

ABSTRACTS

Jabotinsky's Place in the National Pantheon

Israel Kolatt

This paper claims that Jabotinsky's career should be evaluated not only in terms of his fifteen years of revisionist activity but also in terms of his twenty 'visionist' years within the Zionist movement. The paper also traces the course of Ze'ev Jabotinsky's political career in the context of his personal life and cultural background, and raises questions concerning his role in the Zionist leadership.

Although he was a gifted orator, a writer of some genius and a magnetic personality, Jabotinsky failed to rise to a leading position in the Zionist Organization, and subsequently headed the breakaway party that came to oppose it. The question is why, in spite of this historical rift, Jabotinsky went on to retain his undeniable place in the Zionist pantheon? His activities and his chequered career in the Zionist Organization may be better understood *vis-à-vis* the dissonance between his personal idiosyncrasies and the movement whose leader and mentor he became. The activist in search of a movement encountered a potential movement in search of a leader.

Jabotinsky's radicalism and the wish to conduct an independent policy moved him towards such extreme positions that he missed the opportunity to become a leading figure in the Zionist Executive even when Weizmann fell from power in 1931. By leading his party out of the Zionist Organization he brought about a split in his own movement and became a captive of the extreme anti-liberal wing of his adherents. His New Zionist Organization failed to take off and his independent policies did not produce results. The admired leader whose movement had developed a kind of hero worship was criticized by the younger generation of his followers.

The dualism in this idiosyncratic and much admired personality, taken together with the logic of his movement and its circumstances, may help elucidate many of the discrepancies in Jabotinsky's image and heritage. On the one hand he is depicted as a liberal, on the other, as a radical nationalist.

ABSTRACTS

Jabotinsky's place in national memory is assured because he saw Zionism as an epic adventure in the course of the Jewish revival where tragedy lurked in the discrepancy between the fate of European Jewry and the slow advance of a National Home. Jabotinsky gave expression to that tension in Zionism between the wish for 'normalization' and the yearning for a new life of glory. His ideas of statehood and international justice beyond power politics remain his legacy, a legacy that carried over into the Zionist Movement as a whole.

Jabotinsky as Statesman and Leader of His People

Benzion Netanyahu

Excepting his negotiations with British leaders during his campaign for the creation of the Legion, Jabotinsky's independent political activity took place in the four years of his presidency of the National Zionist Organization (from September 1936 to June 1940). His main achievements in this period were:

1. The final organization and solidification of the National Military Organization (*Etzel*) of which he was the commander in chief.
2. The replacement of the self-restraint policy (*Havлага*) by penal reactions to Arab attacks upon the Jews, which minimized anti-Jewish assaults.
3. The opposition expressed in the British Parliament (in 1936) to the creation of a Palestine Legislative Council (proposed by the Colonial Office) – an opposition largely inspired by Jabotinsky who discussed the plan with many parliamentarians. Consequently, the proposal was withdrawn.
4. The influence he exerted (in 1937) upon many members of Parliament (including Winston Churchill), to refuse authorization of the Peel Commission recommendation to divide Palestine into two states, Arab and Jewish.
5. The launching (in 1937) of a campaign for 'illegal' Jewish immigration, which was conducted by the NZO for several years and brought into Palestine more than 15,000 Jews. This activity induced private Jewish groups and ultimately also the Jewish Agency to follow in the footsteps of the NZO.
6. The partial implementation of his plan to convene leading representatives of member states of the League of Nations that would urge the League firmly to oppose the anti-Zionist policy of Britain. In 2.5 years of intensive activity, Jabotinsky enlisted support for his plan on the part of seven European states.

Jabotinsky and Jabotinskyism

Zeev Tzahor

At the peak of his endeavors as a leader, Jabotinsky held four roles that he carried out simultaneously. He headed *Betar*, was the president of the Revisionist party, president of the New Zionist Histadrut and commander of the *Irgun Zvai Leumi (Etzel)*. The decisions he made while performing these four roles were not always compatible with each other, nor, inevitably, were they in accord with his ideological beliefs. They stemmed from rapidly-changing needs in a constantly turbulent period.

Jabotinsky presented himself and his movement as offering alternatives to Zionism's leaders and its way. Within his own movement, the admiration directed at him bordered on a personality cult, while the hostility levelled at him by his opponents came close to demonization.

Despite the wide-ranging changes that have swept through Jewish nationalism from the 1920s and 1930s onward, to this day the Zionist Movement remains divided along these ideological demarcation lines. Thus, both admiration and hostility towards Jabotinsky has seeped into Zionist historiography, and each political movement has its own Jabotinsky.

The article re-explores Jabotinsky's personal and political decisions at the principal junctions of his life, contrasting them with the way they have been shaped in the various strata of Zionism's historiography. Parameters are thus proposed for distinguishing between Jabotinsky's fluctuating positions, which reflected short-term needs, and the underlying trajectory that he never abandoned.

Jabotinsky's Constitutional Guidelines for Israel

Arye Naor

This article reconstructs the constitutional elements in Jabotinsky's thought, through an analysis of his writings – books, newspaper articles, public speeches and poems. Devoted to liberalism, human equality and civil freedoms, Jabotinsky drafted the principles of government in the future Jewish State he foresaw. The paper shows that one of the major sources of thinking, by this opponent of Zionist Socialism, was Austrian Marxism. From this Jabotinsky took the principle of ethnic minority

ABSTRACTS

autonomy as one of the foundations for resolving the national dispute between Jews and Arabs over the historic Land of Israel on the one hand, and the principle of social rights on the other hand. According to this concept, the state is obliged to satisfy the basic human needs: the supply of food, housing, clothing, education and health services. Everyone has a right to have his or her basic needs met by the state. Jabotinsky drafted a constitution based on the distribution of power between the ethnic groups within the state. He opposed a legal definition of the State as Jewish. National character could be determined only by demography. Maintaining a Jewish majority was a must for him, and the Arab minority should enjoy both national autonomy and participation in the government: whenever the premier would be Jewish his deputy would be Arab, and vice versa. Namely, in the Jewish State, according to Jabotinsky, the prime minister could be an Arab citizen. Hebrew and Arabic should be the official languages with the same privileges. All other civil rights must be guaranteed, including the allocation of land. The basic principle was human dignity and human equality. Jabotinsky went on to draft even the guidelines to resolve Jerusalem's political status: Jerusalem will be the capital of the Jewish State. However, the holy sites should be extra-territorial and governed by a council, to be established in agreement between the relevant religious authorities.

An Anatomy of Jabotinsky's Critique of Socialism Part I: Critique of the Fundamental Principles of Socialism*

Reuvan Shoshani

This article contains the first part of an effort to give a comprehensive and systematic presentation of the total approach of Zeev Jabotinsky (1880-1940) to Socialism, in theory and in practice. The attitude of the individual who was known as the '*wunderkind*' of Russian Zionism towards Socialism underwent developments and changes. As a young man he hesitated and revealed ambivalence. However, during the course of his life, and particularly from the first decade of the twentieth century onwards, he gradually developed a clear anti-Socialist position which gained momentum, depth and both theoretical and political discernment. The second half of the 'twenties witnessed its fully developed expression.

At the center of this discussion is the variety of Jabotinsky's criticism of the fundamental principles of Socialism. The Socialist doctrine was worthless, first of

all, because its overriding goal, explicit and declared – the abolition of private property (and consequently all of the social conventions that enable its function) – did not suit human nature stamped by definition with a possessive character. The epistemological point of departure upon which the central trend of Socialism (normative Marxism) relied on was also absurd, leading to undermine the historiosophical validity of the principle of class-warfare. That principle suffers from a materialistic-mechanistic-deterministic orientation, while the right relation between the spiritual and materialistic worlds derives from an opposite pattern: The structures and contents of the human consciousness are defined and distinguished in the pattern of a certain “national psyche”, giving meaning to the material world, leaving its fingerprints on it and determining how it develops. Moreover, Socialism should also be rejected because at the heart of the opposition to the Capitalistic system, built into its fulfillment is a process that leads to the degeneration and fossilization of the society (= the nation). Finally, Socialism should be opposed because by virtue of its very (universal) essence it seeks to undermine the organic adherence and unity of the nation, and also to persistently implant in it, confusion, ambiguity, duplicity and loss of direction.

Therefore, in a word, Socialism, according to Jabotinsky, is unworkable, unscientific and at the same time undesirable.

* Part II was published in *Iyunim Bitkumat Israel*, vol.12.

Race, Nation and Judaism in M. Buber's and V. Jabotinsky's Thought: A Comparative Study

Shalom Ratzabi

This paper deals with the substructure of Vladimir Jabotinsky's Revisionist Zionism and Martin Buber's theopolitical Zionism regarding the Jewish Arab conflict and Jewish nationality. Accordingly, on the one hand, the paper traces the political sources of Jabotinsky and Buber in the political culture of the *fin de siecle* and on the other hand, in their relation to Judaism as culture and religion. In doing this, special heed is paid to find the status and meaning of concepts such as nation, race and Judaism in their national thought.

The conclusions of this research are that though there are some affinities in Buber's and Jabotinsky's understanding regarding the nation's essence, and

ABSTRACTS

principally in their attitude to organic development theories, there exists an enormous gap between their entire worldviews. The paper argues that the focus of the differences that had risen between them was in their attitudes to religion in general and to Judaism as a religion in particular. Besides this, there are other elements, such as the relation between morals and politics, and between the people and their culture. This variance widened the gap between the two thinkers' political attitudes towards the Jewish-Arab conflict, as well as how each of them regarded Zionism and its aims and meaning.

Between Nationalism and Religion: The Transformation of Jabotinsky's Attitude toward the Religious Tradition

Eliezer Don-Yehiya

Jabotinsky's attitude toward the Jewish religion underwent major changes. During the first period of his Zionist activity, he perceived traditional religion as a kind of substitute for the 'natural' bases of national existence – such as territory, language and political sovereignty. Religion, he argued, is necessary under conditions of Exile but is superfluous, even damaging, for an awakening nation returning to its historic homeland.

In a later period, Jabotinsky's view of religion gradually changed. This change culminated in 1935 in the first congress of his 'New Zionist Organization', where he initiated a resolution that was defined as one of the movement's central goals: "The inculcating of the holy treasures of the *Torah* in the nation of Israel".

Contrary to the claims of certain writers, the change in Jabotinsky's position was not motivated by 'opportunistic' considerations related to his desire to gain the support of religious circles, but reflected his new perception of religion as an expression of national spirit and culture, which constitutes an integral part of national existence.

Ze'ev Jabotinsky's Contribution to Modern Hebrew Poetry

Dan Miron

The publication of Jabotinsky's collection of translations in 1924 was an event of utmost historical relevance in the history of Modern Hebrew poetry. The influence of these translations was greatly enhanced in the 1920s until finally in the 1930s and 1940s they facilitated in determining the poetic form of modernist Hebrew poetry. Though Jabotinsky only pointed out the way, the historic relevance of his breakthrough is immeasurable. In his course followed most of the major Hebrew poets amongst whom one can mention A. Shlonsky, N. Alterman, L. Goldberg and Y. Ratosh. They bequeathed the Jabotinsky formula to some of the most prominent poets of the next generation – H. Guri, B. Galai and A. Amir.

Jabotinsky's translations reflected a poetic position that was in total contrast to that of Uri Zvi Greenberg. Jabotinsky offered a musically lyrical poetry and artistic virtuosity. He advocated a poetry that was completely devoid of any public motive. His central message was that the new Jewish society was also in need of an artistic performance for its own sake, that it required a sentiment that did not call for action but rather evoked a pure aesthetic pleasure that was not harnessed to any dictate, mission and vision. Uri Zvi Greenberg's model was one of a poetry that was anti-musical and un-formalistic. A poetry that abolished the barrier between the lyrical and the discursive, and therefore also between the poetic and the political, and prescribed the merging of the personal expression with that of the collective one.

The article explains the dimensions as well as the significance of Jabotinsky's contribution to the development of the new Hebrew poetry. He had considerable influence on the decision that the 'Sephardic' Hebrew poetry would become dominant and would be written in the tonic-syllabic metric and not in free verse. According to Jabotinsky, poetry means elegance, dignity, polish and sublimation. Therefore, it is prohibited from reconstructing expressions that are close to the spoken language. Jabotinsky had reservations regarding the norms of opaqueness and strangeness. Even from this aspect the patterns he set became the high road of modernist Hebrew poetry. Thus he impelled Hebrew poetry to base itself on a colorful and carefully designed secular poetics, eloquent but devoid of references to traditional sources.

The article also discusses another aspect of Jabotinsky's contribution to Hebrew poetry – the eight hymns and political songs. In these poems the genre of the public

ABSTRACTS

hymn achieved its first 'classic' complete modern crystallization. Thus they may also be regarded as enduring assets of the Hebrew language.

The Poetry of the Leader and the Leadership of Poetry: Uri Zvi Greenberg and Ze'ev Jabotinsky

Hannan Hever

The focus of the relationship between Uri Zvi Greenberg and Ze'ev Jabotinsky centered by and large on the politics of Zionist literature and culture. As early as the 1930s, Greenberg, a member of the Revisionist movement under the leadership of Jabotinsky though part of the radical activist faction, proposed opposing ideas, at times radically so, to those preached by Jabotinsky. The two personalities positioned themselves in a dichotomous polarity already at the time of the debate over the *Havlagah*, (restraint), and disagreed on the kind of personality and position that the leader in the Revisionist movement should have. In their poetry, this gap is portrayed in their use of blood as a metaphor. For Greenberg, blood becomes a total metaphor that endows meaning and reasoning to each and every component of national existence. In Jabotinsky's poetry, on the other hand, blood functions as means to an end with no essential being of its own; it does not form a primary target, whose very materialization is a precondition for achieving national existence. This contradiction in their poetic writings goes to the very roots of the contradiction between the radical right wing faction from which Greenberg derives the repertoire of symbols and images that fertilize his poetry and Jabotinsky's national right wing ideology. The ideology that stands in relation to the civil autonomy of the individual and perceives the national collective process as an obligating and necessary framework but does not read it as a totality.

But the political contradiction is not only a poetic one. At the root of this political polarity one can find a deeper level of contrast – a cultural, aesthetic, all encompassing ideological perception. As well as the role that poetry played for each of them, in their political and spiritual life. While Greenberg's perception was that of the totality of national culture, within which poetry is a sublime and extremely important tool for the fostering and crystallizing of this national culture, especially, through an intensive and enhanced phrasing of its themes and messages, Jabotinsky maintained an understanding of a decentralized national culture. One within which

popular, non-elitist cultural options could still reside, and provide an important component to the rise of a national culture. Greenberg never stopped writing his poetry as he who conducts the great battle for the crown of poetry at large and for a political, spiritual leadership that is undifferentiated from the leadership in the world of poetry. Unlike Jabotinsky who was a leader who wrote poetry, Greenberg operated in the arena of Hebrew poetry as one who constantly and repeatedly saw in front of him the crown of poetic leadership. Towards this he marched along the path of the aesthetization of the political, as he set the aesthetic and the political to be identical due to the mutual basis of the cult of violence he planted them in.

V. Z. Jabotinsky as a Multilateral Artist

Yehuda Friedlander

Vladimir Ze'ev Jabotinsky (1880-1940) belongs most distinctively to Modern Hebrew literature in the first half of the twentieth century, and he is the most multilateral one. His contemporaries were H. N. Bialik and S. Tchernihovsky. His genius came to notice in so many literary genres – poetry, fiction, drama, feuilleton, literary criticism and translation. In each of them he was very creative, and even brilliant. Jabotinsky was a polyglot. He wrote his literary works in Hebrew, Yiddish, Russian, German and English, and translated from these languages into Hebrew.

The article deals with Jabotinsky's aesthetic concept as depicted in his poetry, novels, feuilletons and translations. His works are not mere eclecticism, but syncretism. His syncretistic literary world is composed both of Renaissance and Baroque, of Neo-classicism and Romanticism (*Sturm und Drang*), and Naturalism altogether.

Jabotinsky's syncretistic concept came to expression also in his Zionist ideology, which was a certain kind of mixture of nationalism and cosmopolitanism. The article deals also with the attitude of Jabotinsky toward his readers and audience. The "deep structure" in the literary works of Jabotinsky is the Sublime, based not only on the philosophy of the sublime (Longinus, first century A.D.) and his romantic followers, but also on the aesthetic concepts of J. W. Goethe and F. Schiller.

ABSTRACTS

Jabotinsky – Initiator of the Comprehensive Hebrew Schools in the Diaspora

Shlomo Haramati

In this paper, the author presents an unknown aspect of Jabotinsky's public activity to improve Hebrew education in the Diaspora. Jabotinsky understood that the Hebrew language was the basis for a better Jewish education, and concluded that even in the Diaspora Hebrew should be taught as a living language. He therefore demanded that both Hebrew and general subjects be taught in Hebrew.

From 1910 onwards, Jabotinsky presented these ideas in his lectures to numerous Jewish communities in Eastern Europe. He demanded that they establish Hebrew schools in which all subjects would be taught in Hebrew. This idea was met with great resistance from all Jewish organizations including, surprisingly, the Zionists, since none of them believed in the possibility of implementing these ideas. However, when the *Tarbut* organization was established in Eastern Europe (in 1917), its leaders founded a network of Hebrew schools, based on Jabotinsky's model.

This paper describes the stages of Jabotinsky's struggle, until he saw his ideas being implemented in the *Tarbut* schools. These schools made a significant contribution to Hebrew national education in the Diaspora. Furthermore, many graduates and teachers from these institutes immigrated to Eretz-Israel and contributed to improving Hebrew national education in the period before the State of Israel was established.

Exertions and Struggles in the Revisionist *Do'ar Hayom*

Pinhas Ginossar

Three daily newspapers appeared in Eretz-Israel in the 1920s and 1930s: *Ha'aretz*, *Do'ar Hayom* and *Davar*. *Davar* was the Histadrut's paper with inclinations towards Socialism. *Ha'aretz* was a liberal paper and voiced the opinions of the Yishuv's establishment. The third paper, *Do'ar Hayom*, expressed the right-wing opposition and was considered to be sensational and vulgar. These papers were the main communications channels for the Hebrew speaking public in the country. Style-wise, *Ha'aretz* and *Davar* were considered to be those who maintained the 'Russian'

press and Hebrew literature tradition. *Do'ar Hayom* was regarded as the paper that kept up the 'Levantine' tradition that existed in the Eretz-Israeli Hebrew press under the Ottoman rule.

On 2 December 1928, Ze'ev Jabotinsky founder and leader of the Revisionist party became the editor of *Do'ar Hayom*. The Revisionist party had been founded by Jabotinsky in 1925, in opposition to the Zionist leadership headed by Chaim Weizmann, in order to combat two main issues: Weizmann's lenient attitude towards the British rule and its plotting against the establishment of the Jewish National Home in Eretz-Israel; the participation of the non-Zionists in the Jewish Agency Executive. The Revisionist party also rebelled against the hegemony of the labor parties within the Yishuv. Because the founders of the party were part of Russian Zionism their inclinations and style lay far from that of *Do'ar Hayom* and were much closer to that of *Ha'aretz*. One of the assets of the Revisionist party was Jabotinsky's outstanding talent as a journalist and editor.

The Hebrew press was barred to the revisionists and purchasing *Do'ar Hayom* was one of the alternatives open to them. There were hesitations on both sides but what decided in the end were the mutual advantages as well as the warm relations between the founder and editor of *Do'ar Hayom* Itamar Ben-Avi and Jabotinsky.

Jabotinsky succeeded in drawing to the paper some of the more prominent Hebrew literature's authors and poets amongst them Ya'akov Cahan and Avigdor Hameiri. However, in its first year of publication under Jabotinsky's editorship, he delegated the decisive functions of the paper, and in the Eretz-Israeli branch of the Revisionist party to the veterans of the Russian Zionism. Later on, the decisive roles passed to the radical members of the party – the poet Uri Zvi Greenberg, the writer and critique Yehoshu'a Heschel Yeivin and to the historian Abba Ahimeir. Their style and views were far scathing than his. The Mandate government prevented Jabotinsky from reentering the country after a lecture tour in South Africa thereby limiting his control over the paper. Jabotinsky's absence made things far easier for the non-revisionist right to regain control over the paper and to dismiss the revisionist editing board. This occurred on the 20 February 1931.

ABSTRACTS

Who Cried Wolf? How did Ze'ev Jabotinsky Understand the Nature and Intentions of Nazi Germany?

Ya'acov Shavit, Liat Shtayer-Livni

In the literature of the Revisionist Movement, Ze'ev Jabotinsky is described as a man who foresaw the Holocaust of European Jewry. Hence his prophetic call for the organization for the mass evacuation of these Jews to Palestine. This implies that he was also among the few who truly understood the nature of Nazi Germany.

This article examines the way in which Jabotinsky interpreted the character and intentions of the Nazi regime between 1933-1939. It is based on a series of articles and speeches that clearly show that Jabotinsky was convinced that Nazi Germany was a weak state which had neither the desire nor the power to wage a world war. Also, in many cases he, Jabotinsky, actually ridiculed the aggressive declarations made by the leaders of the regime, in particular Adolph Hitler. On the other hand, although he did not regard German anti-Semitism as a unique case, he believed that due to the regime's weakness, the one facet that had to be taken seriously was its anti-Jewish policy. But in this context too, he believed that though the policy was an attempt to deprive the Jews of all their rights and to impair their opportunities to earn a livelihood, the idea of genocide never occurred to him.

At the same time, Jabotinsky was deeply concerned about the fate of East European Jewry, not only because of a possible German occupation of Poland, but also because of the official anti-Semitic policies of these countries. Anyone, who was persuaded that no world war could possibly break out, could have foreseen the results of the German occupation of Poland and the neighboring countries.

The article follows the development of Jabotinsky's attitude towards Germany in general, and to Nazi Germany in particular. It tries to explain why he erred, (he was not the only one, of course), in interpreting Germany's intentions and moves from 1933 until the outbreak of World War II.

The Dispute in Poland in 1936 over Jabotinsky's Evacuation Plan

Daniel Blatman

The importance of Jabotinsky's evacuation plan and the political activity that evolved around it in Poland in 1936, was due to the fact that they prompted the Jewish

public and political-party constellations to explore, in a penetrating and thoroughgoing debate, issues of value and ideological importance: The place of the Jewish people in Eastern Europe in view of the existential problems that Polish Jewry faced during those years; the Jews' status and national identity in the society and state in which they lived; their relations with the hostile regime; and ways of fulfilling the Zionist vision. The debate was instigated by a major Zionist leader whose sensitivity to the deteriorating situation of Eastern European Jewry explained his public activity since the aftermath of World War I. Polish Jewry placed the issue on its agenda amidst complex political realities: An escalation of economic and social discrimination against Jews in government policies and an upturn in the strength of the socialist Bund Party which espoused a tenacious struggle against anti-Semitism; the defense of the Polish Jews' civil rights; and opposition to the Zionist nostrum.

In the years following World War II, the evacuation plan evoked innumerable disputes and clashes due to the intensity of the trauma that the annihilation of European Jewry had inflicted. One painful question stood at the forefront of the controversy: Could the Holocaust have been foreseen and pre-empted by a dramatic, heroic, and comprehensive act of rescue? Thus, the evacuation debate illustrates two aspects that do not belong to one historical reality. The first concerns the events as they unfolded in Poland in 1936, as Jabotinsky's idea was hurled into the tumultuous and complicated existential reality of Polish Jewry in the last years before World War II. The second involves the ideology-driven criticism that Jabotinsky's disciples and successors brought to bear against their movement's opponents. The first reverberations of the controversy became evident even before the war ended, in the pages of the underground press of the *Betar* movement in the Warsaw ghetto. The antagonism became even more severe after the war, as Israeli society confronted the memory and the meaning of the Holocaust and as *Mapai* and *Herut* engaged in fierce political rivalry in the 1950s and 1960s.

A Dangerous Liaison: Jabotinsky and Poland's Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Eli Tzur

After the death of the Polish ruler, Joseph Pilsudski, one of the main targets of his successors was to encourage Jewish emigration from Poland. The Polish Ministry

ABSTRACTS

of Foreign Affairs was in charge of implementing this. At the same time, Zeev Jabotinsky, the leader of the Revisionists who opposed the existing Zionist leadership, realized that his policy of cooperating with the British in order to replace the Zionist Organization, failed. Jabotinsky assumed that the only Jewish population whose conquest would render the ZO into the hands of his own party was dwelling in Poland. He hoped that the support of the Polish government would make this task easier. This cooperation began with high hopes, but no party could deliver what the expected. Following two years of negotiations, the attitude of the Polish government towards Jabotinsky who was at first regarded as a new Moses, and towards his followers, became far less enthusiastic. On the other hand, Jabotinsky had no other option, and could only hope that the Polish state, which he regarded as a European Power, would support his endeavors. The war, which started a few months after his last meeting with a Polish diplomat, revealed his misconception and put an end to his hopes and efforts. The relationship that had begun as a political partnership ended in the Jewish party being exploited by Polish officialdom.

The Place of the United States and Its Jews in Jabotinsky's World View

Chanoch (Howard) Rosenblum

Jabotinsky's evaluation of the United States was based on a composite of factors. He focused on its multi-racial society, its contribution to world culture, the extent of its leaders' influence on international politics and diplomacy, the strength of American Jewish pressure domestically, and its impact on the politics of the Jewish world. Jabotinsky's evolving position underwent four stages:

From 1910-1921, Jabotinsky's sources about America were culled principally from the Russian press, and led him to formulate a negative view. His interest in the rights of minorities generally, and of Jews specifically, in various parts of the world focused his attentions on the racism exhibited by American society toward its blacks.

During the second period, 1921-1936, Jabotinsky was influenced by the impressions he garnered of the country as a result of three trips he made, in 1921, 1926 and 1935, undertaken primarily for fund raising and party organizational work. Jabotinsky was taken aback by the uncultured mass of Eastern European Jews,

found validation of American racism, and denigrated what he considered to be the shallow and prosaic nature of popular American culture. The only hope he held out for America was its ability to buy and ship over the best talents of European culture.

The third phase from 1936-1939, was a period when Jabotinsky assigned increasing importance to America's leaders, as a means of pressuring Great Britain to honor its obligations under the Mandate. He was especially impressed by President Roosevelt's efforts to address the refugee problem.

During the fourth period, September 1939-August 1940, he considered both America's leaders and its Jews as decisive factors for furthering Zionist aims of creating a Jewish army, and actively aiding the Allies.

Why did the Tsarist *Okhrana* Keep Z. Jabotinsky Under Surveillance?

Matityahu Mintz

The opening of the archives of the former Soviet Union has enabled researchers to become acquainted with an interesting facet of Jabotinsky's biography. It turns out that Jabotinsky had organizational connections with the Social-Democratic circle in Odessa and that the Tsarist secret police (The *Okhrana*) even arrested him due to these ties. The secret police kept him under continuing surveillance and maintained in the database a detailed file of his activities in Odessa concerning the events of 1905, and even later when he was an active member of the 'Zionists Party'. The author of this article tries to tackle this information and offers possible explanations regarding these issues.

Jabotinsky and the *Irgun*: 'In the Beginning God Created Politics'

Shlomi Reznik

The main argument put forward in this paper is that Jabotinsky looked upon the *Irgun* from a political perspective. Jabotinsky strongly believed that the role of the armed forces was to serve political ends and never vice versa.

The tension that existed between Jabotinsky and the *Irgun* originated from the

ABSTRACTS

classic conflict between politics and the army, between the political leadership and the officers of the military. In the unique case under discussion, the military organization was an underground force and therefore an illegal organization. Jabotinsky was not the head of a state but the leader of a movement and a party trying to impose his political authority upon the *Irgun* and its leadership.

As long as the *Irgun* accepted the authority of the political leadership headed by Jabotinsky, and accepted the ways that he defined the situation, the tension between them remained relatively low. On the other hand, as the underground began to independently define the situation and its own roles, and demanded more and more autonomy (organizational, ideological and operational), the tension grew between the *Irgun* and Jabotinsky and the Revisionist party as a whole. The end result was a schism within the *Irgun*.

The Forerunner of His People: Zobotinsky and the Idea of the Instruction Center in Italy

Jacob Markovizky

This article focuses on the activities of Zeev Jabotinsky in Italy during the 1930s. At that time 'The idea of the Instruction Center and Maritime School' took precedent in his deeds. These institutions were intended to realize Jabotinsky's idea of changing the features of the Jewish youth in the Diaspora. Attempts to achieve this goal were also influenced by the conflict between Jabotinsky and *Betar's* local leaders.

The author of this paper also draws attention to Jabotinsky's attitude to Italy and his efforts to approach the authorities in Rome. This attitude did not help to maintain the Revisionists' activities in the state when brutal events of the Racist Regulations outlawed all organization and institutions of the Jewish community in Italy during 1938-1939.

Jabotinsky, the Jewish Legion and the Beginnings of *Hagana*

Shmuel Katz

This paper is an almost epic account of how one man's vision, daring and determination brought about a conceptual, as well as a factual change, in the history

of the Jewish people. It is to the credit of Vladimir Jabotinsky that Jewish military tradition was revived. In the first part of the paper, the author traces the trials and tribulations that Jabotinsky had to bear in order for his vision of a Jewish Legion to materialize. The formation of the Legion was announced during World War I, in July 1917, in time to join the Western Allies in the campaign for the liberation of Palestine, and thus was a step in the direction of the restoration of the Jewish people to their ancient homeland.

In the second part of this paper, the author chronicles what happened to Jabotinsky who enlisted and reached Palestine with the Legion, and what happened to the Legion itself. The author traces in detail the physical hardships, as well as the discrimination and hatred they had to endure under the British military administration. This hostile attitude towards the Legion was a function of the military administration's policy towards the Jewish community at large. The British Government, in co-operation with Weizmann, had appointed a commission whose task it was to begin the groundwork for the rebuilding of the country. However, the Balfour Declaration was not allowed to be published in Palestine till August 1919. The Arabs assumed that the British Government had no intention of establishing a Jewish National Home - and British officials helped organize the Arabs against Zionism and against the Jews. Weizmann however, refused to take a public stand against the British, though he did criticise them behind closed doors. The author of the paper points out that here was the beginning of the historic rift between Weizmann and Jabotinsky.

With trouble between the communities brewing for weeks in early 1920, Jabotinsky was pressed by Weizmann, Ussishkin and Pinhas Rutenberg to organize the defense (*Hagana*) of Jerusalem. He undertook this mission. The rest of the paper is a detailed account of what followed, particularly the immense personal hardships Jabotinsky had to bear for he was arrested and tried by the British.