GEOPOLITICAL GENESIS AND PROSPECT OF ZIONISM

Mohameden Ould-Mey, PhD
Department of Geography, Geology, and Anthropology
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN 47809, USA
http://mama.indstate.edu/users/mouldmey/index.html

ABSTRACT

Zionists take for granted and teach three central tenets: (1) the Jews invented Zionism, (2) the Jews are a Semitic people, and (3) the State of Israel should and will remain an exclusively Jewish state. This paper takes issue with the first claim and raises critical questions about the others. First, the paper presents Zionism and the Jewish Question as geopolitical children of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation conflict in Europe and the Euro-Arab/Western-Islamic colonial encounter. Second, it traces the non-Jewish origins of Zionism to Puritan England, the English-Dutch commercial wars, and Napoleon’s attempt to estrange the Jews from their European and Ottoman rulers in his plans to destroy England and Russia and dominate Europe. Third, it shows how the British articulated a set of imperialist imperatives and religious motives designed to make the Eastern Question fit the Jewish Question. Fourth, it examines the emergence of the Jewish Question in Russia in light of successive partitions of Poland and the interference of British Zionism in Eastern Europe. Fifth, it discusses the role of the Jewish Colonization Association in shuffling capital and labor between Europe, Russia, the Americas, and the Middle East. The paper concludes with some remarks on the overall prospect of Zionism in light of new perspectives about the non-Jewish genesis of Zionism, the non-Semitic origins of contemporary Jews, and the non-Zionist future of Palestine/Israel.
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INTRODUCTION

Contemporary Zionists and their political and cultural disciples take for granted and teach that Zionism is a national liberation movement of the Jews, by the Jews, and for the Jews. The State of Israel presents Zionism as an answer to Jewish yearning for Zion and a response to anti-Semitism, which is the core of the Jewish Problem whose only solution is a Jewish state in Palestine, with a Jewish majority (Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2002). Zionist historiography identifies the founders of Zionism as German Moses Hess (who was shaken by the blood libel of Damascus in 1844), Russian Leon Pinsker (who was shocked by the pogroms in Russia in 1881), and Hungarian Theodor Herzl (who was traumatized by the Dreyfus case in France in 1896). Zionist scholars are almost unanimous on Vienna as the birthplace of Zionism, Theodor Herzl as the founding father of Zionism, and the publication of Herzl’s booklet, The Jewish State, in 1896 as the beginning of the history of Zionism (Lewis, 1986; Goldmann, 1978; Duvernay, 1966). In addition to these and other founding myths of modern Israel (Garaudy, 2000), most Zionist scholars continue to deny linkages between Zionism and imperialism and some even consider Israel an anti-imperialist creation (Penslar, 2003:84; Peretz, 1997:8).

Many political geography textbooks used in the United States continue to repeat the above Zionist claims or simply keep quiet about them (Pound, 1963; Prescott, 1972; Norris and
Given the political geography nature of Zionism and given Yves Lacoste’s approach of geography as a strategic and political knowledge (Hepple, 2000), one can assume that the missing critique of Zionism in these textbooks is related to the fear of being charged with anti-Semitism. The charge is that “individuals or nations” who are against Israel or Zionism are “anti-Semitic” (Halkin, 2002). Such fear combined with deep-seated guilt among many Europeans vis-à-vis their Jewry continues to keep Zionism and Israel above and beyond criticism in the Western world. Some recent apologies for “politically incorrect” statements subject to this charge have come from celebrities like British Prime Minister Tony Blair’s wife (Cherie), CNN founder Ted Turner, U.S. Southern Baptist Reverend Bill Graham, and U.S. Congressman James Moran (BBC News, 2002; Billy Graham, 2002; CNN, 2002; CNN, 2003).

This paper attempts to deconstruct the dominant Zionist historiography and present the genesis and prospect of Zionism in light of its historical geography and geopolitics. It focuses on when and where Zionism was born and who fathered it and mothered it. It argues that the Jews did not invent Zionism. Rather Zionism invented the Jews. It addresses some of the questions never raised by Zionist historiography. If Zionism were a genuine national liberation movement, why it did not want to liberate the Jewish Pale of Settlement (where most Jews lived) in Russia? If Zionism were really Jewish, why it was born in England (with no Jewish population)? What claim can Zionism make to Palestine and the Bible that the Palestinians can’t make? How can Zionism justify the dispossession, dispersal, and oppression of millions of Palestinians who have nothing to do with medieval or modern atrocities committed by some Europeans against their own Jewry? What are the prospects of Zionism in light of Israel’s refusal to withdraw to its 1967 boundaries and its rejection of the right of return for the Palestinians while justifying its own existence on the Law of “Return”?


During the Reformation conflict, European Jews were often caught in the middle between Catholics and Protestants in Western Europe and between Catholics and Orthodox Christians in Eastern Europe (Klier, 1986:9; Lewis, 1986:59; Gilbert, 2002:31). Before the Protestants called for the Bible to replace the Pope as the final spiritual authority, the ideas of a “Jewish return” to Palestine and a “Jewish nation” had no place in Catholicism (Sharif, 1983:10). When the Crusaders entered Jerusalem in 1099 and massacred the estimated sixty to seventy thousands inhabitants of the city, they banned Jews from Crusaders-occupied Jerusalem (Hiyari, 2000:138-140; Pethahiah, 1856:61). The Reformation invented those ideas and developed an End Time theology (involving Jewish conversion to Christianity as a prelude to Christ’s Second Coming) which has since bred many apocalyptic millenialist movements and doomsday cults. Above all, the Protestants stressed the Palestinian origins of Christianity, the Old Testament, the Biblical Israelites, and Jerusalem in order to reduce the pretensions and claims of Roman Catholicism, the Pope, and Rome (Epstein, 1984; Tuchman, 1984). In the meantime, European powers were competing for the use of the Jews as a religious title and a political fig-leaf for colonization of Palestine in the heart of the decaying Ottoman Empire and the emerging Arab world.
Political and theological interest in the Jews came first from the Reformation founder Martin Luther (1483–1546) who saw the Jews as possible allies against Catholicism and potential converts to the new religion of Protestantism. In the pamphlet, *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew* (1523), Luther glorifies the Jews and designates them as the true blood heirs of the Biblical Israelites and the blood relatives of Jesus, even though more and more scholarly works question the alleged Semitic origin of contemporary Jews (Renan, 1883; Dunlop, 1954; Koestler, 1970; Patai, 1975; Shakir, 1981; Salibi, 1985; 1988a; 1988b; Bradley, 1992; Wexler, 1993, 1996, 2002; Rice, 1994). Luther challenged his catholic opponents: “I beg my dear papists, should they be growing weary of denouncing me as a heretic, to seize the opportunity of denouncing me as a Jew” (Luther, 1971a:200–1). But Luther reversed his attitude towards the Jews, perhaps after the poisoning incident (involving a Polish Jewish physician) in 1525 and in connection with John Frederick’s (Elector of Saxony) decision to banish the Jews in 1536 (Holmio, 1949:108, 157). Luther then assaulted the Jews as “disgusting vermin” and their synagogues as “devil nests of insolence and lies” (Putnam, 1908:10–11). In the pamphlet, *On the Jews and Their Lies* (1543), Luther criticized the Jews for boasting about their blood and lineage, as if salvation were by race rather than grace (Luther 1971b:140,146).

Luther’s pamphlets reflect increasing competition between Protestants and Jews over the ethnic and/or spiritual inheritance of Biblical Israel. The debate (which culminated later in the social construction of the so-called Aryan and Semitic races) fuelled the myth of the so-called Lost Tribes (Godbey, 1930). Meanwhile, between 1550 and 1750 most Jews in Western Europe were experiencing their own Reformation: the Cabbala, with its emphasis of “Jewish uniqueness” and “Jewish blood” (today “Jewish DNA”) as the reason why Jews are different from non-Jews (Shahak, 1999:11, 62; Wade, 2002). By the same token, the Anglo-Israel movement (known also as British-Israelism) was adamant in its claim that the English were the true, Semitic descendants of the so-called Lost Tribes of Israel: Queen Victoria (1837–1901) had convinced herself that she was a descendant of Biblical David (Wilson, 1876; Tuchman, 1984; Duvernoy, 1966). English and American Protestants were happier “to adopt the history of the ancient Israelites as a substitute” for the much closer-to-hand history of England as a Catholic country (Longley, 2002:33). In many cases, Protestant-Jewish relations turned into love-hate relationships whose relics are still embedded in hate-related literature involving American white separatist groups and their Zionist counterparts (Freedman, 2002; Shahak, 1999:154; Hine, 1999; Simon Wiesenthal Center, 2001; Duke, 2002; Beit-Hallahmi, 1993; Barkun, 1997; Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2002).

The Zionization of the English began when King Henry VIII proclaimed himself head of the Church of England in 1534 (Roberts, 1995; Tuchman, 1984). This is perhaps when the new lay and literal interpretation of the Bible began to view “Semites,” “Hebrews,” “Israelites,” and “Jews” as synonymous. By 1589 Zionism had become visible in England, when a man was condemned and burnt alive for adhering to “Restoration,” then considered heretical (Epstein, 1984). Zionism reached a new peak with the Puritans who were “practically Jews” (Zangwill, 1904:54). They proposed the transference of the Lord’s Day to Saturday and adopted Old Testament names. Most importantly, they readmitted the Jews to England in 1655. The overall Protestant Judeophile tendencies, which started with Luther in Germany in 1523, continued to take roots in Anglican England where the English elites began to ask the
question “Was not our Lord himself a Jew?” (Anglo-Jewish Association and Russo-Jewish Committee, 1933:101).

British Zionism was developing amidst broader geopolitical and economic changes such as the shift of the centre of Europe’s economic gravity from the Mediterranean Sea to the Atlantic Ocean and the growing sea power of the Protestant countries following the destruction of the Spanish Armada in 1588. During and after the Revolt of the Netherlands against Spain, refugees (including many Jews) from all over the Counter-Reformation countries flocked to Amsterdam, where the world’s first national bank was established in 1604 (Barton, 1985). Competition between mercantilist chartered companies (such as the English East India Company and the Dutch East India Company) developed into the first Anglo-Dutch trade wars of 1652-54 (Marlowe, 1972; Tuchman, 1984). The English struck at the heart of Dutch prosperity when they decided to restrict their imports to goods carried by English ships or ships of the country producing the goods (Roberts, 1995:635). Oliver Cromwell invited the Jews because he wanted to transfer the Amsterdam Jewish merchants to London in order to strengthen England in its trade war against Portugal, Spain, and the Netherlands, whose Jewish communities were known for their wealth, commercial skills, and business contacts abroad (Sharif, 1983). With the French Revolution of 1789 and the subsequent rise of Napoleon, following his invasion of Egypt and Palestine and his Jewish Proclamation, English Zionism and French Zionism entered a new phase of fierce competition over European Jewry.

FRENCH ZIONISM AND NAPOLEON’S ATTEMPT TO ESTRANGE THE JEWS FROM THEIR EUROPEAN AND OTTOMAN RULERS

As an atheist European ruler, Napoleon represented a middle ground between the Reformation and Counter-Reformation positions vis-à-vis the Jews (Kobler, 1975). While the French Revolution had emancipated French Jews (Glotzer, 1997b:28–29), the Napoleonic European order forced other rulers to issue ordinances opening the ghettos. Despite or because of his Jewish policies of emancipation, Napoleon seemed determined to use the Jews as a fifth column in his plan to dominate Europe. On the eve of his invasion of Egypt (1798), Napoleon wrote to his soldiers: “You will inflict upon England a blow which is certain to wound her in her most sensitive spot, while waiting the day when you can deal her the death blow” (Kobler, 1975:33).

Following the destruction of his fleet off Alexandria by the English, Napoleon marched on Palestine (1799), and while anticipating the capture of Acre and Jerusalem (something he never did), he prepared a “Proclamation” promising Palestine to the Jews. This made many believe that “every Jew” was a priori “a secret agent” for Napoleon (Duvernoy, 1966). Napoleon wanted to influence European Jewry through his legendary political opportunism. He once told his State Council that he became Catholic to end the Vendée War, Muslim to establish himself in Egypt, Ultramontane to gain the priests of Italy, and that if he governed a nation of Jews he should re-establish the Temple of Solomon (Kobler, 1975:82).

In 1807 Emperor Napoleon invited European Jewry to send representatives to the Great Sanhadrin in Paris. He wanted them to debate a possible French offer of citizenship for all Jews, after which the Jews would be obliged to defend France in its war with Russia and its economic battle against England. The Jews welcomed Napoleon’s emancipation but rejected
Napoleon’s Zionism. The Great Sanhadrin declared that Jews do not form a corporate nation any more, while the Holy Synod of Moscow compared Napoleon’s Sanhadrin to the infamous tribunal of the Crucifixion (Klier, 1986; Crawford, 1838; Kobler, 1975). But Napoleon’s Jewish policies came to further crystallize the *Jewish Question* (Jewish communities living within non-Jewish societies) and made it a subject of controversy in European domestic politics and a source of competition between European powers over what came to be known as the *Eastern Question* (which European power would colonize which parts of the collapsing Ottoman Empire).

Napoleon’s Zionist Proclamation (1799) and Great Sanhadrin (1807) provided blueprints for subsequent Zionist ideas and institutions. These include Lord Shaftesbury’s London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews (1809), the London (anonymous) Memorandum on the Restoration of the Jews (1839), Colonel George Gawler’s Association for Promoting Jewish Settlement in Palestine (1852), Charles Netter’s Alliance Israélite Universelle (1860), Leo Pinsker’s ideas of a Jewish National Congress and a Jewish National Institute (1882), Baron Maurice de Hirsch’s Jewish Colonization Association (1891), Theodor Herzl’s schemes for a Society of Jews and a Jewish Company (1896), and the State of Israel (1948) and its World Zionist Organization and World Jewish Congress arms (Herzl, 1946; Jewish Colonization Association, 1942; Bureau des Archives Israélites de France, 1842; Hess, 1943; Pinsker, 1911; World Jewish Congress, 2001; World Zionist Congress, 2001).

English Zionism and French Zionism had a second major clash during the rise of France’s ally, Mohamed Ali, in Egypt and his decade-long (1831–41) conflict with the Ottomans and their British, Prussian, and Austrian allies. A third clash came with the ascent of Napoleon III in France (1848–70), whose private secretary (Ernest Lahranne) published *La Nouvelle Question D’Orient* which inspired the book *Rome and Jerusalem* (1862) by Moses (Moritz) Hess (1812–1875), a fugitive Prussian Jew living in France. Hess was perhaps the first Jewish leader to be recruited by French Zionists (or British Zionists) at a time when Jews continued to reject Zionism as in the days of Napoleon I. Hess told the Jews, “without a country—you are bastards of humanity” (Epstein, 1984:40; Tuchman, 1984:228). He urged Jews to be loyal to French colonialism as he himself was: “It is to the interest of France to see that the road leading to India and China should be settled by a people [the Jews] which will be loyal to the cause of France to the end” (Hess, 1943:167).

**BRITISH IMPERIALIST IMPERATIVES AND RELIGIOUS MOTIVES SHAPE AND PROPEL ZIONISM**

British foreign policy-makers believed that preserving the territorial integrity of a weak and malleable Ottoman empire was the best protection of the road to India against any French or Russian challenges. It was with the French invasion of Algeria in 1830 and Mohamed Ali’s attempt to establish an independent Islamic state covering Egypt, Syria, and Arabia that a European crisis over the *Eastern Question* developed throughout the 1830s. The crisis ended with the restoration of Syria and Arabia to the Ottomans and the confining of Mohamed Ali to the hereditary rule of Egypt. Now Britain had the opportunity to draw upon Napoleon’s Jewish policies in Europe and Zionist Proclamation as feedback for settling Jews in Palestine (with the consent of other European powers) “for the maintenance” of the British Empire.
Napoleon knew well the value of an Hebrew alliance; and endeavoured to reproduce, in the capital of France, the spectacle of the ancient Sanhedrin, which, basking in the might of imperial favour, might give laws to the whole body of the Jews throughout the habitable world, and aid him, no doubt, in his audacious plans against Poland and the East... That which Napoleon designed in his violence and ambition, thinking “to destroy nations not a few,” we may wisely and legitimately undertake for the maintenance of our Empire (Crawford, 1838:188–90).

In the words of one of the London Times’ correspondents, “the proposition to plant the Jewish people” in Palestine under European protection “is no longer a mere matter of speculation, but a serious political consideration” (Restoration, 1840b). British Zionists had formed the Palestine Association in London in 1804 as a serious effort to re-write (and often distort) the historical geography of Palestine. Researchers were asked to (1) avoid as far as possible all contact with the convents and the authority of the Catholic monks and (2) examine everywhere with the Scriptures in hands (Robinson, 1977:377). Major publications of such subsidized research began with Lord Lindsay’s Letters from Egypt, Edom and the Holy Land, the first in a flood of Holy-Land travel books that averaged 40 books a year for 40 years (Tuchman, 1984:191; Crawford, 1838:188–90). In March 1838 Britain appointed a vice-consul to Jerusalem, who soon reported back to the consul general at Alexandria a census of 9,690 Jews in Palestine (Tuchman, 1984:191). In August 1838 Britain instructed its Ambassador to Turkey to encourage the Sultan to allow the Jews of Europe to “return” to Palestine. In March and August 1840 The Times of London published more details about a Memorandum on the Restoration of the Jews addressed to the Protestant Powers of the North of Europe and the States of North America in 1838 (Restoration, 1840a; 1840b; 1840c).

Unlike Napoleon’s “secular” Proclamation to the Jews as “the Rightful Heirs of Palestine,” the Protestant memorandum cites several Biblical verses to remind Protestant monarchs that the Jews are a “peculiar people,” whom God has “separated and taken into covenant” that “no act of theirs, however iniquitous and rebellious, can repeal or destroy.” By such “unrepealed covenant, God declared unto Abram, concerning the land of Palestine, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt to the great river, the river of Euphrates” (Restoration, 1840c). British Zionism opposed assimilation (“amalgamation”) and preached (“a more congenial”) separation for the Jews citing Numbers 23:9: “the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations” (The Times, 1839; Crawford, 1838). In the meantime, Lord Shaftesbury instructed the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews to build an Anglican church in Jerusalem “if possible on Mt. Zion itself” (Tuchman, 1984:192). He also claimed that Zionism would be “the cheapest and fastest mode” of colonizing Syria, that no “pecuniary outlays” would be demanded of the guarantors, that the “benefits to be derived from it would belong to the whole civilized world,” and that the Jews “will return at their own expenses, and with no hazard but to themselves” (Tuchman, 1984; Epstein, 1984:35).

The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews began to intensify its campaign to Judaize Zionism and Zionize the Jews by planning to distribute some 20,000 copies (of the Old Testament in Hebrew) annually in order to teach the estimated six million Jews “their own holy books” (Crawford, 1838:183-85; Hechler, 1883). In 1841 Colonel Charles Henry
Churchill, the British consul in Syria, pointed out the two *sine qua non* conditions for the success of Zionism: “Firstly that the Jews themselves will take up the matter, universally and unanimously. Secondly that the European powers will aid them in their views” (Epstein, 1984:35). What was needed at this stage was a formal plan providing the nuts and bolts for Zionist colonization in Palestine.

Britain brought in Lieutenant-Colonel George Gawler (1796–1869), a former Governor of South Australia (1838 to 1841) who oversaw the settling of British convicts at an average of 180 per month (Price, 1929:160). Britain deported some 160,000 convicts to Australia between 1788 and 1868 (Shaw, 1997). Gawler was expected to help establish Jewish colonies in Palestine. In 1845 he published *Tranquillization of Syria and the East: Observations and Practical Suggestions, in Furtherance of the Establishment of Jewish Colonies in Palestine, the Most Sober and Sensible Remedy for the Miseries of Asiatic Turkey*. He visited the Holy Land in 1849, retired from the army in 1850, and founded the Association for Promoting Jewish Settlement in Palestine, which evolved later into the Palestine Fund in 1852 (Epstein, 1984:37; Price, 1929:164). Like Colonel Churchill, Gawler insisted that the colonial scheme of Palestine must take into consideration the “feelings” of the settlers and the “desires” of the British. He was perhaps the first Zionist to articulate the Zionist myth that “Palestine is a land without a people” waiting for “the Jews, a people without a land”. Gawler sums up his Zionist colonial plan:

> Reduced to its practical form the question [of the tranquillization of Syria] becomes one of colonization [of Palestine]. There is a fertile country, nine-tenths of which lies desolate. Elsewhere, are civilized men, for whom it is desired to make of that almost forsaken country, an established home. For successful colonization three things are, in the highest degree, indispensable. The probability of safe settlement in the colony—the facility of transit to it—and the will, or the obligation to embrace these opportunities. … On any other principle, the will of the proposed settler would be wanting. No members of the Jewish persuasion, worth sending to Palestine, would accept the boon so tauntingly proffered. We cannot, if we would, force them into colonization as convicts, under the moving agency of compulsory obligation, and must therefore carefully consult their feelings as well as our own desires (Gawler, 1845:8–9).

According to Gawler, Britain should “prepare the Jews for their future station by political elevation in England” (Gawler, 1848:25). It was in this political context that (baptised Jew) Benjamin Disraeli rose from stock market speculation and petit journalism to become British Prime Minister in 1868 and in 1874–80 (Disraeli, 1982). But beyond the big scheme Gawler provided some interesting practical details on what he called “the civilization of Palestine and the East through the Jews.” He was perhaps the first to come up with a blueprint for the *yishuv* and *kibbutz* system of Jewish colonies (a modernized version of the *kehillah* and *shtetl* of Eastern Europe) that were later experimented within both Argentina and Palestine (Gawler, 1845:12,16-17).

With the advent of steam navigation and the completion of the Suez Canal, British Zionism began to link the establishment of depots and settlements along the road to India and China
with the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine, as is indicated by Thomas Clarke’s treatises, *India and Palestine: Or the Restoration of the Jews Viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India*. They argue that the Jewish state would even place the management of British steam communication entirely in friendly hands (Tuchman, 1984:214,216,254; Hess, 1917:260). This argument became even more persuasive when Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli purchased shares in the Suez Canal Company, thanks to financial aid provided by the Rothschilds, a Jewish family banking dynasty in London whose business began in the Frankfurt’s Jewish ghetto (in connection with Prince William IX of Hesse’s involvement in the British war in North America) and expanded to London and Paris in connection with a combination of trade and smuggling operations (behind enemy lines) associated with the Anglo-French rivalry during the Napoleonic wars (McKay, 1990).

The *Nearest Route to India* argument and Gawler’s doctrine about the “political elevation” of Jews in England were bolstered when George Eliot (the pseudonym for Mary Ann Evans, a non-Jewish author who created a noble Jewish character) published the novel, *Daniel Deronda* in 1876 (Eliot, 1900; Epstein, 1984:47). In line with Martin Luther’s *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew* (1523), *Daniel Deronda* designated the Jews as Israelites, claimed that a Christian is “three-fourths a Jew,” and reiterated “the necessity of requiting a moral debt owed to the Jews” (Tuchman, 1984:237). Some consider that *Deronda* created a role model for Theodor Herzl (Sokolov, 1935:107). *Daniel Deronda* begins with a call for a myth or a make-believe story that can galvanize the Jews after so many unsuccessful attempts to involve them into Zionism: “Men can do nothing without the make-believe of a beginning” (Eliot, 1961:1). As the “Zionist Novel” (Leavis, 1960) drew to its conclusion, Deronda said “I am going to the East to become better acquainted with the condition of my race… The idea that I am possessed with is that of restoring a political existence to my people” (Eliot, 1876; Eliot, 1961:606). Yet despite the various efforts to involve the Jews, Zionism remained essentially alien to the masses of European Jewry before Britain introduced it in the wake of the assassination of Russian Czar Alexander II in 1881 (for which the Jews were blamed) and the subsequent pogroms and mass migrations of Eastern European Jews to the Americas.

**SUCCESSIVE PARTITIONS OF POLAND AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE JEWISH QUESTION IN RUSSIA**

Israel Zangwill wrote, “it is not even true that the Jews are scattered; the majority are congested in the Russian Pale and Galicia” (Zangwill, 1904:17). Indeed this region has been the historic destination for many migrations and invasions from the nomadic tribes of the Central Asian steppes and Northwest China, including the Huns, the Bulgars, the Avars, the Uguars, the Khazars, and the Mongols. Many medieval geographers and modern historians have observed or studied the rise and fall of the Jewish Khazar Empire (following the mass conversion of the Turkic Khazars to Judaism) in Southern Russia between the 8th and 10th centuries (Ibn Fadlan and Ghaybah, 1994; Ibn al-Faqih and Hadi, 1996; Al-Masudi et al, 1966-79; Dunlop, 1954; Pritsak, 1978; Golden, 2003). While scholars continue to debate whether the Khazars are the actual ancestors of contemporary Jews, Zionists consider such research agenda as taboo, polemical and anti-Semitic. The emergence of the *Jewish Question* in Russia came after successive partitions of Poland (in 1772, 1793, and 1795) between Russia, Prussia, and Austria. The partition destroyed Poland, transferred the largest Jewish communities in the world to Russian rule, and brought the specter of Napoleon at Russia’s doorstep (Klier, 1986).
In the late nineteenth century, most Jews lived in Poland itself, Western Russia, the Ukraine or Little Russia, and in South Russia, which form the bulk of the Jewish Pale of Settlement (Russo-Jewish Committee, 1891). According to the Russian census of 1897, about 95 percent of the 5,189,401 Jews of the Russian Empire were concentrated in the 25 provinces of the Jewish Pale of Settlement and Russian Poland (see Table 1).

Table 1. Geographic Distribution of Russia’s Jews by Provinces and Regions in 1897

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provinces and Regions</th>
<th>Jewish Population</th>
<th>Percent of Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grodno Province</td>
<td>276,874</td>
<td>17.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kovno</td>
<td>212,230</td>
<td>13.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minsk</td>
<td>338,657</td>
<td>15.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohilev</td>
<td>201,301</td>
<td>11.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vilna</td>
<td>205,261</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitebsk</td>
<td>175,678</td>
<td>11.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>427,863</td>
<td>12.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podolia</td>
<td>306,597</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poltava</td>
<td>111,417</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchernigov</td>
<td>114,630</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volhynia</td>
<td>397,772</td>
<td>13.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessarabia</td>
<td>225,637</td>
<td>11.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekaterinoslav</td>
<td>100,736</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kherson</td>
<td>337,282</td>
<td>12.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauride</td>
<td>66,125</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalisz</td>
<td>72,339</td>
<td>8.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kielce</td>
<td>82,427</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomza</td>
<td>90,912</td>
<td>15.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lublin</td>
<td>153,728</td>
<td>13.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piotrkow</td>
<td>222,299</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plock</td>
<td>50,473</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radom</td>
<td>113,277</td>
<td>13.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siedle</td>
<td>122,370</td>
<td>15.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suwalki</td>
<td>58,808</td>
<td>10.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>349,943</td>
<td>18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasus Region</td>
<td>58,471</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siberia Region</td>
<td>34,477</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia Region</td>
<td>12,729</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Provinces/Regions</td>
<td>269,088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Provinces/Regions</td>
<td>5,189,401</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since Napoleon’s attempts to estrange the Jews from their rulers, Russia has engaged in a serious Russification process involving in part a series of residential and occupational restrictions against the Jews, including the Jewish Statute of 1804, the Jewish Pale of Settlement, and the Laws of May 1882. Some of these restrictions were inspired or based on anti-Jewish reforms suggested first by I. G. Frizel (governor of Lithuania) and G. R. Derzhavin (a Russian senator) (Klier, 1986:89,100). With the exception of the wealthy, the highly skilled, and some long-term soldiers, the Jews of Russia were confined to the Jewish Pale of Settlement. Russia’s Jews were generally “accused” of not taking agriculture, exploiting Russian peasants through money-lending, supplying liquor to drunken peasants, evading military service, and engaging in nihilism and disaffection (Russo-Jewish Committee, 1891:28). The London-based Russo-Jewish Committee explains the “true causes of the persecution” of the Jews in Russia in these words:

In the middle of an older [Russian] economic system of customary prices and long credits they [the Jews] introduce a principle of keen competition that cuts down prices and profits to the advantage of the consumer indeed, but not to the advantage of the commercial classes, who are set against the Jews as rivals who excel them (Russo-Jewish Committee 1891:28).

The Jewish Question in Russia emerged progressively out of popular prejudices, government policies, and social realities (Klier, 1986:186). It was brought to the forefront of Russian politics and geopolitics in the aftermath of the assassination Czar Alexander II in 1881, the May 1882 Laws, and the overall European mass migration to the Americas, where the British Isles alone sent eight and a half million emigrants overseas between 1880 and 1910 (Roberts, 1995:768). British Zionists from the Anglo-Jewish Association and the Russo-Jewish Committee seized on the 1881 events in Russia to organize a series of public meetings chaired by the Lord Mayor of London “to express public opinion upon the outrages inflicted upon the Jews in various parts of Russia and Russian Poland” and “to repeal those laws that afflict these Israelites” (Russo-Jewish Committee, 1891:107-108; Anglo-Jewish Association and Russo-Jewish Committee, 1933:3). The assassination of Russian Czar Alexander II and the reported “Russian solution” to the “Jewish problem” (convert one-third, kill one-third, and expel one-third) gave Britain the opportunity to establish organizational contacts and links with Eastern European Jewry in order to Zionize their aspirations and redirect their migration flows away from the Americas to Palestine.

THE BRITISH ZIONIZATION OF RUSSIAN JEWS AND JUDAIZATION OF ZIONISM

The man the British establishment chose for this mission to the Jews of Eastern Europe was William Henry Hechler (1845-1931) who had proposed in early 1882 the settlement of Russian and Romanian Jews in Palestine. Since it is argued here that Hechler was the British agent who actually fathered Zionism in Eastern Europe and Russia, some details about him may help illustrate the point. His mother, Catherine Clive Palmer, was British. His German father Dietrich Hechler was born in 1812 in Vœgisheim, Duchy of Baden. Catherine and Dietrich married in 1844 at St. Paul Cathedral of London (following Dietrich’s ordainment as a pastor of the Evangelical church) and were sent as missionaries to British India where they stayed for five years. After Catherine died in 1850, Dietrich returned to London around 1853 with his three
children (William, Elizabeth, and Catherine) and joined the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, for which he worked successively in Alsace, London, Heidelberg, Durlach, and Karlsruhe. Thanks to his parents, William Henry Hechler was bilingual and completed his theological studies in England and Germany before he was ordained (as was his father) at the London St. Paul Cathedral in 1869. In 1871, William Hechler began his missionary tenure as an assistant director in charge of catechetical education at the Trinity College in Lagos, British Nigeria. In 1874 he moved to the Karlsruhe castle to tutor the children of Frederick, Grand Duke of Baden, and uncle to a man who was to become Wilhelm II, the German Kaiser. Hechler did not hesitate to preach his Zionism when he presented a messianic map of Palestine to Frederick and ordered Zionism-related books to the royal library. Following the sudden death of crown prince Ludwig in 1876, Hechler left Germany for Britain where he served until the assassination of the Russian Czar in 1881 (Epstein, 1984; Duvernoy, 1966).

In the wake of the 1881 events in Russia and the 1882 London public meetings in support of Russian Jews, Lord Temple and Lord Shaftesbury dispatched their Zionist foot soldier Hechler to meet with the leaders of Eastern European and Russian Jewry in Odessa and to preach Zionism as the only solution to anti-Semitism. Hechler was accompanied by Laurence Oliphant (an English writer and diplomat) who had written a memorandum (in 1878) calling for the settlement of Jewish prisoners in Palestine under the protection of the Sultan. Hechler met with Leo Pinsker on the eve of the publication of the Auto-Emancipation pamphlet in German in September 1882. He showed him a letter from Queen Victoria asking the Sultan to allow Jewish immigration in Palestine. Pinsker was “moved against his will,” when Hechler told him “you have forgotten [to mention in your pamphlet] God’s promise to Abraham and his children” (Duvernoy, 1966:34; Pinsker, 1911).

The Hechler-Pinsker meeting was instrumental in the creation of the Society for the Promotion of the Love of Zion and the Lovers of Zion (Hibbath Zion) movement. Pinsker’s auto-emancipation movement was initially a non-Zionist Jewish movement seeking to find a solution for the Jewish Question in Russia through independence of the Pale or mass migration to North America, not Palestine. Pinsker wanted self-determination for the Jewish Pale: “give us a bit of land; grant us only what you granted the Servians and Roumanians.” He rejected Hechler’s Zionism: “the goal of our present endeavors must be not the Holy Land, but a land of our own.” Pinsker addressed “Judeophobia” (rather than anti-Semitism) as the eternal problem presented by the Jewish Question. His ideas of auto-emancipation developed first “without any relation whatsoever to the land of Israel” (Ahad Ha’am, 1911:3; Pinsker, 1911:2,4,7,11).

Pinsker recommended the [Jewish] societies already in existence as a nucleus from which to start the search for a homeland. These Societies “must convoque a national congress” or at least form “a national institute” or a directory whose first task “would have to be the discovery of a territory adapted to our purpose.” While Pinsker suggested “a small territory in North America or a sovereign pashalic in Asiatic Turkey,” he was clearly in favor of the former because the purchase of lands in America would not be a risky business, but a “lucrative enterprise.” The next step would be to organize a mass migration of the Jews. Pinsker concludes his brochure by stressing that all the above steps for the establishment of one Jewish refuge, instead of many,
cannot be implemented without the support of the governments of the big powers (Pinsker, 1911:2,7,11,16). In the appeal addressed to all the scattered Jewish communities, the Society for the Promotion of the Love of Zion proclaims the native Palestinians as “strangers,” claims Palestine as the Jews’ “own native land,” and calls upon the Jews to compete with Catholic and Orthodox missionary societies in Palestine (Ahad Ha’am, 1911:12). While this colonial appeal had some resonance among the newly Zionist poor Eastern European Jews, most wealthy Jews in Western Europe continued to view the Jewish Question in terms of shuffling capital and labor.


With Hechler’s visit to Odessa and the launching of the Society for the Promotion of the Love of Zion and the Lovers of Zion movement, Zionism began to slowly penetrate Eastern European and Russian Jewish communities. However, the movement was still in search for a more convinced leadership (Pinsker was not a Zionist, just a lover of the Lovers of Zion) and a more focused vision on Palestine, rather than other regions such as the Americas. On the ground, Paris-based Baron Maurice de Hirsch provided funds for a Jewish mass emigration to Argentina, while London-based Baron Edmond de Rothschild encouraged Jewish colonies in Palestine (Tuchman, 1984). Both turned Jewish settlers into capital-borrowing communities investing in land purchase and cash crop production. But overall, Zionism continued to be “the only movement not financed but the Jews” (Zangwill, 1904:47).

In 1891 Baron Maurice de Hirsch (born in 1831 in Munich, Germany), who had inherited a family fortune, founded the Jewish Colonization Association as a share-holding Company designed “to assist and promote the emigration of poor and needy Jews from any parts of Europe or Asia where they are oppressed by special restrictive laws” and to this effect it “proposes to establish agricultural colonies in diverse regions of North and South America, as also in other territories” (Jewish Colonization Association, 1910:6). The composition and residence of the Jewish Colonization Association Board of Directors in 1910 indicate that it was an international capitalist company using cheap Jewish labor from Eastern Europe and run by wealthy Jews from Western European: Narcisse Leven, Arnold Netter, and Salomon Reinach in Paris; Frantz Philippon and Paul Erreara in Brussels; Julius Blau in Frankfurt; Léonard Cohen, Herbert Lousada, and Claude Montefiore in London; Carl Netter and James Simon in Berlin (Jewish Colonization Association, 1910).

By 1910, the Jewish Colonization Association had settled a population of 19,361 Jewish colonists in Argentina (excluding an estimated Jewish population of 55,000 throughout Argentina). The colonists lived on 1,678 farms/concessions in 8 colonies in Santa-Fé, Entre-Rios, Buenos-Aires, and Pampa provinces (Jewish Colonization Association, 1910:307-308). During the 50 years of its activities in Argentina, the Jewish Colonization Association purchased a total land area of 1,525,742 acres and settled tens of thousands of Jewish colonists (Jewish Colonization Association, 1942). In the meantime, the Jewish Colonization Association created a vast system of loan funds (caisses de prêts) for the distribution of money advances at low interest to small shopkeepers, artisans, and farmers in Russia and the Ukraine. Before World War I, there were some 700 of these Loan Banks (caisses) with about 450,000 members (Wolf, 1923:21).
The Jewish Colonization Association represented an early example of shuffling capital and labor around, taking advantage of geographic and cultural variations. The high concentration of Jewish businesses in urban activities and trade (90 percent by some estimates) and the absence of a European Jewish landed gentry or peasantry have something to do with the leading role of Jews in capitalism and urban culture achievements. Since the European Enlightenment, many social thinkers have developed a remarkable and often negative image of the “economic” Jew not as a member of an ethnic group, but as an agent of capitalism, a craft, an occupation, a profession focused on making money (Carmichael, 1992:100-121; Glotzer, A. 1997:10; Marx, 1960).

Theodor Herzl opened his pamphlet *The Jewish State* by an attack on the *physiocrats* and praise for the *entrepreneurs*. The backbone of *The Jewish State* pamphlet was a transnational Jewish Chartered Company. Herzl argued that the Ghetto developed the Jews into a bourgeois people whereas the emancipation had exposed them to competition from the middle classes. He rooted the *Jewish Question* in the economic position of the Jews and the frustration of anti-Semites in getting at them (Herzl, 1896).

Even after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 and the subsequent idea of self-determination for Soviet national minorities, the *Jewish Question* continued to be explained mostly on economic terms. Communist officials view “the ideologically suspect nature of Jewish economic life” as one aspect of the *Jewish Question* (Weinberg, 1998; Weinstein, 2001). Others argued that anti-Semitism is “almost entirely economic in origin rather than racial or religious” (Marley, 1930:3). In 1928 the Soviet government decided to settle Soviet Jews in Birobidzhan, and in 1934 the area became officially the Jewish Autonomous Region (Ambijan Committee, 1936:8,25; Gitelman, 1998). This Soviet Jewish policy seems to be a response to the growing interference of British Zionism into Eastern Europe, especially since the founding of the World Zionist Congress in 1897 and the announcement of the Balfour Declaration of 1917.

**THE FOR-ORDAINED ZIONIST MOVEMENT IS HERE!**

Hechler has been described as an agent working for German and English interests and particularly as a “secret agent” working for the Intelligence Service (Duvernoy, 1966). As a political activist and informant, he had a busy life and did not produce any significant work of intellectual value during his long life (though he arranged and supplemented the *Jerusalem Bishopric Documents*). He was closely connected with Theodor Herzl, at least from 1896 to 1904 (Ellrn, 1961). Herzl had once asked Hechler to be more discreet in order to avoid giving the impression that Herzl was an agent working for the English Protestant missions in Jerusalem (Duvernoy, 1966:95). The reviewed literature indicates that the Hechler-Herzl connection began shortly after Herzl published *Der Judenstaat* (*The Jewish State*, or *The State of the Jews* according to some translation) in Vienna 1896. But it is difficult to imagine that Hechler and the British Embassy in Vienna could have overlooked Herzl until 1896.

It is well known that Hechler and his father had worked for decades for the London-based Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. In 1874 Hechler presented a messianic map of Palestine to Frederick of Baden. In 1882 he suggested the settlement of Russian and Romanian Jews in Palestine, participated in the establishment of the Society for the Promotion of the Love of Zion and the Lovers of Zion movement, and propagated a pamphlet on the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine. He taught at the University of Vienna a decade before
1896, frequented Jewish societies and synagogues in Vienna, and said one time “I know well my Jews of Vienna.” In 1895, Hechler was appointed the chaplain of the British Embassy in the “important city of Vienna,” often considered the cradle of Zionism and Nazism since both Herzl and Hitler successively roamed its streets (Epstein, 1984; Duvernoy, 1966). As for Theodor Herzl, he must have been “visible” in Vienna when he started in 1891 a journalist career with the influential daily Viennese paper Neue Freie Presse, especially after he covered the 1894 trial of French Captain Alfred Dreyfus, an Alsatian Jew who was charged with selling military secrets to Germany.

Herzl reported that when Hechler read his pamphlet he immediately hurried to British Ambassador Monson and informed him that the for-ordained movement is here! Hechler went later to tell Herzl we have prepared the ground for you! Hechler then showed Herzl a large military staff map of Palestine, a chart of comparative history, models of the ancient Temple, and the location of our new Temple. Hechler encouraged Herzl to launch the journal Die Welt in which Hechler published a call titled Children of Abraham Wake Up! As a Christian I equally believe in the Movement called Zionism. That was probably when the term “Zionism” was first coined by Hechler to sum up other terms such as “Restoration,” “Zion,” and “Lovers of Zion.” Hechler actively participated in the First Zionist Congress in Basle, Switzerland in August 1897. He must have been disappointed when the Sixth World Zionist Congress led by Israel Zangwill voted (295 to 178) against Palestine and in favor of Uganda as a homeland for the Jews. He was one of the last to see Herzl dying at the Senatorium in Edlach in early July 1904 (Epstein, 1984). Martin Perez describes the tragic collapse of the entire Herzl family without providing any explanation or speculation on the real causes. After Herzl death at age 44,

His embittered wife died three years later, at the age of 39. His daughter Pauline survived until her thirtieth year, when, a vagrant and a morphine addict, she expired in Bordeaux. His son Hans, uncircumcised and not a bar mitzvah either, dealt with his Jewish burdens by becoming in turn Baptist, Catholic, Lutheran, Unitarian and Quaker before returning to Judaism. When the news came that Pauline had died, he blew his brains out just in time to be buried with her in the same coffin. Hans and Pauline’s younger sister, Trude, survived, but lived for almost a quarter century of her life in a Vienna psychiatric hospital; in 1942, the Nazis transferred all of its patients to the Theresienstadt concentration camp, where she died the following year. Her son, Stephen, Herzl’s only grandchild, jumped off the Massachusetts Avenue bridge in Washington, D.C., in 1946 (Peretz, 1997:5).

Hechler-Herzl relations resemble more to the tutor-student relations rather than to the prophet-prince relations as suggested by many Zionists (Epstein, 1984; Duvernoy, 1966). Beyond tutoring Herzl about what Zionism is all about, Hechler (as a British agent backed and guided by imperial and religious motives and considerations) was even more indispensable to Herzl in terms of politics and geopolitics. Hechler was instrumental in introducing both Herzl and Zionism to the Grand Duke of Baden, the German Emperor, the Russian Czar, the Ottoman Sultan, the Pope (Pie X) and his Secretary of State the Cardinal Del Val, Princes Heinrich and Gunther, Ferdinand de Bulgaria, Vitor-Emmanuel of Italy, several English ministers (Chamberlain, Landsdown, and Cromer), two Russian ministers
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(Plehve and Witte), two German ministers (von Bülow and Eulenburg), an Austrian minister (Koerber), and many ambassadors, representatives, and Anglican and other religious dignitaries (Duvernoy, 1966). Such British babysitting of newly recruited Jewish Zionist leaders continued well after Hechler and Herzl. Barbara Tuchman cited the case of Mark Sykes, liaison officer for Middle East affairs between the War Cabinet, the Foreign Office, and the War Office. She wrote that Sykes “attended their [Zionist Jews] meetings, laid out their strategy, arranged their appointments, and told them whom to see and what to say” (Tuchman, 1984:334).

Drawing upon the blueprints of the British East India Company and the Jewish Colonization Association, Herzl’s Jewish Company was to be “a joint stock company subject to English jurisdiction, framed according to English laws, and under the protection of England.” Herzl’s secular or atheist background and business outlook were reflected in the flag he proposed for the Jewish State: a white flag (that symbolizes a pure new life) and seven golden stars (representing the seven hours of the working-day), a more original and authentic symbol than the newly invented Star of David. To get the Germans and the Russians on board for the British plan to settle European Jews in Palestine, Hechler and Herzl were selling to the Kaiser and the Czar the then widely shared perspective that Zionism would solve the Jewish Question by weakening simultaneously revolutionary movements in Europe and the power of international Jewish capital. In addition to deporting the least desirable elements within European societies (as we have seen with British convicts), Zionism meant the civilization of Palestine and the East through the Jews as part and parcel of the overall imperialist discourse and practice of the time: the English white man’s burden and the French’s mission civilisatrice.

FINAL REMARKS ON THE GENESIS AND PROSPECT OF ZIONISM
This analysis has exposed the non-Jewish origin of Zionism and its organic linkages with imperialism. During the Reformation and mercantilist era, Protestants were interested in the Jews as ammunition against the Catholics and as leaders of the interest-based rising capitalist sector. Martin Luther’s Jewish-friendly writings in 1523, Oliver Cromwell’s readmission of the Jews to England in 1655, and the quasi-Judaization of the Puritans are graphic examples. With the Industrial Revolution and the European Enlightenment, Napoleon boosted the emancipation of the Jews in an attempt to estrange them from their European and Ottoman rulers as part of his unsuccessful plans to destroy the power of England and Russia and dominate Europe. The British learned from Napoleon’s Jewish policies and articulated a complex set of imperialist and religious motives designed to make the Eastern Question fit the Jewish Question (Ould-Mey, 2002). Obviously all of this took place before the alleged founder of Zionism (Herzl) was born in 1860 and well before he referred to anti-Semitism in The Jewish State (1896) as “our propelling force” to “get out” (this is how Zionism helped pave the road for Nazism) (Herzl, 1946; Brenner, 1983).

Ottoman and Palestinian resistance to Zionist settlements and the initial Jewish rejection of Zionism made effective Jewish colonization impossible before the British military occupation of Palestine in 1917. The Hussayn-McMahon correspondence (1915-1916), the Sykes-Picot secret agreement (1916), the Balfour Declaration of November 1917, the British Mandate (1922-1948), the geographic carving of Jordan and Palestine (1922), the dissolution of the Ottoman Sultanate (Caliphate) and the de-Islamization of Turkey in 1922, and the advent of
the Nazis in Germany in 1933, all invigorated Zionism and led to the first major Palestinian uprising (1936-39) against British occupation and Jewish colonization of Palestine. To crush the uprising, Britain used 25,000 British troops and their Zionist auxiliaries beside the bomber squadrons of the Royal Air Force (Ali, 2002:92). Once the Zionists had the upper hand, the British pulled out of Palestine in 1947 and brought in the United Nations as a new façade of legitimacy. Soon the United States took the sponsorship of Zionism and kept the United Nations at arms’ length from the Arab-Israeli conflict through the systematic use of the veto power to shield Israel and Zionism from international condemnation (especially since the UN passed a 1975 resolution equating Zionism with racism). With such change in guardianship and custody, Zionism continues to facilitate Western multilateral hegemony over the Arab world’s strategic location (straits and waterways), cultural heritage (antique and Biblical history), economic resources (oil reserves and business contracts), and against any possible unification schemes (whether under pan-Arabism or pan-Islamism) as illustrated by the ongoing Anglo-American invasion and destruction of Iraq (in collaboration with the six Arab monarchies of the Gulf Cooperation Council), while preserving Israel’s weapons of mass destruction in the heart of the Arab world.

Today Zionism is riding on the War on Terrorism as it did on the Cold War. It continues to draw on the “financial Israel” (the United States) and the “demographic Israel” (Russia) (Samara, 1998). But Zionism is far from declaring victory when it comes to solving the Jewish Question, achieving normalcy for the State of Israel, or erasing Palestine and the Palestinians from the map. Martin Peretz (summing up the conclusions of a symposium of enthusiast Zionist leaders and scholars trying to assess a century of political Zionism) acknowledges that Zionism did not save European Jewry and was not successful at either achieving normalcy or providing a sensible and stable basis for the future of the state of Israel (Peretz, 1997). Haifa University Professor Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi, who considers Zionism an unfortunate detour from Jewish assimilation into humanity, argues that Israel is now an international problem in the Arab world as was the Jewish Question in Europe (Beit-Hallahmi, 1993).

Today the Palestinians outnumber Israeli Jews 2 to 1 (see Table 2). They seem strongly determined to end the Israeli occupation, return to their homes, and establish a Palestinian state as demonstrated by the ongoing war between Palestinian Muslims/Christians and Israeli Jews. An uneven war in which stone-throwing children, women, lone gunmen, and istishhadiyin bombers face the might of the Israeli army and its U.S.-made and paid-for tanks, attack helicopters, and jet fighters (Thomas Stauffer estimates that Israel has cost the Unites States about $1.6 trillion since 1973) (Francis, 2002). According to the Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Palestine Red Crescent Society, between 29 September 2000 and 14 March 2003, about 2,181 Palestinians were killed and 22,218 injured (in addition to systematic home demolition and olive tree uprooting) compared to 758 Israelis killed and 5,099 injured (Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2003; Palestinian Red Crescent Society; 2003). Even with a death ratio about 3 times higher for the Palestinians than the Israelis, the U.S. government continues to veto sending international observers to help protect the civilian Palestinian population. Such imbalance of power and injustice are making Arab and Muslim peoples angry at U.S. foreign policy, driving a wedge between America and its closest allies, and breeding terrorism against America. Israel’s rejection of de-Zionization, opposition to
assimilation within the Arab world, and refusal to give the Palestinians independence or citizenship and right of return, are likely to lead her to repeat the history of European settlers in Palestine during the Roman and Crusade eras and in modern Algeria, Kenya, Zimbabwe, and South Africa. In the face of declining world Jewry (around 13 million), the Israeli government continues to bring in settlers from all over the globe (the latest were Peruvian Indians, see Livneh, 2002), convert them to Judaism, change their names, and have them settle more Palestinian land under the so-called Law of “Return,” while the original people of the Holy Land languish in besieged refugee camps stripped of their right to return in violation of UN General Assembly Resolution 194 of December 11, 1948.

Table 2. Jewish Settlements and Palestinian Dispossession and Dispersion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jewish Settlers in Palestine/Israel 1919-1999</th>
<th>Dispossession and Dispersion of the Palestinians 1948-2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About 3,237,000 Jewish settlers/immigrants arrived in Palestine/Israel between 1919 and 1999.</td>
<td>•Palestine/Israel: 4,715,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Jordan: 2,540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Lebanon: 500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Syria: 443,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Saudi Arabia: 334,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Iraq: 87,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Egypt: 72,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Kuwait: 35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Libya: 31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Other Arab States: 570,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin (% of Total)</td>
<td>Total Palestinians in the Arab World &amp; Israel in 2000: 9.3 million*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Euro-American 71.2%</td>
<td>Total Jews in Israel in 2000: 4.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The figure excludes an estimated 500,000 Palestinians living outside the Arab World and Israel.

Last but not least, Zionism continues to face the same old chronic crisis of identity; a delicate situation captured by the famous saying Israel is in the Middle East but not from it. Israel’s ghettoized identity is sustained by a siege mentality and a clash-of-civilizations ideology. But as Peter Taylor noted, it is the inter-mingling between civilizations (not the clash between civilizations) which represents the new condition of this early 21st century (Taylor, 2000). With the worldwide process of globalization of the economy and denationalization of the state as well as the dying holocaust industry (Finkelstein, 2000), Israel is facing a deepening crisis of geographical and cultural identity where the civic Israelis and ethnic Jews are drifting in
opposite directions amidst a geopolitical schizophrenia between the Middle East, Europe, the United States, and the Jewish Diaspora (Urian and Karsh, 1999; Newman, 2000; Ram, 2003).

After nearly a century of claiming a Semitic/Israelite ancestry, adopting Hebrew names (see Figure 1), and impersonating and appropriating the identity and cultural heritage of the Palestinians (including Jesus), contemporary Jews are increasingly discovering more and more about their non-Semitic origin as well as about their own Khazar and Slavo-Turkic heritage and ancestry (Dunlop, 1954; Koestler, 1970; Patai, 1975; Shakir, 1981; Salibi, 1985; Bradley, 1992; Wexler, 1993, 1996, 2002; Rice, 1994). At the same time the costly efforts by European, American, and Israeli biblical archaeologists have produced nothing of proven archaeological value in terms of incontrovertible traces of Hebrew migration from Iraq to Palestine via Northern Syria, Israelite captivity in Egypt or exodus from it at any period of antiquity, or simply that contemporary Jerusalem is the same as Old Testament Jerusalem, whereas the Arabian origin of both the Bible and the Israelites is being confirmed by more scholarly works (Salibi, 1985:25; 1988a; 1988b; Rice, 1994:114). In their desperate search for a Semitic ancestry, Zionists are now taking what could be considered a new propaganda turn to genetics (a field still virtually closed to most social scientists) after successive failures and frustrations to produce satisfactory evidence within the traditional fields of history, archaeology, toponymy, numismatics, or linguistics (Diamond, 1993; Lucotte et al, 1996; Nevo et al, 1996; Lucotte and Smets, 1999; Halkin, 2000; Hammer et al, 2000; Wade, 2002; Wexler, 2002). Such terrible disappointment for Zionism has led Hebrew University historian Yehoshua Porath to note, “You can’t build a cultural heritage on a lie. Because when young people discover the truth, they can become cynical” (Fletcher, 1995:16).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President of the State of Israel</th>
<th>Prime Minister of Israel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(born Rubashov), originally from White Russia</td>
<td>(born Gruen), originally from Plonsk in Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(born Shimshelvitz), originally from Poltava in the Ukraine</td>
<td>(born Yzernitzky), originally from Ruzinoy in Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(born Katchalski), originally from Kiev in the Ukraine</td>
<td>(born Brug), originally from Byelorussia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1984-1986 &amp; 1995-1996</strong> Shimon Peres</td>
<td><strong>2001-present</strong> Ariel Sharon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(born Perski), originally from Vishneva in Byelorussia</td>
<td>(born Sheinerman), originally from Russia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. The New Children of Abraham Have New Names
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