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Political Zionism was born in central and eastern Europe as a political reaction against their nationalism. Jews for the first time in Europe in nineteenth century were emancipated and allowed the full citizenship. But by the late 1880s due to the rise of ethnic nationalism, they were subjected to pogroms in or mass killings in Russia. As a result some remained in Europe hoping that emancipation’s promises would be realized by next generations and some emigrated to the America, Asia, and Africa with the dream of high standard of living. Apart from these people others began to think the possibility that like the other, Jews could have a national home. But some communities living in United States and Europe rejected the proposal and solution of that problem in the form of Zionism. They argued that Jews emigration to a Jewish state would leave the Jewish people in more vulnerable condition. Theodor Herzl, a Viennese Journalist viewed the main problem of the Jews and after analyzing whole situation reached the conclusion that the formulation of the Jewish state would be the only solution to the social and political vulnerability of the Jews. After convened the Basle congress in 1897 Herzl called for Jewish home in Palestine. During the First World War they succeeded in gaining the French advocacy and due to the efforts of Chaim Weizmann they won the heart of Britain and succeeded to get the Balfour declaration. The Balfour Declaration was incorporated in to Mandatory document by which Britain gained the control over Palestine.

3.1 The Beginning of Political Zionism

After the assassination of Tsar Alexander II of Russia in 1881, a mass exodus of Jews from Russia and the pale of settlement happened. Most of the refugees moved towards Western Europe and America and near about three thousand immigrated to Palestine. These refugees founded a colony near Jaffa called Rishon-le-Zion. About fifty Jewish settlements were established by them in that period. In the same year a movement known as Chibbath Zion was founded in Russia. The followers of this movement organized themselves into societies called Choveve Zion (Lovers of Zion). They propagated and promoted the idea of Palestine and revival of Hebrew Language in these societies. Through these activities seeds of political Zionism were sowing.
Leo Pinsker was the leader of this organization and he was the first to forward the idea of Jews National Home. He presented the real spirit of nationalism in his pamphlet “Auto-Emancipation” published in 1882. He projected the nationalism as an only solution to the Jewish problem and rejected the concept of assimilation because ‘Jude phobia is hereditary and incurable psychic aberration.’ He prescribed that Jews should settle in an appropriate territory in which they could find their state whether in Palestine or elsewhere.

Chibbath Zion movement totally devoted to the establishment of Jewish colonies in Palestine proved a nucleus of Jewish settlement in the country. Majority of the participants belonged to Haskalah movement and the early nationalist school. One society, BILU (House of Jacob, Let Us Go) was formed by the students from the University of Kharkov. It emphasized on community and mystical interests in Palestine and also had secular and nationalist motivation. The colonists were in search of a place where they could develop an environment for institutions. Palestine was suggested by them because of the romantic interest in Holy Land which was generated in nineteenth century.

Choveve Zion convened a conference in 1884 at Kattowitz in Upper Silesia. Leo Pinsker was the presiding officer of that conference though he was not much attached to Palestine. His presidency in this conference was considered as a convergence of the national idea and the colonizing program. Earlier, he was not much interested in Palestine and he had ignored it but he took a qualitative change in his attitude and later his emphasis was that:

“If Palestine was placed in the center of the doctrine, could the emotional drive of the enlightened Jews be turned to the advantage of the movement of Zionism, the yearning evoked by Palestine might supply sufficient emotional drive to justify such a leap in the dark.”

The ‘Lovers of Zion’ separated themselves from other sects of Zionist movement. With some exception who tried to seek permission from the Ottoman Empire to establish a Jewish home land that went in vain, they had only a symbolic value in Palestine. They had not set Palestine as their goal in inception but later they agreed to work on the

---

Zionist project and began to search theoretical justification for Jewish home in Palestine. They projected the settlement of Palestine for personal emancipation and prescribed that Jewish problem could be solved only immigrating to Palestine individually. Pinsker grieved the laws which were stopping the Jews to buy their own land there and stressed the necessity of agriculture as a preface for national life.

When Dr. Pinsker was chairman of the Society for Supporting Jewish Agriculturalists and Artisans in Syria and Palestine a group was also devoted to keep alive the idea of settlement in Palestine. The cooperation between Pinsker and Choveve Zion was considered the real beginning of Political Zionism. After the next decay it became a movement and Theodor Herzl became success in convening Basle congress in 1897. Though Zionism started as a minority Jewish movement but we see that after fifty years it had achieved its goal and established hegemony on Jewish people because of its propaganda of Jewish enlightenment. Although it had intrinsic differences with traditional and other form of Jewish modernism, it got victory that is generally called Zionist Revolution.2

3.1.1 Reform Judaism and Political Zionism

Reform Judaism was established in Germany after the French revolution but its leadership transferred to the United States where it succeeded dramatically. It rejected all forms of Jewish nationalism and completely rejected and repudiated Zionism. It stressed on the unity of human family and the ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity. Reform Judaism rejected the belief that Jews people outside the Palestine were in exile and stressed that Jews were a community not a nation. According to their point of view it was unnecessary and hindrance to Judaism’s universal mission to establish a Jews state. It removed all the references of Jews restoration by Messiah and rebuilding the Temple in Jerusalem and terminated all prayers for return to Zion. The Pittsburgh platform (1885) expressed its view in these words:

“We consider over selves no longer a nation but a religious community. And therefore expect neither a return to Palestine nor a sacrificial worship under the administration

of the sons of Aaron, nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jews state.”

Isaac Mayer Wise the most eminent personality of American Reform Movement established the Union of American Hebrew Congregation in 1873. It consists of thirty four reform congregations and he became the president of the union. He regarded Zionism as an anathema so he detested both its premise and its proposed solution. Central Conference of American Rabbis reaffirming its prior position responded Herzl’s Basle congress:

“We totally disapprove of any attempt for the establishment of a Jews state. Such attempts show a misunderstanding of Israel’s mission which from the narrow political and national field has been expanded to the promotion among the whole human race of the broad and universalistic religion first proclaimed by the Jewish prophet.”

The opposition of Reform Judaism to political Zionism remained up to the Belfour Declaration. At the opening session of Hebrew Union College its president Kaufmann Kohler expressed his feeling that ‘ignorance and irreligion are at the bottom of the whole movement of political Zionism. But after 1917 it made a shift toward Zionism and this shifting was evident in awarding an honorary degree of Doctor of Hebrew Letters to Chaim Weizmann, the then president of the World Zionist Organization. Despite the opposition within members, the Union of American Hebrew Congregation included *Hatikvah* in the *Union Hymnal* in 1930 which later became the national anthem of Israel.

When the support to Zionism increased within the conference there was also an agitation for rethinking on the Pittsburgh Platform. For this purpose, Central Conference of American Rabbis organized a symposium in 1935 to rethinking on Pittsburgh Platform. In it, it was decided that acceptance or rejection would be determined by individual members but support to Jews community in Palestine would be continued. Moreover a committee of six members was also set up to draft a new set of ‘Guiding Principles’. The committee presented its report in Columbus and stressed that:

---

“We behold the promise of renewed life for many of our brethren. We affirm the obligation of all Jewry to aid in its up building as a Jewish homeland by endeavoring to make it not only a heaven of refuge for the oppressed but also a center of Jewish culture and spiritual life.”

In the United States, the American Council for Judaism was founded by Rabbi Louis Wolsey to fight Zionism. It opposed the efforts to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. It said:

“Palestine is a part of Israel’s heritage as it is a part of the heritage of two other religions of the world. We look forward to the ultimate establishment of a democratic, autonomous government in Palestine, wherein Jews, Muslims and Christians shall be justly represented; every man enjoying equal rights and sharing equal responsibilities; a democratic government in which our fellow Jews shall be free Palestinians whose religion is Judaism, even as we are Americans whose religion is Judaism.”

The American council of Judaism was the last stand of Reform Judaism against the Zionism and it was only up to 1934. By the time of the biennial convention in 1946 it had made a dramatic shift toward Zionism and started to support the Zionist drive of a Jewish state although there was an internal opposition. After the establishment of Israel the council was unable to stop Zionism and had to shift from a position of protest group. It became marginal, isolated, unpopular, and irritating critic of Zionism of all shades and degrees. Its only task now is to protect the Jews state from the ultra-Orthodoxy that threatens both her democratic character as well as the nature of Judaism itself.

3.1.2 Cultural Zionism and Political Zionism

The adherents of cultural Zionism, which is also known as ‘spiritual Zionism’ had a vision of Jewish cultural Renaissance. They wanted to create a new sense of Jewish identity which would be free from old tradition, customs and outsider influence. Keeping this vision in mind they rejected the political and economic concept of Palestine Project but accepted this project only as the basis of a cultural center. In this
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5 Ibid., p.74.
cultural center Jews would have a sense of their own zeal and would play a special role. Ahad Ha’m (1856-1927) a famous Hebrew Essayist and renowned thinker was the founder of this school. Ahad Ha’Am opposed the Zionism due to their stress on materialistic aspects of Jewish regeneration. In his first article “The Wrong Way” published in 1889 he severely criticized on the Russian Zionist that they seek economic advantages rather than cultural rewards of settlement in Palestine. He also attacked on the insensitivity of the Jewish colonist toward the Arab displacement and use of militancy to achieve its goal.

Ahad Ha’Am believed in the mixing of spiritual and material values. The national life provided by Talmud is abandoned and threatened by external forces therefore Jewish must search another method to preserve their status. For Ha’Am a new contact could be established with this land on the basis of ‘Love of Zion’. The move of all towards Holy Land neither essential nor easy and possible therefore there was a need to exist of a regenerative center in Palestine. This center would inspire the communities of the diaspora with new life and…preserve the over-all unity of Jewish people. He rejected the economic positivism of Choveve Zion as well territorial concept of political Zionists. He had a Unitarian approach to life therefore he suggested that since the end was combination of material or spiritual, the means must be mixing of land and spirit.

In his article “Judaism and Nietzsche” Ahad ha’Am asserted that Jews had become superior people but they gained this superiority not because of physical bravery but due to morality. He agreed with Nietzsche that “the highest moral aim is not the advancement of the human race as a whole, but the realization of a more perfect human type in chosen few”. For Ahad ha’Am Jews has never subordinated to anyone and they were super people because of their distinction in seeking truth and peace. Therefore every Jews must work for truth and peace.\(^7\)

The goal of cultural Zionism and political Zionism, returning the Jewish people to holy land, was the same but the purposes after returning were not the same. Herzl’s novel, *Altneuland* outlined the Jewish State for the promotion of political Zionism whereas Ahad Ha’Am’s article, The Jewish State and Jewish Problem, argued for cultural aspect of Zionism. Political Zionist viewed the main problem as an individual level it means the problem of the Jews while cultural Zionist dealt with the problem of

\(^7\) Alan R. Taylor, op.cit., p. 53-56.
Judaism that means they viewed the problem at national level. For cultural Zionism the development of Jewish culture was very much suffered due to the assimilation of Jews which occurred when the enlightenment and emancipation were taking place in Europe. Because of this assimilation they had lost their individuality therefore Ha’Am attempted to bring about revival of the Jewish culture. Though both had differences but both views of Zionism played a significant role in the establishment of the State of Israel.8

3.1.3 The Integration of Zionism with Religion

Zionism, from its beginning was a secular ideology which faced extreme opposition from religious establishment. From the religious point of view diaspora was considered a condition ordained by God due to their sinful activities but Zionism propagated the diaspora as problem. Therefore to describe the diaspora a problem was considered a move toward blasphemy. The predominant view of religious Jews about the diaspora was that Jews were living in exile because of their past crimes and sinful activities. They firmly believed that at a certain period of time God would restore them to their land after the coming of Messiah. He would capture the land, reconstruct the temple and reestablish a Jews society in Eretz Israel which would be based on the precepts of Torah. At that time God would grant glory to Jews and this would be a point of universal peace everywhere.

Zionist movement was a rebellion against the abovementioned predominant view of religious Jews. They consciously rejected the classical Judaism and its dogmas. Political Zionist manipulated the ancient symbols of the Promised Land and divine covenant according to the modern conditions of the Jews people. The change in the name of Jewish National fund at the fifth Zionist congress and renamed in Hebrew as Keren Kayemet L’Yisrael was the best example of manipulating the religious tradition. This Hebrew name aroused the feeling of Jews exile from Egypt and entrance into Palestine.

As we have discussed above, religious Jews held a contrary view about political Zionism. They went to Palestine before the advent of Zionism but they did not have any political aspiration. They considered any involvement in the creation of Jews state

a sinful interference in the Messianic time-table of God. Latin patriarch in Jerusalem, Monsignor Luigi criticizing the political Zionism reported to Vatican in 1919 about Jews immigrants that ‘atheism, communism and immorality were rampant among recent Jewish immigrants.’ At the same style the new Zionist considered the religious people to be parasites who were waiting the Jews redemption but not work.⁹

In has been pronounced by some political analysts that Religious Zionism never faced opposition from Muslims because of belonging to the descendants of Abraham and considered them as the People of the Book. They manifest that political Zionism is a perversion and a betrayal of religious Zionism. One of them is Roger Garaudy, French leading intellectual, he said:

“It is to be observed that this religious Zionism (which, moreover, affected only relatively small group) never encountered opposition from the Muslims, who regarded themselves as belonging to the posterity of Abraham and His faith. This spiritual Zionism, alien to any political program for creating a state and domination over Palestine, never led to clashes between the Jewish communities and the Arab population, whether Muslim or Christian.”¹⁰

3.1.4 Rabbi Kook and Accommodation of Political Zionism to Classical Orthodoxy

We have seen the two different attitude of religious and secular people they held in concern to each other. The key figure who played an important role to bring the secular Zionism and orthodox Jews at one platform was Rabbi Yitzhak Kook. He was the first Ashkenazi Chief Rabbi of Palestine during 1921 to 1935.¹¹ He fulfilled his formidable task very carefully by putting the new wine in old bottle. His teaching provided the attempt to mix the religious longing for the land with the active practices of Zionism. Through this way he gave a birth an idea of comprehensive religious nationalist Zionism. He propagated the political Zionism as an instrument of God through which Messianic redemption and restoration would be possible. According to Kook, the divine plan did not depend on orthodox Jews alone but on the all Jews

people. He also viewed that God would restore Jews into the Holy Land whether secular or religious. It is the desire and plan of God to return the children Of Israel in to their promised land and establish a Jews national home there in which Jews would follow the Torah and Halakah and commit the Mitzvot of Eretz Israel which is possible only in the land of Israel.

Rabbi Kook, most people know him simply as Rav Kook, made a synthesis of cultural Zionism and political Zionism holding that both the dimensions would be united in the state. He tried to convince the orthodoxy that Zionism was a means of divine redemption as well he convinced to Zionism that nationalism alone would not satisfy the longing of the Jews people for a long period. Eretz Israel is an essential requirement for the Jewish people’s divine project because the genuine Jews life could not prosper outside the Israel. Israel is a precondition for the complete Jewish sanctity and the divinely enacted conquest of Israel would not be possible without the acquisition of land.

To accommodate the religious and secular sects, Rav Kook presented a vision of Degel Yerushalayim. It was a national-religious Jews movement that aim was to unite all the factions of the religious community. This movement worked alongside the Zionist movement and helped in the process of Shivat Tzion, the return to Zion. Like other religious leader of his time he was very much aware of the dangers threatening the Zionist movement. Therefore he predicted that ‘historical process would be led by secular Zionism only up to point, beyond which Zionism was doomed to failure’. He analyzed that the real objectives of Shivat Tzion would not be achieved only by secular Zionist movement however Zionist movement would play an important and long-lasting role in the process.

Rav Kook also worked for the unifications of religious community. Two major religious political bodies existed at that time: Religious Zionist Mizrachi movement and Agudat Yisrael. He was very much optimistic that both bodies would join the Degel Yerushalayim as part of the religious community as a whole. As far as the chareidi community was concerned Rav Kook failed to communicate his sense of redemption. In the same manner, he believed that Mizrachi would not be very effective on the Zionist leadership. He reached the conclusion that only unifying religious force could change the national enterprise in Eretz Yisrael and capture the
Zionist movement. This unification of religious bodies was propagated by Rabbi Maimon as potentially divisive.\textsuperscript{12}

Rabbi Kook was not succeed during his lifetime but his writings and Merkaz HaRav accorded him glory after his death and he became hero even in 1970s Gush Emunim declared him as their forefather and carried out his legacy. Rabbi Zvi Yehuda leader of this movement and son of Rabbi Kook compiled the writings of Kook and one of such compilations, \textit{Orot} was considered as ‘red book’ of the Gush Emunim cadres. His thought and field work left indelible mark on his contemporaries. His teachings attracted seekers of religious and spiritual perfection and provide a source of inspiration for public and political activities. His influence in the educational system of Israel is also realized. Despite these facts we find that Zionism also faced opposition from the religious circle. Agudat Israel, formed in 1912 to follow and adhere to religious laws strictly, opposed the Zionism because of its hijacking the divine initiative of state building. Its opposition is so severe that with the exception of the first cabinet, it has never accepted cabinet office because if they do so, it would be necessary to take an oath of office to a secular state.\textsuperscript{13}

After the detailed analysis it became evident that although some group from the Jewish community in their beginning opposed the Zionist vision but later they became strongest supporter of Zionism whether it may Reform Judaism or cultural Zionism or Religious Zionism. Although the tenets of Zionism are totally different from the rabbinical eschatology but majority of the religious Jews regard it as a divine origin and as an agent of God. In this transformation Rabbi Kook played a significant role. After him his son declared the Jewish Nationalism only sacred. Through this way amalgam of Orthodoxy and Messianic nationalism came on the world’s screen. But this made possible only after the establishment of Israel. Son of Rabbi Kook also known as younger Kook presented the Israeli Army as sacred and soldiers are considered as righteous as Torah Scholars and weapon as prayer shawl and phylacteries. Despite the opposition of Neturei Karta and Satmar Hasidim, in religious establishment the Israel is accorded Messianic and redemptive significance. The religious support to Zionism has reached on this point that Jonathan Sacks, Chief


\textsuperscript{13} Michael Prior, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 67-69.
Rabbi of Britain said that state of Israel is ‘the most powerful collective expression of Jewry and the most significant development in Jewish life since the Holocaust.’

3.2 Theodor Herzl: The Founder of Political Zionism

Theodor Herzl-journalist, doctor of Jurisprudence and Jewish social and political activist- was the main ideologue of political Zionism. He was born in Budapest in assimilated Jewish family. From his childhood he was very much interested in literature and had started to write critical essays since his student hood. In 1878 his family migrated to Vienna where Herzl began to study at the Law Department of Vienna University. In 1884 he received his Doctorate of Jurisprudence and started to work in the court. From 1885, because of his interest in literature he completely devoted himself to the literature and wrote a number of articles, plays and philosophical stories. In 1889 he married Julie Naschauer but their married life was unhappy and this unhappiness increased when Herzl started to spend more time in his political activities in which she took little interest.

3.2.1 Herzl and Jewish Question

Herzl was not so much interested in Jewish question during his university days. The book About the Jewish Question written by During affected him to some extent. In Vienna he suggested that mass Jews conversion to Catholicism would be a solution to the Jews problem. It did not mean that he was interested in Christianity rather he wanted to find out the solution of ghetto. When he arrived in Paris in 1891 he found the same anti-Jewish feelings as were in Austria. The situation, in which Jews were living, was grim and it was more difficult to live and bear in the Western Europe. Herzl had worked as the Paris correspondent in Viennese Newspaper, Neue Freie Presse and had seen anti-Jewish expressions for covering French Parliamentary life. Until that time he had regarded assimilation as a solution to anti-Jewish feeling and advised that Jews should abandon their distinctive way. But when the Dreyfus affair of 1894 occurred in which Alfred Dreyfus, a Jews in French Army, was charged with crime of spying for Germany, Herzl realized that only solution to Jewish question was the creation of a Jewish state. It is generally held that public degradation of Alfred
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Dreyfus proved for Herzl that assimilation of Jews in European society was impossible. He gave his concern in an article for the *North American Review* that Dreyfus affair made him into Zionist.\(^{16}\)

Herzl convened a meeting with Maurice de Hirsch, one of the richest Jews of his era, in May, 1985 but de Hirsch responded in dissent manner and their meeting ended in mutual shouting. After that meeting he started transcribing his thoughts in a notebook. The first chapter of that notebook was specially titled “An Address to the Rothschilds” which later emerged as *Der Judenstaat or The Jewish State*. It was published in Vienna on February 1896 and soon within a year it was translated into Hebrew, English, French, Russian and Romanian languages. Around the time of publishing *The Jewish State* his article published in a London weekly, *The Jewish Chronicle*. In this article he expressed his concern on the Jewish Question as follows:

“The Jewish Question still exists. It would be foolish to deny it. It exists wherever Jewish live in perceptible numbers. Where it does not yet exist, it will be brought by Jews in the course of their migration. We naturally move to those places where we are not persecuted and there our presence soon produces persecution. This is true in every country and will remain true even in those most highly civilized-France itself is not exception-till the Jewish question finds a solution on a political basis”\(^{17}\)

In his book, Herzl argued that the Jewish Question should be resolved not merely by solving the diaspora problem because it would increase assimilation rather the Jewish Question would be solved by creating an independent Jewish State. He claimed that it would be created by concerting the great powers of the world. These powers would recognize their right to settlement and would transpire organized mass exodus of Jews from Europe to the Jewish State. He also suggested that Jews should especially rely on the countries which plagued by anti-Semitism. In Herzl’s view, in order to create such a state it was essential to form two organs-one was the Society of the Jews and the other was the Jewish company. The first would be officially representative body of Jews people and the other would serve as a joint stock company and would supervise finances.

---

\(^{16}\) David Ben-Gurion, Theodor Herzl: Austrian Zionist Leader, Encyclopedia Britannica, retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/biography/Theodor-Herzl. NA

As far as territory of the Jews State is concerned, Herzl was in favor of the British sponsored Jewish colonization of Argentina or Palestine but intention behind the colonization was the creation of a sovereign Jewish national state. On July 1, 1898 he wrote in his diary: “we can perhaps ask England for Cyprus; we may even consider South Africa or America until the day of Turkey’s dissolution.” About Palestine as a Jewish state he has mixed feelings. He proposed and presented different site of Argentina, the Sinai Peninsula, and Cyprus as the site of Jewish state but he soon realized that it would be difficult to attract the Jewish people except Palestine. He said, ‘Palestine is our ever-memorable historic home. The very name Palestine would attract our people with a force of marvelous potency’. That’s why after the next few years he remained fully committed to Palestine. About the nature of the state of Israel he asserted that Jews would not be a theocratic state rather: ‘We shall keep our priests within the confines of their temple in the same way as we keep our professional army within the confines of their barracks.’

### 3.2.2 Basle Congress: The Foundation of the Jewish State

Herzl started to work on the project which he depicted in his pamphlet, Der Judenstaat. First of all he convened a congress in Basle in August, 1897. Before Basle the congress was going to be held in Munich but due to the strong opposition by German Union of Rabbis the venue of the congress had to be transferred in Basle. A letter was issued by Executive Committee of the Association of German Rabbis in which the efforts of Zionism was declared contradictory to the messianic promises of Judaism. In the opening session of Basle congress Herzl sketched the purpose of Congress: ‘We are here to lay the foundation stone of the house which is to shelter the Jewish nation.’ As it was suggested that Jews should rely on anti-Semitic countries to achieve their goal, he noted in conclusion and thanked to these countries which made possible the gathering of dispersed Jews. “Anti-Semitism has given us our strength again. We have returned home….Zionism is the return of the Jews to Judaism even before their return to the Jewish land.”

---

Herzl proposed some program included (1) to organize a Jewish colony in Palestine (2) acquisition of legal right to colonize Palestine (3) to form an organization to unite all the Jews of the world for the cause of Zionism. Three basic problems, political Zionism had to face before the creation of state of Israel. (1) Sufficient numbers of Jews to make easy the formation of a de facto state (2) to get support from the Gentile nation (3) to prepare the world Jewry to the cause of Zionism. It is essential to discuss in detail how political Zionism faced these problems and tried to solve them.

3.2.3 Herzl: President of the World Zionist Organization (WZO)

After the Basle congress the World Zionist Organization came into existence and Herzl was declared president of it. The organization started to work as a government structure. An Action Committee was formed to pressurize as well an Inner Action Committee for permanent leadership to guide policy. Thus, in Basle the aim and policies of political Zionism were determined and a governmental structure was brought into existence to reach the target through implementation of policies. The proposed organ of “Society of Jews” was formed in the form of the Zionist organization. For the other remaining plan “Jewish Company” Herzl was ready to establish a bank entitled the Jewish Colonial Trust. In starting, his intention was to establish the bank in London with a share capital of two million pound. At first very few Jews were interested to contribute but it was soon realized that more funds would be necessary in the years ahead.

To get support from the gentile nation, first of all Herzl moved to Germany. He explained to the Grand Duke of Baden that the leaders of this movement were German speaking Jews, the language of their Congress was German, and Zionism would also introduce German culture. At that time they need a protectorate and he thought that German would suit them best. Other reason of getting support from Germany was that Germany had a good relationship with the Ottoman Empire and according to him, Kaiser Wilhelm II must use its power to be disposed a charter Of Zionist settlement in Palestine from Ottoman Empire. In September 1898, he met with Prince Bernhard von Bulow by the efforts of the German Ambassador in Vienna,
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21 Howard M. Sachar, op., cit., p.46.
Count Philip Eulenburg but this meeting proved unsuccessful because Bulow did not take interest in Idea.

On October 18, Eulenburg unexpectedly convened a meeting between Herzl and Kaiser Wilhelm during Wilhelm visit to Constantinople. The Ottoman Empire was unaware of that meeting took place at Yildiz Kiosk where both Kaiser and His Foreign minister were resided. Herzl unveiled his plan for a charter of Jewish settlement in Palestine and also stressed on the opening of a land development company under German protection functioned by Zionist in Palestine. Kaiser responded warmly to this plan and intimated that “write your address and give it to von Bulow” and promised that he would put their plan before the sultan.

The second meeting of Herzl with Wilhelm was convened in a tent outside Jerusalem. Herzl read an address to which they had prepared during journey to Palestine. The second meeting of Herzl with Wilhelm was quite different with the first meeting. This time the document was not referred to a charter but merely it was confined to a land company under German protection. The reaction was also not the same. Only after few amenities the meeting was terminated. It had proved that now Kaiser rejected this Idea and in Herzl’s View Bulow the foreign minister was the obstacle. Herzl rushed to Eulenburg and the Grand Duke of Baden but all were in vain.

Herzl returned from Jerusalem assuming himself as a visionary but faker. This was a difficult period he was passing through. He decided to concentrate his attention on sultan. He sent Nevlinski to Constantinople to arrange meeting with royal family. Nevlinski died after three days. At the same period third Zionist congress was convened and in that meeting he reminded that immediate aim of Zionist organization to acquire a charter of settlement in Palestine had not changed. In 1900 Herzl found a potential intermediary in the form of seventy year old Arminius Vambery. He had special relations with Ottoman royal family and he had been a language teacher of Princess Fatima, Abdul Hamid’s sister.22

On May 7, 1901, Herzl received a telegraph from Vambery in which he invited to come at once. Herzl accompanied by Wolffsohn and Oskar Marmorek, reached Constantinople after three days. On May 17 he was received by Abdul Hamid and he

responded by his favorite analogy of Androcles and lion. “His majesty is the lion, perhaps I am Androcles and perhaps there is thorn which I could withdraw.” He considered the Ottoman foreign debt, estimated at a nominal 85 million pounds as a thorn in its side. He went on saying that if this thorn could be removed then Turkey would be able to gather fresh strength. He indicated that Jews associates might collect funds in return of granting Jews a charter for land Settlement Company in Palestine. Lots of conditions were designed by sultan’s advisor: Jews would be permitted to settle in Turkey but would have to become Turkish citizens; there would be only scattered settlements. These conditions were unacceptable for Herzl but he was confident that if would succeed to relieve the sultan of debt consequently he would receive his charter.

Herzl again visited to Constantinople in February and July 1902 but the conditions were same. Jews would have to become ottoman subjects after immigration and they would be allowed to settle throughout the empire but not in Palestine. He indicated that Jews would not be dangerous and troublesome rather they would be industrious, loyal and bound to Muslims. Sultan Abdul Hamid II correctly predicted that only after the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire could the Jews have Palestine.23 Herzl in that condition could not wait more. The Zionist focused their activities in two directions. One was towards demolition of Ottoman Empire and other was to get colony near Palestine. He had already been established contact with Britain for a Jews colony in Africa. That’s why he returned empty-handed from Turkey and concentrated his efforts on London.24

After the failure of his negotiation with Ottoman Empire, Herzl shifted his diplomatic activities to London. A Royal commission was appointed to investigate the growing threat of cheap labor posed by mass Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe into London’s East End. A London based journalist and famous British Zionist Leopold Greenberg offered Herzl’s name for the Commission to testify as Jewish expert. The invitation provided the best opportunity for Herzl to propagate his plan in British capital. On July 7, 1902 he appeared before the parliamentary body and described the miserable conditions of east European Jewry. He was very much optimistic that

Britain would help and would provide asylum for fugitives. He warned that “if you find that they are not wanted here, then some place must be found to which they can migrate without raising the problems that confront them here. These problems will not arise if a home be found them which will be legally recognized as Jewish.”

Through this simple way he advertised his plan.

Before appearing to royal commission Herzl had met with Rothschild who was himself a member of the commission. He put his plan of the Sinai Peninsula or of Cyprus for Jewish settlement before him. Unlike the first meeting, Rothschild did not object. After the third Zionist congress Herzl thought that Cyprus plan might be feasible alternative to be presented before the British government until Turkey was so ready to give Palestinian land for them because the condition of Rumanian Jewry was becoming worse. In October 1902, Herzl managed to meet with Joseph Chamberlain, the British colonial secretary famous for using peoples for the machinery of British imperialism. The period of the meeting was very suitable because public opinion in Britain felt that the solution should be searched to be barred Eastern European Jewry from England. Herzl outlined his plan before the Chamberlain for the colonization either of Cyprus or of al-Arish. Cyprus was ruled out immediately by chamberlain but was offered Egypt itself. Herzl retorted smiling, “we will not go to Egypt-we have been there.” He was ready to talk on al-Arish plan because of some reasons: al-Arish was not integral part of Egypt; there was a possibility of wide-scale cultivation; and most important it would attract the Zionist as the site of Mount Sinai. Next day chamberlain set up a meeting between Herzl and Lansdowne, the foreign secretary. Lansdowne suggested that Herzl should directly negotiate the matter with Cromer, viceroy of Egypt and also asked for a written memorandum for the cabinet. After preparing memorandum he sent Leopold Greenberg to Cairo. He started negotiation with Cromer and the Egyptian Prime Minister Boutros Ghali. Herzl himself went to Egypt in March of 1903 and presented the interim report of Kessler’s technical commission in which al-Arish was declared suitable for Europeans and for farming of tobacco and cotton. It was also mentioned that although irrigation from Nile expensive but not impossible. But Egyptian government rejected the plan on the basis of irrigation expert’s report that five times water would be needed from Nile and the
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diversion of so much water was considered impossible. Four days after he wrote in his diary that he was much confident about the Sinai plan but the matter shattered.

After failure of al-Arish project, Herzl feared that due to lack of motivation the movement would collapse. His private property had been spent on traveling, baksheesh and subsidies and he was also suffered from cardiac disease. He had rejected the proposal of Uganda, offered by chamberlain after visiting Africa, by saying that the Jews settlement would have to be near Palestine. In this crucial period of declining morale, he pursued two important works. One was dashing off the novel, *Altneuland* and other was visiting St Petersburg to speed up Jews emigration from Russia. In Russia he talked to Plehve, minister of interior in the Czar’s Government. He was the main conspirator of Kishinev pogrom that has taken place only a few months earlier in which about fifty Jews were massacred, many wounded and women were raped. Although the meeting with Plehve aroused misgivings and bitter criticism yet to secure a letter from Plehve was a great achievement of Herzl. He admitted that he was ready to get rid of as many Jews as possible. In fact, it seemed that he would become a sympathetic supporter of Zionism. Then Herzl proposed him to write a letter “that he would present before the Zionist congress to the effect that the Zionist movement could count on the Russian government’s morale and material assistance.” After getting this letter, he carried it everywhere and even showed it to the Pope.

In the sixth Zionist congress Herzl reported to the Action Committee about his meeting in St Petersburg. Next day he informed about the message received by Greenberg from Clement Hill, chief of the protectorate Department in the Colonial Office. In that letter it was assured by Britain that its government was ‘interested in any well considered scheme aimed at the amelioration of the position of the Jewish race’. British government proposed that a Zionist commission should visit to East Africa to ascertain personally whether there were any suitable vacant lands or not. If yes, that land would be suitable for a Jewish colony where members would be able to perform their customs. At first the response of the message was a storm of applause but when some factions withdrew to consider it there was much opposition. Herzl in his opening speech said that Uganda was not and could never become Zion but an emergency measure to prevent the Jews scattering in different parts of the world. The proposal was rejected on the basis that East Africa would be unsuitable for mass immigration and delegates especially from Kishinev were unwilling to go anywhere.
except Palestine. There was a storm of the shouting, singing Russian songs, climbing on chairs and throwing of leaflets into the hall. Lights had been turned off but still there was a tremendous noise. It was decided to send the study commission in Africa but it was clear that they would not go East Africa. Herzl was portrayed as traitor before himself and an unsuccessful attempt was made to kill Nordau. There was a possibility of splitting the movement but Herzl in his closing speech said that hope for Palestine was still alive. Uplifting his right hand he said: “If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, may my right hand wither.”

Herzl was very much depressed after seeing the disagreement during sixth Zionist congress. After leaving the congress, he communicated his closest friend that he would say in seventh congress if Palestine not obtained: ‘It was not possible. The ultimate goal has not been reached and cannot be reached within a foreseeable time.’ Although his health declined during 1903 yet he continued his diplomatic mission. In Rome he convened meetings with two personalities—one was Victor Emanuel III and other was Pius X, the new pope. From both the persons he received different responses. Victor responded that in Palestine there were an already largely Jewish people and one day it would belong to the Jews. On the contrary pope was unwilling to favor the movement yet he said: ‘we cannot prevent the Jews from going to Jerusalem, but we could never sanction It.’ it was his last diplomatic mission. His condition rapidly deteriorated and after a heart attack he died on the afternoon of July 3, 1904 at the age of forty-four.

3.2.3.1 Controversies within the Ideas of Herzl

It is commonly held view that Herzl had two personalities. One that was secret but find in his Diaries and other was the public personality which was depicted in his Altneuland. In his Diaries Herzl portrayed himself as a political manipulator who believed in secrecy, clandestine activities and military force to counter the resistance of local Arab inhabitants. But Altneuland, published in 1902, has a different approach. In the novel Herzl portrayed how it would come into existence. In the novel it was portrayed that in Europe a disillusioned Gentile, Kingscourt, try to convince an equally disillusioned Jewish sophisticate, Loewenberg that the Jews hold the key to
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the future and they could create an experimental country which would serve as an example of humanistic value. Yet Herzl himself leaned to a less metaphysical doctrine of nationalism.

Other Inappropriateness we found in the *Altneuland* is in the type of character. He portrayed David Litvak, a Jew of humble origin as the hero of the Jewish renaissance. But there are lot of differences between the character of David Litvak and Herzl. Mrs. Van Der Hoeven Leonhard, the Dutch Orientalist interpreted that the novel was written not for the Zionist but for the world. Through this novel Herzl wanted to get support of non-Jewish for the cause of Zionism. Herzl’s novel demonstrates that his approach to Zionism was cosmopolitan and he was in favor of political separation as a means of transforming Jewish character and he believe in formation of a Jewish majority in one sovereign territory. But practically he suggested a program of cultural assimilation for Jewish renaissance. His New Society, depicted in Altneuland would be dedicated to science, without an army and would be devoid of racial and religious prejudice. For the Arabs the basic creed was “old quarrels had been resolved into new harmonies” but what happened with Arabs in that society everybody knows. Taylor rightly said, “The argument of Altneuland thus reflects the ambivalent inclinations and complicated psychology of Herzl, who was at the same time a liberal idealist and a pragmatist politician, a champion of Jewish well-being and protagonist of Western Gentile culture.”

3.2.3.2 Opposition to Herzl

As the proposed plan of Herzl came into being opposition views started to meet. Chief Rabbi Moritz Gudemann of Vienna opposed his proposal saying that Jews were not a nation and Zionism was contrary to the Judaism. Rabbis also opposed Zionism denouncing that Zionism works as fanaticism and incompatible to the Jewish scripture. They presented their loyalty to Germany. Munich Jews refused to host the first Zionist congress on 6 March 1897. Moreover German Rabbinical council denounced the efforts of the Zionist to establish a Jews state as incompatible to Holy writ. In England Chief Rabbi Herman Adler pronounced that Zionism was a radically divert movement from the Judaism. He regarded the first Zionist Congress as an

‘egregious blunder’ and an ‘absolutely mischievous project’. Assimilated Jews were also in a kind of a panic and they regarded Zionism as main accused of anti-Semitism because Zionism separate them fully from the people among whom they lived. Jews Labor Bund also opposed the Zionism considering that Zionism would end leaving the Jews in distress and hopelessness. They were confident that turkey would not give the Palestinian land to the Jews and if it happens the Jews would not ready to go there in meaningful number. The movement also faced criticism from Jewish socialists. They believed that Zionist movement was quite contrary to the class interest of the working Jewish masses and the movement was a criminal movement that had collaborated with the ruling class and their aim was only to run counter to historical developments. 29

An open rebellion had started against the Herzl during his last months. Ussishkin, the most aggressive leader of the Russian Zionist published a letter after returning from Palestine and stressed that he did not consider Uganda resolution. The Russian Zionist organized a conference in Kharkov and passed a resolution in which it was mentioned that Herzl ignored the Basle program. A three member committee was also appointed to meet Herzl to demand that he would not use autocratic methods and submit all progress report to Action committee. He was also bound not to ask congress for supporting any territorial projects other than Palestine and Syria. The demand was considered as an attempt to over throw the leader and this caused much resentment within Zionist Movement. At the meeting of Action committee in April 1904 a successful effort was made for reconciliation. Herzl promised neither to go Uganda nor to exert any pressure in favor of East Africa. 30

3.2.3.3 Herzl’s contribution to Zionism

Although political Zionism did not gain much before First World War yet Herzl’s contribution to Zionism cannot be overlooked. He brought out the Zionist movement from the emotions and philanthropic relief and the movement became primary agenda of prime ministers and princes due to his personal efforts, his untiring activity and his own funds to pay for world Zionist Organization’s activities. He put Zionism on the
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world map. By creating World Zionist Organization and serving eight years as president of it he gave the Jewish people an address. Herzl’s plan that there should be a political approach to Jewish affair was rejected in the beginning even by his closest friends. Many were on the view that his diplomatic efforts would not yield fruitful results. Indeed Herzl returned empty handed from Germany, Turkey and other statesman yet the seed planted by him, began to grow even during his life. Following Herzl’s death leaders of the Zionist organization Chaim Weizmann and Nahum Sokolow stepped up diplomatic work of Herzl which he started in London and Paris. Even leaders of Young Russian Chovevei Zion learned international diplomacy from Herzl without which Zionism would have not been achieved its goal.

Herzl had established the Zionist movement almost single handed. He had a great ambition to achieve fame as a writer and dramatist, yet he devoted his whole life to solve the Jewish problem. He was considered as new Moses who would lead them out of the slavery and ghetto to the Promised Land. Herzl transformed a mood into political movement. Because of his activism a great uplift was given to the self-confidence of Jews residing in Eastern Europe as well Jews living in Western Europe. He laid the foundation for further activities of the Zionist movement. That’s why he was considered the architect of the Balfour Declaration.31

3.2.3.4 After Herzl’s Death

After Herzl’s death the Zionism divided into two groups. One was supporter of Herzl’s view that the Jews question should immediately be solved whether in Palestine or anywhere else. This group became famous as the ‘political’. The other faction powerfully supported the concept of cultural revivalism depicted by Choveve Zion societies and rejected any plan for the Jewish home or nation other than Palestine. They were titled as the ‘practical’. Finally the practical overpowered the political and they succeeded in demonstration of great strength and a resolution was passed in which it was declared the Zionism’s sole concern would be Palestine.

After deep analysis of these two factions which arose within political Zionism when the British Government offered to Uganda to Zionism, we find that both groups are adherents of political Zionism. It was being discussed above that whether it may
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Reformists, Religionists or Culturists in their inception were in opposition of Political Zionism but ultimately they worked for the Zionist project. The same thing happened with Practical and political factions that emerged after Herzl’s death. Both groups were working for the Zionist Project and they formed one platform. Only difference was that one highlighted legalization and other emphasized colonization of Palestine.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{32} Taylor, op.cit., pp.3-6.