

Statement by Referee of Master's Thesis

The M.H.L. dissertation entitled:

written by Rav A. Soloff
(name of student)

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

Ellis Rivkin
(signature of referee)

Ellis Rivkin
(referee)

5-23-51
(date)

Summary of
SOME ASPECTS OF THE HISTORY
of the
EARLY HIBBAT ZION MOVEMENT

Rav A. ^{Asher} Soloff

Hibbat Zion, the Jewish nationalist movement which centered about a program of Settlement of the Land of Israel, developed among many classes of Jews and in many parts of the world during the period from the 1830's to the 1880's.

Sir Moses Montefiore was the key figure in the development of Hibbat Zion in England. There, in the 1840's and 1850's, many Jews and Christians became interested in Jewish settlement of Palestine. In Germany, during the next decade, the enlightened orthodox rabbis, like Rabbi Kalischer, who had introduced the idea of Habbat Zion a generation earlier, began to receive fairly widespread support. It was not until the late 1870's that any ^{thing} more than individual interest in Habbat Zion developed in Eastern Europe. In that area Hibbat Zion attracted former Maskilim, and, especially after the pogroms, would-be emigrants. Also, from the early part of the nineteenth century on, there grew, in Palestine, a counter-part of the Hibbat Zion movement, a movement of poor Jews who favored agricultural settlement of the land.

In Europe, Hibbat Zion developed only after a period of emancipation and enlightenment had prepared the Jews to accept the generally available nineteenth century ideas, such as nationalism, upon which Hibbat Zion was based. That any group of Jews should accept these ideas, however, was determined by some strong pressure due to a shift in the the nature of their total social and economic situation.

For wealthy, emancipated Jews in England and France, the imperial interests of their countries in the Near East, determined their attitude toward Hibbat Zion, and their class practice of philanthropy determined the form of their participation.

To enlightened-Orthodox, Middle-class Jews of Central Europe, Hibbat Zion offered a modern interpretation of Judaism. With it, they

counter-attacked both Reform and Obscurantism, which contests helped shape their Hibbat Zion. In addition, Hibbat Zion appealed to those Jews who had failed to find individual emancipation, ^{because} ~~it~~ it represented a program for their national emancipation. For Middle-class Jews in Eastern Europe, a national hope and plan was, for psychological reasons, needed to replace their bankrupt individual ones. In addition, emigration became a pressing need. In time, Hibbat Zion also became a rallying point for opposition to the Shtadlanim and to the obscurantist rabbis.

In Palestine, the poor Jews needed a self-respecting and self-supporting social and economic system to replace the archaic and sometimes corrupt Halukah, so ^{they} ~~so~~ turned to a counterpart of Hibbat Zion, to fill this need.

Some Aspects of the History
of the Early Hibbat Zion Movement

by

Rav A. Soloff

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for
the Master of Hebrew Letters
Degree and Ordination.

Hebrew Union College-
Jewish Institute of Religion
Cincinnati, Ohio
January, 1951.

Referee:

Professor Rivkin

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Chapter I.		
Definition of Hibbat Zion		p. 1
Chapter II.		
Outline of the Main Hibbat Zion Developements		p. 4
Chapter III.		
Section 1.	Emancipation, Haskalah and Hibbat Zion	p. 9
	2. Nationalism, Romanticism and Hibbat Zion	p.14
	3. Imperialism and Hibbat Zion	p.17
	4. Philanthropy and Hibbat Zion	p.22
	5. Labor and Hibbat Zion	p.24
	6. Reform, Judaism and Hibbat Zion	p.26
	7. Obscurantism and Hibbat Zion	p.33
	8. Disappointment and Hibbat Zion	p. 35
	9. Emigration and Hibbat Zion	p. 40
	10. Shtadlanim and Hibbat Zion	p. 43
	11. The Palestinian Halukah and Hibbat Zion	p. 44
	12. The Halukah reaction to Hibbat Zion	p. 50
Chapter IV.		
Conclusions		p. 53
Notes		p. 59
Bibliography		p. 74

Chapter I

DEFINITION OF HIBBAT ZION

In dealing with Hibbat Zion it is necessary to notice from the outset its composite nature. The Hibbat Zion of the old Yishuv was not the same as that of the Bilu, nor was theirs the same as that of Sir Moses Montefiore. The German rabbis had a still different approach, and Moses Hess preached in a manner that was not taken up until 30 years or more after his writing "Rome and Jerusalem".

These different emphases reflect the dissimilar social and economic backgrounds out of which the Hovevei Zion developed and the different causes which brought them to Hibbat Zion. For example, the editor of "The Lebanon" did not expect to find any Hovevei Zion of the extreme Orthodox type, for all those Hovevei Zion he had met were of the enlightened Jews. Yet when he traveled through Russia he found the ~~extreme Orthodox~~ ^{extreme Orthodox} Jews predominated among the Hovevei Zion of that country. This variety of approaches to Hibbat Zion and of the social background of its supporters will be discussed at length and analyzed later in this paper.

In spite of the afore-mentioned varieties in Hibbat Zion we must proceed to a definition of those factors common to all Hovevei Zion and to none but Hovevei Zion. There was no one venture which defined the program of the Hovevei Zion. Nahum Sokolow said that it was "Not a personal enterprise or an allegiance to a general venture which might or might not succeed, but that it was and is an attitude, an unconditional outlook like being a pietist, a patriot, a socialist, a pacifist, etc. This was the first principle in the philosophy of Zion lovers".

A prime element of this attitude was a love for the Holy Land. Unlike the love which pious Jews had felt for centuries, that of the Hovevei Zion sought expression in terms of modern ideas and planned ^{an} ~~the~~ actual program of settlement, taking into consideration contemporary political and social conditions. Typical of the older attitude ^{was that of} ~~Nahman~~ ^{who} of Bratzlav, went to Palestine during the last years of the 18th century when Napoleon was about

to march there. The Zadik was interested only in the tombs of the Cabalists, and so he does not qualify as a Hovevei Zion in our sense. ³

Zitron says that the idea of settlement of the land of Israel was first expounded by a number of German Orthodox rabbis. ⁴ Slutski ⁵ credits Rabbi Hayim of Volozhin with being the first of the modern exponents of the idea.

While it is true that the disciples of Elijah of Vilna as opposed to those of Moses Mendelssohn, did found congregations in Palestine as did some of the disciples of the Baal Shem Tov, "Kalischer and Guttmacher were the last in an old and the first in a new series of developments: the one by way of his theological messianic proposition, the other through his appeal for self-help." ⁶ To rephrase this distinction we must emphasize that Rabbi Hayim was concerned with the settlement of Palestine only ^{and} entirely because of its ritual implications, that is, he was thinking in purely theological terms, whereas Rabbi Kalischer, though speaking in equally theological language, clearly demonstrates his awareness of the national implications of what he proposes. Between these two it is possible to see the distinction clearly when they speak of agricultural pursuits in the Holy Land. For Rabbi Hayim these are incidental to a settlement which he thinks of as continuing to be supported from abroad and dedicated to holy pursuits. Rabbi Kalischer, though unwilling to fight against the vested interests of the Palestinian community as it was then organized, clearly envisions a new Yishuv.

~~There are many who had approached the spirit of~~ There are many who had approached the spirit of the 19th century to the extent of favoring agricultural pursuits among the Jews in Palestine and elsewhere, but who, as opponents of the Jewish national idea, cannot be included among the Hovevei Zion. Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise was among these. In 1857 he approved the idea of a Palestine-Euphrates Railroad (as proposed to the U. S. Navy Department) which would encourage

Jewish colonization of the Holy Land but Rabbi Wise "was careful to point out that Jewish settlement in Palestine would be 'under the protection of the great powers' ". Again in 1860 and 1863 Rabbi Wise continued to urge the support of self-sustaining Jewish colonies in Palestine. In fact, after 1857 he attacked the Halukah system ^{for} supporting idle scholars. ⁸ *nevertheless* ~~the~~ Rabbi Wise was far from being a Hovevei Zion and later became a bitter opponent of Zionism. This, of course, was perfectly consistent with his anti-national view of Jewish people as expressed in his entire theology.

Believers in Jewish nationalism do not per se fall into the category of Hovevei Zion. We do not refer to the later development of diaspora nationalism, but to the work of a philosopher like Nachman Krochmal. Nachum Sokolow establishes, I believe, that Krochmal was a true forerunner of Jewish nationalism. ⁹ But as long as he ^{was} unrelated to any activity on behalf of Jewish settlement in Palestine, he ^{was} not one of the Hovevei Zion.

To define Hibbat Zion we may say that it was a ^{movement} ~~movement~~ of Jews dedicated to the settlement of Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine as a means to the solution of the Jewish Problem. ^{9a} The solution might be in terms of hastening the coming of the Messiah or of a political refuge for persecuted Jews, but it always included the recognition of nationality as a crucial factor in the Jewish Problem. It was essentially a rational self-helping attack upon the problem as opposed to the policy of waiting for God, which was still in vogue among the unenlightened Orthodox and essentially a re-definition of Judaism in modern national terms as opposed to the anti-national definition of the reformers.

Chapter II

OUTLINE OF THE MAIN HIBBAT ZION DEVELOPMENTS

zion The history of Hibbat Zion has been very ably outlined by Zitron, and it ^{is} unnecessary for us to repeat his work here. In his history, of course, Zitron concentrates on the activities reflected in the Hebrew and Russian sources most easily available to him. In this chapter we shall attempt to outline some of the areas of interest and activity which he has only mentioned and to indicate the general period during which Hibbat Zion developed in various parts of the world.

Long before the middle of the 19th century interest in Jewish settlement in Palestine and in the possibility of a Jewish State there was manifest in parts of the English speaking world and among certain Jews of Central and Western Europe. The third area in which Hibbat Zion developed at this early time was among the poor Jews of Palestine. It was only a generation later that the Jews of Eastern Europe began to evince an interest in Hibbat Zion.

The key figure in the development of Hibbat Zion in the English speaking world was Sir Moses Montefiore. As early as 1839 Sir Moses had developed a rather clear plan for the settlement and development of a new Jewish community in Palestine. He proposed to rent 100 to 200 villages for a period of 50 years from Mohammed Ali. The rental was to be paid annually direct to the prince, and the villages were to be left free from other taxation as an area in which Jews of Europe might settle instead of going to New South Wales, Canada or the like. Sir Moses was encouraged in these ideas by his observations of the Jews in Palestine who wished to become farmers and by the hope that in Palestine, Jews would be able to observe their religion ^{in a manner} not possible in Europe. Interest in the Holy Land was not limited to Jews of the English speaking world, but was shared by many clergymen of various Christian denominations and by many non-Jews ^{high} placed in government circles. During this same trip to Palestine in 1839, during which Sir Moses outlined his plan for Jewish settlement there, his party met "four Scotch

clergymen who were making a tour of the Holy Land to inquire into the state of the Jews there; they intended going through Poland for the same purpose."¹¹ On his journey in the year 1848 Sir Moses was "accompanied by Colonel Gawler, a gentleman who took a great interest in the colonization of the Holy Land, and had published several valuable papers on the subject....."¹² About the middle of the 19th century this wide-spread interest in Hibbat Zion throughout the English speaking world is evidenced by many references of which the following are typical: In 1853 Sir Moses Montefiore "received a communication from the Rev. S. M. Isaacs, a Minister of one of the Hebrew communities in New York, referring to the 'North American Relief Society', an institution founded by Mr. Sampson Simon and himself (the Rev. S. M. Isaacs) for the purpose of creating a capital, the interest of which was to be annually appropriated to the support of the poor Israelites in the Holy Land." (Sir Moses forwarded the £145 every year, until his death). —————→
←———— Isaacs also told him of Judah Touro's will, which left \$10,000 to the "American Relief Society", and \$5,000 more for the poor Israelites in Palestine,¹³ the latter in Sir Moses's control, conjointly with the executor. In 1858 the Church of the Messiah of New York sent a colony to Palestine to prepare the land for the return of the Jews.¹⁴ And it was probably Mordecai Manuel Noah to whom Moses Hess referred¹⁵ when he said, "I have heard that an American writer has discussed this.....for a number of years. Also representative Englishmen have repeatedly declared themselves in favor of the restoration of the Jewish State."¹⁵ When in 1854 Sir Moses received an appeal from Palestine, ~~from~~ Chief Rabbi N. M. Adler sent a letter to all the congregations of Britain and realized £19,887 for the starving Jews of the Holy Land.¹⁶ Disraeli's romance "The Wondrous Tale of Alroy" (1853),¹⁷ the reports on Palestine by the Christian traveler Robinson and the results of the collecting missions by Rabbi Snersohn to America and Australia all indicate wide-spread attention being

focused by certain classes of people in these parts of the world upon Palestine and the possibility of a Jewish return to their ancient homeland. With reference to the English-speaking world it will be noticed that many Christians turned their attention to Palestine. It is not surprising that these people were from church or government circles, for very often in the process of empire building, missionary interests and Messianic calculations coincided with unofficial government interests. The Jews in the English speaking world who were most interested in Palestine were generally rather well-to-do and loyal citizens of their respective countries. In the following chapter we shall analyze these facts further.

In Germany too, interest in Hibbat Zion began very early in the 19th century. Rabbi Kalischer began thinking of settlement of the Holy Land as early as 1832³⁰ and Rabbi Alkali²¹ began preparing the same method as early as 1837²¹. Under the impact of the Damascus Affair an anonymous German Jew in 1840 called for one of the great powers to set up the Jewish nation in Palestine as the Greek Slavonians and others had been helped. In 1859, when Hausdorf traveled throughout Central and Western Europe to collect money to build houses on Mt. Zion²² for the poor Jews in Jerusalem, he was supported by committees in various German cities, usually headed by the Rabbi. In 1860 Rabbi Kalischer called the first conference for what may be labeled Hibbat Zion, and in 1861 Dr. Haym Loebe²³ of Frankfort on the Oder became president of the first Hibbat Zion organization. Although the support in Germany for Hibbat Zion was largely from among the Orthodox Rabbis, it will be noted that all but a certain group of the more enlightened²⁴ ~~of these~~ dropped away once its national implications were manifest.

In France the interest in Hibbat Zion flourished early but never very extensively and seems to have lasted only a short time. In part it was supported by men like Albert Cohen, who was spiritually very close to Rabbi Adler of London and the German rabbis who became the leaders in Hibbat Zion. On the other hand, it was also supported by Adolphe Cremieux and a number of authors whose thinking was influenced by French national interests. Of this latter group we may mention Dantu, author of "The New Oriental Problem", of whom Moses Hess reports that "he urged our brethren, not on religious grounds, but from purely political and humanitarian motives, to restore their ancient State". Hess, however, points out that the government of France did not share these ideas. Joseph Salvador and Ernest Laharanne also directed their attention to the possibility of a Jewish state in Palestine. But perhaps because of the small number of the Jewish population in France or perhaps because French imperial interests in the Near East did not favor ^a Jewish State there, this country never became a center of Hibbat Zion. We will be able to treat the few outstanding developments in France along with those in Germany and in the English speaking world.

The interest in Hibbat Zion in the rest of Central Europe, in Holland, Austria, Sweden, and Italy, can also be treated as subsidiary developments to be explained along with the major trends most clearly seen in Germany and England. Mr. Lehren of Amsterdam, for example, came into contact with Sir Moses Montefiore as early as 1832 through their mutual interest in the welfare of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. In 1859 Hausdorf received support in Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Brussels, Stockholm, just as he had throughout Prussia. ²³ Turning to Eastern Europe we find that there is no ~~evidence~~ of wide-spread interest in Hibbat Zion before

the 1870's at the earliest. In 1866 Rabbi Gutmacher wrote to Rabbi Abraham of Tcheknov introducing Nathan Friedland, asking the rabbi's support for settlement of the land of Israel. ³⁰ In 1867 some Jews of a small East European community expressed their interest in settling in Palestine. ³¹ It was only in 1872 that Jehiel Michel Pines published "Yaldey Rouhi" in which he advocated that the Jews busy themselves with agriculture in the land of Israel. ³² Even this work on Hibbat Zion was too early to achieve general acceptance among the Jews in Eastern Europe. Later in the 1870's, however, Perez Smolenskin gained a wide following for Hibbat Zion. ³³ The Pogrom of 1881 gave a tremendous impetus to this development, but as late as 1883 David Gordon reported that he tried in vain to convince many wealthy German Jews of the merits of Hibbat Zion. They had no feeling for the Jewish nation, he reported, and some refused to support Hibbat Zion on the grounds that the Jews of Russia and Poland who were to be benefited by the movement showed no signs of wanting it. The Jews of Germany claim as late as 1883 that the Jews of Poland were either not interested or *on p'usha p'shna* ^{fundamentalists} and laughed at Hibbat Zion. ³⁴ Even limited support of Hibbat Zion developed very late in Eastern Europe, particularly in the 1870's, among certain Maskilim and gained general support only after the pogroms of the early 1880's.

Chapter III

SECTION 1. Emancipation, Haskalah, and Hibbat Zion	p. 9
2. Nationalism, Romanticism, and Hibbat Zion	p.14
3. Imperialism and Hibbat Zion	p.17
4. Philanthropy and Hibbat Zion	p.22
5. Labor and Hibbat Zion	p.24
6. Reform Judaism and Hibbat Zion	p.26
7. Obscurantism and Hibbat Zion	p.33
8. Disappointment and Hibbat Zion	p.35
9. Emigration and Hibbat Zion	p.40
10. Shtadlanim and Hibbat Zion	p.43
11. The Palestine ^{On} Halukah and Hibbat Zion	p.44
12. The Halukah Reaction to Hibbat Zion	p.50

..... We must now attempt to discover those conditions which made for the development of Hibbat Zion at different times in different areas. Although a few individuals like Rabbi Kalischer and Rabbi Alkali^u were thinking in terms of Hibbat Zion in Central Europe as early as the 1830's, it was not until twenty or more years later that the idea gained any general support in that part of the world. It was particularly in England and in the nations most closely tied to it that the earliest Hibbat Zion developed as something more than one man's opinion. It was precisely in these western countries that the rise of capitalism and the new power which it brought to the middle class^{had} made for the emancipation of the Jews. As usual, the new free situation in which the Jews found themselves made their old way of life inadequate, and so they turned to the process of enlightenment. They attempted to integrate themselves as modern men into the society of their economic peers. Sir Moses Montefiore, for example, joined the militia in 1809.⁹⁵ In the 1820's he and Mr. Goldsmid met with Catholics and Dissenters to discuss religious liberty and work toward civil rights for the Jews as well as others outside the Established Church. A partial list of those English Jews interested in working for civil rights includes the names of^{most of} those who had reached any economic height. ³⁶ In 1827 English took the place of Spanish in the Bevis Marks Synagogue of London,³⁷ and in spite of a certain amount of opposition from high government figures, the emancipated Jews of London continued to work for their full rights, and to polish themselves to be^{come} full English gentlemen. In England the Jews never felt a keen disappointment in the results of their emancipation and enlightenment. Even after the Damascus Affair, Sir Moses Montefiore still looked upon enlightenment as a necessary step toward the amelioration of the Jewish Problem ^{every} where in the world. In 1840 Dr. Loewe gave an address in Constantinople to the Jews of that

city urging that they pay more attention to acquiring a liberal education," and Sir Moses told the Hacham Bashi that he, Sir Moses, would gladly pay the initial expenses for getting a teacher of the Turkish language for each Jewish school.⁴⁸ The Turkish Jews responded to the idea just as their English co-religionists had a generation before, and as their Russian co-religionists would a generation later. They were happy at the idea of learning the Turkish language and expected their new knowledge to raise their dignity in the eyes of the Moslems and the Greeks among whom they lived.⁴⁹ Further, it is not surprising that English Jewry did not feel threatened or disillusioned as a result of the Damascus or other persecutions of their fellow-Jews. There in England Sir Moses was allowed supporters on his coat-of-arms by the queen because of what he had done in defense of his fellow-Jews,⁵⁰ and five years later, he was made a baronet for his character and his work on behalf of his fellow-Jews.⁵¹ Also the fight for civil rights proceeded successfully in England and at the very time when the Jews of Moldavia and of Rome were appealing to their English brothers for help, Baron Lionel Rothschild was allowed to take his oath in Commons on the Old Testament.⁵² By 1858 this Baron took his seat in Commons, and the fight for civil rights by the Jews of England may be considered as won.⁵³

In the case of England, then, we see that interest in Hibbat Zion developed after the process of emancipation had developed far enough for the Jews to undertake a program of enlightenment and to carry out this program for many years. As they never felt a keen disappointment in the results of their enlightenment, Hibbat Zion did not appeal to them as a program for greater personal fulfillment. The internal problem of Judaism among enlightened Jews of the 19th century and British imperial interests

in the Near East, both of which factors underlay the development of British Hibbat Zion will be analyzed in detail in a later section of this chapter.

After the French Revolution the Jews of that country were soon emancipated and proceeded on the road of enlightenment. The Jews of Bordeaux had already become integrated among their neighbors and even the Jews of Alsace found little difficulty in joining them in declaring their unconditional allegiance to France during the Napoleonic Synhedrion. Albert Cohen and others took pride in a manner typical of the enlightened Jews of their time in the fact that their co-religionists of the Turkish Empire joined the army rather than taking the alternative offered to all non-Mohammedans. ⁴⁴ Sermons were delivered in Paris in the French language, ⁴⁵ and the French Jews supported schools in the East for the enlightenment of their co-religionists. The schools were founded about 1845, and by 1859 boasted 1700 pupils. ⁴⁶ It is thus obvious that in France as in England, interest in Hibbat Zion was preceded by a similar process of emancipation and enlightenment.

The Jews of Germany were not emancipated as suddenly and completely as were those of France, nor had they by the middle of the 19th century reached the degree of freedom enjoyed by the Jews of England. Gradually, however, concessions had been obtained from the Prussian government, and the enlightenment of the upper class Jews in the centers of trade progressed rapidly. By the middle of the 19th century the Jewish enlightenment in Germany had produced a second level of scholarship. They had moved beyond the Mendelssohn School and were delighting in the fruits of the Wissensthaf. Rabbi Silbermann, editor of ^{He-Maggid} ~~"the Jew"~~, expresses his great faith in enlightenment. He considers anti-Jewish writers as benighted and wonders when they will recognize that the sun had risen. ⁴⁷

Though his paper recognizes that anti-Jewish feeling does exist in
 Germany and elsewhere throughout the world, the faith of its editors in
 the enlightenment cannot be shaken. The editors scorn superstition
 and feel confident that the spirit of the times points toward peace and
 greater brotherly love. Even the Mortara case was greeted as an instance
 which would prove the power of the enlightened world against so formid-
 able an opponent as the Pope. ⁴⁹⁷ In reading this material one wonders how
 long such a faith ^{could} persist when faced with disappointment in one after
 another of its hopes. During this period of fervent faith and enlight-
 enment, the reports on Palestine printed in ~~the Times~~ ^{the Morning Post} indicate only a
 detached scientific interest in the archeology of the land or in travel-
 ogues similar to those they published on China or Persia. ⁵⁰ Even in report-
 ing the activities of Sir Moses Montefiore, ~~the Morning Post~~ ^{the Morning Post} of 1857 maintains
 an enlightened interest in Sir Moses' relations with the prince of Egypt,
 without showing any Hibbat Zion interest in Sir Moses' work for the Jews
 of Palestine. ⁵¹ Among the Jews of Germany we have seen, as in the case of
 those in France and England, that emancipation and an enlightenment move-
 ment were the fore-runners of Hibbat Zion. The difference in time between
 the enlightenment of the Jews of England and France, and those of Germany,
 may in part explain why there was a relatively wide-spread acceptance
 of Hibbat Zion ideas in the western countries before this development
 took place in Central Europe.

The emancipation and enlightenment of the Jews of Russia and Poland
 may have begun even during the 18th century. Elijah of Vilna contributed
 to the process of enlightenment, and in the Yeshivah founded by his dis-
 ciple, Rabbi Hayyim of Volozhin, his spirit was carried on. "The Yeshivah
 of Volozhin raised a whole generation of scholars and rabbis 'in the spirit
 of the Gaon'. In these circles one could even detect a certain amount

of toleration towards the anathematized 'secular sciences'....."

This spirit, however, was not wide-spread, and the fate of Rabbi Menasseh, a disciple of the Gaon who wished to adjust Judaism to modern conditions illustrates the lack of tolerance toward enlightenment displayed by the Jews in Eastern Europe during the early 19th century.⁵³ The last years of Alexander I and the reign of Nicholas I during which the attitude of the Russian government was extremely severe against the Jews or at best "educational" served to destroy whatever seed of enlightenment had reached

Poland under Napoleon's Duchy of Warsaw. Typical of the trials imposed upon the Jews of Russia during this period was the Deportation Ukase of which Sir Moses Montefiore was informed in 1842.⁵⁴ Even during this time there were, it is true, a small number of enlightened Jews in Russia.⁵⁵

These were the people who along with Dr. Lilienthal urged Sir Moses to come to Russia to speak to Count Oubaroff and the emperor.⁵⁶ But when Sir Moses did reach Russia in 1846, his arguments with Count Oubaroff concerning the possibility of enlightening the Jews, and Count Kisseleff's report to Sir Moses that the Russian Jews ~~were~~^{were} fanatic, that five to six ^{hundred} thousand of them were welcome to leave at any time, and that Sir Moses could take 10,000 or more of them to Palestine or any place else if he so desired, all reflect the true situation of the Jews in Russia.⁵⁷ In the late 1850's

there were signs of increasing activity among the enlightened Jews of Russia. Permission was granted to ~~the Jews~~^{Ha-Maggid} to be sent to the Jews of Russia and Poland, and it was greeted in certain circles in Minsk and Odessa and elsewhere as a welcome instrument for the advancement of enlightenment among the Jews of those areas.⁵⁸ Czar Alexander II was hailed as a liberator by the swelling ranks of the enlightened Jews. In 1860 permission was granted for the establishment of several newspapers in Hebrew

and Russian which would carry on the process of enlightenment among the Jews.⁵⁹ The change was not instantaneous, however, and the vast majority of Jews in Eastern Europe continued to worry about the coming end of the world or that someone had deliberately made their oil unkosher, and they continued to look upon study of the Talmud as the most reasonable means for perfecting the world.⁶⁰ We may note, then, that any wide-spread enlightenment among the Jews in Eastern Europe began only in the 1860's and operated for close to 20 years before Hibbat Zion found any response in this part of the world.

.....SECTION 2

In this section we shall attempt to consider the impact of 19th century ideas such as nationalism, romanticism and so on, as they helped shape the Hibbat Zion philosophy. We shall be especially concerned with the problem of why certain Jews at certain times and places were influenced by these ideas that were in a sense available throughout Europe to all 19th century Jews. In each case, we shall try to understand the development in terms of the total social and economic forces operating upon the Jews. Further, we will notice that not only did the impact of the total situation upon the Jews determine that Hibbat Zion should develop at a given time in a given area, but that it also determines what kind of Hibbat Zion should develop. Thus, we will find that Hibbat Zion in Palestine was related to the immediate economic problems of the lower class Jews for whom Halukah was not a satisfactory system and who, therefore, were impelled toward agriculture, while philosophy^{with} was a dominant consideration in the minds of English Hovevei Zion and nationalism was very important to the German rabbis, etc.

Nationalism of several kinds swept Europe during the 19th century. In Germany it served as a philosophical base for both revolutionary and

reactionary political theories. In England the idea of a Chosen People helped rationalize the empire. In Russia Pan-Slavism served the interests of the Czar. Some Jewish historians might be satisfied to say that the Zeitgeist^e of nationalism operated on the Jewish people as on all others in Europe. However, it did not operate identically upon all the peoples of Europe nor did it operate at the same time in each country, and so to understand Jewish nationalism we would have to go deeper and analyze the specific causes of its various manifestations. ^f Jewish science in Germany follows closely upon the model of the German historical studies, and the Jewish historians in contact with the culture of their period were subject to the same philosophical influences as their non-Jewish contemporaries. Krochmal was a Hegelian and spoke of the Jewish nation as capable of constant renewal. "In other words, Jewish nationality does not rest upon physical but upon spiritual grounds and is therefore stronger than mere nationality." Thus, Krochmal speaks in a manner typically Hegelian. ⁶¹

Zacharias Frankel has been called an outspoken nationalist. ⁶² The great Jewish historian Graetz wrote in a manner typical of 19th century German historiography. Thus when the editor of ~~"the Magid"~~ ^{He g} proposed to tell of great Jews whose histories were previously unknown, he ~~must~~ ^{must} by reviewing some of the results of the Wissenschaft, necessarily convey to his readers a history of the Jewish People written from a national point of view. ⁶³

Moses Hess exemplifies the influence of the German philosophical schools upon a Jewish writer. He was originally a Spinozist and somewhat under the influence of Hegel. ⁶⁴ He spoke of the rationalists as spiritual dwarfs and considered history meaningful only as the history of nations. ⁶⁵ Nationalism was, he said, as necessary to the organic development of history as differences between individuals and species are necessary to ~~the~~

development in the organic world.⁶⁶ With keen insight Hess suggested one of the reasons why the spirit of German nationalism did not automatically induce nationalism among all classes of German Jews. "But while the unprejudiced stranger considers the problem of Jewish nationalism a kindly one, it appears to cultured German Jews unreasonable. For it is in Germany that the difference between the Jewish and German races is emphasized and used both by the reactionaries as well as by the liberal anti-Semites as a cloak for the Judeo-Phobia. It is there that the existence of Jewish nationality is still ~~employed~~ as an argument against the granting of practical and civil rights to the Jews."⁶⁷

George Eliot thinks of Hibbat Zion in terms of Palestine, the soil, and Israel's role in world destiny. She speaks of the special function of each nationality very much as British imperialists must have thought of England as having a special role.⁶⁸

Dr. Zeitlin analyzes Smolenskin's Jewish nationalism as a spiritual nationalism very much like Pan-Slavism. Like the Slavophiles his nationalism wished to have no foreign culture added to it. Further, Smolenskin realized that anti-Semitism in Russia was based not on national grounds alone, but largely upon questions of religion and economics. And so he felt that Jewish anti-nationalism would be to no avail.⁶⁹

19th century romanticism also had its influence upon Hibbat Zion. ~~Magid~~^{Na} Magid constantly reflects this spirit as it recalls the ancient glory of Persia or other areas that had long since degenerated.⁷⁰ The romantic appeal of Jewish nationalism manifest in George Eliot's "Daniel Deronda" was noted by a reviewer: "This age of unfaith gives no outlet for his deep spiritual yearnings (nor for those like him).....yet ^{there} comes.... a burning Zion message. Is it strange that Deronda should not have refused the heritage of his race?"⁷¹

.....SECTION 3
The idea of Jewish nationalism ^{is} not out of place in the 19th century and ^{could} be expected to have ^{had} at least a romantic appeal for some individuals. We shall now try to discover what conditions in various parts of the Jewish world led to more than individual interest in these ideas. Imperial interests in the Near East directed the attention of many Englishmen close to government circles toward the possibility of a Jewish State in Palestine. In 1839 and 1840 conditions in that part of the world were almost anarchic. The Turkish Empire was extremely weak, and Syria was between Turkey and Egypt, which though normally subject to the Sultan, was attempting to gain greater freedom and power. To western Europe the threat of Russia appeared constant in the Near East, and whereas the British seemed to want to hold the Turkish Empire together, the French supported Egypt and were willing to have the empire crumble. ⁷² When Sir Moses spoke to various British government officials concerning the Holy Land, they revealed their interest in a bank for Constantinople, for railroads in Syria. ⁷³ It was ^{not} pure altruism but certainly British imperial interests that led Lord Palmerston and Lord Aberdeen to tell Sir Moses that he could inform Jews of the Holy Land to take their grievances to the English Consul for redress before the Porte. ⁷⁴ Though his conversation with Lord Posonby concerning the East reminded Sir Moses to send a printing press to Israel Drucker, this was probably not Lord Posonby's purpose in mentioning the need for industry in that part of the world. ⁷⁵ It was to be expected that Sir Moses would find a sympathetic listener in Lord Palmerston when he suggested that he would like to build a hospital in the Holy Land and encourage agriculture there, especially if there were Turkish troops with English officers to insure the peace of the country. Lord Palmerston blamed superstition for the fact that no Englishmen were allowed to buy land in

Palestine, but assured Sir Moses that long leases were available.⁷⁶ Similarly, Sir Moses found willing listeners in the governor of Malta, Sir Lawrence Oliphant, and many many others.⁷⁷ The limited imperial interests of Egypt must also be taken into account as determining in part the fate of projects for the betterment of the state of the Jews in Palestine. The Egyptians were trapped under the Turks supported by England and were not happy, but had to be polite to anyone introduced by the British Consul. Thus, Sir Moses always received a friendly greeting in that country. In 1839 Sir Moses spoke to the Pasha about buying land in Palestine. The Pasha said he had no land of his own in that country, but would approve any arrangements Sir Moses might make with the local Arabs. The Pasha also expressed his approval of any plans for more efficient farming in the Holy Land and said that the walls of Tiberias might be repaired. "I then spoke of establishing joint stock banks with a capital of a million pounds sterling with power to increase it, if necessary. His eyes sparkled at this; he appeared delighted, and assured ... protection."⁷⁸ Minor imperial interests could usually be measured in dollars and cents. Later Sir Moses asked one of the Pasha's lieutenants for a copy of the promises in writing, and he was told to make his request in writing. He did so, and again interviewed the Pasha's spokesman who did not care to express himself on any other subject than that of the proposed bank. Still later there were more promises but again nothing in writing, with the excuse, "Yesterday was your Sabbath. Today is ours." Months later Sir Moses had received no answer to his letters, and he never did.⁷⁹ On a still more local level Sir Moses was faced with the imperial instincts of a Moslem landowner. Sir Moses wanted to buy some land at Hebron for dispensaries

that would serve all the poor of the area, Jews and non-Jews, but overnight the price rose from £50 to £500, and so he did not hear of it. ⁸⁰

⁸¹ The possibility of a Jaffa to Jerusalem railroad was discussed in England for many years. Sir Moses did not believe that the railroad would get 50 more Jews to return to the Holy Land but hoped that it might improve their situation. Sir Culling Eardley, great-grandson of Gideon Sampson, an 18th century Jewish industrialist who had converted ^{to Christianity} had introduced the plan to Sir Moses in terms of its possibly encouraging Jewish settlement in Palestine. Lord Palmerston approved the idea, because it would allow troops to be moved more efficiently and would increase commerce for both Turkey and England. ⁸² The entire Damascus Affair which was recorded so completely in Sir Moses' diaries again reveals the influence of England with the Turkish Empire, and the way in which British interests sometimes coincided with Jewish interests in the Holy Land.

Benjamin Disraeli was interested in the East, in the Asiatic problem and in the Jews' role at home and elsewhere. "His ideas emerged from a coherent system of imperialist theories which, while provoking disagreement, revealed originality and vigorous thought. It is well known that the history of the second administration was the history of the Eastern Question. His antagonists maintain that his statesmanship seemed the product of his imagination rather than of his party's traditions, and that he introduced the dreams of his eastern heroes into the practical politics of the West; that he, therefore, took hold of the Suez, had taken Cyprus, prevented Czarist Russia from conquering Constantinople, made Queen Victoria empress of India, etc., as hinted long before in his novels." ⁸³ We might feel that the dreams of Disraeli's eastern heroes were the effects rather than the causes of his ^{practical} ~~political~~ political program. Sokolow reported ^d that rumor in

political circles had it that Disraeli sounded out the Sultan on the possibility of autonomy for the Jews in Palestine. This was unproven to say the least but Sokolow claimed ^{that there must have been} some psychological ~~frustration~~ to it or it would not have been believed. ⁸⁴

In such a world the idea of a national home for the Jews was not ridiculous. Even an unfriendly reviewer of George Eliot's "Daniel Deronda" reveals this attitude: "If the Jews to whom Deronda undertakes to restore a national home of their own, really wished such a home, they are abundantly able to do for themselves what no Deronda can do for them, and the fact that they themselves stand in the way sufficiently proves that they do not deem the end desirable." ⁸⁵ Thus, it is abundantly reasonable that Sir Moses should find support from many English Jews and non-Jews when he proposed that the Pasha "permit land and villages to be rented on a lease of 50 years free from all taxes or claims of governors, the rent to be paid at Alexandria; that he will allow me to send people to assist and instruct the Jews in a better mode of cultivating land, the olive, the vine, cotton, and mulberries, as well as the breeding of sheep; finally that he will give me a firman to open banks in Beyrout, Jaffe, Jerusalem and Cairo. I sincerely pray," Sir Moses continued, "that my journey to the Holy Land may prove beneficial to the Jews; not only to those already there, but to many others who may come to settle holy cities either from love for the Land of Promise or from a desire to quit countries where persecution prevents their living in peace." ⁸⁶ Sir Moses thought that the Jews in Palestine would wish to live as loyal Turkish subjects, but did not believe that a single Jew in England would wish to return to the Holy Land at that time. ⁸⁷

French imperialist interests in the Near East were the reverse of those in England. A minority, as mentioned before, supported a policy

favorable to the Jews, but officially the French government was not so inclined. In 1840 this became very clear when the French Consul at Damascus was one of the chief antagonists of the Jews. In such a situation, even such an outstanding ^{French Jew} ~~as~~ as Adolphe Cremieux was ^{as were some English Jews} not ^{so} ardently dedicated to the cause of the Jews in the Holy Land. Cremieux proposed that Sir Moses build a hospital for the Jews of Cairo, and he would build a school with 1,000 ducats given by the Baroness de Rothschild of Paris. Sir Moses said, "Were it for the Holy Land I should be delighted to establish both hospital and school." In 1847 the Rothschilds of Paris introduced Sir Moses to the Queen of France, so that the latter might finally assure him that the French agents in Syria would stop attacking the Jews with charges of ritual murder. Cremieux himself was absent from the interview to avoid embarrassment. The Pope tied to the kingdom of France and guided by Church interests would not be convinced of the innocence of the accused Jews in Damascus. In Austria and Prussia, fear of Russia brought government interests closer to those of England than to those of France, and so we ^{are not surprised that} the Austrian Consul ^{at} Jerusalem ^{was} interested in a road to Jaffa, ^{nor by} the friendship toward the Jews ^{demonstrated} by the consuls of these governments during the Damascus Affair.

When the imperial interests that had led many British Jews and non-Jews to their interest in the Holy Land dropped away, support of Hibbat Zion almost vanished. In 1875 Sir Moses hoped that "Notwithstanding the present disinclination of the testimonial committee to encourage agriculture, the time might yet arrive when they would gladly avail themselves of a favorable opportunity to promote ^{his} long cherished scheme." In 1882 Sir Lawrence Oliphant recognized that Jews were not being allowed a foothold in Palestine at the moment, because of the problem of British imperial interests as opposed to those of Turkey on the question of Egypt. He felt, however,

that it was very important for the Jews to keep up their Hibbat Zion.⁹³ In 1883 Dr. Loewe reported that all the Jewish leaders besides Montefiore were interested in other things than Settlement of the Holy Land. There were some Christians still interested, the Rabbi H. Adler and Montefiore's nephews. These few Hovevei Zion had met in London, but their meeting was not reported in the Jewish Press of the city, because of anti-Hibbat Zion feeling.⁹⁴ Even those who had formerly contributed to the Montefiore testi-

monial had now lost interest.⁹⁵ David Gordon suggested that because the leading Jews of England had Christians on the testimonial committee, they hesitated to do anything expressly Jewish.⁹⁶ A little later, however, Gordon recognizes more clearly the real problem when he indicates that imperial interests determining British interest in the Jewish settlement of Palestine and reported that the Turks fear^{ed} "another Bulgaria".⁹⁷ Interest in emigration of Jews from Russia among the leading Jews in London was directed neither to Palestine nor to the United States, but to Canada and probably to other parts of the British Empire as well.⁹⁸ Sokolow felt that the spirit of the Alliance in its early stage was nationalist and that the establishment of Mikveh Israel was no accident.⁹⁹ This may have been true.

at the moment of the founding of the Alliance, which coincided with the interest Moses Hess reported among certain French circles in Jewish settlement in Palestine. By 1864, however, David Gordon found no trace in Paris of those who supported Hausdorff in 1857 except for the Rothschilds.¹⁰⁰ And though in 1862 Hess thought France would favor Jewish colonization^{of Palestine}, in the 1880's, Rashi Fine reported a change of attitude in the Alliance, so that they have become negative, through Mikveh Israel, toward all new colonies.¹⁰¹

.....SECTION 4
While the imperial interests of several western European powers in the Near East during the nineteenth century determined that Hibbat Zion should or should not gain popularity among the upper classes, and especially

among the upper class Jews in those countries, yet it was another aspect of their total social and economic situation which determined the form ~~of~~ ^{their} support Hibbat Zion should take. The growing of city populations in England, for example, were composed largely of industrial workers who were periodically unemployed, and who, even in times of relative prosperity, could barely support their immediate families. The sick, the old, the orphans, and even the workers' ^{own families} were in constant need of food, clothing, fuel, etc. The potential social unrest generated by this situation was partially ameliorated through charity. It became the fashion among the wealthy to display their wealth, solve their consciences, and alleviate some potentially explosive human misery through the practice of philanthropy. In the early 19th century Hibbat Zion, for these wealthy people, was essentially another type of philanthropy.

Sir Moses Montefiore records that giving to all charities was the accepted thing for his entire circle, those who became Hovevei Zion and those who did not. ¹⁰² When he and Lady Montefiore ~~have~~ survived a shipwreck, Sir Moses gave ~~£~~ 50 to the poor of each, the German and the Portuguese Jewish congregations in London, and ~~£~~ 500 for the poor Jews of Jerusalem. ¹⁰³ Sir Moses sent Dr. Frankel to attend the poor of Jerusalem at his (Sir Moses') expense, ¹⁰⁴ and a few years later the philanthropist recorded helping the poor of London in the same entry in his diaries, and in the same sort of language as he recorded sending supplies to Dr. Frankel's dispensary in Jerusalem. ¹⁰⁵

Hibbat Zion, because of British imperial interests, and especially upon a philanthropic plane, appealed to many English Christians. Perhaps romanticism also colored the thinking of some descendants of English Jews who had converted, for many anonymous gifts were received from these quarters. ¹⁰⁶ Again, Christians may merely have felt obligated to reciprocate after the constant gifts of the Jewish philanthropists to Christian charities. ¹⁰⁷ Sir Culling Eardly seems to reflect all of these influences. ¹⁰⁸

For the Exhibition of 1851, Dr. Loewe reported concerning Montefiore, "In his zeal for the promotion of the welfare of the Holy City, and with the object of drawing the attention of the public to the superior talents of his co-religionists in Palestine, Sir Moses exhibited two beautiful vases executed by Mordechai Schnitzer of Jerusalem¹⁰⁹" The Hibbat Zion activities of the Rothschilds were all along philanthropic lines.¹¹⁰ Even the building of low-cost housing for the poor of Jerusalem was not a Hibbat Zion project unrelated to the general practices of philanthropy¹¹¹ at that time. The wealthy of Berlin also built houses to aid the poor who could not afford high rents, as had been done in England and Costa Rica.¹¹² Thus, we see Sir Moses' interest in Jerusalem and that of his fellow Hovevei Zion in England and western Europe, expressed in a manner entirely typical of their time, place and position in society.

Hibbat Zion

Because of the fact that their activities were essentially of a philanthropic nature, the early Hovevei Zion in western Europe were subject to problems of competition and "honor". In the case of Montefiore, who had to give up a longstanding ambition to build a hospital in Jerusalem because he found that the Rothschilds had already begun to work on the project, Hibbat Zion did not lose, for Sir Moses devoted his energies elsewhere in Palestine.¹¹² In the case of Baron de Hirsch and Baron Edmund de Rothschild of Paris, however, may we suspect that one of the contributing factors to de Hirsch's founding I C A was Rothschild's role in P I C A? In 1883 de Hirsch was still considered by David Gordon much as Rothschild was. It was only later that the difference in ideas between these men became obvious.¹¹³

.....SECTION 5
 "Another aspect of early Hibbat Zion merits our attention. One of the distinguishing features of the movement in all stages was its emphasis on

establishing a Yishuv that would not depend on charity, one that would build up the land as well as study. ^{Torah} The ideas of land and nationality were ^{inter-} closely related in 19th century thinking. Though he wrote in the twentieth century, A. D. Gordon expressed an attitude basic to Hibbat Zion from the very beginning.

The glorification of labor, widely expressed in the nineteenth century ¹¹⁴ had a special appeal to enlightened Jews as a program for their less fortunate brethren. It was not only the desire to become farmers, ¹¹⁵ expressed by the poor Jews in the Holy Land as early as the 1830's, which led Sir Moses Montefiore to his interest in promoting labor among his co-religionists, for he was interested in agriculture for the Jews of Russia and Poland as well. ¹¹⁶ His special interest in Palestine, however, led him to devote much energy to the Hibbat Zion goal of promoting the development of a laboring, self-sustaining Yishuv. ¹¹⁷ Similarly the enlightened editors of ^{Ha-Naggid} ~~the Naggid~~ (1857), before they were particularly concerned with the problems of Palestine, reported hopefully on some Jews in Russia who were given land. Recognizing the objective difficulties and the fact that it would involve a very hard adjustment, the ⁹ Magid felt that Jews had been, could be, and should again become good farmers. ¹¹⁸ Jacob Riefman, a Maskil, in his "Maamar Teudat Yisroel" (1868) advocated a return of Jews to the soil, though not, ¹¹⁹ yet, a return to the soil of Palestine, along with his championing of Jewish nationality and national creativity. ¹²⁰ On his seventh voyage to Palestine (1875) Sir Moses Montefiore reported, "It was in the ancient Hebrew community of Venice that a subject closely connected with the interests of the Holy Land was first broached to me. Signora F. C. S. Randegger-Friedenberg, the authoress of a work entitled 'Strenna Israelitica', had an idea of establishing a female agricultural

school in the Holy Land at an annual outlay of thirty thousand Austrian
florins....." Thus we have seen an attitude favoring industry and es-
pecially farming for the Jews advocated in enlightened circles in England,
Germany, Poland and Italy. Among the Hovevei Zion this attitude was ap-
plied especially to industry and farming in Palestine.

.....SECTION 6

Turning now to what may be the most crucial element in Hibbat Zion,
we shall try to understand why a nationalist interpretation of the nature
of the Jews was needed, and by whom. We have seen that nationalistic ideas
were current in the nineteenth century, and that they appealed to different
groups of Jews at different times and places. Jewish nationalism was im-
portant to wealthy west European Jews, as to many non-Jewish Englishmen,
as it was related to Palestine, and the interests of various powers in
the fate of the Near East. To the German rabbis who became Hovevei Zion
this was a minor consideration. These latter, as enlightened Orthodox
Jews of the nineteenth century, found in Jewish nationalism the solution
to an acute inner problem of Jewish life. To most of the former group
with the probable exceptions of the rabbis of London, Sir Moses Montefiore,
Albert Cohen and the Rothschilds of Paris, the inner problem of Judaism
was secondary, so their interest in Hibbat Zion did not outlast their gov-
ernments' policies favorable to a Jewish state in Palestine.

The internal Jewish problem of the enlightened Orthodox of the early
nineteenth century was this: Judaism had to be redefined in modern terms.
After the emancipation, Judaism could no longer command the ~~undivided~~ loyalty of
enlightened Jews as the sole determiner of all political, social and religious
moves, as had been possible in the medieval ghetto. The Reform movement
tried to redefine Judaism as a religion only in the way various Protestant
demoninations were "religions". For those who felt completely emancipated
socially and politically, this seemed reasonable. On the other hand, the

the unenlightened Orthodox did not feel the pressure of modern ideas keenly enough to force them to change their medieval ways of thinking, and so they merely retreated into a darker obscurantism to avoid and resist that pressure. The enlightened Orthodox were unable or unwilling to escape the implications of modern ideas at the price of obscurantism, and were unable to accept the Reform redefinition which meant giving up in large measure their ancestral ways and group identity in return for almost nothing. The modern Orthodox rabbis were almost a vested interest group, but a considerable section of the Jewish middle class in central and later in eastern Europe felt the same way. They had gained too little wealth too late to win acceptance in the top circles of their countries, and the treatment of the Jews in Syria, Morocco, Poland and even Germany did not make them share the confidence of the Reform Jews that they could exchange their ancient Jewish solidarity for something more valuable. Faced with the need for a modern interpretation of their Judaism, one that would not sacrifice the ancient hopes and consolations; challenged from the one side by Reform, and from the other by reactionary Orthodoxy; and living in nineteenth century Europe, many Jews turned to the idea of a natural national restoration.

We have considered the influence of the Wissenschaft as a channel whereby the national interpretation of history was made available to all enlightened Jews of that time. Generally, the Jews who took up the national idea and became Hovevei Zion were those described by Moses Hess: "Many who have emancipated themselves from dry orthodoxy have recently manifested in their studies a deepening conception of national Judaism; and have thus brought about the banishment of that superficial rationalism which was the cause of a growing indifference to things Jewish and which finally

led to a total severance from Judaism. But we find, on the other hand, among the nationalistic ranks, rabbis, such as I used to meet in my younger days, who do not fall behind the Reformers in science and knowledge." ^{122a}

The entire circle of writers about ^{Hx-9} ~~the~~ Magid falls into the first group mentioned by Hess. Even S. D. Luzzatto "appears to have desired to reach the ears of the Rothschilds when in 1857 he wrote to M. Albert Cohen, the secretary of the Paris member of the family, 'Palestine must be peopled by Jews, and its land tilled by the sons of Israel, in order that the land of our fathers take on again as in days of yore -- beauty and glory!'" ^{122b}

The rabbis too were very much the sort Hess described. The spiritual descendants of Elijah of Vilna were often found among the Hovevei Zion, from its earliest days. ^{122c} Rabbi Eliasberg, though Orthodox, did not even use the excuse of ^{הנהגת חסידות} in his arguments for settling the Land of Israel, as Rabbi Kalischer and Guttmacher ^{122d} did. Rather, he was the sort who quoted Steinschneider. ^{122e} Rabbi Kalischer wrote articles on science and philosophy as well as Talmud. ^{122f} Rabbi S. L. Rapoport of Prague spoke to the Montefiores several times while they were in that city on the subject of the Holy Land. ^{122g} And Rabbi Alkali^a, in "Goral Ladonoy" (1857) shows himself to be an courant on world affairs: "After an able homiletical discussion of the Messianic problem, in which he shows considerable knowledge of the older writers, Alkali^a suggests the formation of a joint-stock company, such as a steamship or railroad trust, whose endeavor it should be to induce the Sultan to cede Palestine to the Jews as a tributary country, on a plan similar to that on which the Danube principalities were governed." ^{122h}

For the rabbis, the problem was often stated in terms of the coming of the ¹²³ Messiah. Rabbi Kalischer opened the entire problem with his discussion of the possibility of bringing the restoration of Israel through

natural means without waiting for the messiah. By 1872 Rabbi H. Z. Sneersohn summed up the problem thus:

"Among the Hebrews there are three different opinions concerning these questions. Some say: It is absurd to think of a coming Restoration....But this is generally the opinion of those who live in countries where no difference is made between the believers in one creed and another. They do not think of the manifold oppression and vexations which Jews have to suffer in other countries....Besides, this opinion is in opposition to the Holy Writ as well as to common sense...."¹²⁴

"There are many other Jews, especially those without any profound knowledge, who believe in a restoration of the former glory....But they think that this change is to spring forth suddenly; not in a natural way, but through signs and wonders, in a miraculous manner....¹²⁵ [which is possible, but hard to believe]"

"But there is another view which agrees both with the word of God and with the human understanding -- and this seems to me to be the true and right one: Many of the wise men of the Jews say that the future salvation is a two-fold salvation; one the amelioration of their material welfare only, the other the spiritual and intellectual of which all the inhabitants of the earth will partake in various means and ways according to these men, the political restoration of Israel will only depend on the efforts of the Israelites and on the kings and rulers who are guided by truth and justice. And such is the will of God, with the advent of the Messiah.

"And the salvation which is to come to all nations will be fulfilled in a wonderful way."¹²⁶

A decade before Rabbi Sneersohn, Moses Hess analyzed the impact of modern ideas on Judaism in slightly different terms, but reached the same three-part division of Jewish opinion on the nature of Judaism. "In Jewry, as well as in the world, there are to be discovered at present two main tendencies which, though diametrically opposed to each other, still originate from the same source, namely, the need of objective religious norms and the inability to create them." The one tendency was to turn back, as in the case of the supernaturalism of Rabbi Hirsch of Frankfort on the Main, and the other, an "antidote", was negative reform, with its "extreme individualism and incoherence."¹²⁷

Hess's own opinions:

"do not agree with the conceptions of either extreme faction, but belong to a different order of ideas. I believe that not only does the national essence of Judaism not exclude civilization and humanitarianism, but that the latter really follow from it, as necessarily as the result follows from the cause. If, in spite of this, I emphasize the national side of Judaism, which is the root, rather than the humanitarian aspect, which is the bloom and flower, it is because in our time people are prone to decorate themselves with the flowers of culture rather than cultivate them again in the soil on which they grew. It is out of Judaism that our humanitarian view of life sprang."¹²⁸

Their opposition to the Reform movement was one of the motivating factors in the turn of many enlightened Orthodox Jews to Hibbat Zion, and the form of their Hibbat Zion was partially determined by this opposition.

Dr. Zeitlin states the Reform alternative to the medieval all-inclusive definition very concisely, "On the other hand the Reformists

maintained that the Jews were only a religious community and not a nation." Waxman cites the Reform Synod of Frankfort, 1845, as an occasion on which the opposition of German progressive Jews to the idea of Jewish nationality was reaffirmed and might have drawn the attention

of Moses Hess. Jewish nationalism, therefore, served as a whip against Reform. As early as 1819 Rabbi Akiba Eger and his son-in-law Rabbi

Moses Sofer attacked Reform for omitting Hebrew on the grounds that it is the national as well as the holy language of the Jews. Dr.

Sachs of Berlin in "The Religious Poetry of the Spanish Jews", referring to Judah Halevi, offers a lesson to the Reformers, "The one who cannot theoretically conceive the solution of the problem, how a dispersed

people may possess a nationality and a homeless nation a fatherland, will find in the personality of this great singer and, in his poetry,

a practical solution to that problem." A few years later Dr. Michael

Sachs of Berlin was a supporter of Rabbi Kalischer. Moses Hess directed a series of arguments precisely against the Reform opponents of Jewish Nationalism:

"But, mark you, from all these real or imaginary benefits which the Jews in dispersion confer upon the world, none will be diminished even after the restoration of the Jewish State. For just as at the time of the return from the Babylonian exile, not all the Jews settled in Palestine, but the majority remained in the lands of exile, where there had been Jewish settlements since the dispersion of Israel and Judah, so need we not look forward to a larger concentration of Jews at the future restoration. Besides [the benefits Jews bestow upon the world world are exaggerated by the Reformers]. As to affecting the unity of life and theory, it is only possible with a nation which is politically organized."

Even when not speaking of the Reform Jews with reference to their theology, the enlightened Orthodox Hovevei Zion often responded to attacks from anti-nationalist Jews who were concerned only with emancipation. Rabbi Guttmacher, in his introduction to Rabbi Kalischer's

113 he'77 argued that equal rights would come to the Jews only after the onus of being "captives" had been removed through settlement of the Land of Israel. ¹³⁵ Rabbi Eliasberg argued against the fears of some Maskilim and Reformers that Hibbat Zion would impede their progress toward equal rights. He even invited all these people and all other Jews to join in the effort. ¹³⁶ One of Moses Hess's polemics on this subject reveals an evaluation of Moses Mendelssohn less revolutionary than that of Perez Smolenskin, but perhaps more accurate: "Even the nationalistic Mendelssohn did not know of a cosmopolitan Judaism. It is only in modern times that, for the purposes of obtaining equal rights, some German Jews denied the existence of Jewish Nationality." ¹³⁷

We noted above that Sir Moses Montefiore was exceptional among the English Jews in that he remained loyal to Hibbat Zion when most of them dropped away. His position as an opponent of Reform may be taken to indicate that he, like many of the modern Orthodox rabbis of his time, felt Hibbat Zion to be an answer to an inner problem of ^{his} Judaism, as well as to the problems of Jewish refugees or the poor of the Holy Land. As early as 1830, one of the London Goldsmids was ready to start a new congregation along the lines of the Hamburg Temple, in part at least, because he felt that the Board of Jewish Deputies was not fighting hard enough on civil rights for Jews. ¹³⁸ When in 1841 the Reform movement did start in London, Sir Moses Montefiore was chairman of the Board of Deputies, and though personally tolerant, as his biographer

put it, he followed rabbinic advice to oppose all Reform. Moses' Torah could stand the test of reason, Montefiore felt. Finally, the West End Synagogue was established as a concession. In 1842 Sir Moses urged the New Synagogue at Liverpool to rejoin the old one. ¹³⁹ In his personal practices too, Sir Moses remained Orthodox, even when it meant forgoing official duties to observe the Passover. ¹⁴⁰

.....SECTION 7

Turning to the anti-obscurantist implications of Hibbat Zion with its enlightened outlook and rational program for the restoration of Israel, we find that the conflict involved a clash with old institutions as well as old ideas. The old system of collections for Palestine, the Halukah, was the vested interest of a whole network of rabbis throughout Europe, as well as in Palestine itself. These rabbis continued to preach ^{the} coming miraculous salvation of Israel, and to fight against modern science and all philosophy, etc. as paths to heresy. At first the Hovevei Zion, especially the rabbis among them, did not understand, or did not wish to acknowledge their revolutionary role within Rabbinic Judaism as it was then organized. Rabbi Eliasberg considered the question of Israel's restoration, of which the great German Rabbis had been saying it will come ^{naturally,} and of which one of the great authorities had said it will come ^{miraculously} ^{or} ^{thoughtfully} he solved the dilemma: ^{both are correct.} ¹⁴¹ Rabbi Kalischer defended the position of the Orthodox German Rabbinical authorities when they had been by-passed on a decision by the Austrian government. ¹⁴² ~~the~~ ^{the} Magid⁹ called upon all to cooperate, in helping the poor of Palestine, and not to fight. Let one build houses, another buy fields, another build hospitals, schools, etc., for what is better for the whole community must benefit each member of it. Rabbi Berlin at first had hoped that by cooperating with the Halukah and the rabbis, Hibbat Zion could best reach the Jews of Russia and Poland.

Gradually, however, the lines began to become clear. Moses Hess stated his opposition to Reformers who deny Jewish nationality, as we have seen, but he stood "as vigorously against the dogmatic fanatics who, not being able to develop our historic religion along modern lines, have sought shelter under the wings of ignorance, so as to avoid a struggle with the deductions of science and criticism." ¹⁴⁵ Rabbi Kalischer soon suggested that contributions to Palestine be divided into three parts, one to buy fields, a second for a settlement fund and that only the final third ^{to} be used for the support of scholars. ¹⁴⁶ Rabbi Eliyahu of Graydiz suggested a slightly different division that also implied a tremendous cut in the amount of money that would go through Halukah channels and would be used at the discretion of its chiefs. ¹⁴⁷ If some Orthodox leaders had not grasped the full implications of Hibbat Zion and Yishub Erez Yisrael from the start, they soon came to understand and to criticize. ¹⁴⁸ And the spokesmen of Hibbat Zion responded at first in a concilliatory tone, protesting their own Orthodoxy, and then more strongly, without any apology whatsoever. In 1872, Rabbi Kalischer had two answers for his Halukah opponents: first, that there was plenty for all, indeed, that the use of funds for the support of agricultural settlement would aid the Halukah communities by dispelling the charge that the people are all lazy; and second, that the holy work of settling the Land of Israel is even more important than mere ~~charity~~ giving money to the poor. ¹⁴⁹ Before Rabbi Kalischer died (1874), ¹⁵⁰ Zebulun Leyb Brit wrote to him arguing that they should expect opposition, and should fight against their Halukah critics. After all, the argument ran, the movement for Settlement of the Land of Israel was not really hurting the Halukah people, but even if it were, it would be justified. ¹⁵¹ The Halukah supporters especially after the early 1880's, ~~the Hovevei Zion~~

were forced to the defensive, and then the Hovevei Zion were no longer so fearful of charges of heresy. Rabbi Berlin appealed for funds for the settlement of the Land of Israel, and urged all, even intermarried and unobservant Jews to participate.¹⁵² By 1890, the list of rabbis who sponsored the idea of collection plates for settlement of the Land of Israel was so formidable as to mark the end of the struggle between the old type of Orthodoxy and Hibbat Zion. (153) The Palestinian phase of the struggle will be dealt with later in this chapter.

SECTION 8
....The development that led the largest number of Jews to Hibbat Zion was not imperial interest in the Near East, not the theoretical problem of Judaism in the modern world. Each of these factors *did* continue to shape the movement, to determine its policies and its ideas. For large numbers of people to accept the new ideal, however, their faith in the old ones had to be shaken by clear, incontrovertible signs. Disappointment caused by the failures of emancipation made many Jews in Central Europe, and later in Eastern Europe ready to accept the Hibbat Zion analysis of Jewish history, and ready to accept its goal of a restoration of the Jewish nation in Palestine.

What Sokolow said is true, "the Maskilim (adherents of the Haskalah) became, earlier or later, the rank and file of Nationalists, 'Lovers of Zion' or Zionists...." (154) These, however, were not the only Jews who turned to Hibbat Zion as a result of their disappointment with the failure of enlightenment to halt prejudice and pogroms. Indeed, to many Maskilim, Hibbat Zion was at least as important because of its spiritual values to Judaism as it was

because of its political and economic program for the Jewish People. In other words, though the fact that they turned to Hibbat Zion often depended on external pressure, the internal needs satisfied by Hibbat Zion soon became primary in determining the form of its ideology. Sokolow was thinking of these people when he wrote that, while colonization was the purpose of Hibbat Zion, the ideological means to that end became valuable in itself, enriching Jewish life that had been deprived of its national future and its national solidarity. Hibbat Zion filled the internal Jewish need for a larger than personal goal. (154-a)

We shall turn first to another small but significant group that turned to Hibbat Zion due to disappointment in the emancipation. These Jews were not so deeply rooted in Judaism as were the Maskilim. They were those who had been radicals or had otherwise moved in circles dedicated to goals not specifically concerned with Jewish questions. Ten to fifteen years after the close of the period with which we are concerned, Theodore Herzl turned to Zionism the same way these Jews had. And because they were not as completely involved in things Jewish, before their turn to Hibbat Zion, as the Maskilim had been, these formerly estranged Jews developed a Hibbat Zion ideology which reflected primarily the social and political concerns which had driven them to Hibbat Zion. Unlike the former Maskilim, they did not emphasize the spiritual values that ^{co}lonization of the Land of Israel offered to Judaism as much as they emphasized the social and political status which a state would give to Jews.

Moses Hess was one of the ex-radicals who turned to Hibbat Zion. It will be noticed that his case history and his statement

of the goals of Hibbat Zion are typical of such "converts", and support, in a sense, Dr. Zeitlin's statement that Hess did not comprehend Judaism. (155)

The first blow to Moses Hess's faith in radicalism was the Damascus affair and its repercussions in Europe:

" Twenty years ago, when an absurd and false accusation against the Jews was imported into Europe from Damascus, it evoked in the hearts of the Jews a bitter feeling of agony. Then it dawned upon me for the first time, in the midst of my socialistic activities, that I belong to my unfortunate, slandered, despised and dispersed people. And already, then, though I was greatly estranged from Judaism, I wanted to express my Jewish patriotic sentiment...." (156)

Though at the time Hess continued to occupy himself with the problems of the suffering European Proletariat, he nevertheless formed some strong opinions on the Jewish Problem. As if answering a critic of these early opinions he later wrote:

" You say that there are many noble spirits among the Germans who have banished from their hearts every trace of race prejudice...and as for the progressive Jews, you think that many of them have always displayed a fine spirit of self-sacrifice when the honor of their religion or the welfare of their brethren called for it... I admit that my judgement was too general in its character and it can only be justified by the fact that it was

written under the influence of the Damascus Affair. Today I would hesitate very much before subscribing to it." (157)

As a Hovev Zion, Hess was still concerned primarily with the political and social position of the Jews, though we have seen earlier in this chapter that he had a very clear understanding of the importance of nationalism to a modern definition of Judaism. Hess analyzed and attacked those who could not reach a satisfactory modern explanation of the Jewish People, but to him the motivating goal of Jewish nationalism was a restored state and new status for Jews everywhere. "What brother did not obtain from brother [i.e. equal rights for Jews from the Germans], what was not granted by man to man, will be given by a people to a people, by a nation to a nation." (158) This sort of thinking was found among the ex-Maskilim and other Hovevei Zion as well, but it did not dominate the movement during our period. After 1881, for example, one of the East-European Hovevei Zion, Friedberg, argued that even a token state of Jews would make "Semites" a respected name and give the Jews status among the nations. (159) We may feel, then, that in the case of formerly estranged Jews who turned ~~to~~ ^{went} to Hibbat Zion, disappointed in their emancipation was often not only the cause of their "conversion", but the determining factor with respect to their Hibbat Zion ideology as well.

In the case of the Maskilim who, during the 1860's in Germany and during the 1870's in Eastern Europe, turned to Hibbat Zion, the situation was slightly different. David Gordon was one of the Maskilim associated with ~~"The Maggid"~~ from its earliest days. He wrote series of articles on scientific matters of all sorts, comets, for example. (160) Then, in 1863, he wrote his first essay on Settlement of the Land of Israel. David Gordon attributed his turning to Hibbat Zion to the influence of Moses Hess, and, even more immediately, to the questions received by ~~"The Maggid"~~ ^{the} from Jews

in Poland during the revolutions against Russia, in which the Jews asked, are we Russians or are we Poles? As they were attacked by both parties, the unfortunate Jews of Poland were clearly neither Russians nor Poles, either to their neighbors or to David Gordon. (161) Yet Gordon's Hibbat Zion was not shaped primarily by political considerations, though engendered by them. His background was with ~~the~~^{the} ~~Maggid~~^{Maggid} which proposed, as early as 1856, to strengthen the Holy Language which binds all Jews together, and never to attack any Jewish community or Hebrah, (162) ^{Hibbat Zion continued to express his} and his concern with the spirit of the Jews, as well as ^{with} their political condition. Similarly, Jacob Riefman moved from strict Haskalah thinking in his early years with ~~the~~^{the} ~~Maggid~~^{Maggid} to a nationalism which stressed the need for revivifying the spirit and creativity of the Jewish people. (163) We may also note among other, slightly later East-European adherents of Hibbat Zion, who had been Maskilim, such as Mical Pines and Eliezer Ben-Yahudah a concern with revivifying the spirit of the Jews and overcoming their enervating factionalism. (164) Perez Smolenskin spoke of spiritual nationalism, (165) and Friedberg recognized in the name of Palestine an emotional appeal that would unite all Jews, whereas America or distant parts of Russia, which might offer a more realistic practical solution to their problems, would gain only a slight response. (166) The ex-Maskilim who came to Hibbat Zion, then, even those who came because of their disappointment with political liberalism as opposed to those ex-Maskilim who may have been motivated by the problem of a modern definition of Judaism, did not look to Hibbat Zion primarily as the solution to the external political or social aspect of the Jewish problem. They were more concerned with the internal psychological and cultural problems of the Jewish People.

It is interesting to conjecture to what degree Sir Moses Montefiore and the Rothschilds were influenced by their awareness of the shortcomings of emancipation. Though he never felt personally disappointed in the progress

of enlightenment, or in that of the emancipation of the Jews in England, to the best of our knowledge, yet Sir Moses Montefiore did appreciate the strength of the opposition to Jews' rights, even in England. He and the Rothschilds were also extremely well informed as to what the Jews of Russia, Persia, Morocco, and other parts of the world were suffering. The Rothschilds of Paris had been particularly keenly aware of the French government policy on the Damascus Affair and of the implications on the Mortara case. As early as 1838, a leading Jew of Nice expressed to Sir Moses his disappointment in the results of the Napoleonic Synhedrion and the later Papal reaction,¹⁶⁷ an opinion that must have been known to, if not shared by the Rothschilds of Paris.

.....SECTION 9

Though the vocal rank and file of Hibbat Zion in eastern Europe were the rabbis and former Maskilim, Jews who had the education and the economic background necessary for one to become a writer or speaker, yet there were a large number of less vocal adherents who came from a different class. The autobiographies of Shmaryahn Levin and Dr. Chaim Weitzmann, though dealing with the period of the later 1880's whereas we are concerned only with the very early 1880's, support this generalization. Levin recorded his influence on the Jews of his tiny village, for example, Jews who of themselves would not have come into contact with any

movements but who were prepared by the pogroms and fear of the pogroms for a message of hope and promise from Zion.¹⁶⁸ To these Jews, Zion appeared as a solution to their personal problems of need and insecurity in eastern Europe. Many of them lacked even the meager sums necessary for emigration, and the hope of Zion served as a balm in very bleak days. The more fortunate ones who could go to America could develop the spiritual implications of the movement in their ideologies of Hibbat Zion, but to the poor Jews stuck in Russia and Poland, the very material picture of a sanctuary in Zion had an overwhelming appeal. The collection of funds for settlement of the land of Israel among those Jews who remained in eastern Europe again indicated their economic level. Rabbi Yaffe wrote that only the poorest Jews wanted to go to settle the Land of Israel, but some of the rich would later join them to start businesses. In the meanwhile, all must contribute their pennies.^{168a} Their Hibbat Zion ideology was simple and direct--they wanted a new home in Zion, for the pogroms had left them no future where they were.

The refugee problem was one of the motivations toward Hibbat Zion even before the pogroms. Rabbi Eliasberg, over a decade before, thought of Yishub Erez Yisrael in relation to the problem of the Jewish refugees

in Persia and Roumania. His idea was to have some picked refugees settle in the Land of Israel and thereby increase the size of the agricultural Yishuv.¹⁶⁹

The Jews of London also considered immigration and settlement in Palestine for some of their refugee brethren. In 1881-2, waves of emigrants reached London en route to America. When the United States announced that it wanted only workers and mechanics, some of the "others were dispatched to the Holy Land, and on May 4, 1882, Sir Moses received letters reporting the foundation of the first colony, 'Rishon Lezion.'¹⁷⁰ The settlers of Rishon Lezion themselves stated the causes of their Hibbat Zion very simply. They said that after the they decided to leave and become farmers in Palestine.¹⁷¹

This needy class of Jews developed not only an immigration-centered philosophy of Hibbat Zion, but even came into conflict with those to whom Hibbat Zion was not exclusively a practical problem. The Hovevei Zion of Bialistok wanted to send a delegation to the sultan with a petition assuring him that the Jews did not want to rebel against Turkey. They were not even interested in a Jewish state, if only immigration were opened to the poor, needy Jews.¹⁷² These Hovevei Zion had no sympathy for those who resented the overseers appointed by Rothschild, and the Bialistokers were quite content to have the Rothschilds support the colonies.

They proposed to use the collected money to establish the newcomers, not to support the established colonies.¹⁷³
.....SECTION 10
Hibbat Zion in eastern Europe, however, served

another function for the ex-Maskilim who joined it, and so it was not only a matter of the spiritual values in philosophy of self-help that led these to their strong stand against the Bialistok type of Hibbat Zion. The enlightened middle class in eastern Europe which had flourished especially during the first decade of the reign of Alexander II, was not satisfied with its position in the Jewish community. With respect to the government, it was still not represented. The Jewish barons in St. Petersburg wielded whatever influence the Jews had with the Tsar.¹⁷⁴ With the Jewish masses, on the other hand, the rabbis were the accepted leaders.¹⁷⁵ Through Hibbat Zion this enlightened Jewish middle class tried to take over the spokesmanship for their people.

Even before 1880, the students and writers were in revolt against the Shtadlanim of St. Petersburg.¹⁷⁶ In 1182, the Jewish writers Saul Pinkas Rabinowitz, Moses Lillienblum, Judah Leib Levin, Jacob Lipshitz and Shalom Friedberg wrote a letter to Baron Ginsburg. In in they complained that they had not been represented at a conference of Jewish leaders. They claimed to be closest to the problems of the Jews, and accused the wealthy Russian Jews of having failed to help the victims of the pogroms, as the rest of world Jewry had done.¹⁷⁷ The

disassociation practiced by these wealthy Jews was not a new thing,¹⁷⁸ but in Hibbat Zion, the ex-Maskilim found a new whip against the Shtadlanim, and they molded their ideology to fit this use. They applied their principle of opposition to Shatdlanut to Rothschild too, and emphasized the ideas of self-help and self-respect. This attitude is seen in a letter of 1883 in which the writer felt that Rothschild did not support the principles of Hibbat Zion as outlined in "Auto-Emancipation," but rather looked upon his support of the colonies in Palestine as help to beggars. Let there be no begging for Hovevei Zion, the writer continued, and let them not depend upon the wealthy, nor upon committees in France and England.¹⁷⁹ A Hibbat Zion philosophy of auto-emancipation was exactly suited to the needs of these ex-Maskilim as an answer to the internal Jewish social problem they faced, as well as to the larger Jewish Problem.

.....SECTION 11

The Palestinian counterpart of Hibbat Zion was dedicated to settling on the land and building a new Yishuv based on self-help instead of charity. This movement was indigenous to Palestine and developed because of the needs of the mass of Jews in that country. Like the protagonists of Hibbat Zion in Europe and elsewhere, so those in Palestine made use of generally available ideas to frame the answer to the particular problem they faced. (Settlement of the land or self-support through

labor were the usual phrases used to describe the movement in Palestine, but we shall continue to use "Love of Zion" as the generic term).

In 1839, Sir Moses Montefiore already found the poor Jews of the Holy Land eager to work for their bread and strongly attracted to the idea of farming. "There was no lack of spirit, and Sir Moses thought that some trifling assistance from the proper persons in Europe would speedily restore health and plenty, should such be the will of Heaven."¹⁸⁰ The governor and the majority of the Jewish leaders agreed that farming by many poor Jews was economically a sound and necessary idea.¹⁸¹ In 1855, this judgment was repeated. "Sir Moses and the other trustees arrived at the conclusion that the future well being of the Israelites in the Holy Land must, under Providence, depend upon active support being accorded to the institutions established there for the promotion of agriculture and industrial pursuits."¹⁸² A piece of property was accordingly purchased at Jaffa and some poor Jews were engaged upon the land. This was the place known as "Biera."¹⁸³ In 1862, a group of Jews organized in Palestine for the purpose of living as farmers for they did not wish to depend upon the Holukah system for support,¹⁸⁴ and the movement for self-support grew among the poor Jews of Palestine.

It was not only the direct need for a better living, but the need for a better economic system as well which

precipitated and shaped Palestinian Hibbat Zion. On the same visit during 1839 on which he was informed that many Jews in the Holy Land were actually starving, Sir Moses Montefiore was treated to an elaborate reception by the spiritual head of the German Congregation. Though Sir Moses did not note any inequity in the situation, the poor Jews of Palestine undoubtedly resented the fact that a spiritual leader could offer his guest coffee, sweetmeats, wine and cakes while they starved.¹⁸⁵ Of course, the Halukah collections paid for the support of the spiritual leaders as well as that of the starving lesser Jews. Dr. Loewe recorded, by the way, that the German elders appeared to be the more honest in handling the money which Sir Moses wanted distributed equally among the poor Jews. The German elders distributed the money according to the loss (i.e., the more one had had before the earthquake or raid, the more he received), whereas the Portuguese elders gave the most money to those learned in our Holy Law (i.e., themselves).¹⁸⁶ In addition to this system of distribution, the elders had a few other sources of income. In Hebron, they presented the Montefiore party with certificates entitling them to free seats in their several synagogues,¹⁸⁷ seats for which the local Jews had to pay, and without which no local Jew would be "kosher" enough to receive any Halukah funds. An 1857 letter from Jerusalem informed readers of the ^{Ha-Maggid} ~~the "Maggid"~~ as to the administration of the

latest starvation relief fund, and mentioned that a new synagogue building was founded with some of the money.¹⁸⁸ There were, of course, fights within the Halukah system, such as that of 1865 between the Jerusalem and the Hebron spiritual leaders which led the losers to consider agriculture as a means of support.¹⁸⁹ Now in 1866, Montefiore considered it very noble of Jacob Aaron Kalisher, a poor whitewasher with seven children of his own, to care for two orphans. He was also impressed with the information that other poor Jews also took care of orphans.¹⁹⁰ But the poor themselves were not of Sir Moses' opinion. A large group of poor Jews in Tiberias got Rabbi Sneersohn to be their spokesman, for they wanted to have some land upon which they could earn their bread by the labor of their hands.¹⁹¹ Their spokesman was familiar with the Halukah and his constituents complaints against it. He spoke quite forcefully:

"The heads of the congregations are only mindful of their own interest, and the collectors and benefactors residing in Europe do not pay sufficient attention to the proceedings, neglecting to give sound advice and to see that good and useful regulations be made for the benefit of the poor here. And when some eminent man comes to visit us here, such as the illustrious Sir Moses Montefiore or M. Albert Cohen, the heads find means to engage their attention in useless things.... The cries of the poor do not reach the ears of these righteous and good men...."¹⁹²

Sneersohn was right about the exclusiveness of the contact with Sir Moses Montefiore which the heads of the

of the congregations maintained while he was in Palestine.¹⁹³ And Sir Moses consistently supported the spiritual heads against the implications of a British Consul's statement in 1861, or the charges brought by the Friends of Zion in the 1870's.¹⁹⁴

In the late 1860's and in the 1870's, however, the revolutionary implications of Hibbat Zion and agricultural settlement of the Land of Israel became apparent to the Jews of Palestine. Rabbi Sneersohn began to fight the Halukah, instead of trying to appease it. A group of poor Jews who wished to found a colony in 1878, by-passed the Halukah, sent their own shaliah to Roumania. ~~and~~ ^{he} there continued the fight. Though this shaliah's initial victory was swallowed up by the Halukah after he left Roumania, we can see that the fight was by then open and recognized.¹⁹⁵ In 1882, a society of Maskilin dedicated to settling on the land in Palestine, speaking Hebrew, and so on, looked for like-minded people among the Hovevei Zion in Russia to support them.¹⁹⁶ In 1883, Moses Lillienblum advised the colonists on how to avoid the tithes without antagonizing the Orthodox,¹⁹⁷ for the fight with the Halukah, though well under way, had not yet been decided in favor of the Hovevei Zion. The signs of a victory for the new Yishuv were becoming clear, however. In 1886, Rabbi Hayyim Wax preached an anti-Halukah sermon in Jerusalem. This indicates that the Halukah no longer had the dominant influence it had once

hand, even among the most orthodox Jews in Europe, because Rabbi Wax was the man who had planted ethrogim near Tiberias, and then published a book to show that ~~only ethrogim near Tiberias, and then published a book to show that~~ only ethrogim from the Land of Israel were "kosher."¹⁹⁸ Surely, if the Halukah had been a dominant force in Orthodox Jewish life throughout the world, Rabbi Wax would not have deliberately antagonized its leaders. Apparently the revolt in Europe against the obscurantist counterparts of the Palestinian Halukah leaders was proceeding apace. The same Rabbi Berlin who a few years earlier had urged the Hovevei Zion of Warsaw not to fight the Halukah, since the rabbis connected with it controlled public opinion among the Jews of Russia and Poland, by 1889 took a more belligerent stand. Concerning the charges of un-orthodoxy against the Bilium at Gadera Rabbi Berlin replied that their actions, even if they were not orthodox, constituted no excuse for agitation against Hibbat Zion.¹⁹⁹ (Though Rabbi Berlin also published a letter in 1889 from Ezekiel, ²/₁₀ at Gadera, which testified to the poverty and Kashrut of the settlers).²⁰⁰ When Rabbi Mohliver, who had written very strong letters against the maligners of the colonies, was received with honor as the head of the Hovevei Zion by the Halukah leaders in Jerusalem (1890), we may consider the revolt as having succeeded.²⁰¹ The pressure of the needs of the mass of Jews in Palestine, of the need in

Europe for emigration to Palestine, plus the growing power and concern of the enlightened Jews of eastern Europe in the settlement of the Holy Land, all put together comprised a force too great for the archaic and sometimes corrupt Halukah system to resist.

.....SECTION 12

The attempts of the Halukah to deal with the growing pressure for change can be outlined briefly. At first, the Halukah leaders tried to "contain" the efforts toward settlement of the land and the development of a new Yishuv free from their control. The leaders of the Halukah tried to retain their control by organizing and heading the committees Sir Moses Montefiore requested to help him encourage agriculture in Palestine.²⁰² "Assisted by this committee, he selected 35 families from the Holy City of Safed, provided them with means to commence agricultural pursuits, and also secured for them the protection of the local governors. Some orphan lads were also provided for, by being placed under the care of the committee to be trained as agriculturalists."²⁰³ Fifteen families were established near Safed, under the supervision of the agricultural committee at Safed. And a little later in this report of his 1855 trip to Palestine, Sir Moses recorded, "Turning again to the administration of the Appeal Fund, the reader will learn that, independently of the several grants made to the respective institutions, a considerable sum was entrusted to the elders of the

of the communities, to be distributed among the necessitous poor...."204

But to control economically independent Jewish farmers was evidently not as easy or as satisfactory to the Halukah system as was the doling out of funds to the poor Jews of the cities. For the relief of the poor they advised alms houses and hospitals,²⁰⁵ to be administered as part of the Halukah system.²⁰⁶ Even Rabbi Hazan, Hacham Bashi of Jerusalem, who was known as an advocate of Jewish agriculture in Palestine appealed for funds to build Houses of Refuge on Mount Zion, and did not mention farming.²⁰⁷ By 1866, the antagonism of the Halukah leaders to agriculture among the Jews of Palestine was decried in public by Rabbi Sneersohn.²⁰⁸ In the early 1870's, some Halukah leaders still tried to join the growing movement for settlement of the land, but they could not contain the movement, and were obliged to fight it. The journal "Havazelet" of Jerusalem supported Rabbi Alkalai's attempt to found a Society for the colonization of Palestine in 1870, but later, as a Halukah organ, opposed all such efforts.²⁰⁹ Rabbi Meir Auerbach of Jerusalem at first assented to Rabbi Alkalai's plan, and then withdrew.²¹⁰ Indeed, as soon as Rabbi Alkalai left Jerusalem, all the rabbis who had joined him instead of fighting him returned to their places in the opposition. On his 1875 tour of the Holy Land, however, Sir Moses Montefiore heard vigorous denials of the

charges of laziness and escapism by the Halukah leaders in Haifa and Safed.²¹¹ They had felt the growing pressure from the local poor, represented by Rabbi Sneersohn, for one, and from the growing Hibbat Zion movement in Europe.

In addition to direct encouragement of other-than-farming ventures in philanthropy for Jews in Palestine and opposition to agriculture, the Halukah tried to color all information on affairs in the Holy Land to their own ends. Sir Moses, for example, received reports on the loss of cattle by the farmers he had helped establish, on drought, plagues, and famines, on the abandonment and destruction of the garden at Jaffa, and so on, from 1857 through 1874.²¹² In 1875, however, he reported from Palestine that the Biera garden was not in anything like the awful shape described by reports to England, and these reports could have come only from Halukah sources.²¹³

In 1860, "The Maggid" which had begun to interest itself in the settlement of the Land of Israel, received a fascinating letter from Yehiel Brill of Jerusalem. This writer told that he had been ordered by the heads of the Halukah system to keep the editor of "The Maggid" informed on all matters pertaining to the East (including Palestine, naturally).²¹⁴ A perfectly clear attempt to supply news colored to favor the case of the Halukah!

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions

Hibbat Zion from the 1830's to the 1880's was hardly a well-organized movement dedicated to the establishment of a Jewish State, as was the Zionist Movement after 1897. During this period there had not even developed the considerable network of societies, the periodicals, the personal correspondences, the colonization attempts, and all the other tangible activities which marked the Hibbat Zion movement from the time of the Katowitz Conference to that of the Basle Congress. It is only by selecting individual writings and scattered activities, partially on the basis of their common sympathy with the idea of a restored Jewish Nation in Palestine, and partially because of their later absorption into the formal Hibbat Zion Movement, that we can speak of Hibbat Zion at all during this time.

Yet, those many and various phenomena in Jewish life of the nineteenth century which we have labeled collectively "Hibbat Zion from the 1830's to the 1880's," scattered and unrelated as they may seem, do represent a single community of spirit and endeavor. The individuals recognized in each other kindred souls, and they had more extensive contact with one another than we can now trace accurately. Now, why did so many different Jews, coming as they did from dissimilar classes, from all parts of the world, over the course of half a century find Hibbat Zion an attractive idea?

In the nineteenth century the idea of nationalism was developed by the thinkers of many lands to help them interpret history and their national destinies. With the enlightenment, many Jews absorbed these ideas and applied them to their own situation. This, however, was often a merely intellectual process. For example, Jewish historians themselves did not necessarily become involved in Jewish national movements simply because they wrote Jewish history from a national point of view. Occasionally the unusual individual might be so completely involved with his intellectual products that he would carry over the implications of his theories into action. But even granting the unpredictability of the individual, any more widespread support of an idea or movement can be analyzed in terms of other than purely intellectual considerations. Only strong pressure from some aspect of the total social and economic situation of a particular group of Jews could lead an appreciable number of them to become personally involved in Hibbat Zion.

In the case of the upper-class Jews of England and France who had been exposed to modern ideas, and those of their non-Jewish compatriots who joined them as Havevei Zion, we have noted the impact upon their thinking of British and French imperialist interests in the Near East. In England, when a Jewish state in Palestine seemed likely to serve the ends of the Empire, Hibbat Zion appealed

to a considerable portion of the class of Jews among whom Sir Moses Montefiore moved. In France, on the other hand, and later in England, when imperial considerations led to official dis-interest in the possibility of a Jewish State in Palestine, these Jews ceased to be Havevei Zion.

Not only do the time, place, type and extent of support given a movement depend upon the total situation of the people involved, but we have seen that the form taken by the movement is similarly determined. Hibbat Zion in England took on the form of a philanthropy, necessarily. That was the means used by Jews and non-Jews of the class to whom Hibbat Zion appealed whenever they proposed to help needy people or support worthy "causes." Similarly the Hibbat Zion emphasis upon industry and agriculture was derived from the general ideal of the hard-worker developed by early nineteenth century industrialism, as well as from the direct economic and social needs of the poor Jews in Palestine.

In Germany and the rest of Central Europe, it was not the wealthiest and most emancipated class of Jews from which Hibbat Zion received support. The imperial interests of these countries in the Near East were not such as to direct the thinking of patriotic, emancipated Jews toward Palestine and the possibility of a Jewish State there. Enlightened Orthodox rabbis and laymen, of the middle class in these countries, however, did find

in Hibbat Zion an answer to certain very pressing problems. Nationalism was a popular, modern concept about which an interpretation of Judaism and the Jewish People could be built. Such an interpretation would serve as a weapon against the Reform view which sacrificed national hopes and action for individual emancipation, reducing the Jewish People to the role of a voluntary association for ethical and spiritual ends. To the enlightened Orthodox, many of them former Radicals or Maskilim, individual emancipation of the Jews as citizens of Prussia, Austria, etc. was not a reality, nor even realistic enough a possibility to serve as the focalpoint of all their hopes. National restoration of the Jewish People in Palestine was more appealing a goal. And just as it served as both a weapon against, and an alternative to the Reform view, so Hibbat Zion was a modern, rational alternative to, and weapon against the obscurantist aspirations for a miraculous Jewish national restoration. In both cases, the struggle represented social as well as ideological differences.

The disappointment and the need for new goals felt by the Maskilim of Eastern Europe was more keen than that of their German fellows, for by the late 1870's, the illusion of a possible new era for the Russian Empire was lost to all but a very few. In addition to the psychological and social factors that had operated a few years

earlier among the Jews in Central Europe, in Eastern Europe the archaic Jewish social order provided considerable incentive to any enlightened middle-class movement that would contest the control of the Shtadlonim in St. Petersburg, and of the old Orthodox rabbis throughout the Palestine Hibbat Zion served as such a movement.

The practical need for a refuge after the pogroms of the early 1880's led many Jews of the lower middle class, and even of the proletariat, to support Hibbat Zion. They were not a vocal group, but they contributed pennies and dreamed.

In Palestine, increasingly from the early nineteenth century on, the Jewish community recognized the need for some Jewish agriculture. To the poor, this goal meant economic and social independence from the autocratic and sometimes corrupt Halukah system. The revolutionary social and economic implications of a movement from the settlement of the land were at first shied away from by its protagonists, but eventually, with the aid of growing support from the Hovevei Zion in Europe, they fought it out and won. The Halukah leaders also seemed at first unaware of the implications of the movement toward industry and agriculture, and then they tried to join and control it. Finally, the issue could no longer be hidden, even by the Halukah propaganda machine, and

the colonies, supported by the Havevei Zion, attracted so much of the wealth and sympathy of the Jews that the Halukah sued for peace. The social revolution had passed through its typical phases.

NOTES

1. ע.ל. צ'יכרון. תולדות חבת ציון. אופוסה.
"חור'ה", תרע"ד. page 110.

ק.ש. 'הגא'ל. הבקרה של תנועה, לקט מאמרים
תולדות חבת ציון. חל-אברהם, תולדות חבת ציון
תולדות (של חבת ציון). תרצ"ד. page 77.

2. Nahum Sokolow, Hibbat Zion. Jerusalem, Reuben Mass, 1935, page XXV.
3. Simon Dubnow, History of the Jews in Russia and Poland, Volume I. Philadelphia, J.P.S., 1916, page 383.
4. צ'יכרון, Op. Cit., page 72.
5. אברהם אלקנה סלוצקי. חבת ציון. אופוסה.
חלקים שונים, תרנ"ה. Part Two, page 14.
6. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 27.

Dr. L. Loewe, The Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore. London, Griffith Favran, Okeden and Welsh, 1890, Volume I, page 166.


7. Melvin Weinman, "The Attitude of Isaac Mayer Wise Toward Zionism and Palestine," American Jewish Archives, Volume III, Number 2. Cincinnati, 1951, pages 16ff.

21. Ibid., page 11.
22. Sokolow, Op. Cit., pages 72ff.
23. ק'ענן, 1859, page 71; 1860, page 71.
24. 11743, Op. Cit., page 12.
25. Ibid.
26. Hess, Op. Cit., pages 149f.
27. Ibid., page 114; pages 150ff.
28. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 87.
29. ק'ענן, 1859, page 71; 1859, page 58; 1859, page 46.
30. 173180, Op. Cit., Part Two, pages 40f.
31. 11743, Op. Cit., pages 63f.
32. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 59.
33. 11743, Op. Cit., page 85.
34. 11'3-חנה חנה'ל פ'ת'ל .ל'l'

 ל'l'ל'ל'ל'ל'ל'ל'ל'ל'ל'ל'ל'l'

Volume I, page 105.

35. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 14.
36. Ibid., pages 60ff.

37. Ibid., pages 69-70.
 38. Ibid., page 269; page 270.
 39. Ibid., page 275.
 40. Ibid., pages 299ff.
 41. Ibid., page 388.
 42. Ibid., Vol. II, pages 20f.
 43. Ibid., page 78.
 44. ש"ס נד, 1857, page 51.
 45. Ibid., 1859, page 65.
 46. Ibid., 1859, pages 14f.
 47. ש"ס נד, 1857, page 46.
 48. Ibid., page 46; page 50; 1858, page 50; 1857, pages 150f.
 49. Ibid., 1857, page 134, page 150; 1858, page 193, page 189.
 50. Ibid., 1858, page 39; 1857, pages 158f., page 163,
page 116, page 120.
 51. Ibid., 1857, page 138.
 52. Dubnow, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 381.
-  Meyer Waxman, A History of Jewish Literature. New York,
Bloch, 1936, Volume III, pages 57-8.

53. Waxman, Op. Cit., Vol. III, page 57.
54. Dubnow, Op. Cit., Vol. II, pages 114ff.
54. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 315-19.
55. Ibid., pages 344ff.
56. Ibid., pages 311ff.; page 324.
57. Ibid., page 334; pages 330ff.
58. ש'ע"נ, ח"ו ע"ה, י"ב ח"ו; 1857, page 90;
1858-constant references to Maskilim in Odessa.
59. Ibid., 1857, page 142, page 158; 1860, page 52.
60. Ibid., 1857, page 90, page 78.
61. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 52, pages 43ff.
62. Ibid., page 41.
63. ש'ע"נ, 1857, page 105.
64. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 70.
65. Hess, Op. Cit., pages 111ff.
66. Ibid., pages 120f.
67. Ibid., page 37.
68. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 105.

69. Solomon Zeitlin, "Judaism as a Religion," Jewish Quarterly Review, N.S., Volume XXXV. Philadelphia, 1944-1945, pages 322ff.
70. ש'ע"ד, 1857, page 45.
71. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 106.
72. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 204ff.; page 268.
73. Ibid., page 269, page 25.
74. Ibid., page 303; Vol. II, page 19.
75. Ibid., Vol. I, page 308.
76. Ibid., Vol. II, page 38.
77. Ibid., Vol. II, pages 63f.
78. Ibid., Vol. I, page 199.
79. Ibid., page 200, page 206.
80. Ibid., Vol. II, page 57; ש'ע"ד, 1857, page 77;
Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 109.
81. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 58, pages 132ff.
82. Ibid., pages 58f.
83. Sokolow, Op. Cit., pages. 85ff., page 97.
84. Ibid., page 98.
85. Ibid., page 102.

86. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 196f.
87. Ibid., pages 271ff.; Vol. II, page 107.
88. Ibid., Vol. I, page 258.
89. Ibid., Vol. II, pages 4ff.
90. Ibid., Vol. I, page 288.
91. Ibid., Vol. II, page 110.
92. Ibid., page 286.
93. Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 37f.
94. Ibid., page 131.
95. Ibid., page 132.
96. Ibid., page 135.
97. Ibid., pages 147ff.
98. Ibid., page 256.
99. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 30.
100. Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 242.
101. Ibid., pages 152ff.
102. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 137-9; Vol. II, page 273.
103. Ibid., Vol. I, page 105.
104. Ibid., pages 312f.

105. Ibid., Vol. II, page 11.
106. Ibid., pages 33f.
107. Ibid., pages 113ff.
108. Ibid., pages 120ff., page 84.
109. Ibid., pages 22f.
110. Q'EN, August 15, 1856; 1857, page 77; 1859, page 95;
1857, page 184; 1858, page 184.
111. Ibid., 1857, page 38.
112. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, pages 24ff., page 36, pages 68f.
113. 2156'177, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 106ff.
- Jacques Bigart, "The Alliance Israélite Universelle,"
American Jewish Yearbook, Volume II. Philadelphia,
1900-1901, page 59.
114. Frances S. Osgood, "Labor is Worship," Williams's Choice Literature, Book VII. London, 1912, page 147.
115. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 166.
116. Ibid., Vol. II, page 9.
117. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 323f.
118. Q'EN, 1857, pages 146f.
119. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 57.
120. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 272.

121. Moses Klein, Migdal Zophim. Philadelphia, Published by the Author, 1889. The sub-title to this book is, "The Jewish Problem and Agriculture as its Solution."
122. פ'ל'l, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 3.
- 122a. Hess, Op. Cit., pages 39f.
- 122b. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 142 n. 97.
- 122c. פ'3180, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 14 names Akiba Eger and Moses Safer as supporters of Kalischer; Ibid., page 60, Kalischer himself is a pupil of the former; Ibid., page 5, names Zebi Yehudah Berlin of Volozhin as a supporter of Hibbat Zion.
- Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 26 names Herschel Levin of Valozhin as a supporter of Kalischer.
- M. Seligsohn, "David Deutsch" and Goodman Lipkind, "Emanuel Deutsch," Jewish Encyclopedia, Volume IV. New York, 1907. These articles indicate that David Deutsch was a disciple of Moses Sofer, and Emanuel a disciple of David Deutsch. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 119, quotes Joseph Jacobs on Emanuel Deutsch, " he laid down his life for the regeneration of our views of Israel's future."
- 122d. פ'11513, Op. Cit., page 67.
- 122e. פ'3180, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 12.

- 122f. *g'evn*, 1862, page 38, page 199, and elsewhere.
- 122g. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 40.
- 122h. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 25.
123. *g'3188*, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 45, in a letter from Rabbi Kalischer to A.M. Rothschild, 1836.
124. Sneersohn, Op. Cit., page 74.
125. Ibid., page 75.
126. Ibid., pages 79f.
127. Hess, Op. Cit., pages 112f.
128. Ibid., pages 118f.
129. Zeitlin, Op. Cit., page 316.
130. Hess, Op. Cit., page 153 n. 10 (by the translator, Meyer Waxman).
131. Waxman, Op. Cit., Vol. III, page 412.
132. Hess, Op. Cit., pages 107-8.
133. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 26.
134. Hess, Op. Cit., page 116. Though Hess attacks the Reform "mission" idea, on page 157 of the same work he addresses the Jewish People thus: "A great calling is reserved for you: to be a living channel of communication between three continents." On page 159,

Hess calls upon the Jews to be the "moral stay of the East."

135. 'p3180, Op. Cit., Part Two, pages 43f.
136. Ibid., page 13; 117'3, Op. Cit., page 67.
137. Hess, Op. Cit., page 64.
138. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 83.
139. Ibid., pages 301-2, pages 302ff., page 309.
140. Ibid., page 74, page 77, pages 134f, page 138, etc.
141. 'p3180, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 9.
142. 8'6N2, 1858, page 61.
143. Ibid., 1859, page 45.
144. 'p3180, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 8.
145. Hess, Op. Cit., page 38.
146. 8'6N2, 1862, pages 202-3.
147. Ibid.
148. 'p3180, Op. Cit., Part Two, pages 50f.
149. Ibid., page 61.
150. 117'3, Op. Cit., page 9, page 39 gives the dates of Rabbi Kalischer's life as 1804-1874; Sokolow,

Op. Cit., page 18 gives 1795-1874; Margolis and Marx gives 1795-1874.

151. ¹⁷³¹⁸⁰, Part Two, pages 55ff.
152. Ibid., page 5.
153. Ibid., page 30.
154. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 57.
155. Zeitlin, Op. Cit., page 316.
156. Hess, Op. Cit., pages 67f.
157. Ibid., pages 78f.
158. Ibid., page 37.
159. ¹¹⁶¹⁷³, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 3.
160. ¹¹⁶¹⁷³, 1857, page 103.
161. ¹¹⁷⁴³, Op. Cit., pages 16f.
162. ¹¹⁶¹⁷³, 1856, September 3; ^{5"1711" 11'0 11"}
163. ¹¹⁶¹⁷³, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 95; Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 57.
164. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 60; ¹⁷³¹⁸⁰, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 6.
- 165.
166. ¹¹⁶¹⁷³, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 3.

167. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 151f.
168. Shmaryahn Levin, Youth in Revolt.
- 168a. *p3180*, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 16; page 30.
169. *p174'3*, Op. Cit., page 67.
170. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 306.
171. *p156'178*, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 91.
172. Ibid., page 177.
173. Ibid., page 178.
174. Ibid., pages 13ff.
175. *p3180*, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 8.
- p156'178*, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 2.
- Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 354.
176. *p174'3*, Op. Cit., page 94.
177. *p156'178*, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 13ff.
178. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 201.
179. *p156'178*, Op. Cit., Vol. I, pages 76ff.
180. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 166.
181. Ibid., Vol. I, page 172, page 174, page 178, page 189.
182. Ibid., Vol. II, page 56.

183. Ibid.
184. ש'בן 7, 1862, #18.
185. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 168.
186. Ibid., pages 164f.; Sneersohn, Op. Cit., pages 113-4.
187. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol, I, page 183.
188. ש'בן 7, 1857, page 127.
189. ש'בן 7, 1857, page 127. *ש'בן 7, 1857, page 127. ש'בן 7, 1857, page 127.*
page 42 *ש'בן 7, 1857, page 127.*
190. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 183.
191. Sneersohn, Op. Cit., page 119.
192. Ibid., pages 110ff.
193. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 178, page 182, pages 45ff.
194. Ibid., page 129, page 274, page 281.
195. ש'בן 7, Op. Cit., pages 54f.
196. ש'בן 7, Op. Cit., Vol. I, page 24.
197. Ibid., pages 88ff.
198. ש'בן 7, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 42 n. f.
199. Ibid., page 8, pages 18f.
200. Ibid., page 19.

201. Ibid., pages 19ff., page 27.
202. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 47.
203. Ibid., pages 47f.
204. Ibid., page 51.
205. Ibid., pages 68f.
206. Ibid., pages 110ff.
207. Sneersohn, Op. Cit., pages 89ff.
208. Ibid., pages 112f.
209. 117 V 3, Op. Cit., page 33; p 31 ff, Op. Cit., Part Two, page 16.
210. Sokolow, Op. Cit., page 25.
211. Loewe, Op. Cit., Vol. II, page 275.
212. Ibid., pages 66f., pages 169ff, page 187, pages 260ff.
213. Ibid., pages 274f.
214. 9'6N 7, 1860, pages 107f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jacques Bigart. "The Alliance Israelite Universelle"
(American Jewish Yearbook, Volume II). Philadelphia, 1900-1.

Simon Dubnow. History of the Jews in Russia and Poland.
Philadelphia, Jewish Publication Society, 1916.

Moses Hess. Rome and Jerusalem. New York, Bloch, 1943.

Moses Klein. Migdal Zophim. Philadelphia, 1889.

Shmaryahu Levin. Youth in Revolt.

Goodman Lipkind. "Emanuel Deutsch" (Jewish Encyclopedia,
Volume IV). New York, 1907.

Dr. L. Loewe. The Diaries of Sir Moses and Lady Montefiore.
London, Griffith Farran Okeden and Welsh, 1890.

Frances S. Osgood. "Labor is Worship" (Williams's Choice
Literature, Book VII). London, 1912.

M. Seligsohn. "David Deutsch" (Jewish Encyclopedia,
Volume IV). New York, 1907.

Hyam Zvee Sneersohn. Palestine and Roumania. New York,
Hebrew Orphan Asylum Printing Establishment, 1872.

Nahum Sokolow. Hibbat Zion. Jerusalem, Reuben Mass, 1935.

Meyer Waxman. A History of Jewish Literature. New York,