

PALESTINE AND ISRAEL

IN THE 19TH AND 20TH CENTURIES

edited by
Elie Kedourie and Sylvia G.Haim

**PALESTINE AND ISRAEL
IN THE 19th AND 20th CENTURIES**

This page intentionally left blank

**PALESTINE AND ISRAEL
IN THE
19th AND 20th CENTURIES**

Edited by
ELIE KEDOURIE
and
SYLVIA G. HAIM

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1982 by
FRANK CASS AND COMPANY LIMITED

Published 2013 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY, 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Copyright © 1982 Frank Cass & Co. Ltd.

ISBN 13: 978-0-714-63121-9 (pbk)

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Contents

FOREWORD		vii
EUROPEAN JEWS IN MUSLIM PALESTINE	Emile Marmorstein	1
THE ZIONIST ATTITUDES TO THE ARABS 1908–1914	Yaacov Ro'i	15
THE BALFOUR DECLARATION AND ITS MAKERS	Mayir Vereté	60
NAZI GERMANY AND THE PALESTINE QUESTION	R. Melka	89
THE THIRD REICH AND PALESTINE	David Yisraeli	103
THE 'STERN GANG' 1940–1948	Y. S. Brenner	114
ARAB IMMIGRATION INTO PRE-STATE ISRAEL	Fred M. Gottheil	143
CROP-SHARING ECONOMICS IN MANDATORY PALESTINE	Ya'akov Firestone	153
CHANGES IN THE SETTLEMENT PATTERN OF JUDEA AND SAMARIA DURING JORDANIAN RULE	Elisha Efrat	195
RASHID HUSAIN: PORTRAIT OF AN ANGRY YOUNG ARAB	Emile Marmorstein	211
INTELLECTUALS IN ISRAELI DRUZE SOCIETY	Gabriel Ben-Dor	229
THE POLITICAL STATUS OF JERUSALEM IN THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN 1948–1967	Naim Sofer	255

This page intentionally left blank

Foreword

Middle Eastern Studies first appeared in 1964. The brief Editorial Note prefixed to the first number declared that the purpose of the Journal was the promotion of the study of the Middle East and North Africa since the end of the eighteenth century, and that it aimed to take within its ambit the political, economic, religious and legal history of the area, its literature, social geography, sociology and anthropology. That the Journal, now in its fourteenth volume, has been able to conform to this programme is due to its contributors who, over the years, have kept it supplied with a constant and abundant flow of articles on the various subjects here enumerated.

This selection of articles on Palestine and Israel in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, drawn from its first thirteen volumes, illustrates the great variety of subjects which authors have thought worth investigating, and the diversity of approaches which they have adopted. This book also shows that an appreciable part of the Journal, in terms simply of volume, has been devoted throughout to Palestine and Israel. In retrospect, it seems indeed as though the first article in the first number of the first volume served to prefigure things to come. This article—reprinted in the present volume—was Emile Marmorstein's examination of the work of a young Arab Israeli writer, Rāshīd Husain.

The pair of articles with which the book begins, Emile Marmorstein's 'European Jews in Muslim Palestine' and Yaacov Ro'i's 'Zionist Attitude to the Arabs 1908–1914' are both concerned with the first reactions of Jewish immigrants to Muslim Arab society in the midst of which they found themselves, and to the political conditions of a province in an Ottoman Empire shaken from its traditional moorings by administrative and legal 'reform' by a military coup d'état, and by the political agitations to which the abrupt disappearance of Hamidian autocracy opened the door.

The three articles which conclude the volume—Marmorstein's discussion of Rāshīd Husayn, Gabriel Ben Dor's examination of the state of mind of Druze 'intellectuals' under Israeli rule and Naim Sofer's account of East Jerusalem under Jordanian rule—are, in a sense, the other side of the coin. They deal with some of the myriad effects and reactions within indigenous society which were the consequence of the Zionist-Arab conflict and the establishment of Israel.

Another group of four studies revolves around the history of Zionism and Palestine during the British connexion. These are Mayer Vereté's detailed scrutiny of the Balfour Declaration and its makers, Y. S. Brenner's account of the 'Stern Gang' in the last years of the Mandate,

and the pair of studies by the late R. Melka and by David Yisraeli on National Socialist policies and attitudes towards Zionism and the Jewish settlement in Palestine.

The last group of studies included in this book concerns social and economic history. Perhaps by reason of their difficulty and of the paucity of material these subjects seem to attract fewer scholars than other topics, and the Editors of *Middle Eastern Studies* have tried to look out for and encourage the submission of articles on them. Of the many studies concerned with these subjects which over the years have appeared in the Journal, the Editors reprint here three which, it is hoped, will throw some light respectively on the historical demography of Palestine (by Fred. M. Gottlieb), on the economics of Arab agriculture (by Ya'akov Firestone), and on the pattern of settlement in the West Bank under Jordanian rule (by Elisha Efrat).

E.K.
S.G.H.

European Jews in Muslim Palestine

Emile Marmorstein

Since this study was prompted by reading three books in one another's company, I had better begin by introducing them and their authors. They all help, albeit indirectly, to show how the experience of living in the Holy Land during the last hundred years of Muslim rule impinged upon the minds of European Jews. *

A. R. Malachi (Engelsman) was born in Jerusalem of Eastern European parents in 1895, emigrated to New York shortly before the outbreak of the First World War and has been writing for Hebrew and Judaeo-German periodicals ever since. His native community provided him with a theme and a mission: well before the prosperity of a few of its sons turned their forbears' adventures into a minor academic industry, he was exhuming the literary relics of its factions and feuds. He became its champion, rebutting charges of mendicancy and sloth with evidence of the 'productive' aspirations of its worldlier members and their preparatory role in the process of Zionist colonization—a propaganda line started at about the time of his birth. Nevertheless, the fact that what his community professed, and was subsidized, to 'produce' was an accumulation of merit before the Throne of Glory emerges openly from his accounts of its experiences.

On the other hand, the late Galiyah Yardeni, who was responsible for this useful selection from Malachi's numerous and dispersed articles and used them extensively for background information in her own book, evidently regarded all Jewish settlement in the Holy Land as a forerunner of the Zionist state—such, at least, is the inference that makes her allocation of praise and blame so monotonously predictable. Somehow, perhaps owing to her prim approach to their frequent and intense quarrels, she brings out the worst in her picturesque characters. Naftali Herz Imber, for instance, who had published a Hebrew dirge in lament for Baron Edmond de Rothschild's mother, accused Eliezer Ben-Judah (Perlman) of palming-off his French rendering as the original and then pocketing the bereaved son's reward; and Ben-Judah replied with a denunciation of Imber's vulnerable character—he was the alcoholic of the group, which also included a morphine-addict (p. 197). Not that they were all rogues: many of Jerusalem's early journalists led austere and honourable lives, and the consistency with which defenders of the communal leadership upheld principles unpopular with the wealthiest of potential patrons points to a certain degree of courage on the part of a community whose sole economic asset was the Holy Land's appeal to charitable Jews. That appeal was, of course, the basis of Hebrew journalism in Jerusalem: the proprietors of primitive presses, around whom Hebrew journalists were grouped, relied less on their local than on their distant readers—indeed,

**Peraqim Betholedhoth Hayyishuv Hayyashan* (Studies in the History of the Old Yishuv) by A. R. Malachi. Tel-Aviv University, 1971. Pp. 412.

Ha'itonuth Ha'ivrit Be'eres Yisra'el 1863-1904 (The Hebrew Press in Palestine 1863-1904) by Galiyah Yardeni. Tel-Aviv University, 1969. Pp. 419 + Catalogue of Hebrew periodicals, annuals, etc.

Pirqa Hayyay (Autobiography and Diaries) by Artur Ruppin. 'Am 'Oved. Tel-Aviv, 1968. Three Volumes. Pp. 238, 314, 393 (a shortened version of this book entitled *Memoirs, Diaries and Letters* was published by Weidenfeld and Nicolson in 1972).

they descended on them in person from time to time in order to cadge subscriptions and donations; and their slender and irregular periodicals, although inferior to the more substantial journals that were then distributing a Hebrew version of the Enlightenment in Eastern Europe, could attract readers by virtue of their direct news and views of the Holy Land. Some of these entrepreneurs, however, were far from content with the proceeds of their export trade; and in their attempts to take over the institutions, the sources of communal power, they used their papers to discredit the administrators and publicize rival projects originating within their own circles. Allegations that their schemes were solely designed to deflect the flow of alms into their purses, which derive largely from their own attacks on one another, are all too plausible.

Ben-Judah's arrival (1881) sharpened the tone of ideological argument. He was imported by Israel Dov Frumkin to deputize for him during his absence in Europe. It was a curious appointment: here was a staunch Pietist putting his paper in the charge of a writer whom he knew to be sceptical of essential belief and neglectful of compulsory practice. According to Ben-Judah's account, Frumkin accepted his promise to conform on nationalist grounds to Jerusalem's standards, i.e. he would hardly jeopardise his chances of winning over the whole community to the cause by allowing suspicions of his orthodoxy to arise: and, in fact, until he despaired of making headway, he conformed quite convincingly. Perhaps Frumkin, who was then at the peak of his own nationalist phase, did not need much persuasion. At any rate, their collaboration continued amicably for a year or so, with Frumkin, who had put off his European tour, concentrating on local affairs and leaving nationalism to his colleague's ardour. By the middle of the decade, however, each was openly returning to his basic allegiance. Their press war culminated in Ben-Judah pouring out his venom on the communal leadership and Frumkin dramatically acknowledging its foresight, confessing his own past errors and branding the nationalist movement as the enemy of the faith.

An impeccable reputation was by no means all that set Artur Ruppin apart from these communal politicians and their successors. Born and bred in a society in an advanced stage of secularization, he was indifferent both to their rhetoric and to their schemes. His arrival in Jaffa to take charge of the Palestine-Amt was the result of a decision taken at the cost of the more dignified and remunerative career which his legal qualifications and commercial experience should have ensured him. For him it was a matter of destiny: a chain of circumstances had made him available and willing at the very time (1907) when the Zionist Organization turned to 'practical activity' and needed someone fit to conduct it (I, p. 238). Had he not taken this opportunity, 'his life would have missed its mark' (II, p. 42). Accordingly, the rest of his working life was occupied with the development of the Zionist economy and with Jewish demography, his favourite academic pursuit. Within the movement, his prestige may ultimately have rested on his share in promoting organized labour's political and economic hegemony, but it was originally earned by his avowed aloofness from factional ties, his ability to get on with all kinds of useful people and his lucid presentation of facts and figures. He was unique among the Zionists of his generation in that he harmoniously combined the role of the dispassionate administrator of Western legend with that of the committed servant of a fervent nationalist organization.

His diary is a model of discretion: it revealed no secrets and criticized only those, such as Weizman, whom he had rebuked for unwarranted interference in tasks specifically allotted to him. It is one of those diaries kept in order to convince the diarist that he is achieving something of value and still continues a warm-hearted and cultivated human being. Unlike the politicians, he invariably wrote in his native tongue—at least until 'Sonabend, 19 Juli 1941,' nearly

eighteen months before his death, when he wrote: 'I think I should try to write this diary in English. If anybody should be interested in it, it would be probably one of my children, and I am doubtful if, 20 or 30 years hence, they would be able to understand my German in my hasty handwriting' (facsimile, III, p. 339). Why not in Hebrew, the language in which his children were reared? Did he then despair of Zionism's prospects? Not necessarily, despite the doubts occasionally confided to the balance-sheet for the outgoing year that he was in the habit of compiling on Sylvesternacht. On his arrival, he knew enough Hebrew to read a vocalized printed text 'and not always correctly' (II, p. 62); but he was soon persuaded that Hebrew had to be imposed on the polyglot Jewish population for the sake of national unity—'though from the point of view of practical advantage the adoption of a European language would have perhaps been far preferable' (II, p. 63). So he diligently studied Hebrew with Agnon as his teacher and became proficient enough not only to use it for business purposes but even to lecture in it (from a script), though constantly envying others whose fluency was less inhibited by grammatical mistakes more numerous and glaring than his own. It was probably his concern for precision that prevented him from expressing himself in it to his own satisfaction. 'I did not want to speak German in public so as not to set a bad example and worsen the state of affairs. The result was that I either tried to hold back from appearing in public or, though a special effort, I managed to force myself to speak Hebrew, however faulty it might be. It often appeared to me that by giving up the German language, I forfeited, as it were, a large part of my personality and of my influence on the public as well' (II, pp. 64–5).

Evidently Ruppin was no more attracted by the romance of the Hebrew revival than by the ideology of organized labour, although he firmly appreciated the value of both for the implementation of his plans. Race attracted him more, perhaps because he accepted it as a branch of science: at one time he thought of taking photographs and measurements of the Middle East's varied ethnic types as a means of demonstrating that Jews were included in its racial pattern; but he never succumbed to the mysticism that so often accompanies racial studies. It was from a practical standpoint that he came to regard relations with Palestinian Muslims as Zionism's gravest problem and founded an organization to study it. By that time, however, Palestine was no longer under Muslim rule.

Professor Kedourie's quip, 'The Ottoman Empire died of Europe', (*England and the Middle East*, p. 14), makes the history of European settlement in Jerusalem read like the Sick Man's temperature-chart. The Capitulations concluded with France (1536) and England (1583) when he was at his healthiest had made little difference there. Three French attempts to establish a consulate (in 1621, 1699 and 1713) were soon and easily thwarted—allegedly by the local elements with most to gain from helpless foreigners; and even in the eighteenth century when most of the remaining Capitulations were signed, the signatories' representatives resided only in the maritime cities with commercial interests to be protected. The change came with the conquest of Syria (1831) by Mehmet Ali's troops under the command of his son, Ibrahim Pasha, but was more conspicuous after their enforced withdrawal (1841). Britain, the first to appoint a consul in Jerusalem (1838), was followed by France, Prussia and Sardinia (1843), the United States (1844), Austria (1849), Spain (1854) and Russia (1858)—from 1839 Russia had entrusted a (Jewish) consular agent with the protection of Russian Jews. Britain also took the lead in promoting Christian prestige in as much as the Anglican Bishopric (1841) preceded the actual, if not the titular, presence of the Greek Patriarchate (1845) and the inauguration, under Pio Nono, of the Latin (1847). While European Christians were the main beneficiaries, European Jews were also offered hope for the future. Their past had been perilous.

In 1687, when they first organized a community of their own, Europeans

constituted a small minority of the Jewish population of Jerusalem. Their numbers increased in 1700 with the arrival of survivors of the 'holy company' of Judah the Pious. So did their troubles; there were outbreaks of plague in the two following years; and a revolt in the third exposed them to pillage, as long as the city was under siege, and to the indiscriminate ferocity of suppression (1706). A more lasting threat was the burden of debt incurred in the hope of additional support from Europe. Their creditors were powerful Muslims, whose documents may have conformed to the Islamic prohibition of usury, but whose demands, reinforced by rough methods of exacting payment, swiftly mounted. The leaders of the older Jewish community who were better equipped to cope with such threats, managed through their connections in the imperial capital, to secure 'compromises', i.e. instructions freezing debts at current levels; and in Europe, where epistles and emissaries from the Holy Land had spread a sense of emergency, exceptionally large sums were raised. Why these efforts failed is not at all clear from the correspondence, from which the bulk of the evidence for this episode derives—there are, of course, the usual hints of mismanagement at both the collecting and receiving ends—but in 1720 a mob was let loose on the European Jewish quarter and set fire to its synagogue. Some of the inhabitants found shelter in the homes of their oriental brethren, others fled to Hebron or Galilee. Not until 1836, under Ibrahim Pasha, was the quarter redeemed from the creditors' heirs.

Between these dates, European Jews lived in Jerusalem clandestinely in oriental dress, although they continued to solicit alms separately and were even joined from time to time by newcomers from their native lands. However, Jerusalem was then altogether less hospitable than Galilee, which had long been the centre of Jewish life in the Holy Land. The fresh waves of European immigration at the turn of the century were almost entirely drawn there—and not only the Pietist groups, with their obvious affinity to the sites of Jewish mysticism. Even their staunch opponents who, apart from resenting the proximity, let alone the predominance, of Pietists, had set their hearts on Jerusalem, settled first in Tiberias and soon afterwards in Safed; and although they subsequently helped to revive the European Jewish community of Jerusalem on a much larger scale—it was on Safed's ruins. Indeed, the first of them to set foot in Jerusalem came as fugitives from the plague that raged in Safed in 1813—and the few who remained there after the plague had eased still looked to Safed for leadership.

It is with this group's preparations for settlement in the Holy Land that Malachi's sketches begin. He traces them from Shklov to Safed, where their peace was shattered by a series of calamities, the insurrection in the summer of 1834, the earthquake at the beginning of 1837 and the three-day occupation of the city by Druze rebels in July 1838. According to his sources, the fiercest fighting in the 1834 rising took place around Hebron where insurgents from Jerusalem and Nablus had gathered to make a last stand; and the Jews of Hebron were plundered and ill-treated both by them and by the Egyptian soldiers who were granted a free hand for six hours as a reward for their hard-won victory—'had not Ibrahim Pasha hastened to the aid of the Jews, none of the Jews of Hebron would have survived' (p. 73). As a result, Galilee was undefended; the Jews of Tiberias sold all their belongings to purchase their safety for a ransom of 'a hundred purses' (pp. 72–3); and the larger community of Safed endured thirty-three days of terror. Malachi, who names many victims of murder, torture and rape, suggests that most of the atrocities were committed in cold blood for the sake of gain; and he also reports that large sums of money had to be paid to the Qadi of Safed and to the village elders of 'Ayn Zaytun for sheltering Jews. (Throughout this tale of cruelty and greed the solitary and heroic exception is a woman who rebuked her son and was stabbed to death by him when she tried to hinder him

from joining the looters.) Again, the deliverer is Ibrahim Pasha, who is credited with a concern for justice and the will and capacity to administer it. When he was informed, through the consuls in Beirut, to whom a messenger had been sent, of the situation in Safed, he despatched a force under Amir Bashir to restore order and inflict punishment (pp. 67–72).

Scenes of pillage and torture were re-enacted four years later with the Druzes as the villains. This time 'a miracle occurred' (p. 76). The leader of the Pietists, Abraham Ber of Owruetz, who had already handed over 75,000 piastres out of his group's funds, lay fettered while a sword was being sharpened in front of him. A respite for prayers had been granted him, and his assailants sat down to a meal, intermittently mocking and menacing their unfortunate captives who had sought refuge in the Rabbi's house and were listening in awe to his fervent acceptance of Heaven's judgement. Suddenly an elderly man burst in to announce the arrival of Ibrahim Pasha's men, and the rebels fled leaving all their spoil behind them. So fierce was Ibrahim Pasha's revenge and so acute was the dread of his subsequent house-searches that much of the loot was abandoned in the open and eventually restored to the owners. Meanwhile many Jews were naked and penniless. 'Fortunately for them, an Arab friendly to Jews by the name of Muhammad Mustafa, who had tried to protect them during the troubles, lent them money and was concerned to procure food and clothing for them' (p. 77). He is one of the very few Palestinian Muslims to be identified by name in this book, which relies exclusively on Jewish material, i.e. chronicles, memoirs, letters, appeals, dirges and legends, for its fairly detailed accounts of Safed's tribulations.

Some of the following articles, and particularly the survey of the blood-libel's recurrences (pp. 79–89), reflect Jerusalem's rise in the estimation of World Powers, Christian Churches and the Ottoman Empire itself. They certainly testify to the value attached to consular intervention during the second half of the century when European Jews were rapidly increasing in numbers. On the Russian Consul's withdrawal at the start of the Russo-Turkish war of 1877, Russian Jews in Palestine were reported to have paid relatively large sums to consular officials for documents which they erroneously believed would entitle them to the protection of the U.S.A. The alternative, acceptance of Ottoman citizenship, was apparently regarded as exposure to robbery and outrage. Indeed, European Jews tended to register their institutions with their consulates and thus to embroil them in their own internal as well as external disputes—Malachi suggests that Jewish quarrels, grievances and anxieties saved consular staffs from utter boredom (p. 271). Muslims, on the other hand, were involved collectively and almost impersonally in Jewish affairs. To illustrate the interplay of factors, rapacious landlords exploiting the increase in immigration provided a motive for Jewish suburbs outside the Old City; the military posts set up to secure the completion of the Jaffa-Jerusalem road in readiness for the Emperor Franz Josef's visit (1869) made suburbs outside the walls habitable; and the impetus to buy land came from the influence of Christian romantics on Jewish philanthropists. Mrs Yardeni's study enables us to observe the different stages of such developments. For instance, the Gawlor, father and son, devised schemes for Jewish agricultural settlement in Palestine as a first step towards universal redemption and for some forty years pressed them on Sir Moses Montefiore. He passed the message on to other magnates more amenable to 'the spirit of the age' and less to rabbinic authority. It was discussed in the Jewish communal press of Europe (pp. 46–7). Thence it was conveyed to Jerusalem, where a few Jewish newspapers had correspondents. But the initial response of Jerusalem's European Jews was less enthusiastic.

An article in Jerusalem's first Hebrew newspaper (*Lebanon* Vol. 1, Nos. 5 and 6, 1863), referred to the interest shown by Christians over the previous

twenty years in Palesine, to their declared belief 'that the Holy Land would be draped in mourning as long as the people which had once dwelt there did not return' and to their attempts to persuade their governments to help Jews 'to settle on their land, the land of the Lord'. This agitation has led 'several of our brethren abroad' to suppose that it was now possible to buy Palestine from the Turks. After ridiculing the delusion that Turkey would ever sell the land, which every child knew to be sacred to Muslims as well, the writer of the article turned to the desolate and lawless state of the country 'beset by robbers and murderers'. Even in the towns Jews were insulted by Muslims. 'All his spittle and vomit do not suffice him, when he passes a Jew walking in his direction, for spitting in his face' What would be their fate if they entered rural areas and tried to acquire large stretches of land? The article concluded with an emphatic warning, based on the previous British Consul's disastrous failure, of the folly of agricultural ventures. 'We will sit still and continue to wait for the Lord's salvation . . . We will not entertain the vain notion spreading to the ends of the earth that we should attempt in these days to acquire our land' (p. 22).

The Consul was James Finn, who, with the aid of his determined missionary wife, encouraged Jews to engage in agriculture. When his long service (1846-62) was abruptly terminated in consequence of his bankruptcy, two of his Jewish protégés were forced to abandon the land they had purchased in the vicinity of Jerusalem, and to appeal, in the next issue of *Lebanon*, to the philanthropists to obtain a decree confirming them in legal possession of it (*ibid.*, p. 23). Soon afterwards *Havaşseleth* published an article in favour of Jewish agriculture and reported an improvement in security following the Pasha's recent tours of intimidation (*ibid.*, pp. 31-2); but its motives would seem to have had little or nothing to do with either agriculture or security. Shortly before *Lebanon's* appearance, its publishers had started a printing-press in competition with Israel Bak's, which had been transferred from Berditchev to Safed in 1831, only to be wrecked in 1834 and re-established in Jerusalem in 1841 thanks to Sir Moses' munificence; and Bak's claim to a monopoly of Hebrew printing in the Holy City was rejected by the Rabbinical Court. Consequently, seeing that *Lebanon* tended to publicize the dominant faction, Bak accepted a subsidy from its opponents to publish *Havaşseleth* on their behalf. Their press war came to a sudden end in the following year (1864) when both were suppressed on the grounds that their publishers had neglected to apply for permission; and public discussion of Jewish factional strife in the Holy Land was once again confined to that section of the Jewish press of Europe whose readers had been—and, in later years, continued to be—the main target of Jerusalem's Jewish journalists.

It was not until 1870 that Israel Bak managed to obtain a license to publish *Havaşseleth*, which then continued, under the editorship of his son-in-law, Frumkin, until 1911. A new breed of Jewish philanthropist was now wielding the power of the purse in Europe; and their eagerness to wean young men from sacred study to manual toil was liable to tempt any writer with a grudge against the spiritual leaders of Jerusalem's ever growing European community and the administrators of its institutions. Frumkin was perhaps the most successful exploiter of the call for self-help. The slur that the poor were being provided with synagogues instead of chances to earn a livelihood began in his editorials and was repeated with topical variations in his appeals to the charitable in Western European cities and in the Eastern European towns which he (and his competitors) visited at intervals in order to retrieve their fortunes. Fund-raising, however, was not in itself a qualification for communal leadership. In addition to fomenting strife inside the community, one had to defend it against external foes. Most of the paper's allusions to Muslims came in the form of protests against outrages, e.g. assaults on Jews (and the customary arrest of the victims rather than the

perpetrators) and the desecration of Jewish places of worship and burial. Indeed, an article on the plight of the Jews of Hebron resulted in the editor's appearance in court—which he, of course, attributed to his enemies' machinations. But he also published travelogues by Joshua Yellin, one of James Finn's protégés, who still cherished the prospect of Jewish agriculture and was then the warmest supporter of a plan for settlement near Jericho. Yellin was enthusiastic not merely about the landscape of the Holy Land but also about its inhabitants' uprightness and the extent of their hospitality which had enabled him to observe the commandments of the Torah during his extensive travels. He concluded his appeal to Jews to settle in the villages and support themselves by cultivation of the soil with the assurance 'that even the shadow of fear has departed from us on the other side of the Jordan as well as on this' (p. 75). Frumkin also maintained, despite reports to the contrary in his columns, that one could now travel safely throughout the length and breadth of the land.

More reliable testimony that fear was being gradually dispelled came from Joel Moses Salomon, the editor of *Judah and Jerusalem* and, like Yellin, a native of Jerusalem. In 1877, five years after Yellin's article, Salomon was sent by the Rabbis of the European community to investigate certain orchards with a view to discovering whether grafting was practised and, if so, forbidding the ritual use of their citrons during the Feast of Tabernacles. He described his friendly reception:

in the manner of the people of the Orient to whom flattering speech and a smooth tongue are a heritage from ages past. The faces of the proprietors of the orchards and the look in their eyes in this lonely plain cast terror and dread upon anyone unacquainted with them, for they resemble desert wolves in the mountains of prey and their glances pierce kidneys and heart (p. 100).

On closer acquaintance, he asserted, fear changed to contempt; and there was every reason for Jews to emulate the Wuertembergers who had proved that Europeans could farm in Palestine. Four years later (1881), Pethaḥ Tiqwaḥ, the first Jewish agricultural colony in the Holy Land, was founded by European Jews from Jerusalem.

The other colonies started during the eighties were inhabited by fugitives from the outbreak of violence that marked the end of the most promising reign in Russian history. Zionism (in the modest form that it assumed before Herzl came to it) gained a foothold in Palestine in 1882 when some hundreds of Russian Jewish families landed in Jaffa. No preparations had been made to feed and shelter them, opportunities of employment were few, and dismay at the prospect of watching their savings fruitlessly dwindle prompted some of them to leave, even more hastily than they had come, for other havens of refuge. The plight of the remainder was gradually relieved by the philanthropists, who now renewed their efforts to provide work for them, but not before the government imposed restrictions on immigration from Russia and Rumania. The decree, according to Mrs Yardeni, was greeted by a mixture of regret and relief in the press (p. 107). In addition to the burden of the immigrants' poverty on a far from prosperous community, they had attracted the unfavourable attention of the populace and the government. Even Ben-Judah, who was later to support the newcomers, felt that they were too conspicuous. His disciple, David Yudelovitz, claimed that their arrival had brought about two major misfortunes: 'the tumult that arose among the Arabs', who had doubled and trebled the prices of their lands, and immigration of 'a mob of people expecting to find in front of them a table laid with all the land's bounty'. The best of them, he added, left almost as soon as they had come, while the worst remained and were caught in the snares of the

missionaries (pp. 123–4). Ben-Judah himself was privately troubled as to whether the official decree had been partly provoked by his writing, and the vehemence of Frumkin's editorial disclaimer suggests that at least a share of responsibility was popularly attributed to his paper. On parting from Frumkin soon afterwards, Ben-Judah formed a secret society. Its manifesto (September 1882) stated:

We shall not succeed . . . If we proceed with storm and tempest and carry out our work with a loud noise, for the government will view us adversely, however far the thought of rebellion and disobedience may be from us, and the people of the land will be hostile to us, should they think that we have come to drive them from the land (p. 119).

To judge from a letter written in the following year, that was precisely what he wanted (pp. 320, 403).

During their collaboration Frumkin had ridiculed Ben-Judah's agitation in favour of Hebrew as the medium of instruction in schools. His own stubborn advocacy of secular education, in the teeth of the community's ban on it, was based largely on its capacity to relieve poverty, a purpose which Hebrew, unlike Arabic, Turkish and French, could hardly be expected to fulfil. To him, apart from its value as a path to employment for the bread-winners of needy families, the Arabic language had no special appeal. He was more interested in the manners and customs of those who spoke it, since folklore belonged to his general notion of enlightenment. In the seventies, for instance, *Havaṣṣeleth* published a translation of a translation of an Arabic poem and two stories of Beduin life—which had all been received from Russia—the fact that they were outnumbered by articles on the exotic habits of more distant peoples may merely indicate the relative scarcity at that time of material pertaining to the life of the region in the European (mainly German) papers from which Frumkin, his contributors and competitors borrowed freely and often without acknowledgement of their sources. Admittedly, Ben-Judah displayed a keener interest in Arabic on the grounds of its power to enrich the Hebrew vocabulary and throw light on the mentality and condition of contenders for the ownership of the country. In respect of them, his paper, on its appearance in 1885, differed from Frumkin's in that it identified them by language instead of, as was more common at the time, by religion and that it regularly contained his versions of articles on their social and economic life by European writers.

By then Frumkin also tended to pay more attention to a subject of increasing relevance to his readers. The colonists were in daily contact with the villages around them—the satires composed by their critics picture the men as watching labourers at work on their land and the women as reading novels and leaving domestic work to servants—and the growth of trade and industry in the towns was introducing more European Jews to their Muslim and Christian counterparts. In the early nineties, the first crop of direct translation from Arabic into Hebrew was produced—a sparse crop derived for the most part from oral rather than written material and selected on grounds of resemblance to Jewish tradition rather than literary or historical merit. Mrs Yardeni's final chapter, ostensibly devoted to translation from the Arabic in the Hebrew press of the second half of the period under review, mentions only one Arabic author—al-Samaw'al, the famous Jewish poet of pre-Islamic Arabia. The Hebrew translator of extracts from his *diwan* was David Yellin (the son of Joshua Yellin by a Baghdadi mother). Though probably not the first Palestinian Jew to read or write Arabic as well as Hebrew characters, David Yellin was undoubtedly the mentor of a small band of writers grouped round a political myth more lasting than their literary and educational work. Three of them were his pupils and followed him into

teaching at the secular schools founded under the aegis of European philanthropists. (School-teaching, it must be stressed, was then a new profession in Palestine, and its pretensions to a higher status than was accorded to elementary instruction in traditional institutions were not yet generally accepted).

Since the schools, though banned by the European, were initially patronized by the Ottoman Rabbinate, a high proportion of their pupils came from Arabic-speaking homes. One of them was David Yellin, whose father, ex-communicated and deprived of his share in the monthly subsidy from Eastern Europe for sending him to school, was more or less affiliated to the Ottoman community. From youth onwards, Joshua Yellin had courted the friendship of the Muslims whom he encountered in the course of his commercial activities; and he now saw to it that his son was taught literary Arabic and instilled in him a partiality for the *milieu* in which it was cherished. David's feet, together with those of his emulators, were thus set on the path to Orientalism, for their secular education imbued them with a respect for current modes of European thought among which enthusiasm for Oriental studies was the most easily applicable to their circumstances. Not only was it likely to raise their status but it also helped to overcome a technical difficulty to their profit. As Hebrew teachers in secular schools, they envied their colleagues the text-books available for instruction in secular subjects: more specifically, they wanted compatible readers to supplement the sacred texts they were employed to expound. So they compiled their own, ransacking Arabic folklore to fill anthologies with legends, maxims, verses, anecdotes, witticisms, rites and ceremonies paralleled in biblical and rabbinic literature. Their quest inevitably exaggerated the extent to which the whole cultural zone had been permeated by Judaism before the rise of Islam. From there, under the secularizing pressure of linguistic nationalism, it was but one step towards emphasis on the unifying force of cultural ties as opposed to the divisive demands of religion. To quote Joseph Meyuhas, as assiduous collector of 'mass-literature' (*sifrut hamonith*):

The two peoples are one people, and these two branches belong to one stock, and the more we explore the roots, disposition, language and literature of the Arab people, the more shall we reveal Israel and the secrets of its language (p. 323).

They found allies outside their circle. Indeed, Israel Belkind, who was also a teacher and an author of text-books but belonged to the first batch of Zionist immigrants, went a step further. While travelling on both sides of the Jordan in 1894, he came to the conclusion that 'the overwhelming majority' of the inhabitants were descended from Jews 'who had not left the land but had endured their political and spiritual exile in it'. This discovery impelled him to ask: 'Are we to go on distinguishing them as Arabs . . . only because they speak Arabic?' Evidently not. 'We are brothers, brothers in stock, brothers, sons of one people' (p. 320). He and the kindred spirits whose predilection for tribal and village traditions with scriptural connotations was amply reflected in the press of the period, were searching for ancestors whose prestige would redress their doubts of themselves and their future—naturally enough, since they had brought with them from Europe the new Jewish learning whose ancillary aim was to meet the challenge of emancipation by showing up Jewish self-esteem with historical scaffolding. In all traditional faiths, a shift from theology and sacred law to history has myth-forming propensities, and a myth involving the rediscovery of remote ancestors invariably issues from a family rift. Accordingly, the colonists, under constant attack from *Havaṣṣeleth*, then virtually the organ of the European community of Jerusalem, were now being harassed by fellow-nationalists. Yet

while both trends of criticism converged on the colonists' failure to adjust themselves to their new surroundings, the motives underlying them were very different. Frumkin, for example, resented their attachment to Russian headgear and other characteristics that led Muslims to identify them—to their pride and pleasure—with Islam's foremost enemy in the society of nations. He was actuated, as he stated more than once, by fear of the consequences for his own community and, particularly for those who wanted to join it for, in his final phase, he became more appreciative of his community's value as a shelter for devout pilgrims. Besides, he now subscribed more readily to the traditional concept of Exile: in this unredeemed world Jews had to pay for protection in the discharge of their sacred duties, and subservience and tact were part of the price exacted from them. (*Havaşseleth* paid it with inordinately long and flowery eulogies on the 25th anniversary of the Sultan's accession, the German Emperor's visit and the death of Queen Victoria in addition to the respectful tone of its routine references to Ottoman personalities and occasions). Belkind, on the other hand, was not content to be a protected outsider: it was in order to renew their oriental roots that he urged the colonists to jettison their European outlook, enter into genuine partnership with the people of the country and learn from their ways and skills.

His blend of Russian populism and biblical romanticism became fashionable. By the turn of the century it was providing Hebrew fiction with fresh characters and the younger generation in the colonies with ideological support for their imitative inclinations. Zionist writers, residents and tourists alike, were soon to acclaim a new breed of Jew, at home in the saddle and a fair marksman, fluent in Arabic and crowned with the distinctive headgear of the countryside, as proof of the capacity of Eastern European Jews to take root in the land of their fathers; and for many years exotic modes of entertainment, e.g. the sword-dance performed on the occasion of the Baron's inspection of Kinnereth in 1912 (Ruppin, II, p. 130), were used to convince visiting philanthropists of the efficacy of their donations. But Joseph Klausner in Odessa, while welcoming signs that the exilic aura of timidity and helplessness was being dispelled, 'would have liked it to be a direct result of the new life itself, of the cultivator's and vine-grower's life in nature's bosom, of the life close to nature of an inhabitant of a land far from Europe's over-rated and artificial civilization; but I would not at all have liked—and all Zionists will surely agree with me here—Jews to imitate the Arabs and the Beduins, that is to say, that they should be influenced by a primitive civilization, which, despite its virtues, has ever so many grave defects.' He was quick to note the one-way direction of the cultural traffic and to contrast Hebrew's minimal influence on Arabic with Arabic's growing intrusion into Hebrew speech and writing. The colonists, he alleged, not only called their own settlements by their Arabic names instead of by the Hebrew names conferred on them, but had in certain instances failed to give them a Hebrew name at all—a dangerous omission, in Klausner's view, since the retention of an Arabic name sustained hopes of the land's ultimate reversion to Arab ownership. He was also indignant about the arrangement of facilities for immigrants to learn Arabic 'as if our fathers and mothers had not learned as much Polish, Russian and even Lithuanian as they needed for their business without evening-classes' (*Hash-shiloah*, 11, Nos. 5–6, 1907–8).

Ruppin, whose preliminary tour of Palestine preceded the publication of these criticisms by several months, may have disagreed: in his account of his impressions (which the Zionist Organization's paper, *Die Welt*, published in March 1908), he advocated the inclusion of Arabic 'since it is the dominant language in the land' in the primary school curriculum (II, p. 29); and throughout the second volume of his memoirs, which he compiled towards the end of his life, the settlements' original names (followed by the Hebrew in brackets) frequently

occur. Yet he undoubtedly shared the implicit fear of a permanently dependent Jewish minority. All his own undertakings seemed to him (in 1908) insignificant in the light of the task he had set himself. 50,000 out of a total Jewish population of 70,000 were 'indifferent or hostile to the national movement'; of the remainder only about a thousand families were engaged in agriculture; 'and their situation was by no means satisfactory. It is a matter of urgency to extend this narrow base immediately, if colonization activity in the country is not to become a kind of children's game' (II, p. 96). To raise funds he travelled widely, wrote informatively and appealed earnestly. Much of the manpower had already been imported, from 1905 onwards, with the second wave of Zionist immigration, young men reared in the movement and eager to work on the land. Nevertheless, their absorption into Jewish agriculture presented difficulties. The colonists, far from affluent in the best of years and on the verge of ruin in the worst, were reluctant to employ labourers twice as expensive as, and less experienced, industrious and obedient than, neighbouring villagers; and the would-be labourers accused them of looking after their own material interests while posing as 'idealists' and soliciting aid from Zionists on that score. Ruppín characteristically tried to please both sides—and succeeded up to a point: in order to enable Jews to compete in the agricultural labour market, he encouraged immigration from the Yemen, provided cheap housing in the settlements and entrusted organized groups of workers with the development of some of the newly purchased areas. He was thus in a position to report to the eleventh Zionist Congress (1913) an increase in the number of Jewish agricultural workers from a few hundred to over a thousand (II, pp. 96–100).

Organized labour then started on its march to power under the influence of A. D. Gordon and J. H. Brenner, whose writings offered a more exacting alternative to the complacent romanticism of the time; and Ruppín was drawn to it by its consciousness of long-term Zionist aims and readiness for arduous toil and sacrifice in their service. Before he set foot in the country, Brenner had recognized the Arabs of Palestine as the enemy and foreseen his own death at their hands. An encounter with ruffians on his first evening in Haifa (1908) followed by observation of bullying and extortion on the part of minor officials and of the settlers' passivity in the face of highway-robbery and murder, led him to associate them not with rustic idylls of scriptural antiquity but with their Eastern European counterparts, whose victims were similarly inhabited by fears of vengeance from retaliating. He envied the Arabs only their assurance, despite poverty and disease, of their right to be there; and he derided the idealization of their lives by contemporary writers as an example of the debilitating pacifism engrained in Jews by their long depression. Ruffin was extremely reticent on the subject of violence and expressed his disapproval of it in the slightest of hints. He mentions Brenner, who translated his *Die Juden der Gegenwart* into Hebrew, only once—in a brief entry reporting his murder in the May-day massacre of 1921. His own allusions to insecurity are singularly brief and unemotional. Clashes over land, for instance, elicit a sober resolve to compensate tenants in all future land-deals, regardless of the additional burden on the movement's resources (II, p. 125). Like most Zionists at that time, he attributed hostility to economic grievances alone. It was in order to show 'tangible benefits' that the Baron gave large sums to the Jerusalem and Jaffa municipalities for the relief of the Muslim poor and offered to endow an Arabic *gymnasium* in Damascus (II, p. 137).

The military coup which forced the Sultan to restore the constitution (July 22, 1908) escaped the diarist's notice, despite the public displays of fraternization between members of all three faiths—David Yellin is reported to have addressed Arab nationalist meetings in those days. Ruppín's solitary reference to the

Committee of Union and Progress occurs in one of a series of articles on the situation in Asiatic Turkey, which he wrote for the *Berliner Tageblatt* in the summer of 1912. After noting that elections in the Arab provinces were being held later than in European Turkey and Asia Minor, he added: 'The Arabs have no love for the Young Turks and would willingly have voted for the opponents of the government. Yet when news of the Committee's victory arrived from the rest of the country, they preferred to support the victors, and in the event the Committee's candidates were elected with a decisive majority' (II, pp. 189-190). Apart from this paragraph, he concentrated on government projects and the need for the administration of public health, education and justice to match them; and his diary confirms that he really believed his cautiously optimistic forecast. In an entry dated January 1, 1914—his customary appraisal of the past year—he wrote that 'with the end of bloody quarrels between Turkey and its neighbours Asiatic Turkey is about to Europeanize itself, with the aid of the Turkish government or with the aid of Western powers; and in a Europeanized state it is seven times as hard to secure economic and cultural predominance. We must now surpass our previous efforts if we are to take advantage of the interlude' (II, p. 224).

His philosophy—'man can find comfort in his troubles only if he links them with history or destiny' (II, p. 188)—was to undergo a severe test. At the end of the year, during the expulsion of Russian Jews who declined to become Ottoman subjects, he could still write: 'Yet this expulsion by order of the Turkish authorities is no worse than the actions of all the European states now waging war; the Turkish authorities are even more lenient than they are and behave more decently; but they work clumsily and thereby cause many difficulties and great distress' (II, p. 235). Under Jamal Pasha, the Military Governor of Syria, the country reverted to a cruder and more capricious style of government. For instance, on January 16, 1915, thirty Jewish notables of Jerusalem, Jaffa and the colonies assembled before him only to be told brusquely that they were all to be deported to Constantinople: but after private conversation with Antebi, a favoured Turkish-speaking Jew, agreed that only fourteen of the thirty should be exiled and not to Constantinople but to Haifa, Tiberias or Damascus for a period of between ten to fourteen days (II, p. 237). Again, on March 2, 1915, towards evening, he unexpectedly arrived in Jaffa. 'He spent most of his time walking through the streets of Tel-Aviv and inspected the *Gymnasium*. Moreover, in a speech which he delivered, he declared that he was friendly to Jews and guaranteed their safety. He also ordered the distribution of printed leaflets to the effect that he absolved Jews from the charge of lack of patriotism that was being levelled at them and would punish anyone accusing them of anything of the kind' (II, p. 241). Ruppin hints that this gesture followed American diplomatic intervention, which, together with material aid, partially relieved the very grave plight of the Jewish population.

Zionists were in greater danger than other Jews of blackmail, denunciation, home-searches and arrests, since Jamal had openly condemned their movement as subversive. Ruppin tried repeatedly to explain his case but was not even admitted—indeed, as a result of the mediation of Jamal's German Chief-of-Staff, he incurred hatred. After a succession of threats had failed to move him, he and four of his colleagues were put on trial. The entry on the verdict reads as follows:

Jerusalem February 13, 1916. I have now tasted the pleasure of appearing before a Turkish military court. Five years ago they denounced me for selling Qeren Qayyemeth le-Yisrael stamps and thus offending against state sovereignty. For five years prosecution documents went to and fro between Constantinople and Jaffa. In January, 1916, a court investigator in Jaffa took evidence

from me and when I returned from my journey to Transjordan and was getting off my horse, a policeman confronted me and handed me a summons to appear before the military court in Jerusalem. In addition to myself, Dr Thon, Ulitski, Feldman and Blumenfeld were prosecuted as accomplices. The trial lasted, with intervals, for three weeks (six sessions) and ended on February 9, with a declaration that, on the proposal of the government prosecutor, we were all acquitted, since nothing had been said about the distribution of forged stamps, which the prosecution had alleged, and even though collecting money for the benefit of foreign organizations was not allowed, it was neither prohibited nor punishable by a fine in any clause of the Constitution. The trial was conducted by the President of the Court (Major Ibrahim Bey) with extraordinary courtesy and friendliness. I was allowed to explain the nature of Zionism to the court and to read to the judges extracts from my book *Die Juden der Gegenwart*. Nevertheless, I think that my German citizenship and the energetic intercession of the German Embassy in Constantinople and the German Consul here contributed more than logical reasons towards my acquittal.

Indeed, the German Embassy refused to comply with Jamal's request for Ruppin's, at least temporary, recall from Palestine. (Although prepared for publication during 1941, the extracts from the diary and even the narrative covering the earlier war testify to the consistent and vigilant friendliness and humanity of German's representatives, military and civilian, towards Jews). Soon afterwards, however, Jamal let it be known that the colonies would suffer for Ruppin's obstinacy. In order to spare them, Ruppin sought and was granted an interview during which he offered to hand over his functions to his assistant, Dr Thon, who was ready to become an Ottoman subject, and withdraw to Jerusalem where he would write a book on Syria's economy. To his astonishment, Jamal immediately agreed; and Ruppin, armed with Jamal's letters of introduction, visited the main cities to collect material and then wrote it up in the American Archaeological Institute. As soon as the work was finished, a French translation was made and sent to Jamal, who naturally expected to find in it a tribute to his own contribution to Syria's economic progress. In his disappointment, he sent for Ruppin, gave him eight days in which to leave the country and swore that he would never return (II, pp. 256-8). So Ruppin spent the last two years of the war in Constantinople where, with the use of German facilities, he helped to keep open the movement's channels of information and aid.

The second volume ends with his second rendezvous with destiny. On July 2, 1920, he was engaged in amicable conversation with a Jewish High Commissioner in the very room where he had been irrevocably expelled by a ruler once all powerful and now a fugitive under sentence of death (II, p. 313). Two years later (July 22, 1922) Jamal was assassinated in Tiflis by two Armenians.

To summarize, the situation of European Jews in the Holy Land was unique during the period under review: nowhere else in the world did a Jewish community depend on charity from abroad for sustenance and on the consuls of foreign states for safety. Yet they still submitted to their immediate environment in traditional fashion: that is to say, they respected lawful authority, appeased lawless power and were circumspect in their dealings with their neighbours, whom they judged solely by their behaviour towards themselves. Indeed, their initial resentment of the first wave of Zionist Immigration was provoked by indiscretion rather than ideology.

The newcomers relied heavily not only on subsidies from Europe and consular protection but also, if they were to survive as farmers, on the experience, industry and low wages of the cultivators in nearby villages. They came to admire their qualities, to adopt some of their ways and even—in literature, at any rate—to

assume an ethnic kinship with them and with the population as a whole. In their enthusiasm, which undoubtedly helped them to acclimatize, they were evidently ready to overlook the implication of permanent dependence; and it was left to the second wave of Zionist immigration to recall the movement's basic purpose and subordinate myths to it.

The final episode serves to remind us of the consular regime's merit in relieving the plight of victims of oppression and hardship. In its annals, the humanitarian endeavours of the representatives of the United States and Germany in Palestine during the First World War deserve a place of honour.

The Zionist Attitude to the Arabs 1908-1914

Yaacov Ro'i

I

A good deal has been written about the beginnings of the Arab national movement, its cultural background and early teachings. A certain amount has been written about its political manifestations in the period before World War I, the different groups and societies and their various inclinations and aspirations. However, one aspect of this movement has received very little attention, namely its relations with the Zionist movement and Jewish activity in Palestine, one side of which will be discussed in this article.¹

As early as 1905 a number of Arab nationalist and anti-Zionist manifestations drew the attention of the European press and of Zionists to the Arab national movement. In that year Negib Azoury published *Le Réveil de la Nation Arabe* which demanded the establishment of an independent Arab empire from the Nile to the Euphrates. He indicated the danger to the fulfilment of the project inherent in the Zionist movement, the ultimate aim of which, according to Azoury, was the revival of the ancient Jewish state at its most expansive.²

An article on the Arab movement devoted largely to an analysis of Azoury's book, was the first of three articles published on the subject in the Jewish nationalist periodical *Hashiloah*. The article discussed 'the Arab movement, that has just come to light and attracted the gaze of all the peoples of Europe'. The writer pointed out that while there was as yet no real Arab nationalist movement, and although the Arab was still living in a state of ignorance, serfdom and religious fanaticism 'in history it is the movements, not the

governments, that are victorious. And if the Arab movement — if such a movement exists as yet — develops into a movement that is simultaneously nationalist and popular, it can be expected to prove dangerous to Zionism, for even if they cannot say that Palestine is their country historically, the Arabs are *in effect* the masters of the country in that they comprise the majority of its population and, most important, of the tillers of the land'.³

At the Seventh Zionist Congress that took place in Basle in July 1905, the President of the Congress, Max Nordau referred to 'a movement' which 'has taken hold of a large part of the Arab people' and 'can easily take on a direction that will affect Palestine'.⁴ On the occasion of the Congress, a Palestinian then studying in Switzerland gave a detailed account of the Arab problem as encountered by the new Jewish settlers in Palestine, a lecture that was printed in 1907 under the caption: 'An Unapparent Question'.⁵ A prominent Russian Zionist suggested to M. Ussishkin, who had been appointed by the Seventh Congress to the Inner Zionist Actions Committee (or Executive, as it was later known) that the Actions Committee 'appoint a *political commission*.... This commission will decide concerning our attitude to the movement of the Arabs so that everyone will not hold forth according to his inclination'.⁶

It soon, however, became clear to the Zionists — as to others — that the Arab awakening had not yet adopted concrete form, and Zionist literature, official and otherwise, seems to have made no further mention of the problem until after the Young Turk Revolution of July 1908.

Before turning to the main theme of this article, it is worth recording — notwithstanding the above-mentioned essay — that the new Jewish Yishuv (or settlement) had not been entirely oblivious to an inherent Arab question even though it gave it relatively little attention. The Yishuv, whose history begins about 1880, grew out of the 'Lovers of Zion' movement and later, to an extent, out of political Zionism and a number of the more observant and farseeing of its members drew some important conclusions concerning their new Arab neighbours, with whom they had daily contact. It is not possible, within the scope of this article, to discuss the attitude of the Jewish population of Palestine to the Arabs before 1908 or even from 1908-1914 except

insofar as it is represented in the attitude of official Zionist institutions. Nevertheless it is necessary to make the point that a few people in the new Yishuv were aware of the fact that the expansion of the Yishuv could not be undertaken without taking into consideration in one way or another and on various levels the country's Arab population. This demand for a positive attitude to the Arabs was relevant to the commercial life of the towns, to the development of the country's agriculture, to co-existence within the framework of local administrative institutions and to the cultural and educational aspects of the Jewish national movement which were of great import in the Yishuv.

Finally, mention must be made of the few occasions on which Theodore Herzl, the creator of the Zionist Organization and its president from its founding in 1897 until his death in 1904, made allusion to the Arabs or an Arab problem. In 1899 Herzl wrote to the Arab Yusuf Ziya al-Khalidi that as far as the Arab population of Palestine was concerned, the Zionist has no intention of expropriating it; on the contrary, the non-Jews would only be enriched by the introduction of Jewish wealth into Palestine.⁷ Herzl's diaries include only very sparse and unimportant reference to the Arabs, the last of which, entered four months before his death, mentions 'an Arab movement which intends to make a descendant of Mohammed Caliph. The Caliphate was stolen by Sultan Selim. Now it ought to be restored, as a sort of papacy with Mecca as Rome!'⁸

II

Although the Zionist Organization was founded in 1897, it had no official representative in Palestine until 1908 when in accordance with a decision taken the previous year at the Eighth Zionist Congress, an official office was opened in Jaffa known as the Palestine Office (*Palästina-amt*).⁹ The head of the office for the entire period under discussion was Dr. Arthur Ruppin, who came to Palestine specifically to fill the post. He was assisted by Dr. Jacob Thon and a very small staff, among them Joshua Radler-Feldmann, who joined the office towards the end of 1909; Joshua Hankin, engaged in May 1910; and Nissim Malul whose task it was from January 1912 to read the Arab press, and report on,

translate into Hebrew and reply to articles concerning the Jews and Zionism.¹⁰

The Palestine Office was responsible to the Zionist Inner Actions Committee, the seat of which was in Cologne from 1905 until August 1911, and in Berlin from that date until the end of our period. From September 1911, the Inner Actions Committee (which was, in effect, as already mentioned, the executive body of the Zionist Organization) had a representative in Istanbul, Dr. Victor Jacobson, whose functions included the supervision of all that occurred in Palestine. Jacobson had been in the Turkish capital since September 1908, at which time he was placed at the head of the Anglo-Levantine Banking Company, then created to provide official camouflage for an office of the Zionist Organization that could not be otherwise established in the Turkish capital.

We shall try to show the attitude to the Arabs and the Arab national movement of the various Zionist institutions: the Congress held biannually in the years under discussion; the Zionist Greater and Inner Actions Committee; the Zionist office in Istanbul and the Palestine Office.

This article cannot feasibly deal with the land purchase policy of the Zionist Organization as a whole or of the Palestine Office, nor with the labour question, except insofar as they reflect the attitude of these institutions to the Arabs. Both of these subjects were, however, of primary significance in the development of the Yishuv, and had important repercussions on relations with the Arabs. Suffice it to say at this point that Dr. Ruppin as well as many of the Russian Zionists looked upon the purchase of every available tract of land as the foremost, immediate objective upon which every effort must be concentrated. At the same time the socialist element in the Zionist movement in general, and in the Palestine Yishuv in particular, placed special stress on the need for Jewish labour. The motives in both instances were internal, emanating from considerations of the inherent needs of the Jewish revival; but the local Arab fellaheen occasionally reacted — from the earliest days of the new Yishuv — by perpetrating physical violence. These outbreaks were not the results of the actual purchase by Jews of land in Palestine — since most of the fellaheen themselves were not landowners — but of its implementation. Hitherto the

proprietors had been chiefly absentee landowners to whom a percentage of the crops had to be paid but who did not interfere with the traditional rights of pasture, or with other aspects of everyday life that gave rise to bad feeling and sometimes conflict when the Jewish colonists came to settle on the land they purchased. In the course of time the neighbouring Arabs of each village or colony also manifested their dissatisfaction with the attempts to introduce Jewish labour.

These disputes and the resulting incidents had become an important feature of Palestinian life in the last year before the First World War. Yet at this time Jews possessed little more than 100,000 acres, or 2 per cent of the land of Palestine, while the number of Jewish agricultural labourers was approximately 2000, or 10 per cent of the total hired labour employed in Jewish farms and villages.¹¹

The meagre results of over thirty years of endeavour and a good deal of suffering were certainly not the outcome of lack of trying or vision as far as the Palestine Office, for example, was concerned. The constant setbacks and slowness of achievement reflected a number of phenomena which were the bane of the Yishuv. The first was internal dissension and strife: only in the last two or three years of the entire period 1880-1914 was there any more or less recognized concerted action and leadership, personified in the Palestine Office. The second factor was the extreme poverty of the Zionist Organization as a whole and the paucity of means at the disposal of the actual Palestine effort, in view of which the myth of international Jewish influence and high finance stands out in tragi-comic contrast. The third obstacle was external: the corruption and intricacies of Ottoman rule and the virtually constant, though not always open, hostility of the Ottoman government to the Yishuv and to its expansion in which the Arabs played no small role, though not always a direct one.

This article will try to show the beginnings of an official or semi-official policy towards the Arabs of Palestine, both per se and within the framework of Zionist Turkish policy. It will also try to indicate the first moves towards contact with the incipient Arab national movement.

III

The Arab-Jewish incidents in which settlers or labourers were attacked and sometimes killed, and their farms and livestock pillaged, increased in number and intensity after the Young Turk Revolution of 1908, or more specifically from April 1909 onwards. Such mention as was made of the Arabs or an Arab problem at Zionist congresses or in the Zionist press was mostly in connection with those incidents, of which official Zionist opinion was inclined to make light. Conflicts with local Arab villagers or cases of infiltration on the part of desert tribes who came to pasture their flocks on land now in Jewish possession, were considered simply examples of the Arab nomads' tendency to plunder wherever the opportunity presented itself. Alternatively, they were described as manifestations of deliberate provocation on the part of unrepresentative Arab elements, who, for the sake of their own vested interests, wished to cause bad feeling between the Arab population and the Jewish Yishuv.

A Poalei Zion delegate at the Tenth Zionist Congress, S. Kaplansky, thus took pains to stress the animosity of the Christian Arabs and the Arab landowners as distinct from the community of interests of the Jews and the Arab population as a whole. The latter reaped great economic benefit from the coming of the Jews to Palestine and from the expansion of the Yishuv. The speaker was convinced of the feasibility of achieving an understanding with the local populace (*'mit der arabischen Demokratie'*).¹² This essential identity of interest was a major theme in the ideology of the Palestine Social-Democratic Poalei Zion party which thus countered the charges of other Russian Jewish socialist elements that Zionism meant the depopulation and disfranchisement of the Palestine Arabs. The Poalei Zion theoretician Y. Ben-Zvi indicated the benefit to the Arabs of the introduction into Palestine of modern mechanized and intensive agriculture.¹³

At the same Tenth Zionist Congress, Dr. J. Thon of the Jaffa Palestine Office, likewise referring to the frequent outbreaks of violence in Palestine between Arabs and Jews, said that they must not be exaggerated in that they did not reflect popular Arab opinion. The disturbances were caused, according to Thon, by individual local officials and jour-