

INSTRUCTIONS TO LIBRARY

Statement  
by Referee

The Senior Thesis of Allen Maller

Entitled: "Aspects of the Emancipation and Anti-Semitism in  
Modern Jewish Historiography"

- 1) May (with revisions) be considered for publication ( ) ( )  
yes no
- 2) May be circulated ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )  
to faculty to students to alumni no restriction
- 3) May be consulted in Library only ( ) ( )  
by faculty by students
- ( ) ( )  
by alumni no restriction

(date)

(signature of referee)

Statement  
by Author

I hereby give permission to the Library to circulate my thesis  
(✓) ( )  
yes no

The Library may sell positive microfilm copies of my thesis

(✓) ( )  
yes no

3-6-64  
(date)

Allen S Maller  
(signature of author)

Library  
Record

The above-named thesis was microfilmed on July 23, 1964  
(date)

For the Library

Moiria Steiner  
(signature of staff member)

ASPECTS OF THE EMANCIPATION AND ANTI-SEMITISM

IN MODERN JEWISH HISTORIOGRAPHY

by

ALLEN MALLER

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

Hebrew Union College-  
Jewish Institute of Religion  
1964

Referee: Professor Ellis Rivkin

## THESIS DIGEST

This thesis presents an analysis of Jewish historiography in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with special attention to the attitudes to and interpretation of the Jewish Emancipation and modern anti-Semitism. The opening chapter discusses the nature of history and the involvement of the historian in the historical process. The second chapter presents theories of Jewish historiography by several leading historians: Heinrich Graetz, Simon Dubnow, Salo Baron, Raphael Mahler, and Howard Sachar; and it discusses their reactions to each other. A translation of an important statement of method and system by Mahler, whose works unfortunately are not available in English, appears as an appendix to this chapter at the end of this thesis. The third chapter examines the various interpretations given to selected men and movements in modern Jewish history by the historians mentioned above. The concluding chapter deals again with the nature of Jewish historiography as it has been developed by these historians and presents some suggestions for conceptualization of Jewish history.

TO MY MOTHER

FOR HER LOVE, COURAGE, WISDOM  
AND FAITH.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I - Theory and History .....	4
II - Theories of Jewish History .....	20
III - Jewish History in Practice .....	50
IV - Conclusions and Suggestions .....	64
V - Appendix - "Periodization in the History of the Jewish People in Recent Generations" by Raphael Mahler .....	72
VI - Footnotes.....	89
VII - Bibliography .....	96

## Chapter I - Theory and History

"History is a science; no less, and no more," said Bury. It is only natural to ask to which science history may be compared. The most prestigious of the sciences are the physical sciences whose attainments both in exactitude and magnitude have added to our knowledge and our power. Yet the very claim to truth and excellence that the sciences make is based on the public verifiability of their theories by means of objective experiment. Whether this experiment is in the controlled conditions of the laboratory or is the result of nature's performance in a previously predicted manner is unimportant. Predictability is the criterion of truth in the physical sciences. This assumes an underlying eternal repetition of physical phenomena imbedded in unchanging relationships.

History, however, is imbedded in time. One cannot duplicate under controlled conditions a revolution or a depression which occurred in the past. Indeed, rare is the historian who would venture to predict any future event on the basis of his studies of current trends. If he were to do so, he would be decried by other historians for acting in a manner unbefitting a scientific historian.

Not only can the historian not duplicate past events nor predict future ones, but he even runs into difficulty in trying to compare events. The geologist or paleontologist deals

with the record of past events and is also limited in his ability for controlled experimentation and the possibility for prediction. But they, at least, can compare similar periods or structures without the problem of individual differences. Here again the attempt of some historians to initiate comparative studies (Anatomy of a Revolution, by C. Brinton) has not met with notable success or approval.

Every event, it is claimed, is an unique event. It is emeshed in a particular web of time, place, and culture with a particular group of individual characters. Not only do the factors themselves vary, but the relative interaction of all these forces varies from event to event and is never exactly duplicated. Some have even held that this difference is fundamental and that history therefore can never be scientific. However, the difference is not that radical. The physical sciences are exact only when dealing with large quantities. On the level of quantum mechanics, i.e., the subatomic microchoism, the uncertainty principal becomes dominant. It is impossible to know at any particular time what any particular electron, neutron, or other particle is doing. One can only predict the probability that it will be at a certain point; but in dealing with the billions of particles, one can predict with great certainty that some particles will be in that place. The exact determination, therefore, of any particular event is always beyond the ability of the observer, even in the sciences.

The major objection, however, to conceiving history as a form of the physical sciences lies in the nature of its subject matter. The physical sciences describe material objects and their energy interactions. History, however, is concerned with events, but these events are the result of human decisions. The entrance of human decision into history makes personality an integral part of every historical occurrence. Therefore to understand history, we must understand the ideas, passions, beliefs, desires, and, in general, all motives which influence people in their actions. The subject matter of history is thusly not primarily physical in nature, but mental.

There are, however, sciences which deal with the mind, and, although there are great disputes between behaviorists and psychoanalytically-oriented psychologists and although many would deny the status of science to the latter, there can be little doubt that these disciplines have contributed greatly to our understanding of human action. If by science Bury meant a systematic knowledge of facts or principles gained through study of the world, then history could be a science. But if predictability and experimentation are essential to science, then history is not a science.

In any case, the label that we use for history is not important. What is really behind this controversy is the question of "law" in history. Even with the uncertainty principle, the physical sciences exhibit a much higher accuracy in prediction than the social sciences. The laws or generalities evolved by these sciences are judged by the accuracy of their predictions and the universality of their applications. Can history, which



deals with a mental world, develop laws of this type?

Some of the laws which are occasionally offered in history seem of doubtful value because of their extreme lack of quantitative determinants. Toynbee's principle of "challenge and response" in the growth and disintegration of civilizations is a case in point. If the civilization fails to respond, the challenge was too small. If, on the other hand, the civilization is destroyed, the challenge was too great. Yet there is no way one can tell, except by seeing what the result was, what kind of challenge, in fact, faced us. Cheyney has offered six historical laws<sup>1</sup>, some of which seem tautologous and others of which seem only desirable. Baron, on the other hand, suggests a historical law that "whenever society as a whole controls economic life through intricate regimentation of its activities, the Jews do not fare as well as under a liberalist regime, where state interference is restricted."<sup>2</sup> Baron has derived this generality from an examination of modern Jewish history during the mercantilistic age, the age of capitalism and of Socialism. While this generality may indeed relate to several historical periods, the question is how many exceptions to the rule must we find in order to disprove it. In other words, what are the criteria that we use to determine when an adequate historical explanation has been offered for any particular event, series of events, or class of similar events. Although there are men who claim that the subject matter of history is sui generis, we must remember that both science and history talk about one world although they may be looking at different subjects from different perspectives. 3

Before we can consider the criteria for historical generalities, we must face another very serious problem which also arises from the mental nature of the subject matter of history. The scientist who is concerned with the description of natural phenomena does not concern himself with the question of value. An experiment may be either successful or unsuccessful, accurate or inaccurate, but it is never moral or immoral. The scientist claims objectivity. This means that the observation and interpretation of the event observed is not dependent upon the personality, morality, sex, race, or any cultural value of the observer. This is also the ideal in the social sciences, although in fact it is often difficult to achieve it in this area because we must deal with values and motives.

The historian must select from a large number of facts those which he thinks are important both in their influence and for his readers' present knowledge. Intuitively we feel that the color of shoes worn by Napoleon at the Battle of Jena did not effect the outcome. However, not all other selections of pertinent facts will be this easy. What the historian thinks is important will determine the type of information which he seeks during his historical inquiry. This is also equally true for the scientist. History, however, as we have indicated above, is the study of human actions. The historian, in order to understand any event, must understand why the people involved in this event acted as they did. Merely to relate successive occurrences is not to write history. The narrative including the facts is only the form of history. The essence of history is the historical explanation. The scientist is concerned with the description of

phenomena and his explanation consists of telling how these events came about. The historian only describes events in order to then explain why they came about. The scientist does not deal in motives which can be verified only by introspection, as the historian does. Insofar as historians try to understand events by classifying them and establishing relations between the classes thus defined, they neglect their proper task of penetrating to the thoughts of the agents whose acts they are studying and content themselves with determining the externals of these acts. <sup>4</sup>

Knowledge of other minds is possible although there are many problems involved. Scholarship, society, and culture would all be impossible if knowledge of other minds were impossible. Yet the amount of disagreement and misunderstanding in these areas clearly indicates that there are limits to what we can and do know of other minds. First we must recognize that, as Paul Valéry once said, "history is inseparable from the historian."

Not long ago, two former American ambassadors to Spain, both of them professional historians, published books on the Spanish Civil War. In spite of the identity of their subject matters and of the authors' official functions, the content of the two books is absolutely antagonistic. One considers the Spanish Civil War as a prelude to World War II, the other, as a prelude to the cold war between the United States and Russia. The former author is a liberal in the Jeffersonian tradition while the latter is a Catholic.<sup>5</sup>

One has only to read Napoleon: For and Against, by Pieter Geyl to see how many different historical Napoleons there really

can be. Even in Napoleon's own lifetime Chateaubriand opposed him from the right, glorifying the Bourbons, while Madame DeStael opposed him from the left, charging that he had assassinated the republican liberty. Thiers, writing in the eighteen-fifties, used Napoleon as a symbol of anti-English feelings, but he himself was later on infected by the anti-liberal actions of Napoleon III. Landrey attacked Napoleon's greatness (and the government then in power) by claiming he had only ambition and a lust for power. For Taine, Napoleon is devoid of all humanity. He felt that the cult of the Revolution and Napoleon had resulted in the disaster of 1870. Before the Dreifus Affair, Arthur Levy excused almost all of Napoleon's mistakes, but after the Dreifus Affair, Jules Issac saw the wars as betraying the ideals of the Revolution. Perhaps the change in the relationship between the French army and the Jews had something to do with this.

How are we to account for this astonishing ability of different historians to see the same events so differently? First, we must recognize the importance of the personality of the historian. It is always easier to understand the actions of someone who is similar in emotional makeup to oneself. The similar experiences and institutions which people in one social-economic class are exposed to also makes it easier to understand another person of the same class than an individual from an opposing class. To a very rational individual the behavior of a certain historical figure might seem absurd and so he finds hidden rational and logical motives. Another who is introspective and psychologically oriented tends to interpret a situation

with emphasis on personal charisma of a leader rather than the trends and needs of his followers. One does not have to agree with Mommson that "those who have lived through historical events, as I have, begin to see that history is neither written nor made without love or hate,"<sup>6</sup> to acknowledge the importance of personal experience for the historian.

It is a commonplace that several witnesses to an accident will each relate the facts differently. Every historical mind views history from a perspective. The totality of these individual perspectives is historical reality. Since this totality is unattainable, historical certainty is limited to historical knowledge, which is dependent on the critical ability of the historian to reconstruct from several perspectives an approximation of the total perspective.

In addition to the psychological and class influences, there is the even more persuasive effect of culture. The individual is always aware of the differences in personal values among his acquaintances and he should be always aware of the difference of class attitudes in society. Until recently, however, cultural societies tended to be fairly isolated and it was easy for men to think that men had always thought and acted in the past as men do presently. In an age of advanced technological development, our attention is drawn to the importance of science and economic forces. We then use this new-found understanding to analyze periods in the past in which very different economic forces were at play. We, of course, are aware of the difference between an agricultural, mercantilistic, or industrial society. Yet the values of the present, the modes of thought, and

even the politics often influence our evaluation of the past and they are even more powerful if they operate unconsciously.

The different answers given by successive historians to Gibbon's question of why the Roman Empire fell are an example of all these influences at work.

For Gibbon himself, the cause was the triumph of Christianity and barbarism; for Seeck, it was the extermination of the Roman elite; for Kaphahn, physical decline; for T. Frank, racial degeneracy; for Huntington, a climatic crisis and drought; for Liebig and Vassiliev, the degradation of the soil; for Max Weber, the decline of slavery and the return to natural economy; for Rostovtzeff, a class struggle between the peasant-soldiers and bourgeois townspeople; for Piganiol, the barbarian invasions; and, finally, for Toynbee, the danger from abroad and the desertion by the masses.<sup>7</sup>

Still another problem facing the historian is his knowledge of the outcome of the past event. He can never appreciate the anxiety of men making decisions, the eventual outcome of which is unknown to them. Knowing that something will occur, the historian seeks antecedent causes and often exaggerates factors which will only later have the importance he attributes to them. To a historian of the Roman Empire in the first century, primitive Christianity is unimportant. Only for history subsequent to this period will it have any importance. If he devotes to it an amount of space according to its contemporary importance, he deprives the reader of information which will in a later period of the Roman Empire be important. If he devotes considerable space to Christianity, he distorts for the reader the historical reality of the first century.

One might deal with this problem by devoting sufficient space for an adequate explanation while at the same time con-

stantly reminding the reader of the contemporary insignificance of these events. Or one might abandon a strictly chronological approach and write about longer periods of time as seen from different structures: the decay of the old order and then the rise of the new order. One could present the same facts, assigning them the relative importance that they deserve for each structure.

Still another limit for the historian is the selection of documents available. What has remained is often the product of chance, censorship by the winner, or the articulation of certain classes. The importance which the past assigned to certain types of literature may be totally unrelated to the documents the historian would consider important. Some historians facing this situation fall into the trap of stressing the material in his sources while skipping lightly over other areas. He may justify this as being a conservative approach. In reality, it is a historical distortion unless he writes a specialized history just on the area covered in his sources. Yet even if he does this, he must either ignore the outside influences or still theorize on their influence from the little that he knows.

Thus we have seen that the need for theory appears in many areas of the historian's activity. Perhaps the most important use of theory in its most philosophical sense is to keep the historian aware of the human factors and limits in the writing of history. The theory that "the facts speak for themselves" is not only naive, but harmful. It makes the historian insensitive to his own subjectivity (and how can he try to correct that of which he is unaware?) and may lead to arrogance

in denouncing others whose interpretation differs from "the facts." Also, if he is aware of the different possibilities of theoretical reconstruction, he has more flexibility in determining which reconstruction he will use for the ordering of his own data and why he has chosen it. Theory is concerned, moreover, not only with the reconstruction of past history, but with the purposes of writing history.

History has been used, especially during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, to attack or to defend the existing order. From the cry "everything that is, is right" to that of "this too shall pass away," history has been used and abused to prove both sides of many cases. Many historians would agree with Collingwood that "history is for human self-knowledge."<sup>8</sup> Do you want to know what kind of man you are? Biology deals with men. Psychology deals with you. History deals with kinds of men. If the purpose of history is human self-knowledge, then the needs of the reader are important for the historian.

In recent generations, there has been an expansion of the scope of historical analysis to include all aspects of human life. "No one would now dare to maintain with Seeley that history was the biography of states, and with Freeman that it was past politics."<sup>9</sup> The new emphasis on social history, cultural history, and even the history of art or technology is the result of the advancement of the social sciences and our realization of the interpenetration and influences of historical forces relating to all aspects of a civilization. Thus the historian must decide the theoretical balance that he will maintain between the different subjects of historical inquiry. Theory also affects his selection



of evidence. How much evidence and of what kind is necessary to present in order to narrate a course of development or in order to offer a historical explanation. Even more important, theory is a criteria for what is an adequate explanation,

History, as has been indicated above, deals with the motivations that men or groups of men have for acting in a certain way. Natural science deals with those events which are repetitive. It is interested in the factors which make each event conform to a general pattern. History, however, is concerned with the unusual. Since history is concerned with change, the historian assumes a reason for any change in human behavior or in a society's organization. The change occurs because a problem has arisen for which the old pattern of behavior has no effective answer. The solution of the problem results in a new pattern of behavior or organization.

To provide an adequate explanation of this event, the historian must show that certain conditions have been satisfied. The problem must be known to those whom it affects. How it was known, and if in a distorted way or not, must then be shown. A reason is offered to explain the new pattern of behavior. The historian must show that the knowledge and the concepts involved were available to the individuals at that time and that the other implications which flow from this concept are not inconsistent with reasons given to explain other concurrent events.

Since men's minds are not directly available to us, we must reconstruct their thoughts from their acts and words. We empathize as much as possible with their situation and then try to see how we would act in such a situation. Or, knowing the action involved,

we try to see why we would act thusly. We accept an explanation as true if we assent to it. That is, we say, "Yes, I also would do that if I were in those conditions." The explanation of actions by groups or classes also depends on a feeling that the groups or classes that I experience today would act in the same manner under similar conditions. The explanations seems coherent and therefore correct if it fits the facts and it fits my experiences with people, institutions, and movements.

There has been a shift in the recent generations from the individual and personal to the multiple and social concept of explanation. This is connected with a growing sophistication in dealing with the concept of causation. When someone asks what caused World War I, he is really asking several questions, and different answers may be correct depending upon the question they are answering. The death of an Archduke caused the war to happen exactly when it did. Balkan politics caused it to happen where it did. Economic rivalry caused it to become the world war that it did.

Thus the historian must be very careful with his words. The statement "Alexander the Great conquered Persia" is correct but unclear. It is obvious that he alone did not conquer the Persian Empire. Do we then assume the statement to mean that the Greek army without Alexander could not have conquered Persia and that therefore Alexander is the proximate cause. Perhaps it means that the Greek army could have conquered Persia under Phillip, but that Alexander in fact did it. Or perhaps it means that both the Greek army and Alexander as its general were necessary for the victory. If the former is the case, the statement should read: "the Greek army, with Alexander at its head, conquered Persia"; if the lat-

ter, it should read: "Alexander and the Greek army conquered Persia." This lack of mathematical precision in historical writing is one of the major differences between science and history.

Often the historian, for dramatic effect or simply through carelessness, makes statements which he really would not want taken as adequate explanations. Lest the reader think that this exists only in theory, I offer the following example. Baron states:

Hugo Grotius, the most systematic jurist of the seventeenth century, well conversant not only with Hebrew Scripture, but, unlike most other Christian Hebraists, able to read the Talmud, inevitably became a political friend of the Jews.<sup>10</sup>

Are we to conclude that the ability to read the Talmud inevitably causes one to become a political friend of the Jews? Or perhaps it is inevitable only when one is a most systematic jurist committed to certain concepts of law.

The reason that the concept "cause" involves so many different questions is that in historical reality there are many different factors, both long-term and short-term, operating on every person and event. From experience we know that these factors differ in importance, but in actuality, it is not always easy to separate and evaluate them. There is always the question of chance factors. Actually these are only very short range factors and their effects are conditioned by probability and by long range factors.

Sainte-Beuve thought that had there been a sufficient number of petty causes, the outcome of the French Revolution could have been the opposite of what it was. This is a great mistake. The great social needs that gave rise to the French Revolution would

not have been eliminated by any configuration of petty causes. To make the outcome of this movement the opposite of what it was, the needs that gave rise to it would have had to be the opposite of what they were.<sup>11</sup>

Plekhanov defends the Marxist position that it is social relations and not personalities which determines the course of history. He illustrates this well by pointing out that given the opportunities created by the Revolution, certain actors, barbers, dyers, lawyers, peddlers, and fencing masters became great military leaders. There are a sufficient number of different men with different abilities so that when the general conditions are suitable some man will always be found with the necessary talent.<sup>12</sup>

Since the long range factors are of major importance, the length of time covered in a historical analysis is very important. A history of the American Revolution which does not refer to ideas, institutions, and developments previous to the eighteenth century and originating even earlier in Europe would be superficial.

Yet there is a limit to how far one can regress. Already the Renaissance has been traced to the twelfth century. Conceptually, a historical period must be an intelligible whole. Spectacular events make poor starting places. The basic institutions, economic and political forms, and cultural configurations should be traced back to their original confluents. Beginning here, the rise and finally the fall and disappearance of this set of factors should be traced. Each period should overlap

both its preceding and succeeding period, for no period begins with one event. During this overlap, material should be presented twice: from the point of view of the old order and then from the new.

I have not written this introduction in order to prove any particular philosophy of history or even to present all of the various theories. Nineteen pages would hardly be adequate for either purpose. I have attempted to show my pattern of thought so that in the ensuing discussion of Jewish historiography the reader is explicitly aware of the personal position involved. To explicitly present to the reader the writer's system of historical interpretation and not to distort consciously the material to fit this system, seems to me to be the closest that one can come to objectivity in historical treatment.

In the next chapter I will present in their own words the views of Jewish historians on the question of conceptualizing Jewish history. In the third chapter I will discuss their application of these theories to several specific movements and personalities. I will attempt to show the inadequacies and contradictions in their treatments by the juxtaposition of inconsistent statements and by my own short comments.

## Chapter II - Theories of Jewish History

The first modern Jewish historian was Issak Markus Jost. He was born at Bernburg, Germany in 1793. He received both a heder and a gymnasium training. He taught in Berlin until 1835 and then in Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he died in 1860. Between 1820 and 1828 he published his nine-volume History of the Israelites from the Maccabean period to our own day. In 1846 he published a tenth volume in three parts.

Very little was really known about Jewish history when Jost started to write. Simultaneously with his work several great scholars were also working and would unearth a whole new world of the past. By the time Jost had issued his tenth volume the previous nine had already become obsolete. But in addition to this there was another reason that his work was so rapidly and totally superseded. His cold, rationalistic approach, a heritage of the Enlightenment, was unappealing in mid-nineteenth-century Germany where romanticism held sway. What was needed was a warm, positive, and indeed militant author who would defend Jews and Jewish history from the many accusations that history-conscious Germans were making. This man was Heinrich Graetz.

Born in 1817 in Posen, a Polish province of Germany, Graetz studied in yeshivot till 1836, acquiring secular learning privately. He also studied for three years with Samson Raphael Hirsch whose Nineteen Letters of Ben Uziel had strongly influenced him. In 1845 he obtained his Ph.D. from the University of Jena and from 1854 until his death in 1891 he taught at the semin-

ary in Breslau. In 1872 he went to Palestine to study the scenes of Biblical Jewish history. His major work was A History of the Jews in eleven volumes (1853-1876).

Graetz's historiography set the standard which other great historians would later revolt against. Yet Graetz in his work does not explicitly deal with the problems of a philosophy of Jewish history, although in the English edition he added a retrospect in which he comments on the marvel of Jewish survival and revival. He also wrote an address in 1887 for the Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition. From these we see that for Graetz Jewish history falls into three major phases: an early period of creativity, a middle period when, due to general ignorance and persecution, the Jews sank to the level of their neighbors, and now recently a new marvelous rebirth. This revival of a race long past its youthful vigor, whose history has spread over thousands of years, is a miracle which deserves the most attentive consideration from every man who does not stolidly overlook what is marvelous.<sup>1</sup>

Just as amazing as the modern Jewish revival is the historic survival of the Jewish people. For it would seem that the persistence of a single people in the midst of an inimical world, hunted to death for more than a thousand years, contradicts the iron law of nature: the survival of the strongest. Why were the Jews able to survive when all others failed?<sup>2</sup>

In ancient times it was the Greeks and the Jews who originated higher culture.<sup>3</sup> But the Greeks, notwithstanding their great contributions, did not survive. It was the mission of

the Greeks to bring to light the ideals of art and science. But the Greeks themselves had no knowledge of this fact. The Hebrew people, on the other hand, had to fulfill the life task by which it was held together and by which in direst misfortune it was comforted and preserved.<sup>4</sup> It is true that the people had to evolve its national soul into a consciousness of its purpose. In the early Biblical period the Judges and Kings evince so few of the national characteristics that they may equally pass for Canaanites, Phillistines, or Moabites. But finally the body was molded by the national soul.<sup>5</sup>

The people were fully convinced that its sole importance lay in its possession of the law and its vocation in the announcement of the truths of its salvation. The people existed only on account of this law and in order to be its exponent.<sup>6</sup> And the Jewish people has had its effect in the world. It scattered some sparks at Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome, and thus gave rise to Christianity. It scattered some seeds at Mecca and Medina, and thus gave rise to Islam. From a few traces of light left by it was derived the scholastic philosophy of the second half of the Middle Ages and the Protestantism of the Continent in the sixteenth century. Not in vain then has this people dragged its weary feet around the world and thus to some degree solved one of its tasks.<sup>7</sup>

The influence of the historiography of Graetz is illustrated in great detail by the introduction prepared by the young Russian historian Simon Dubnow for a projected three-volume translation of Graetz's History of the Jews. The introduction, An Essay in the



Philosophy of History, which appeared separately when the translation failed to materialize, was translated into German and English and widely read. The essay opens with a consideration of the range, content, and significance of Jewish history. Historical peoples are usually divided into three groups:<sup>8</sup> (1) the most ancient civilized peoples of the Orient, such as the Chinese, the Hindus, the Egyptians, and the Chaldeans; (2) the ancient, or classic, peoples of the Occident, the Greeks and the Romans; and (3) the modern peoples, the civilized nations of Europe and America of the present day.

The Jewish people, however, does not fit any of these classifications, for it may lay claim to all three. The only description applicable to it is "the historical nation of all times." The history of the Jewish people is like an axis, crossing the history of all mankind from one of its poles to the other. As an unbroken thread it runs through the ancient civilization of Egypt and Mesopotamia down to the present-day culture of France and Germany.<sup>9</sup> At first glance, Jewish history during the period of independence seems to be but slightly different from the history of other nations. There are the same wars and intestine disturbances, the same political revolutions and dynastic quarrels, the same conflicts between the classes of the people, the same warring between economic interests. This is only a surface view of Jewish history. If we perceive to its depths and scrutinize the processes which take place, we perceive that even in the early period there were latent within it great powers of intellect, universal principles which, visible or not, determined

the course of events. "We have before us not a simple political or racial entity, but to an eminent degree, 'a spiritual people;'"<sup>10</sup>

The all-pervasive religious tradition was associated with the idea of a particular spiritual mission. In the closing centuries of the second commonwealth the Jewish people reached its permanent spiritual form. This store of spiritual energy was strong enough to survive the destruction of the political state. The Jews proved that without a state, territory, army, and all the external attributes of national power, a nation could survive solely through strength of spirit. This proof, adduced by Jewry at the cost of eighteen centuries of privation and suffering, forms the characteristic feature of the second half of Jewish history, the period of homelessness and dispersion. Uprooted from its political soil, national life displayed itself on intellectual fields exclusively. "To think and to suffer" became the watchword of the Jewish people not merely because it was forced upon it by external circumstances beyond its control, but chiefly because it was conditioned by the very disposition of the people, by its national inclinations.

In its second half, the originality of Jewish history consists in that it is the only history stripped of every political element. There are no diplomatic artifices, no wars, no campaigns, no unwarranted encroachments backed by armed force upon the rights of other nations, nothing at all that constitutes the chief content—the monotonous and, for the most part, idealess content—of many other chapters of the history of the world.<sup>11</sup> In spite of the note-worthy features that raise Jewish history above the

level of the ordinary, it is not isolated nor severed from the history of mankind. Rather it is most intimately interwoven with world affairs at every point throughout its whole extent. This connection is twofold: in the times when the powers of darkness and fanaticism held sway, the Jews were amenable to the physical influence exerted by their neighbors in the form of persecutions, inquisitions, violence of every sort; and during the prevalence of enlightenment and humanity, the Jews were acted upon by the intellectual and cultural stimulus proceeding from the peoples with whom they entered into close relations. Momentary aberrations and reactionary incidents are not taken into account here.

The significance of Jewish history is also twofold. It is at once national and universal. At the present the fulcrum of Jewish national being lies in the historical consciousness. In the days of antiquity, the Jews were welded into a single united nation by the triple agencies of state, race, and religion. Later, during the dispersion, it was chiefly religious consciousness that cemented Jewry into a whole. Today historical consciousness is the keystone of nation unity. Jewish history has universal significance for philosophy inasmuch as it is pre-eminently a chronicle of ideas and spiritual movements. It may serve, therefore, as a means of testing theories of history. Also, it is significant for humanity at large as a means of enobling the heart.<sup>12</sup>

Graetz himself in his history follows a linear chronology. Events of all kinds, from all places, are united in the same chapter because they occurred within the dates with which a chapter

begins and ends. Only the size of the chapters seems to determine how much will be covered in any one period. Dubnow's essay suggests that in Jewish history there may be distinguished three chief stratifications answering to its first three periods: the Biblical period, the period of the second Temple, and the Talmudic period. The later periods are nothing more than these same formations combined in various ways, with now and then the addition of new strata. These composite periods are the Gaonic Period (500-980), the Rabbinic-Philosophical Period (980-1492), the Rabbinic-Mystical Period (1492-1789), and finally the modern Period of Enlightenment.<sup>13</sup>

The essay concludes with a consideration of the teachings of Jewish history. Jewish history possesses the student with the conviction that Jewry at all times, even in the period of political independence, was pre-eminently a spiritual nation. Being a spiritual entity, it cannot suffer annihilation; the body may be destroyed, the spirit is immortal. The Jewish people will go on living because of a creative principle which permeates it. This principle consists first in the sum of religious, moral, and philosophical ideas. Next, in the sum of historical memories of what in the course of many centuries the Jewish people experienced, thought, and felt in the depths of its being. Finally, it consists in the consciousness that true Judaism, which has accomplished great things for humanity in the past, has not yet played out its part and therefore may not perish.<sup>14</sup>

Simon Dubnow was born in 1860 in Mstislav, in White Russia. He was educated in the traditional heder and entered the official

government school at the age of fourteen. At an early age he developed a love for Jewish history and for Russian literature. His failure in mathematics discouraged him from university studies and he became an autodidact in Western culture and Jewish history. In 1922, he left Russia and moved to Berlin, where he published his major works. In 1933 he moved again, this time to Riga, where he lived until he was murdered by the Germans in December, 1941.

In his introduction to his ten-volume World History of the Jewish People, Dubnow presents the reader with his new approach to Jewish history. In order to synthesize a history which has embraced most of historical time and the entire civilized world (except India and China), we must have a carefully worked out plan of procedure. The first condition for this plan and for a clear general conception of Jewish history is a clear idea of its bearer or subject, the Jewish people. This conception must not be marred by dogmatic and scholastic concepts and it will, in turn, determine in advance the pertinent methods of scientific research.

Dubnow then shows how until recently there were great obstacles in the way of such a scientific conception of Jewish history. The theological conception both of the Orthodox and Liberal Jews dominates the interpretation of Biblical history. Medieval and modern Jewish history is also dominated by a one-sided spiritualistic conception that is based on the axiom that a people deprived of state and territory can play an active role in history only in the field of intellectual life, while elsewhere, in its social life, it is condemned to being a passive object of the history of the peoples among whom it lives. The historiography initiated by Zunz and Graetz deals mostly with in-

tellectual activities and heroic martyrdom.<sup>15</sup> This concept of Jewish history resulted in a periodization (Talmudic, Gaonic, Rabbinic, Mystical, and Enlightenment) valid only for a history of literature. This one-sided conception of Jewish history was due to the origins of scientific Jewish historiography in western Europe in the middle of the nineteenth century, when the dogma of assimilation (that Jewry is not a nation, but a religious community) held complete sway there.

The profound revolution of national consciousness which characterizes our age inevitably wrought a transformation in our conception of the historical process. The secularization of the Jewish national idea liberated historical writing and a new conception much more appropriate for the content as well as the scope of Jewish history came into being. The Jewish people had concerned itself with constructing its life as a separate social unit under the most varied conditions of existence and therefore it is the foremost task of historiography to try to understand this process of building the life of the Jewish people. Thus, we have now arrived at a more comprehensive and strictly scientific conception of Jewish history which Dubnow terms "sociological." Basic to this conception is the idea which Dubnow claims is derived from the totality of Jewish history, that "the Jewish people has at all times and in all countries always and everywhere been the subject, the creator of its own history, not only in the intellectual sphere, but also in the general sphere of social life."<sup>16</sup>

The subject of scientific historiography is the people, the national individuality, its origin and growth, and its struggle

for existence. Initially amorphous, this national individuality moved to its final formation during the Babylonian Exile. The victory of Rome gave rise to new forms of struggle by the dispersed people for its national unity. The indomitable urge to autonomous life and to the preservation of the greatest social and cultural individuality while amidst alien peoples found expression not in political, but in other social forms. The entire spiritual vitality of the nation came to be directed to this goal. The religion of Judaism was fashioned in accordance with the image of social conditions of the nation's existence, and not the reverse.<sup>17</sup>

This method of investigation is strictly evolutionary. First the period of the formation of the national individuality is examined, then the period of its struggle for separate existence for the preservation and unfolding of its characteristic national traits and of the cultural treasures it accumulated in the course of centuries.<sup>18</sup>

The organization of these materials covering thousands of years of Jewish history presents special difficulties. In the most ancient period, we have only to cope with the synchronous existence of both Judah and Israel after the division of the realm, and with a limited Diaspora during the Persian period. The difficulties increased in the Roman period with the expansion of the Diaspora. The historian's attention is divided between Judea and the "Great Diaspora," as later it is divided between Palestine and Babylonia on one side and the expanding European Diaspora on the other side. The difficulties further increase in the later Western period, for here we are faced with an

enormous number of countries in each of which the destiny of the Jewish people is intertwined with the most diverse political and cultural conditions.

This mass of material may be organized and presented in one of two ways. The historian may arrange the history of the Jewish people according to the countries in which it was scattered and thus present it as a purely external collection of monographs, or he may treat the history of the Jews in all countries concurrently and, converting the history into a chronicle, he may present a chronological history of events that coincide in time but differ fundamentally in character and local conditions. The latter was the method of Graetz. This artificial stringing together of the most heterogeneous events lacks what is indispensable for scientific synthesis, a concatenation of events with local conditions. With Graetz, the confusion is further augmented by his method of throwing together political, socio-economic, and literary data in the narrowest sense of the word, into a single chapter.<sup>19</sup>

The only way to avoid all of these limitations, according to Dubnow, is to divide the material according to the three-fold principle of time, place, and subject matter. The history of each period must be presented according to the country in which it occurs and within each country according to the order of causal connections that link the external conditions with those of internal life. Within the limits of each period, the history of the different segments of the nation is presented in such a way that the main center of national hegemony comes first and is then followed by the other countries according to their importance



to the total national history.<sup>19</sup> The national center and the historical environment thus become the criteria for the division of Jewish history into periods and epochs.

The period of statehood should be divided along lines correspondent to the changing position of Palestine amidst the world powers from Egypt till Rome. The history of the stateless period, on the other hand, after the Jews had lost their unified center, must be subdivided in accordance with clear-cut geographical considerations and along lines corresponding to shifts in the center of national hegemony with the Jewish people. Each epoch is determined by the fact that the dispersed nation possessed within this period one main center or sometimes two co-existing centers, which assumed the leadership of all other parts of the Diaspora because they were able to achieve far-reaching national autonomy and a high state cultural development.

Thus we have two main periods. The Oriental Period which has three parts, starting with the purely Oriental (1200-332), the period of mixed Oriental and Western culture (332-70 C.E.), and finally the period of dual hegemony of Roman-Byzantine Palestine and Persian-Arab Babylonia with leadership passing from the former to the latter. The second millennium of the Oriental Period in Jewish history, which coincides with the first Christian millennium, paved the way for a shift of the national hegemony from East to West. The eleventh century forms the dividing line between the Oriental and the Occidental periods of Jewish history. First Arab and the Christian Spain and then France and the Rhineland took the lead. In the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries Germany and the autonomous Jewish center in Poland shared the hege-

mony. Under the impact of the Enlightenment German Jewry took the leadership of the progressive movement in the West, while Polish Jewry remained traditional until it was swept into the vortex of the latest currents in the second half of the nineteenth century.<sup>20</sup> The exodus from Europe to America and Palestine plus the devastation of the Russian center by the World War and its aftermath marks a new dividing line. The future indicates "a rivalry for national hegemony between East and West, between Palestine and the European-American Diaspora."<sup>21</sup>

If Dubnow was interested in a periodization of Jewish history around centers in order to synthesize Jewish experience in national terms, Salo Baron was and is interested in the analysis of Jewish institutions and movements wherever or whenever they are found. Baron was born in Tarnow, Poland, in 1895. He went to gymnasium there and received his Ph.D (1917), Pol. Sc.D. (1922), and D.Jur. (1923) at the University of Vienna. He was also ordained (1920) at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Vienna. He came to the United States in 1926, and since 1930 has been professor of Jewish history at Columbia University. In 1937 Baron published his three-volume Social and Religious History of the Jews, which is now being expanded to over a dozen volumes. The work itself does not contain a statement on Jewish history, but at the annual session (1938) of the National Council for Jewish Education he read a paper explaining certain fundamental views and methods implied rather than stated clearly in his history.

Baron agrees with Dubnow that Jewish historiography has been dominated by idealistic conceptualizations. This has, in

fact, been true from the very beginning, for there is no really vital distinction between the ancient theistic view of the Biblical historians and some of the modern idealistic approaches. For the former it was God's will, humanly comprehensible even though supernatural, which guided the destinies of mankind and of Israel. Under this scheme, almost all happenings could be interpreted in the light of the moral-religious behavior of the Jewish people. This theocratic view of history was carried on with minor or major modifications by the ancient and medieval authors for whom the experience of exile and the ensuing need for apologetics became of paramount importance. For the latter it was the more humanistic "spirit of Judaism" which took over the place of God as the determining factor.

The basic outlook of nineteenth century scholarship was to see in Jewish history the gradual progression of the Jewish religious or national spirit in its various vicissitudes and adjustments to the changing environments. Even the positivists, such as Dubnow, essentially accepted the primacy of such "inner" factors. It cannot be denied that this idealistic approach no longer satisfies the present generation. Historical explanations of the Jewish past must not deviate fundamentally from the general patterns of history of all mankind.<sup>22</sup>

We should take into account the influence of geography. The economic approach has in recent years assumed a much greater importance. Students of Marxism and exponents of Socialist ideologies have tried to interpret the history of the Jews in terms of basic changes in economic structure and the class struggle within the Jewish community. While many of these

studies have shed illuminating light on certain stages of the history of the Jewish people, no attempts have as yet been made to extend these researches into other equally important phases of Jewish history and to correlate their findings into a continuous historical account of the career of the people as it unfolds itself under the stimulus of preponderately economic factors, if not altogether under the dictates of economic determinants.<sup>23</sup> While welcoming this new emphasis on economic history, Baron feels that of all human groups, Jewish history will most stubbornly resist any full explanation which may be advanced for it exclusively on the basis of the progressive changes in the means of production or of any other economic transformations.<sup>24</sup>

Great promise is held out by an analysis of the important population developments and their bearing upon the general history of the Jewish people. The contradiction and conflicts between the known facts and the legal and ethical sources will also be significant. Another integral element in Jewish historiography ought to be the community approach to Jewish history, that is to say, the local organizations and communities which influence the daily lives of the masses. We must guard ourselves against being misled by the sources, mostly written in central points, into overestimating the significance of the centers as against that of the local agencies, the recorded history of which unfortunately is very meager.<sup>25</sup>

Finally, Baron clarifies the meaning of the socio-religious approach to Jewish history. It is evident that religion could generally be classified as just another social force and that

a socio-religious approach would only be the equivalent of a general sociological approach with some specific emphasis upon religion. Such specific emphasis, it must be admitted, is entirely warranted in the case of the Jews. There is no doubt that among the various social factors, population, economics, community, secular culture, and religion, the latter has held the most conspicuous place, at least in the consciousness of the Jews throughout the three and one-half millennia of their existence. In no other people's history has the impact of religion been so strong, continuous, and comprehensive as in the history of the Jews, especially in post-Biblical times. It is consequently but the unavoidable and intrinsically justified adaptation of the general method of sociological interpretation to the peculiar problems of Jewish history when the element of religious experience is given its due large share within the totality of the social forces. In this sense and in this alone, we may agree to calling this particular variation of the general sociological method a "socio-religious" approach to Jewish history.<sup>26</sup>

In addition to his new emphasis on different aspects of Jewish history, Baron introduces into his history a new treatment of chronology. Present day scholarship, he claims, is confronted anew by the problems of the relations between history and chronology. Evidently the most important single factor in history is that of chronological sequence. The fundamental concept of history is "development." Development does not necessarily mean "evolution," and still less does it imply the idea of "progress." Both of these terms introduce an element of evaluation based on an assumption that history reveals a pro-

gression from the lower to the higher which may or may not be. But no historian can view the past of a group of men without conceiving it in terms of the development from one stage or form to another. This development takes place in time, and chronology, therefore, is an integral part of all historical treatment.

Chronology, however, if it is too limited and rigid, may interfere with the conceptualization of history. The more historiography emancipated itself from the mere registering of events into an interpretation of past developments, the more were the rigid chronological shackles cast off in favor of a consecutive analysis of events and trends which for one reason or another appeared to the historian as belonging to the same whole. Also, the progress of recent historiography from a primarily biographic and military-diplomatic to a preponderately social orientation has tended to lengthen the periods reviewed in their inner-relationships. As long as dramatic turns in military campaigns or diplomatic exchanges of notes occupied the focal position in the historic narrative, so long could historians adhere to the chronological sequence of these happenings with somewhat greater consistency. When the emphasis was shifted, however, to underlying social events, it was easily recognized that certain basic movements took decades, if not centuries, to generate, grow, and decay. The analysis of each movement often had to be isolated in treatment and completed before one could try to interpret another contemporary development in a similar narrative extending over a period of many generations.<sup>27</sup>

The history of the Jewish people falls into three major phases: (1) that of ancient Israel, from its beginnings to the Hellenistic period; (2) that of Pharisaic-Rabbinic Judaism, from Alexander the Great or the Maccabees to the seventeenth century; (3) that of modern Judaism during the last three centuries.

In the history of ancient Israel, the periods of the socio-religious developments roughly coincided with the chronological sequence of Israel's origins, the era of the monarchy and the crisis of exile and restoration. After that time the chronological sequence became less and less important and, for example, the history of the Jews under Islam, medieval as well as modern, had to be separately treated from medieval and early modern Christianity. The story of the rise and development of Hasidism had to be told in conjunction with the evolution of the kabbala and popular ethics within the general make-up of the medieval and early modern ghetto. At the same time the chronology preceding influences of the Protestant Reformation upon Jewish history had to be treated in a subsequent chapter as an integral factor in the transformation of modern Europe and in the ensuing emancipation of the Jews.<sup>28</sup>

Raphael Mahler was born in Nowy Sacz, in the district of Cracow, Poland, in 1899. He received his Ph.D. at the University of Vienna in 1922. From 1924 until 1937 he taught Jewish and general history in Warsaw. He has been very active in the Jewish Workers' Movement. His scientific work in Jewish history was carried on mainly in connection with the activities of the Yiddish Scientific Institute. In 1937 he came to the United States and after the rise of the State of Israel he moved there, where he is presently teaching at the University of Tel Aviv. He has written on the Karites, the

struggle between the Haskalah and Hasidim in Galicia, and has published the first four volumes of his Modern Jewish History, which covers 1780 to 1815.

In his preface,<sup>29</sup> Mahler gives two reasons why a new general synthetic account of modern Jewish history is needed. First of all, there is a tremendous amount of new material available. Second and even more important is the change in method of approach. Most historians represented a class or political viewpoint (Dubnow and his school) and did not pay sufficient attention to class struggles inside the people, ignoring them almost entirely in the history of recent generations. They describe class institutions and views and ascribe them to the whole nation. They did not analyze the attitude of the ruling powers to the different classes among the Jews, nor did they adequately describe the economic structure of the people. By ignoring economic conditions they could not give rational explanations to the lead certain Jewish communities took in Jewish history. Also, they could not clarify the intellectual movement in recent times because they did not show the social roots of these movements and how they satisfied the interests of the classes which supported them. Modern Jewish history was restricted to the description of the progress of emancipation. The large center of Jews in America and the settlement of the Jews in Israel received scant attention. History is a guide and not just "an interesting picture book for the curious." The tragedy of our people in World War II has given us a new perspective for Jewish history during the Galut. The



system which has explained general history so well and will also explain Jewish history is historical materialism. With all the abnormality of Jewish history in the Galut, it does not escape the analysis of historical materialism. In fact, only this system can explain the disaster in Europe and the national liberation in Israel. A large space will be devoted to the French Revolution and the wars of Napoleon because during this period arose all the problems of subsequent generations.

Mahler next outlines the major developments in modern Jewish history according to his conceptual framework of dialectical materialism. Since his work and his viewpoint is so little known in the United States, a translation of this essay has been prepared and appears as an appendix to this work. Therefore only a very short summary plus his periodization is presented in this chapter.

Jewish history is unique. On one hand, it is so interwoven with general history that the fate of the Jews is tied up with the fate of the nations. On the other hand, the Jewish people are different from all other nations because they are not attached to a homeland. The lack of a normal basis for their economy (a peasant class) causes them to have an inverted class structure both in capitalistic and in Socialistic countries. The period of growing capitalism was marked by emancipation, the entrance of the Jews into European culture, and increasing urbanization. But the breakdown in capitalism when the reaction attacked the spirit of progress was marked by economic and social discrimination and even violence. The dif-

ferent rates of capitalistic development in various countries accounts for the differences among Jewish communities. Even Jewish culture suffered because the bourgeoisie, instead of developing a national culture as the bourgeoisie of other nations did, tried to assimilate to the native middle class and denied the national existence of the Jewish people. Even the proletarian Yiddish culture lacked a normal wholeness which comes from a normal state.

The reactions to social progress grew stronger and more frequent as capitalism began to decay during the stage of imperialism. The reaction to the Russian Revolution of 1917 was the Nazi-Fascists and the destruction of European Jewry. Each of these reactions helped strengthen Jewish national consciousness and stimulated aliyah to Israel which had been made feasible by the capitalistic developments in production, communications, and organization. The combination of Socialism and Zionism rebuilt the land and realized the ancient dream for a free political state. The following is the periodization of the primary trends in modern Jewish history. 30

- I. Modern capitalism and civil emancipation of Jews (1789-1917)
  1. The French Revolution and the spread of the new regime during the Napoleonic Wars (1789-1815)
  2. The period of reaction in Europe (1815-1848)
  3. The period of the flourishing of liberal capitalism and the national movements (1848-1878)
  4. The period of Imperialism, declining stage of capitalism (1878-1917)
- II. The international struggle between capitalism and Socialism and the auto-emancipation of the Jewish people (1917-1950)
  5. The period of the Socialist Revolution and the Counter-revolution; the Balfour Declaration and the third Aliyah (1917-1924)

6. The period of building Socialism in Russia, capitalistic relative stability, and the fourth aliyah (1924-1932)
7. The rising force of Fascism and the Nazis; the fifth aliyah (1933-1939)
8. The Second World War and the destruction of European Jewry (1939-1945)
9. The War of Liberation and the Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel (1945-1950)

In this introductory essay "Periodization in Modern Jewish History" Mahler appears to be a dogmatic Marxist-Leninist. In his work, however, he is much less rigid. This essay was written after the Russian victory over Nazism and support for establishment of the Jewish state. It may represent the high point of his faith in Russian Socialism. It should not lead one to think that Mahler's work has little value due to his dogmatism. At the very least, Mahler presents facts that others had ignored. In addition, his conceptualizations are very incisive and his explanations convincing.

Howard M. Sachar was born in Saint Louis, Missouri, in 1928. He received his Ph.D. from Harvard University, his specialty being Near Eastern studies. He was a Hillel director at U.C.L.A. and is presently teaching history at Brandeis University, of which his father is President. His first published book (1958) was The Course of Modern Jewish History. Unlike the other historians previously presented, Sachar does not base his work on original sources, but on secondary literature. While his scholarship cannot be compared to a Graetz or Dubnow, I have thought it fit to include his work inasmuch as it represents an important modern development in Jewish his-

toriography: the emergence of native Americans as Jewish scholars and the impact of the destruction of European Jewry and the rise of the State of Israel. The approach of the book as stated by the author in his preface is to demonstrate the interaction between Jewish and non-Jewish factors.

It is hardly necessary to add that Jewish history cannot be understood without an evaluation of the influence of non-Jewish factors. This is true of every phase of Jewish civilization; but nowhere, surely, is it more transparently evident than of the modern period. For the very existence of a genuinely modern Jewish civilization is due, almost entirely, to the impact of non-Jewish political, economic, and cultural influences.<sup>31</sup>

The five men whose attitudes and concepts have been presented differ in many ways. During the century that has lapsed between Graetz and Sachar both Jewish history and general historiography have undergone tremendous changes. The movement to America, the Russian Revolution, the new anti-Semitism, and the rise and success of Zionism has changed completely the structure of modern Jewry. These tremendous events and experiences alone would affect any writer of Jewish history. In addition, historiography has been deepened and expanded by Buckle's methods of statistical investigation of mass movements and his stress of the importance of science, Karl Marx with his concept of class struggle, Burchhantt's stress on cultural history, and the present trend to social history of the mores of the masses.<sup>32</sup> Von Ranke's evidence that foreign relations have a decisive impact on internal developments and Toynbee's arguments that states should not be seen in isolation but as a part of a whole (the civilization) have been paralleled by an increasing awareness of the

impact of Gentile civilization on the Jews and an increasing discernment of the differences between Jewish communities existing simultaneously but differing due to their background civilization and its state of development.

The passing of time has given us a deeper perspective. The spread of Jewish scholarship has given us a broader perspective. Baron today can view Mendelssohn and the German Haskalah in a context unthinkable to Graetz. Dubnow and Mahler, who lived in eastern Europe, could see the Hasidim actually, and not polemically. It is not just by chance that as a historian's birthplace moves east from Bernberg to Posen to White Russia, their histories become more concerned with the Eastern European masses and their historiography becomes more national in orientation. In addition to time and space, the contributions of predecessors have helped change Jewish historiography. Each man had his own personality and his own society's outlook, but he could build on previous work and was aware of the conceptualizations that preceded his own. Graetz, who was influenced in his views by Krochmal and Rappaport, and negatively by Jost, has in turn influenced Dubnow, Baron, and Mahler. As they have all written about him and even about each other, let us see what they have to say.

Dubnow writes about Graetz after describing Giger, who tried to make the Jews only a religious group, and before dealing with Moses Hess, the early nationalist.<sup>33</sup> After quickly relating his birth in the Polish part of Russia and his Orthodox youth and disposition for Samson Raphael Hirsh-type Ortho-

doxy, he concludes with an argument that Graetz opposed Reform Judaism "not because it was an insult to tradition, for he was a free thinker, but he complained of its estrangement from our people and its clinging to another people." Between these two contradictory statements he also claims that Graetz denied the principle of his generation that there was no Jewish nation in the Diaspora. Nevertheless he admits that "Gaetz didn't follow his system to its conclusions." That Graetz realized that Jewish history is not just a history of ideas is clear, but that he had in mind a separate Jewish nation in the political or even culturally autonomous sense is not warranted by his own statements, and especially by his treatment of the German Emancipation.

Baron claims that we can see Graetz as a Nationalist with Zionist tendencies in a pre-Zionist period. He at first supported the "Lovers of Zion" movement but broke away later because of its radical nationalism. Although he had a great love for Hebrew, his Hebrew style was poor. He devoted little space to modern Hebrew literature in his history.<sup>34</sup>

"Graetz drew inspiration for his deep national pride," writes Mahler, from the 1848 Revolution, just as Jost was influenced by seventeenth century cosmopolitanism, and Dubnow by the first Russian Revolution. However Graetz, who wrote during the Romantic period, was still negative to the Messianic movements. He judged them as atypical adventures, the fruit of imagination and madness. Dubnow, the national historian, saw them as desires of the Jewish people for liberation and redemption.

These desires grew as the suffering of the people grew, and hope for imminent salvation was renewed in every period of international political change. Dubnow had the same profound perception of the Kabbalah, especially the Lurianic Kabbalah. Graetz, with his rationalistic view, denounced the Kabbalah as a corrupt idea which degraded Jewish culture till the modern period. Dubnow heard the national feeling beating within the hearts of the people and arousing them to individual affirmation. The strong opposition of Graetz to any kind of mysticism reached its height in his description of the Hasidim. If he admits occasionally that the Hasidim or the Zohar offered anything constructive to the people, it is only to show how low pilpulistic Talmud had sunk. Dubnow saw more objectively and could even compare the Hasidim to the Haskalah, both of them enriching Orthodoxy, each according to the different stages of development of the Jewish people in the East and in the West. Graetz based his historical conceptualization on the dialectical system of Hegel, especially his idea of the development of the world spirit through self-realization by opposition.<sup>35</sup> In modern Jewish historiography, Jost was the first to express the idea that the Mishnah and the Rabbinic literature that developed from it fulfilled the function of a moveable motherland in Jewish history. Graetz, following Jost's footsteps, called it the Palestine of the exile. For Dubnow and others, the religious system of separation became a mechanism for preserving the nation. Mahler disagrees completely. The Talmudic system is not unique (as the development of Islam shows) and the idea of a Medieval hibernation is

not accurate and fails to explain the character of Jewish culture in the Middle Ages. Also, the weakness of Judaism in the pre-Emancipation era cannot be explained without reference to the general trends in European culture. Dubnow stresses only the subjective aspect of nationality. It is necessary to understand the objective forces of Jewish experience. Jewish culture was bound to the feudal and semi-feudal regimes in which the Jews fulfilled the economic function of a "third estate." Dubnow never gave enough weight to economic, even when he did discuss it. Another theme of Dubnow which Mahler criticizes is his construction of individualistic religion versus collective religion. Dubnow says the latter is normative Judaism, i.e. national in orientation. All heterodoxy in Judaism is a revolt by the individual against the bonds of Jewish society. Thus until the present, anyone who rebelled against the legal tradition, either due to religious feeling or due to free thought, was in reality rebelling against the nation.

That which Graetz regarded as "the essence of true Judaism" becomes for Dubnow a legalistic religion which guarded the national existence. In Graetz's system there was progress, while for Dubnow there is no progress in traditional Judaism. For Dubnow, almost two thousand years of history has only one form of culture—the national—and all other streams are regarded as exceptions. This ignores the general development of human thought and apprehends events in isolation from their social contexts.<sup>36</sup>

Dubnow's emphasis on autonomism hid from his eyes the desire to return to Zion which has filled the hearts of the people in a



generations. "Not a permanent existence as a national minority in the Diaspora, but the ingathering of the exiles and the rebuilding of Zion was the desire of the people..."<sup>37</sup>

Baron thinks that Dubnow differed from Graetz more in theory than in practice. The name of his major work, A World History of the Jewish People, suggests a departure from the historiography of Graetz, for whom the Jewish past was viewed separately from all other nations. Dubnow uses national centers to organize his material instead of Graetz's synchronistic method. He is right in this, for Graetz "put in one chapter everything that happened to the Jews in a certain number of years without paying attention to the basic differences in the different lands in which they dwelled."<sup>38</sup> However, in practice Dubnow has not succeeded in avoiding the pitfalls of Graetz which he himself so bluntly denounced.

Except for his artificial attempts at periodization, his forced quest for hegemony centers in various periods and, due to his own political 'autonomism,' his special attention to Jewish self government, one finds in Dubnow's otherwise remarkable attempt at a new synthesis of Jewish history little that is a substantial advance over Graetz's still unsurpassed Jewish history.<sup>39</sup>

Both of them accept the primacy of spiritual factors. Dubnow set up an autonomous national will which was the driving force in shaping the destiny of the people and which, in the supreme interest of national self-preservation, made all the necessary adjustments required in different periods and regions.

If Baron objects to Dubnow because of his artificial at-

tempts at periodization, Dubnow objects to Baron for his lack of periodization. The last half of the seventeenth century, which Baron considers part of the period of Jewish emancipation, brought about no change in the situation of the people, writes Dubnow.<sup>40</sup> True, the beginning of capitalism in Italy and Holland affected some Jews, but what is fundamental is the situation of all the people, not just a few individuals or a small group. In the Middle Ages we also had rich Jews and free thinkers. The chapter on emancipation is chaotic because different periods are mixed together. Dubnow was afraid that the title A Social and Religious History of the Jews indicated that secularism would be subordinated. Religion does occupy a larger part than in other histories, but Baron is not one-sided. Dubnow objects to calling the Sadducees nationalists. They should be called political nationalists, and the Pharisees spiritual nationalists. The reason for his objection is revealed when he states that this struggle is continuous and manifests itself today in the Zionist movement. In his epilogue, Baron surveys the present situation and suggests that the Jews must be willing to adjust. If the Fascists will give us corporate rights in exchange for civil rights, the danger is not so great. The Stalin constitution also may give us a chance to adjust to Russian Communism. Dubnow disagrees, as from his point of view he must. Hitler and Stalin will pass away. To build on them is dangerous. Unfortunately Dubnow was wrong. His attachment to the Diaspora led to his rejection of Zionism for spiritual autonomism. His attachment to eastern Europe led to his refusal during the thirties to immigrate to

America, which he himself admitted was the new center of the Diaspora. He was fortunate only in not living to see the full extent of the annihilation of East European Jewry.

It is this catastrophe which Mahler says demands a new examination of the Emancipation in Jewish history.<sup>41</sup> Dubnow used the attainment of equal rights by western Jews as a guide and a reproach to Tsarist Russia. We today see emancipation as bound up with capitalistic development to a certain stage at which the regime itself generates reactionary forces which endanger its existence. Jewish existence, which was always dependent on a Jewish economic function, is during the recent confrontation of imperialistic capitalism and Socialism only secure in a Jewish state.

Mahler's thesis that the advent of Socialism is beneficial for the Jewish people is doubtful to Baron. He writes, and subsequent history has borne him out, that Communist policy does not justify the belief that the proletariat as a class is necessarily friendly to the Jews. The revolutionary Fourth Estate, in the early stages of its struggle against the existing social order, champions humanitarian ideals, as did the Third Estate during its revolutionary stage. A proletariat in opposition supports civil and political liberties and the rights of the oppressed peoples. But, when empowered, it might easily be persuaded to abandon liberty and equality for the sake of general economic equality. The Russian experience has been too short to allow for legitimate generalizations.<sup>42</sup>

The historians' own philosophy, having been presented, plus their criticism of each other's work, we now turn to an analysis of their principles in action through selected historical cases. Here again our method will be to present inconsistencies and difficulties in each conceptualization by the juxtaposition of the historians' own statements.

### Chapter III - Jewish History in Practice

We will now examine the treatment of several individuals and movements by our five historians. The selection of Mendelssohn, the Napoleonic Sanhedrin, the East European Haskalah, and anti-Semitism has been determined partly by the availability of material, partly by their controversial nature, and partly by the different types of historical reconstructions possible.

For Graetz, Mendelssohn is the symbol of the revival of the Jewish people in modern times. But he is more than a symbol. He is its cause. Although Graetz claims that this rejuvenating of the Jewish people "may be unhesitatingly ascribed to Mendelssohn," he states that he neither "intended nor suspected it."<sup>1</sup> Graetz also mentions that Mendelssohn had enlightened teachers and also associates who even in his youth had started a Hebrew newspaper.<sup>2</sup> He also relates that Lessing had written his play "The Jews" before meeting Mendelssohn.<sup>3</sup> In spite of all this, Mendelssohn remains the originator of modern Jewish culture. However Graetz admits that it did not occur to Mendelssohn to use the Torah translation he had prepared for his children to educate his brethren.<sup>4</sup>

For Dubnow the Haskalah was not the result of one man's activities, nor was it the result of outside influences. The need for renewal arose in Judaism.<sup>5</sup> However, he interprets the actions of Mendelssohn as a conscious attempt to bring the Jews out of their isolation. "The best means to accomplish this appeared to Mendelssohn to be similar to what the German reformer, Luther, had done in his time; a new translation of scripture."<sup>6</sup> The book Jerusalem was intended to answer those who claim that the Jews should not receive equal rights in a Christian state. It was not a new

program for Jewish reconstruction.

Baron emphasizes the pre-German Haskalah in Holland and Italy. All the fundamental tendencies of the Hasklah, such as secular learning, purified Hebrew, historicism, and the revolt of the individual against communal power, had become more and more marked in Italy and Holland long before Mendelssohn.<sup>7</sup> The scene had been set for the profound transformation which was to emanate from the German and eastern Haskalah. The German Jewish Haskalah was much less radical than the French enlightenment for something of traditional Judaism had to be preserved if the Jews were to survive. Baron follows Graetz in ascribing the German translation of the Bible as primarily for the benefit of Mendelssohn's children.<sup>8</sup>

For Mahler, the powerful cultural upswing in eighteenth century Germany was sufficient to shake awake the slumbering Jewish culture.<sup>9</sup> In addition, the upper class wealthy Jews needed a knowledge of German for their business activities and a reform of many religious practices for their social activities.<sup>10</sup> Mendelssohn did not want to lead a struggle. He was forced to defend himself and the Jews by others. He was really much more of a conservative and quite modest in his desires for Jewish advancement.<sup>11</sup> Mahler follows Dubnow in attributing Mendelssohn's translation to an attempt to aculturate the Jews. This he objects to as an undermining of Yiddish, which could have been the basis of a national culture.<sup>12</sup>

Sachar mentions the pre-German Haskalah, but feels that Mendelssohn "nevertheless emerges as the key personality of western European Jewry in the early modern era."<sup>13</sup> He emphasizes the European Humanists' readiness to receive the "exception Jew" but claims that Mendelssohn left no enduring

mark on their thinking. His main impact was on the Jewish people through his Bible translation which was done to prod the Jewish community into an increased awareness of the secular world about them.<sup>14</sup>

Mendelssohn himself states that he prepared the translation of the Torah for his children. Dubnow, Mahler, and Sachar do not accept this. For all three of them, the later assimilationist groups, which claimed to harken back to Mendelssohn's example and which they oppose, have colored their picture of the man. It is indeed strange that Graetz, who ascribes the Jewish reawakening to Mendelssohn's activities does not credit him with imitating Luther. Although the Dutch and Italian Haskalah preceded the German in time, it was so far removed in space that one can seriously question Baron's assertion that the scene was set for the eighteenth century German Haskalah. Mahler's explanation has the advantage of intimacy in time and space. His remarks that Mendelssohn was very conservative are correct, from our vastly changed perspective but ignore the relative radicalness of his secularism in the eighteenth century. Graetz and Sachar present biographies of Mendelssohn as a model of an age. Baron and Mahler treat him fragmentary as examples for incidents in a movement. Dubnow inclines more to the former group.

The Napoleonic Sanhedrin seems to have aroused mixed emotions in Graetz. While he describes its conception as a happy thought and the selections of delegates as fortunate,<sup>15</sup> he also states that they adopted the disintegrating view that Judaism consisted of two wholly distinct elements -- the purely religious and the purely political-legislative.<sup>16</sup> He denounces Napoleon for the Infamous Decree and writes that he who deceived the whole world could not be expected to keep his word with the Jews and leave their

freedom unmolested.<sup>17</sup> This may have influenced him to see in Napoleon's Palestine offer of 1799 "only a trick on the part of Bonaparte intended to win over to his side the Jewish minister of the pasha of Acco." But he does say that had Napoleon succeeded in conquering Syria, he would perhaps have assigned a share of his government to Jews.<sup>18</sup>

Napoleon's promise, for Dubnow, was a device to get the Jews in the Middle East to assist him in his conquest of Palestine.<sup>19</sup> Napoleon did not have much contact with the Jews and his relations to them as to all of Europe were both beneficial and harmful. The Sanhedrin showed its compliance with French rather than Jewish demands by agreeing to the opening of its first session on the Sabbath. Their spirit of servility passed all limits when they denied Jewish nationality.<sup>20</sup> Just what national rights they were giving up in order to secure civil rights Dubnow never makes clear.

Baron says that the Sanhedrin left a deep impression during its own time. It helped the Jews of Russia by scaring the Russian government into withdrawing its decree of expulsion of Jews from the villages issued in 1804.<sup>21</sup> In spite of this he devotes very little space to the Sanhedrin itself or its influences on later generation. He does not see it as a betrayal or as a watershed in Jewish history but rather as a part of a larger trend toward modernization.

Mahler points out that of the 111 men who were nominated for the Assembly of Notables, many could not afford to come, and some who did come could not afford to stay, the whole period (nine months). Thus the Assembly was mainly composed of wealthy people.<sup>22</sup> They slavishly glorified Napoleon, forgetting that the French Revolution had brought them freedom



and that it was Napoleon who was questioning their rights.<sup>23</sup> Several of their pronouncements that Judaism is only a religion and that the Messianic Age does not involve a return to Israel were later carried on by the Reform movement.<sup>24</sup> In fact, they reinterpreted Jewish history to show that only the poor left Babylonia to return to Israel with Ezra, that most of the people remained in Babylonia.<sup>25</sup> Napoleon's purpose in convening the Sanhedrin and in issuing the Infamous Decree was to control the Jews. David Friedlander opposed the Parisian Sanhedrin, but for reasons of German patriotism.<sup>26</sup>

For Sachar, Napoleon himself is the prime figure. His instinct for dealing with the religious factions of his country had always been shrewd. "If I were governing Jews, I should rebuild the Temple of Solomon," he once said. Napoleon felt he could manipulate the Jews but all changes must appear to come voluntarily from them.<sup>27</sup> Napoleon's motivations for summoning the Sanhedrin were more far-reaching than might have been apparent to the Jews in France. For one, he wanted the Jews to turn their backs forever on their corporate status, their separate nationhood. He also wanted to gain the loyalty of the numerous Jews of Poland to supply his recently-arrived armies. Finally, he summoned the Sanhedrin to divert attention from his plan to issue the Infamous Decree. He succeeded in all of these areas. The Sanhedrin's solemn renunciation of separate Jewish nationhood was truly of watershed importance in Jewish history. It set the tone for western Jewish life for the next century.<sup>28</sup>

For Dubnow, Mahler, and Sachar, the Sanhedrin represents a betrayal of Jewish national interests. For Mahler, it is a betrayal by the upper class

For Dubnow, it is a betrayal by the assimilationists. For Sachar, whose fellow countrymen would agree, more or less, with the statements of the Parsian Sanhedrin, it is Napoleon who outwitted these men into a unforeseen betrayal. Sachar repeats several times the theme that the definition of Jews as a religious group was due to the influence of the Sanhedrin. Perhaps he does this for dramatic effect, for the influence of the Sanhedrin was small compared to the social realities of the new economic and political organization of the state as he himself writes in chapter three.

According to Graetz, the Haskalah in Galicia arose on one hand due to the increase in communication during the Napoleonic Wars and, on the other hand, as a response by reasonable men to meet with firm opposition the spread of the Hasidic cult.<sup>29</sup> The most appropriate method of removing the boorish ignorance in religious and secular matters, and the childlike credulity was by means of education. While the affects of trade on the Haskalah are mentioned, they are bypassed as merely incidental. The general treatment of the Haskalah is of men and their work in Jewish scholarship. Graetz does not conceive of the Haskalah as a social movement rooted in the needs of some groups, and unappealing to other groups, due to their different circumstances.

Dubnow also treats the Galician Haskalah through biographies rather than as a social movement. The Russian Haskalah however is treated extensively and as a social movement. In concluding his section dealing with the Haskalah in Galicia, Dubnow differentiates between the literature in Austria, which was nationalistic, and in Germany, where it was assimilationist.<sup>30</sup> But elsewhere he writes that the budding Haskalah in Poland

resulted in "Poles of the old covenant" who for the first time included themselves in the Polish nation.<sup>31</sup> Dubnow devotes considerable space to the machinations of Hertz Homberg who used the Austrian Government to fight the Hasidim. Yet he rationalizes the actions of Levinsohn who used the oppressive Tsarist government to reform the Jews.<sup>32</sup> It would seem that things permitted to an East European Jew are prohibited to a German Jew.

Baron finds the major difference between the German Haskalah and the Galician and Russian Haskalot in the large masses of Jews living among national minorities with no strong national culture. With the assumption of power by the Poles after 1867, there began the large scale Polonization of the Jewish intelligentsia. Between the extremes of rigid Orthodoxy and Hasidism on one hand, and assimilation on the other, the Haskalah had little chance to survive.<sup>33</sup> Baron devotes only two lines to the conflict between the Hasidim and the Haskalah and this is found only in his notes.<sup>34</sup> He does, however, indicate one of the important differences between the Haskalah in Galicia and Russia. In the latter, where the Kahal had become an instrument of government oppression, especially after 1827 when it became responsible for the delivery of Jewish boys into the army, the Haskalah was much more antagonistic to religious tradition, especially during its Yiddish phase.<sup>35</sup> Dubnow had glossed over this antagonism when treating the Jewish cantonists and the Khappers. He only mentions it in reference to the abolition of the Kahila.<sup>36</sup>

Mahler points out that the wealthy merchant who was the social foundation of the Haskalan movement is in its literature held up as a model for the Jew. Although he admits that many of the Maskilim had to struggle for

their daily bread, he claims that their identification with their wealthy benefactors is patent in an analysis of the Haskalah program. Education, the main watchword, of the Haskalah was necessary for a merchant-trading class. The Maskilim disdained the poor who they identified with either the ignorant or the lazy.<sup>37</sup> They were not nationalists, but rather religiously conservative. They were also politically conservative. They kept aloof from the revolutionary struggle, allying themselves with the Austrian government in its period of reactionary absolutism.<sup>38</sup> The struggle between the Haskalah and the Hasidim was socio-political. It mirrored the antagonism between the rising Jewish upperclass, who looked upon the government as an aid in their social elevation, and the masses who struggled to escape the burden of taxation, oppression, and the alien German culture. The Hasidic teachings complain against the oppression of the Jews. The Hasidim evaded the excessive wedding taxes and the law concerning the examination of all prospective bridal couples on a Haskalah cateschism prepared by Hertz Homberg and evaded the government's prohibition of selling liquor in the villages. They evaded military service, and the civil courts, and succeeded in transferring money illegally to Palestine.<sup>39</sup>

Sachar places the awakening of secular interests among the Jews of Russia as an integral part of a larger Russian response to Western ideas.<sup>40</sup> He sees the close tie of the Haskalah to the middle class. In fact, his whole treatment (page 201) is really a paraphrase of Raphael Mahler. However the major part of his chapter is devoted to the intellectual consequences rather than the social significances of the Haskalah.

Mahler views the Hasidim, the masses struggling against oppressive absolutism, as the liberals and the Maskilim, who are allied with the government, as the conservatives. This is the very opposite of Gaetz. Mahler is happy to bring evidence of Jewish resistance to the laws of the government which for most non-revolutionary-oriented historians would prove embarrassing. Dubnow and Graetz see the Haskalah as primarily the intrusion of Western ideas into Eastern Europe. Baron sees it in the context of a national revival versus intellectual assimilation. Sachar realizes the importance of Mahler's contribution, but seems to feel that the problem of Jewish cultural creativity is more significant for his readership. He devotes most of his attention to the problem of cultural creativity in Jewish forms versus assimilationist forms. He claims that emancipation clearly could not have been effectively extended as an act of grace from above unless the Jewish community was prepared intellectually and emotionally for it. Yet the motive of reforming the Jews and giving them more rights was often urged from above for state reasons entirely independent of Jewish cultural enlightenment.

The attitude a historian takes to the phenomena of anti-Semitism will depend upon his conception of why men fight and hate in general and on the kind of anti-Semitism that he experiences both in his own lifetime and in his historical materials. The word "anti-Semitism" is a vague term used to describe everything from social exclusion at a fraternity to the mass-murder of men, women, and children. Therefore, the historian cannot find a cause for anti-Semitism, he must find many causes (at least equal in number to the various kinds of anti-Semitism) and show their inter-action.

Graetz regards anti-Semitism as an irrational quirk. A professor will

become a Jew-hater if an officer gives him a grudging salute.<sup>41</sup> Voltaire hated all Jews because one English Jew caused him to lose money and another Prussian Jew sued him.<sup>42</sup> Graetz does admit that frustrated nationalism could be directed against the Jews, but even this he sees as unplanned and illogical.<sup>43</sup> He never conceives of anti-Semitism as a problem of society itself.

Dubnow sees the new anti-Semitism as part of the reactionary movement after 1870. It was not directed against Judaism, but against Jews. In France racial anti-Semitism was imported from Germany, but was really more national than racial.<sup>44</sup> The Poles resented Yiddish, the Litvaks, and the attempt to create a separate Jewish culture in Poland. This and election politics for the fourth Duma led to a major boycott of Jewish enterprises in an attempt to push the Jews out of the economy.<sup>45</sup> Defeated Hungary attacked the Jews for participation in the Communist Revolution.<sup>46</sup> Dubnow sees anti-Semitism as a political problem between hostile peoples rather than individuals (Graetz) or classes (Mahler). He fails to differentiate adequately between anti-Semitism in France where the Jews as a small assimilated minority are only used as a wedge for a major attack directed against another segment of society, and Poland where the large Jewish population had a definite economic and cultural position which could be opposed for itself.

Baron lists numerous factors causing anti-Semitism. The dissatisfaction of the masses was directed into anti-Jewish channels. In Russia this even led to pogroms, something which had not happened previously. The new anti-Semitism concentrated on biological issues. Psychologically the very defenselessness of the Jews provoked hatred. Religious prejudice was still

alive as the blood ritual charges in Eastern Europe showed. Jews were attacked because of their economic concentration by radicals and for their radicalism by conservatives, and for their internationalism by everybody. The fact was that the Jews had not succumbed to ethnic or economic absorption. The increasing nationalism of the last decades whetted the resentment of the majorities. The unification of Germany had resuscitated the antagonism of the national state toward the Jew. On the other hand, in the struggle of nationalities in Eastern Europe the Jew was a buffer and a scapegoat.<sup>47</sup> If the Jew had been attacked for his separateness in the past, he was now accused of dominating the nation of culture. Some anti-Semites went as far as to reject that Jewish heresy: Christianity.<sup>48</sup>

Baron shows his understanding of the multi-faceted aspects of anti-Semitism and its causes as the long list above shows. But as it also shows, he has made little attempt to determine the relative importance of these factors and under which circumstances the different factors become stronger or weaker. In other writings he has suggested a regular formula to explain the alternation of toleration and intolerance through the inner evolution of the host countries. In addition to religious antagonisms and economic rivalry, one must pay close attention to nationalism as a major factor in changing Jewish destinies, especially in the medieval and early modern period. States with a nationally homogeneous population, sooner or later turned against their Jewish "subjects" and sought to eliminate this "alien" ingredient. On the other hand, multinational states considered their Jews valuable to help maintain imperial unity and gave them many privileges.<sup>49</sup>

If Baron presents us with dozens of reasons, Mahler finds only one basic cause of anti-Semitism and that is socio-economic. The Jewish question in Poland was not solved because the fundamental social questions were not solved and because the status of the peasants was not changed. The nobility despised the Jews, even though they needed them for their economic activities.<sup>50</sup> The peasants' interests did not conflict violently with those of the Jews. It was the economic rivalry of the Polish and Jewish bourgeois that was driving force behind Polish anti-Semitism for centuries.<sup>51</sup> Mahler does admit that after the 1867 revolt, anti-Semitism came to a standstill for several decades. He also admits that the special character of Polish anti-Semitism was due to Jewish national and cultural separateness.<sup>52</sup>

Mahler also tries to maintain that the peasants and the masses were not really anti-Semitic and that the Poles did not cooperate with the Germans in the "final solution."<sup>53</sup> The former is a result of his Marxist attitude that the masses are the "good guys." The latter is due to his Polish loyalties. In the first version of this essay written early in the War, he thought that the common enemy would serve to unite the "two nations on one soil." This remark was dropped from the revised edition.

In his latest essay on anti-Semitism (5723), Mahler rejects the socio-economic interpretation of anti-Semitism.<sup>54</sup> It is true that anti-Semitism is caused by competition within a class and/or opposition from an exploited class, but these are conflicts which are continuous and do not, therefore, explain the rise and fall of anti-Semitism during different periods. Nor does it explain why, given the weakness of the Jews, anti-



Semitism is restricted at all. Further the anti-Semite does not distinguish between different classes of Jews, but hates all Jews.<sup>55</sup> The answer is that the Jews are useful as political enemies. They are used as a diversion for economic and political unrest.<sup>56</sup> The Jews have been the prime scapegoats (and now are the traditional scapegoats) because they are different in religion, customs, and economic function. The only solution to this problem would be world peace and progress. Inasmuch as this progress is dialectical, there will be conflagrations which will envelope the Jews. The ingathering of the exiles is the real solution for the Jewish people.

Sachar focuses on the individual in his analysis of anti-Semitism, but he, unlike Graetz, finds in the very irrationality of anti-Semitism its rational (psychological) explanation. While upperclass conservatives may have supported respectable anti-Semitism as a means of fighting the liberals, it was the frustrated and embittered lower-middle classes that the demagogues were able to mobilize for the new nihilistic anti-Semitism.<sup>57</sup> Sachar differentiates between men like Von Plehev, who used the Jews as part of their political policy, but personally had little against them,<sup>58</sup> and those like Drumont and Ahlwardt, who sublimated their own frustrations in racist Jew baiting.<sup>59</sup> Sachar does not ignore the economic considerations, especially in the Slavic countries. However, he regards the total nihilism of the Nazis as intelligible only in terms of abnormal psychology.

Another theme which reappeared several times in Sachar's book is the Jews' lack of a "big brother" state to protect them. "The Jews were marked out for special treatment for they alone of all the minority peoples had no influential intercessor in Europe to speak and, if necessary,

retaliate on their behalf."<sup>60</sup> The reactionary aspects of European culture generally ignored by liberal assimilated Jews, are given extensive treatment.<sup>61</sup> Not that they were such important causes of anti-Semitism, but in order to call to the attention of today's Jewish intelligentsia that "Europe did not, could not, would not, love them back."<sup>62</sup> These themes are the historiographic and didactic outgrowth of Sachar's Zionist commitment.

The development of Jewish historiography is nowhere better illustrated than in the differing analyses of anti-Semitism. Graetz, writing in a pre-Marxian and pre-Freudian intellectual climate, can only see anti-Semitism as a perversion of man's normal nationality. The elimination of ignorance and superstitious religions would be enough to solve the problem. The obvious cultural achievement of German Jews should convince any anti-Semite of his error. Dubnow, although living after the initial impact of Marx and Freud, is influenced by his experiences among the competing nation minorities of Eastern Europe. He cannot derive anti-Semitism from the unique social and economic position of the Jews because he believes in the Diaspora. Dubnow rejects anti-Semitism as a permanent factor of society. He believes it can be fought and overcome.<sup>63</sup> Mahler, who is also an Eastern European Jew, has, in his Marxist framework of class conflict, an explanation of anti-Semitism. Yet even he lately seems to feel that mere economic competition is not sufficient to explain Germany's total war against the Jews.<sup>64</sup> While for Mahler, Nazism was the reaction of decadent capitalism to rising Socialism, Sachar sees it as a violent revolution against law, order, and conventional morality. It was not the system, but the collapse of the system that loosed the flood. Mahler

disregards the capitalist crisis in America during which relatively little anti-Semitism occurred. Sachar disregards the German industrialists' preference for the radical right due to their violent anti-Communist program. But the "Final Solution" itself is intelligible only in terms of psychoanalysis. Mahler sees the importance of "diverting the people's unrest" but lacks the conceptualization of how this takes place. A much closer study of the men who joined the Nazi party is needed for the details but the main trend of Sachar's argument rings true. It was the obsession for domination, the total involvement of the Nazis with the Jews, and the intoxication of racism that drove them to destroy and be destroyed.<sup>65</sup>

#### Chapter IV - Conclusions and Suggestions

Each of our historians has criticized his predecessors for ignoring non-Jewish factors be they cultural, sociological or economic. Jewish history, intertwined as it is in Gentile history, must take all these factors into account. Sachar goes the furthest when he says that modern Jewish civilization is due almost entirely to the non-Jewish factors.<sup>1</sup> This, at first, may seem strange for Sachar is a Zionist, and nationalists usually do not like to admit that there have been foreign influences in their history. But Sachar, living in the United States, experiences a Jewish society built almost completely in non-Jewish forms. If he stresses the non-Jewish factors more than an East European historian, it is because American Jewry is more "modern" in form than East European Jewry was. While Elbogen lists six yishevot in his index the only Yeshiva listed by Sachar is Yeshiva University. Even language, the basic form for most nationalists, is not stressed. In fact, Sachar himself knew neither Hebrew nor Yiddish when he wrote his book. Yet, he is aware of a strong American Jewish identification expressed through "Jewishness." Thus, his nationalism is very different from that of Dubnow or Mahler which was the result of Jewish experience in Eastern Europe.

While the impact of Gentile culture and society is important for Jewish history, the biographies of non-Jews are not. They acted out of the structure of their society and thereby do not deserve a place in Jewish history unless it be as an example of the societies pressures. Sachar goes too far when in addition to relating Stolypin's rise to power, he informs us that he "was a genial and charming person, handsome, superficially

friendly, a devoted husband and father."<sup>2</sup>

For Menachem Ussischkin, Sachar has hardly a word. It is doubtful that Sachar thinks that anti-Semites are of more concern for Jewish history than Jewish national leaders. Perhaps the real explanation is his desire to show that for political reasons anybody can be an anti-Semite. Also he tends to ignore internal Jewish conflicts. Ussischkin led the opposition to Weizmann at the twentieth Zionist Congress and also led the Zione Zion during the Uganda fight. Sachar's partisan presentation of Zionism is clearly indicated by his omission of Jabotensky and the Jewish Legion. The altelena affair is also ignored. Lest one think that these omissions are due to the limitation of space, it should be noted that Bernhard Berenson (an apostate) is not only listed but receives more space than Ussischkin, Abba Hillel Silver and Judah Magnus combined. This is not due to an odd concept that the alienated Jewish intellectual is more important for Jewish history than the committed and active Jew but to Sachar's long contact with the Jews on the University campus and his desire to show them that they could and should create Jewishly. In addition, Sachar was forced to use secondary sources in Western languages and so includes much information irrelevant (that Mescherski a Slavophile editor was the Tsars confidant) in a study of Jewish history. While the course of Jewish history cannot be understood apart from its Gentile environment, it must be stressed that it is not the environment itself but the details of the Jews reaction to the environment, that makes up Jewish history. The frequent omission of the principal is one of the most serious faults in Sachar's history.

Definition of the subject is not the only problem which arises from Jewish inter-involvement. The position of the Jews must be related to that of the Gentile population. Since the Jews are not distributed proportionately among the various classes in society, the historian must always make clear to whom he compares the Jews. Any comparison to the ruling classes would be unfavorable. Any comparison to the peasants would be favorable. The historian must not complain of Jewish lack of rights and ignore the fact that other groups also lack rights. To do so leaves the reader with the impression that everybody had what only the Jews lacked. In writing of Jewish emancipation in England, the historian must mention Catholic and non-conformist disabilities and the restriction on voting due to use of property qualification. The historian must always present Jewish disabilities in relation to all segments of the population or the reader will be misled to believe things were worse than they really were.

The democratic election offers us vast new possibilities. While much has been written about conflicts in parliaments, newspapers and pamphlets little has been done to analyze elections which are really vast public opinion polls. Through the study of issues, candidates and local voting patterns, we could discover a great deal of information about Gentile attitudes to Jews.

The initiative amendment to the Swiss constitution which prohibited Shehita was carried 191,527 to 127,701.<sup>3</sup> A study of who voted for and who voted against this issue would tell us of the varying class, religions and national attitudes of Swiss citizens to the Jews.

The fact that Jews live in a culture means that the external influences are much greater than the influences of one culture on another. Jewish

history is more often subjected to outside influences than the history of geographically contained cultures. This does not mean, however, that Jewish history is only a series of successive societies. There are several factors which unite all Jewish history.

From the earliest period of Jewish history, there was a consciousness of a difference between "Israel" and the "nations." The Jew in the twelfth century Rhineland may have had more in common with his Gentile neighbors than with a Jew in Muslim Spain but since he never met the Spanish Jew he saw only the difference between Jews and Gentiles in the Rhineland. Thus he felt that all Jews were unified and differentiated from all Gentiles. Even the literature which did circulate was interpreted by the reader in terms of his own culture. The Guide was a source of conflict in the thirteenth century but by the sixteenth century Isserles could write a commentary on it not because he was closer to Islamic culture than Feudal Christian culture but because he was too far removed to see the conflict. The literature then, although of diverse origins and representing different societies, becomes an unifying factor as it was interpreted. The slow rate of change and the poor communications characteristic of the pre-modern period made it easy to see the past as only slightly different from the present. Babylonian epics, Hellenistic legal codes, and Islamic philosophical works were all studied in Eastern Europe. Whatever conflict there was when the new forms penetrated the old, disappeared when all the previous forms were assimilated in the next cultural state. For the historian this interaction is not a foreign influence but the unique aspect of Jewish history.

The problems facing every historian seeking to conceptualize history

are even more complicated for the Jewish historian. Not only must he select and organize his data, and then explain them, but he must first decide who are the Jews and what is Jewish. The normal categories of land, language, or government used to define the subject of a historical study are not sufficient for Jewish history. Judaism cannot be used as the criterion because it itself is the product of the Jewish historical experience. One feels that Graetz has erred in treating Borne so extensively in a "History of the Jews." Borne was no longer a Jew nor did he make a contribution to Judaism or the development of Jewish history. The constant involvement of Jewish history and Gentile history forces the Jewish historian to evaluate every marginal figure and some that are not even marginal. The usual decision is to include him, especially if he is famous or admired or colorful. This can reach absurd limits. Lowenthal, in a book directed against German racism, writes that Baron Richthofen "when he fell bled Jewish blood from his veins."<sup>4</sup>

Yet, Jewish history cannot be limited to those who live and act only within the Jewish community. Often a man influences Jewish history due to his influence in Gentile history (Trotsky). Often a man influences Gentile history due to his influence by Jewish history (Freud). Often a man contributes to mankind's heritage and it is impossible to determine if his Jewish heritage had anything to do with it or not (Disraeli).

This problem is related to another one; the modern Jewish activists rejection of a passive part. Hazaz has one of his characters say "You've already heard that I'm opposed to Jewish history... I want to explain why .... First, I will begin with the fact that we have no history at all.



That's a fact... Because we didn't make our own history, the goyim made it for us...they made our history for us to suit themselves, and we took it from them as it came. But it's not ours, it's not ours at all! Because we didn't make it, we would have made it differently.... we have no history of our own."<sup>5</sup>

To what extent is this true? Has the Jewish people "at all times and in all countries, always and everywhere, been the subject, the creator of its own history,"<sup>6</sup> in the same way that the Chinese in their geographic isolation have been? The foreign relation of two sovereign states with different languages and forms of society are not the same as the relations of a small minority living in close proximity and subject to a majority. Yet, just because the Jews were so exposed to cultural configurations of varying types we cannot ignore the selectivity of the Jewish society. Historians have paid too much attention to what was borrowed or adopted and not enough to what was rejected. What did not happen may be as significant as what did happen.

However the historian may choose to interpret his information, he must find some system to present it. Graetz chose time. Within the time span of each chapter be included all kinds of events from every place. Dubnow related his material to a geographical center with discourses for the periphery. Baron abandoned both time and space to concentrate on subject matter. Mahler emphasizes world progress measured in time but modified by area according to its stage of development. Sachar also basically structures his history in time, but divided spacially and with the addition of culture sections in given space-time structures.

Periodization is necessary in history not only for organization but

for conceptualization. Graetz starts the modern period with Mendelssohn for this marks the cultural awakening which for Graetz characterizes this period. Dubnow, Mahler and Sachar begin with the transformation wrought by the French revolution in political and civic organization which for them led to emancipation for the Jews. Baron draws from the sixteenth century onward for the social movement that will modernize the Jews. Dubnow objected to Baron that we must consider the majority of the people. In this he is wrong. Even a small group is still part of Jewry and if its history must be considered separately to be intelligible that fact is very important for Jewish historiography. The transformation of Jewish society in seventeenth century Italy did not affect the Jews in Russia just as the transformation of nineteenth century Jewish society in Russia did not affect the Jews in the Middle East. Emancipation starts in the Western hemisphere in 1740 when England naturalized Jews in the colonies. For the Jews of Yemen emancipation came in 1949 when they moved to Israel. To ignore the edges for the sake of unity is to disfigure Jewish history. The adjustment to modern Israel of Jews from Arab lands is part of a series of adjustments to new forms of technology and social-political organization that marks modern Jewish history.

We may expect future historians to modify the present preoccupation with European Jewish history as interest and information about Sephardic Jewry grows. The careful differentiation of Jewish communities, according to the environment will also be more in evidence, as historians can now travel and see the different forms of community life. Psychological interpretation of Jewish activity should grow since Gentile comparisons are so readily available. If Jews are the most historical of all people

then Jewish historiography should be the most philosophical of all social studies. They are and it is.

## APPENDIX

"Periodization in the History of the Jewish People  
in Recent Generations"

by

Raphael Mahler

During the dramatic period of human history in recent generations (the last hundred and fifty years) in which occurred earth shaking revolutions in the fields of economics, technology, social and political relations, and existing cultural patterns, the history of the Jewish people stands out in its unique development. On one hand, Jewish history is fully interwoven with the history of mankind to the point that it could be justly compared to a barometer, for by their conditions in any period, we can definitely determine the direction, not only of the development of mankind, but also of each state. In spite of this, there is not any people similar to the Jewish people in the uniqueness of its national history, its special economic and cultural development, and its severe struggle for biological and national existence. It is not necessary to bring rational or historical proof for this while the most tragic example of its terrible fate during World War Two is still fresh in our memories. But on the other hand, one can point to a fact that is incomparable in the history of other nations, namely, the restoration of its political independence two thousand years after it was expelled from its land. Indeed,

these two trends in Jewish history seemingly contradictory, are only two sides of the same phenomenon and this is the detachment of the Jewish people from the soil. This "detachment" is the foundation of the people's special economic function in all the lands of its dispersion and is the foundation of its special social structure and the uniqueness of its cultural condition. This same "detachment" is also the reason for its unusual political weakness which makes it dependent more than any other people on the situation of the world's nations and the direction of their development.

Because of this "detachment" the Jewish people's historical development in every period can only be explained in relation to parallel developments in each period of universal history. Every period of human progress results in improvements for the Jewish people while every reaction in the life of other nations brings double calamity and suffering on a people lacking political power. The great inequality in the social, political, cultural, and economic development of different Jewish communities is a direct by-product of the inequality in the development of mankind, especially during the period of capitalism. Just as this same unequal general development cannot obscure the main trend of world capitalism in every period, so also in periodizing modern Jewish history we must view first of all, the general trends of development of this universally dispersed people including all the visible deviations in the various Jewish communities.

The fundamental law in the development of society is progress and never has progress advanced in all areas of human life with such giant steps as in recent generations. The outstanding development in economics and the great advance of civilization and culture can be measured only by

measuring the distance between feudalism, which still enchained mankind on the eve of the French Revolution, and the Socialism that today rules more than one-third of mankind. Through unceasing class warfare, through repeated bloody revolutions, and through destructive warfare, mankind, elevated during these same turbulent generations, reached this stage.

Simultaneously with the development of capitalism, a change occurred in the economic and social foundation of the Jewish people. A nation of middlemen, a nation of usurers and peddlers in Western Europe, of tenants, tavern-owners, shopkeepers, and artisans in Eastern Europe was significantly transformed into a nation with a capitalistic economic and class structure. Commerce and industry became the basic branches of Jewish economy and in the liberal professions the Jews occupied a disproportionate position. In place of dispersal into small communities in distant villages, there was during capitalism a continually increasing concentration in the major cities, especially in Western Europe, and in the new center, the biggest of the Jewish communities in the world, in America.

The Socialist Revolution marks, first of all, a higher stage also in the economic development of the Jewish people. Shopkeepers, peddlers, tailors, shoemakers of the past penetrated in the Soviet Union into factories in all branches of industry. The Jewish population, the overwhelming majority of which was for generations middle class, was transformed completely into a laboring class, a class of factory and office workers.

Not less prominent is the development of its legal and political condition in modern times. During feudalism, the Jewish people, except for the upper classes of the very rich, were restricted in their freedom of

settlement and entrance into all economic activities. They were bent under the heavy burden of special taxes and additionally they stood outside of the political life of the land in which they dwelled. With the victory of the bourgeois regime arrived the era of Jewish emancipation, the equality of Jews with the rest of the citizens of the land before the law. As the bourgeois revolution advanced, so too Jewish emancipation spread out and included more and more states and area. In the footsteps of the bourgeois revolution which brought legal liberty to the Jewish community of America, came the French Revolution and the Napoleonic era which presented civil rights to the Jews of Western Europe. The Revolution of 1848 declared emancipation for Jews in central Europe. With the stabilization of the bourgeois legal state at the beginning of the last third of the nineteenth century, emancipation of Jews was completed in all of Europe except for the absolute regime of Tsarist Russia and for Rumania, which was subjugated to the regime of the Boyars. The Socialist Revolution of 1917, besides bringing for the first time civil equality to the largest Jewish community in Europe, also formed the first experience in history for real equality of Jews. The difference between emancipation of Jews in a Socialists regime and their emancipation in bourgeois states is as big as the difference between social equality in Socialism and the legal civil equality in a society based on a class regime.

In the same measure as the general progress, surely we can measure the cultural advance of the Jewish people in recent centuries. During the decline of feudalism, the culture of the Jewish people, more than that of other nations, was frozen in ancient tradition and sunk in religious lethargy and above all, separated by a Chinese wall from the surrounding

world. But in the period of modern capitalism the gates of general human culture and education were opened. The famished, who had suffered centuries from rightlessness and cultural isolation, jumped enthusiastically into occupations of technology, science, art and literature, and their names are among the most distinguished pioneers of general human culture. In this generation Jewish national culture started to flower in various ways: Jewish scholarship, literature, the Hebrew and Yiddish press, the plastic arts, and music. The victory of the Socialist revolution revealed new horizons also for Jewish culture. Jewish culture in Socialistic lands ceased to be a monopoly of the upper classes and became a possession of the masses. Jewish literature and science reached new heights to the same extent that the Socialist seminal idea was profound and the new viewpoint broad.

In spite of this, a powerful curse was trailing behind the Jewish people, i.e., its unique national existence, the outcome of its "detachment" from the land. This abnormality was a dark shadow accompanying the progress of the people in all areas of life, not only as an obstacle in its striving for equality with landed nations, but it restricted and damaged them in all their achievements and finally caused the very existence of an uprooted people to become mortally dangerous.

The economic development of the Jewish people in capitalism came to a dead end because of its unique means of production. Because of its alienation from the basic branches of production, especially from agriculture, the Jewish people in all capitalistic countries reflects an inverted pyramid of economic structure. Commerce, or commerce and industry, serve as a base. An unusual amount of free artisans rest upon this, and a few



farmers are on the top. Jewish industry is restricted to a few branches of consumer industry alone, principally clothing and food. In Eastern Europe, the major center of Jewish population, Jewish industry was distributed in such small units that its plant was hardly different from the workshop of artisans. Even the new center of Jewish mass immigration in America where the rapid progress of industrialization first occurred and resulted in concentrating immigrants in large factories, Jewish industry didn't break out of the narrow framework of the traditional branches and the Jewish people remained essentially a nation of "sissors and irons." Also, this process of industrialization was halted by the cessation of mass immigration. From then on, the reverse process of permanent depopulation became stronger with a flowing into commerce, liberal professions, and clerical work. This situation was worst in the new centers of immigration in the twentieth century in Central and South America, South Africa, and Australia. The working class there is almost nonexistent.

The abnormality of the social structure of the people is bound to the inverted pyramid, whose outstanding sign is the overwhelming majority of the middle class. In the Americas and in Western Europe and the middle and lower-middle class in Eastern Europe. Parallel to this is the weakness of the Jewish working class chained in the narrow and stifling limits of special branches of production. This narrow limit which chains the productive forces of the Jewish people is also the reason for the unusual poverty of the Jewish population in the lands of underdeveloped capitalism in Eastern Europe. More than this the concentration of Jews in commerce and consumer industries in all the capitalistic lands and especially in

middle and Eastern Europe causes growing sharp competition from the native middle class and lower middle class. Especially among shop-keepers and artisans who are gradually impoverished by the concentration of capital. This competition is evident not only in the field of economics through the elimination of Jewish shop-keepers and artisans and their severe impoverishment, but also serves as a social-economic foundation similar to the competition in liberal professions and trades for the anti-Jewish propaganda of every political reaction which exists in a capitalistic society. It appears in the end as an organized anti-Semitic movement.

The special economic structure of a "detached" people has left unique characteristics also on the Jews in socialist countries. With all the serious consequences of efforts by Socialist regimes to integrate the Jews in all branches of production the Jewish population itself does not reveal a tendency to exploit the new possibilities of mass return to the land and thus its proportionate share of office work and professions is higher than the rest of the population.

The abnormal life conditions of this dispersed people is an evident defect also in Jewish cultural development in recent generations. The unique national culture was preserved by the people as a precious jewel and enriched from generation to generation in every period of the long exile. The first crisis already came upon them at the beginning of capitalism. With the other nations the bourgeois revolution served to revive the national culture which was borne by the new ruling classes. Not so with the new Jewish bourgeois in Western and Central Europe. At the first taste of the new regime of civil emancipation, they didn't desist from any effort in order to buy consideration and respect from the native

bourgeois by denying the principle of their existence as Jews, nationality and by the announcement that the Jews are only a religious group. Through this the Jewish bourgeois noisily strove to uproot the traditional Jewish culture and first of all the Yiddish language from the midst of the Jewish people in order to activate and further the process of cultural and linguistic assimilation. Thus the breach was deep and bitter between the continually assimilated Jews of Western Europe and the Jews of Eastern Europe who were the backbone of the people. This same process of assimilation in areas of developed capitalism in time also sucked into its whirlpool the new large center of the Jewish people in America. The greatest masses of the Jewish people who were concentrated in the underdeveloped lands of capitalism in Eastern Europe, were guardians of the national and linguistic tradition, and the builders of a new Jewish culture. Even here the leaders of the bourgeois class did not stop from preaching assimilation in the fashion of Western Europe. But even the glorious Renaissance of the Jewish folk culture in Eastern Europe was expressed only in the field of belle-lettres in Hebrew and Yiddish. A people which is not concentrated on its lands had no possibility to include in its national culture all the creative cultural vocations. Not only is it lacking a political life of its own, but also technology, land and sea communication, physical science, medicine, modern jurisprudence, and the other humanities do not enter its domain and mostly aren't even reflected in its language. This hollow defective nature of Jewish culture under the conditions of "detachment" is very evident in the same way as is the danger of assimilation, especially in the days of the flowering of capitalism.

This abnormality appears in its sharpest form in lands that have already

entered the stage of Socialism. In spite of modern Jewish schools and cultural institutions that were established by the state itself, a phenomenon unique in history, the Jewish Socialist culture which flowered did not last. Already during the period before the disaster, assimilation had spread among the Jews of Soviet Russia with a rapidity unknown in Jewish history. With the destruction of the Jews in Eastern Europe, among them the majority of the Jews of Soviet Russia, the flowing spring Jewish cultural creativity in the dispersion of the exile was sealed. The existence of the Jewish nation as a special national group had reached a crisis point in the Diaspora. Even more than this the political development of Capitalism especially in its second stage, the stage of decay and encounter with increasingly powerful Socialism, indicates to the Jewish people clearly the bloody lesson that under conditions of exile not only its national existence but even its physical existence is in mortal danger.

In recent generations, as in all history of class society, the progress of mankind isn't a straight ascending line, but is comparable in the classic expression of Karl Marx, to a spiral. The curves of retreat in it are the outcome of the temporary success of the forces of social and political reaction in society. The rapid progress of mankind in modern times is also compounded by a incomparably severe class struggle. Just as the last 150 years of economic development was dynamic so too the frequent revolutions were dynamic, one more radical than the next, and opposed to this, the recurring counter-revolutions by which reaction tries in vain to stop the march of mankind forward with waves of blood and terror. The usual scapegoat of the reaction as a social and political

diversion is well known: it is the Jewish people. Dispersed in the world for two thousand years, because of its political weakness and its social-economic structural uniqueness, and outcome of its dispersion the Jewish people was selected as a sacrifice for any reaction. Not without reason was a book of Jewish history during the exile called The Book of Tears. However, in recent generations the time of respite from suffering grows shorter and the sufferings increase until they reach the most terrible tragedy in all history.

Even at the apex of capitalism the process of emancipation of the Jewish community was interrupted time and again by the curtailment of their rights and by anti-Semitic movements parallel to the counter-revolutionary periods. The reactionary period of Metternich against the French revolution, the counter revolution that killed the Revolution of 1848, and the political reactions of Imperialism, a stage of decline in capitalism that began with the cruel suppression of the Paris commune were also the hour of the birth and spread of modern anti-Semitism. It was also the time of the oppressive decrees and riots against the Jews in Tsarist Russia, the fortress of European reaction. The height of these pogrommes was the wave of bloody pogrommes which overwhelmed the Russian Jews during a period of cruel terror against the Revolution of 1905.

With the victory of the Socialist Revolution in Russia (1917) a new wave of reaction arose in the Capitalistic world which reached its climax in the years of Fascist and Nazi power in Europe. This was not a reaction of camp against camp in the body of the property classes, as in the days of the fight of feudalism and absolutism against the industrial bourgeois.

This was a reaction of a united middle class in the declining world of private property against Socialism that had come to power. No wonder, therefore, that the turbulent united reactionary forces, the most terrible in history, which turned against the fortress of man's social advancement, overwhelmed in bloody terror the workers and brought disaster on the Jewish people such as hasn't been written in the history of suffering until this time. The story of the suffering of the people parallels in all its steps the stages of the most decadent of reactions. The counter revolutionary experience of the White Guard in the Ukraine was stained by the blood of Jewish victims whose number was not in the hundreds, as in Tsarist times, but in the tens of thousands. The transition to Nazi rule in Germany, the mercenaries of world capitalism's preparation for war against Soviet Russia, cast the Jews of Germany and neighboring Fascist lands into an abyss of suffering and mortal danger. After the invasion of the Nazis into most European states in World War II, the most terrible hour of the tragic exile of the Jewish people arrived: the murder in various ways of the majority of European Jews. This "solution" of the "Jewish question" was arranged by the mercenaries of Fascism, the child of declining capitalism, which in its growing period, had been overflowing with slogans of "the eternal rights of man" and of Jewish emancipation and the necessity of their assimilation. And this is only the beginning of its decay.

However, the law of progress, the iron law of all human development, neither exempts nor skips any nation in the world, including the Jewish people, in spite of its terrible experiences. History commands a blessing also for the Jewish people, a blessing by the author of Psalms;

"eternal life" there "on the mountains of Zion" "brethren dwelling together in unity." Especially in recent turbulent and fateful generations, we and all the world are witnesses to this great undertaking of the Jewish people which is incomparable in the history of mankind.

This giant effort of a people to resolve the strange contradiction in its living conditions between the economic and cultural means of production which raged forward and between the rootless conditions of production. Even more contradictory is the contradiction between the strong human and national sense of self-preservation and the permanent danger to its very national and physical life. The resolution of this tremendous contradiction has only one solution: the elimination of the curse of "detachment" which is its base and therefore the marvelous effort of the people to return to its historical territory, its motherland.

Every period in recent generations is also a new stage in the deepening national consciousness of the Jewish people and a new achievement in its efforts to revive its past in the land of its fathers.

In every generation in its long exile, the yearning for Zion and the desire for redemption in its land filled the people's hearts and the ideal of the return to Zion was the light motif of its cultural creativity and the perpetual goal of all spiritual and social trends. However, in the economic, social, political and cultural situation of Feudalism, it was impossible that this historical striving be realized as a concrete national goal. All the necessary conditions to materialize it were lacking both in the world and in the people. Just as for all mankind so too for a people itself a general rule is "a society doesn't

make a goal in any period which can't be realized" Marx. Only with the development of modern capitalism occurred the changes in economics, society, politics, and world culture which paved the way for the realistic proposal of building the land of Israel by the Jewish people. Just one direct outcome of the development of means of production by capitalism, namely, transportation by railroad and steamship, played an important role in the great immigration to Israel. Following the progress of capitalism, economic and social development was aroused also among the Jews, a process of rising cultural, social and political organization of the population which was a prerequisite to the appearance of an organized movement for the national liberation, i.e., modern Zionism.

During the dawn of modern capitalism in the period of the French and American Revolutions and during the Napoleonic Wars, realistic political programs appeared concerning the revival of the Jews in their own land. In these programs the French and English statesmen-authors involved their own states interests in the Middle East. These programs were enthusiastically received by the heads of the Jewish communities in America and a few farsighted intellectuals in Western Europe where the victory of the Revolution in their lands strengthened in their hearts national pride and the desire for national liberation of their people. The programs of return to Zion appear more often in the first half of the nineteenth century both in Jewish periodicals and in Jewish articles in the general political literature in America and Western Europe. Also Jewish agencies were organized to reform the economy of the old settlement in Israel (Moses Montefiore). The period of the flourishing of liberal capitalism following 1848 aroused in the footsteps of the beginning of economic and



political expansion of the Western powers into the Middle East, a political movement into Western Europe, especially in England, for settlement of Palestine by Jews. Under the influence of the nationalist movement in Europe, national consciousness was aroused also among Jewish intellectuals in Western Europe (Moses Hess) and by the first apostles of the "lovers of Zion" movement.

All these phenomena are only the first "buds" of an awakened people, the echoes of a message for a movement of national liberation to come. In the same period of capitalistic development there still were many powerful factors delaying the progress of national consciousness of the Jewish people and undermining the realization of the historic goal to return to Zion. The unequal development of world capitalism is the basis of the phenomenon that Palestine, as part of the Ottoman Empire, which was immersed in decadent feudalism, was closed to immigration and settlement of the wastelands. Immigration was still illegal at the beginning of the twentieth century. This unequal capitalistic development is also the reason for a backward, semi-feudalistic Europe and the Jewish population in this main center of the diaspora did not quickly awaken from its Medieval religious lethargy to its national and social consciousness. On the other hand, the enlightened didn't see that the "detachment" was the root of the abnormality in the people's lives. On the contrary, they made special efforts to convince their people that the sooner they adjusted to the diaspora, the better would be their chances to improve their condition. Most of the Jewish bourgeois in Western Europe erred in the illusion that, by cutting every connection with the historic homeland of the people and denying their national character, and by assimilating into

the midst of the ruling bourgeois, they would find the definite answer to the question of existence. The *haskalah* movement of the new bourgeois and the Jewish intelligentsia in Eastern Europe didn't go so far as to preach clear assimilation, but even they appeared with a program of intellectual, social, and political adjustment to the native population and ignored any connection between the Jewish people and the land of Israel.

During the stage of Imperialism, when the Jewish middle and lower classes were pushed out of their position in the economy and when the modern anti-Semitic movement spread out, and after the oppressive laws and pogrommes against Russian Jews, the modern Zionist movement was aroused and increased its power as a national mass movement. However, the difficult economic and political conditions for an active resettlement in the land of Israel caused the major immigration to flow to the United States, a nation of flourishing capitalism and great absorbtive power. Immigration to Israel, which grew especially after the suppression of the Revolution of 1905 in Russia, established in the moterhland of the people a normal population rooted in the soil. The quantity of the population however was only a foundation for the masses to come. Immigration and settlement in this period is stamped in the character of early pioneers who were a historical necessity because of the situation in the land and also because of the social-economic development of the people in the period of the galut. A large settlement was beyond the realm of possibility as long as conditions were not made suitable by pioneering labor, transforming the desolation into an inhabitable area. And so the people detached from the land and basic productivity for several generations, were not ready, in spite of their deepening national consciousness,

and their desire for their motherland to abandon the occupations they were accustomed to and to enter new pioneering occupations, as long as they weren't forced by the pressure, an increasingly strong pressure, from the structure in the galut. The pioneers, the men of the second aliya, were drawn mostly from the pioneering stream of the Jewish working class which, in opposition to the majority party of this class, connected the liberation of the people in its homeland with its program of Socialist class warfare.

With the Socialist Revolution in 1917, which opened a new era in world history, a new period in the history of Jewish national liberation began. The previous stage in the growth of modern capitalism was characterized in Jewish history by the process of civil emancipation, which was interrupted by periods of reaction during which the achievements of emancipation were weakened or eliminated. The second stage, a result of the decay of the capitalistic world, was the period of the greatest destruction and of the severest crisis of existence in Jewish history. It was also the period of auto-emancipation of the people when "the sons returned to their land." In this generation of the progress of Socialism in the world the land of their fathers was transformed. It was revived thanks to the pioneering power of selected sons and daughters, enthused by the idea of national, socialistic liberty. It became the great refuge of the wanderers and a spiritual center for the Diaspora. The terrible experiences that the people went through during the confrontation of the old and the new order, served as stages in its growing immigration to the land and its rebuilding. The pogroms of Petlura's troops in the Ukraine strengthened

the third aliya. The national suppression in Poland strengthened the fourth aliya. The wave of Nazism and Fascism in central and Eastern Europe incited the fifth aliya, the biggest immigration until the outbreak of World War II.

The worst catastrophe in Jewish history, in which one-third of the people were destroyed, is the blood-price that they paid for the two thousand years of galut. This people, which in the midst of the nightmare of Nazi hell was able to arouse the admiration of the whole world by its heroic uprising in the Ghettos, awoke after the destruction to battle for independence in its own land. A people dwelling in Zion bought with its own blood the freedom of its land and was supported in its battle by the political and moral aid of the socialist sector of the divided world and the progressive elements in the captialistic states. On the fourteenth of May, 1948, the independence of the State of Israel was declared by the people in Israel. The echo of the words of Bialik on the Kishnev pogrom seemed a prophecy, "because God called for spring and slaughter together." The slaughter was arranged by the Fascist reaction of bankrupt capitalism. The spring was seized by the weakest of people through hard labor and arms, during the spring of Socialism in mankind's history. The powerful expectation of all generations of Jews for a free political state was realized. A new chapter started in Jewish history. A period of ingathering of the wanderers, dispersed and divided among the nations. The path to complete national restoration is still as long and hard as the splitting of the Red Sea. As hard as the struggle of oppressed and suffering mankind for the complete victory of progressive Socialism, but strong as a rock is the future of that people which builds its national renewal on the foundation of the fighting, toiling, vanguard of mankind.

FOOTNOTESChapter One

1. Alfred Stern, Philosophy of History and the Problem of Values (The Hague, 1962), p. 113
2. Salo Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews (New York, 1937), p. 187.
3. Pat Gardiner, The Nature of Historical Explanation (Oxford, 1952), p. 61.
4. R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (New York, 1956), p. 228.
5. Stern, op. cit., p. 129.
6. G. A. Gooch, History and Historians in the 19th Century (Boston, 1959) p. 462.
7. Stern, op. cit., p. 77.
8. R. G. Collingwood, op. cit., p. 10.
9. Gooch, op. cit., p. 523.
10. Baron, op. cit., p. 202.
11. G. Plebchanov, The Role of the Individual in History (New York, 1940), p. 44.
12. Ibid., p. 51.

FOOTNOTESChapter Two

1. H. Graetz, History of the Jews (Philadelphia, 1895) VI, p. 291.
2. H. Graetz, Papers of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition (London, 1887), p. 8.
3. H. Graetz, History of the Jews, VI, p. 706.
4. Ibid., p. 718.
5. Ibid., p. 715, p. 717.
6. Ibid., p. 718.
7. H. Graetz, Papers of Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition (London, 1887), p. 10.
8. S. Dubnow, Nationalism and History (New York, 1961), p. 257.
9. Ibid., p. 259.
10. Ibid., p. 260.
11. Ibid., p. 262ff
12. Ibid., pp. 264-268.
13. Ibid., p. 272.
14. Ibid., p. 322
15. Ibid., p. 337.
16. Ibid., p. 338f
17. Ibid., p. 339f.
18. Ibid., p. 343
19. Ibid., p. 349
20. Ibid., p. 345ff
21. Ibid., p. 348
22. Salo Baron, "Emphases in Jewish History," Jewish Social Studies, 1939, Vol. I, p. 25-7.

23. Ibid., p. 23
24. Ibid., p. 25
25. Ibid., p. 32
26. Ibid., p. 35
27. Ibid., p. 16f
28. Ibid., p. 19.
29. Raphael Mahler, הגדרת 'מ' ישעיהו (מרחיק, 1952) כרך א, עמ' 6-11
30. Ibid., pp. 21-30.
31. Howard Sachar, The Course of Modern Jewish History (Cleveland, 1958) p. 19.
32. In addition to the influences of other disciplines.
33. Simon Dubnow, הגדרת 'מ' ישעיהו (תל אביב, 1952) כרך א, עמ' 6-11
34. Salo Baron, Encyclopedia Judaica (Berlin, 1929), p. 647.
35. Raphael Mahler, p. 118-23, Vol 164-5, (1962) הגדרת 'מ' ישעיהו (מרחיק, 1962) כרך א, עמ' 6-11
36. Ibid., pp. 124-26
37. Ibid., p. 127
38. Baron, הגדרת 'מ' ישעיהו (תל אביב, 1940) כרך א, עמ' 6-11
39. Salo Baron, "Emphases in Jewish History," Jewish Social Studies, 1939 Vol. I, p. 28.
40. Simon Dubnow, Die Zukunft (New York, 1937) Vol XLII, pp. 765-68. I wish to thank my father for his help in translating this review.
41. Mahler, op. cit., p. 127f.
42. Salo Baron, Social and Religious History of the Jews, Vol. II, pp. 416, 17

FOOTNOTESChapter Three

1. Graetz, op. cit., pp. 292ff
2. Ibid., p. 295
3. Ibid., p. 297
4. Ibid., p. 328
5. Dubnow, op. cit., p. 502
6. Ibid., p. 503
7. Baron, op. cit., III, p. 139
8. Ibid., II, pp. 212-14
9. Mahler, op. cit., I, p. 57.
10. Ibid., II, p. 58
11. Ibid., II, pp. 63, 67
12. Ibid., II, p. 68f
13. Sachar, op. cit., p. 47
14. Ibid., p. 48
15. Graetz, op. cit., p. 481f
16. Ibid., p. 496
17. Ibid., p. 498
18. Ibid., p. 460
19. Dubnow, op. cit., p. 542
20. Ibid., pp. 544f
21. Baron, op. cit., II, pp. 237f
22. Mahler, op. cit., Vol I, p. 187
23. Ibid., p. 189



24. Ibid., p. 190
25. Ibid., p. 193
26. Ibid., p. 197
27. Sachar, op. cit., p. 60
28. Ibid., p. 63f
29. Graetz, op. cit., pp. 611-12
30. Dubnow, op. cit., p. 596
31. Ibid., p. 574
32. Ibid., p. 560 and Dubnow, History of the Jews of Russia and Poland, (Philadelphia, 1918) II, p. 129
33. Baron, op. cit., II, p. 221
34. Ibid., III, p. 144
35. Ibid., II, p. 222
36. Dubnow, op. cit., Vol II, pp. 23, 29, 60
37. Mahler, "The Social and Political Aspects of the Haskalah in Galicia," Yivo Annual of Jewish Social Sciences (New York, 1946), pp. 66, 80
38. Ibid., pp. 70, 79
39. Mahler, "The Austrian Government and the Hasidim During the Period of Reaction," Jewish Social Studies, (New York, 1939), I, p. 20.
40. Sachar, op. cit., p. 199
41. Graetz, op. cit., p. 360
42. Ibid., pp. 339f
43. Ibid., p. 528
44. Dubnow, op. cit., p. 682
45. Ibid., p. 720
46. Ibid., p. 734
47. Baron, op. cit., II, pp. 286-297

48. Ibid., pp. 303f
49. Baron, "World Horizons in Jewish History," Simon Dubnow: The Man and His Work (Paris, 1963), p. 35.
50. Mahler, "Antisemitism in Poland," Essays on Antisemitism (New York, 1946), pp. 151, 156.
51. Ibid., pp. 149, 160
52. Ibid., p. 159
53. Ibid., p. 168
54. "הגאונים של שאלת ישראל וכוונותיהם" עם שמואל וואלף  
העולם הקונסביבטיבי כעולם, תשנ"ד
55. Ibid., p. 61f
56. Ibid., p. 63
57. Sachar, op. cit., p. 225
58. Ibid., p. 247
59. Ibid., pp. 229, 236
60. Ibid., p. 367
61. Ibid., pp. 103, 222, 228, 233-5, 431
62. Ibid., p. 437
63. S. Dubnow, Nationalism and History, pp. 354-359
64. Mahler, op. cit., p. 61
65. Sachar, Ibid., p. 458

FOOTNOTESChapter Four

1. Sachar, op. cit., p. 19.
2. Ibid., p. 252.
3. Brooks, Civic Training in Switzerland (Chicago, 1930), p. 227.
4. Lowenthal, The Jews of Germany, (New York, 1936), p. 285.
5. Hazaz, "The Sermon" Israeli Stories (New York, 1961) p. 69.
6. Dubnow, Nationalism and History, p. 338.
7. In one paragraph he covers about 150 years (op. cit., II, p. 180).

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Historians Analyzed

- Salo W. Baron. "Bibliography of the Writings of Salo W. Baron" Essays on Jewish Life and Thought. New York, Columbia University, 1959.
- , "Emphases in Jewish History" Jewish Social Studies. New York, January 1939, Vol 1, No. 1, pp. 15-38.
- , "Graetz Heinrich" Encyclopedia Judaism. Vol VII, pp. 645-52, Berlin, Verlag Eschkol A.G. 1929.
- , "I.M. Jost, the Historian" Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research. New York, American Academy for Jewish Research, 1930.
- , Modern Nationalism and Religion. New York, Meridian Books, 1960.
- , "Modern Period" Great Ideas and Ages of the Jewish People. New York, Random House, 1956.
- , "New Horizons in Jewish History" Freedom and Reason. Glencoe, Ill. Free Press, 1951.
- , ה'תש"ד "היהדות והמדינה" חלק ג'  
December, 1940, Vol. III, No. III, pp. 212-15.
- , A Social and Religious History of the Jews. 3 Vols., New York, Columbia University, 1937.
- , "The Study of Jewish History" The Jewish Institute Quarterly. New York, 1928, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 7-14.
- , "World Horizons in Jewish History" Simon Dubnow: The Man and His Work. Paris, World Jewish Congress, 1963.
- Simon M. Dubnow. היסטוריה של היהדות והמדינה  
-----, History of the Jews in Russia and Poland. 3 vols. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1916-1920.
- , Nationalism and History. New York, Jewish Publication Society, 1961.
- , "Social and Religious History of the Jews" reviewed in Die Zukunft, 1937, vol. 42, pp. 765-68.

Heinrich Graetz. Die Konstruktion der Juedischen Geschichte. Berlin, Sochen Verlag, 1936.

-----, "Historic Parallels in Jewish History" Papers: Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition. London, Anglo-Jewish Historical Exhibition, 1887.

-----, History of the Jews, 6 vols. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1895.

Raphael Mahler. "Antisemitism in Poland" Essays on Antisemitism. New York Conference on Jewish Relations, 1946.

-----, "The Austrian Government and the Hasidim During the Period of Reaction (1818-1848)" Jewish Social Studies. New York, January, 1939, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 195-240.

-----, דברי ימי ישראל דורות אחרונים ד' כרכים מרחביה ספרית כוללים, 1952

-----, "הגורמים של שואת ישראל וכוונותיה הנחשיות" עם ישראל ואומות העולם פריס הקונגרס הבינלאומי הצרפתי השני

-----, "ההיסטוריה של עם-עולם" דבר חס' ג' אלו תש"ק 1960

-----, Jewish Emancipation: a Selection of Documents. New York, American Jewish Committee, 1941.

-----, "מה יוצא קפקא בשורה?" דבר אנרגיה ויציג חס' 2 סיון תשכ"ג 1963

-----, "שיטת דוקטרינאליזם בישראל בימינו" מס' 164-5 ניסן תשכ"ג 1962

-----, "The Social and Political Aspects of the Haskalah in Galicia" Yivo Annual of Jewish Social Science 1. New York, YIVO, 1946.

Howard M. Sachar. The Course of Modern Jewish History. Cleveland, World, 1958.

-----, "The Frontier in Jewish History" Judaism 1954, vol. 3., no. 3, pp.

### Background Materials

- R. C. Brooks. Civic Training in Switzerland. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1930.
- R. G. Collingwood. The Idea of History. New York, Galaxy, 1956.
- E. P. Cheyney. Law in History and Other Essays. New York, Knopf, 1927.
- William Dray. Laws and Explanation in History. London, Oxford University, 1957.
- Ismar Elbogen. A Century of Jewish Life. Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1944.
- Peter Geyl. Napoleon: Forward Against. London, Jonathan Cape, 1949.
- Patrick Gardiner. The Nature of Historical Explanation. London, Oxford University, 1952.
- , Theories of History. Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1959.
- G. P. Gooch. History and Historians in the 19th Century. Boston, Beacon Press, 1959.
- Haim Hazaz. "The Sermon" Israeli Stories. New York, Schocken Books, 1961.
- Solomon Horowitz. דברי חכמים ופוסקים 2 vols., Haifa, 1959.
- Moses Hess. Rome and Jerusalem. New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1943.
- Max Kahler. Jewish Rights at the Congress of Vienna. New York, American Jewish Committee, 1918.
- Hans Kohn. Panslavism. New York, Vintage, 1960.
- Marvin Lowenthal. The Jews of Germany. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1936.
- C. A. Macartney. An Independent Eastern Europe. London, 1962.
- George Plehkhonov. The Role of the Individual in History. New York, International Publications, 1940.
- Ellis Rivkin. The Writing of Jewish History. New York, Futuro Press, 1960.
- Alfred Stern. Philosophy of History and the Problem of Values. Hague, Mouton & Co., 1962.
- World
- C. Seymour. How the/Votes. 2 vols. Springfield, Mass., Nichols Co., 1918