

**Genesis and Prospect of the Palestine-Israel Conflict:
From the Jewish Question in Europe to the Jewish
State in Palestine and the Jewish Lobby in America**

Dr. Mohamed Elmey Elyassini
U.S. Fulbright Scholar 2011-2012
Associate Professor of Geography
Department of Earth & Environmental Systems
Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana, USA
Email: mohamed.elyassini@indstate.edu
URL: <http://faculty.indstate.edu/melyassini>

Book Draft in Progress

To all dead, living, and unborn victims of Zionism and the State of Israel

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

Preface

The Jewish Question in Europe

1. Introduction to the Jewish Question
2. The Non-Jewish Origin of Zionism
3. The Non-Herzlian Genesis of Herzlian Zionism

The Jewish State in Palestine

4. The Non-Semitic Origins of Contemporary Jews
5. The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine by Jewish Settlers since 1948
6. The Non-Zionist Future of Palestine

The Jewish Lobby in America

7. What is the Jewish Lobby in the United States?
8. Branches of the Jewish Lobby in the United States
9. The Jewish Lobby at Work
10. Why Does America Support Israeli Jews who do not believe in Jesus against Palestinian Muslims and Christians who do believe in Jesus?

Endnotes

Chronology of Key Dates

Maps

Bibliography

Index

Acknowledgements

While the acknowledgements section of a book praises the efforts of those who contributed to the work, it sometimes ought to denounce the efforts of those who tried to undermine the work. The central argument of this book was outlined in six conference presentations to the annual meetings of the Association of American Geographers (AAG) between 2002 and 2008. However, from the outset there were overt and covert attempts by pro-Israel individuals and groups to undermine and obstruct the progress of this research. In an article published in the 2002 AAG *Newsletter* 37 (5) and entitled “The Middle East Comes to Los Angeles,” AAG Executive Director Ronald F. Abler revealed to the readers that the Israeli Geographical Society and the Jewish Simon Wiesenthal Center and their Zionist political associates in the United States had unsuccessfully lobbied to remove the first conference presentation (a summary of the research project entitled “Zionism Is Back To Square One: From the Jewish Question in Europe to the Israeli Problem in the Arab World”) from the AAG program in Los Angeles in 2002. Because of pro-Israeli pressure, AAG Executive Director Ronald F. Abler called me when I was about to leave Terre Haute for Los Angeles. He wanted me to give him permission to have my presentation videotaped. I did not give him permission and I told him that he should not submit to such outrageous pressure. At the same time, Rabbi Abraham Cooper, associate dean, and Aaron Breitbart, senior researcher of the Jewish Wiesenthal Center, sent a written petition to AAG President Janice J. Monk and strongly urged her to have the AAG ban what they called the “bashing of Israel.” These pro-Israel individuals and groups had also managed to have the content of the first conference presentation editorialized and distorted in *The Jerusalem Post* (20 March 2002), on *The Simon Wiesenthal Center* website (20 March 2002), and in *The Los Angeles Times* (21 March 2002). Moreover, *The Los Angeles Times* refused to publish a short op-ed reply to its distorted story about the AAG paper presentation.

The first paper (entitled “The Non-Jewish Origin of Zionism”) of this research was published in *The Arab World Geographer* in 2002, translated to Arabic by Dr. Masad Arbid and published in *Majallat Kanaan* in 2003, and republished in English in the *International Journal of the Humanities* in 2005. The second paper (entitled “Geopolitical Genesis and Prospect of Zionism”) was withdrawn from press in August 2003 by the American editor of *Political Geography*, Professor John O’Loughlin of the University of Colorado, after it had been peer-reviewed by three anonymous reviewers, accepted by the journal’s British editor, Professor David Slater of Loughborough University, copyedited by Elsevier Publishers, and posted on the website of Science Direct for about two months as an article in press. A revised version of the paper was entitled “Geopolitical Genesis of Herzlian Zionism,” peer-reviewed again, and accepted in October 2004 for publication in *Political Geography* only to be withdrawn again from the publication queue in December 2004 by John O’Loughlin who “justified” his decision to the author in these words: “I took the unusual step of intervening twice because I am determined to uphold the journal’s reputation and I acted to prevent the publication of a paper that draws upon such ‘sources’ [Roger Garaudy’s *The Founding Myths of Modern Israel* and Michael Bradley’s *Chosen People from the Caucasus: Jewish Origins, Delusions, Deceptions and Historical Role in the Slave Trade, Genocide and Cultural Colonization*], as scurrilous and vile as some of those you have chosen to use.”

Book Draft in Progress

John O'Loughlin went further and considered it to be "offensive," "strange," "egregious," "selective," "incomplete," and/or "irrelevant" to discuss in the paper significant and relevant topics such as (1) Joseph Stalin's reply to the Balfour Declaration of 1917 by the establishment in 1928 of the current Russian Autonomous Jewish Region of Birobidzhan near the border between China and Russia, (2) the East European and Hebrew names of Israeli presidents and prime ministers, (3) the Khazar origins of contemporary Ashkanazi Jews, (4) the unexplained suicide of the family members of Theodor Herzl (the alleged founder of Zionism), (5) the reference to espionage charges against Prussian-Jewish Moses Hess in Prussia in 1849 and against French-Jewish Alfred Dreyfus in France in 1894, (6) the British strategy to have European and Russian Jews fill in the blank for the non-existing native Protestants in the Holy Land, (7) the use of the phrase "the Jewish question" in the paper as well as in the writings of Karl Marx, (8) the role of British agent Reverend William Hechler in the Zionization of Eastern European and Russian Jews, (9) the symbols embodied in the current Israeli flag and how they were unrelated to the original flag proposed by Theodor Herzl (a white flag symbolizing a pure new life and seven golden stars representing the seven hours of the working-day), and (10) the discussion of why Western powers backed and continue to back their own Jewish citizens to dispossess and displace the Muslim and Christian natives of the Holy Land, etc... John O'Loughlin, an enthusiast aficionado pro-Israel Irish immigrant in the United States, a 2004-2005 John Simon Guggenheim Fellow, and author of "Editorial Essays: Israel at 50," *Political Geography* 18(2), 1999, stressed that the paper's references to Bradley and Garaudy "undermine the credibility of the whole exercise." In his letter to the Board of Political Geography (dated 20 December 2004) about the editorial procedures he used to justify withdrawing the accepted paper "Geopolitical Genesis of Herzlian Zionism", John O'Loughlin explained his devotion to the matter in these words: "[On the eve of the April 2005 meeting of the Board of Political Geography] John O'Loughlin is going through this large stack of approximately 40 submissions - reading all papers, all referee reports, examining all revisions, and looking at the communications between David Slater and the authors." That is an average of reading and reviewing more than 10 papers and their related reports per month. Obviously, John O'Loughlin was not working on his own and was not motivated by the "journal's reputation" as he claimed when he "took the unusual step of intervening twice" to prevent the publication of a paper that was peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. He simply wanted to maintain the journal's reputation as a pro-Israel journal that publishes pro-Israel editorial essays like the ones John O'Loughlin himself published in 1999.

Professor David Slater, the British Editor of *Political Geography*, wrote (January 10, 2005) to Professor O'Loughlin: "The paper has a long history and I oversaw a period of review that lasted up to 2 years. The paper was revised on a number of occasions and was finally approved by 2 referees and a third referee was neutral in their assessment but had no objection to publication. After this process you have unilaterally taken an arbitrary decision which is unacceptable... I trust you will see sense and reverse your decision and proceed with the publication ... To do otherwise would be to break the contract the journal has with an author of a submitted paper which has been accepted for publication." Professor Slater wrote (January 11, 2005) also to the Editorial Board Members of *Political Geography*: "This is a serious matter. I have written to John O'Loughlin as you can see below but I wanted to clarify my own position here. The Ould-Mey paper (which discusses the Geopolitical Genesis of Herzlian Zionism) has been surrounded by controversy since 2002. The finally-approved version was sent to Elsevier in October 2004.

Book Draft in Progress

This version had been approved by 2 referees who had kindly given their advice over a long period of time and had seen various previous versions. The third referee had a non-committal view on the final version but was not against publication. To take such a paper out of the production process is quite unacceptable and leads me to question my ex coeditor's motives, especially given his pro-Israeli state bias. You will have to consider your own position on this matter. I have been unilaterally and arrogantly excised from the editorial advisory board without any reason given, an indication perhaps of how far political prejudice has gone in this sorry affair. Given the orientation and practice of the present editor, I am deeply concerned about the future of the journal called *Political Geography*."

Professor Peter Taylor, Founding editor of *Political Geography*, wrote (February 3, 2005) a letter entitled "*Political Geography* in Crisis" to the Editorial Board of *Political Geography*. First, Professor Taylor emphasized the "Editorial practice" of the journal by noting that "*Political Geography* has always operated with two editors, one dealing with US submissions, the other fielding submissions from the rest of the world. This dual arrangement has not operated hierarchically; editors are equal and operate independently. This means that when a paper is submitted, it is dealt with solely by one editor who chooses the referees, assesses their comments and recommendations, and makes the decision on whether to publish the paper. When the paper is accepted, usually after revisions, it is forwarded to the publisher who deals with all subsequent practical matters up to the paper's appearance in the journal. This is common practice for most journals with more than one editor, and it has been operated successfully for *Political Geography* since the journal's launch in 1982." Second, Professor Taylor identified the "violations of editorial practice" by pointing out the "two basic violations of this common practice":

1. The publisher is intervening in the academic editing process by calling in files in order to check on the work of an editor;
2. As a result of this, decisions made by that editor are being abrogated and the other editor is beginning the editorial process afresh.

Basically, the opportunity provided by the resignation of an editor has been used to violate editorial practice in these ways.

Professor Taylor concluded: "It seems that the key problem with one disputed paper is that there remain 'errors in the interpretation of the history of Zionism and Jewish settlement'. This is an extremely dangerous statement: there are always several interpretations of historical processes and editors should not be in the business of imposing an interpretation on an author. Disagreeing with somebody's historical interpretation does not qualify as an extraordinary circumstance to justify withdrawal of an accepted paper."

Finally, Professor Taylor made the following proposal to be discussed by the *Political Geography* Editorial Board at the AAG Conference in Denver:

"Reading the emails on this crisis I recognise entrenched positions that will likely lead to litigation unless a reasonable solution can be found. It seems to me that the best way out will be as follows (I refer to just the one paper that I know has been affected by the crisis, similar principles should apply to other papers):

1. The paper should be returned to the publication queue. Publication should be expedited to make up for the crisis delay.
2. A critical comment paper should be immediately commissioned to offer an alternative interpretation of the history, indicating why the latter is preferable. The first author, as is usual, will have a right to reply."

Book Draft in Progress

After the above strong petitions by the British editor of *Political Geography*, Professor Slater, and by the British founder of *Political Geography*, Professor Taylor, neither the Editorial Board of *Political Geography* (who met and discussed the issue at a meeting in Colorado in the United States) nor the petitioned administrators of the *Association of American Geographers*, the *Association of American University Professors*, and *Indiana State University*¹ were able and/or willing to do anything to reverse the outrageous decision of pro-Israel editor John O'Loughlin, simply because of pro-Israel networks and operatives working as octopuses inside these various academic and professional American institutions. The decision to withdraw the paper twice from publication was not only against the grain of academic freedom and the universal standards of the scholarly peer review process; it was equally a flagrant violation of the journal's editorial practice which has for years provided for two separate editors who are equal and do not operate hierarchically. The withdrawal of the two accepted papers delayed my tenure and promotion to associate professor (as Diane Michelfelder, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Tom Sauer, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, knew too well and with indifference), put a major roadblock to my promotion to full professor, and undermined my overall research agenda and future publications.

Critical studies of Zionism and Israel have in general been tabooed, polemicized, and considered anti-Semitic and conspiratorial in mainstream U.S. academia, U.S. media, U.S. politics, and U.S. culture. For example, the unabridged version of the Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language (1986 Edition) has gone as far as defining *anti-Semitism* as any "opposition to Zionism" and/or "sympathy with opponents of the State of Israel," even when the United Nations General Assembly had determined in 1975 that Zionism is "a form of racism and racial discrimination" (again responding to Israel's pressure, the United States pressured the United Nations to revoke the resolution in 1991). The power of the Israel lobby in the United States and Europe combined with the relentless harassment of world conscience about the real and imagined persecution of the Jews throughout history and around the world continue to keep Israel and Zionism above and beyond any serious academic research or criticism within the Western world. The Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004 (signed by President Bush two weeks before his reelection in 2004), the [HR 3077] International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003² (passed by the U.S. House and referred to the U.S. Senate), and the Middle East

¹ I met Indiana State University President Lloyd Benjamin in his office and asked him what can or should the University do about the breaking of a contract the *Political Geography* journal has with an author of two submitted papers which have been accepted for publication, especially in light of the likelihood of litigation noted by Professor Peter Taylor, the founding editor of the journal. President Benjamin promised to get back to me after consulting with his legal advisor (Melony A. Sacopulos), but he never did. When I insisted by email on some kind of reply, the chairperson of our department (Susan Berta) told me that she received a 'verbal' reply from President Benjamin through Provost Maynard and Dean Sauer. The 'verbal' reply says that the issue should never have been brought to the President's attention.

² Ori Nir, "Groups Back Bill To Monitor Universities," *Forward*, 3/12/2004: Abstract (Summary): Jewish organizations argue that, "rather than encouraging academic objectivity, these centers expect scholars to promote a positive image of Palestinians, Arabs, and the Islamic world -- and to avoid topics that might reflect negatively on these constituencies," in the words of an American Jewish Committee memo submitted to the JCPA plenum. The result, the memo argues, is "a profound pro-Palestinian, pro-Arab, and reflexively anti-Israel and anti-American, anti-Western-bias in these federally funded centers." See also: "CLU Letter to the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee Expressing Academic Freedom Concerns re: H.R. 3077, the International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2003: <http://www.aclu.org/freespeech/gen/10967leg20040213.html>

Book Draft in Progress

Forum Campus Watch (which blacklists American university professors who criticize Israel) have made it even more difficult and more intimidating for scholars to critically examine the making and unmaking of the State of Israel and Zionism without being labeled anti-Semitic. I have made known to the Zionist groups and their supporters and operatives that their fear of academic debates (the realm of persuasion) and their refuge into politics and the media (the realm of power and deception) demonstrate the weakness of their claims (when presented on the basis of historical facts, international law, and the principles of justice) and their inability to support them on a scholarly basis. I invited them to take the opportunity to refute my argument in a professional manner, not in such behind-the-scene attacks on academic freedom and ethics. I also extended the same invitation to the pro-Israel Irish immigrant, John O'Loughlin.

I can document many more cases of censorship and academic harassment by pro-Israel networks and operatives who often can see you from where you cannot see them. For the time being I will limit myself to a couple of examples. Shortly after joining Indiana State University faculty in the fall of 1999, I made a conference presentation (titled "Introduction to the Arab World") to the National Council for Geographic Education meeting in Boston, Massachusetts. As soon as I returned to Terre Haute, my Department's chairperson, Bill Dando, called me and told me that he received "more than one call" complaining about my presentation. He did not share with me who were the callers. In fall 2001, I submitted a minor revision of an existing course (Geography of the Middle East) and it was delayed without explanation at several levels of the routing process, especially at the level of the Curriculum and Academic Affairs Committee. It took a whole calendar year to have the revision passed in fall 2002, whereas it normally takes no more than a few weeks to complete the routing process for revising an existing course. At one level I had to bring in copies of the proposed textbooks and *defend* their selection before the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and in the presence of Indiana State University President Lloyd Benjamin (one senator—Harriet Hudson—expressed disdain for the detailed questions raised by other senators about the content of the proposed textbooks). In March 2002, I was scheduled to make a 'Sunday' morning presentation to the annual conference of the *Midwest Association for Middle East and Islamic Studies* in the Hulman Memorial Student Union at Indiana State University (ISU). When conference participants came in the morning they found that the conference's audio-visual equipment was removed from the conference room during the night. We moved the presentation to Science Building in a snowy day, and there were attempts by pro-Israel individuals to disrupt the presentation. Some ISU faculty members condemned the disruption, while others remained silent. Following the *biennial review* during the fall of 2013, my teaching load was increased from three to four courses because my Fulbright scholarship grant (\$46,000) was not accepted as a 'Research' grant and my Service to the the Department, the United Way of the Wabash Valley, and the Islamic Center of Terre Haute was considered irrelevant. I decided to develop and propose a new Foundational Studies (Integrative and Upper Division Electives) course entitled *Geographies of the Palestine-Israel conflict*, <http://faculty.indstate.edu/melyassini/Geographies%20of%20the%20Palestine-Israel%20Conflict%20course%20proposal.pdf>. The course was in my area of teaching and research, and there was a documented strong campus demand for Foundational Studies upper division courses. The review process took twelve months (March 2014-March 2015) at the department level and the course was ultimately voted down (9-2-1) by my colleagues whose

Book Draft in Progress

leading teaching and research interests include bioarchaeology, biochemistry, geoarchaeology, geomorphology, GIS, geochemistry, paleoecology, dendrochronology, and oceanography). Concerns about Israel and Zionism were the polarizing issue and dominated the year-long review process. At some point there were even suggestions that my selection of Theodor Herzl's *Jewish state* (a 100-page pamphlet) as a textbook needs to be re-examined or cancelled. Overall the review process and the vote (or 'gang vote,' according to some) bring to mind American Jewish comedian John Stewart's satirical attempt to discuss Israel's 50-day military operation in Gaza in 2014 during which more than 2,100 Palestinians were killed (including 564 children in their homes) and 67 Israelis were killed (including 64 soldiers killed in the battlefield): <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hrlUzkd8Z8g>.

Inviting speakers with Middle East expertise to campus was even more challenging. The College of Arts and Sciences used to have a sort of speakers program in which the College matches funds raised by various college departments to cover the costs of inviting speakers to campus. When I began inviting speakers with some Middle East expertise in issues and topics such as the Palestine-Israel conflict, the Iraq war, or Islam, the program was simply cancelled by the College of Arts and Sciences. Later, I approached the Indiana State University Speaker Series committee with a request to invite Alison Weir, Executive Director of "If Americans Knew" and President of the "Council for the National Interest" so she can help our campus community and students better understand a major conflict in which the United States has been deeply involved for decades and with devastating human, financial, and moral consequences. The following is the reply of the spokesperson (Nancy Rogers) of the University Speaker Series committee to me: "Members of the University Speakers Series committee met at the end of April to consider speakers for the 2004-2005 academic year. A number of possibilities were presented, including Alison Weir. The committee believes that Ms. Weir has a point of view that is important to be heard, but the Speakers Series is not the best venue for her. I apologize for not getting back to you sooner with the committee's decision."

In 2005-2006, Bob Woodward was invited to Indiana State University apparently to market his book *Plan of Attack* which was not critical of the Iraq war as it avoided linking it to the Palestine-Israel issue. The hardback cover his book *Plan of Attack* includes photos of National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of State Colin Powell, Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, Vice President Dick Cheney and President George W. Bush, CIA Deputy Director for Operations James Pavitt, CIA Director George Tenet, CIA Deputy Director John McLaughlin, and General Tommy Franks.³ However, one wonders why did Bob Woodward or his publisher (New York's Simon & Schuster) omit from the hardback cover of *Plan of Attack* (dubbed the "definitive" and "behind-the-scenes account" of "how and why" the US invaded and occupied Iraq) the photos of the prominent architects of the Iraq war, including Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle, Douglas Feith, Lewis Libby, Elliott Abrams, Robert Kagan, Michael Ledeen, William Kristol, Frank Gaffney Jr., or any of the 41 Zionist signatories⁴ of the 20 September 2001 letter urging President Bush to invade Iraq and

³ Bob Woodward, *Plan of Attack* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004).

⁴ William Kristol, Richard V. Allen, Gary Bauer, Jeffrey Bell, William J. Bennett, Rudy Boshwitz, Jeffrey Bergner, Eliot Cohen, Seth Cropsey, Midge Decter, Thomas Donnelly, Nicholas Eberstadt, Hillel Fradkin, Aaron Friedberg, Francis Fukuyama, Frank Gaffney, Jeffrey Gedmin, Reuel Marc Gerech, Charles Hill, Bruce P. Jackson, Eli S. Jacobs, Michael Joyce, Donald Kagan, Robert Kagan, Jeane Kirkpatrick, Charles Krauthammer, John Lehman,

Book Draft in Progress

remove Saddam Hussein from power despite the fact that there were no connections between Iraq and 9/11 and there were no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq? One can hardly think of a more misleading omission. But while Bob Woodward and his publisher focused only on those involved in the “planning of military operations” instead of those involved in the “planning of the war,” Bob Woodward himself acknowledged in the book that Paul Wolfowitz was “the intellectual godfather and fiercest advocate” of the war with Iraq, and Richard Perle was “the most outspoken public advocate for war with Iraq.”⁵

In September 2008, Political Science Assistant Professor Carl Klarner approached me and requested a presentation at the Social Science Research Colloquium (SSRC) at Indiana State University. He emphasized that it has been very hard to get people to volunteer to do Social Science Research Colloquium presentations. I thanked him for the invitation and told him that before I can make a commitment, I would like him to send me the list of Indiana State University SSRC speakers in recent years and whatever general guidelines he has concerning the expected format and/or content of SSRC presentations. I just wanted to know whether or not there were other SSRC presentations that relate to my research on the Palestine-Israel conflict. I also was not sure whether or not the SSRC has the kind of intellectual and political interest needed for presentations on the Palestine-Israel conflict, a tabooed topic in many American universities because of Israeli lobby agents and operatives working openly and secretly inside various university, college, and department committees. For example, during the haydays of the Iraq war, no critical speaker was ever invited by the University Speaker Series committee to shed light on the tragic war because any serious discussion of the war will bring up the Palestine-Israel conflict and will end up pointing finger at Israel and blaming her for embroiling and dragging America into the war. As for the Palestine-Israel conflict itself, no Indiana State University professor (with the exception of retired Political Science Professor Glenn Perry) dares to critically talk about it publically on campus let alone suggest or invite outside speakers to discuss it. When Carl Klarner contacted me for the second time in January 2009 and requested again a Social Science Research Colloquium presentation, he emphasized that it would really help him if I did a presentation for the SSRC. I sincerely accepted the invitation and provided the following brief abstract plus an Internet link to a detailed handout about the presentation:

"Presentation abstract: The Palestine-Israel conflict is one of the world's major sources of war, violence, and oppression, as exemplified by the tragic blockade and destruction of Gaza. The United States government is a highly involved partisan in this conflict, which has largely contributed to America's embroilment into the Cold War, the War on Terrorism, the Iraq War, and the Afghanistan War. It is a costly conflict. Thomas Stauffer, a consulting economist in Washington, estimates that between 1973 and 2002 Israel has cost the United States about \$1.6 trillion. A January 2009 study by India's Strategic Foresight Group estimates that conflict has cost the Middle East \$12 trillion during the last twenty years. Drawing upon a wide reading of a variety of historical and contemporary materials combined with academic analysis and day-to-day media reportage, the presentation focuses on two issues. First, it examines the emergence of

Clifford May, Martin Peretz, Richard Perle, Norman Podhoretz, Stephen P. Rosen, Randy Scheunemann, Gary Schmitt, William Schneider, Jr., Richard H. Shultz, Henry Sokolski, Stephen J. Solarz, Vin Weber, Leon Wieseltier, Marshall Wittmann. See *The New American Century Project's* letter to "The Honorable George W. Bush, President of the United States, Washington, DC," September 20, 2001, <http://www.newamericancentury.org/Bushletter.htm>

⁵ Bob Woodward, *Plan of Attack* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004), pages 21, 281.

Book Draft in Progress

the Jewish question in Europe and Russia, the establishment of the Jewish state in the Arab world, and the rise of the Jewish lobby in the United States. Second, it reiterates the conclusion of a 1943 secret memo to President Franklin Roosevelt in which his special envoy to the Middle East US Army Lt. Col. Harold Hoskins warned against the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine because “only by force can a Jewish state in Palestine be established or maintained.”

Carl Klarner accepted the presentation and announced that it will be held, Wednesday, February 25, 2009, in Holmstedt Hall, Room 223, from 3:00 – 4:30 p.m. During the presentation I noticed the attendance of several operatives of the Israel lobby on campus, including Professor Herschel N. Chait, Chairperson of the Organizational Department in the College of Business at Indiana State University, who appears to believe that his real or imagined “Jewish ethnicity” constitutes a necessary and sufficient academic credential to qualify him for questioning any scholarly findings on the Palestine-Israel conflict. I also noticed that a number of “quiet students” were apparently deployed in the room on my left and my right and instructed to take notes and record the presentation without asking my permission and without asking any questions during the entire presentation. Before I even completed my presentation, Herschel Chait (who was flanked by Professor Betsy Frank from the Department of Baccalaureate Nursing Completion in the College of Nursing, Health, and Human Services at Indiana State University) tried to disrupt the presentation by depicting it as “none sense.” When his provocations failed to disrupt the presentation, Chait and Frank withdrew from the room, leaving their ‘quiet’ operatives complete the monitoring and taperecording job of the long presentation and discussion. One faculty member attending the presentation said “I later heard that one of them hurled an abusive word at you.” On March 4, 2009, Chait wrote “There is no secret to anyone who was in the room that Dr. Frank and I are Jewish and were the first ones to speak up questioning Dr. Ould-Mey's various thesis [sic].”⁶ Two day before Chait’s email, I was surprised to receive a letter from Political Science Associate Professor and Chair Michael R. Chambers who did not attend the presentation. The title of Michael Chambers’ letter was “Your Social Science Research Colloquium presentation.”⁷

After reminding me with an authoritarian tone that the Social Science Research Colloquium (SSRC) "was created four years ago by the Political Science Department in collaboration with other departments to provide a forum in which social scientists could share their research (including research in progress) with colleagues across the College of Arts & Sciences and the whole ISU community", Michael Chambers wrote, "I have heard several reports from people who did attend, and based on the reports that I've heard, it sounds to me as if you did not follow the spirit of the SSRC in your presentation." Then he concluded in a disingenuous way: "I have no problems with your right to present your point of view on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict and the U.S role therein. However, I am concerned about the SSRC being used in ways contrary to its initial purposes, and it appears that the SSRC was not the appropriate venue for this presentation."

When I read Michael Chambers’ letter, I asked myself who is this guy and why he is doing this? I noticed that he did not attend the presentation but he has “reporters” who did. Chambers wrote, “The reports that I have received suggest that there was a serious breakdown in the spirit of

⁶ Email message from Herschel Chait, dated March 4, 2009, 3:59 PM.

⁷ Email message from Mike Chambers, dated March 2, 2009, 3:58 PM.

Book Draft in Progress

collegiality and civility during your presentation, caused in part by the fact that your presentation had a very strong political objective to it. In fact, the impression I've received is that your presentation was largely a very long op-ed with some citations to secondary sources for confirmation of your view points, but that it really was not standard social science research. Since I was not there, I can not pass my own judgment on what you presented. I have spent a half hour looking over the materials that you provided Dr. Klarner and which were available to the attendees, and those materials do point in the direction of a more op-ed type of presentation than a traditional social science presentation.”

To open a wider discussion about the issue, I decided to share Chambers’ undocumented claims with those who attended the presentation, including those who attempted to disrupt it. I wrote:

“Concerning the first question you raised about the ‘reports’ informing you that I ‘did not follow the spirit of the SSRC,’ I would like to note first that I conveyed my presentation exclusively to people who were physically present in the presentation room and who had the opportunity to respond to my findings. Any statement taken outside that specific context (slide show, eye-to-eye contact, discussion, etc.) would belong to the hearsay category of evidence whether based on mouth-to-mouth transmission or unauthorized recording and/or videotaping. Academia is not based on undisclosed reports or informants. Second, you need to clarify what you mean by ‘the spirit of the SSRC’ that you said I did not follow. I am not aware of any specific guidelines on what and how should faculty members make their presentations to colloquia. I am not sure how familiar you are with the Palestine-Israel conflict, but I thought you should have a solid background on the level of support we provide for Israel and how it constitutes a national security threat to this country. Third, since you are the chairperson of the Political Science Department and you did underline that ‘the SSRC was created four years ago by the Political Science Department,’ allow me to share our email conversation with other members of your department and some of the faculty and staff who actually attended the presentation (I don’t remember all the names). Therefore I am ccing them.”

In the lengthy email discussion that followed, several social science professors (including Richard Lotspeich, Paul Burkett, Glenn Perry, and Bassam Yousif) who attended the colloquium took issue with Michael Chambers’ unfounded claims and expressed concerns about attempts to weaken academic freedom. Lotspeich wrote to Chambers, “I take issue with your second-hand characterization of Professor Ould-Mey’s presentation on 25 February in the SSRC... There were two individuals attending who were obviously upset with Professor Ould-Mey’s talk. If there was any ‘breakdown in the spirit of collegiality and civility,’ it was during their comments and questions... and Professor Ould-Mey retained an air of equanimity throughout their verbal attack. Moreover, I found their rejoinders to be incoherent and thoroughly lacking in sophistication and substantive basis.” Addressing Chait, Lotspeich added, “you, together with Dr. Frank, were the most agitated and aggressive in presenting questions and comments.” Burkett wrote, “I agree completely with Rick’s characterization of what happened at the seminar. I was there for the part after the first half-hour, including the question/answer session. And I disagree with your characterization of the presentation as a long op-ed. It was an interesting discussion of the history of Zionism as relevant background for the Palestinian conflict. I find your attempt to reprimand the presenter based on second-hand information completely inappropriate. It smacks of repression and comprises an attempt to weaken academic freedom,

Book Draft in Progress

IMHO [in my humble opinion].” Perry wrote, “Belatedly, let me say that you presented very good material. You are a brave person--and one whose knowledge is unusually extensive. Some members of the audience told me how much they had been enlightened... The idea that scholarship has to be value free has been widely rejected in recent decades, especially when dealing with big issues relating to ethnic cleansing and apartheid. As for the ‘op-ed’ comparison, the themes of many of the most important books in recent years have appeared simultaneously as op-eds in the NYT or elsewhere. Books by people such as Samuel P. Huntington are expanded op-eds. On the issue of primary sources, scholars dealing with big issues necessarily rely mainly on secondary sources... You and I are quite familiar with the way these people come to present their hasbara and sometimes to disrupt. I have been called ‘obscene’ by some of them. Those who played that role after your presentation are undoubtedly serious but unknowledgeable people who simply accept the old propaganda. I later heard that one of them hurled an abusive word at you. I must have heard it directly, but I am so used to such things that I didn't even remember it.” Yousif wrote, “I was actually hoping to steer clear of the email flurry, but I feel that I need to say a couple of things about this... Dr Ould Mey largely conducted himself in a civil and collegial manner. The topic is controversial, but not because Mohammed was making outlandish statements or even because there is a lot of controversy about the content of his presentation; for example, most social scientists (including Israelis) working on the topic agree that ethnic cleansing occurred in Israel-Palestine in 1948. The controversy arises because in the US at this point in time it is politically impolite to say so.”

One would think that at this point the solicited presentation was simply a campus issue and the party was over. But it wasn't. The pro-Israel elements used the presentation as a ‘meme’ to infect the minds of other like-minded people on and off campus.

A couple of months later, on May 15, 2009, I visited a home mortgage company (Wells Fargo Home Mortgage, 403 Wabash Avenue, Terre Haute) to discuss a financial matter. The consultant (David C. James) suggested that it would be a good idea to see a lawyer and he suggested Attorney Scott Skillman (30 N 7th Street, Terre Haute) and gave me his business card. I called Skillman's office and set an appointment for May 18, 2009 at 10 am. About an hour later, Scott Skillman himself called me and said that he wanted just to let me know in advance that he was “Jewish,” that he did read my handout (the Palestine-Israel Conflict and the United States, Social Science Research Colloquium presentation, February 25, 2009), and that he did disagree with it, and that he was a close friend of some of Terre Haute Jewish community leaders such as those who attended and attempted to disrupt the presentation. He seems to indicate that he wanted me to know this in advance so I won't feel uncomfortable meeting with him, perhaps implying that I don't want to meet with “Jews” and that he does not want to meet with me either. He did not say explicitly he does not want to meet with me but he suggested that he can refer me to another legal office if I wanted to. In our discussion I tried to convey to him that the factual issues I raised in my presentation and handout are open to a variety of political and moral judgments but they cannot be refuted as facts. For example, since he defined himself as a “Jewish” person he can go to Israel tomorrow and becomes a citizen (just because he is Jewish) while millions of Muslim and Christian Palestinian refugees around the world (who were expelled from their ancestral home in Palestine by Jewish settlers in 1948 and thereafter) can't go back to their homes in Palestine-Israel (just because they are not Jewish). These are facts. They can't be refuted. While this is morally and politically wrong as far as most normal people are concerned,

Book Draft in Progress

it could well be morally and politically right for others, including Skillan who—like Chait and Frank—appears to believe that his real or imagined ‘Jewish ethnicity’ is a necessary and sufficient academic credential to challenge any research findings about the Palestine-Israel conflict.

Seven months later, I had a similar encounter with Vigo Superior Court Judge Phillip I. Adler who did not hesitate to make a series of false claims and assumptions coupled with a number of hostile and provocative court orders in an otherwise ordinary child custody case. He confiscated my Mauritanian passport which has my Mauritanian legal name and the picture of my son. Adler claimed baselessly that I can take the child out of the United States in the middle of the academic year before his custody is settled because the child picture is on the Mauritanian passport. When my attorney and I explained to him that I cannot use the Mauritanian passport myself to exit the United States because I have to show the I-94 form which I had surrendered to the U.S. Immigration service when I became a U.S. citizen. We also explained to him that (at the time) the legal name on the Mauritanian passport is different from legal name on the U.S. passport. He refused to listen to us or to do the necessary verification with U.S. immigration or with the Mauritanian Embassy in Washington, DC. Adler also claimed based on false testimony that I will not even return to the United States at the end of my Fulbright scholarship because he said I ended a mortgage contract. I can cite more examples (probably later) which illustrate how pro-Israel syndicates can transform an ordinary academic discussion inside a small classroom into an infectious ‘meme’ of hatred that distracts from the subject matter. They do this all the time in accordance with the “Hasbara Handbook: Promoting Israel on Campus,” which teaches the “Seven Basic Propaganda Devices” that “engage the emotions” and “downplay rationality.”⁸

Even with these fairly documented attempts at academic censorship in the areas of research, teaching, and service, many at Indiana State University continue to be skeptical about this whole issue. For example, when I informed Department Chairperson Russell Stafford about this coordinated censorship and its harmful effect on my job and professional career, he noted that “no one is buying” this claim at Indiana State University. When I repeated the same thing to Dean John Murray of the College of Arts and Sciences, he reminded me: “you have chosen to focus your scholarship on an area that is steeped in controversy.” While these documented obstructions of teaching, research, and service are clearly part and parcel of a systematically coordinated censorship by pro-Israel elements on campus, it was difficult for me personally to fully persuade my university colleagues and administrators to do something about this type of obstruction of the right of expression and the right of inquiry, which are deemed so essential to the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge and truth, as stipulated in Indiana State University Handbook (910.1 Overview of Policy).

I am grateful for the services rendered by Indiana State University Cunningham Memorial Library, especially its Interlibrary Loan service. I thank Julia Rauchfuss for her cartographic assistance. Many thanks also to the United States Department of State’s Fulbright Program whose award for the 2011-2012 academic year has encouraged me to move ahead with this work.

⁸ *Hasbara Handbook: Promoting Israel on Campus*, March 2002, <http://www.muzzlewatch.com/wp-content/wujshasbara.pdf>

Preface

The idea of Zionism and the practice of the State of Israel take for granted and teach three central claims: (1) Zionism is a “national liberation movement” of the Jews, by the Jews, and for the Jews, (2) the Jews are a special “Semitic people” with an exclusive inheritance “right” over the territory of Palestine and the “genetic material” and heritage of the Biblical Israelites, and (3) the State of Israel should and will remain an exclusively “Jewish state.” Drawing upon a wide range of historical and contemporary materials combined with academic analysis and day-to-day media reportage, this work raises critical questions about the above claims and envisions the prospect of a non-Zionist Palestine. It examines the overall idea and process of importing and settling the now (2014) more than 6 million Jewish Israelis in Palestine who dispossessed, displaced, and oppressed the now more than 12 million Muslim/Christian/Arab Palestinians who live inside and outside Palestine. It takes a closer look at how these extraordinary population movements and their serious consequences in Europe, America, and the Arab world constitute the direct result of the idea of Zionism, the international colonial movement designed to make Palestine a unique extraterritorial nation-state for world Jewry. This book presents these claims—often in the Zionists’ own words and historiographies—and then takes issue with them. These claims had been disseminated on a global scale since the Zionists are—in the words of Jeff Gates—skilled at “displacing facts with beliefs” via the manipulation of academia, think tanks, media, politics, and popular culture.⁹ Taking issue with the Zionist and Israeli claims requires a careful selection of facts that matter to both the professionals and the wider public. Philip Kitcher remarked that scientists must seek not just truth in general but truth that matters, and truths that matter not just to scientists but also to the larger society in which they live and work.¹⁰ The three parts of the book are articulated around the triangular configuration of (1) the Jewish question in Europe, (2) the Jewish State in Palestine, and (3) the Jewish lobby in America.

PART ONE presents the emergence of the Jewish question in Europe and takes issue with the Zionist claims about the origin of Zionism. **Chapter 1** stresses the persistence of the Jewish Question and defines it simply as a question of loyal integration of Jews into their host countries versus Zionist separation of the Jews in a Jewish state in Palestine. **Chapter 2** discusses the claim “the Jews invented Zionism” through a careful examination of the religious conception and geopolitical gestation of Zionism in Europe. First, it traces the roots of the non-Jewish origin of Zionism to the Reformation and Counter-Reformation conflict in Europe, the rise of the Puritans in England, the English-Dutch commercial wars, the Anglo-French rivalry and Napoleon’s attempt to estrange the Jews from their European and Ottoman rulers. Second, it outlines how British imperialist imperatives and religious motives ultimately forged Zionism as “the solution” to the two intertwined “problems” the British themselves help create and label the “Eastern Question” and the “Jewish Question.” **Chapter 3** deconstructs Herzlian Zionism and its portrayal as a “national liberation movement”. First, it examines the emergence of the Jewish Question in Russian politics and its recycling through Zionism into British geopolitics. Second, it presents the British policy of Zionization of the Jews and Judaization of Zionism through the creation of the Society for the Promotion of the Love of Zion in Eastern Europe and Russia. Third,

⁹ Jeff Gates, *Guilt by Association: How Deception and Self-Deceit Took America to War* (State Street Publications, 2008).

¹⁰ Philip Kitcher, “On the Autonomy of the Sciences,” *Philosophy Today*, 2004, pp. 51-57.

it analyzes how the British introduced Jewish Hungarian writer Theodor Herzl to Zionism and then introduced both Herzl and Zionism to the Europeans, the Russians, the Ottomans, and the Jews. Fourth, it outlines the four projects or proposals to solve the Jewish Question through (1) the British-promised homeland for the Jews in Palestine, (2) the Maurice Hirsch-promised homeland for the Jews in Argentina, (3) the Soviet-promised homeland for the Jews in Birobidzhan, and (4) the Nazi-promised ‘final solution’ to the Jewish question. It concludes by pointing out that Herzlian Zionism (very much like pre-Herzlian Zionism) was much more the enfant terrible of European geopolitics than the legitimate child of European Jewry.

PART TWO examines the creation of the Jewish State in Palestine on the basis of the Jewish impersonation and ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians. **Chapter 4** explores Zionism as a political idea founded on a theory of racial appropriation of space and time. It takes issue with the contemporary Jewish claim to Semitic and Israelite ancestry. The idea of racial appropriation of space and time recognizes an exclusive Jewish inheritance claim over the territory of Palestine and the cultural heritage and ‘genetic material’ of the Biblical Israelites, whereas it denies such exclusive inheritance rights to the Muslim and Christian Arabs who are the natives of Palestine and probably the closest heirs of the Arabian Biblical Israelites. First, the chapter presents the 1950 Israeli Law of “Return” as the embodiment of the contemporary Jewish claim to Semitism. Second, it presents the documented ethnic origins of East European and Russian Jews. Third, it synthesizes the major critical findings about the Semitic claim in the academic fields of history, archaeology, linguistics, and genetics. **Chapter 5** presents a synthesis of the leading critical studies on the *nekba*, or the ethnic cleaning of Palestine by Jewish settlers in 1948 and thereafter. First, it discusses Israel’s misleading and confusing discourse about the ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians and their right of return. For example, in 1969 Israeli Minister of Defense Moshe Dayan stated, “there is not one place built in this country that did not have a former Arab population,”¹¹ whereas Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir denied even the existence of the Palestinian people. In 2001, Israel passed the Law for Safeguarding the Rejection of the Right of Return of the Palestinians. In 2008, Israel Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni urged the Palestinians to forget their past, whereas Israel Defense Minister Ehud Barak urged the Israelis to remember their past.¹² Along the lines of this confusing recognition and denial, Israeli President Shimon Peres claimed in 2008 that Israel was always against the Arabs leaving Israel. Second, it examines the ethnic cleansing in light of Palestinian scholar Walid Khalidi’s *Plan Dalet* (1959), Irish scholar Erskine Childer’s *The Other Exodus* (1963), Israeli scholar Benny Morris’ *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem* (1988), Israeli scholar Benjamin Beit-Hallahmi’s *Original sins* (1993), and Israeli scholar Ilan Pappé’s *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (2006). **Chapter 6** examines the claim: “Israel should and must remain a Jewish state.” It argues that Israel is not a viable and sustainable state even at gunpoint, as its legitimacy was and will continue to be questioned. It explores the prospect of a non-Zionist democratic Palestine founded on: (1) the UN-backed right of return for the Palestinians, (2) the repeal of the illegitimate Israeli Law of “Return,” and (3) a to-be-negotiated right for Israeli Jews to either assimilate in Palestine or return to their countries of origin along the lines of what happened in Jerusalem after 88 years

¹¹ Quoted in Edward Said, “Introduction: The Right of Return at Last,” In Naseer Aruri, (ed.), *Palestinian refugees: the right of return* (Sterling, Va.: Pluto Press, 2001), page 1.

¹² Rotem Sela, “FM: Palestinians will celebrate independence when they stop using the word 'nakba',” *Haaretz*, 15 May 2008.

of Frankish Crusade occupation (1099-1187), in Algeria after 132 years of French colonization (1830-1962), and in post-Apartheid South Africa (1994-present).

PART THREE focuses on the rise of the Jewish lobby in America. **Chapter 7** draws the configuration and contour lines of the Jewish lobby as defined by many writers, including the following. Glenn Frankel described the Israel lobby as “a collection of American Jewish organizations, campaign contributors and think tanks -- aided by Christian conservatives and other non-Jewish supporters -- that arose over the second half of the 20th century and that sees as a principle goal the support and promotion of the interests of the state of Israel.”¹³ John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt defined it as “the loose coalition of individuals and organizations that actively work to shape U.S. foreign policy in a pro-Israel direction.”¹⁴ Grant Smith defined it as “an overlapping matrix of organizations, some working in direct coordination with the Israeli government, that extract military, financial, and political resources from America through policy formulation, grassroots and direct lobbying, pressure on media and elites in direction of reward and punishment.”¹⁵ **Chapter 8** presents a survey of the major branches of the Jewish lobby in the United States, including the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations (or THE LOBBY¹⁶), the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC), the Israel Project, StandWithUs, the Jewish congressional caucus, the Federal Reserve Chairmanship and the Twelve Federal Reserve Districts, the Federal government employees network, the media conglomerate, the campus watch, the Holocaust industry, the Adjunct Evangelical groups, the European and Russian branches of the lobby, the neoconservative think tanks, the Leftwing J-Street, and the underground Mossad-Sayanim collaborators. **Chapter 9** provides examples of how the Jewish lobby works to influence elections, sway Congress, pressure the president, manipulate the media, dominate think tanks, police academia, misuse anti-Semitism, demonize the Palestinians,¹⁷ and encourage ethnic consciousness among other groups. **Chapter 10** focuses on the core question: Why Does the United States of America Support the State of Israel?

¹³ Glenn Frankel, “A Beautiful Friendship? In search of the truth about the Israel lobby's influence on Washington,” *The Washington Post*, July 16, 2006.

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.

¹⁴ John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007.

¹⁵ Grant F. Smith, *The Scott Horton Show*, <http://scotthorton.org/interviews/2014/07/23/072314-grant-f-smith/>

¹⁶ “The group that is really in charge that you don’t hear about very often is the Conference of Presidents of Major [American] Jewish Organizations... All of the synagogue groups, all of the fund-raising groups, all of the political groups, all of the influencing organizations, 53 people in one room control those groups... The Conference of Presidents, these 53 people are the board of AIPAC. It is in that body that these decisions are made and that all of this confluence comes together. The synagogues get their marching orders. The universities get their marching orders. The charities get their marching orders from those 53 people.” Seth Morrison, 4/10/2015, http://israellobbyus.org/transcripts/1.2Seth_MorrisonT.htm

¹⁷ John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007. See also Nathan Guttman, “ADL and AJC Suffer Big Drop in Donations,” *The Forward*, December 9, 2011, <http://jewishresearch.org/v2/2011/articles/December-11/12-9-11-aryeh.htm>

Book Draft in Progress

**Part One:
The Jewish Question in Europe**

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Jewish Question

The Jewish Question is still alive and well today

After more than a century of Jewish emancipation in Europe and Russia, and despite more than six decades of Jewish statehood in Palestine and Jewish lobbying in the United States, the Jewish Question is still alive and well in Europe, Russia, the United States, and the Arab world. Indeed the Jewish Question (Jewish integration and assimilation within host societies versus Jewish separation and emigration to Palestine), anti-Semitism (hostility to Jews), Israel (the Jewish state in Palestine), and the Jewish lobby (American Jews who manipulate American politics in a pro-Israel direction) continue to haunt and preoccupy the Jews themselves, the Europeans, the Russians, the Americans, the Arabs, and the Muslims.¹⁸ For example, in an essay published in *The Jerusalem Post* and reprinted in *The Jewish News Weekly of Northern California*, Editorial Page Editor Saul Singer carefully reported that an American Jewish Committee¹⁹ centennial panel has “distilled” the “Jewish predicament” (the “American Jewish Question”) into these words: “We as a people remain ensconced in exile like a bug trapped in sap and may not survive if we cannot extricate ourselves.”²⁰ Singer also quoted A. B. Yehoshua saying that “it was impossible to be a complete Jew outside of Israel.” If this is how an American Jewish Committee panel depicts the status of the Jews in the United States where they are considered the wealthiest and best-educated ethnic or religious community,²¹ one can only imagine how the American Jewish Committee panel depicts the status of the Jews in the rest of the world. Saul Singer is a co-author of the 2009 book, *Start-up Nation: The Story of Israel's Economic Miracle*, which Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu said “every single Arab businessman, Arab bureaucrat, and Arab politician should read.”²² Saul Singer is also the author of the book, *Confronting Jihad: Israel's Struggle & the World After 9/11*. On the other hand, Israeli historian

¹⁸ Moshe Halbertal, a professor of Jewish thought and philosophy at the Hebrew University, fears “the transformation of the Arab-Israeli conflict from a political conflict into a religious war” with the prospect of enlarging the scope of the conflict where “Israel is not only engaging in a battle or conflict with the Palestinian people, but slowly, slowly—God forbid—the conflict is redefined as a Jewish-Muslim struggle.” Moshe Halbertal, “The Forms and Fortunes of Jewish Spirituality: The Role of Spirituality in the Life of the Jewish People,” *At a Century's End, At a Century's Beginning SYMPOSIUM ON THE PROSPECTS FOR JUDAISM AND THE JEWS, CENTENNIAL SYMPOSIUM PAPERS, VOL. 1, AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE*, April 2006, http://www.ajc.org/atf/cf/%7B42D75369-D582-4380-8395-D25925B85EAF%7D/SymposiumVol1_April2007.pdf

¹⁹ The American Jewish Committee is a New York-based global Jewish advocacy organization with 22 U.S. regional offices that “engage with local diplomats, elected officials, and intergroup/interreligious partners;” ten overseas posts in Berlin, Brussels, Hong Kong, Jerusalem, New Delhi, Paris, Rome, São Paulo, Tokyo, and South East Asia; three U.S.-based regional institutes covering Africa, Asia, and Latin America; and 30 international partnerships with Jewish communities around the world. AJC, <http://www.ajc.org/>

²⁰ Saul Singer, “Interesting Times: Ensnared in exile,” *The Jerusalem Post*, May 11, 2006,

<http://www.jpost.com/Opinion/Columnists/Interesting-Times-Ensnared-in-exile>

Saul Singer, “To blend or not to blend: the American Jewish question,” *The Jewish News Weekly of Northern California*, May 19, 2006, <http://www.jweekly.com/article/full/29282/to-blend-or-not-to-blend-the-american-jewish-question/>

²¹ In his 1986 book *Jews in America Today*, Lenni Brenner (who is Jewish) provides a graphic description of the class transformation of American Jews from poverty to becoming the wealthiest and best-educated ethnic or religious community in the U.S. and from the mainstay of American communist thought to dominating the editorial boards of the most conservative journals.

²² “Mr. Saul Singer,” The Israel Democracy Institute, accessed February 14, 2012,

<http://www.idi.org.il/sites/english/AboutIDI/Staff/Pages/BioSaulSinger.aspx>

Shlomo Sand has published two books in which he explained the made-up nature of the two core mindsets or ideas of “The Jewish People” and “The Land of Israel.”²³ Gilad Atzmon added that the “Jewish People” is “a made-up notion consisting of an imaginary past with very little to back it up forensically, historically, or textually.”²⁴

Abraham Foxman, National Director of the Jewish Anti-Defamation League acknowledges that in the dawn of the twenty-first century, “the demands that Jews *demonstrate* their love for and loyalty to the United States—and disavow any intention of betraying America’s interests on behalf of a foreign land, especially Israel—are little louder and more insistent than usual.”²⁵ Pulitzer Prize-winning George Will assertively proclaimed in *The Washington Post* (2 May 2002) that post-World War Two European culture “has produced the truly remarkable phenomenon of anti-Semitism without Jews,” an anti-Semitism that “has become the second—and final?—phase of the struggle for a ‘final solution to the Jewish question.’” A poll requested by the European Commission and conducted by Taylor Nelson Sofres/EOS Gallup Europe between 8 and 16 October 2003 found that about 60 percent of Europeans said “Israel was a bigger threat to world peace than Iran, North Korea and the US.”²⁶ A subsequent poll released by the Jewish Anti-Defamation League in December 2003 found that 43 percent of Americans see Israel as a threat to world peace²⁷. In the meantime, the European Union remained divided over how to deal with claims such as “the Holocaust never happened.”²⁸ In 2015, the UN had its first ever meeting on anti-Semitism attended by about half of UN member states with leading speakers from the United States, Saudi Arabia, and France. At the meeting, United States Ambassador Samantha Power called for nations to take a stand against “this monstrous global problem” of anti-Semitism.²⁹

In Germany the situation is similar. Melody Sucharewicz, a political communications and strategy consultant in Israel and Germany, reported that a 10-member independent expert committee commissioned in 2009 by the German Bundestag released a 204 page report in January 2012. The committee, whose members were composed of sociologists, police officials, anthropologists and social psychologists, found that 16 percent of Germans believe that the country's Jews "have too much influence"; 12 percent think Jews "share the guilt for their persecutions"; 45 percent feel that "Jews still talk too much about what they went through during the Holocaust"; 44 percent say they can understand why, considering Israeli policy, people might dislike Jews; nearly 60 percent believe that Israel is waging a war of extinction against the Palestinians; and over 40 percent say that "what Israel is doing to the Palestinians is in principle

²³ Shlomo Sand, *Comment le peuple juif fut inventé: de la Bible au sionisme*, Paris: Fayard, 2008 [published in English: *The Invention of the Jewish People*, Verso, 2010].

Shlomo Sand, *The Invention of the Land of Israel*, Verso, 2012.

²⁴ Gilad Atzmon, *The Wandering Who?*, Zero Books, 2011.

²⁵ Abraham H. Foxman, *The Deadliest Lies: The Israel Lobby and the Myth of Jewish Control*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, page 22.

²⁶ Chris McGreal, "EU poll sees Israel as peace threat," *The Guardian*, November 3, 2003, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2003/nov/03/eu.israel>

²⁷ Anti-Defamation League, “ADL Poll Finds Americans Continue To Strongly Support Israel,” accessed 24 December 2007, http://www.adl.org/PresRele/IsIME_62/4429_62.htm

²⁸ Reuters, “Diplomats: EU still divided over how to handle Holocaust denial,” *Haaretz*, 15 February 2007, accessed 24 December 2007, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/826540.html>

²⁹ RT, January 24, 2015, <http://www.rt.com/news/225787-un-meeting-anti-semitism/>

Book Draft in Progress

no different from what Nazis did to the Jews in the Third Reich."³⁰ Nobel Prize-winning German writer Guenter Grass, 84 year-old, was branded by some as "the eternal anti-Semite" when he condemned German arms sales to Israel and said that Israel is a threat to world peace and must not be allowed to launch military strikes against Iran. Grass expressed himself in a poem, *what must be said*, published in the German *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* daily on April 4, 2012.³¹ Similar charges were also raised against Norwegian sociologist professor and pioneer of global peace studies Johan Galtung, 82 year-old, when he made hints while lecturing at the University of Oslo claiming a possible connection between Anders Behring Breivik, responsible for massacring dozens of children in Norway on July 22, 2011, and the Israeli Mossad.³²

Even in Britain, the country that invented Zionism, there were reports in 2015 of neo-Nazis demonstrating against the "Jewification of Great Britain."³³ In a religious studies paper, the British examination board Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA), England's biggest, had set a question which asks examinees to "Explain, briefly, why some people are prejudiced against Jews." The head of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, Jon Benjamin, reacted immediately by describing the question as "unacceptable" and said he will take it up with the examination board and with the Department of Education. British Education Secretary Michael Gove reacted quickly by describing the question as bizarre: "To suggest that antisemitism can ever be explained, rather than condemned, is insensitive and, frankly, bizarre. AQA needs to explain how and why this question was included in an exam paper." In the meantime, a spokeswoman for the British examination board Assessment and Qualifications Alliance rushed to say that "In many exam questions 'explain' is used to mean 'give an account of'... The board is obviously concerned that this question may have caused offence, as this was absolutely not our intention."³⁴

In post-Soviet Russia, experts of the Jewish Question argued in *The Current Digest of the Post - Soviet Press* (12 June 1996) that two-thirds of Russian Jews fear anti-Semitism. Some ten years later, a study published by N. G. O. Pereira in *Canadian Slavonic Papers* (March-June 2006) pointed out that the factors conducive to anti-Semitism in contemporary Russian literature include "the end of censorship of ethnic hate literature" and "the prominent role of Jewish oligarchs in the privatization of national resources through a series of schemes and scams." S. A. Greene, a Moscow-based reporter who covers Jewish life in the former Soviet Union for the American-Jewish newspaper *The Forward* (13 September 2002), reviewed David E. Hoffman's book *The Oligarchs: Wealth and Power in the New Russia*. Greene reported that "Russia is still asking its 'Jewish question,'" at a time when most of Russia's famous business oligarchs are Jews who, in the aftermath of communism's fall, "ran banks, oil companies, television stations

³⁰ Melody Sucharewicz, "Germany's anti-Semitism problem," Haaretz, February 12, 2012, accessed 2/12/2012 at <http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/opinion/germany-s-anti-semitism-problem-1.412090>

³¹ Gareth Jones, "German author Grass says Israel endangers world peace," Reuters, April 4, 2012, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/04/us-germany-israel-grass-idUSBRE8330R920120404>

³² Ofer Aderet, "Pioneer of global peace studies hints at link between Norway massacre and Mossad," Haaretz, April 30, 2012, <http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/pioneer-of-global-peace-studies-hints-at-link-between-norway-massacre-and-mossad-1.427385>

³³ Jewish Telegraphic Agency, June 30, 2015, <http://www.jta.org/2015/06/30/news-opinion/world/neo-nazi-march-in-jewish-london-suburb-ordered-moved>

³⁴ Peter Walker, "Michael Gove criticises 'bizarre' Jewish exam question," The Guardian, May 25, 2012, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2012/may/25/michael-gove-jewish-exam-question>

Book Draft in Progress

and, increasingly, the country.” Nickolai Butkevich, research and advocacy director at the Union of Councils for Jews in the Former Soviet Union wrote in *Forward*: “Jew-hatred is on the rise in the land of pogroms.”³⁵ In his testimony before the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom Hearing entitled “Russia: Religious Communities, Extremist Movements, and the State,” Butkevich noted that an “extremist newspaper published a letter with the signatures of 19 members of the State Duma [Federal Assembly of Russia, or Russian Parliament] that was sent to the Prosecutor General’s office demanding that all Jewish organizations in Russia be banned.”³⁶ The problematic question of Jewish loyalty to host countries is perhaps typified by Russian tycoon Viatcheslav Moshe Kantor’s apparent many loyalties. At the same time Viatcheslav Moshe Kantor (1) is President of the European Jewish Congress, (2) is President of the Russian Jewish Congress, (3) is President of Russia’s largest fertilizer company (Acron agrochemical company), (4) is President of the World Holocaust Forum Foundation, (5) is Chairman of the European Jewish Fund, (6) is Co-Chairman of the European Council on Tolerance and Reconciliation, (7) holds Israeli citizenship, (8) splits his time between Israel and Switzerland, (9) holds Honorary Doctorate from Tel-Aviv University, and (10) compares his position in Russia to Joseph’s in Egypt & Esther’s in Persia.³⁷ In 2015, Kantor appeared to blackmail Europe when he said: if Jews leave, Europe will face “economic disaster.”³⁸

In the Middle East region, over 12 million Palestinians continue to struggle to reclaim their homeland of Palestine from which most of them were expelled by Jewish settlers in 1948 and thereafter. They are denied the right to return to their homes in more than 500 towns and villages in Palestine simply because they are not Jewish. As a result Arab popular culture considers Zionism “a far more heinous crime than Nazism.”³⁹ Significant propaganda efforts are currently made by the Zionists throughout the Arab world in order to make the Holocaust an “Arab story” as it was once a “European story.”⁴⁰ Iran held the “World Without Zionism” conference in Tehran in October 2005 and “The Holocaust: A World Prospect” conference in December 2006, while Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was quoted in October 2005 saying “As the Imam [Iran’s revolutionary leader Ayat Allah Khomeini] said, Israel must be wiped off the map.” In May 2006, Israeli Vice Premier Shimon Peres said “Iran can also be wiped off the map,” while in December of the same year Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert came close to admitting

³⁵ Nickolai Butkevich, “Jew-Hatred Is on The Rise in the Land of Pogroms,” *Forward*, 19 October 2007.

³⁶ UCSJ: Union of Councils for Jews in the Former Soviet Union, TESTIMONY OF NICKOLAI BUTKEVICH, Research and Advocacy Director, UCSJ: Union of Councils for Jews in the Former Soviet Union Before the USCIRF Hearing “Russia: Religious Communities, Extremist Movements, and the State,” The Capitol, Room SC-4, February 7, 2005, <http://www.fsmonitor.com/stories/020505USICRFTestimony.pdf>

³⁷ Grant Slater, “Kantor: European Jewry has bigger problems than Russian Jewry,” Jewish Telegraphic Agency, 2/12/2009, <http://jta.org/news/article/2009/02/12/1002981/russian-jewry-chief-stepping-down-to-focus-on-europes-woes>

President [Kantor]’s Page, European Jewish Congress, 1/16/2009,

http://www.eurojewcong.org/ejc/section.php?id_rubrique=97

Amiram Barkat, “Putin ally is frontrunner to head European Jewish Congress,” Haaretz, 6/23/2007,

<http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/873804.html>

³⁸ RT, 3/10/2015, <http://rt.com/news/239285-europe-economic-disaster-jews>

³⁹ Robert Satloff, *Among the Righteous: Lost Stories of the Holocaust's Long Reach into Arab Lands* (New York: Public Affairs, 2006), 167.

⁴⁰ Robert Satloff, *Among the Righteous: Lost Stories of the Holocaust's Long Reach into Arab Lands* (New York: Public Affairs, 2006), 18

what many already take for granted, that Israel has nuclear weapons. According to President Jimmy Carter, Israel “has 150 nuclear weapons.”⁴¹ In the meantime, Douglas Davis speculates in the London-based *The Spectator* (5 January 2007) that the Americans and/or the Israelis are likely to launch military nuclear strikes aimed at crippling Iran’s nuclear program. Mohammed el-Katatny of Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak’s National Democratic Party was quoted saying in a heated parliament session held to discuss Israeli excavations near the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem “That cursed Israel is trying to destroy al-Aqsa mosque” and “Nothing will work with Israel except for a nuclear bomb that wipes it out of existence.”⁴² Leon Wieseltier noted that “Israel faces a grave strategic threat in the nuclear program of Iran—but it is the only strategic threat that Israel now faces, the fevers that are sweeping some of the Islamic world notwithstanding.”⁴³ In 2015, United States political and cultural elites were as obsessed with the security of Israel as ever in light of an agreement reached in July 2015 between world powers [US, UK, France, China, Russia and Germany] and Iran on limiting Iranian nuclear activity in return for the lifting of international economic sanctions. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was quick to depict the deal as a “stunning historic mistake” that would provide Iran with “hundreds of billions of dollars with which it can fuel its terror machine and its expansion and aggression throughout the Middle East and across the globe.”⁴⁴ It seems that concerns about the Iranian nuclear program’s relation to the security of Israel had somehow eclipsed the United States presidential election of 2016 and will likely shape it more than ever before because U.S. Supreme Court’s rejection of U.S. campaign funding limits has just opened the door wider and wider for big-money donors.⁴⁵

The above facts and statements underscore not only the persistence of the Jewish Question but also the gravity of the Palestine-Israel conflict. Between September 29, 2000 and July 24, 2015, fighting between the Israelis and the Palestinians led to the death of at least 9,139 Palestinians (including 2,061 children) and the injury of 72,864, compared to 1,198 Israelis killed (including 133 children) and 11,430 injured.⁴⁶ According to the September 2009 *Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict*, Israel’s military operations (codenamed “Operation Cast Lead”) in the Gaza Strip from 27 December 2008 to 18 January 2009 involved Israel’s navy, air force and army. The number of Palestinians killed in this latest Gaza war was 1,444 (according to the Gaza authorities), between 1,387 and 1,417 (according to non-governmental organizations), and 1,166 (according to the Government of Israel). The Report added that the percentage of civilians among those killed raised “very serious concerns.” The number of Israelis killed was 13 (according to the Government of Israel).⁴⁷ This disproportionate death ratio of more than 100 Palestinians to 1 Israeli seems consistent with the July 2009

⁴¹ “Israel ‘has 150 nuclear weapons’”, BBC, May 26, 2008, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/7420573.stm

⁴² The Associated Press, “Egyptian MP: Nothing will work with Israel except nuclear bomb,” *Haaretz*, February 13, 2007, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/pages/824984.html>

⁴³ Leon Wieseltier, “American Jewry at the Start of a Century: What Should We Worry About Next?” At a Century’s End, At a Century’s Beginning SYMPOSIUM ON THE PROSPECTS FOR JUDAISM AND THE JEWS, CENTENNIAL SYMPOSIUM PAPERS, VOL. 1, AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, April 2006, pp. 12-20, http://www.ajc.org/atf/cf/%7B42D75369-D582-4380-8395-D25925B85EAF%7D/SymposiumVol1_April2007.pdf

⁴⁴ BBC, July 14, 2015, <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-33518524>

⁴⁵ Reuters, April 2, 2014, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/04/02/us-usa-court-election-idUSBREA3116V20140402>

⁴⁶ IfAmericansKnew, July 25, 2015, <http://www.ifamericansknew.org/>

⁴⁷ Human Rights Council, *Report of the United Nations Fact Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict*, September 15, 2009, pages 10-11, <http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Guardian/documents/2009/09/15/UNFFMGCReport.pdf>

Book Draft in Progress

Amnesty International report entitled *Israel/Gaza—Operation ‘Cast Lead’: 22 Days of Death and Destruction*, which states that “some 1,400 Palestinians had been killed, including some 300 children and hundreds of other unarmed civilians, and large areas of Gaza had been razed to the ground, leaving many thousands homeless and the already dire economy in ruins.”⁴⁸ This is on top of six major Arab-Israeli wars, including the July-August 2006 Israeli war on Lebanon in which 1,193 Lebanese were killed (90% of them civilian, a third of them children), 3,700 injured, and an infrastructure damage estimated at \$6 billion; whereas only 158 Israelis were killed (74% of them soldiers), 895 injured (35% of them soldiers), and a damage to the economy estimated at \$1.6 billion.⁴⁹

In the United States we often hear that two catchy soundbites by President George W. Bush (“a free Iraq will help secure Israel”) and Osama Bin Laden (“we swore that America wouldn't live in security until we live it truly in Palestine”) that aptly summarize how U.S. government support for Zionism and Israel led directly to both the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the subsequent wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Even before 9/11, the Report of the National Commission on Terrorism (2000) suggested, “An astute American foreign policy must take into account the reasons people turn to terror and, where appropriate and feasible, address them.”⁵⁰ The report was submitted to the President of the United States, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House, and the Republican and Democratic parties leaders on June 7, 2000, that is six months after the National Commission on Terrorism began its Congressionally mandated evaluation of America's laws, policies, and practices for preventing and punishing terrorism directed at American citizens. The 9/11 attacks came to confirm the above assessment. We read on pages 147 and 162 of *The 9/11 Commission Report*: “By his own account, KSM [Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the principal architect of the 9/11 attacks]'s animus toward the United States stemmed not from his experience there as a student, but rather from his violent disagreement with U.S. policy favoring Israel.” Also “When someone asked why he and Atta [one of the 9/11 hijackers] never laughed, Shehhi [one of the 9/11 hijackers] retorted, ‘How can you laugh when people are dying in Palestine.’”⁵¹ The Report of the *Defense Science Board Task Force on Strategic Communication* (2004) found out that “Muslims do not ‘hate our freedom,’ but rather, they hate our policies. The overwhelming majority voice their objections to what they see as one-sided support in favor of Israel and against Palestinian rights.” *The Iraq Study Group Report* (2006) concluded, “The United States will not be able to achieve its goals in the Middle East unless the United States deals directly with the Arab-Israeli conflict.” In a revealing reaction to *The Iraq Study Group Report*, Israeli Prime Minister Olmert was quick to reject this conclusion and to assert, “The U.S.'s problems in Iraq are entirely independent of the problems between us and the Palestinians.”⁵² These simple facts were rarely highlighted because the pro-Israel media in the United States often misreports

⁴⁸ Amnesty International, ISRAEL/GAZA--OPERATION ‘CAST LEAD’: 22 DAYS OF DEATH AND DESTRUCTION, 2009, <http://faculty.isuad.indstate.edu/mouldmey/Operation%20Cast%20Lead.pdf>

⁴⁹ Sunday Times, 14 August 2006,

<http://www.sundaytimes.co.za/zones/sundaytimesNEW/basket7st/basket7st1155560552.aspx>

⁵⁰ From the Forward by Ambassador L. Paul Bremer III and Maurice Sonnenberg, Chairman and Vice Chairman, respectively, of the National Commission on Terrorism. The report was titled “COUNTERING THE CHANGING THREAT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM,” Report of the National Commission on Terrorism. Pursuant to Public Law 277, 105th Congress, <http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/commission.html>

⁵¹ *The 9/11 Commission Report*, 2004, <http://www.9-11commission.gov/report/911Report.pdf>

⁵² Scott Wilson and Sudarsan Raghavan, “Proposals Draw Sharply Divided Reactions in Mideast,” *The Washington Post*, December 8, 2006.

Book Draft in Progress

the Palestine-Israel conflict. For example, Howard Friel and Richard Falk published a book in 2007 entitled *Israel-Palestine On Record: How the New York Times Misreports Conflict in the Middle East*.⁵³ They showed the persistent misrepresentations of the Palestine-Israel conflict in the editorial and news pages of *The New York Times*⁵⁴, a policy designed to shield the readers from Israel's systematic violations of international law and human rights. Similar media bias was found in news reports of ABC, CBS, NBC evening news as well as in the Associated Press Newswire.⁵⁵

However, going beyond these carefully worded observations will not be tolerated by the Jewish lobby and will be considered unacceptable or even anti-Semitic, especially amidst the widely Zionist-by-default public opinion in America. For example, Kenneth W. Stein, an advisor to President Jimmy Carter and a professor of Middle Eastern history and political science at Emory University, ended his 23-year association with the Carter Center simply because of anger at President Carter's book *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid?*⁵⁶ Carter used the word "apartheid" in the title of the book and in one passage stating that the Israelis are imposing a system of "apartheid on the Muslim and Christian citizens of the occupied territories."⁵⁷ A couple of months later, a United Nations human rights investigator likened Israel's occupation of the Palestinian territories to apartheid South Africa.⁵⁸ South African Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu likened conditions in the Palestinian territories to those that existed in South Africa under apartheid.⁵⁹ Long time ago (in 1961), South African prime minister Hendrik Verwoerd declared to the U.N. General Assembly that "Israel, like South Africa, is an apartheid state."⁶⁰ The anti-Semitism charge, which scares the hell out of all, claims that "individuals or nations" that are against Israel or Zionism are "anti-Semitic," that is anti-Jewish or Jew-haters. For example, the 1986 edition of the unabridged version of the Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language went even to define anti-Semitism as any "opposition to Zionism" and/or "sympathy with opponents of the State of Israel." The European Commission had to apologize to Israel for the 2003 opinion poll, which found that about 60 percent of ordinary Europeans regard Israel as the biggest threat to world peace. Cherie Blair, the wife of the UK prime minister, had to apologize for any offence caused to the Israelis by her remarks in 2002 at a charity event in London when she said that young Palestinians felt they had "no hope" but to blow themselves up. European Union Foreign Affairs Chief Catherine Ashton had to retract an "inappropriate"

⁵³ Howard Friel and Richard Falk, *Israel-Palestine On Record: How the New York Times Misreports Conflict in the Middle East* (London: Verso, 2007).

⁵⁴ The real power of media outlets such as *The New York Times* was displayed in 1971 when *The New York Times* "published the Pentagon Papers, a highly classified government history on the Vietnam War that embarrassed the administration of President Richard Nixon, which demanded the Times stop publication of the series on grounds of national security. The Times, citing the First Amendment, refused and the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in the newspaper's favor." "Former New York Times executive Arthur Sulzberger dies at 86", Reuters, 9/29/2012, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/09/29/us-usa-sulzberger-idUSBRE88SOBX20120929>

⁵⁵ *If Americans Knew*, <http://www.ifamericansknew.org>

⁵⁶ Brenda Goodman and Julie Bosman, "Former Aide Parts With Carter Over Book," *The New York Times*, December 7, 2006.

⁵⁷ Jimmy Carter, *Palestine: Peace Not Apartheid?*, New York: Simon & Schuster, 2006, pages 189-1990.

⁵⁸ Rory McCarthy, "Occupied Gaza like apartheid South Africa, says UN report," *The Guardian*, February 23, 2007.

⁵⁹ Adrienne Appel, "U.S.: Desmond Tutu Likens Life in Gaza to Life under Apartheid," *Global Information Network*, Oct 29, 2007.

⁶⁰ Sasha Polakow-Suransky, *The Unspoken Alliance: Israel's Secret Relationship with Apartheid South Africa*, New York: Pantheon Books, 2010, page 241.

comparison between a 19 March 2012 attack on a French Jewish school in Toulouse and civilian deaths in the Gaza Strip.⁶¹ CNN founder Ted Turner had to apologize for asking “Aren't the Israelis and the Palestinians both terrorizing each other?” Similarly, Congressman James Moran of Virginia had to apologize and step down from his leadership post when he said on the eve of the U.S. invasion of Iraq: “If it were not for the strong support of the Jewish community for this war with Iraq, we would not be doing this.” House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi of California boasted at the time that she left Moran with little choice but to give up his leadership post by resigning because his remarks and comments were “irresponsible,” “inappropriate,” “offensive”, and “have no place in the Democratic Party.”⁶² Moran’s remarks were interpreted as “anti-Semitic” by some and were condemned as “shocking” by the White House. Ron Kampeas of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency noted that the U.S. State Department’s report on religious freedom in 2011 claims a ‘rising tide’ of anti-Semitism, but it was not clear from the report how its authors assessed an “increase” in anti-Semitism. He noted that “the emphasis on anti-Semitism reflects a policy initiated by Hannah Rosenthal, the current special envoy on anti-Semitism. Rosenthal has pressed for the incorporation of anti-Semitism monitoring into the department’s overall human rights reports, arguing that it increases awareness of the issue among U.S. diplomats.”⁶³ Today the State of Israel and its supporters do not seem to view anti-Semitism as something shameful or embarrassing. They tend to view it as something you can boast about in order to define and crystallize the elusive Jewish identity and justify some of the unjustifiable Jewish actions against their victims. While the above shows clearly that the Jewish Question is still alive and well, it does not explain what is the essence of the Jewish Question and what makes it so omnipresent and pressing in three continents for over a century.

The Essence of the Jewish Question

Zionism (settling world Jewry in Palestine) and the Jewish Question (Jewish integration versus Zionist separation) need to be understood within (1) the occupational medieval context of the Jews as functional groups,⁶⁴ (2) the cultural context of the Renaissance and the Reformation, (3) the economic context of mercantilism and capitalism, and (4) the geopolitical context of European colonial competition and imperial rivalry. Therefore, the roots of the Jewish Question involve a complex set of religious, ethnic, residential, economic, political, and identity dimensions. Each dimension could be more significant than the others depending on the time, place, and political context. However, the core of the modern Jewish Question has remained centered on the issue of Jewish integration and assimilation into the social fabric of the modern political unit, the nation-state, since it emerged from the Peace of Westphalia which ended the religious wars in Europe in 1648. Alex Bein, Assistant Director of the Central Zionist Archives in Jerusalem, defines the Jewish Question as “the problem of the existence of the Jews among

⁶¹ “Lieberman: Ashton's comparison of Toulouse attack to Gaza deaths 'inappropriate'”, Haaretz, March 20, 2012, <http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/lieberman-ashton-s-comparison-of-toulouse-attack-to-gaza-deaths-inappropriate-1.419704>

⁶² Ted Barrett, "Lawmaker under fire for saying Jews support Iraq war, Moran apologizes; White House blasts comments," CNN.com, March 12, 2003, <http://www.cnn.com/2003/ALLPOLITICS/03/11/moran.jews/>

⁶³ Ron Kampeas, "State Dept. report describes ‘rising tide’ of anti-Semitism," JTA, July 31, 2012, <http://www.jta.org/news/article/2012/07/30/3102241/state-dept-describes-rising-tide-of-anti-semitism>

⁶⁴ Abdelwahab Elmessiri, *mawsoot el-yehud wal yedudiya wal sahyooniya* (Encyclopedia of Jews, Judaism and Zionism), beit el-arab littawtheeq el-asri wannoudhum, 2001 (in a CD format).

the nations.”⁶⁵ Bein acknowledges that it was only when “the Jews left the ghettos and the Jewish districts, entered the economic, social, and political life around them, and demanded equal status with the other citizens” that “did people begin to regard their existence as a problem requiring a solution, as a question that demanded an answer.”⁶⁶ Along the same vein, Jewish political thinker Isaiah Berlin believes that there was no Jewish Question when regional religious orthodoxy was insulating the Jews from the external world.⁶⁷ In this regard the question of Jewish integration and assimilation was somehow “normal” because it was part and parcel of the broader questions of modern citizenship and inter-state migration. These include Protestant integration into predominantly Catholic France, Catholic integration into predominantly Protestant England, Christian and Jewish integration into the predominantly Muslim Ottoman Empire, and Jewish and Muslim integration into the predominantly Orthodox Russian Empire. Jewish historian and journalist Lucien Wolf points out that Jewish integration and assimilation means that the Jews shall become good citizens in their native countries “in the same way as Roman Catholics are good citizens in England and Protestants are good citizens in France.”⁶⁸ But what ultimately made the Jewish Question different, even unique when compared to other integration questions, was England’s quasi opposition to Jewish integration (“amalgamation” or “assimilation”) and strong support for Jewish separation (“Zionism” or “Restoration”) based on both Biblical interpretations of Numbers 23:9 (“They are a nation that lives alone”) and political justifications (the Jewish Question must be tailored to fit the Eastern Question). Columbia University Professor of Semitic Languages Richard Gottheil has defined Zionism for the Jewish Encyclopedia as the “movement looking toward the segregation of the Jewish people upon a national basis and in a particular home of its own.”⁶⁹ Thus when stripped to its essentials, the modern Jewish Question is a question of Jewish loyal integration within many nation-states versus Zionist separation into a single Jewish state. Albert Einstein, who supports Zionist separatism, uses a thermodynamics jargon when he said “the instinctive feeling of lack of kinship” among the Jews “is referable to the law of conservation of energy.” Einstein asserts that “nationalities do not want to be fused: they want to go each its own way.”⁷⁰

Advocating such a separatist ideology had required tremendous political and diplomatic efforts to deliberately alienate the Jews from their native communities around the world and make them believe that they are descendants of the Israelites and ancient Palestinian Jews and that they constitute a single “Jewish people” with nearly four thousand years of “unbroken” history. These efforts, which were concomitant with both the rise of the Jewish Question and anti-Semitism, included the systematic attempts to create a new Jewish identity by substituting the words “Hebrew” and “Israelite” for the word “Jewish” (as in *Alliance Israélite Universelle* and *United Hebrew Charities*) and to assume or forge a variety of historical relationships and connections

⁶⁵ Alex Bein, *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem*, translated by Harry Zohn, a Herzl Press Publication, London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1990, page 21.

⁶⁶ Alex Bein, *The Jewish Question: Biography of a World Problem*, translated by Harry Zohn, a Herzl Press Publication, London and Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1990, page 19.

⁶⁷ Geoffrey Wheatcroft, *The Controversy of Zion: Jewish Nationalism, the Jewish State, and the Unresolved Jewish Dilemma*, New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1996, page 21.

⁶⁸ Lucien Wolf, “The Zionist Peril,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 17(1):1-25, October 1904, page 9.

⁶⁹ Richard Gottheil, “Zionism,” *JewishEncyclopedia.com*, accessed 31 August 2007.

⁷⁰ Albert Einstein, “Assimilation and Nationalism,” *About Zionism: Speeches and Letters*, Translated and Edited by Leon Simon, In Lenni Brenner, ed., *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, New Jersey: Fort Lee, 2002, pages 29-31.

between what were often unrelated and unconnected Jewish communities throughout Europe. Israeli political scientist Shlomo Avineri recognized that “until 1815 hardly any Jewish person had had a major impact on European politics or philosophy, finance or medicine, the arts or the law.”⁷¹ Likewise Richard Levy stressed that “until the founding of the State of Israel, Jews had always played a wholly peripheral role in Islamic civilization. They were of minor importance to its theologians, philosophers, and politicians. The endless theorizing about them, the conscious dissemination of a negative stereotype, and their placement at the very center of world evil are foreign to Islam.”⁷² Moreover, Alice Mae Roper noted that despite some 40,000 Jews living in France on the eve of the French Revolution in 1789, it was “pure folly” to think of a Jewish “homogeneous entity” or a single “Jewish community” in France, let alone in Europe.⁷³ It was partly the sharp Sephardic-Ashkanazic contrast between “Portuguese” Jews of the Bordeaux-Bayonne southwest region of France and the “German” Jews of the Alsace-Lorraine eastern region that “sparked” a debate on the Jewish Question in France in the 1780s (similar to the *Jew Bill* debate of 1753 in England, a naturalization act for foreign Jews that was repealed following an anti-Jewish storm).

Some aspects of that French debate about the Jewish Question were mirrored in a remarkable essay contest sponsored by the Royal Society of Arts and Sciences of the city of Metz in 1787 on the question: “Are there means for making the Jews happier and more useful in France?” The three winning essays (Abbé Grégoire’s *Sur la Régénération Physique, Morale, et Politique des Juifs*; Claude Thiéry’s *Dissertation sur cette question: Est-il des moyens de rendre les Juifs plus utile et plus heureux en France?*; and Zalkind Hourwitz’s *Apologie des Juifs*) indicated clearly that Jewish integration and assimilation were at the core of the Jewish Question and were particularly stressed by Jewish immigrants and ultimately endorsed by the French Revolution. Zalkind Hourwitz, a Jewish immigrant from partitioned-Poland to Paris via Berlin, where he associated for some time with Jewish enlightenment leader Moses Mendelssohn, championed the idea of Jewish integration and assimilation and the rights of Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe in his essay *Apologie des Juifs* (Vindication of the Jews) when he wrote with a grain of sarcasm: “The means of making the Jews happy and useful? Here it is: stop making them unhappy and unuseful... The simplest means would be therefore to accord them throughout the kingdom the same liberty that they enjoy in [Bordeaux and Bayonne]; nevertheless, however simple this means appears, it is still susceptible to greater perfection, in order to render the Jews not only happier and more useful but even more honest in the following manner:”

“1. They must be accorded permission to acquire land, which will attach them to the fatherland, where they will no longer regard themselves as foreigners and will increase at the same time the value of the land. 2. They must be permitted to practice all of the liberal and mechanical arts and agriculture, which will diminish the number of merchants among them and in consequence the number of knaves and rogues... 4. To make their merchants more honest, they must be accorded the freedom to exercise every sort of commerce, to keep their stores open, to carry any product,

⁷¹ Shlomo Avineri, *The Making of Modern Zionism: The Intellectual Origins of the Jewish State*, New York: Basic Books, 1981, page 6.

⁷² Richard S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Antology of Texts*, Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1991, page 12.

⁷³ Alice Mae Roper, *Voltaire and the Jews*, Dissertation: Thesis (Ph. D.)--Rice University, Houston, Texas, April 1976, pages 1-2.

and to live among the other citizens. Then being more closely allied with the other citizens, more at their ease and with their conduct more exposed to the inspection of the police, having moreover to manage their credit, their reputation, and especially their regular customers, they will have in consequence less inclination, less necessity, and less facility in cheating and buying stolen goods. 5. To better diminish this facility in cheating, they must be forbidden, on pain of annulment of the transaction, the use of Hebrew and German [Yiddish] language and characters in their account books and commercial contracts, whether between themselves or with Christians. 6. It is necessary therefore to open the public schools to their children, to teach them French, which will produce a double advantage: it will make it easier to instruct them and to make them familiar from earliest infancy with Christians. They will establish with the Christians bonds of friendship which will be fortified by living near to each other, by the use of the same language and customs, and especially by the recognition of the freedom that they will be accorded; they will learn from these bonds that the Christians worship a Supreme Being like themselves, and as a result the fraud that the Talmud authorizes in dealings with pagans will no longer be permitted. 7. To better facilitate these bonds, their rabbis and leaders must be severely forbidden from claiming the least authority over their co-religionists outside of the synagogue, from prohibiting entry and honors to those who cut their beards, who curl their hair, who dress like Christians, who go to the theater, or who fail to observe some other custom that is irrelevant to their religion and only introduced by superstition in order to distinguish the Jews from other peoples. . . .⁷⁴

A few years later the Jews were emancipated in France, decades before their emancipation in other countries such as England, Germany, and Russia. In 1791 the French National Assembly granted full French citizenship to Jewish individuals “who will swear the civic oath which will be regarded as a renunciation of all the privileges and exceptions introduced previously in their favor.”⁷⁵ The question of Jewish loyalty to their home countries was at the core of this French citizenship oath. However, British advocacy for Jewish separatism and “restoration” gave rise to the question of Jewish *national* loyalty throughout Europe and Russia, and especially in Britain, where the problem “became acute” with the rise of the Zionist movement.⁷⁶ Moreover, repeated wholesale expulsions of Jews (for example, in 1290 from England and in 1392 from France) gave rise to the “often-repeated charge that they were rootless nomads, wanderers without true attachment to the land in which they dwell for the moment.”⁷⁷ British repeated calls for “Restoration” of the Jews and for a Europe-wide “Jewish agitation” were strongly felt throughout Europe to the extent that when in 1878 Gyözö Istóczy proposed to the Hungarian parliament that Jews be expelled from Europe, he did cite an English newspaper suggesting the

⁷⁴ Lynn Hunt, *The French Revolution and Human Rights: A Brief Documentary History*, Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin’s Press, 1996, pages 48-50. Zalkind Hourwitz, *La Revolution Francise et l’émancipation des Juifs: Apologie des Juifs en réponse à la question; Est-il des moyens de rendre les Juifs plus heureux et plus utiles en France?* Ouvrage couronné par la Société Royale des Arts & des Sciences de Metz. Par M. Zalkind-Hourwitz, Juif Polonais. Edhis—Paris, 1968. NB: The list of Zalkind Hourwitz’s suggestions “to render the Jews not only happier and more useful but even more honest” is not fully reported in both books since pages 37-40 are missing from Zalkind Hourwitz’s book, while several of Zalkind Hourwitz’s suggestions are also missing from Lynn Hunt’s book.

⁷⁵ Lynn Hunt, *The French Revolution and Human Rights: A Brief Documentary History*, Boston: Bedford Books of St. Martin’s Press, 1996, page 101.

⁷⁶ U.R. Q. Henriques, “The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain,” *Past and Present* 40 (July 1968):126-146, page 146. . . . See also Benjamin Disraeli, Lord George Bentinck (London, 1852), page 504..

⁷⁷ Richard S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Antology of Texts*, Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Health and Company, 1991, page 14.

settlement of Jews in Palestine.⁷⁸ The Zionist tenet of “restoration” precluded the full integration of Jews into their host societies, and ultimately gave grist to both the anti-Semites and the philo-Semites who ironically agree that “the Jews form a nation in the midst of the nations.”⁷⁹ Mohammed Ruhi El-Khalidi noted that the history of Zionism was concomitant with the history of anti-Semitism, adding that the Alliance Israélite Universelle was formed as a colonization society before its focus on Zionist education.⁸⁰ Daniel Stone cited Krystyna Zieńkowska saying that the conflict between Christian burghers and Jews in Warsaw’s suburbs in 1775 “arose from the Jews’ reliance on noble and even foreign protection that hindered Polish democratic aspirations.”⁸¹ Eugene Dühring wrote that “the Jewish question does not limit itself to a people; it is a question of nations.”⁸² Even in France Jewish patriotism and attachment to the French Empire were at the core of the main questions Napoleon put before the Jewish Assembly of Notables he summoned to Paris in 1806.⁸³ Bruno Bauer’s pamphlet *Die Juden-Frage* (The Jewish Question) was about the interlocked problem of Jewish emancipation from, and integration into Christian nation-states of Europe. Bauer acknowledged that the European nations did exclude the Jews from their general affairs. But he asked: “could they have done it, if the Jews had not excluded themselves?”⁸⁴ He added that when Christianity abolished Judaism, it also abolished Jewish exclusiveness. Bauer concluded that “the emancipation of the Jews in a thoroughgoing, successful, safe manner will only be possible when they are emancipated not as Jews, that is as forever alien to the Christians, but as human beings who are no longer separated from their fellowmen by barriers which they wrongly consider to be all-important.”⁸⁵ Pavel Pavlovich Demidov came to a similar conclusion when he wrote that the real issue in the Jewish Question is not to blame or to praise the Jews “for engaging exclusively in trade,” but rather to understand the causes that often convert trading industry into an “instrument for fleecing the producing classes of the nation.” This aspect of the Jewish Question, he added, “makes it part and parcel of the whole Russian economic problem.”⁸⁶

Karl Marx’s review of Bruno Bauer’s Jewish Question presents “the contradiction which exists between the effective political power of the Jew and his political rights” as the embodiment of

⁷⁸ Richard S. Levy, *Antisemitism in the Modern World: An Anthology of Texts*, Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Health and Company, 1991, page 102.

⁷⁹ *The international Jew, the world's foremost problem, being a reprint of a series of articles appearing in the Dearborn independent from May 22 to to October 2, 1920* [Dearborn, Mich., The Dearborn Pub. Co.], 1920, page 86.

⁸⁰ Walid El-Khalidi, *Kitab el-sihyunism aw el-masala es-sahyuniya limuhammed ruhi el-kalidi el-mutewaffa senet 1913* (The Book of Zionism or the Zionist Question by Mohammed Ruhi El-Khalid who died in 1913), *dirasat filastiniya, majmuat ebhath wudiat takreeman lidductoor qustantin zureiq*, 1988, pp. 37-81 (Arabic section).

⁸¹ Daniel Stone, “Jews and the Urban Question in Late Eighteenth Century Poland,” *Slavic Review* 50 (3), Fall 1991, pp. 531-541, page 532.

⁸² Eugen Karl Dühring, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews: A Translation of Dühring’s The Jewish Question, A Racial, moral and cultural question with a world-historical answer (2nd edition, 1881)*, edited with an introduction by d Alexander Jacob, Brighton, England: Nineteen Eighty Four Press, 1997, page 59.

⁸³ Esther Benbassa, *The Jews of France: A History from Antiquity to the Present*, Translated by M. B. DeBevoise, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999, page 88.

⁸⁴ Bruno Bauer, *The Jewish Problem*, translated by Helen Lederer and edited by Ellis Rivkin, professor of Jewish History, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1958, page 11.

⁸⁵ Bruno Bauer, *The Jewish Problem*, translated by Helen Lederer and edited by Ellis Rivkin, professor of Jewish History, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1958, page 62.

⁸⁶ Pavel Pavlovich Demidov, principe Di San Donato, *The jewish question in Russia*, London : Darling and Son, 1884, page 94-95.

the broader contradiction between politics and the power of money. While politics is in principle superior to the power of money, in practice it has become its bondsman. It was argued that “the Jew, who is merely tolerated in Vienna for example, determines the fate of the whole Empire by his financial power. The Jew, who may be entirely without rights in the smallest German state, decides the destiny of Europe.”⁸⁷ Karl Marx cited Bruno Bauer’s reference to the question of Jewish loyalty when he said that the Jew “regards himself as a member of the Jewish people, and the Jewish people as the chosen people.”⁸⁸ The question of Jewish loyalty was pointed out even louder by Marx himself when he observed that “the chimerical nationality of the Jew is the nationality of the trader, and above all of the financier.”⁸⁹ But loyalty can sometimes be difficult. For example, after the Franco-German war of 1870-71, the Alliance Israélite Universelle faced serious internal dissensions and there were attempts in Berlin to split up the organization into a number of National Alliances. In 1871 the English Jews created the London-based Anglo-Jewish Association in connection with the Alliance Israélite Universelle whose Central Committee members were living in thirteen countries in the early 1900s.⁹⁰ In the process of uprooting Jews from their host societies, the Zionist Organization held its conferences in various European cities including Basel, Carlsbad, Vienna, The Hague, Hamburg, Prague, Lucerne, Geneva, and Zurich. The question of Jewish loyalty had also for long time been impacted by the treatment of Jews as strangers or semi-citizens as well as by their repeated migrations and expulsions such as from Spain (1492), Portugal (1495 and 1497), Italy (Sicily: 1492, Naples: 1540-1541, Genoa and Venice: 1550), and German cities (Cologne: 1424-5, Augsburg: 1439-40, Strasburg: 1438, Erfurt: 1458, Nuremberg: 1498-9, Ulm: 1499, Ratisbon: 1519).⁹¹ It is interesting and revealing to notice that under the above terrible circumstances of repeated expulsions prior to Zionism, the Jews did not choose or try to settle in Palestine. They mostly preferred to settle in other Arab and Muslim lands including North Africa and Turkey.

Since then Jewish national loyalty has been at the core of many real or alleged cases of famous inter-state espionage such as those involving Moses Hess in Prussia in 1849, Alfred Dreyfus in France in 1894, Viktor Grayevsky in Poland in 1956, and Jonathan Pollard in the United States in 1986. In the book *The Dreyfus Affair*, Piers Paul Read reveals that after its humiliating defeat in the Franco-Prussian war, France reorganized its army and appointed a Jewish officer, Major Samuel, as the commander of a secret unit of intelligence and counter-intelligence attached to the Second Bureau and working in concert with the Prefect of the Parisian police. Major Samuel “set up espionage networks in Berlin and the lost province of Alsace.” Read noted that a memorandum from the Paris Police dated around 1872 recommended “as suitable for future recruitment... *les Israélites allemands, Presque tous achatables mais tous à surveiller*” (‘German Jews, almost all venal but all to be watched’).⁹² Today the situation is even more complex since

⁸⁷ Karl Marx, “On the Jewish Question,” in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, Second edition, ed. Robert C. Tucker, New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1978, pp. 26-52.

⁸⁸ Karl Marx, “On the Jewish Question,” in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, Second edition, ed. Robert C. Tucker, New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1978, page 30.

⁸⁹ Karl Marx, “On the Jewish Question,” in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, Second edition, ed. Robert C. Tucker, New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc., 1978, pp. 26-52, page 51.

⁹⁰ Jewish Encyclopedia.com, 6 May 2007, <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/>

⁹¹ Werner Sombart, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, Translated with notes, by M. Epstein, New York: Burt Franklin, 1969, page 321.

⁹² Piers Paul Read, *The Dreyfus Affair: The Scandal That Tore France in Two*, Bloomsburg Press, New York, 2012, pages 51-52. Piers Paul Read wrote “if Dreyfus had not been Jewish it seems unlikely that his case would have

Israel defines itself as the Jewish State and the State of the Jews, speaks and acts on behalf of world Jewry, considers itself the center and the source of Jewish loyalty, and continues to lead efforts to collect billions of dollars as reparations for the Jews who perished in World War Two. For example, the Israeli Knesset enacted the Zionist Organization Status Law (5 December 1952) which declares that “The State of Israel regards itself as the work of the whole Jewish people.”⁹³ Jewish citizens worldwide who do not denounce Israel will likely be regarded as part of this alleged work. Under this law, the Zionist movement “calls for continuous efforts by the Jewish people in the countries of the Diaspora.”⁹⁴ French Guillaume Weill-Raynal refers to this intricate situation of Jewish loyalty today as “the subtle imbroglio of the double allegiance.”⁹⁵ He cited the numerous rabbis whose regular sermons “make loyalty to the State of Israel a quasi-religious obligation” and whose synagogues sometimes serve as conference rooms for propagating Israeli policies.⁹⁶ David Ben Gurion, for whom the name “Jew” says much more than the name “Zionist,” went even beyond double allegiance when he wrote: “I believe that every Jew belongs to the Jewish people, and only to the Jewish people.” Ben Gurion added that “the moral greatness of Zionism in Germany and the other countries of Western Europe lay in the fact that by the force of the Zionist ideology it succeeded in uprooting many Jews from the German, French, or Italian worlds in which they had been immersed since the Emancipation.”⁹⁷ Indeed Zionism has transformed the Jews into the most uprooted people in the world, as indicated by a study released in March 2012 by the Pew Research Center’s Forum on Religion & Public Life. The study found that Jews are the most internationally migratory of all the world’s major religious groups.⁹⁸

As mentioned earlier, this process of uprooting Jews from their countries was congruent with holding the anti-assimilation World Zionist Congress in various European cities (Basel, The Hague, Hamburg, Vienna, Carlsbad, Zurich, Prague, Lucerne, and Geneva) during the first fifty years of its existence. Today the central mission of the Jewish Agency for Israel is to work with over 500 Jewish communities around the world to build their loyalty and commitment for “a strong Israel” in order to facilitate Jewish migration and settlement in Palestine and ultimately dispossess and expel the Palestinians from their homes. Indeed it is Jewish loyalty to Israel that makes the Mossad operate with fewer case officers than fellow intelligence agencies. The term “sayanim” (singular “sayan”) or “assistants” describes Jews who live outside Israel as foreign citizens and who volunteer to provide assistance to the Israeli Mossad, the legendary Israeli spy organization (officially known as Israel’s Institute for Intelligence and Special Operations). These sayanim Jews, who are only paid for their expenses, represent a pool of thousands and

become a *cause célèbre* of such magnitude. He also noted that “The French historian Alain Pagès asked how the sufferings of Dreyfus could cause worldwide indignation at a time when France was committing crimes in Africa or in Indo-China that were ‘without a doubt a thousand times more odious... without arousing much reaction from French political opinion.’” Piers Paul Read, *The Dreyfus Affair: The Scandal That Tore France in Two*, Bloomsburg Press, New York, 2012, page 2.

⁹³ David Ben-Gurion, *Israel: a personal history*, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1971, page 409.

⁹⁴ David Ben-Gurion, *Israel: a personal history*, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1971, page 409.

⁹⁵ Guillaume Weill-Raynal, *Une Haine Imaginaire: Contre-enquête sur le « nouvel antisémitisme »*, Paris : Armand Colin, 2005, page 144.

⁹⁶ Guillaume Weill-Raynal, *Une Haine Imaginaire: Contre-enquête sur le « nouvel antisémitisme »*, Paris : Armand Colin, 2005, page 144.

⁹⁷ David Ben Gurion, “Zionism and Pseudo-Zionism,” in Carol Diamant, ed., *Zionism: The Sequel*, New York: Hadessa, The Women’s Zionist Organization of America, Inc., 1998, pp. 45-49, pages 46-47.

⁹⁸ “Study: Jews are world’s most migratory religious group,” JTA, March 9, 2012,

<http://www.jta.org/news/article/2012/03/09/3092068/study-jews-are-worlds-most-migratory-religious-group>

Book Draft in Progress

thousands of active and inactive individuals who can provide services discretely out of loyalty to “the cause of Israel” as defined by any current mossad operation.⁹⁹ The sayanim or “assistants” make up “part of Israel's secret army abroad, soldiers who held no rank, wore no uniform, received no recognition...”¹⁰⁰ The Jewish Anti-Defamation League acknowledges that the duality of loyalty is “one of the most stable and telling indicators of anti-Jewish prejudice in the United States,” while former United Nations arms inspector Scott Ritter views it inherent in AIPAC [American Israel Public Affairs Committee], where “Israeli interests continuously trump those of the United States.”¹⁰¹ Myron Kuropas wrote,

“A few years ago I read a book by Victor Ostrovsky and Clare Hoy titled “By Way of Deception: The Making and Unmasking of a Mossad Officer.” What intrigued me most about the book was the claim that the Israeli intelligence service, perhaps the best on our planet, has only 1,200 employees, including 30 to 35 case officers or “katsas” operating in the world at any one time. During its heyday the KGB had 150,000 employees. Even the CIA has some 25,000 personnel. With so few full-timers, why is the Mossad so effective? “Israel can tap the significant and loyal cadre of the worldwide Jewish community outside Israel,” wrote Mr. Ostrovsky. “This is done through a unique system of ‘sayanim,’ volunteer Jewish helpers.” They “must be 100 percent Jewish. They live abroad, and though they are not Israeli citizens, many are reached through their relatives in Israel ... there are thousands of sayanim around the world. In London alone, there are about 2,000 who are active and another 5,000 on the list.” Among the most important sayanim are those who work with the Western press people like the late British newspaper publisher Robert Maxwell.”¹⁰²

French President Nicolas Sarkozy, who was accused of working for the Mossad as a Sayan before he was elected president, told the Israeli Knesset that the State of Israel does not belong only to its citizens, but also to world Jewry.¹⁰³ The Mossad is responsible for intelligence collection, counter-terrorism, covert operations such as paramilitary activities, and the facilitation of Jewish immigration whenever it is banned. Victor Ostrovsky, cited above, was born in Canada of an Israeli mother and a Canadian Jewish father whose parents emigrated from Russia. He has written two books about his experiences: (1) *By Way of Deception: The Making and Unmaking of a Mossad Officer* and (2) *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*. Ostrovsky describes himself as someone who came from

⁹⁹ James Petras, *The Power of Israel in the United States*, Atlanta: Clarity Press, Inc., 2006.

¹⁰⁰ Sybil S. Steinberg, “The Assistant,” *Publishers Weekly* 247 (23):72-73, 5 June 2000.

¹⁰¹ David G Dalin, John F Rothmann, “The ‘conspiracy’ continues - let's blame the Jews,” *The Jewish News Weekly of Northern California*, 11 May 2007; William Fisher, “Religion-US: 35 Million Americans Are Anti-Semitic, ADL Poll Finds,” *Global Information Network*, 25 Apr 2005.

¹⁰² Myron B. Kuropas, “Faces and Places: Gideon's spies,” *Ukrainian Weekly*, Jersey City, N.J.: May 2, 1999. Vol. LXVII, Iss. 18; pg. 7. (Nicolas Sarkozy, «Le discours de Nicolas Sarkozy à la Knesset, » LE MONDE, June 6, 2008. “Furl the flag: Gamal Nkrumah reflects on Sarkozy's bad week,” Al-Ahram Weekly Online, 25 - 31 October 2007, Issue No. 868, <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2007/868/in2.htm>. JEAN-MARC LECLERC, Les étranges accusations d'un cybercorbeau, Le Figaro, 10/22/2007, http://www.lefigaro.fr/actualites/2007/10/12/01001-20071012ARTFIG90291-les_etranges_accusations_d_un_cybercorbeau.php).

¹⁰³ Nicolas Sarkozy, «Le discours de Nicolas Sarkozy à la Knesset, » LE MONDE, June 6, 2008. “Furl the flag: Gamal Nkrumah reflects on Sarkozy's bad week,” Al-Ahram Weekly Online, 25 - 31 October 2007, Issue No. 868, <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2007/868/in2.htm>. JEAN-MARC LECLERC, Les étranges accusations d'un cybercorbeau, Le Figaro, 10/22/2007, http://www.lefigaro.fr/actualites/2007/10/12/01001-20071012ARTFIG90291-les_etranges_accusations_d_un_cybercorbeau.php).

an ardent Jewish Zionist background, spent four years inside the Mossad, and learned meaningful information such as “the Mossad had the best capability of all for cracking locks.” This is recognized to the extent that when various British lock manufacturers send new mechanisms to British intelligence for security testing, they in turn send them on to the Mossad for analysis.¹⁰⁴ He learned also about the *sayanim*, “a unique and important part of the Mossad’s operation”¹⁰⁵ [Gordon Thomas noted that the Mossad “is still the only intelligence service that has an officially sanctioned assassination unit: its *kideon* squads have continued to kill and kill again”¹⁰⁶]:

Sayanim—assistants—must be 100 percent Jewish. They live abroad, and though they are not Israeli citizens, many are reached through their relatives in Israel. An Israeli with a relative in England, for example, might be asked to write a letter saying the person bearing the letter represents an organization whose main goal is to help save Jewish people in the Diaspora. Could the British relative help in any way? There are thousands of sayanim around the world. In London alone, there are 2,000 who are active, and another 5,000 on the list. They fulfill many different roles. A car sayan, for example, running a rental agency, could help the Mossad rent a car without having to complete the usual documentation. An apartment sayan would find accommodation without raising suspicions, a bank sayan could get you money if you needed it in the middle of the night, a doctor sayan would treat a bullet wound without reporting it to the police, and so on. The idea is to have a pool of people available when needed who can provide services but will keep quiet about them out of loyalty to the cause. They are paid only costs... One thing you know for sure is that even if a Jewish person knows it is the Mossad, he might not agree to work with you—but he won’t turn you in. You have at your disposal a nonrisk recruitment system that actually gives you a pool of millions of Jewish people to tap from outside your own borders. It’s much easier to operate with what is available on the spot, and sayanim offer incredible practical support everywhere. But they are never put at risk—nor are they privy to classified information. Suppose during an operation a katsa [a Mossad case officer] suddenly had to come up with an electronics store as a cover. A call to a sayan in that business could bring 50 television sets, 200 VCRs—whatever was needed—from his warehouse to your building, and in next to no time, you’d have a store with \$3 or \$4 million worth of stock in... the one problem with the system is that the Mossad does not seem to care how devastating it could be to the status of the Jewish people in the diaspora if it was known. The answer you get if you ask is: “So what’s the worst that could happen to those Jews? They’d all come to Israel? Great.” ... The system allows the Mossad to work with a skeleton staff. That’s why, for example, a KGB station would employ about 100 people, while a comparable Mossad station would need only six or seven... You can get less information on Saudi Arabia from the Saudis themselves than you can from the Americans. What do the Saudis have? AWACs. Those are Boeing’s American. What do you need the Saudis for? The total recruitment in Saudi Arabia during my time with the Institute was one attaché in the Japanese embassy. That was it. And if you want to get to those senior officers, they study in England or the United States. Their pilots train in England, France, and the United States, their commandos train in Italy and France. You can recruit them there. It’s

¹⁰⁴ Victor Ostrovsky and Claire Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1990, page 86.

¹⁰⁵ Victor Ostrovsky and Claire Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1990, page 86.

¹⁰⁶ Gordon Thomas, *Gideon’s Spies: The Secret History of the Mossad*, Updated for 2009 (New York: Thomas Dunne Book, 2009), page 674.

Book Draft in Progress

easier and it's less dangerous.¹⁰⁷ The following examples illustrate how Sayanim-Mossad operatives kill Israel's opponents around the world with impunity.

Ostrovsky revealed some details about Mossad's Operation Domino in which a Mossad team planned to carry out the assassination of a Palestinian cartoonist (Ali Al Ahmad) who worked for a Kuwaiti newspaper and then lay the blame on PLO terrorism since the cartoonist was critical of the PLO leadership. He also provided even more details about Mossad's Operation Trojan:

“Trojan was a special communication device that could be planted by naval commandos deep inside enemy territory. The device would act as a relay station for misleading transmissions made by the disinformation unit in the Mossad, called LAP, and intended to be received by American and British listening stations. Originating from an IDF navy ship out at sea, the prerecorded digital transmissions could be picked up only by the Trojan. The device would then rebroadcast the transmission on another frequency, one used for official business in the enemy country, at which point the transmission would finally be picked up by American ears in Britain. The listeners would have no doubt they had intercepted a genuine communication, hence the name Trojan, reminiscent of the mythical Trojan horse. Further, the content of the messages, once deciphered, would confirm information from other intelligence sources, namely the Mossad. The only catch was that the Trojan itself would have to be located as close as possible to the normal origin of such transmissions, because of the sophisticated methods of triangulation the Americans and others would use to verify the source.”¹⁰⁸

On the night of 17-18 February 1986, the Mossad planted the Trojan device in Tripoli, Libya. By the end of March 1986, “the Americans were already intercepting messages broadcast by the Trojan, which was only activated during heavy communication traffic hours. Using the Trojan, the Mossad tried to make it appear that a long series of terrorist orders were being transmitted to various Libyan embassies around the world (or, as they were called by the Libyans, Peoples' Bureaus). As the Mossad has hoped, the transmissions were deciphered by the Americans and construed as ample proof that the Libyans were active sponsors of terrorism. What's more, the Americans pointed out, Mossad reports confirmed it. The French and the Spanish, though, were not buying into the new steam of information.”¹⁰⁹

The Mossad was tied in to many of the European terrorist organizations, and it was convinced that in the volatile atmosphere that had engulfed Europe, a bombing with an American victim was just a matter of time.” That's what actually happened when a planted bomb killed one American serviceman and wounded several others in La Belle discotheque in West Berlin on 5 April 1986. The Mossad was counting on “the American promise to retaliate with vengeance” against Libya. “The Trojan gave the Americans the proof they needed. The Mossad also plugged into the equation Qadhafi's lunatic image and momentous declarations, which were really only meant for internal consumption”... “Operation Trojan was one of the Mossda's greatest success. It brought about the air strike on Libya that President Reagan had promised—a strike that had

¹⁰⁷ Victor Ostrovsky and Claire Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990, pages 86-88.

¹⁰⁸ Victor Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, New York: Harper Colins Publishers, 1994, page 113.

¹⁰⁹ Victor Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, New York: Harper Colins Publishers, 1994, pages 114-115.

three important consequences. First, it derailed a deal for the release of the American hostages in Lebanon, thus preserving Hizballah (Party of God) as the number one enemy in the eyes of the West. Second, it sent a message to the entire Arab world, telling them exactly where the United States stood regarding the Arab-Israeli conflict. Third, it boosted the Mossad's image of itself, since it was they who, by ingenious sleight of hand, had prodded the United States to do what was right."¹¹⁰ "After the bombing, the Hizballah broke off negotiations regarding the hostages they held in Beirut and executed three of them, including one American named Peter Kilburn." .. Ephraim, the Mossad agent, said "After the bombing of Libya, our friend Qadhafi is sure to stay out of the picture for some time. Iraq and Saddam Hussein are the next target. We're starting now to build him up as the big villain. It will take some time, but in the end, there's no doubt it'll work."¹¹¹

The following is Gordon Thomas' description of how the Mossad assassinated Palestinian Yasser Arafat's deputy, Khalil Al-Wazir (known on Mossad's Honeywell computer as Abu Jihad), in his villa on the outskirts of Tunis, Tunisia, in 1988:

"For two months Mossad agents conducted an exhaustive reconnaissance of Abu Jihad's villa in the resort of Sidi Bou Said on the outskirts of Tunis. Access roads, points of entry, fence heights and types, windows, doors, locks, defenses, the routing employed by Abu Jihad's guards: everything was monitored, checked, and checked again. They watched Abu Jihad's wife play with her children; they came alongside her as she shopped and went to the hair dresser. They listened to her husband's phone calls, bugged their bedroom, listened to their lovemaking. They calculated distances from one room to another, found out what the neighbors did, when they were at home, and logged the makes, colors, and registrations of all the vehicles that came and went from the villa. The rules for preparing an assassination Meir Amit had laid down all those years ago was constantly in their minds: Think like your target and only stop being him when you pull the trigger. Satisfied, the team returned to Tel Aviv. For the next month they practiced their deadly mission in and around a Mossad safe house near Haifa that matched the target villa. From the time they would enter Abu Jihad's house, it should take the unit just twenty-two seconds to murder him. On April 16, 1988, the order was given for the operation to go ahead. That night several Israeli air force Boeing 707s took off from a military base south of Tel Aviv. One carried [Israel Prime Minister] Yitzhak Rabin and other high ranking Israeli officers. Their aircraft was in constant touch by safe radio with the execution team already in position and led by an operative code-named "Sword." The other aircraft was crammed with jamming and monitoring devices. Two more 707s acted as fuel tankers. High above the villa the fleet of aircraft circulated, following every move on the ground through a secure radio frequency. A little after midnight on April 17 the airborne officers heard Abu Jihad had returned home in the Mercedes Yasser Arafat had given him as a wedding gift. Prior to that the hit team had set up sensitive listening devices able to hear everything inside the villa. From his vantage point near the villa, Sword announced into his lip mike that he could hear Abu Jihad climbing the stairs, going to his bedroom, whispering to his wife, tiptoeing to an adjoining bedroom to kiss his sleeping son, before finally going to his study on the ground floor. The details were picked up by

¹¹⁰ Victor Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, New York: Harper Colins Publishers, 1994, pages 116.

¹¹¹ Victor Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, New York: Harper Colins Publishers, 1994, pages 117.

the electronic warfare plane—the Israeli version of an American AWAC and relayed to Rabin’s command aircraft. At 12:17 A.M. he ordered : “Go!” Outside the villa, Abu Jihad’s driver was asleep in the Mercedes. One of Sword’s men ran forward, pressed a silenced Beretta into his ear, and pulled the trigger. The driver slumped dead across the front seat. Next, Sword and another member of the hit team laid and explosive charge at the base of the villa’s heavy iron front door. A new type of “silent” plastic explosive, it made little sound as it blew the doors clean off their hinges. Inside, two of Abu Jihad’s body guards were standing in the entrance hall, too stunned by the explosion to move. They, too, were shot dead by silenced weapons. Running to the study, Sword found Abu Jihad watching video footage of the PLO. As he rose to his feet, Sword shot him twice in the chest. Abu Jihad crashed heavily to the floor. Sword stepped quickly forward and put two more bullets through his head.”¹¹²

The following is Gordon Thomas’ description of how the Mossad assassinated Dr. Gerald Bull, a Canadian scientist and the world’s greatest expert on barrel ballistics, in Brussels, Belgium, in 1990:

Dr. Gerald Bull, a Canadian scientist, was the world’s greatest expert on barrel ballistics. Israel had made several unsuccessful attempts to buy his expertise. Each time Bull made his distaste for the Jewish state. Instead he had offered his services to Saddam Hussein to build a supergun... On February 17, 1990, a *katsa* [a Mossad case officer] in Brussels obtained copies of documents setting Babylon’s technical goals: the supergun was really going to be an intermediate range ballistics missile... Mossad’s director general, Nahum Admoni, sought an immediate meeting with Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir... Shamir spent only a short time studying Mossad’s file on Bull... On the afternoon of March 20, 1990, in the prime minister’s office, Yitzhak Shamir agreed with Nahum Admoni that Gerald had to die. Two days later after the decision was taken, a two-man kideon team arrived in Brussels. Waiting for them was the *katsa* who had been closely monitoring Bull’s activities. At 6:45 on the evening of March 22, 1990, the three men drove in a hired car to the apartment block where Bull lived. Each kideon carried a handgun in a holster under his jacket. Twenty minutes later, the sixty-one-year-old Bull answered the chiming doorbell of his luxury apartment. He was shot five times in the head and the neck, the kideons firing their 7.65-mm pistols in turn, leaving Bull dead outside his doorway.... Once the kideon team was safely back home, Mossad’s Department of Psychological Warfare began to feed stories to the media , strongly suggesting that Gerald Bull had died because he had planned to renege on his deal with Saddam Hussein.”¹¹³

Sometimes the sayanim try even to do more than they were asked to get, as was the case of Jonathan Pollard. Ostrovsky cited the following example: “Sometime in 1984, Uri had decided with the agreement of his bosses that Pollard [a US civilian defense analyst and a sayan for the Mossad convicted of espionage for Israel] was too volatile to handle, since he was always trying to do more than he was asked to get, taking unnecessary risks, and generally becoming more of a

¹¹² Gordon Thomas, *Gideon’s Spies: The Secret History of the Mossad*, updated for 2009 (New York: Thomas Dunne St Martin’s Griffin , 2009), pages 111-113.

¹¹³ Gordon Thomas, *Gideon’s Spies: The Secret History of the Mossad*, updated for 2009 (New York: Thomas Dunne St Martin’s Griffin , 2009), pages 119-121.

liability than an asset.”¹¹⁴ Ostrovsky also showed “how callous the Israeli government has been in recruiting *sananyim* [sayanim]—supporters within foreign Jewish communities—to betray the countries in which they live and thus make Jewish citizens of every country in the world suspect in the eyes of their countrymen.” For example, Ostrovsky wrote that on 30 July 1997 Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu secured a unanimous authorization from Israel's security cabinet to implement “extreme measures” (i.e., an assassination campaign) against the leadership of the Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas) in Palestine. Then Netanyahu decided the assassination of Khaled Meshal, head of the political bureau of Hamas, after some consultation with heads of Israel's intelligence agencies, including Ami Ailon, head of the Shabak; Danny Yatom, head of the Mossad; Amnon Lifkin Shahak, commander-in-chief of the Israel Defense Forces; Gen. Moshe Lalon and Gen. Amos Gilad, head and deputy head of Aman, the national intelligence evaluation section; and Uzi Arad, the prime minister's personal intelligence adviser, a Mossad officer until six months ago in charge of analysis.¹¹⁵ Ostrovsky wrote that Komemiute “operates almost like a Mossad within the Mossad, a highly secretive department that handles the combatants, the real “spies,” who are Israelis sent to Arab countries under deep cover. There is a small internal unit within this department called *kideon* or “bayonet,” divided into three teams of about 12 men each. They are the assassins, euphemistically called “the long arm of Israeli justice.” Normally, there are two such teams training in Israel and one out on an operation abroad. They know nothing about the rest of the Mossad and don't even know each other's real names.”¹¹⁶ Ostrovsky said that the reasons that motivated him to tell his story exclude “personal vendetta”¹¹⁷ and include “love for Israel” and hate for the Mossad's “greed, lust, and total lack of respect for human life.”¹¹⁸ He revealed that when the Israelis captured the Palestinian “terrorists” alive, most of the time they would be announced dead over the radio so no one would await their return. “We all know that a prisoner brought there [to the Nes Ziyona interrogation facility] would probably never get out alive.”¹¹⁹

The following is Ostrovsky's detailed description of a wicked Mossad covered operations to poison Palestinian leader Khaled Meshal at high noon in Amman, Jordan (one of only two Arab countries at the time having full diplomatic relations with Israel):

“On Sept. 19, six members of the Israeli hit squad arrived in Amman and registered at the Amman Intercontinental Hotel. Two had come on a flight from New York and registered as Canadian tourists. The others arrived from Europe, three with Canadian passports, one under the assumed name of Guy Erez, and the fourth on a French passport. All four posed as businessmen, and also had fake Egyptian passports in their possession to be left behind in the event of an accident, to point a finger in a different direction. The passports did not attract the attention of

¹¹⁴ Victor Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, New York: Harper Colins Publishers, 1994, pages 190.

¹¹⁵ Victor Ostrovsky, “Bungled Amman Assassination Plot Exposes Rift Within Israeli Government Over Peace Negotiations,” *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, December 1997, Pages 7-8, 92, accessed 7 October 2007, <http://www.wrmea.com/backissues/1297/9712007.html>

¹¹⁶ Victor Ostrovsky and Claire Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990, page 18.

¹¹⁷ Victor Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, New York: Harper Colins Publishers, 1994, page ix.

¹¹⁸ Victor Ostrovsky and Claire Hoy, *By Way of Deception*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990, page vii.

¹¹⁹ Victor Ostrovsky, *The Other Side of Deception: A Rogue Agent Exposes the Mossad's Secret Agenda*, New York: Harper Colins Publishers, 1994, page 188.

Book Draft in Progress

Jordanian officials because all passports used in such operations are replicas of the real thing, and the persons to whom the real passports belong actually reside in Israel. These persons turn in their passports willingly, and promise not to report them stolen. Unknown to them, however, they are unable to leave the country while their passports are in use by Mossad agents unless they are active, in which case their addresses and phone numbers are used as umbilical cords for operatives in the field. The two triggermen, using the names of Shawn Kendall, 28, and Barry Beads, 36, set out to see the city and did not associate with the other team members. They already knew details of the plan and they went over their planned escape route. The other agents rented a Hyundai automobile and several cellular phones... On Sept. 25, "Kendall" and "Beads" accosted Meshal as he sought to enter his office in Amman. One stepped in front of him while the other assaulted him from behind, placing a pressure-gas injector against his neck and releasing a toxin that immediately penetrated the skin without breaking it. As they fled, one of Meshal's two bodyguards, Mohammad Abu Saif, sprinted after them. He was gaining on them until they turned a corner and jumped into the Hyundai, driven by "Guy Erez," who was waiting for them with his motor running. Abu Saif then flagged down a passing vehicle and continued the pursuit. He caught up with them when the Hyundai stopped and the two triggermen got out, as part of a prearranged plan to switch cars. When they saw Abu Saif, however, "Kendall" and "Beads" ran across the street and then attempted to disappear into an alley while the Hyundai sped off to the Israeli Embassy. But Abu Saif overtook them, knocked one of the two to the ground, was in turn gashed in the head, and then pushed the other triggerman down a slope, plunging after him. At this time a Jordanian security guard who was passing by came to Saif's assistance and, together, they managed to subdue the two triggermen, get them into a taxi, and deliver them to the police... By that time Meshal was in the hospital in critical condition. Jordanian interrogators then turned their attention to the two men in custody and, after several hours of intense interrogation, they broke down and admitted their real identity. Soon negotiations were underway between Israel and Jordan in an attempt by the Israeli government to contain the storm. King Hussein warned that if Meshal died, Jordan would try the triggermen and have them publicly hanged for murder. He insisted that Israel could avoid this only by handing over the antidote the Mossad back-up team, now holed up in the Israeli Embassy in Jordan, must be carrying in case of an accident. The Israelis insisted on the release of their agents and claimed the antidote the agents had been carrying had been discarded. They offered to send some antidote from Israel. Hussein, not trusting Netanyahu and suspecting the antidote sent from Israel would be nothing more than another dose of poison, demanded to know what the poison was. Netanyahu, through emissaries, since at this point the king would not talk directly to Netanyahu, refused, stating the poison was a state secret. King Hussein asked U.S. President Bill Clinton to intervene. The frustrated president declared Netanyahu an impossible man, but finally the prime minister agreed. The poison was identified, the Jordanians applied the antidote, and Meshal's life was saved. As quid pro quo, the Jordanian government allowed the Mossad back-up team holed up in the Israeli Embassy to leave for Israel. By this time some of the information was in the hands of the media, and events moved rapidly... Netanyahu suggested that if he released the spiritual leader of Hamas, Sheikh Ahmed Yassin [a nearly blind and a paraplegic man in a wheelchair whom the Israelis assassinated later by Hellfire missiles while he was wheeled out of an early morning prayer in a mosque], who had spent eight years in Israeli prisons, the king would be seen as the man who brought about his release, putting a different spin on the matter. (Several months earlier, Netanyahu turned down a similar American request, saying that Sheikh Yassin's release would be a direct threat to Israeli security by bolstering Hamas.)... After the

release and return of Sheikh Yassin to Gaza, the release from Israeli jails of 20 Hamas members accused of “terrorism,” and a promise of 50 more releases, the Jordanians returned the two triggermen and Netanyahu hoped that the story dubbed by the Israeli media as “the Jordanian affair” would come to an end.”¹²⁰

The Jewish Question in the Eastern Question

The political and diplomatic intrigues involving Jewish loyalty in the countries where Jewish communities live could be traced back to Napoleon’s Declaration about settling Jews in Palestine and his attempts to establish a Jewish Sanhadrin and to encourage the Jews to serve France even against their own native countries. This Napoleonic policy raised questions about Jewish loyalty throughout much of the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian lands. When Napoleon was defeated, British Zionism tried to emulate Napoleon’s Jewish policy by more subtle means such as the establishment of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, especially the bulk of world Jewry in Eastern Europe and Russia whose intellectuals ultimately converted to Zionism and produced what Shlomo Sand has called the first Jewish Zionist “intelligentsia.”¹²¹ Indeed the diplomatic history of the Jewish Question shows that the Great Powers intervened repeatedly in the internal affairs of countries where Jews live in order to further Jewish emancipation. For example, the Jewish Question was on the agendas of the Congress of Vienna (1815), the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), the Conference of London (1830), the Congress of Paris (1856-1858), the Congress of Berlin (1878), and even the so-called “Willy-Nicky” Letters exchanged by the German Kaiser and the Russian Czar between 8 November 1894-10 July 1895.¹²² Lucien Wolf argued that none of these diplomatic interventions on behalf of the Jews “took cognizance of their ill-treatment in Russia [where most Jews lived at the time], although until the recent Revolution it afforded, in magnitude and cruelty.” He also noted that while the Jewish Question had influenced the overall evolution of the European international system, it played a special role in the Franco-Russian alliance of 1894 and the Triple Entente (between Britain, France and Russia) of 1907. The link between the Jewish Question and the Eastern Question (who should get what from an eventual partition of the Ottoman Empire) became a visible political reality when the Powers rested Syria from Mohamed Ali’s Egypt in 1841 and discussed four separate schemes concerning the future of Palestine. Citing published documents, Lucien Wolf presents a summary of those four schemes, which are clearly reminiscent of the Crusades and very suggestive of what subsequently became the State Israel:

“The first scheme apparently suggested by France, contemplated the creation of a small autonomous Ecclesiastical State, consisting of Jerusalem, constituted as a Free City, with a limited *rayon* of territory. This was to be governed by a Christian municipality, organized and protected by the Great Christian Powers. Russia raised objections in October 1840, and

¹²⁰ Victor Ostrovsky, “Bungled Amman Assassination Plot Exposes Rift Within Israeli Government Over Peace Negotiations,” *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, December 1997, Pages 7-8, 92, accessed 7 October 2007, <http://www.wrmea.com/backissues/1297/9712007.html>

¹²¹ Shlomo Sand, *Les mots et la terre: Les intellectuels en Israël*, Préface de Pierre Vidal-Naquet, Traduit de l’hébreu par Lavana Frenk, Michel Bilis et Jean-Luc Gavard, [Paris]: Fayard, 2006, page 66.

¹²² Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919.

incidentally took occasion to ridicule the idea of a National Restoration of the Jews. Both Russia and Austria were anxious to preserve the Turkish domination and to that end made counter-proposals. The Russian scheme proposed that Palestine should become a separate Pashalik, that the Church of the Orient should be restored, that the Greek Patriarch should resume his residence in Jerusalem, and that a special Church and Monastery should be founded for the use of the Russian clergy and pilgrims. The Austrian scheme proposed to leave the Turkish administration untouched except in regard to jurisdiction over Christians. This was to be confided to a high Turkish official directly responsible to Constantinople and advised by a Council of Procureurs appointed by the Great Powers. Russia opposed the Austrian scheme. Thereupon Prussia put forward a fourth scheme of a far more ambitious character. It provided for a European Protectorate of the Holy Cities of Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Nazareth, and a sort of national autonomy for the various Christian sects which might be extended to the Jews, the whole to be governed by three Residents appointed by the Christian Powers. Each Resident was to have a small military guard. The protestant Church, under the joint protection of Great Britain and Prussia, was to be recognized as on an equal footing with the other churches, and to establish its headquarters and other institutions—including schools for Jews—on Mount Zion, which was to be fortified. This scheme was strongly opposed by Austria, in whose view Lord Palmerston concurred. Russia also opposed it, but in Paris it was received sympathetically. In the end all these schemes were dropped, and Palestine was handed back to the Porte practically without any new conditions.”¹²³

The British call for a Europe-wide Jewish agitation

The failure of the Great Powers to agree on any of their proposed schemes further encouraged the British to go ahead with their own scheme founded first on involving the Jews themselves as foot soldiers in the future colonization of Palestine and then seeking European endorsement for such an enterprise. 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.”¹²⁴ Colonel Churchill laid down those guidelines in a letter to Sir Moses Montefiore hoping that the latter will help persuade the wealthy and influential members of Jewish communities to launch a simultaneous “agitation” Europe-wide designed to instill Zionism in the hearts and minds of Jews. Colonel Churchill called upon the Jews to begin “an agitation” and promised that “Syria and Palestine, in a word, must be taken under European protection and governed in the sense and according to the spirit of European administration.” He wrote:

“MY DEAR SIR MOSES,—I have not yet had the pleasure of hearing from you, but I would fain hope that my letters have reached you safe.

¹²³ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, pages 105-106.

¹²⁴ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, pages 119-121.

Book Draft in Progress

I have enclosed you a petition which has been drawn by the Brothers Harari, in which they state their claims and their earnest desire to be immediately under British protection. I am sorry to say that such a measure is much required even now, not only for them, but also for all the Jews in Damascus.

They are still liable to persecutions similar to those from which, through your active and generous interventions, they have so lately escaped. The Christians still regard them malevolence, and the statement in the petition enclosed is perfectly correct.

I cannot conceal from you my most anxious desire to see your countrymen endeavour once more to resume their existence as a people. I consider the object to be perfectly attainable. But, two things are indispensably necessary. Firstly, that the Jews will themselves take up the matter universally and unanimously. Secondly, that the European Powers will aid them in their views. It is for the Jews to make a commencement. Let the principal persons of their community place themselves at the head of the movement. Let them meet, concert and petition. In fact the agitation must be simultaneously throughout Europe. There is no Government which can possibly take offence at such public meetings. The result would be that you would conjure up a new element in Eastern diplomacy—an element which under such auspices as those of the wealthy and influential members of the Jewish community could not fail not only of attracting great attention and of exciting extraordinary interest, but also of producing great events.

Were the resources which you all possess steadily directed towards the regeneration of Syria and Palestine, there cannot be a doubt but that, under the blessing of the Most High, those countries would amply repay the undertaking, and that you would end by obtaining the sovereignty of at least Palestine. That the present attempt to prop up the Turkish Empire as at present constituted is a miserable failure, we who see what is going on around us must as once acknowledge. What turn events will take no one can possibly tell, but of this I am perfectly certain that these countries must be rescued from the grasp of ignorant and fanatical rulers, that the march of civilisation *must* progress, and its various elements of commercial prosperity *must* be developed. It is needless to observe that such will never be the case under the blundering and decrepit despotism of the Turks or the Egyptians. Syria and Palestine, in a word, must be taken under European protection and governed in the sense and according to the spirit of European administration. It must ultimately come to this. What a great advantage it would be, nay, how indispensably necessary, when at length the Eastern Question comes to be argued and debated with this new ray of light thrown around it, for the Jews to be ready and prepared to say: “Behold us here all waiting, burning to return to that land which you seek to remould and regenerate. Already we feel ourselves a people. The sentiment has gone forth amongst us and has been agitated and has become to us a second nature; that Palestine demands back again her sons. We only ask a summons from these Powers on whose counsels the fate of the East depends to enter upon the glorious task of rescuing our beloved country from the withering influence of centuries of desolation and of crowning her plains and valleys and mountain-tops once more, with all the beauty and freshness and abundance of her pristine greatness.”

I say it is for the Jews to be ready against such a crisis in diplomacy. I therefore would strenuously urge this subject upon your calm consideration, upon the consideration of those who, by their position and influence amongst you are most likely to take the lead in such a glorious

Book Draft in Progress

struggle for national existence. I had once intended to have addressed the Jews here in their Synagogue upon the subject, but I have reflected that such a proceeding might have awakened the jealousy of the local Government. I have, however, prepared a rough petition which will be signed by all the Jews here and in other parts of Syria, and which I shall then forward to you. Probably two or three months will elapse first. There are many considerations to be weighed and examined as the question develops itself—but a *beginning* must be made—a resolution must be taken, *an agitation must be commenced*, and where the stake is “Country and Home” where is the heart that will not leap and bound to the appeal?

I am the Resident Officer at Damascus until further order. Believe me to be, Dear Sir Moses,
Yours very faithfully, CHAS. H. CHURCHILL.

Before closing my letter, I cannot avoid offering one or two further considerations. Supposing that you and your colleagues should at once and earnestly interest yourselves upon this important subject of the recovery of your ancient country, it appears to me (forming my opinions upon the present attitude of affairs in the Turkish Empire) that it could only be as subjects of the Porte that you could commence to regain a footing in Palestine. Your first object would be to interest the Five Great Powers in your views and to get them to advocate your view with the Sultan upon the clear understanding that the Jews, if permitted to colonize any part of Syria and Palestine, should be under the protection of the Great Powers, that they should have the internal regulation of their own affairs, that they should be exempt from military service (except on their own account as a measure of defence against the incursions of the Bedouin Arabs), and that they should only be called upon to pay a tribute to the Porte on the usual mode of taxation.

No doubt, such an undertaking will require *Patriotism* in the fullest sense of the word, energy and great perseverance. It will require large capital at the outset, but with good prospect of remuneration, returned after the lapse of a few years.

In all enterprises men must be prepared to make great sacrifices, whether of time, health or resources. To reflect calmly before commencing an undertaking and once begun to carry it through, vanquishing, surmounting, triumphing over every obstacle, this is worthy of man's existence and carries with it its own reward, if the judgment is sound, the head clear and the heart honest. I humbly venture to give my opinion upon a subject, which no doubt has already occupied your thought—and the bare mention of which, I know, makes every Jewish heart vibrate. The only question is—*when and how*.

The blessing of the Most High must be invoked on the endeavour. Political events seem to warrant the conclusion that the hour is nigh at hand when the Jewish people may justly and with every reasonable prospect of success put their hands to the glorious work of National Regeneration. If you think otherwise I shall bend at once to your decision, only begging you to appreciate my motive, which is simply an ardent desire for the welfare and prosperity of a people to whom we all owe our possession of those blessed truths which direct our minds with unerring faith to the enjoyment of another and better world.—C. H. C.

I will keep you “au fait” of all that passes in this country if you wish it.¹²⁵

In another letter (dated 15 August 1842) reiterating his proposal, Colonel Churchill wrote to Moses Montefiore “it appears to me that it [Churchill’s proposal] might with advantage be brought under the notice of the Jews of the Continent, and if this be your opinion, perhaps you could get my paper, which, as you will perceive, I have drawn up in the shape of an “address,” translated into German and forwarded to your friends in Prussia and Germany.”¹²⁶ One passage of the “address” reads: “My proposition is that the Jews of England conjointly with their brethren of the Continent of Europe should make an application to the British Government through the Earl of Aberdeen to accredit and send out a fit and proper person to reside in Syria for the sole and express purpose of superintending and watching over the interests of the Jews residing in that country. The duties and powers of such a public officer to be a matter of arrangement between the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and the Committee of Jews conducting the negotiations.”¹²⁷ However, all of this British insistence and persistence did not persuade the Board of Deputies of British Jews to join this Zionist scheme, as can be inferred from their letter of 8 November 1842:

That the President be requested to reply to Colonel Churchill to the effect that this Board, being appointed for the fulfilment of special duties and deriving its pecuniary resources from the contributions to the several congregations it represents, is precluded from originating any measures for carrying out the benevolent views of Colonel Churchill respecting the Jews of Syria, that this Board is fully convinced that much good would arise from the realisation of Colonel Churchill’s intentions, but is of opinion that any measures in reference to this subject should emanate from the general body of the Jews throughout Europe, and that this Board doubts not that if the Jews of other countries entertain the proposition those of Great Britain would be ready and desirous to contribute towards it their most zealous support.¹²⁸

Contrary to the widely-shared perception that the Jews invented Zionism, Colonel Churchill’s letters leave no doubt about who first conceived and initiated the Europe-wide Zionist “agitation”, which sowed the seeds for an intensification of the Jewish Question and anti-Semitism in Europe and Russia. From the 1840s to the 1860s the first wave of this “agitation” was concomitant with important development of the Jewish Question. These include the call for Jewish “Restoration” in the 1830s, the publication of a pamphlet in Berlin in 1840 lamenting the Jews’s fate in exile and proposing a New-Judaea, Bruno Bauer’s pamphlet *Die Juden-Frage* (The Jewish Question) in 1842, Karl Marx’s response (The Jewish Question) to Bruno Bauer’s

¹²⁵ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, pages 119-121.

¹²⁶ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, page 122.

¹²⁷ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, page 123.

¹²⁸ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, page 123.

pamphlet, Colonel Gawler's proposal of 1845, the establishment of the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Paris in 1860, the founding of *Razsvyvet* (the first journal in Russian devoted to Jewish interests, later renamed *Sion*) in Odessa in 1860, and increased Jewish emancipation in Russia. The second wave of Zionist "agitation" took a new name, anti-Semitism, especially during the tenure of Benjamin Disraeli as British prime minister. However, Lucien Wolf noted that when the ruler of Egypt Mohamed Ali was driven out of Palestine and Syria in 1840 amidst a heated debate about the future of Palestine, "not a voice was raised among the Jews for the restoration of the land to them" at a time "when Sir Moses Montefiore and M. Crémieux were busy in the East in connection with the Damascus Blood Accusation, and when Lord Palmerston was proposing to take the Jews under British protection as a separate nationality."¹²⁹ Moreover, the Churchill-conceived Zionist "agitation" of the Jews met with strong rejection from many other Jewish corners. The Reform wing of the Synagogue rejected altogether the doctrine of restoration. For example, in July 1845 [when Gawler was launching his proposal], the Conference of Rabbis in Frankfort-on-the-Main decided to eliminate from the ritual "the prayers for the return to the land of our forefathers and for the restoration of the Jewish state." In November 1869, the Philadelphia Conference, proclaimed that "The Messianic aim of Israel is not the restoration of the old Jewish state under a descendant of David, involving a second separation from the nations of the earth, but the union of all the children of God in the confession of the unity of God, so as to realize the unity of all rational creatures, and their call to moral sanctification." This was re-affirmed again in November 1885, in the following words: "We consider ourselves no longer a nation, but a religious community; and we therefore expect neither a return to Palestine, nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning a Jewish state."¹³⁰

It was with the early difficulty of politically persuading the Jews about Zionism that the London Society for Promoting Christianity Among the Jews began to Judaize Zionism and Zionize the Jews, with more focus on Russian and Eastern European Jews. The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews was established in early 1809, obviously in a response to Napoleon's Great Sanhedrin in Paris in 1807. It was established under the patronage of the Duke of Kent, father of Queen Victoria. By 1841 the Society had appointed a baptised Jew, Michael Solomon Alexander, as its Anglican bishop in Jerusalem.¹³¹ The Society aimed at teaching "the Jews their own holy books" and works and circulating them worldwide, where, in the previous two years (prior to 1838), some 5 400 copies [of the Old Testament in Hebrew] had been sold in addition to tracts, Pentateuchs, and other works. The Society estimated that some 20 000 copies were needed annually to educate world Jewry about Zionism.¹³² The Society had 23 stations in Europe and the East, 49 missionaries and agents (24 of them Jewish converts), 10 schools (2 in London and 8 in the duchy of Posen), and had baptised many Jews (throughout Europe and

¹²⁹ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, page 102.

¹³⁰ Richard Gottheil, "Zionism," *JewishEncyclopedia.com*, accessed on 15 February 2008.

¹³¹ A. M. Hyamson, *British projects for the restoration of the Jews* (The British Palestine Committee, Publication No. 1. Leeds : Petty & Sons, 1917).

¹³² Alexander Crawford (Lord Lindsay), "Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land," *The Quarterly Review* 125 (December 1838):166–92.

Russia) who now “preach the faith they once destroyed.”¹³³ The Society had an eye on all of world Jewry, supposed to be around 6 million in 1871.¹³⁴ British Zionism began also to combine religion and politics in the person of Lewis Way (lawyer and theologian), who travelled through France, Holland, and Germany, and visited Russia, where he studied the life of the Jews. His scheme of establishing, in south Russia, settlements for baptised Jews and his memorandum of September 1818 on the Jews (*Mémoire sur l’Etat des Israélites*) were said to be of interest to Czar Alexander of Russia.¹³⁵ At the Great Powers Congress of Aix-La-Chapelle (1818), Way defended “Jewish Nationalism” which the Sanhedrin of 1807 in Paris has solemnly repudiated.¹³⁶ The British call for a Europe-wide Jewish “agitation” in the 1840s and the British policy of political “elevation” of the Jews triggered the new discursive phenomenon of Semitism and anti-Semitism, especially during the premiership of Jewish-born Benjamin Disraeli in the late 1860s and the 1870s.

Disraeli’s premiership of Britain triggered anti-Semitism in Europe

World War Two British Prime Minister Winston Churchill thinks highly of Benjamin Disraeli as “the Jewish Prime Minister of England, and Leader of the Conservative Party, who was always true to his race and proud of his origin.” Churchill also praises “the truth” of Disraeli’s assertion: “The Lord deals with the nations as the nations deal with the Jews.” Churchill cites the “miserable state of Russia” and “the fortunes” of England as a evidence of the truthfulness of Disraeli’s assertion.¹³⁷ Churchill goes even to say that “it would almost seem” as if the Jews “had been chosen for the supreme manifestations, both of the divine and the diabolical.”¹³⁸ Churchill divided the Jews of his time into “three main lines of political conception.” First, the “National” Jews who “regard themselves as citizens in the fullest sense of the State which has received them. For example, a Jew in England would say “I am an Englishman practicing the Jewish faith.” Churchill added that the “National Russian Jews” “have been among the staunchest upholders of friendship with France and Great Britain.” The other two types of Jews are the “International Jews” and the “Terrorist Jews.” The former “have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire” and the latter’s “madness has been allowed to prey upon the temporary prostration of the German people.” Therefore, Churchill noted it becomes especially important “to foster and develop any strongly-marked Jewish movement which leads directly away from the International Jews and the Terrorist Jews. And this is here that Zionism has such a deep significance for the whole world at the present time.” “It has fallen to the British Government, as the result of the

¹³³ Alexander Crawford (Lord Lindsay), “Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land,” *The Quarterly Review* 125 (December 1838):183-184.

¹³⁴ W. H. Hechler, *The Jerusalem bishopric documents*, Arranged and supplemented by the Rev. Professor William H. Hechler, British Chaplain at Stockholm (London: Trubner and Co., 1883).

¹³⁵ F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews* (Jerusalem: Massada Press, 1975).

¹³⁶ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents* (London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919), page 16.

¹³⁷ Winston Churchill, “Zionism Versus Bolshevism. A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People,” *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, February 8, 1920, In Lenni Brenner, ed., *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, New Jersey: Fort Lee, 2002, pages 23-28, page 23.

¹³⁸ Winston Churchill, “Zionism Versus Bolshevism. A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People,” *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, February 8, 1920, In Lenni Brenner, ed., *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, New Jersey: Fort Lee, 2002, pages 23-28, page 24.

conquest of Palestine, to have the opportunity and the responsibility of securing for the Jewish race all over the world a home and a center of national life.”¹³⁹ Churchill recommended that it is the “duty” of the “National Jews” in every country to come forward on every occasion and “take a prominent part in every measure for combating the Bolshevik conspiracy” and “make it clear to all the world that the Bolshevik movement is not a Jewish movement.”¹⁴⁰ Winston Churchill was not the first British to preach Jewish disloyalty as a virtue and a necessity for Zionism.

The question of loyalty was on the spotlight of domestic and international politics in Europe when British Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli attempted to force the Jewish Question into the Eastern Question. Lucien Wolf argues that Disraeli “was sufficient to induce a host of writers and speakers to vent all their party spleen on the Jewish race.”¹⁴¹ Disraeli’s rise to power was part of a broader British policy of political “elevation” of the Jews in England for the purpose of colonizing Palestine.¹⁴² Such elevation was exemplified by David Salomons becoming the first Jewish Lord Mayor of London in 1855, Lionel de Rothschild becoming the first Jewish member of the House of Commons in 1858 (after being permitted to omit the phrase “on the true faith of a Christian” from the then required Oath of Abjuration), George Jessell becoming the first Jewish judge appointed to High Court Bench in 1873, and Nathaniel de Rothschild becoming the first Jewish member of the House of Lords in 1884.¹⁴³ The culmination of Jewish elevation in England came with baptized Jew Benjamin Disraeli who served twice (in 1868 and again from 1874 to 1880) as prime minister of the United Kingdom. Disraeli, who was also ennobled in 1876 as Earl of Beaconsfield, climbed to premiership through the Conservative Party and through friendship with Queen Victoria for whom he invented the title “Empress of India” in 1877 via the Royal Titles Act. He showed great interest in the Jewish Question, especially through the purchase of nearly half of the shares of the Suez Canal Company as well as through the vision of the Jewish Question in relation to the Eastern Question. When Russia declared war on Turkey in 1877 following the Bulgarian-led political unrest in the Balkans, the conflict was widely viewed as a religious war between Christians and Muslims. When Benjamin Disraeli’s Conservative Party supported “Muslim” Turkey against “Christian” Russia, the Liberal Party attacked this stance and depicted Disraeli as siding with Muslims because of his “Semitic” origins.¹⁴⁴ Many have also criticized Disraeli’s irritating methods of “dandyish insolence,” “putting ambition above conviction,” and “making use of convictions he did not share.” For

¹³⁹ Winston Churchill, “Zionism Versus Bolshevism. A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People,” *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, February 8, 1920, In Lenni Brenner, ed., *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, New Jersey: Fort Lee, 2002, pages 23-28.

¹⁴⁰ Winston Churchill, “Zionism Versus Bolshevism. A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People,” *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, February 8, 1920, In Lenni Brenner, ed., *51 Documents: Zionist Collaboration with the Nazis*, New Jersey: Fort Lee, 2002, pages 27-28.

¹⁴¹ Lucien Wolf, “A Jewish View of the Anti-Jewish Agitation,” *Nineteenth Century*, February 1881, pages 338-357, page 341.

¹⁴² George Gawler, *Organised Special Constables: A Very Efficient Bulwark in this Period of Serious Danger against Internal Anarchy and Foreign Invasion, with Further Remarks upon the Present Duties of Great Britain*, London: T. & W. Boone, 1848. George Gawler, *Tranquilization 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*, London: T. & W. Boone, 1845.

¹⁴³ Amy Levy (1861-1889), *Reuben Sachs: A Sketch*, edited by Susan David Bernstein, Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Editions, 2006.

¹⁴⁴ Amy Levy (1861-1889), *Reuben Sachs: A Sketch*, edited by Susan David Bernstein, Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Editions, 2006.

example, he boasted that “one half the world worships a Jew and the other half a Jewess” and “if the Jews had not prevailed upon the Romans to crucify our Lord, what would have become of the Atonement?”¹⁴⁵ Moreover, when Robert Knox’s *The Races of Men* (1850) placed the Jews with the “dark” races, which include Irish, Celts, and Africans, Benjamin Disraeli imagined Jews as the “quintessential Caucasian race.”¹⁴⁶ U. R. Q. Henriques noted that Disraeli argues that “the Jews were not a separate nation but a superior race, permeating and spiritualizing the nations of more plebeian descent among whom they live.”¹⁴⁷

Disraeli’s vision of the Jewish Question in relation to the Eastern Question came out clearly at the Berlin Congress when the great powers (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Britain, Russia, France, Turkey, and Italy) met in Berlin between 13 June and 13 July 1878 to reconsider the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano, which Russia had forced on the Ottomans earlier in 1878 following the Russo-Turkish war. The Congress made some former provinces of Turkey independent and required them to grant full civic and political rights to Jews as a condition for the recognition of their independence.¹⁴⁸ Balkans countries whose governments and territories were affected by the Berlin Conference included Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Macedonia, Montenegro, Rumania, and Serbia. Franz Kobler cited a significant diary entry (prior to the Berlin Congress) found in the diary of Leon von Bilinski, later Austrian Minister of Finance. The diary entry indicates that British Prime Minister Disraeli had sent to the British Ambassador in Vienna, Sir Andrew Buchan, an English draft of Disraeli’s essay *The Jewish Question in the Oriental Question* for translation and anonymous publication. Kobler pointed out that Baron Johann Chlumecky, a well-known Austrian political writer, translated the essay which was published in Vienna in 1877 as a pamphlet under the German title *Die jüdische Frage in der orientalischen Frage*,¹⁴⁹ under the protection and participation of Perez Smolenskin, the famous Hebrew author and champion of Jewish renaissance. He specifically added that Chlumecky presented Bilinski with a copy of the pamphlet and informed him that Disraeli originally intended to raise the question of Palestine on the agenda of the Berlin Congress but had abandoned these efforts due to the opposition of German Chancellor Otto von Bismarck and the Austrian Foreign Minister, Count Andrassy, and instructed the Embassy to stop the distribution of the pamphlet and to destroy all available copies. Kobler considers the story of this pamphlet to be the most dramatic chapter in the history of Zionism prior to Theodor Herzl. He stressed that “through Disraeli’s sixteen-page essay the British Restoration movement proclaimed its ideal throughout the length and breadth of the Continent of Europe, the creation of a Jewish State under the protection of Great Britain.” He cited the author of the pamphlet raising the question: “Is it not probable that within, say, half a century, there would be developed in that land a compact Jewish people, one

¹⁴⁵ Geoffrey Wheatcroft, *The Controversy of Zion: Jewish Nationalism, the Jewish State, and the Unresolved Jewish Dilemma*, New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1996, pages 25 and 32. Joseph Jacobs and [Victor Rousseau Emanuel](#), “Disraeli, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield,” [JewishEncyclopedia.com](#), 2 September 2007.

¹⁴⁶ Amy Levy (1861-1889), *Reuben Sachs: A Sketch*, edited by Susan David Bernstein, Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Editions, 2006.

¹⁴⁷ U.R. Q. Henriques, “The Jewish Emancipation Controversy in Nineteenth-Century Britain,” *Past and Present* 40 (July 1968):126-146, page 140.See also Benjamin Disraeli, Lord George Bentinck (London, 1852), page 504.

¹⁴⁸ [Gotthard Deutsch](#) and [Oscar S. Straus](#), “Berlin Congress,” [JewishEncyclopedia.com](#), 2 September 2007.

¹⁴⁹ Franz Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, Published for the World Jewish Congress, British Section, London: Lincolns-Prager (Publisher) Ltd., 1956. However, the Department of Zionist Education of the Jewish Agency for Israel claims that Yehuda Leib Gordon (1831-1892) published the pamphlet “*Die jüdische Frage in der orientalischen Frage*” (“The Jewish Question in the Eastern Problem”) in Vienna in 1877.

million strong, speaking one language.”¹⁵⁰ All of this took place on the eve of the German Elections of 30 July 1878, which brought the Jewish Question, Semitism, and anti-Semitism to the spotlight. Shlomo Avineri believes that the Jewish Question “was an expression of the deep crisis of European society, and this society was unable to solve it: hence a solution had to be found outside of Europe through the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth.”¹⁵¹

The Jews were being caught in the middle of European inter-state relations and rivalries when the Entente Powers of Great Britain, France and Russia agreed secretly that “With the view of securing the religious interests of the Entente Powers, Palestine, with the Holy Places, [should be?] separated from Turkish territory and subjected to a special régime to be determined by agreement between Russia, France and England.”¹⁵² It was eventually the question of loyalty amidst European rivalries and increased religious tolerance coupled with the economic crisis of the 1870s and the German Elections of 30 July 1878 that actually transformed the medieval Christian hatred of the Jews into the modern “racial” hatred known as “anti-Semitism,” or what Lucien Wolf described in February 1881 as “the wave of anti-Jewish agitation” that swept across Europe and reached its “fiercest and most significant torrents” in Germany.¹⁵³ Wolf argues that the late nineteenth century wave of “anti-Jewish agitation” deserves attention because it is not confined to one country.¹⁵⁴ The hatred of the Jew by the Christian combined with Jewish economic prosperity led Germans in 1820 to give vent to “all their grievances in one mighty outburst” against the Jews. As noted earlier Prime Minister Disraeli “was sufficient to induce a host of writers and speakers to vent all their party spleen on the Jewish race.”¹⁵⁵ It should be pointed out that this anti-Jewish agitation came nearly four decades after British Colonel Henry Churchill recommended the launching of a simultaneous and “patriotic” agitation Europe-wide to instill Zionist separatism in the hearts and minds of European Jewry. Jewish loyalty could not have escaped Ernest Daudet when he described the Franco-Russian Alliance from 1873 to 1893 as a “dyke” in front of “our [German] enemies.”¹⁵⁶ Even political essays published in the Jewish-friendly British journal *Nineteenth Century* echoed the question of Jewish loyalty as can be seen in British historian Goldwin Smith’s article “Can Jews Be Patriots?” (May 1878).¹⁵⁷

The diplomatic history of the Jewish Question shows also repeated and systematic interventions by the United States government on behalf of the Jews in European and other countries. Cyrus Adler (1863-1940), President of the American Jewish Historical Society, reviewed and presented

¹⁵⁰ Franz Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, Published for the World Jewish Congress, British Section, London: Lincolns-Prager (Publisher) Ltd., 1956, pages 94-95.

¹⁵¹ Shlomo Avineri, “Theodor Herzl’s Diaries as a Bildungsroman,” *Jewish Social Studies*, Volume 5, Number 3, accessed 16 January 2007, <http://www.iupress.indiana.edu/journals/jss/jss5-3.html#f80>

¹⁵² Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, page 124.

¹⁵³ Lucien Wolf, “A Jewish View of the Anti-Jewish Agitation,” *Nineteenth Century*, February 1881, pages 338-357.

¹⁵⁴ Lucien Wolf, “A Jewish View of the Anti-Jewish Agitation,” *Nineteenth Century*, February 1881, pages 338-357.

¹⁵⁵ Lucien Wolf, “A Jewish View of the Anti-Jewish Agitation,” *Nineteenth Century*, February 1881, pages 338-357, page 341.

¹⁵⁶ Ernest Daudet, *Histoire Diplomatique de l’Alliance Franco-Russe 1873-1893*, Paris : Paul Ollendorff, 1894, page 331.

¹⁵⁷ Amy Levy (1861-1889), *Reuben Sachs: A Sketch*, edited by Susan David Bernstein, Peterborough, Canada: Broadview Editions, 2006.

“over 2000 quarto type-written pages” of diplomatic dispatches passed between the United States and other countries (Turkey, Switzerland, Morocco, Roumania, Russia, and Persia) relating to the Jews.¹⁵⁸ Adler identified the first action taken by the United States Government on behalf of foreign Jews in a dispatch dated 14 August 1840. The dispatch was addressed to the Ottoman Government in relation to a charge of ritual murder brought against the Jews of Damascus in 1840 at the instance of the French consul at Damascus with the advice of the monks of the Franciscan order. In the dispatch, the president of the United States takes note of the effort of several of the Christian Governments of Europe on this subject and directs his Secretary of State John Forsyth to instruct U.S. consul in Alexandria, John Gliddon, to “employ, should the occasion arise, all those good offices and efforts which are compatible with discretion and your official character, to the end that justice and humanity may be extended to these persecuted people, whose cry of distress has reached our shore.” Diplomatic correspondence between the United States and Russia relating to Jews grew out of the question of passports of American Jews in Russia as early as 1875. The problem stems from the fact that early American-Russian treaties gave American Jews in Russia no rights in addition to those held by Russian subjects of like faith. This means that an American Jew in Russia will be treated very much like a Jew in Russia.¹⁵⁹

The question of loyalty continued to intensify and expand as a direct result of the progress of Zionism as a new Jewish ethnic identity, especially in Germany and Russia during the First World War. In a speech entitled "The Jewish Problem: How To Solve It," Jewish American and Zionist leader Louis D. Brandeis told the Conference of Eastern Council of Reform Rabbis, April 25, 1915: “The [First World] war is developing opportunities which make possible the solution of the Jewish Problem.”¹⁶⁰ James Renton noted that the British government officials and politicians behind the Balfour Declaration viewed Jewish identity through the prism of nineteenth-century racial thought and the belief that Jewish “allegiance” could be wrested from German and Russian influence through an appeal to Zionism.¹⁶¹ Obviously this will require Jewish disloyalty to these countries and will fuel anti-Semitism. For example, Sir Mark Sykes, who negotiated the 1916 Sykes-Picot secret agreement, wrote to Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Arthur Nicolson that he believes the Zionists can help Britain win the war if “they do their best which means they will (a) calm their activities in Russia (b) Pessimism in Germany (c) Stimulate in France England & Italy (D) Enthuse in USA.”¹⁶² Sykes commented later that the Balfour declaration of November 2, 1917 and the entrance of Allenby into Jerusalem on December 11, 1917 gave Britain “a hold over the vital, vocal and sentimental

¹⁵⁸ Cyrus Adler (1863-1940), *Jews in the diplomatic correspondence of the United States*, Being the Address Delivered by Cyrus Adler, Ph.D., President of the American Jewish Historical Society, at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, February 27th, 1905, Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, Number 15, Baltimore, MD, 1906.

¹⁵⁹ Cyrus Adler 1863-1940., *Jews in the diplomatic correspondence of the United States*, Being the Address Delivered by Cyrus Adler, Ph.D., President of the American Jewish Historical Society, at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting Held in Cincinnati, Ohio, February 27th, 1905, Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society, Number 15, Baltimore, MD, 1906, pages 4 and 5.

¹⁶⁰ University of Louisville, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law, "The Jewish Problem: How To Solve It, by Louis D. Brandeis", accessed March 23, 2012, <http://www.law.louisville.edu/library/collections/brandeis/node/234>

¹⁶¹ James Renton, *The Zionists Masquerade: The Birth of the Anglo-Zionist Alliance, 1914-1918*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pages 4-5.

¹⁶² Quoted in James Renton, *The Zionists Masquerade: The Birth of the Anglo-Zionist Alliance, 1914-1918*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, page 54.

forces of Jewry.”¹⁶³ Alan Hart explained that during the course of World War I, the British concluded that without countering the “German submarine peril,” British surrender could not be postponed beyond November 1917.

The British were also alarmed about the prospect of losing Russia as an ally in the war. To deal with these serious challenges, the British used Zionist Jews in Germany and Russia as a sort of fifth-column allies¹⁶⁴ and created the Jewish Zion Mule Corps within the British army. In July 1937, Winston Churchill acknowledged the use of Jews as a fifth column when he said that “It is a delusion to suppose this [the Balfour Declaration] was a mere act of crusading enthusiasm or quixotic philanthropy. On the contrary, it was a measure taken... in due need of the war with the object of promoting the general victory of the Allies, for which we expected and received valued and important assistance.”¹⁶⁵ Arthur Belfour himself was quoted saying on October 31, 1917 (two days before announcing the Balfour Declaration): “If we could make a declaration favourable to such an ideal [of Zionism], we should be able to carry on extremely useful propaganda both in Russia and America.”¹⁶⁶ Citing *The American Zionist* of October 1953, Alan Hart wrote that the President of the Zionist Organization of America, Rabbi Emanuel Neumann, explained why Britain issued the Balfour Declaration in this way: “Britain, hard pressed in the struggle with Germany, was anxious to gain the whole-hearted support of the Jewish people; in Russia on the one hand and in America on the other.”¹⁶⁷ While Alan Hart and other sources seem silent about the nature of the “valued and important assistance” the Zionist Jews were expected to provide in Russia and America, it is obvious that it involves national Jewish loyalty in those two countries (the first was willing to withdraw from the war while the second was unwilling to join it).

According to John Cornelius (the nom de plume of an American with long-standing interest in the Middle East), between the Balfour-Weizmann agreement of October 1916 (which was and remains entirely secret) and the Sykes-Zionist meeting of 7 February 1917, important decisions were made to goad the Germans into resuming unrestricted submarine warfare and proposing a German-Mexican alliance against the United States (the famous Zimmermann Telegram). This led the United States to declare war on Germany on 6 April 1917. The important decisions include, but are not necessarily limited to the following (since the Balfour-Weizmann agreement of October 1916 remains secret):

(1) In Britain, Alfred Ewing, the civilian head of code breaking “Room 40” (the name given the British code breaking organization) in London, was replaced by Captain Reginald Hall, the director of Naval Intelligence.

(2) Gottlieb von Jagow, who had been foreign minister since 1913, was replaced by Arthur Zimmermann as German foreign secretary.

¹⁶³ Quoted in James Renton, *The Zionists Masquerade: The Birth of the Anglo-Zionist Alliance, 1914-1918*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, page 90.

¹⁶⁴ Alan Hart, *Zionism: the Real Enemy of the Jews*, Volume 1, Kent, England: World Focus Publishing, 2005.

¹⁶⁵ Alan Hart, *Zionism: the Real Enemy of the Jews*, Volume 1, Kent, England: World Focus Publishing, 2005.

¹⁶⁶ James Renton, *The Zionists Masquerade: The Birth of the Anglo-Zionist Alliance, 1914-1918*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, page 69.

¹⁶⁷ Alan Hart, *Zionism: the Real Enemy of the Jews*, Volume 1, Kent, England: World Focus Publishing, 2005, page 52.

Book Draft in Progress

(3) Herbert Asquith, who had been prime minister since 1908, was removed from power, and a new War Cabinet was formed, in which Lloyd George was prime minister and Balfour foreign minister—both friends of Zionism since 1903.

(4) The key to German code 7500 (in which the Zimmermann Telegram was to be sent) was provided to Room 40 by an informant.

(5) A draft of the Zimmermann Telegram (ZT) was concocted in London and presented to Arthur Zimmermann in Berlin by one of his subordinates, Herr von Kemnitz, an East Asia expert in the German foreign office and presumably a Zionist agent. Zimmermann sent the ZT on his own authority. Neither the German Kaiser nor Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg knew anything of it until it was made public in America.

(6) On 16 January 1917, two telegrams were sent sequentially, by cable, from Foreign Minister Zimmermann, in Berlin, to the German ambassador in Washington, Count Bernstorff. The first, which both Zimmermann and Bernstorff considered to be by far the more important, informed Bernstorff of the decision to resume unrestricted submarine warfare on 1 February 1917, and gave him instructions on when and how to inform the American government. The second, which came to be known as the Zimmermann telegram, was relayed to the German Embassy in Mexico City on 19 January 1917. The Zimmermann Telegram was transmitted by cable from Berlin to Washington and was copied by Room 40 and promptly decoded.¹⁶⁸ No doubt the treason role the British assigned to some German and Russian Jews in World War One was sufficient to generate an anti-Jewish movement in post-war Germany and to pave the way for Hitler in the 1930s.

In its assessment of the first 120 years (1882-2002) of Zionism, the Jewish Agency for Israel acknowledged the question of Jewish loyalty during the First World War when it stated that indeed “World War I placed the Jewish people in a tremendous dilemma.”¹⁶⁹ There is little doubt that Britain’s Jewish policy in the First World War intensified anti-Semitism in both Germany and Russia along the lines of what happened under Disraeli’s premiership during and after the Congress of Berlin (13 June-13 July 1878) and the subsequent German elections (30 July 1878). Lucien Wolf depicted Zionism as a peril because “it is the natural and abiding ally of anti-Semitism and its most powerful justification.”¹⁷⁰ We also know that the text of what became known as the Balfour Declaration was discussed in four successive formulae by British officials and Jewish representatives between October 1916 and November 1917.¹⁷¹ These formulae indicate serious concerns raised about the Declaration’s political implications for Jewish loyalty in other countries outside Palestine, especially when using the definite versus indefinite article in the key phrase of the Declaration: “the establishment in Palestine of *the/a* national home for the Jewish people.” Winston Churchill wrote his famous essay “Zionism versus Bolshevism: A Struggle for the Soul of the Jewish People” in this context. Opening his essay with the statement

¹⁶⁸ John Cornelius, “The Hidden History of the Balfour Declaration,” *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* 24(8):44-50, November 2005, also available at http://www.wrmea.com/archives/November_2005/0511044.html

¹⁶⁹ Jewish Agency for Israel, *Zionism: The First 120 Years 1882-2002*, 18 September 2007, <http://www.jewishagency.org/JewishAgency/English/Jewish+Education/Compelling+Content/Eye+on+Israel/120/>

¹⁷⁰ Lucien Wolf, “The Zionist Peril,” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 17(1):1-25, October 1904.

¹⁷¹ Herbert Sidebotham, *Great Britain and Palestine*, London: Macmillan, 1937.

Book Draft in Progress

“some people like Jews and some do not,” Churchill identified “the National Russian” Jew (ie, the Zionist) as an ally and the “International” Jew (ie, the communist) as a foe. Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann noted how the struggle between the two (British Zionism and Russian Communism) divided his own family [source?]. It was hardly a coincidence that the Russian Communist Revolution of 17 October 1917 and the British Belfour Declaration of 2 November 1917 came that close. It should not be surprising that the Anglo-Russian struggle had put earlier on Russia and Germany at loggerheads and made the Germans and the Jews its first victims. In his prefatory remarks to the book *Eugen Dühring on the Jews*, Alexander Jacob noted that Nazi leading thinker Alfred Rosenberg (1893-1946) insisted that it should be established by German legislation that “Zionism must be powerfully supported, in order to promote yearly a certain number of German Jews to Palestine or, in general, over the borders.”¹⁷² Similarly French philosopher and Jewish sympathizer Jean-Paul Sartre had warned that Zionism “is harmful to the Jews who want to live in their countries of origin, because it gives arguments to the anti-Semite.”¹⁷³ The following chapter takes this point further and argues that the Jews did not invent Zionism. Rather the British invented Zionism, which invented both the Jewish Question and contemporary Jews themselves.

¹⁷² Eugen Karl Dühring, *Eugen Dühring on the Jews: A Translation of Dühring's The Jewish Question, A Racial, moral and cultural question with a world-historical answer (2nd edition, 1881)*, edited with an introduction by Alexander Jacob, Brighton, England: Nineteen Eighty Four Press, 1997, page 45.

¹⁷³ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Réflexions sur la Question Juive*, Paris : Paul Morihien, 1946, page 184.

Chapter 2: The non-Jewish origin of Zionism

Introduction

The State of Israel has always claimed that the Jews invented Zionism. This chapter takes issue with this claim through an examination of the religious conception and geopolitical gestation of Zionism in Europe. First, it traces the non-Jewish origin of Zionism to (1) the Reformation and Counter-Reformation conflict in Europe, (2) the rise of the Puritans in England and the English-Dutch commercial wars, and (3) the Anglo-French rivalry and Napoleon's attempt to estrange the Jews from their European and Ottoman rulers. Second, it outlines how British imperialist imperatives and religious motives ultimately forged Zionism as "the solution" to the two intertwined "problems" the British carefully help create and label the Eastern Question and the Jewish Question.

The Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs defines and presents Zionism as "the national liberation movement" for the "re-establishment of the Jewish people" in "their homeland and the resumption of Jewish sovereignty in the Land of Israel." It claims that Zionism came as an answer to Jewish "yearning" for Zion (considered a synonym for Jerusalem) and a response to "anti-Semitism" (hostility to Jews), which is considered the core of the "Jewish Problem" (Jews living among non-Jews), whose "only solution" is "a Jewish state in the Land of Israel, with a Jewish majority."¹⁷⁴ According to this Zionist historiography, the founding fathers of Zionism include 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). However, ignoring the fundamental role of British imperialism and Anglicanism in the conception and planning of Zionism is equivalent to asserting with great self-conceit and little humility that the "Zionists" were essentially driven by Jewish messianism and European anti-Semitism.¹⁷⁵ Zionist historiography specifically portrays Theodor Herzl, a Hungarian Jewish playwright dramatist, as the man who founded the Zionist movement. Herzl's remains were moved from Austria to Israel and buried on "Mount Herzl" in Jerusalem some 45 years after his death. He is considered the symbol of Zionism. "His picture dominates Israeli government and Zionist offices. His name is commemorated in the names of towns, schools and streets. Every fair sized town in Israel has a Herzl street." The Israel government has declared that his birthday is to be marked each year one week following Israel Independence Day.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁴ Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Facts about Israel*, 2002. Retrieved October 31, 2002 from <http://www.israel.org/mfa/go.asp?MFAH00080> on the World Wide Web.

¹⁷⁵ Benny Morris, *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2008, page 1. The jacket illustration of the hard copy of Benny Morris's book *1948: A History of the First Arab-Israeli War* (2008) shows a photo of Israeli troops entering Beersheba during Operation Yoav on October 21, 1948. This contrasts with the Jacket illustration of the hard copy of Ilan Pappé's book *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* (2006) which shows a photo of a Palestinian refugee camp whose inhabitants were freshly expelled by Jewish settlers in military operations like Operation Yoav in Beersheba. Morris, who calls the ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians in 1948 a "civil war," did not list Pappé's book *The Ethnic Cleansing of Palestine* or any of Norman Finkelstein's many works on the Palestine-Israel conflict on his book bibliography.

¹⁷⁶ Zionism and Israel Information Center, *Zionism and Israel – Biographies: Biography of Theodor Herzl*, 2006, http://www.zionism-israel.com/bio/biography_herzl.htm (accessed 19 November 2006).

The paramount Zionist claim here is that the Jews alone invented Zionism. The Zionists insist that thanks to Zionism “Jews control their own fate – leaving it neither to God nor others.”¹⁷⁷ Bernard Lewis (often hailed as the *doyen* of Middle Eastern Studies) argues that “the first modern precursor” of “the new idea” of Jewish “restoration” in Palestine was a Bosnian rabbi called Yehuda Alkalay, who conceived the idea in 1843. Lewis identifies 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.¹⁷⁸ Nahum Goldmann (Founder President of the World Jewish Congress) repeats the same claims and traces the “Zionist idea” to the year 1897,¹⁷⁹ while Claude Duvernoy considers Herzl the “Prophet” of Zionism and “the corner stone upon which rests the entire Zionist structure.”¹⁸⁰ Martin Peretz (editor-in-chief of the *New Republic*) tried to dig a little bit deeper in his 1997 article, *Zionism at 100* (again counting from 1897), but did not go beyond the mid-19th century, writing, “the first *modern* Zionist was Moses Hess.” Martin even claimed that “the State of Israel was born when the Zionists sent the British packing” and “Israel was an anti-imperialist creation.”¹⁸¹ One of the most recent scholarly reiteration of these “facts” came in Mitchell Bard and Moshe Schwartz’s *1001 Facts Everyone Should Know about Israel*. From the outset, the authors have described themselves as “avowed and proud Zionists” and their book as “an accurate, honest, and comprehensive compilation of facts that tell the story of Israel, and is not meant to be “a propaganda piece for Israel.” The book, titled after *1001 Arabian Nights*, begins its entries by the first “fact” about “Zionism” as “The national movement for the return of the Jewish people to their homeland and the resumption of the Jewish sovereignty in the Land of Israel.”¹⁸² Even though the “1001 facts” that tell the story of Israel in this book did include entries about UN General Assembly resolution 181 of 1947 (UN Partition Plan) and resolution 3379 of 1975 (UN resolution defining Zionism as a “form of racism and racial discrimination”) as well as UN Security Council resolution 242 of 1967 and resolution 338 of 1973 calling for the “withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the occupied territories,” the book did not include under its United Nations entries any entry about UN Resolution 194 of 11 December 1948 calling for the return of Palestinian refugees expelled by Jewish settlers in the war of 1948.¹⁸³

The following analysis is an attempt, based on published primary and secondary sources, to rethink the genesis of Zionism in light of the historical geopolitics of the movement. The overall focus will be on when and where Zionism was born and who really fathered it, European Jews or non-Jewish Europeans. It is argued that from the time of the Reformation on, many schemes of colonial “Restoration” or Zionist colonization were conceived and developed by non-Jewish Europeans (religious as well as atheist), well before Yehuda Alkalay (1798–1878), Moses Hess

¹⁷⁷ Alan Levenson, “Gentile reception of Herzlian zionism, a reconsideration,” *Jewish History* 16: 187–211, 2002, page 187.

¹⁷⁸ Bernard Lewis, *Semites and anti-Semites: An inquiry into conflict and prejudice*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1986, pages 68-69.

¹⁷⁹ Nahum Goldmann, “Zionist ideology and the reality of Israel,” *Foreign Affairs* 57(1):70–82, 1978, page 72.

¹⁸⁰ Claude Duvernoy, *Le Prince et le prophète*, Jerusalem: Le Département des publications de l’agence juive, 1966, page 122.

¹⁸¹ Martin Peretz, “Zionism at 100: The God that did not fail,” *New Republic* 217(10–11):1–24, 1997, pages 2, 8.

¹⁸² Mitchell Bard and Moshe Schwartz, *1001 Facts Everyone Should Know about Israel*, Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005, pages x and 1.

¹⁸³ Mitchell Bard and Moshe Schwartz, *1001 Facts Everyone Should Know about Israel*, Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2005, pages 168-172.

(1812–1875), and Theodor Herzl (1860–1904), whose emergence actually marked only the beginning of the Zionization of the Jews themselves and their direct involvement with the originally and essentially non-Jewish idea of Zionism. But as the non-Jewish origin of Zionism continues to emerge into the full light of history, the Jewish Zionists reacted by developing a variety of cover-up concepts such as “Christian” Zionism, “forerunners” of Zionism, and “fore-history” of Zionism, while dismissing those forerunners as no more than “project-makers” who are “solitary figures isolated from the mainstream of socio-historical development” and whose “projects” “were soon reduced to ridicule and oblivion.”¹⁸⁴

The Reformation and counter-Reformation conflict Saw the seeds of the Jewish Question

The conflict between Reformation and Counter-Reformation was the main ideological event in the geopolitics of Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries. During the Reformation era and prior to the political doctrine separating the state and the church, European Jews were often caught in the middle between Catholics and Protestants in Western Europe and between Catholics and Orthodox Christians in Eastern Europe.¹⁸⁵ Before the Reformation called for the Bible to replace the Pope as the final spiritual authority, the idea of a “Jewish return” to Palestine and the concept of a “Jewish nation” had no place in traditional Catholic thought.¹⁸⁶ In fact when the Crusaders entered Jerusalem in 1099 and massacred the estimated sixty to seventy thousands inhabitants of the city, they banned Jews altogether from Crusaders-occupied Jerusalem.¹⁸⁷ The Reformation invented those ideas of “Jewish nation” and “Jewish return” and subsequently developed an End Time theology (that included Jewish conversion to Christianity as a prelude to Christ’s Second Coming), which has since bred many apocalyptic millennialism movements and doomsday cults. Gary North argues that what persuaded Christian fundamentalists to move from either hostility or neutrality to vocal support of Israel is the doctrine of the imminent Rapture [the events surrounding the second coming of Jesus Christ to earth] which allows some Christians to believe seriously that they can go to heaven without dying. But “in order for most of today’s Christians to escape physical death, two-thirds of the Jews in Israel must perish, soon. This is the grim prophetic trade-off that fundamentalists rarely discuss publicly, but which is the central motivation in the movement’s support for Israel.”¹⁸⁸ Above all the Reformation stressed the Palestinian origins of Christianity in order to reduce the pretensions and claims of Roman Catholicism. The Protestants put more emphasis on the Old Testament, the Biblical Israelites, and Jerusalem, as opposed to the New Testament, the Pope, and Rome.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁴ Jacob Katz, “The Forerunners of Zionism,” in Jehuda Reinharz and Anita Shapira, eds. *Essential Papers on Zionism* (New York: New York University Press, 1996).

¹⁸⁵ J. D. Klier, *Russia gathers her Jews: The origins of the “Jewish Question” in Russia, 1772–1825*, Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986, page 9. Bernard Lewis, *Semites and anti-Semites: An inquiry into conflict and prejudice*, New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1986, page 59.

¹⁸⁶ R. Sharif, *Non-Jewish Zionism: Its roots in Western history*, London: Zed Press, 1983, page 10.

¹⁸⁷ M. Hiyari, “Crusader Jerusalem 1099-1187 AD,” In *Jerusalem in History*, edited by K. J. Asali, pp. 130-176, New York: Olive Branch Press, 2000, pages 138-140. Pethahiah, of Regensburg, fl. 1175-1190 ; Benisch, A., 1811-1878; (Abraham),; tr.; Ainsworth, William, 1807-1896, *Travels of Rabbi Petachia*, London: Messrs, Trubner & co., 1856, page 61.

¹⁸⁸ Gary North “The Unannounced Reason Behind American Fundamentalism's Support for the State of Israel,” 19 July 2000, accessed 25 August 2007, <http://www.lewrockwell.com/orig/north7.html>

¹⁸⁹ L. J. Epstein, *Zion’s call: Christian Contributions to the origins and development of Israel*, New York: University Press of America, 1984. B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984.

Political and theological interest in the Jews came first from Reformation founder Martin Luther (1483–1546), a German monk and professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg. He was excommunicated by Pope Leo X in 1520 and outlawed by the Emperor Charles V in 1521 after he nailed a 95-thesis critique of the established church (especially when it came to the sale of indulgencies) to the door of the Wittenberg Cathedral on 21 October 1517. The power of Luther’s discourse following his break with Rome impressed some of his contemporaries—one of them wrote that Luther “drives home his points, like nails, into the minds of his hearers.”¹⁹⁰ After his famous sermon at Wittenberg on Invocavit Sunday (March 1522), Luther himself preached more than 3,000 sermons, which generated a huge proliferation of tracts, letters, pamphlets, and disputations, which together “constituted what came to be known as the Protestant Reformation.”¹⁹¹ Luther envisioned the Jews as possible allies against Catholicism and potential converts to the new religion of Protestantism. In a shrewd political move designed to pull out the rug from under the Catholics and recruit the Jews to his Reformation, Luther published in 1523 his famous pamphlet, *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew*.¹⁹² Thereby he made a grandiose and unsubstantiated claim when he designated contemporary Jews as the true blood heirs of the Biblical Israelites and the blood relatives of Jesus, even though many scholarly works by Jews and non-Jews have established the non-Semitic, non-Israelite, and non-Palestinian origin of the bulk of contemporary Jews.¹⁹³ Luther glorified the Jews in his pamphlet as if to instill a permanent religious inferiority complex and a psychic feeling of guilt among his Christian fellows, who until then had satanized the Jews and considered them to have rejected, persecuted, and killed Jesus. Luther wrote:

I will cite from Scripture the reasons that move me to believe that Christ was a Jew born of a virgin, that I might perhaps also win some Jews to the Christian faith. ... I hope that if one deals in a kindly way with the Jews and instructs them carefully from Holy Scripture, many of them will become genuine Christians and turn again to the faith of their fathers, the prophets and patriarchs. ... When we are inclined to boast of our position we should remember that we are but Gentiles, while the Jews are of the lineage of Christ. We are aliens and in-laws; they are blood relatives, cousins, and brothers of our Lord. Therefore, if one is to boast of flesh and blood, the Jews are actually nearer to Christ than we are, as St. Paul says in Romans 9. God has also demonstrated this by his acts, for to no nation among the Gentiles has he granted so high an honor as he has to the Jews. For from among the Gentiles there have been raised up no patriarchs, no apostles, no prophets, indeed, very few genuine Christians either. ... Accordingly,

¹⁹⁰ Robert Wuthnow, *Communities of Discourse: Ideology and Social Structure in the Reformation, the enlightenment, and the European Socialism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989), page 2.

¹⁹¹ Robert Wuthnow, *Communities of Discourse: Ideology and Social Structure in the Reformation, the enlightenment, and the European Socialism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989), page 3.

¹⁹² Martin Luther, *The Christian in Society II*, ed. Walther Sherman, Volume 45 of *Luther’s Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1971.

¹⁹³ Paul Wexler, *The Ashkenazic Jews: A Slavo-Turkic People in Search of a Jewish Identity*, Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, 1993. Paul Wexler, *The Non-Jewish Origins of the Sephardic Jews*, New York: University of New York Press, 1996. M. Bradley, *Chosen people from the Caucasus: Jewish origins, delusions, deceptions and historical role in the slave trade, genocide and cultural colonization*, Chicago: Third World Press, 1992. A. Shakir, *Dawlat al-Khazar al-jadidah aw Isra’il* (“The New Khazar State or Israel”) al-Tab’ah 1, Bayrut: Dar Misbah al-Fikr, 1981.

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.¹⁹⁴

In another Jewish-friendly act of defiance towards the Pope and the established Catholic Church, Luther removed from the Old Testament the books (the so-called Protestant Apocrypha) that were not accepted by the Jewish canon as part of the Hebrew Bible or Scriptures. He placed them in a separate section (known as inter-testamental books) between the Old and the New Testaments. Since then the Protestant Bible has generally excluded these fourteen books and established them as Apocrypha, or Scriptures of dubious authenticity (for example, the English-language King James Version of 1611 followed the lead of the Luther Bible and in 1826 the British Foreign Bible Society banned the distribution of bibles with apocrypha). 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).¹⁹⁵ Luther then assaulted the Jews as "disgusting vermin" and their synagogues as "devil nests of insolence and lies" (Putnam 1908, 10–11).¹⁹⁶ In the pamphlet, *On the Jews and Their Lies* (1543), Luther criticized the Jews for boasting about their blood and lineage and questioned salvation by race rather than grace:

There is one thing about which they [the Jews] boast and pride themselves beyond measure, and that is their descent from the foremost people on earth, from Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Rebekah, Jacob, and from the twelve patriarchs, and thus from the holy people of Israel. ... In comparison with them and in their eyes we Gentiles (Goyim) are not human; in fact we hardly deserve to be considered poor worms by them. For we are not of that high and noble blood, lineage, birth, and descent. This is their argument, and indeed I think it is the greatest and strongest reason for their pride and boasting. ... We must rejoin, first of all, that the question at issue is whether nobility of blood in itself is so valid before God that one could thereby be or become God's people.¹⁹⁷

Jewish-Protestant love-hate relationships and rivalry over Biblical Israel

Luther's pamphlets reflect increasing competition between Christians and Jews over the ethnic and/or spiritual inheritance of the Biblical Israelites. 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, whom the Spaniards, the English, and early colonial authors saw in Native Americans, while theological seminaries, as well as erroneous anthropological and ethnological assumptions, disseminated the myth worldwide.¹⁹⁸ At the same time (between 1550 and 1750), most Jews in Western Europe were experiencing their own Reformation: the Jewish Cabbala, with some of its assumptions claiming that Jewish and non-Jewish souls are fundamentally different, with the Jews having an additional level of soul that non-Jews do not have. While this

¹⁹⁴ Martin Luther, *The Christian in Society II*, ed. Walther Sherman, Volume 45 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1971, pages 200-201.

¹⁹⁵ A. K. E. Holmio, *The Lutheran Reformation and the Jews: The birth of the Protestant Jewish missions*, Hancock, MI: Finnish Lutheran Book Concern, 1949, pages 108, 157.

¹⁹⁶ B. H. Putnam, *The enforcement of the Statutes of Labourers during the first decade after the Black Death, 1349–1359*, New York: Columbia University, 1908, pages 10-11.

¹⁹⁷ Martin Luther, *The Christian in Society IV*, ed. Franklin Sherman, Volume 47 of *Luther's Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971, pages 140, 146.

¹⁹⁸ A. H. Godbey, *The lost tribes: A myth*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1930.

demonization of non-Jews may be viewed as a response to the demonization of Jews in Western and Christian thought, the Jewish Cabbala ultimately developed the concepts of “Jewish uniqueness” and “Jewish blood” (and even “Jewish DNA” today) as the reason why Jews *are different* from non-Jews.¹⁹⁹ The naïveté of European historians about the origin of their Jewry continued well after Martin Luther: in 1866 Henry Milman wrote that the Jews were “perhaps the only unmingled race, which can boast of high antiquity.”²⁰⁰ Werner Sombart noted that “it is almost as though at the point where the general Jewish Question intersects the race problem, a thousand devils had been let loose to confuse the minds of men.” He added that the Semite/Aryan controversy “only shows how vicious it is to allow linguistic concepts to interfere in the anthropological divisions of mankind.”²⁰¹

Amidst this relentless search for an ancestor and a national origin, the great Elizabethan historian, William Camden, discarded pagan Brutus (considered the grandson of the Trojan Aeneas and the eldest *known* British ancestor) and arbitrarily picked up Biblical Gomer (considered the grandson of Noah) as the eldest Briton. Similarly, Cambridge scholar Aylett Sammes wrote *The Antiquities of Ancient Britain Derived from the Phoenicians* in 1676.²⁰² By the 19th century the Anglo-Israel movement was well under way, with its adamant claim that the English were the true, Semitic descendants of the Lost Tribes of Israel: Queen Victoria (1837–1901) had convinced herself that she was a descendant of Biblical David. According to the Jewish Encyclopedia, there were about 2,000,000 adherents to this movement in England and the United States in the early 1900s. For example, in “A Revealed Knowledge” (1794), Richard Brothers (1757-1824) declared himself “Nephew of the Almighty” and claimed ancestry in Biblical David. The movement reached new high with the publication in 1845 of John Wilson’s *Our Israelitish Origin*. It reached a new peak with the publication in 1871 of Edward Hine’s *Identification of the British Nation with Lost Israel*, of which a quarter million copies are said to have been sold. The movement seemed to have expanded with the appearance of S. Backhaus’s *Die Germanen ein Semitischer Volksstamm* in Berlin in 1878 as well as the publication of the monthly journal *Heir of the World* in New York in 1880. Perhaps the Anglo-Israel movement reached its zenith in 1919 with the founding of The British-Israel-World Federation at a time when it was said that the sun does not set on the British Empire. Writing in the Jewish Encyclopedia in the early 1900s, Joseph Jacob sums up the fallacy of the “theory” of Anglo-Israelism:

The whole theory rests upon an identification of the word "isles" in the English version of the Bible unjustified by modern philology, which identifies the original word with "coasts" or "distant lands" without any implication of their being surrounded by the sea. Modern ethnography does not confirm in any way the identification of the Irish with a Semitic people; while the English can be traced back to the Scandinavians, of whom

¹⁹⁹ Israel Shahak and N. Mezvinsky, *Jewish fundamentalism in Israel*, London: Pluto Press, 1999, page 11, 62. N. Wade, “In DNA, new clues to Jewish roots,” *The New York Times*, 14 May 2002.

²⁰⁰ H. H. Milman, *The History of the Jews: From the Earliest Period down to Modern Times*, Volume 1, London: John Murray, 1866.

²⁰¹ Werner Sombart, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, Translated with notes, by M. Epstein, New York: Burt Franklin, 1969, pages 282-284

²⁰² B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984. See also Adrian Gilbert, *The New Jerusalem-- Rebuilding London: The Great Fire, Christopher Wren and the Royal Society*, New York: Bantam Press, 2002.

Book Draft in Progress

there is no trace in Mesopotamia at any period of history. English is a branch of the Aryan stock of languages, and has no connection with Hebrew. The whole movement is chiefly interesting as a *reductio ad absurdum* of too literal an interpretation of the prophecies.²⁰³

Manifestations of British-Israelism's obsession with a Biblical and/or Semitic ancestry were still to be found as late as 1924, when Lawrence Waddel published the book, *The Phoenician Origin of Britons, Scots, and Anglo-Saxons*.²⁰⁴ As a result of this competition for a Biblical history or ancestry, Protestant-Jewish relations have since developed into a vicious circle of love-hate relationships between Judeophiles and Judeophobes, exemplified by contemporary support of Zionism and Israel by many fundamentalist evangelists who may harbour anti-Jewish feelings. For example, Southern Baptist evangelist Rev. Billy Graham had to apologize to the Jews for chatting with President Nixon in the Oval Office in 1972 about how Jews controlled American media.²⁰⁵ On the other hand, Israel Shahak cited one incident of Jewish fundamentalists' "hatred of Christianity and Christians":

Israeli educational authorities removed the international plus sign from the textbooks of elementary arithmetic used in the first grade of Israeli schools. Allegedly, this plus sign, which is a cross, could religiously corrupt little Jewish children. Instead of the offending cross, the authorities substituted a capital "T."²⁰⁶

Relics of what might now be called the British "ethnic apostasy" are still found today among some American white supremacist/separatist groups who, like many Jews, have constructed a myth about a supposed Biblical Israelite ancestry. The deep-rooted identity crisis on both sides seems to underline much of the hate-related literature in the United States, such as is found in the Simon Wiesenthal Center's *The New Lexicon of Hate* and in David Duke's *Jewish Supremacism*.²⁰⁷ For example, members of the Christian Identity movement claim that they are descendants of the Biblical Israelites, whereas the Jews are the children of Satan.²⁰⁸ The Israeli government boasts about the alleged Israelite origin of contemporary Jews by disseminating statements that almost appropriate the "copyright" of the Bible by claiming that the Jews "gave to the world the eternal Book of Books."²⁰⁹ Jewish American Louis Brandeis claimed even that

²⁰³ *JewishEncyclopedia.com*.

²⁰⁴ B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984. F. Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, Published for the World Jewish Congress, British Section. London: Lincolns-Prager (Publisher) Ltd., 1956, page 85. C. Duvernoy, *Le Prince et le prophète*, Jerusalem: Le Département des publications de l'agence juive, 1966.

²⁰⁵ S. G. Freedman, "Evangelicals, Jews build bridges," *USA Today*, May 7, Retrieved October 18, from <http://www.usatoday.com/news/comment/2002/05/08/nguest1.htm> on the World Wide Web, 2002.

²⁰⁶ I. Shahak and N. Mevinsky, *Jewish fundamentalism in Israel*. London: Pluto Press, 1999, page 154.

²⁰⁷ Simon Wiesenthal Center, *The new lexicon of hate: The changing tactics, language and symbols of America's extremists*. A Simon Wiesenthal Center and Snider Social Action Institute report. 2nd Rev. Ed. Los Angeles: Simon Wiesenthal Center, 2001. D. Duke, *Jewish Supremacism: My Awakening on the Jewish Question*, A New e-Book, Retrieved October 25, from <http://www.davidduke.com/supremacism/preface.shtml> on the World Wide Web, 2002.

²⁰⁸ B. Beit-Hallahmi, *Original sins: Reflections on the history of Zionism and Israel*, New York: Olive Branch Press, 1993.

²⁰⁹ Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *Facts about Israel*, Retrieved October 31, 2002 from <http://www.israel.org/mfa/go.asp?MFAH00080> on the World Wide Web, 2002.

"The Jews gave to the world its three greatest religions."²¹⁰ British-Israelism exponent Edward Hine said that the Jews will return to Judaea, "but not until we ourselves restore them."²¹¹ In his booklet, *Identity of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel with the Anglo-Celto-Saxons*, Hine wrote, "it is almost unpardonable to allude to the Jews as embodying Judah and Benjamin." Then he claimed that "the Anglo-Saxons are identical with the Ten Lost Tribes," simply because the word "Saxons" is derived from the phrase "Sons of Isaac."²¹²

It was Zionism that invented the Jews, not the other way around

While the overall European Renaissance seemed focused on the "restoration" of the cultural heritage of Rome and Greece partly preserved in living Arabic, the Protestant Reformation seemed focused on the "restoration" of the Biblical heritage partly preserved in dead Hebrew and Aramaic. This was the point of departure for the study of the so-called "Semitic" languages, which later provided a breeding ground for the racial concepts of "Semite" and "Aryan" and the claptrap discourse about "civilization" and "barbarism." The Protestants wanted to secure a niche for themselves within Christianity but outside the realm of the Pope and Rome. They saw in the Jews a sort of "title" that can be used to claim and appropriate a Biblical heritage. The Judeophile mood or Zionization of the English elites actually began when King Henry VIII severed relations with the Roman Catholic Church and proclaimed himself head of the Church of England (the Anglican Church) in 1534 and severed it from the Roman Catholic Church. Later he ordered one English copy of "the whole" Bible to be placed in every church in England. As the new *lay* interpretation of the Bible penetrated English culture, with a particular emphasis on the Old Testament, the English Reformation began to look like a process of false Judaization of the British people. This is probably when the words "Semites," "Hebrews," "Israelites," and "Jews" began to be viewed as almost synonymous by an English culture deeply penetrated by the new *literal* interpretation of the Bible. By 1589 Zionism had become visible in England, when a man named Francis Kett was condemned and burnt alive for adhering to Zionism ("Restoration"), then considered heretical.²¹³ British Zionism continued to grow, despite occasional anti-Jewish incidents, such as in the case of the Jewish personal physician of Elizabeth I, who was "accused of high treason and of an attempt to poison the Queen."²¹⁴ English Zionism inspired a variety of ideas and claims such as English Henry Finch's book *The World's Great Restoration or Calling of the Jews* (1621), Jewish Greek Sabbathai Zevi's *messiahhood* (1665), and Danish Holger Paulli's *Zionist scheme* presented to King William III of England with a view to its submission to the Peace Conference of Ryswick (1697).²¹⁵

²¹⁰ University of Louisville, Louis D. Brandeis School of Law, "The Jewish Problem: How To Solve It, by Louis D. Brandeis", accessed March 23, 2012, <http://www.law.louisville.edu/library/collections/brandeis/node/234>

²¹¹ F. Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, Published for the World Jewish Congress, British Section, London: Lincolns-Prager (Publisher) Ltd., 1956, page 85.

²¹² E. Hine, *Identity of the ten lost tribes of Israel with the Anglo-Celto-Saxons*, (Abridged), CPA Books, 1999, pages 13–14, 62.

²¹³ L. J. Epstein, *Zion's call: Christian Contributions to the origins and development of Israel*, New York: University Press of America, 1984.

²¹⁴ J. Carmichael, *The Satanizing of the Jews: Origin and development of mystical anti-Semitism*, New York: Fromm International Publishing Corporation, 1992, page 91.

²¹⁵ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, page 103

With the emergence of the Puritans, considered by some Zionists as “practically Jews,”²¹⁶ Zionism reached a new peak. English Puritans were partly inspired and influenced by Calvin’s attitude toward wealth and Calvinist teachings, which claim that financial success and industriousness (so-called *work ethic*) were God’s greatest commandment.²¹⁷ Calvinists also believed in the doctrine of predestination (God pre-selected some for salvation and others for damnation). The zealous Puritans proposed the transference of the Lord’s Day to Saturday and adopted Old Testament names; some converted to Judaism, others rejected the divinity of Jesus. Most importantly, Jews were readmitted to England in 1655 (King Edward I expelled the Jews in 1290, after all debts to them were cancelled). In 1753 both houses of the British Parliament passed the “Jew Bill” for the naturalization of all Jews who had resided three years in Britain. Though the “Jew Bill” received royal assent, it was later repealed because of English mercantile jealousy and religious prejudice.²¹⁸ In another case, some of the voices hostile to the Jews suggested “disburdening the kingdom of the weight of Irish affairs by selling the island to the Jews.”²¹⁹ However, overall Protestant Judeophile tendencies, which started with Luther in Germany in 1523, continued to take roots in Anglican England, as is reflected in the Earl of Meath’s speech to some two thousand members of the English clergy and nobility in a Guildhall meeting in 1890: “was not our Lord himself a Jew? If it had not been for this race Christianity would have been unknown. We owe the Bible to the Jews, both the Old and the New Testament.”²²⁰ In today’s United States, one can often read on the bumper stickers of many trucks similar statements, such as “My boss is a Jewish carpenter.”

British Zionism was developing amidst broader geopolitical and economic changes. The most important changes include the shift of the center of Europe’s economic gravity from the Mediterranean Sea (especially the Italian shores) to the Atlantic Ocean (especially the Dutch and English shores) and the growing control of the seas by the Protestant countries following the destruction of the Spanish Armada by the English navy and bad weather in 1588. During and after the Revolt of the Netherlands against Spain, refugees (including many Jews) from religious persecution in the Counter-Reformation Catholic world flocked to Amsterdam, where the world’s first national bank (the Bank of Holland) was established in 1604.²²¹ Sombart pointed out that when “the center of European trade and finance shifted from the Dutch capital to London, more and more Amsterdam Jews were attracted to the English metropolis by the promise of higher returns in the colonial trades and inter-European commerce.”²²² English-Dutch

²¹⁶ Israel Zangwill, *The East African question: Zionism and England’s offer*, New York: The Maccabean Publishing Company, 1904, page 54.

²¹⁷ Webster’s New Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1993, New York: BD & L, page 1529. M. Weber, *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*, Trans. Talcott Parsons, New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1956, page 157.

²¹⁸ H. H. Milman, *The History of the Jews: From the Earliest Period down to Modern Times*, volume 3, London: John Murray, 1866, page 399.

²¹⁹ H. H. Milman, *The History of the Jews: From the Earliest Period down to Modern Times*, volume 3, London: John Murray, 1866, page 358.

²²⁰ Anglo-Jewish Association and Russo-Jewish Committee, *Reprint of reports of the public meeting at the Mansion House on Wednesday, February 1st 1882 and of the public meeting held at the Guildhall, London on Wednesday, Dec. 10th 1890: Concerning the treatment of the Jews in Russia*, London: Joint Foreign Committee, 1933, page 101.

²²¹ N. Barton, *The world: A television history: The West and the wider world 1500-1800*, Network Television/Goldcrest Television, 1985.

²²² Marcus Arkin, *Aspects of Jewish Economic History*, Philadelphia: the Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975, pages 150-159.

trade wars intensified in the 17th century, as mercantilism began to crystallize in the form of protected trade by chartered companies such as the English Company of Merchants of the Levant (1581–1825), the English East India Company (1600–1874), and the Dutch East India Company (1602–1798).²²³ During the English-Dutch trade war of 1652–54, the English struck at the heart of Dutch prosperity, when they decided to restrict imports to England to goods carried by English ships or ships of the country producing the goods.²²⁴ Oliver Cromwell (who won the eight-year civil war and tried and executed King Charles I) invited the Jews because he was determined 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.²²⁵ Thomas Witherby noted that the Jews were permitted to return to England upon three express conditions: (1) they should make no proselytes, (2) they should bury their dead, and (3) they should maintain their poor.²²⁶ They were welcomed as merchants since the Middle Ages had turned many Jewish communities into “functional groups” many of them often focused on moneylending. Thomas Friedman, a New York Times commentator quoted Leon Wieseltier, the Jewish scholar and literary editor of *The New Republic*: “In their relations with power, Jews in exile have always preferred vertical alliances to horizontal ones... They always preferred to have a relationship with the king or the bishop so as not to have to engage with the general population, of which they were deeply distrustful — and they often had reason to be distrustful.”²²⁷

French philosopher John Paul Sartre stressed that the Church did not force the conversion of the Jews in the middle ages because they fulfilled the indispensable economic function of moneylending.²²⁸ Ain Shams University Professor Emeritus Abdelwahab Elmessiri, a graduate from Columbia and Rutgers universities and author and editor of *The Encyclopedia of the Jews, Judaism, and Zionism*, provided an analysis of the reasons for the transformation of some Jewish communities into functional groups, especially “middleman and financial” ones.²²⁹ Even the words “Judaeus” and “Mercator” appeared as synonyms in Carolingian documents due to language skills and middleman position between the Christian West and the Muslim East.²³⁰ When the Crusades destroyed Jewish trade in the Mediterranean, a shift to the transcontinental routes led to the emergence of important Jewish entrepôts at Mainz, Regensburg, and Prague.

²²³ J. Marlowe, *Cecil Rhodes: The Anatomy of Empire*, London: Paul Elek, 1972. B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984.

²²⁴ J. M. Roberts, *The Penguin History of the World*, New York: Penguin, 1995, page 635.

²²⁵ R. Sharif, *Non-Jewish Zionism: Its roots in Western history*, London: Zed Press, 1983.

²²⁶ Thomas Witherby, *A vindication of the Jews, by way of reply to the letters addressed by perseverans to the English Israelite*. Humbly submitted to the consideration of the Missionary Society, and the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, London: Printed for the author, by Stephen Couchman, Throgmorton-Street; And Sold by J. Hathcard, Piccadilly: Cadell and Davies, Strand; and Sheerwood, Neely, and Jones, Paternoster-Row, 1809, page 4.

²²⁷ Friedman, "What Does Morsi Mean for Israel?", *The New York Times*, July 3, 2012.

²²⁸ Jean-Paul Sartre, *Réflexions sur la Question Juive*, Paris : Paul Morihien, 1946, page 87.

²²⁹ Abdelwahab Elmessiri, *mawsooat el-yehud wal yedudiya wal sahyooniya* (The Encyclopedia of the Jews, Judaism, and Zionism), beit el-arab littawtheeq el-asri wannoudhum, 2001. The Encyclopedia is the product of over 25 years of research and critical inquiry. It addresses almost all aspects of Judaism, the Jews, Zionism, and Israel, is written by a non-Jewish Arab, and is considered the first of its kind. It is not only a deconstructive encyclopedia, taking a critical stance vis a vis its subject matter, but also a reconstructive one, suggesting alternative ways of looking at Jewish, Zionist, and Israeli phenomena, and a new terminology to deal with them.

²³⁰ Mercus Arkin, *Aspects of Jewish Economic History*, Philadelphia: the Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975, page 44-45.

Because of this middleman position, some viewed the Jews as the trading “instruments by which the most distant nations converse with one another” or “the pegs and nails” that keep the whole frame of a building. Others have argued that “the spirit of early modern capitalism had been nourished by the rational approach of Judaism toward economic problems, particularly the Deuteronomic injunction which permitted a different code for commercial dealing between Jews and non-Jews, especially in the matter of interest.”²³¹ Sixteenth century English fiction plays such as Christopher Marlowe’s *The Jew of Malta* and William Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* highlighted the significance of Jews as occupational and functional groups often focused on moneylending. With the rise of the Rothschilds Jewish family on the bourses of five major European capitals and with the Goldsmids Jewish family becoming the largest loan contractors in England, one can see why Jewish leaders such as Rabbi Hirsch Kalischer and Moses Leib Lilienblum dared to propose the purchase of the whole country of Palestine from the Ottoman Turks.²³² When Napoleon visited Strasbourg in January 1806, French Alsatian farmers complained to him that their progressive impoverishment was the result of extensive debt to Jewish money lenders.²³³ Werner Sombart (1863-1941), a German economist and sociologist, authored a leading study on “the influence of Jews on modern economic life.” His book, *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* (1911), is considered a pendant to Max Weber’s study on the connection between Protestantism (especially Calvinism) and Capitalism, only that Sombart puts the Jews at the core of the development. Sombart even linked the shift of the center of gravity of mercantilist and capitalist economy since the sixteenth century to Jewish migrations. The causes Sombart assigned for Jewish economic success include dispersion over a wide area, treatment as strangers, semi-citizenship, wealth, Deuteronomy 23:20 [“You may charge a foreigner interest, but not a brother Israelite”], Ghetto life, and a long experience in money dealing.²³⁴ This strong financial position explains why 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.

Napoleon’s attempt to estrange the Jews from their European and Russian rulers

By the eighteenth century, religious tolerance had improved throughout Europe because of the Enlightenment movement and its emphasis on reason and science, and its marginalization of revelation and mysticism as a source of knowledge and wisdom. As an atheist European ruler, Napoleon represented, somehow, a middle ground between the Reformation and Counter-Reformation positions vis-à-vis the Jews.²³⁵ Before Napoleon’s rise to power, the French Revolution of 1789 had already emancipated French Jews, when the French National Assembly decreed on 24 December 1789 “that non-Catholics are eligible for all civil and military positions,

²³¹ Mercus Arkin, *Aspects of Jewish Economic History*, Philadelphia: the Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975, page 146.

²³² Jacob Katz, “The Forerunners of Zionism,” in Jehuda Reinharz and Anita Shapira, eds. *Essential Papers on Zionism* (New York: New York University Press, 1996). Mercus Arkin, *Aspects of Jewish Economic History*, Philadelphia: the Jewish Publication Society of America, 1975, pages 150-159.

²³³ Jay R. Berkovitz, *The Shaping of Jewish Identity in Nineteenth-Century France*, Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989, page 42.

²³⁴ Werner Sombart, *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*, Translated with notes, by M. Epstein, New York: Burt Franklin, 1969.

²³⁵ F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Jerusalem: Massada Press, 1975.

as other [Catholic] citizens.”²³⁶ This new social policy haunted Europe’s Old Regime during the entire Napoleonic era. Under the Napoleonic European order, many rulers had to issue ordinances opening the ghettos and admitting Jews to civil rights. This was the case of the Grand Duke of Baden in 1809, the King of Prussia in 1812, the Duke of Mecklenburg Schwerin in 1812, and the King of Bavaria in 1813.²³⁷ But when Napoleon fell, the emancipation of the Jews was reversed, and some of the restrictions on the Jews were restored in Counter-Reformation countries like the Papal States, Austria, and Germany, where anti-Jewish riots took place in 1818.²³⁸ Despite or because of his Jewish policies of emancipation, Napoleon seems to have been determined to use the Jews as a “fifth column” throughout Europe and even within the Ottoman Empire. In 1798, the French Directory (French government, 1795-99) secretly prepared a scheme designed to enlist the support of the Jews for a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine as part of the plans for a French expedition in the Levant. According to Anglo-Jewish historian and journalist Lucien Wolf whose wealthy German Jewish father migrated to England after 1848, “the Jews were alleged to be anxious to support the French in the Levant, and a bogus Zionist scheme—very much on the Herzlian lines—supposed to be written by an Italian Jew—was widely circulated in France.”²³⁹ The bogus Zionist scheme “was supported in a very soberly reasoned article by the *Décade Philosophique et Littéraire*, and was soon after published in the London Press and reprinted as a two penny pamphlet by the *Courier*” under the title “Re-establishment of the Jewish Government, with a letter from a Jew to his Brethren; copied from the *Courier*, June 10, 1798.”²⁴⁰ Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt and Palestine in 1798–99 was also encouraged by his belief in the imminent fall of the Ottoman Empire and was part of a plan to destroy English power. He wrote in his manual of discipline for the army (dated 22 June 1798):

You are about to undertake a conquest whose effects on the world’s civilization and trade are incalculable. 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.²⁴¹

While in Egypt, Napoleon was about to convert to Islam and had professed himself as a friend of the religion of Islam and the Prophet Mohammed, “whom I love,” he said.²⁴² Following the destruction of his fleet off Alexandria by the English, Napoleon decided to invade Palestine. During his Jaffa campaign, Napoleon’s forces are reported to have killed some 4 000 soldiers and a large part of the inhabitants (including Palestinian Jews) and ordered the execution of some 2 300 Turks after they had led down their arms.²⁴³ When Napoleon was anticipating the capture of Acre and Jerusalem (something he never did), he prepared a propaganda “Proclamation”

²³⁶ S. Glotzer, *Napoleon, the Jews and the constitution of modern citizenship in early nineteenth century France*, Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Dissertation Services, 1997, pages 28-29.

²³⁷ H. H. Milman, *The History of the Jews: From the Earliest Period down to Modern Times*, volume 3, London: John Murray, 1866, page 412.

²³⁸ F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Jerusalem: Massada Press, 1975, pages 182, 187.

²³⁹ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, page 104.

²⁴⁰ Lucien Wolf, *Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents*, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, page 104.

²⁴¹ F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Jerusalem: Massada Press, 1975, page 33.

²⁴² Bonaparte, Commander in Chief, to the people of Cairo, *The Times*, 30 October 1798.

²⁴³ F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Jerusalem: Massada Press, 1975, page 42.

promising the Holy Land to the Jews. In the proclamation, Napoleon called for a worldwide agitation by the Jews when he wrote: “Rightful heirs of Palestine! ... Arise!... Hasten!...” Franco-English competition for European Jews was clear from the Proclamation, when Napoleon said that France “offers to you [the Jews] at this very time, and contrary to expectations, Israel’s patrimony!” He continued, “France calls on you not indeed to conquer your patrimony, nay, only to take over that which has been conquered and, with that nation’s warranty and support, to maintain it against all comers.”²⁴⁴ With such a Proclamation, “every Jew” was considered a priori a secret agent for Napoleon.²⁴⁵ Such a perception was later reflected in a flood of anti-Jewish pamphlets following the battle of Waterloo. The Proclamation was an important element of Napoleon’s propaganda to influence European Jewry, as Napoleon’s atheism and opportunism are legendary. He once told his State Council:

It was by becoming Catholic that I ended the Vendée War. It was by becoming a Musulman that I established myself in Egypt, by becoming an Ultramontane that I gained the priests of Italy. If I governed a nation of Jews I should reestablish the Temple of Solomon.²⁴⁶

In 1806 Emperor Napoleon summoned 111 delegates of the Assembly of Jewish Notables drawn from the lands of the French Empire and Italy. Then he invited all Jewish communities of Europe to send representatives to the Great Sanhedrin (a French version of the “restoration” of the Jews), which ultimately met in 1807. The convocation and the rhetoric of the meeting encouraged Napoleon’s enemies (especially Russia and Austria) to be more vigilant vis-à-vis the political loyalty of their large Jewish population. Napoleon wanted Jewish leaders 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 in its economic battle to deny English ships access to Europe’s continental ports.²⁴⁷ Napoleon engaged in designs for the advantages of the Jews in order

to turn to his own advantage, by cheap sacrifice of the national vanity, the wide-extended and rapid correspondence of the Jews throughout the world, which notoriously outstripped his own couriers; and the secret ramifications of their trade, which not only commanded the supply of the precious metals, but much of the internal traffic of Europe, and probably made great inroads on his Continental System.²⁴⁸

But while Jews welcomed Napoleon’s emancipation, they rejected Napoleon’s Zionism, as only one Jewish group in Prague welcomed the Proclamation, while French Jews reminded Napoleon, “Paris is our Jerusalem.” Worse, the Great Sanhedrin declared, in the Preamble to the *Décisions doctrinaires du Grand Sanhedrin*, that Jews did not form a corporate nation any more. The Holy

²⁴⁴ F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Jerusalem: Massada Press, 1975, page 55.

²⁴⁵ Claude Duvernoy, *Le Prince et le prophète*, Jerusalem: Le Département des publications de l’agence juive, 1966.

²⁴⁶ F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Jerusalem: Massada Press, 1975, page 82.

²⁴⁷ When Napoleon proclaimed a European continental blockade against Britain, he was already in direct or indirect control of several major European ports such as Genoa, Livorno, Amsterdam, Hamburg, Breme, and Lubeck. About one year later, the blockade had been adopted not only by the states under French control or influence, but also by other states such as Russia, Prussia, and Austria, while Denmark had adopted the blockade after the English bombarded Copenhagen in 1807 (see Silvia Marzagalli, “Le Blocus continental et l’économie européenne,” In *Napoléon et L’Europe*, Somogy Éditions D’Art, Paris, 2013, pages 68-70).

²⁴⁸ H. H. Milman, *The History of the Jews: From the Earliest Period down to Modern Times*, volume 3, London: John Murray, 1866, pages 407-408.

Synod of Moscow compared Napoleon's Sanhedrin to the infamous tribunal of the Crucifixion and ridiculed the possibility that Jews might proclaim the Messiah in the person of Napoleon.²⁴⁹ As mentioned above, during the rise of Napoleon and after his defeat at the hands of Anglo-Belgian and Prussian armies at Waterloo in Belgium (on 18 June 1815) and his exile to St Helena, where he died in 1821, many European (especially German and Russian) restrictions against Jews were imposed to counter Napoleon's attempt to estrange Jews from their European rulers. On the one hand, it appears that Napoleon's Zionist Proclamation, the Assembly of Jewish Notables, and the Great Sanhedrin had crystallized what came to be known as the Jewish Question 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). On the other hand, Napoleon's Zionist Proclamation (1799), the Assembly of Jewish Notables (1806), and the Great Sanhedrin (1807) represented the concrete blueprints and forerunners for major 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), the World Zionist Organization (1897), the World Jewish Congress (1936), and the State of Israel (1948).²⁵⁰

English Zionism and French Zionism had a second major clash, with the rise of France's ally, Mohamed Ali, in Egypt and his decade-long (1831–41) conflict with the Ottoman Empire and its British, Prussian, and Austrian allies. Napoleon's Zionism continued with the ascent of Napoleon III in France (1848–70), the Crimean War (1854–56), the digging of the Suez Canal (1854–69), and the establishment of the Alliance Israélite Universelle in Paris in 1860. Abram Francois Petavel (a French Christian) wrote a memorandum entitled *Devoir des nations de rendre au peuple juif sa nationalité*. In 1860 Ernest Lahranne (a Roman Catholic and private secretary to Napoleon III) published his appeal (*La Nouvelle Question D'Orient: Reconstruction de la Nationalite Juive*) on behalf of the Jews.²⁵¹ Lahranne's appeal inspired the book, *Rome and Jerusalem* (1862), by Moses (Moritz) Hess (1812–1875), a fugitive Prussian Jew living in France. Moses Hess was condemned to death by the Prussian government in 1849 but he fled to

²⁴⁹ J. D. Klier, *Russia gathers her Jews: The origins of the "Jewish Question" in Russia, 1772–1825*, Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1986. Alexander Crawford Lindsay (Lord Lindsay), "Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land," *The Quarterly Review* 125 (Dec.):166–92, 1838. F. Kobler, *Napoleon and the Jews*, Jerusalem: Massada Press, 1975.

²⁵⁰ T. Herzl, *The Jewish state*, Trans. by Sylvie D'Avigdor, American Zionist Emergency Council Ed, 1946, Retrieved October 19, 2001 from <http://www.geocities.com/Vienna/6640/zion/judenstaadt.html> on the World Wide Web. Jewish Colonization Association, *Jewish Colonization Association: Its Work in the Argentine Republic, 1891–1941*, Buenos Aires: Ayucacho, 1942. L. Pinsker, *Auto-emancipation*, Rep. in Ahad Ha'am 1911, *Pinsker and his Brochure*, 2nd Ed. Trans. Henrietta Szold, New York: Federation of American Zionists, 1911. World Jewish Congress, Jewish Communities of the World, Retrieved October 19, 2001 from http://www.wjc.org.il/communities/jewish_communities_of_the_world/chartmap.html on the World Wide Web. World Zionist Congress, The First Zionist Congress and the Basel Program, Retrieved October 19, 2001, from <http://www.wzo.org.il/home/movement/first.htm> on the World Wide Web.

²⁵¹ L. J. Epstein, *Zion's call: Christian Contributions to the origins and development of Israel*, New York: University Press of America, 1984, page 40.

Geneva. When the Prussian government demanded his extradition, he fled again and found refuge in Paris in 1853.²⁵² Hess was one of the first Jewish leaders to be recruited by French Zionists at a time when Jews continued to reject Zionism as in the days of Napoleon I. Moses Hess told the Jews, “without a country—you are bastards of humanity.”²⁵³ His emphasis on “race struggle” over “class struggle” put him at odds with his contemporary, Karl Marx. The main idea in *Rome and Jerusalem* was that Jews would always remain aliens and that even if some nations emancipated them for humanitarian reasons, such nations would never respect them.²⁵⁴ Hess (known in France as “Communist Rabbi Moses”) 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 which will be loyal to the cause of France to the end.”²⁵⁵ Moses Hess worked for France as Rabbi Hirsch Kalischer (who published “Seeking Zion”²⁵⁶ in 1862) worked for Prussia and Theodor Herzl for Britain.

From the days of the Reformation to the ascent of Napoleon III in France and the digging of the Suez Canal, there were no Jewish leaders in the Zionism movement, despite repeated British and French attempts to recruit them. The non-Jewish origin of Zionism is further illustrated by the simple fact that the idea of Restoration was developed first in England (with no Jewish population) instead of Germany, Poland, or Russia (where the bulk of European Jewry lived). It took about one hundred years after Oliver Cromwell for the number of Jews to reach 12 000 in England and another hundred years to reach 25 000, whereas the census of 1897 showed 5 189 401 Jews (4.13 % of total population) in the Russian Empire.²⁵⁷

British imperial politics and Anglican religion propel Zionism

Barbara Tuchman’s *Bible and Sword: England and Palestine from the Bronze Age to Balfour* provides a coherent analysis of the symbiotic and synchronous interplay between imperialist and religious motives within British Zionism from the days of Oliver Cromwell and the Puritans, through those of Lord Palmerston and Lord Shaftesbury, to those of Balfour and Weizmann. After the loss of the American colonies, British colonialism focused on India (“the Jewel of the Crown”) and, perhaps more importantly, on the road to India. Napoleon’s military campaigns in Egypt and Palestine in 1798–99, the British takeover of Malta in 1799, the French invasion of Algeria in 1830, the British capture of Aden (Yemen) in 1839, the erosion of Ottoman power, all

²⁵² M. Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem: A study in Jewish nationalism*, Trans. with Intro. and Notes by Meyer Waxman, New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1943 page 22.

²⁵³ B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984, page 228.

²⁵⁴ Sokolov, *Hibbath Zion (the love for Zion) Stating the principles and activities of the Pre-Herzl Palestinophile (Hovevey-Zion=Lovers of Zion) Movement in Religion, Literature and Life about 1840–1897*, Jerusalem: Rubin Press, 1935, page 66.

²⁵⁵ M. Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem: A study in Jewish nationalism*, Trans. with Intro. and Notes by Meyer Waxman, New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1943 page 167.

²⁵⁶ ?

²⁵⁷ J. Carmichael, *The Satanizing of the Jews: Origin and development of mystical anti-Semitism*, New York: Fromm International Publishing Corporation, 1992, page 96. Bureau des Archives Israélites de France, *Archives Israélites de France 1840–1847*. Paris: Bureau des Archives Israélites de France, 1842, page 759. “Statistics of Prussian Jews,” *The New York Times*, 6 January 1885, page 2. Jewish Colonization Association, *Recueil de matériaux sur la situation économique des Israélites de Russie, d’après l’enquête de la Jewish Colonization Association*, Tome 2 of *La Grande industrie, misère et bienfaisance, instruction*, Tableau 1, Paris: F. Alcan, 1908.

marked an Anglo-French rivalry over the Eastern Question and the road to India. 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 "Proclamation" for a Jewish state in Palestine as feedback for more elaborate British Zionist plans and schemes, focused on settling Jews in Palestine with at least the tacit consent of the other major European powers. In the words of one of the *London Times*' correspondents, "the proposition to plant the Jewish people in the land of their fathers, under the protection of the five Powers, is no longer a mere matter of speculation, but a serious political consideration."²⁵⁸

Secretary of State Lord Palmerston worked closely with Lord Shaftesbury (President of the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews) on British Zionist policies at a time when there was no Jewish movement willing or prepared to "return" to Palestine. Because there were no Protestants in Palestine or any other part of the Ottoman Empire, Anglican England was working to place Ottoman Jews under its special protection, as a counterweight to the Russians and the French who had been trying to provide similar "protection" for the Orthodox and Catholic Ottomans of the Holy Land. Since that time, British Zionism might be considered the main "Protestant mission" in the Holy Land. 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.²⁵⁹ The first Anglican bishop entered Jerusalem in 1842.²⁶⁰ The vice-consul of Jerusalem was given jurisdiction over "the whole country within the ancient limits of the Holy Land." His appointment represented the first step of a carefully planned strategy by Britain to use Jews for imperial domination, after Napoleon failed to achieve the same objective. A quote from the *Quarterly Review* of 1838 reveals one of the first major British Zionist plans to settle Jews in Palestine "for the maintenance" of the British Empire.

The growing interest manifested for these regions, the larger investment of British capital, and the confluence of British travellers and strangers from all parts of the world, have recently induced the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to station there a representative of our Sovereign, in the person of a Vice-Consul. This gentleman set sail for Alexandria at the end of last September—his residence will be fixed at Jerusalem, but his jurisdiction will extend to the whole country within the ancient limits of the Holy Land; he is thus accredited, as it were, to the former kingdom of David and the Twelve Tribes [the contemporary idea of "Greater Israel" goes back to this British promise]. The soil and climate of Palestine are singularly adapted to the growth of produce required for the exigencies of Great Britain; the finest cotton may be obtained in almost unlimited abundance; silk and madder are the staple of the country, and oil-olive is now, as it ever was, the very fatness of the land. Capital and skill are alone required: the presence

²⁵⁸ Restoration of the Jews, *The Times*, 17 August 1840.

²⁵⁹ B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984, page 191.

²⁶⁰ W. H. Hechler, *The Jerusalem bishopric documents*, Arranged and supplemented by the Rev. Professor William H. Hechler, British Chaplain at Stockholm, London: Trubner and Co., 1883.

of a British officer, and the increased security of property which his presence will confer, may invite them [the Jews] from these islands to the cultivation of Palestine; and the Jews, who will betake themselves to agriculture in no other land, having found, in the English Consul, a mediator between their people and the Pasha, will probably return in yet greater numbers, and become once more the husbandmen of Judæa and Galilee. ... Napoleon knew well the value of an Hebrew alliance; and endeavoured to reproduce, in the capital of France, the spectacle of the ancient Sanhedrim, 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.²⁶¹

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 (Queen Victoria of Great Britain and Ireland, King William Frederick III of Prussia, King Frederick William of the Netherlands, King John Charles XIV of Sweden and Norway, King Frederick VI of Denmark, King Ernest Augustus of Hanover, King William of Wurtemberg, the Sovereign Princes and Electors of Germany, the Cantons of the Swiss Federation professing the Reformed Religion, and the States of North America.²⁶² The Memorandum “urges upon the consideration of the powers addressed what may be the probable line of duty on the part of Protestant Christendom to the Jewish people in the present controversy in the East.”²⁶³ The term, “controversy”²⁶⁴ refers to an incident in which a Catholic, Father Thomas, disappeared from a street in Damascus near a Jewish-owned barbershop where one eyewitness had placed him on 7 February 1840. The Jewish barber was arrested and tortured. The charge was that Jews had ritually killed Father Thomas, drained his blood, and used the blood to celebrate Passover.²⁶⁵ O. J. Simon and Joseph Jacobs noted in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* that 210 “important residents” of London held a meeting on 3 July 1840 to protest against this incident. This was the first of what will be later known as the Manson House and Guildhall Meetings held at the summons of the lord mayor of London. In the meantime, an 1840 pamphlet was published in Berlin lamenting the exile of the Jews and proposing the rebuilding of an independent Jewish empire.²⁶⁶ The Damascus incident

²⁶¹ Alexander Crawford Lindsay (Lord Lindsay), “Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land,” *The Quarterly Review* 125 (Dec.):166–92, 1838, pages 188-190.

²⁶² Restoration of the Jews, *The Times*, 26 August 1840.

²⁶³ Restoration of the Jews, *The Times*, 9 March 1840.

²⁶⁴ In 2007, Bar Ilan University Professor of Medieval and Renaissance History Ariel Toaff, the son of a former Chief Rabbi of Rome, has published a book in Italy entitled “*Pasque di Sangue*” (“Bloody Passovers”). According to Haaretz correspondent Ofri Ilani, the work focused on the use of blood by Jews in Ashkenazi communities in the Middle Ages and found that “there is a factual basis for some of the medieval blood libels against the Jews.” Toaff reportedly went even to say “I will not give up my devotion to the truth and academic freedom even if the world crucifies me.”²⁶⁴ Ofri Ilani, “Bar-Ilani prof. defiant on blood libel book 'even if crucified',” *Haaretz*, 2 February 2007. Gabriel Sanders, “Scholar Pulls Book Revisiting Blood Libel,” *Forward*, 16 Feb 2007.

²⁶⁵ L. J. Epstein, *Zion's call: Christian Contributions to the origins and development of Israel*, New York: University Press of America, 1984, page 31.

²⁶⁶ Geoffrey Wheatcroft, *The Controversy of Zion: Jewish Nationalism, the Jewish State, and the Unresolved Jewish Dilemma*, New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1996, page 18.

transferred the intensity of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation conflict and rhetoric from Europe to the Holy Land of Palestine.

British Zionism preaches Jewish separation

Unlike Napoleon's "secular" Proclamation to the Jews as "the Rightful Heirs of Palestine," the Protestant memorandum (speaking of the Jews in the third person) cites several Biblical verses from Genesis, Exodus, Matthew, Isaiah, and Jeremiah to remind Protestant monarchs that the Jews ("our brethren of the circumcision") 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.*" The memorandum concludes with the following appeal:

As the spirit of Cyrus, King of Persia, was stirred up to build the Lord's Temple, which was in Jerusalem (II Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23), who is there among you, high and mighty ones of all nations, to fulfil the good pleasure of the holy will of the Lord of Heaven, saying to Jerusalem, "Thou shalt be built," and to the temple, "Thy foundation shall be laid."²⁶⁷

The memorandum was anonymously "signed and sealed in London, 8th of January, in the year of our Lord 1839, in the name of the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, on behalf of many who wait for the redemption of Israel." In his acknowledgement receipt Viscount Lord Palmerston referred to "a letter and a memorandum from some of Her Majesty's subjects who feel deeply interested in the welfare and future prospects of the Jews." He also noted that the Queen "has been pleased graciously to receive" the memorandum. In the same 26 August 1840 issue of *The Times*, an anonymous letter to the editor (signed F.B.) praised "the general expression of interest in the Jewish nation which has been elicited by the recent sufferings of their brethren at Damascus." The letter depicts Jews as

Subject to the caprice and cruelty of any nation among whom they may dwell, fleeing from the persecutions of one only to meet with like treatment from another, having no city of refuge where they can be in safeguard, no single spot to call their own, they are in a more pitiable condition than the Indian of the forest, or the Arabs of the desert. *The wild bird hath her nest, the fox his cave, Mankind their country, Israel but the grave.* Is this state of things always to continue? They think not. ... There are political reasons arising from the present aspect of affairs in Russia, Turkey, and Egypt, which would make it to the interest not only of England but [also] of other European nations, either by purchase or by treaty, to procure the restoration of Judea to its rightful claimants.²⁶⁸

British Zionism opposed *assimilation* and preached *separation* for the Jews because they were considered a *unique* people. In a long letter entitled "The State and Prospects of the Jews" and published by the *The Times* of 24 January 1839, the anonymous author ("From a Correspondent," perhaps Shaftesbury) attacked the idea and the process of assimilation and naturalization ("amalgamation") of the Jews, described "their own little communion as the

²⁶⁷ Restoration of the Jews, *The Times*, 26 August 1840.

²⁶⁸ Restoration of the Jews, *The Times*, 26 August 1840.

church and the people of God,” and called for “a more congenial” destiny “for the Children of Abraham,” of whom the Numbers 23:9 says, “the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations.”²⁶⁹ In *Impressions of the Theophrastus Such* (1879), George Eliot (pen name of Mary Anne Evans), a leading writer in the Victorian age, reiterated the same British doctrine opposing assimilation and preaching separation for the Jews in these terms: “If they drop that separateness which is made their reproach, they may be in danger of lapsing into a cosmopolitan indifference equivalent to cynicism.” In the meantime, Shaftesbury instructed the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews to build an Anglican church in Jerusalem “if possible on Mt. Zion itself.”²⁷⁰ He also assured Palmerston that Zionism would be “the cheapest and fastest mode” of colonizing Syria, that no “pecuniary outlays” would be demanded of the guarantors, and that the “benefits to be derived from it would belong to the whole civilized world.”²⁷¹ Shaftesbury gave more details on how the plan for settling Jews in Palestine would not cost much to the British treasury:

They [the Jews] will return at their own expenses, and with no hazard but to themselves; they will submit to the existing form of government, having no preconceived theories to gratify, and having been almost everywhere trained in implicit obedience to autocratic rule; they will acknowledge the present appropriation of the soil in the hands of its actual possessors, being content to obtain an interest in its produce by the legitimate methods of rent and purchase. Disconnected as they are, from all the peoples of the earth, they would appeal to no national or political sympathies for assistance in the path of wrong, and the guarantee which I propose, for insertion in the Treaty to be carried out by the personal protection of the respective Consuls and Vice Consuls of the several nations would be sufficient to protect them in the exercise of their right.²⁷²

British Zionists formed the Palestine Association in London in 1804 for the purpose of procuring and publishing information regarding the geography, the people, the climate, and the history of the Holy Land. This was a serious and organized effort to re-write (and often distort) the historical geography of Palestine from an exclusively British Zionist point of view. In this regard, researchers were asked to observe for themselves two important principles that should guide their research in the Holy Land: (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.²⁷³ Major publications of such Protestant-subsidized research and information about Palestine 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.²⁷⁴ The idea that was

²⁶⁹ “The State and Prospects of the Jews,” *The Times*, 24 January 1839. Alexander Crawford Lindsay (Lord Lindsay), “Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land,” *The Quarterly Review* 125 (Dec.):166–92, 1838.

²⁷⁰ B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984, page 192.

²⁷¹ B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984, pages 191-200.

²⁷² L. J. Epstein, *Zion’s call: Christian Contributions to the origins and development of Israel*, New York: University Press of America, 1984, page 35.

²⁷³ E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine: Mount Sinai and Arabia Petra*, Vol. I. New York: Arno Press, 1977, page 377.

²⁷⁴ B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984, pages 191.

to become the British Mandate appeared first in the above-mentioned article in Lord Shaftesbury's review of Lindsay's book for the *Quarterly Review* of December 1838. The article explains that Zionism will create for Britain a "body of well-wishers in every people under heaven" (especially among millions of Jews in Russia). It attacked the Catholic and Orthodox "arch-assailants of our Zion" who "disparage the Old Testament by a contemptuously exclusive preference of the New" and "ascribe to the Gospels and Epistles *alone* the title of the Christian Scriptures!"²⁷⁵ By the 1840s, British Zionism moved from preaching Jewish separation to putting together a formal plan providing the nuts and bolts for Zionist colonization in Palestine.

From Penal Colonies in Australia to Jewish Colonies in Palestine

Following the failure of Colonel Charles Henry Churchill to involve the Jews in Zionism, Britain brought in Lieutenant-Colonel George Gawler (1796–1869). From 1838 to 1841, Gawler was Governor of South Australia. During his term, British convicts were settled in Australia at an average of 180 per month.²⁷⁶ As an experienced military administrator and a colonization expert who established penal colonies in Australia, he was expected to help establish Jewish colonies in Palestine. In 1845 Gawler 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 1852.²⁷⁷ Before we look at Gawler's plan, let us take a glance at the infamous British colonial policy of "converting the most useless men in one country into active citizens [settlers] of another."²⁷⁸

In 1656 Britain legalized the apprehending and deportation of British "lewd and dangerous persons ... who have no way of livelihood... and treating with merchants for transporting them to the English plantations in America."²⁷⁹ The Transportation Act of 1718 continued this policy designed to deter criminals and to supply the colonies and plantations with labour by sentencing (to a seven-year deportation to America) persons convicted of grand or petit larceny or any felonious stealing or taking of money or goods and chattels.²⁸⁰ Colorado State University Professor of History Henry Weisser and Harvard University Baird Professor of History Mark Kishlansky give the following picture of 18th-century British society: "Crime was so common in 18th-century Britain that Parliament made more than 200 offenses punishable by death. Executions were weekly spectacles."²⁸¹ To deal with excess prison populations, thousands and

²⁷⁵ Alexander Crawford (Lord Lindsay), "Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land," *The Quarterly Review* 125 (Dec.):166–92, 1838, pages 188-190.

²⁷⁶ A. G. Price, *Founders and Pioneers of South Australia*, Adelaide: F. W. Preece and Sons, 1929, page 160.

²⁷⁷ L. J. Epstein, *Zion's call: Christian Contributions to the origins and development of Israel*, New York: University Press of America, 1984, page 37. A. G. Price, *Founders and Pioneers of South Australia*, Adelaide: F. W. Preece and Sons, 1929, page 164.

²⁷⁸ A. G. L. Shaw, *Convicts and the colonies: A study of penal transportation from Great Britain and Ireland to Australia and other parts of the British Empire*, Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1997, page 17.

²⁷⁹ A. G. L. Shaw, *Convicts and the colonies: A study of penal transportation from Great Britain and Ireland to Australia and other parts of the British Empire*, Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1997, page 24.

²⁸⁰ A. G. L. Shaw, *Convicts and the colonies: A study of penal transportation from Great Britain and Ireland to Australia and other parts of the British Empire*, Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1997, page 25.

²⁸¹ Henry Weisser and Mark Kishlansky, "United Kingdom," Microsoft® Encarta® Online Encyclopedia 2006, <http://encarta.msn.com>.

thousands of British convicts were deported (the unpleasant, unhealthy, and dangerous sea passage was about 8 to 12 weeks) during the century before the American Revolution, after which England could no longer send her convicts to the American colonies.²⁸² In the aftermath of Captain James Cook's landing on Australian shores in 1770 and the American Revolution in 1776, Britain enacted the Transportation Act of 1784 to mandate transportation to New South Wales, an Act that was extended in 1788. Under this law Britain deported some 160 000 convicts to Australia between 1788 and 1868.²⁸³ It was also the age of mass emigration from Europe. Some estimated that between 1835 and 1935 as many as 75 million emigrated from Europe.²⁸⁴ The combined number of emigrants from Britain and Italy between 1880 and 1910 was estimated to exceed fourteen and a half million. But while Britain was engaged in exporting its Irish peasants, Welsh miners and steelworkers, and English farmers it was taking in an influx of Jews from Eastern Europe.²⁸⁵ Unlike the early imported Jewish merchants from Amsterdam, these poor Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe were to be planted as settlers in Palestine. It was this policy that produced Jewish Zionist leaders like Vladimir Jabotinsky, who served his Majesty the Russian Czar, then his Majesty the British King, before becoming the chief ideologue of the Jewish terrorist group Irgun in Palestine during the British Mandate.²⁸⁶

In planning Jewish colonies in Palestine, Gawler had invested his experience and had learned from the main difficulty he faced with settling British convicts in Australia, namely the *will* of the settlers. He insisted that the colonial scheme must take into consideration the “feelings” of the settlers as well as the “desires” of the British. His vision was that Jewish colonies in Palestine would “tranquillize” Syria and the East. With his land-hungry settler mentality, Gawler conveniently claimed that 90 percent of the land of Palestine lay waste and unprofitable, waiting for the “civilized” settlers to make it productive. He was perhaps the first Zionist to conceptualize and articulate the Zionist myth and slogan that “Palestine is a land without a people” waiting for “the Jews, a people without a land.” But contemporary Zionist historiography deliberately ignored Gawler's “contribution” (published in 1845) and claimed that Israel Zangwill (born in 1864) was the one who coined the baseless slogan: “a land without a people waiting for a people without a land.” Gawler sums up his Zionist colonial plan in these words:

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*

²⁸² A. G. L. Shaw, *Convicts and the colonies: A study of penal transportation from Great Britain and Ireland to Australia and other parts of the British Empire*, Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1997, page 37.

²⁸³ A. G. L. Shaw, *Convicts and the colonies: A study of penal transportation from Great Britain and Ireland to Australia and other parts of the British Empire*, Victoria, Australia: Melbourne University Press, 1997.

²⁸⁴ H. J. de Blij and Alexander B. Murphy, *Human Geography: P Culture, Society, and Space*, Sixth Edition, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1999, page 96.

²⁸⁵ J. M. Roberts, *The Penguin History of the World*, New York: Penguin, 1995, pages 768-769.

²⁸⁶ Claude Duvernoy, *Le Prince et le prophète*, Jerusalem: Le Département des publications de l'agence juive, 1966, page 136.

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.²⁸⁷

According to Gawler, Great Britain should gain “protection for, and give protection to, all Israelites who desire to establish themselves in depopulated Palestine,” and should “prepare the Jews for their future station by political elevation in England.”²⁸⁸ It was in the context of this “political elevation” that (baptised Jew) Benjamin Disraeli rose from stock market speculation and petit journalism to become England’s first and only Jewish prime minister in 1868 and in 1874–80. But beyond the big scheme of settling Jews in Palestine, Gawler provided some interesting practical details on what he bluntly 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 settlements or colonies (a modernized version of the *kehillah* and *shtetl* of Eastern Europe) that were later experimented within both Argentina and Palestine.

Gawler recommended “the establishment of a colony or colonies, *large enough to be respectable and influential; but not so large as to be unmanageable*, as regards system of internal order, individual employment, or the supply of the necessaries of life.”²⁸⁹ In terms of population, the colony should range between 700 and 1 200 “effective men,” making a community of 3 000 to 5 000 souls with women and children. The colonies should be within 25 miles from the maritime roadsteads of Palestine, in order to be able to export their products and enjoy the protection of British naval forces, frequently present on the coast.²⁹⁰ In terms of the security of the settlers, the British would put the Jews under their protection, as the French and the Russians did the same for the Catholic and Greek Palestinian communities. The colony should be formed of three classes of settlers, who would receive protection and land privileges: (1) persons possessing sufficient capital to provide entirely for themselves would receive up to 300 acres, (2) persons with a small amount of capital, providing wholly their own passages and means of transit to the location, would receive up to 50 acres, and (3) persons of very small means, receiving a free conveyance for themselves, their families, and a regulated weight of luggage, would receive up to 10 acres. When the British occupied Palestine later, they adopted the Australian Torrens system [?] of “legal” dispossession of the natives.²⁹¹

As in the days of Napoleon, Britain continued to defend its imperial policy of protecting the territorial integrity of the decomposing Ottoman Empire as the lifeline of its road to India. The

²⁸⁷ G. Gawler, *Tranquilization 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*, London: T. & W. Boone, 1845, pages 8-9.

²⁸⁸ G. Gawler, *Organised Special Constables: A Very Efficient Bulwark in this Period of Serious Danger against Internal Anarchy and Foreign Invasion, with Further Remarks upon the Present Duties of Great Britain*, London: T. & W. Boone, 1848, page 25.

²⁸⁹ G. Gawler, *Tranquilization 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*, London: T. & W. Boone, 1845, page 12.

²⁹⁰ G. Gawler, *Tranquilization 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*, London: T. & W. Boone, 1845, pages 16-17.

²⁹¹ Salman Abu Sitta, “MAP AND GRAB: A Survey of Palestine under the British Mandate, 1920–1948, by Dov Gavish,” Book review, *Journal of Palestine Studies* 35(2), 2006, page 101-102.

Turco-Egyptian crisis of the 1830s and the Crimean war of the 1850s were fought over the same Eastern Question issue. In 1844 England turned down a Russian proposal for a joint partitioning of the Turkish Empire: Russia to become protector of Turkey's European possessions in the Balkans, England to have Egypt and Crete, and Constantinople to become a free city "temporarily occupied." Following the Crimean War, Henri Dunant (a representative of the *Compagnie Genevoise des Colonies de Sétif in North Africa and Sicily*) established the *Universal Society for the Revival of the Orient* and proposed a diplomatic status for the first Jewish agricultural colonies in Palestine.²⁹² With the advent of steam navigation (steamships depend on frequent ports of call for recoaling) and the completion of the Suez Canal, Zionism and the interests of world commerce 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.

Palestine viewed as the nearest route to the Indian "Jewel" of the British Crown

In *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India*, Thomas Clarke attempted to prove that the restoration of the Jews to Palestine "was not only a Prophetic but Political necessity." With such a project, "England need have no fear of her darling Indian possessions," and her power will become "irresistible" and "supreme." Like his Zionist predecessors, he believed that planting Jews in Palestine would be inexpensive for the British, would serve British imperial interests, and would deny access to Britain's rival powers. Clarke, who presents himself as "a Christian and an Englishman" and "a poor and humble advocate," first published his proposal in the *Jewish Chronicle*, the organ of British Jewry. Addressing the Editor, Clarke opened his essay as follows:

Sir, Will you permit me to make use of your columns for the dissemination of opinions, which long study and reflection have indelibly fixed upon my own mind? ... Whatever may be the result of my obscure labours, one thing will at all events remain, and that is, my hope and sympathy for the scattered Children of Israel... I ponder over the hollowed associations with which every foot of that sacred soil is blended--when I think of the site of God's holy temple prophaned by the blasphemy of Mohammed—Jerusalem, the beloved, trodden down by her relentless enemies, her children hiding almost for life, her vineyards, her gardens, her palaces, her fruitful vales laid waste and desolate—what was once the joy of the whole earth turned into a barren wilderness--my heart murmurs—How Long, O Lord! how long wilt Thou hide Thyself from Thy people, and Thy presence from Thy glorious land?²⁹³

Clarke argued that when England showed its mercy to the Jews, her wealth increased. He asserted that "at no previous time in the history of Europe were the destinies of its nations more completely in the hands of the Jews."²⁹⁴ Since the Jews are essentially a "trading and financial

²⁹² Claude Duvernoy, *Le Prince et le prophète*, Jerusalem: Le Département des publications de l'agence juive, 1966, page 28.

²⁹³ T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, pages 1-2.

²⁹⁴ T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, page 19.

people” and have dealings on “every bourse” in the world, “what so natural as that they should be planted along that great highway of ancient traffic?”²⁹⁵ Even more significant for him is that the Jewish wealth “is not only immense—it is moveable.”²⁹⁶ Clarke asked himself, “why should I delate upon this glorious vision? To you and your brethren it will be plain enough. I can but repeat a few sentences from an article which recently appeared in the “Witness,” and which was properly deemed worthy of transference to your columns:”

Syria must be occupied by a trading and commercial people—it lies in the great route of ancient commerce; and were the Ottoman power to be displaced, that old commercial route would immediately re-open. Trade would flow once more in its old channel, across Syria and along the valleys of the Euphrates. The Jew has dealings in every bourse on the world; and in what more skillful hands could the exchanges betwixt the East and the West be placed? In his harbours would the ships of Europe discharge the fabrics and manufactures of the industrious West, and return laden with the wine and oil, the silks and gems of the East.²⁹⁷

Clarke could see that the forthcoming disintegration of the Ottoman Empire would open the door for Russian and French intervention in the region. When this happens, he argued, it could endanger England’s “Overland Route to India” and force her “to communicate with India again by doubling the Cape.”²⁹⁸ Hence when the partition of the Ottoman Empire takes place, “the possession of Acre is absolutely essential to the salvation of British interests in the East.”²⁹⁹ The plantation of Jews in Palestine will “deny entrance to the Frenchman and exit to the Muscovite.”³⁰⁰ This is when the British Zionists began to argue that the Jewish state would even place the management of British steam communication entirely in friendly hands.³⁰¹ 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 Rothschild’s (a Jewish family banking dynasty in London, ennobled by the Austrian and British governments).

²⁹⁵ T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, page 13.

²⁹⁶ T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, page 15.

²⁹⁷ T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, pages 14-15.

²⁹⁸ T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, page 10.

²⁹⁹ T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, page 10.

³⁰⁰ T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, page 15.

³⁰¹ B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984, pages 214, 216, 254. M. Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem: A study in Jewish nationalism*, Trans. with Intro. and Notes by Meyer Waxman, New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1943, page 260.

At the peak of British industrial and colonial expansion, Clark also wanted to sell his proposal to all nations concerned about or interested in the so-called Eastern Question:

The great Eastern question... involves the consideration of the nearest route to our great Asiatic possessions ... The West is ever requiring the productions of the fertile and half civilized East; and the East is as constantly demanding the manufactures of the enlightened and inventive West. To all the nations of both continents, therefore, it is absolutely of the first importance that the shortest, most convenient, and most protected route should be obtained. As regard England, this is especially the case; for being essentially a manufacturing and commercial country, having in the East and Indian colony of nearly two hundred millions of inhabitants, and an Australian colony rapidly rising into one of the first rank, and the probability of an immense trade with China, having a population of at least three hundred and fifty millions more, it was a vital necessity to her that the way to and from the East should be such as we have described” ... England, for her own selfish purposes, and for carrying out the figment of the balance of power (...), has thought proper at all times to defend the integrity of the Ottoman Empire, and thus maintain, as an alliance, the greatest anomaly, both in religion and morals, of this or almost any age.” It is acknowledged by all that, had we had the nearest route to India at the time of the rebellion [Indian rebellion against the British East India’s rule in 1857], not only should we have been sooner forewarned of the danger, but we should have been enabled to crush it at once when in the bud ... The valley of the Euphrates thus secured, with the possession of Acre, defended by sea, would make us perfectly irresistible ... Turkey is in itself effete; so effete, indeed, that too active an attempt at stimulation from within might bring the whole down in ruin ... the Turkish Empire only exists until the great powers can decide what shall be done with it... with the Jew in Palestine under our protection, and the Euphrates valley in our grasp, we might safely, not allow France to monopolize the Red Sea passage, but defy the combined force of all Europe to wrest either the Euphrates route or India from us. A fortified port at the east end of the Mediterranean would, with our possession of Corfu, Malta, and Gibraltar, make our power in the Mediterranean supreme.³⁰²

Zionist novel Daniel Deronda: winning the hearts and minds of Jews

The British Zionists’ *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* (1876), which focused on English fiction about the Jews.³⁰³ Daniel Deronda tries to pull out the “Semite” Jew from the “German” and the “Slave” of Europe as one pulls a hair out of dough. This novel raised awareness about a new racial realignment and could indeed be viewed as another major milestone on the road to the anti-Jewish “agitation” (or anti-Semitism) of the late nineteenth century in Europe and Russia . The novel portrays a group of Jewish youths that “consisted of a black-eyed young woman who carried a black-eyed little one, its head already

³⁰² T. Clarke, *India and Palestine, or the Restoration of the Jews viewed in Relation to the Nearest Route to India: In two parts, with a map*, Manchester: William Bremner & CO., 11, Market Street; London: F. Pitman, 20 Paternoster Row, 1861, pages 21-22, 26-28, 38-39.

³⁰³ E. Eliot, *The Writings of George Eliot*, Boston: Little Brown, 1900.

covered with black curls, and deposited it on the counter, from which station it looked round with even more than the usual intelligence of babies: also a robust boy of six and a younger girl, both with black eyes and black-ringed hair--looking more Semitic than their parents, as the puppy lions show the spots of far-off progenitors.” Franz Kobler argues that George Eliot’s *Daniel Deronda* “forms the pinnacle of the British Restoration Movement.”³⁰⁴ This political novel aimed at creating and strengthening Zionist awareness among the Jews who until then did not embrace Zionism. *Daniel Deronda* was born a Jew but raised as an English non-Jew. His Sephardi Jewish mother planned to save her son from the Jewish fate she despises. Her plan did not work because of the influence of the spiritual figure of the novel Mordecai Ezra Cohen who tried to galvanize the Jews and inspire a “prophet” among them for his vision of a Jewish “republic” state, before he died in the midst of preparations of *Deronda*’s departure to Palestine:

They have wealth enough to redeem the soil from debauched and paupered conquerors; they have the skill of the statesman to devise, the tongue of the orator to persuade. And is there no prophet or poet among us to make the ears of Christian Europe tingle with shame at the hideous obloquy of Christian strife which the Turk gazes at as at the fighting of beasts to which he has lent an arena? There is a store of wisdom among us to found anew policy, grand, simple, just, like the old—a republic where there is equality of protection, an equality which shone like a star on the forehead of our ancient community and give it more than the britness of Western freedom amid the despotisms of the East. Then our race shall have an organic center, a heart and brain to watch and guide and execute; the outraged Jew shall have a defence in the court of the nations, as the outraged Englishman or American. And the world will gain as Israel gains. For there will be a community in the van of the East which carries the culture and the sympathies of every great nation in its bosom.³⁰⁵

The novel presented also a new image of the Jews as good and moral nationalist heroes, despite being non-Christians, in sharp contrast with their previous image as “Christ-Killers, apostates, money lenders, exotic foreigners, and poor immigrants.”³⁰⁶ Again, like Martin Luther’s pamphlet *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew* (1523), *Daniel Deronda* emphasized the claim that the Jews are descendants of Biblical Israelites and that “a whole Christian is three-fourths a Jew.” It also stressed the idea of “the necessity of requiting a moral debt owed to the Jews.”³⁰⁷ Some even consider that *Deronda* created a Jewish nationalist spirit for Zionism and a role model that later inspired Theodor Herzl.³⁰⁸ In line with earlier calls from Colonel Charles Henry Churchill and Lieutenant-Colonel George Gawler to involve the Jews into the Zionist movement, Mary Ann

³⁰⁴ F. Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, Published for the World Jewish Congress, British Section, London: Lincolns-Prager (Publisher) Ltd, 1956, page 89.

³⁰⁵ F. Kobler, *The Vision Was There: A History of the British Movement for the Restoration of the Jews to Palestine*, Published for the World Jewish Congress, British Section, London: Lincolns-Prager (Publisher) Ltd, 1956, page. 90-91.

³⁰⁶ L. J. Epstein, *Zion’s call: Christian Contributions to the origins and development of Israel*, New York: University Press of America, 1984, page 47.

³⁰⁷ B. W. Tuchman, *Bible and sword: England and Palestine from the bronze age to Balfour*, New York: Ballantine Books, 1984, page 237.

³⁰⁸ N. Sokolov, *Hibbath Zion (the love for Zion) Stating the principles and activities of the Pre-Herzl Palestinophile (Hovevey-Zion=Lovers of Zion) Movement in Religion, Literature and Life about 1840–1897*, Jerusalem: Rubin Press, 1935, page 107.

Evans' *Daniel Deronda* began 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."³⁰⁹ As the "Zionist Novel" (Leavis 1960) drew to its conclusion, Deronda's vision became clear when he said "if I live,"

I am going to the East to become better acquainted with the condition of my race in various countries there. ... The idea that I am possessed with is that of restoring a political existence to my people, making them a nation again, giving them a national centre, such as the English have, though they too are scattered over the face of the globe. That is a task which presents itself to me as a duty: I am resolved to begin it, however feebly. I am resolved to devote my life to it. At the least, I may awaken a movement in other minds, such as has been awakened in my own.³¹⁰

Conclusion

First, it is clear that despite the various efforts either to create or instigate a Jewish Zionist movement and a Jewish leadership who were able and/or willing to assist in carrying out the British-proposed colonization schemes for Palestine, Zionism remained essentially alien to the masses of European Jews before Britain introduced it in the wake of the assassination of Russian Czar Alexander II in 1881 and the subsequent mass migrations of Eastern European Jews to the Americas. Second, one can safely conclude that the Jews did not invent Zionism. Rather Zionism invented the Jews. In fact, both David Ben Gurion and Theodor Herzl implicitly acknowledged this when the former wrote that the latter defines Zionism as "the Jewish people in the making."³¹¹ 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. After Napoleon the British articulated a complex set of imperialist and religious motives designed to make the Eastern Question fit the Jewish Question. Obviously all of this took place before the alleged founder of political Zionism (Jewish Hungarian Theodore Herzl) was born in 1860, as well as before British Zionism began to push for a Europe-wide Jewish "agitation" that would encourage anti-Semitism as a propelling machine to get the Jews out of their homelands in Europe and Russia according to what Colonel Charles Henry Churchill, the British consul in Syria, had suggested in a letter to British Jew and financier Moses Montefiore in 1841.³¹²

³⁰⁹ G. Eliot, *Daniel Deronda*, New York: Torchbooks, 1961, page 1.

³¹⁰ G. Eliot, *Daniel Deronda*, Retrieved October 26, 2002, from <http://www.lang.nagoya-u.ac.jp/~matsuoka/Eliot-Deronda.html> on the World Wide Web, 1876. G. Eliot, *Daniel Deronda*, New York: Torchbooks, 1961, page 606.

³¹¹ David Ben-Gurion, *Israel: a personal history*, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1971, page 841.

³¹² Lucien Wolf, Notes on the diplomatic history of the Jewish question; with texts of protocols, treaty stipulations and other public acts and official documents, London, Printed for the [Jewish Historical] Society [of England] by Spottiswoode, Ballantyne, 1919, pages 119-121.