clear with regard to the Jewish Question in Russia. Witte said that he used to tell the former Czar, Alexander III, that if it were possible to shove six or seven million Jews into the Black Sea so that they drown, he would be all for the idea. However, since this is hardly possible, one will just have to let them live! "Das ist meine Ansicht geblieben. Ich bin gegen weitere Bedrückungen."<sup>53</sup> This was the major development in his interview with this arch anti-semite. Yet, despite all of these obstacles, proving himself to be a real diplomat, or public relations expert, or merely a deluded individual, Herzl went before the sixth Zionist Congress and maintained that

"Finally the Russian government is willing to use its influence with his Majesty the Sultan, in furthering our efforts to obtain Palestine. The importance of this statement, which I am

empowered to make to the Zionist Congress, is surely evident to you all."<sup>54</sup>

The above statement could hardly have been said with a straight face by Herzl; he simply could not have believed that the Russians would help him in the establishment of a Jewish State; their orientation toward the Jews was unfavorable in the extreme and, had they helped or wanted to help Herzl in the Near East, they would only have used the Jews as a bargaining pawn in their relations with the Western Powers. It is evident, then, that here as well as with the other Powers, Herzl did not have the slightest chance of succeeding in his endeavors. His plans were directly contradictory to the objectives of Germany, England, France and Russia. He was alinged against the Powers of the world; and instead of his using them, they used him for their own purposes and according to the way the mood struck them. Herzl's ideal was doomed.

At the time, however, Herzl did not realize the futility of his dream. After his early interests in other "promised lands," he soon directed all of his energies toward Palestine and considered it the Homeland of the Jews. In this vision, he had Goldsmid and Montague at his side as they thought along these lines also. Palestine, according to Herzl was to be the gateway to the most important area of the world in the near future, Asia. At the second Congress, Herzl stated

"Palestine ..... is of great importance to all Europe because of its geographical situation. The time cannot be distant when it will be traversed by a cultural and commercial highway to Asia. Asia is the diplomatic problem of the coming decade."<sup>55</sup>

Again, two years later, in regard to the position of Palestine in this new trend of world politics,

"The Asiatic problem grows more serious day by day ..... For this reason it is more and more to the interest of the civilized nations and of civilization in general that a cultural station be established on the shortest road to Asia. Palestine is this station ..... Those who concern themselves with politics will perceive ..... that a valuable opportunity to draw nearer to Asia is thus presented."<sup>56</sup>

Whereas some of the leaders of the movement simply envisioned all of the Jews boarding ships and quickly being transported to the land of Palestine,<sup>57</sup> Herzl knew that there was more to the scheme than others realized. He understood that it would be of extreme importance that Palestine become an industrial nation and that the Jews be put to work immediately upon arrival. Whereas other nations simply used this area of the world for exploitation, Herzl felt that one should develop a country but then stay in it and continue this development.<sup>58</sup> Instead of being imperialists, the Jews would enter Palestine in a spirit of friendship and their work in the land would be of profit to all the inhabitants of the area. As a necessary corollary, of course, all other faiths and nationalities would be treated with equality and respect. That the land held out promise of successful development he realized as early as 1898, when these remarks were made by the Kaiser, at the time of Herzl's second interview with him:

"The settlements which I saw, the German as well as those of your people, can serve as examples as to what one can do with the land. The country has room for all. Obtain only water and shade ..... your movement, with which I am very familiar, contains a very healthy thought."<sup>59</sup> (translation mine)

The Promised Land, then, was to be the new homeland for the Jews. It had been promised to the people by God and now Herzl intended to make it the place where "hooked Noses, black or red beards, and bent legs

would be a sign of honor; the mocking and taunting call 'Jew' would now become a name of honor."<sup>60</sup> The flag of the new land was to be a field of white with seven stars, of gold, upon it. The white symbolized the "new, pure life" and the stars would indicate the number of hours men would work per day in the new society. All, therefore, was beautifully arranged except for one basic antagonist or one factor which was the key to the entire Near Eastern situation. This factor, around which all else revolved, was Turkey.

The problem of Turkey may be summarized in one word, money. The finances of the Ottoman Empire were in an impossible state and thus she had to allow other Powers to enter the country as industrialists, investment bankers and militarists just so the empire would continue to function. The Berlin-Bagdad Railway was, of course, the big enterprise through which Turkey would receive large grants of money and through which the Western Powers would control Turkey. In 1896 the announcement was made by the Foreign Minister of Turkey that grants had been given for the construction of this new railway and this, of course, had also been Herzl's idea.<sup>61</sup>

"Railroad building and commodity exchange, are fostered by the state on the basis of a rapid disintegration, ruin and exploitation of Asiatic peasant economy in the course of which the Turkish State becomes more and more dependent on European capital, politically as well as financially."<sup>62</sup>

Herzl also wanted to obtain his Jewish State in the Ottoman Empire by giving the Turks some much-needed money. In Der Judenstaat, the central idea for the carrying out of the scheme is to be found in the thought that "Supposing His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine, we could in return undertake to regulate the whole finances

of Turkey."<sup>63</sup> This is what Herzl set out to do; all he needed from this point on was the permission of Turkey and the money from the wealthy Jews of the world. Today we know that neither was forthcoming. In the face of this philosophy of obtaining the land Herzl had one great worry, aside from the usual one of lack of support. He correctly reasoned that if Turkey would become a favored nation, or would win its present war (Greco-Turk, 1896) the whole scheme would come to nought. At a peace conference, if Turkey won, the victor would probably ask for so much money as indemnity that Turkey's financial problem would be solved for the time being. This left Herzl out of the picture since he could only operate if Turkey was in heavy debt.

Nevertheless, although he desired that Turkey should lose this war, he was not taking any chances. In the midst of the conflict, he sent a message to the Turkish government expressing his hope for their victory and offering to collect money for the wounded Turkish soldiers. Herzl went to collect from Zionists as well as from anti-zionists presumably on humanitarian grounds but, in reality, for political reasons.<sup>64</sup> When Turkish troops gained significant victories, Herzl sent the following letter to one of the top government officials:

"Your Excellency: Allow me to congratulate you on the magnificent victories won by the Turkish armies. The wish of quite a number of Jewish students who desired to enter the ranks of Your Majesty voluntarily, is a small token of our Friendship and Thankfulness, which we, as Jews, feel towards Turkey ....."<sup>65</sup> (translation mine)

Here is the perfect example of how Herzl handled the situation, as a model diplomat of the times. On the one hand he favored the victory of Turkey and openly agitated for it; on the other hand, he secretly hoped for the defeat of Turkey as this would speed the establishment

of a Jewish State. At one time, when Turkey was about to be divided by the Powers, an entry in his diary reads that if there were a European Congress to decide what to do with the Empire, the Jews might get a piece of neutral land, such as Belgium or Switzerland.<sup>66</sup> At any rate, things looked black for Turkey and Herzl was fully aware of all the implications of the actions of the Big Powers. At one point, his heart sank again, in that he heard a rumor that the Powers would merely depose the present Sultan and put a new one in his place. This was a bad situation for the Jews as a new Sultan, placed on the throne under the auspices of the Powers, would certainly find plenty of money and would have no need of the Jews. The interesting fact is that although Herzl secretly envisioned the partition of Turkey with relish, he openly had to present a pleasant countenance to the Turkish officials; thus, he was completely at odds with the ambitions of the western diplomats. Herzl was caught in a maze of contradictions from which there could hardly be an escape.

"European diplomats frequenting the Yildiz look askance at the black bearded mysterious foreigner whose intention is to heal sick Turkey while all Europe needs an incurable Turkey which can be partitioned when the time comes."<sup>67</sup>

At present, however, no one really wanted to take so drastic a step as to partition Turkey outright. The present method of dividing the country from within was so much more practical and did not bring about the possibility of an open conflict. On the other hand, there were always hot-heads who could not wait to cut up the Empire. One of these was the employer of Herzl, the editor of the Neue Freie Presse. When the Armenian massacres took place world opinion was directed against Turkey and this powerful, influential newspaper came out

openly for the partition program. Herzl, of course, was now in a very difficult position. It was necessary for him to make clear to the Turks that he, although an employee of the Paper, did not represent its editorial policy. This was a hard task and it is doubtful whether Herzl ever convinced the Turkish officials as to his independence in this matter. All this worry came to nought, however, when in early 1897 a substantial loan was given to the Turks and they were out of difficulties for the present. Nevertheless, Turkey could not control its finances. By 1881, the Turkish debt was two hundred fifty-three million pounds Sterling and by the end of that year, the debt was consolidated by a union of creditors and was reduced to one hundred six million pounds Sterling.

"It was only by the removal of this foreign tutelage that Turkey could hope to recover genuine independence, and it was toward the achievement of this end, argued Herzl, that the Jews, and only the Jews, could be used. If they were given Palestine as an independent state, they would undertake the regulation and normalisation of Turkish finances and liberate the country from foreign control."<sup>68</sup>

All this, of course, was in the realm of theory and could never be achieved, as Herzl was to discover in the following years. Nevertheless, he founded a bank with a capital of two million pounds Sterling and sought to use it as the instrument for all future negotiations. Herzl envisioned that sometime in the near future, the bank would have assets totalling ten or more million pounds Sterling. This figure was never achieved. As if this were not bad enough, in 1900 the Turkish government passed, in addition to the 1891 decree, a new immigration restriction aimed at Palestine and its population. And, as early as 1896, Ziad Pasha, a close advisor to the Sultan told Herzl that Pales-

tine would never go to the Jews as an independent country, his only hope was for a Vassal-state arrangement,<sup>69</sup> and this was expressed only in terms of "maybe."

Herzl had two distinct views of Turkey and its people. One he expressed to the second Congress and the other was privately given him by Ben Jehuda, in 1899. Herzl maintained,

"The Turks have excellent qualities ..... but they do not possess those qualities which are requisite for industrialism and the cultivation of a country ..... We may state that the Turkish government is well aware of the thorough uprightness of our efforts. We neither want to smuggle in settlers nor engage in any creative work whatsoever without a previous agreement. In fact, we should have no interest at all in helping to strengthen Turkish economy if we were to receive nothing in return."<sup>70</sup>

Ben Jehuda, one of the earliest settlers and the driving force in making Hebrew the language of the Jewish colony of Palestine, told Herzl that

"All in the Orient fear all. The people are a ravenous animal ..... If the Officials would wink, the Mohammedans would fall all over the Jews ..... this is my long-felt argument against the plan to infiltrate. In the upper ranks of officialdom one already is discussing Zionism. All depends on the Sultan. Even the Grossvizier is only a lakey."<sup>71</sup> (translation mine)

The most important matter, then, was to see the Sultan, on whom everything depended, according to Herzl. He began his preparations for this momentous event by taking lessons, with his son Hans, in the Turkish language. He felt that it would make a better impression if he could speak a few words of Turkish to the Sultan when the time for the interview came and so that he could check Turkish translations of his letters to the Sultan.<sup>72</sup> He always feared that no one could be trusted in the land of the Bakshish and that all major communica-

tions would have to be checked personally by him.

In his efforts to make contact with the Sultan, Herzl used his many interested friends who were, in various ways, connected with the Turkish government. From these he heard a variety of opinions as to what were the aims of the Sultan, and as to the sentiments he had actually expressed. The Sultan was worried as to the Holy City of Jerusalem; he wanted to know why the Jews must have Palestine and why any other country would not help them also; he considered, at an early stage of the developments, accepting the proffered help of the Jews but then managed to relieve his financial difficulties and thus did not need the Jews anymore; the Jews did not bother the Sultan but the implications of the Zionist movement did and he was afraid of the reaction of the Great Powers if he would grant the Jews a charter; the Sultan believed it best for the Jews to save their money as he would not give them anything at all, however they should just be patient and in time they might, perhaps, obtain Palestine for nothing. All these reports came back to Herzl and it is easy to imagine how confused he was as to the real intentions of the Sultan.

But this was merely the beginning. It was told to Herzl that the Sultan reacted most unfavorably toward the intervention of the Kaiser in 1898, and the Kaiser, being a guest, could not pursue the matter any further. Count von Eulenburg, German ambassador to Vienna, told Herzl three years after the interview that the position of Germany is so delicate, in regard to the balance of power between England and Russia, that nothing can happen which would upset this delicate position of Germany. This meant that in Asia, where Russia also had interests, no differences could arise;<sup>73</sup> as a result Ger-

many would not help the Zionists. Another report which Herzl heard of the after-effects of the Kaiser's trip to the Holy Land was that the Kaiserin felt that although her trip was most pleasant, the only unpleasant aspect was the fact that she had to look upon so many Jews.<sup>74</sup> On such remarks, the fate of Jewry hinges.

Herzl, depending on how the mood moved him, or what the expedient course of action was to be, waxed hot and cold in regard to the Turks and the Sultan. Mostly, at least outwardly, he showed himself very friendly toward the Turks and said in one of his most important speeches,<sup>75</sup>

"The Sultan is favorably disposed toward the Jews. In fact, I would dare to believe that the Jews have no better and more accomodating friend in the world than the present reigning Sultan." (translation mine)

Also, he attempted to be of service to the Sultan in the diplomatic realm and inform the ruler as to the way he saw political events. When the nations busied themselves with the Open Door Policy in China, Herzl saw the handwriting on the wall and felt that this same technique of conquest might one day be applied to the Turkish territory. He wrote along these lines to a friend,<sup>76</sup> a Turkish official, but the reaction to this letter is unknown. At any rate, Herzl did not have a chance: the first Secretary of the Sultan, Iszet Bey, proved to be vehemently opposed to the plan and from the son of the Grandvizier he heard that Herzl's type of government, an aristocratic republic, would be totally unacceptable to the Sultan. Djawid tells Herzl that the Sultan is mightily afraid of the word "republic" and with such a plan there could be no headway. As if this were not enough, Herzl felt that the Jews were working against him also in Constanti-

nople.

" ..... I just learned of a monstrous matter from the Palace in Constantinople, where I have friends: someone from the Jewish side is intriguing against me. It sounds so unbelievable that one can hardly credit this."<sup>77</sup>  
(translation mine)

After all this heartache and personal disappointment, Herzl finally managed to obtain an interview with the Sultan. This took place on May 17, 1901 and it was to be the great occasion on which all future developments would hinge. The main portion of the interview went as follows:

"Sultan: I was and always am a friend of the Jews. In fact, I only put my trust in ..... Jews. I have not as much faith in my own underlings as I have toward them (Jews) .....

Herzl: Now I must tell you a beautiful, old story concerning Androcoles and the Lion. Your Majesty is the Lion, I am perhaps, Androcoles, and perhaps there is a thorn which must be removed ..... I believe that the thorn is the public debt. If one can remove it Turkey would retain her vitality, in which I believe, and could make progress.

Sultan: That would be very nice .....<sup>78</sup>  
(translation mine)

The interview lasted two hours during which time many matters were fully discussed but the answers of the Sultan were continually vague and did not contain promises of any sort. On the following day Herzl was called to the Palace once again but only to receive a small present from the Sultan. Herzl, overcome with emotion, expressed his thanks and discovered that the Sultan had presented him with a tie-clasp, which contained a gold-yellow jewel. Nothing more concrete than this came of the interview and Herzl was not to see the Sultan again. A few days later, Herzl wrote in his diaries,

"My impression of the Sultan was that he is a weak, cowardly, but completely congenial type of person. I do not believe him to be malicious, nor fearsome, rather a deeply unhappy prisoner, in whose name a band of thievish, infamous people enact the greatest horrors. Had I not to bother with the Zionist matter, I would go now to write an article through which I would give this poor prisoner his freedom."<sup>79</sup>  
(translation mine)

Although Herzl knew better than to write or publish articles dealing with the Turkish question in the face of Western opposition, he did correspond with the Sultan and continued to outline his plans for the Jewish State. The company which was to be the central agency of the new government would have Ottoman representation, the Jews would become subject to military duty<sup>80</sup> and, on the other hand, the Sultan would give the Zionists a charter of concession for Jewish colonization in Mesopotamia, adding the territory of Haifa and its environs in Palestine.<sup>81</sup> At the time of the fifth Congress, in his Presidential address, Herzl stated that,

"Last May I had the honor of being granted a lengthy interview by His Majesty the Sultan, Abdul Hamid. The kindness and cordiality of my reception filled me with the highest hopes. I was convinced by the words and manners of His Majesty that the Jewish people has a friend and a benefactor in the ruling Caliph. The Sultan empowered me to declare this officially."<sup>82</sup>

A year later, with no tangible results, Herzl said

"Given the kindly sentiments of the ruler and the indispensable benefits to be gained by the Turkish Empire it would appear that the obstacle in our path is to be sought in the attitude of the great powers which are interested in the Near East, especially Russia."<sup>83</sup>

Herzl, then, was able to speak only in terms of hopes and dreams, of the kindness and beneficence of the Sultan instead of definite achieve-

ments pertaining to the goal of the Zionist movement. These concrete results were never forthcoming; Herzl saw correctly that they were an impossibility due to the struggle of the Powers for a country which could not offer more than mere encouragement and hope.

When Herzl returned from his trip to Constantinople he set down some of the conditions asked by the Sultan. Herzl, as a leader committed to an ideal, could never agree to these conditions even if the Turks would have promised to take in the Jews. Immigration was not to take place in mass movements but only five families here and five families there;<sup>84</sup> Jews would have to become subjects of the Sultan, would have to become Turkish citizens and would have to give up their former citizenship, would have to do military duty whenever the Sultan called them to the colors;<sup>85</sup> the Sultan would allow them to settle in Mesopotamia, Syria, Anatolia and any other place except Palestine.<sup>86</sup> And wherever they were to be settled, they would be scattered and without interconnection. It did not take Herzl long to realize what role he played in these events and consultations. Losing his former exuberance for the Turks, he writes,

"Evidently the Sultan made capital out of my presence. I was the Jew whom they had come so that it would be more difficult for the other competitors. It is accomplished ..... I only have the satisfaction that the Turks are getting their ears boxed properly from the French swindlers."<sup>87</sup> (translation mine)

The main argument now, as heretofore, was still Money.

Herzl wrote the Sultan once again and said that if his people could enter Palestine without restrictions, he would found a great Ottoman Bank, whose central seat would be in Constantinople with branches in all of the major cities of the Empire. The Executive Committee of

the Bank would be composed of Jews and Mohammedans only. However this letter, as well as the others, produced no results. It is conceivable that the Sultan knew that Herzl suffered from the same ailment as he did, lack of funds. "From the moment Herzl began his negotiations with the Turkish authorities, he felt himself hampered by uncertainty; he did not know whether he could procure the money which he promised the Turkish government."<sup>88</sup>

"Even if they (the proposals of the Sultan) had been in good faith, the Jewish people refused to give Herzl the means with which to close any bargain. They were sufficiently unimaginative to decline the risk of a few paltry millions in getting at the heart of the evil."<sup>89</sup>

At one time it came to the ears of Herzl that Edmund Rothschild had sent a representative to the Sultan to offer him money but nothing definite came out of this either. Herzl, however, was forced to wonder whether this was a move against him or whether it was merely a general business deal between the French and the Turks.

At any rate, with the bank Herzl could accomplish much more; he would have bargaining power, the bank was to accomplish three purposes: (1) normal banking business; (2) a trading connection with the government from which the settlement is to be acquired; and (3) the establishment of a great land company which would be designed to bring the Zionist plan into activity. But try as he might, Herzl could only lay these plans in theory, for the fact of the matter was that he was poor himself and the movement was steeped in poverty. Had the money been forthcoming, he would have been, according to Izzet Bey, set up in business immediately. This Turkish noble offered the Jews the development of the mining industry, the exploitation of all the mines in the Empire, the banking business and all the necessary

concessions, including permission to carry out the colonization project. Whether this man spoke with real authority is only a matter of conjecture but, as always, the money was not available. In a bitter outburst against the attitude of the Jews in regard to his work, Herzl wrote,

"It is unbelievable and in fifty years one will spit on the graves of these people; then one will discover that I almost reached an agreement with Abdul Hamid but could not get the trifling amount of money."<sup>91</sup> (translation mine)

Whether Herzl was ever as close to completing negotiations with the Sultan is a disputable point, but he was certainly correct in his attitude toward the wealthy Jews of his day who consistently refused to aid him in his endeavors. Herzl, already in the early days of the movement, saw the inevitable financial struggle and considered himself to be heading an army of children, beggars and trash.<sup>92</sup> Although the Jewish Colonial Trust was established in March of 1899, by 1914 the total amount of capital was not more than \$1,300,000.<sup>93</sup> By 1902, out of an envisaged capital of lbs. 2,000,000 they had only gathered lbs. 250,000 and this with great effort.<sup>94</sup> Furthermore, the other governments were not too kindly disposed toward this gathering of large amounts of money for the Zionist cause, presumably they believed that this money would be put to better use within the homeland. In Austria they went so far as to call the editor, Brecher, of Herzl's paper to the police, no light matter in those days. Also, an offer by the Deutsche Bank, much inferior to the Jewish proposal, was accepted much to the chagrin of Herzl. All this evoked a bitter, sarcastic speech from Israel Zangwill at the fifth Congress, where he said,

"Herzl turned to the Jews: Give me two million pounds and I shall create something great. He never received even a quarter of that sum and now the Jews, who never opened their pockets, ask: 'Where is the great deed?'"<sup>95</sup>

But the "eastern" group was not silent either. Weizman lost no opportunity to speak against the leader. In his Trial and Error, he writes,

"Herzl spoke in large terms, on international recognition, of a charter for Palestine, of a vast immigration. But the effect wore off as the years passed on, and nothing remained but the phrases. Herzl had seen the Sultan, Kaiser ..... he was about to see this or that important man. And the practical effect was nothing. We could not help but become skeptical about these nebulous negotiations."<sup>96</sup>

And,

"There were other, related reasons for our opposition. Herzl's pursuit of great men, of princes and rulers, who were to 'give' us Palestine, was the pursuit of a mirage. It was accompanied, most unfortunately, but perhaps inevitably, by a shift of the leadership to the right. Herzl played to the rich, powerful, to Jewish bankers and financiers ..... We, on the other hand, had little faith in the benevolence of the mighty ..... official Zionism, as represented by the thoroughly respectable leadership, might have won the tolerance of the Russian authorities. Not so the young men, with their definite leftist leanings. We began to represent a 'danger' to the movement — we were the 'subversives.'"<sup>97</sup>

In summation, it might be said, that although his negotiations were unsuccessful, his political methods might be questioned, his conception of the Jewish state was deserving of criticism, it is important to remember that he was the only figure in the Jewish world who stood for something and the way he stood for it was all

important. His plan had no way of succeeding, but his influence on the Jewish scene was and is lasting.

Chapter Three

1. Gersell, Schmarpa, Nahal in seiner Tagesblätter, Schriftenreihe der Jüdischen Rundschau, 1927. p. 12
2. Nahal, Theodor, Historische Schriften (Reihe, veränderte und erweiterte Auflage), Schalom Verlag Co., Ltd., Tel Aviv, 1943. p. 103. (hereafter referred to as Schriften)
3. The Tragedy of Jewish Immigration (Evidence given before the British Royal Commission in 1921), Zionist Organization of America, New York, 1920. pp. 25-7. (hereafter referred to as Immigration)
4. Scholow, Rahne, History of Zionism 1880-1918, Volume I and II, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1919. Vol. I, pp. 100-2
5. Nahal, Theodor, The Jewish State (Third Edition, translated by Sylvia Waverider), Central Office of the Zionist Organization, London, 1936. p. 33. (hereafter referred to as State)
6. Tagebücher (3 volumes) Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, 1922. Vol. I, p. 139. (hereafter referred to as Tagebücher)
7. Ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 141
8. Ibid, Immigration, p. 12
9. Ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, pp. 25-2
10. Ibid, Worte, (ed. by Felix Thielhaber), Welt-Verlag, Berlin, 1921. p. 12. (hereafter referred to as Worte)
11. Ibid, Schriften, p. 206
12. Ibid, Old-New Land, (translated by Louis Javowsky), Black Publishing Co., New York, 1941. p. 56. (hereafter referred to as Old-New Land)
13. Ibid, Old-New Land, p. 51
14. Ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 197
15. Davis, Edward H., Tarling, The Great Power, and the Egyptian Railway, (A Study in Imperialism), The Seemann Co., New York, 1907. p. 126
16. Ginsberg, Isidor (Achal Nahal), The Parting of the Ways, (Essays on the Philosophy of Zionism), (translated by Milton M. Bernstein), Reprinted from the Jewish Chronicle, London, 1905, p. 15

## Notes

### Chapter Three

1. Gorelik, Schmarya, Herzl in seinen Tagebücher, Schriftenreihe der Jüdischen Rundschau, 1929. p. 10
2. Herzl, Theodor, Zionistische Schriften (Dritte, veränderte und erweiterte Auflage), Hotsah Ivrit Co., Ltd., Tel Aviv, 1943. p. 189. (hereafter referred to as Schriften)
3. \_\_\_\_\_, The Tragedy of Jewish Immigration, (Evidence given before the British Royal Commission in 1902), Zionist Organization of America, New York, 1920. pp. 26-7. (hereafter referred to as Immigration)
4. Sokolow, Nahum, History of Zionism 1600-1918, Volumes I and II, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1919. Vol. I, pp. 268-9
5. Herzl, Theodor, The Jewish State (Third Edition, translated by Sylvie D'Avigdor), Central Office of the Zionist Organization, London, 1936, p. 69. (hereafter referred to as State)
6. \_\_\_\_\_, Tagebücher (3 volumes) Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, 1922. Vol. I, p. 139. (hereafter referred to as Tagebücher)
7. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 141
8. ibid, Immigration, p. 10
9. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, pp. 58-9
10. ibid, Worte, (ed. by Felix Theilhaber), Welt-Verlag, Berlin, 1921. p. 12. (hereafter referred to as Worte)
11. ibid, Schriften, p. 286
12. ibid, Old-New Land, (translated by Lotta Levensohn), Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1941. p. 56. (hereafter referred to as Old-New Land)
13. ibid, Old-New Land, p. 81
14. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 199
15. Earle, Edward M., Turkey, The Great Powers, and the Bagdad Railway, (A Study in Imperialism), The Macmillan Co., New York, 1923. p. 136
16. Ginzberg, Asher (Achad HaAm), The Parting of the Ways, (Essays on the Philosophy of Zionism), (translated by Lillian R. Bentwich), Reprint from the Jewish Chronicle, London, 1905, p. 15

17. \_\_\_\_\_, Selected Essays, (translated by Leon Simon), Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1912. p. 289. (hereafter referred to as Essays)
18. ibid, Essays, p. 293
19. Weizman, Chaim, Trial and Error, (An Autobiography), Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949. p. 31
20. Herzl, op. cit., Tagebücher, Vol. II, pp. 107, 108, 111
21. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 115-6
22. Lowenthal, Marvin, Herzl's Diaries, The Menorah Journal, Nov./Dec. 1924, Vol. I, No. 5. p. 116
23. Bein, Alex, Theodor Herzl, (translated by Maurice Samuel), Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1948. p. 276
24. Herzl, op. cit., Tagebücher, Vol. II, pp. 197, 198
25. Patai, Josef, Star over Jordan (The Life of Theodor Herzl), (translated by Francis Magyar), Philosophical Library, New York, 1946. p. 214
26. ibid, p. 218
27. Herzl, op. cit., Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 304
28. \_\_\_\_\_, The Congress Addresses, (translated by Nellie Straus), Federation of American Zionists, New York, 1917. p. 18. (hereafter referred to as Addresses)
29. Earle, op. cit., pp. 40-42
30. ibid, pp. 123-4
31. Bein, op. cit., p. 276
32. Earle, op. cit., pp. 50-51
33. ibid, pp. 36-7
34. Swain, Joseph W., Beginning the Twentieth Century, (A History of Europe from 1870 to the Present), W. W. Norton and Co., New York, 1938. p. 237
35. Herzl, op. cit., Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 573
36. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 612
37. ibid, Schriften, p. 237

38. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 78
39. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. III, pp. 324-5
40. *ibid*, Schriften, p. 422
41. *ibid*, Addresses, p. 24
42. Sokolow, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 303
43. Herzl, *op. cit.*, Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 79
44. Langer, William L., The Diplomacy of Imperialism, 1890-1902, Vol. II, Alfred Knopf, New York, 1935. pp. 632, 634
45. Herzl, *op. cit.*, Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 126
46. Moon, Parker T., Imperialism and World Politics, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1930. pp. 247-8
47. Weizman, *op. cit.*, p. 17
48. Neuman, Emanuel, The Birth of Jewish Statesmanship (The Story of Theodor Herzl's Life), Zionist Organization of America, New York, date of publication: unknown. pp. 7-8
49. Patai, *op. cit.*, p. 315
50. Weizman, *op. cit.*, p. 82
51. Herzl, *op. cit.*, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 466
52. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. III, pp. 477, 479
53. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 472
54. *ibid*, Addresses, p. 38
55. *ibid*, Addresses, p. 13
56. *ibid*, Addresses, p. 24
57. Levin, Shmarya, Youth in Revolt, (translated by Maurice Samuel), Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1930. pp. 42-3
58. Herzl, *op. cit.*, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 16
59. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 224
60. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. I, pp. 112-3
61. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 553

62. Luxemburg, Rosa, The Accumulation of Capital (translated by Agnes Schwartzschild), Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1951.  
p. 445
63. Herzl, op. cit., State, p. 30
64. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 615
65. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 620
66. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 309
67. Patai, op. cit., p. 286
68. Bein, op. cit., pp. 199-200
69. Herzl, op. cit., Tagebücher, Vol. I, pp. 420-1
70. ibid, Addresses, p. 14
71. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. II, pp. 279-80
72. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. II, pp. 258-9
73. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. II, pp. 523-4
74. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 241
75. ibid, Schriften, p. 113
76. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 467
77. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. I, p. 508
78. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 14
79. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 31
80. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 70
81. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 244
82. ibid, Addresses, p. 30
83. ibid, Addresses, p. 34
84. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 40
85. Bein, op. cit., pp. 361-2
86. Herzl, op. cit., Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 138
87. ibid, Tagebücher, Vol. III, p. 178

88. Bein, op. cit., p. 251
89. Gottheil, Richard, Zionism, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1914. p. 119
90. Pessin, Deborah, Theodor Herzl, Behrman House, Inc., New York, 1948. pp. 86-7
91. Herzl, op. cit., Worte, p. 47
92. *ibid*, Tagebücher, Vol. II, p. 20
93. *ibid*, Addresses, p. 14
94. Bein, Alex, The Return to the Soil, The Youth and Hechalutz Department of the Zionist Organization, Jerusalem, 1952. p. 16
95. Patai, op. cit., p. 269
96. Weizman, op. cit., p. 53
97. *ibid*, p. 52

## Chapter Four

### EPILOGUE

Although Herzl experienced his main difficulties on the international scene in his attempts to bargain with the Powers, he also had great difficulty at home and not merely on a financial level. As soon as he began to realize that the land of Palestine would not be as easily obtainable as he had once thought, he set into motion all sorts of schemes which were to obtain other areas for the Jews, some as a stop-over and some as national home-lands. Thus, he negotiated for Mesopotamia, for Cyprus, for El Arish, and for the Sinai Peninsula. In regard to the last, Herzl was so positive that this area would be obtainable that he abstained from buying a family plot in the cemetery where his father rested for he considered this place only "temporary."<sup>1</sup> He dealt with the project of the Sinai Peninsula in the same spirit of immediacy.

The big blow to Jewish ambitions, however, came when Herzl reacted favorably to the proposal to settle in the British colony of Uganda. This proposal indeed even the suggestion to investigate the possibilities of the area — was to split the Zionist movement in two and to leave Herzl a broken and defeated man. Nordau was chosen to offer the territory to the 1903 Congress as an "asylum in the night" (nachtasyl), which was to serve as a stopping place for Jews till the day when Palestine would finally be in their hands. The reaction to this proposal was so violent that at a party, Chamukoh eve, 1903, a young student approached Nordau, cried out, "Death to

Nordau, the East African," and fired two shots. Fortunately, the shots missed. Weizman, active in the movement at the time of this proposal looked upon it with deep foreboding and felt that this was the crucial test of the movement and of Herzl's power. When a vote was finally taken, after a long and stormy debate, two hundred ninety-five voted for an investigation committee of Uganda, and one hundred seventy-seven voted against it. About one hundred delegates abstained. As soon as the motion passed, a whole group of eastern European Zionists withdrew from the meeting and staged a sit-down strike until Herzl personally came to plead with them to return and assured them that this was only a temporary measure. Weizman justifies the action of this group as follows:

"We were vindicated in our attitude toward the Western leaders when ..... following the Kishinev pogrom, Herzl attempted to substitute Uganda for Palestine ..... he failed to perceive that, with all their suffering, the Jews of Russia were incapable of transferring their dreams and longings from Palestine to any other territory. It was thus made manifest that Palestine had, in fact, never been 'available' to the Western leadership. It had been a mirage and the mirage had faded....."<sup>2</sup>

But the problem of Uganda was not the only one which Herzl had to face. Just before he went to attend the first Zionist Congress in Basel he realized the difficulty of his position; he felt as if he would have to do a dance on eggs, which was to be a rare artistic masterpiece. There was the egg of: (1) the press; (2) orthodoxy; (3) Reform Jewry; (4) Austrian patriotism; (5) the Sultan and the Ottoman Empire; (6) the Russian government because of the situation of the Jews there; (7) the Christian Religions because of the Holy Grave in Palestine; (8) Edmond de Rothschild; (9) the Russian Friends

of Zion; (10) colonies enjoying the support of Rothschild; (11) personal differences; and (12) envy and jealousy.<sup>3</sup> All in all, not a very pleasant task when one is setting out on a mission. But within the Jewish world arose another factor of contention, the "Protest-rabbiner." Herzl characterized him as,

"..... die Leute, die im sicheren Boot sitzen und den Ertrinkenden, die sich an dem Bootrand klammern möchten, mit dem Ruder auf die Köpfe schlagen. So ist schon der gewöhnliche aggressive jüdische Zionsfeind."<sup>4</sup>

One of the great problems of Herzl was to convey his views to the Jewish and general public. As such, he felt that he could accomplish this purpose best by buying or editing a newspaper. As early as 1897, Herzl founded Die Welt, which carried the Star of David as its symbol. The first issue appeared on June 6, 1897 and was specifically designed to be a "Jewish" paper. In the lead editorial of the first issue, Herzl writes,

"Unsere Wochenschrift ist ein 'Judenblatt.' Wir nehmen dieses wort, das ein Schimpf sein soll, und wollen daraus ein Wort der Ehre machen."<sup>5</sup>

The paper made headway and had a fair circulation but Herzl, of course, always sought for more publicity and more prestige. As such, in 1899, he thought of buying an interest in the Neue Freie Presse, the leading newspaper of the day. He would become co-editor, would have editorial freedom and would be in a wonderful position to use the prestige of this paper to further his aims. The objective was never realized. "Herzl's salary became the highest on the newspaper, he was put in executive charge of the literary section and was given the definite promise that henceforth the purely practical achievements of the Zionist movement could be printed freely in the Neue Freie

Presse."<sup>6</sup> Small consolations for what might have been. The last scheme which was offered to him, in regard to a newspaper, was that he buy the paper Stamboul, in Constantinople. This was rejected as ridiculous.

Lastly, another important faction arose within the Zionist party. Those were the "cultural Zionists," led by Achad HaAm. This great essayist was concerned not with political developments but with the Jewish spirit to be founded in the new land, and in present day Jewry. He stated his views in his essay on "The Spiritual Revival."

"For my own part, I am of the opinion that work for the improvement of the material and political position of the Jews in the Diaspora, though it is undoubtably necessary and useful as a temporary measure of relief, however slight, and though it has, therefore, undeniable claims on all who have the opportunity of taking part in such work, is yet not properly to be included in the work essential to Zionism."

Achad HaAm was an active Zionist from his earliest youth. He was a leader of the "B'nai Moshe," the training school for many of the Russian Zionist leaders. He was no person to live in a purely scholarly environment but was very much a part of this world. It is simply that he and Herzl did not see eye to eye in the matter of how to carry out the Zionist program and which phase of it was the most important. In Herzl's book, Altneuland, Achad HaAm found much to his liking as regards to the "new society." However, "the one thing that he considered the specific Jewishness of the Eastern Jew, was missing in it."<sup>8</sup>

"The Zionist movement stood for a time under the double sign of Herzl and Achad HaAm. There was Herzlian Zionism, with its great political vistas and its deferment of the practical work; there was the Zionism of Achad HaAm, concentrating on the qualitative progress of the resettlement."

ment in Palestine. It was only in later years that the two views were synthesized ..... but as between the two men, there was always a feeling of mutual respect."<sup>9</sup>

These, then, were the major forces active in the life of Herzl aside from the international, political field.

In summation, the following points may be made as to Herzl's activities:

- (1) Herzl lived in a time when the spirit of nationalism was evident throughout the class of which he was an integral part. His theory of the Judenstaat was a product of his milieu; nationalism was the dominant theme of many minorities.
- (2) National sovereignty, however, was merely a lever for the power struggle which was brought to the fore by political and economic imperialism. This movement for colonies and markets was the instrument by which the Powers perpetuated themselves. The national sentiment, including that of Herzl, was both utilized and stifled by Imperialism.
- (3) Due to the large-scale imperialistic movement, any nationalistic movement was doomed to failure. The idea of Herzl, to build a sovereign state amid the power struggles of his day was completely impossible. Although Herzl spoke and acted like Mazzini, the times were against him.
- (4) Palestine, the land which Herzl desired for the Jewish people, was located in one of the most strategic spots of the world. With every major power attempting to

obtain control of the Ottoman Empire, they would never allow a new, sovereign nation to enter this arena of imperialist rivalry.

- (5) The construction of the Railroad in Turkey was a major factor in the plans of Herzl and of the Powers. It would serve the purpose of consolidation from the Turkish point of view; it would serve as a means of encroaching on the economic and political life of the Turks. Herzl could not hope to compete with these vested interests.
- (6) Herzl, in his schemes to help with the finances of Turkey was as much a part of the Imperialistic trend as were the other Powers. However, due to his lack of funds he was no competitor of Great Britain, France and Germany.
- (7) Herzl, attempting to set the Powers against each other, was really used as a pawn by these nations. Turkey, certainly, used him and the Zionist movement as a tool for bargaining power.
- (8) Herzl placed great emphasis on his dealing with Germany wanting to obtain the sanction of the Kaiser. It might have been better, perhaps, had he dealt with France. This nation was as powerful as Germany and her holdings in the Ottoman Bank were unequalled. France might have proved more helpful but was probably saturated with a spirit of anti-semitism at this time, the period of the Dreyfuss trials. On the other hand, Herzl may have considered France a useless instrument in his designs

for she already had a wedge, her position in the Bank, into the much desired area of the Ottoman Empire.

- (9) Herzl, although he had many supporters, did not have the wealthy Jews behind him. He, as the man with an Idea, did not count on nor calculate with the desire of the Western Jew to assimilate himself in his environment. This was particularly true of the German and Austrian Jew. As a result, they did not support this "crazy" scheme with funds or moral enthusiasm.

- (10) Although Baron Rothschild and Baron de Hirsch did not take part in any aspect of the movement, it would seem that they were closer to the solution of the Jewish problem than was Herzl. It was they who followed the general trend of expansion; they settled their people in South America and Palestine. These people were seldom disturbed and began the building of a fertile country. Although the number of their colonies were small, had Herzl sided with them they might have been able to transport many more Jews into Palestine and thus would have succeeded in a small measure, whereas Herzl accomplished nothing at all of a practical nature. On the other hand, it might well be argued that the colonies were only successful because they were small. Had they grown larger, with an influx of Jews, the Turkish authorities might well have caused trouble for those settlers and this movement would not have made any headway either.

- (11) There was continuous friction between the Jews of the East and those of the West. (The schism which resulted between the followers of Herzl and those of Achad HaAm was never as serious.) The groups following the leadership of Herzl wanted; (a) an external and political buildup of the state, to make it a national force, (b) a Western European orientation, (c) the Uganda project and its investigation by the committee -- viewing this as a temporary refuge for the Jews particularly after the Kishinev pogrom, (d) the van Flehve interview.

Those that followed the Eastern European leaders, such as Weizman and Ussishkin, wanted; (a) a practical, internal development of the State, (b) an East-European orientation, (c) Uganda project and the investigation committee turned down because of Kishinev, (no other place would offer them a permanent haven of refuge than Palestine), and (d) no interview with van Flehve, and considered it a point of honor not to converse with this noted anti-semitic.

- (12) The Eastern masses of Jews were no vital factor in the Zionist movement until after 1900. They were rarely allowed to attend the Congresses, had to be careful of what they said, their leaders were also hampered in the expressing of their point of view by considering their fellow Jews still behind the pale. Also, the Jews of the East were no vital factor in immigration to Palestine

until the first decades of the twentieth century, since most of them went to America. Small groups did go to the Holy Land during the nineteenth century but real immigration into Palestine, from their part of the world did not begin until the immigration laws of America became more severe, and immigration to the West was virtually blocked.

- (13) One has the definite feeling that the Tagebücher were written with the intention of future publication. Herzl fully realized his role in the history of his people and wanted to leave his diaries as a memorial and as the first text-book on Zionist history. There are other points to be considered, however, in regard to the diaries. Landau<sup>10</sup> mentions some interesting facts: too much in the original manuscript was left out in the published editions, particularly in regard to Herzl's struggles with the Action-Committee. Also, it is interesting to note that, for some inexplicable reason, the Diaries were published eighteen years after Herzl's death and one does not know, for certain, who the editors were. There are no signatures to the introductory remarks. There is no derogatory remark made in the entirety of the Tagebücher about such a man, for instance, as Ussishkin. This is strange for it is known that Herzl only referred to this Zionist as "Iwan Grozny (Iwan der Grausame) ..... in seinen Privatgesprächen."<sup>11</sup> Again, some important incidents, such as Herzl's secret discussions

with von Bilinski, Austrian Finanz-minister and later Governor of the Austro-Hungarian Bank, are not to be found even in his unpublished manuscripts. Herzl simply never recorded these secret, top-level discussions. If this was the case once, it might be well to assume that there were other discussions of which we have no knowledge.

- (14) One has the definite feeling that although Herzl participated extensively in the political and economic intrigues of his day, his most heartfelt desire was to establish the homeland for the Jews. That Herzl was convinced of the plausability of his plan and of his ability to carry out his proposals is beyond doubt. Herzl was a great leader of the Jewish people, and a sincere one.

The story of Theodor Herzl ends on June 4, 1904. His heart weakened by the strain of the Uganda debates and from his battles with the Actions Committee, he decided to take a short vacation in order to refresh himself. With some trusted friends he travelled to Edlach. There he took ill, pneumonia developed and he was confined to bed. On Saturday afternoon, the doctor turned his eyes away from the patient for a moment to prepare an injection. He "heard a deep sigh. As he whipped round he saw the head sink on the breast. Herzl was dead."<sup>12</sup>

And the funeral,

"It was a singular day, a day in July, unforgettable to those who participated in the experience. Suddenly, to all the railroad stations of the city, by day and by night, from all the realms and lands,

every train brought new arrivals. Western, Eastern, Russian, Turkish Jews; from all the provinces and all the little towns they hurried excitedly; the shock of the news still written on their faces; never was it more clearly manifest what strife and talk had hitherto concealed — it was a great movement whose leader had now fallen. The procession was endless. Vienna, startled, became aware that it was not just a writer or a mediocre poet who had passed away, but one of those creators of ideas who disclose themselves triumphantly in a single country, to a single people at vast intervals. A tumult ensued at the cemetery; too many had suddenly stormed to his coffin, crying, sobbing, screaming in a wild explosion of despair. It was almost a riot, a fury. All regulation was upset through a sort of elementary and ecstatic mourning such as I had never seen before nor since at a funeral. And it was this gigantic outpouring of grief from the depths of millions of souls that made me realize for the first time how much passion and hope this lone and lonesome man had borne into the world through the power of a single thought.<sup>13</sup>

## Notes

### Chapter Four

1. Haas, Jacob de, Theodor Herzl (A Biography), (2 volumes), The Leonard Co., Chicago, New York, 1927. Vol. II, p. 117
2. Weizman, Chaim, Trial and Error (An Autobiography), Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949. p. 54
3. Patai, Josef, Star Over Jordan (The Life of Theodor Herzl), (translated by Francis Magyar), Philosophical Library, New York, 1946. p. 166
4. Die Welt, Vol. I, No. 7, July 16, 1897. p. 1
5. Herzl, Theodor, Worte, (translated by Felix Theilhaber), WeltVerlag, Berlin, 1921. p. 21
6. Bein, Alex, Theodor Herzl (translated by Maurice Samuel), Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1948. pp. 335-6
7. Ginzberg, Asher (Achad HaAm), Selected Essays, (translated by Leon Simon), Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1912. p. 293
8. Patai, op. cit., p. 294
9. Weizman, op. cit., p. 107
10. Landau, Saul Raphael, Sturm und Drang Im Zionismus, (Vor, Mit und Um-Theodor Herzl), Neue National Zeitung, Wien, 1937. p. 181 ff.
11. ibid, p. 187
12. Bein, op. cit., p. 503
13. Zweig, Stefan, The World of Yesterday, The Viking Press, New York, 1943. p. 109

## Bibliography

### Historical Background

Earle, Edward M., Turkey, The Great Powers and the Bagdad Railway (A Study in Imperialism), The Macmillan Co., New York, 1923.

Fay, Sidney B., The Origins of the World War (Second Edition, Revised), The Macmillan Co., New York, 1930.

Gewehr, Wesley M., The Rise of Nationalism in the Balkans, 1800-1930, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1931.

Griffith, Gwilyn O., Mazzini: Prophet of Modern Europe, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1932.

Hayes, Carlton J. H., A Political and Social History of Modern Europe, Vol. II, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1916.

Hilferding, Rudolf, Das Finanzkapital, (Eine Studie über die jüngste Entwicklung des Kapitalismus), Vienna, 1910.

Hobson, John A., Imperialism, George Allen and Unwin Ltd., London, 1938

Langer, William L., The Diplomacy of Imperialism, 1890-1902 (Vol. II), Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1935.

\_\_\_\_\_, (Editor), The Rise of Modern Europe; Vol. XVII: Hayes, Carlton J., "A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900," Harper and Brothers, New York, 1941.

Lenin, Nicolai, Imperialism; The Last Stage of Capitalism, Communist Party of Great Britain, London, 1916.

Luxemburg, Rosa, The Accumulation of Capital (translated by Agnes Schwartzschild), Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1951.

Moon, Parker T., Imperialism and World Politics, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1930.

Morison, S. E. and Commager, H. S., The Growth of the American Republic (Vol. II), Oxford University Press, New York, 1942.

Randall, John H. Jr., The Making of the Modern Mind, (Revised Edition), Houghton Mifflin Co., New York, 1940.

Sternberg, Fritz, Capitalism and Socialism on Trial (translated by Edward Fitzgerald), Victor Gollancz, Ltd., London, 1951.

Swain, Joseph W., Beginning the Twentieth Century (A History of Europe from 1870 to the Present), W. W. Norton and Co., New York, 1938.

Townsend, Mary E., European Colonial Expansion Since 1871, J. B. Lippincott Co., New York, 1941.

Wolf, John B., The Diplomatic History of the Bagdad Railroad, The University of Missouri Studies, A Quarterly of Research, Vol. XI, No. 2, April 1, 1936.

### Writings by Herzl

Herzl, Theodor, The Jewish State (Third Edition), (Translated by Sylvie D'Avigdor), Central Office of the Zionist Organization, London, 1936.

\_\_\_\_\_, Das Neue Ghetto (Play in Four Acts), Wien, 1903

\_\_\_\_\_, Zionistische Schriften (Dritte, veränderte und erweiterte Auflage), Hozaah Ivrit Co., Ltd., Tel Aviv, 1934.

\_\_\_\_\_, Herzl-Briefe (Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von Manfred Georg), Brandussche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Berlin, Date of publication: unknown.

\_\_\_\_\_, Tagebücher, (3 volumes), Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, 1922

\_\_\_\_\_, Old-New Land (Translated by Lotta Levensohn), Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1941.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Tragedy of Jewish Immigration (Evidence given before the British Royal Commission in 1902), Zionist Organization of America, New York, 1920.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Congress Addresses (Translated by Nellie Straus), Federation of American Zionists, New York, 1917.

\_\_\_\_\_, Worte (Translated by Felix Theilhaber), Welt-Verlag, Berlin, 1921.

\_\_\_\_\_, Philosophische Erzählungen, B. Harz Verlag, Berlin-Wien, 1919.

\_\_\_\_\_, Feuilletons (2 volumes), Verlag Benjamin Herz, Berlin, 1919.

### Biographies of Herzl

- Bein, Alex, Theodor Herzl (Translated by Maurice Samuel), Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1948.
- Baker, Nina, Next Year in Jerusalem (The Story of Theodor Herzl), Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1950.
- Franks, Oscar B., Theodor Herzl (The Jew and the Man), Storm Publishers, New York, 1949.
- Finkelstein, Z. F., Schicksalstunden eines Führers, Sawitra-Verlag, Wien, 1934 (?).
- Friedman, Adolf, Das Leben Theodor Herzls, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin and Leipzig, 1914.
- Georg, Manfred, Theodor Herzl: Sein Leben und sein Vermächtnis, Ralph A. Hoger-Verlag, Berlin, 1932.
- Gorelik, Schmarya, Herzl in seinen Tagebücher, Schriftenreihe der Jüdischen Rundschau, 1929.
- Haas, Jacob de, Theodor Herzl (A Biography), (2 volumes), The Leonard Co., Chicago, New York, 1927.
- Kellner, Leon, Theodor Herzls Lehrjahre (1860-1895), R. Lowit Verlag, Wien und Berlin, 1920.
- Landau, Saul Raphael, Sturm und Drang Im Zionismus, (Vor Mit und Um-Theodor Herzl), Neue National Zeitung, Wien, 1937.
- Lazaron, Morris S., Seed of Abraham (Ten Jews of the Ages), The Century Co., New York and London, 1930.
- Lowenthal, Marvin, Herzl's Diaries, The Menorah Journal: June/July 1924, Vol. I, No. 3; Aug./Sept. 1924, Vol. I, No. 4; Nov./Dec. 1924, Vol. I, No. 5.
- Neuman, Emanuel, The Birth of Jewish Statesmanship (The Story of Theodor Herzl's Life), Zionist Organization of America, New York, Date of publication: unknown.
- Nordau, Max, Theodor Herzl, Furrows, Vol. I, No. 9; July/Aug. 1943.
- Patai, Josef, Star Over Jordan (The Life of Theodor Herzl), (Translated by Francis Magyar), Philosophical Library, New York, 1946.
- Pessin, Deborah, Theodore Herzl, Behrman House, New York, 1948.
- Thon, Osia, Theodor Herzl, Zionistischen Zentralbureau, Berlin, 1914.

Weisgal, Meyer W., (Editor), Theodor Herzl, A Memorial, Zionist Organization of America, New York, 1929.

Weltsch, Robert, Theodor Herzl and We, The Zionist Labor Party of America, 1929.

Zweig, Stefan, The World of Yesterday, The Viking Press, New York, 1943.

Zangwill, Israel, Dreamers of the Ghetto, Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1923.

### Zionism

#### BOOKS

Bein, Alex, The Return to the Soil, The Youth and Hechalutz Department of the Zionist Organization, Jerusalem, 1952.

Ernst, Ludwig, Kein Judenstaat sondern Gewissensfreiheit, Literarische Anstalt, Leipzig, 1896.

Ginzberg, Asher (Achad HaAm), Selected Essays (Translated by Leon Simon), Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1912.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Parting of the Ways (Essays on the Philosophy of Zionism), (Translated by Lillian R. Bentwich), Reprint from the Jewish Chronicle, London, 1905.

Gottheil, Richard, Zionism, Jewish Publication Society, Philadelphia, 1914.

\_\_\_\_\_, The Aims of Zionism, American Federation of Zionists, New York, 1899.

Hess, Moses, Rome and Jerusalem, (Translated by Mayer Waxman), Bloch Publishing Co., New York, 1943.

Learsi, Rufus, Fulfillment: The Epic Story of Zionism, World Publishing Co., New York, 1951.

Levin, Shmarya, Youth in Revolt, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1930. (Translated by Maurice Samuel)

\_\_\_\_\_, The Arena, Harcourt, Brace and Co., New York, 1932. (Translated by Maurice Samuel)

Nordau, Anna and Maxa, Max Nordau (A Biography), Nordau Committee, New York, 1943.

Pinsker, Leo, Auto-Emancipation, (translated by D. S. Blondheim), The Maccabaeon Publishing Co., New York, 1906.

Sokolow, Nahum, History of Zionism, 1600-1918 (2 volumes), Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1919.

Weizman, Chaim, Trial and Error (An Autobiography), Harper and Brothers, New York 1949.

Wise, Stephen, The Challenging Years, (An Autobiography), G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1949.

#### PERIODICALS AND PAPERS

Die Welt, Vol. I, Vienna, 1897.

Ost Und West (Edited by Leo Winz), Heft 8/9-Aug./Sept. 1904, IV Jahrgang Illustrierte Monatsschrift für Modernes Judentum.

Jüdische Rundschau (Organ der Zionistischen Vereinigung für Deutschland), Vol. IX, No. 27. Berlin, July 8, 1904.

No. 28. Berlin, July 15, 1904.

No. 29. Berlin, July 22, 1904.

No. 30. Berlin, July 29, 1904.

No. 31. Berlin, Aug. 5, 1904.

Zionisten-Congress in Basel, Aug. 29-31, 1897. Officielles Protocoll.  
Basel, Aug. 28-31, 1898. Officielles Protocoll.  
Basel, Aug. 15-18, 1899. Officielles Protocoll.  
London, Aug. 13-16, 1900. Officielles Protocoll.  
Basel, Dec. 26-30, 1901. Officielles Protocoll.  
Basel, Aug. 23-28, 1903. Officielles Protocoll.