



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Negation of Galut in Religious Zionism

Author(s): Eliezer Don-Yehiya

Source: *Modern Judaism*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (May, 1992), pp. 129-155

Published by: Oxford University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1396185>

Accessed: 01-12-2018 14:34 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Oxford University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Modern Judaism*



THE NEGATION OF GALUT IN RELIGIOUS ZIONISM

The negation of Galut, not only as a state of dispersion, subjugation and distress but also as an essentially defective way of life, was highly prevalent in those circles of the Zionist movement that were antagonistic towards the Jewish religious tradition.¹ The rejection of Galut by these groups was linked to their rejection of traditional Jewish culture, which flourished in conditions of exile. In this light it is interesting to note that the negation of Galut was not confined to secular Zionism alone but was shared by religious circles in the Zionist Movement as well.

Moreover, in recent decades religious Zionists have become the most vigorous defenders of the negation of Galut doctrine. As will be demonstrated below, this involved significant shifts of meaning in the concept of Galut. In order to highlight these changes, the various formulations of the anti-Galut position in the writings of religious Zionist thinkers will be explored. These changing ideological positions will be traced to developments in the wider context of Israeli society and culture. With this objective in mind, we begin our discussion by examining the various conceptions of Galut in the literature of pre-state religious Zionism.

It should be noted that the negation of Galut approach was not accepted by all religious Zionists. The founder of the Mizrahi Movement, Rabbi Yitzhak Yaakov Reines, saw Zionism as an active process whereby Jews would be gathered to the Land of Israel and thus rescued from the abject conditions of the Diaspora. But he had no intention of 'reforming' the lifestyles of Diaspora Jews because he believed they included much that was positive.² The negative approach to Galut Jewry is not even appropriate to the messianic 'proto-Zionist' ideology of Rabbi Kalisher. He identified the return to Zion with the beginning of the Redemption not because it marked a total change in the Jewish way of life, but because it expressed the actual renewal of the bond between the people of Israel and its land.³

Certain Religious-Zionist thinkers even condemned the 'negation of Galut' approach as vehemently as did the anti-Zionist Haredi lead-

ers. For example, Rabbi Moshe Avigdor Amiel who served as the Chief Rabbi of Tel-Aviv, insisted that the unequivocal negation of any form of Jewish existence in the Diaspora was rooted in the questionable assumption that territory and state are necessary conditions for a normal national life. Interestingly, this territorial-political conception of nationalism was shared by both Zionists and assimilationists, 'only' that while the assimilationists claimed that Jews should be integrated into the various nationalities of their countries of residence, the Zionists contended that Jews had to be concentrated in a country of their own. In Rabbi Amiel's view by contrast, Jewish national existence is not based on territory and state, but on the Torah of Israel and traditional Jewish culture, both of which have the power to preserve the existence and uniqueness of the people even under Galut conditions.

In 1934 Rabbi Amiel wrote that "the principle of negating Galut . . . evolved amongst the Zionists . . . from assimilation." For assimilation "could neither comprehend nor perceive a national Galut life." However, "Jewish nationalism is not a geographic term only; in the Galut as well, we have produced lofty and great works." According to Rabbi Amiel, there is much to be said in favour of Jewish existence in the Diaspora, and efforts must be made toward the preservation and strengthening of Judaism in "every country and not only in Israel."⁴

In contrast to these ideas, many religious Zionists perceived Jewish life in the Diaspora as a negative and inferior form of existence. It should, they believed, be totally abolished and replaced by an entirely new way of life in the homeland. Such a view was held by the first Chief Rabbi of Eretz-Israel, Ha-Rav Avraham Yitzhak Hacohen Kook.

GALUT AS THE LIMITING OF THE SACRED IN RAV KOOK'S TEACHINGS

In Rav Kook's approach, Galut constitutes a defective and alienated existence characterized by decline, narrowness, displacement, seclusion and weakness. The Diaspora way of life, he believes, is diametrically opposed to a 'national renaissance.' This renaissance is manifested not only in the return to Zion, but also in the return to nature and creativity, in the promotion of heroic and aesthetic values which were neglected in the Diaspora and in the renewal of the powers of the individual and society.⁵

Exile from the Holy Land not only separated the Jewish people from their ancestral homeland; it also separated the sacred from the secular in Jewish national existence.⁶ This 'separation,' Rabbi Kook argues, characterizes other nations as well. It befalls those who find

themselves in a “cosmic-like exile” created by the loosening of the ties that bound them to their Godly source. Nevertheless, with the exception of the Jewish people, all other nations continue to dwell in their own lands, to govern themselves and to develop their own economies—even though their lives lack a spiritual dimension. By contrast, Jewish life in the Diaspora, although it excels in spirituality and holiness, is insulated from anything beyond the purely religious sphere.

This tendency towards insularity and withdrawal from the world is, in fact, unnatural to Judaism in its original and authentic form. In the difficult conditions of exile, it is a mechanism of self-defense. Its object is to preserve the Jewish people from the grave spiritual dangers posed by physical separation from the Holy Land and by life in alien lands dominated by secularism. The Diaspora’s great emphasis on spirituality can be seen, Rabbi Kook believes, as penance for the excessive preoccupation with mundanely material matters in the pre-exilic period during which Jewish national life became detached from its Divine source. This process of separating the “National Idea” from the “Divine Idea” resulted in the decline and near destruction of national existence and in the limiting of religious life through exile and dispersion.

When the spirit of God left the people because they had

separated their national nature from the Source of their life, they were forced to live in exile. Public life, corrupt at its roots, was bound to be oppressive. . . . Galut—internal destruction and external dispersion—dashed to pieces the national idea which turned away from its God . . . There was no longer room for the influence of the Divine idea on the national idea whose force had been defiled and turned into ‘wild shoots of a strange vine’ and then destroyed at its base. The Divine idea was confined, therefore, throughout the whole period of exile, to a small, impoverished nest; within the little holiness left in synagogues and study houses, in the purity of family life and in the observance of religion and Torah.⁷

Galut is a hard and painful existence, Rav Kook asserts, but it is also a destruction for the sake of rebuilding. Life in the exile actually purifies and refines the people spiritually, thus preparing the ground for a national and religious revival in the homeland. Rav Kook is convinced that the time has come for the return of the Jews to their land because they can no longer carry the burden of Galut. The Jewish people could exist in conditions of exile because of the strength they drew from their historical connection with Eretz Israel and from the hope of returning to their Land. Nevertheless, in order for this emotional attachment to have the power to sustain the nation, real contact between the Jew and his homeland must become possible.

Diaspora Jewry, without the nourishment it receives from the dew of life deriving from the sanctity of Eretz Israel, would, in fact, have no practical foundation. Its preservation depends on a vision based only on precious memories and hopes concerning the past and the future. However, . . . what is the capacity of that vision alone to carry on the burden of life and to pave a path for the life of a nation?! . . . Hence, Judaism in exile has been suffering a very severe decline, and its only hope is in the Land of Israel. Even one spark of this real life in the homeland will revive a very vital existence. Only with the people's return to its land, which is the only route to its rebirth, will the real, sacred life of Judaism be revealed.⁸

The national renaissance of the Jewish people involves a revolt against Galut. Despite the positive aspects of this revolt, it also has negative consequences. In reaction to the "excessive spiritualism" of Diaspora Jewry, there is the contrary tendency to be concerned with mundane matters only and of completely neglecting the spiritual dimension of national existence. The Galut-type segregation between the secular and the sacred developed largely from the desire to reinforce, insofar as possible, the sacred aspect of Jewish life. Hence, it is not surprising that opposition to the narrowness of Diaspora existence found its initial expression in the weakening of the sacred dimension and in the enhancement of secularism in national life.⁹

The negation of Galut is an attitude that Rav Kook shares with secular Zionists. There are, however, some very significant differences. In the view of the 'classical' secular Zionists, the narrowness of Diaspora existence resulted mainly from its strictly religious nature and from the total control that Jewish law exercised over all aspects of life. Hence, the liberation of the Jewish people from Diaspora life entailed the liberation of Jewish society from the dominating position of Jewish religion; liberation involved transforming religion into a private, voluntary and individual matter.

By contrast, Rav Kook believed that the insularity of Diaspora existence is foreign to the original character of Jewish tradition. Indeed, this tradition can be identified by its striving to permeate all spheres of life and activity with the sacredness of the Divine. He therefore perceives the liberation from Galut as the renewal of the integral bond between all the aspects of life and their Divine source as revealed in the Torah and its laws. Hence, release from the limitations of Diaspora existence entails increasing rather than limiting the impact of religion on all areas of human activity. This will be made possible only within the context of a sovereign Jewish state whose laws and institutions are based on the Torah and guided by it. Jewish sovereignty will establish the infrastructure for a full Jewish existence both for individuals and for the community as a whole.

Rav Kook's perception of Galut, as a condition that does not permit a full Jewish life, is shared by contemporary Israeli critics of the Diaspora, such as Nathan Rotenstreich and Eliezer Schweid.¹⁰ Like Rav Kook, these critics differ from the classical Zionist negators of the Diaspora in that their criticism of Galut does not entail a thoroughgoing rejection of the traditional culture of exiled Jewry. Unlike Rav Kook, however, those thinkers do not regard traditional Jewish law (Halakha) as the authoritative guide for a renewed Jewish existence in the Land of Israel.

THE NEGATION OF GALUT IN THE IDEOLOGY OF "TORAH VA'AVODAH"

During the Yishuv period, the religious Zionist critique of Galut found its most outspoken expression in the ideology of 'Torah Va'Avodah' (Torah and Labor) of the Hapoel Hamizrachi Movement. This anti-Galut ideology was influenced quite substantially by the ideas of Rav Kook. And yet, the attitudes which prevailed in the Hapoel Hamizrachi also reflected a sense of scorn and antagonism towards Diaspora Jews whose origin can be found in the ideas of secular socialist Zionism rather than in the doctrines of Rav Kook. Hapoel Hamizrachi literature often depicted the culture and way of life of Diaspora Jews as deficient, ugly, even immoral in nature. 'Galut Jewry' is described as suffering from social inequality, economic exploitation and lack of productivity. Hence, as long as Jews dwell in the Diaspora, they are unfit to confront their national destiny of becoming a holy people. Only by renewing the Jewish people's way of life, i.e., basing it on productive labor and social justice in the Homeland, do they make themselves worthy of their national destiny.

In an article published in the journal *Hapoel Hamizrachi* in 1925, it was claimed that the goal of the religious workers' movement was "to produce a working, perfect and holy people in our newly reborn country, where Galut transactions of 'horse-trading,' procuring, moneychanging and the like would be alien to the Jewish spirit. A peddling people and a holy people are self-contradictory."¹¹ Official documents of the Hapoel Hamizrachi also reflect this very negative assessment of the Diaspora way of life. A prominent example is a manifesto which was issued by the central committee of the Movement, following its first convention held in 1922. The manifesto declares that "the religious worker has come to Israel with the intense longing to renew Jewish life . . . in his homeland after this life had been paralyzed in the Diaspora."¹² The manifesto alludes to motifs which often appear in the literature of radical Galut negators, such as criticism of

the excessive spiritualism of Diaspora Jewry and its alienation from nature and mundane affairs.

We cannot only occupy ourselves with spiritual matters . . . we want a Judaism of Torah and labor which will come in contact with nature, life and the nation, and will no longer only be a tradition . . . but a vital, inner feeling.¹³

The literature of the Torah Va'Avodah Movement also adopted the idea—which was broadly accepted by secular Zionism—that there must be a return to the early, pre-exilic sources of Biblical Jewry. These early sources were perceived as the well from which moral-religious renewal could be drawn; they were understood, moreover, to commend a life of labor and social justice, of equality and cooperation in the Land of Israel. Rabbi Yeshayahu Shapira, one of the central ideologues of Ha'Poel HaMizrachi who was known as the 'Pioneering Admor' (a Hasidic Rabbi),¹⁴ declared that "Hapoel Hamizrachi strives to return to the original Biblical life which was based on justice and honesty . . . We too have neglected a large part of the Torah . . . We must return . . . to the natural and original life, we must act out the Torah and implement it in real life".¹⁵

Elsewhere in the above-mentioned manifesto, the idea is repeated for emphasis: "We strive to return to early Hebrew life, to Judaism of the Bible which is based on justice, honesty and tradition."¹⁶ In even more forceful form, the same idea appears in an article published by *Hapoel Hamizrachi* in 1924. Here it is argued that

the only remedy [to the defects of the Diaspora] found by the religious youth is the return to Hebrew authenticity, to the simplicity and integrity of the ancient and original Hebrew and to pure Judaism, free of any mark of the pollution of exile. This can be achieved only by work which purifies the soul.¹⁷

It is interesting to note the frequent use of the term "Hebrew" (as opposed to Jewish) by religious writers. This term was widely used by Yishuv secular Zionists who wished to distinguish themselves from the Diaspora Jews.¹⁸ Hapoel Hamizrachi literature even makes explicit use of the Zionist myth of 'The New Hebrew Man,' who is explicitly contrasted to the traditional type of 'Galut Jew.' In 1921, Rabbi Yeshayahu Shapira wrote that the Jews of Eretz-Israel must "stand at the front lines of workers fighting to prepare the people for its revival both materialistically and spiritually. . . . They must create the prototype of the renewed original Hebrew."¹⁹

Like the Labor Movement, Hapoel Hamizrachi actively practised the negation of Galut by giving clear priority to settlement programs in Israel over activities amongst Jews in the Diaspora. Both religious

and socialist Zionists criticized manifestations of 'Galut' behavior in the Land of Israel. Such criticism was voiced against the (less labor-oriented) Mizrachi by certain Hapoel Hamizrachi writers. For example, the following appeared in a 1924 article:

The method of the Mizrachi is . . . to conquer the Diaspora communities. The 'conquest' of a town in the Diaspora by either a Rabbi or a Shoheit (a ritual slaughterer) is probably as important in the eyes of the 'Mizrachists' . . . as the conquest of the Emek [The Jezrael valley]. The Mizrachi has gone so far as to conceive of the establishment of herring shops and other such repulsive Galut customs, as part of the settlement enterprise in the Land of Israel.²⁰

The relationship between the negation of Galut and the idea of Torah Va'Avodah is clearly expressed in the teachings of the Hapoel Hamizrachi leader and ideologue, Shmuel Chaim Landau. In an article published in 1926, Landau wrote:

if we strive for revival, for being cleansed of the scum of the Diaspora, purified from the dross of wandering and of a life without a land . . . under our feet; if our movement strives for liberation and freedom from the Diaspora and the exile mentality, then 'labor' is one of the main foundations of this goal and is a practical manifestation of it.²¹

Landau also asserted that the separation of Diaspora Jews from the soil of the Homeland and from the life of labor and productivity was profoundly detrimental to their very national existence. Jews in the exile ceased to be a people in the normal sense of the word. For, "a nation whose natural life force no longer exists and who has no land . . . cannot as such be considered a nation."²²

The severe damage inflicted by Galut on the body and spirit of the Jewish people, Landau charged, was responsible for the unhealthy cleavage within the contemporary Jewish collective character. It was, in fact, the main reason for the apparent contradiction between the passive spirituality of traditional Diaspora Jewry and the political activism and "earthiness" of modern Zionism. In Landau's view, the attitudes of Diaspora Jews served a positive purpose, in as much as they enabled them to hold their ground in exile against a hostile world. However, the continuing influence of Galut tendencies constitute an obstacle to the national revival movement with its emphasis on self-reliance and activism.

Landau maintains that Diaspora conditions fostered a dismissive attitude towards concrete reality which greatly reduced the importance of mundane concerns such as Land and State. In effect, it legitimized a national existence without a territorial basis and in so

doing ranged itself squarely against the Zionist program of creating a normal national existence based on territory, language and productive labor. This 'Diaspora mentality,' Landau believes, is the main source of the intense ultra-orthodox opposition to Zionism; it fostered the spiritualization of terms such as the Land of Israel, Zion and Jerusalem, their reduction to impoverished abstractions.

Israel, which always served as a center for Hebrew thought and which was always the 'Land of Life' for the Hebrew People, acquired . . . under the influence of the Galut outlook, an abstract form suited to the state of mind of the Diaspora Jews and their negative approach to life.²³

The unfavorable effect of the Diaspora is also evident in the non-productive tendencies of the Jews, in their utter disrespect for physical labor and in their alienation from a life of work and creativity.²⁴ The adherence of traditional Diaspora Jews to these negative attitudes, Landau observes, accounts for the misconceived opinion that identified Galut values with the religious Jewish tradition. Hence, the negation of the Galut by secular Zionism was mostly associated with the negation of religious Jewry.

The secular Zionists, when observing the new [Galut] 'values' which were born of the Galut outlook, forgot that Mount Sinai and the banks of the Vistula were separated not only by an enormous geographical distance, but also by periods of time . . . extending over thousands of years of exile and calamity. They considered those [Galut] values as having been drawn from the original Jewish conception and thus they concluded that the Land of Israel and the People of Israel can and must be renewed and reborn only on secular foundations devoid of all holiness and spirituality, without any link to the Torah and Jewish tradition.²⁵

Landau acknowledges that the Hapoel Hamizrachi shares with Labor Zionism a commitment to productive work in the Land of Israel as the means to emancipation from harmful Galut influences. This common outlook, Landau believes, can contribute to creating a close and cooperative relationship between the two movements. Admittedly, Labor-Zionist pioneers are to be condemned for their fanatical and misinformed anti-religious position. But Landau argues that the negative influences of Galut are also to be blamed for this objectionable stance which is "like a sore on the body of the pioneering enterprise, remnants of the Galut influences which remain attached to the idea of the national rebirth."²⁶

The Labor Movement's shortcoming lies in its failure to realize that the return to the Land of Israel needs to be linked to a return to the Torah of Israel as part of the process of redemption. Hence,

despite the deep respect felt by the Hapoel Hamizrachi for the pioneers of the Labor Movement, it had no choice but to denounce the “contradiction and deception of that movement which strives for revival, originality, a renewal of life and an exodus from Galut and its effects, while the actions of its members wallow in the quagmire of the Diaspora whose polluting influence has left its indelible mark on them.”²⁷ (It is interesting here to note the reversed use of the term “Galut” by a religious leader in an argument with secular Zionists who often employed the term to censure the way of life of orthodox Jewry.)

RADICAL NATIONALISM AND THE NEGATION OF THE DIASPORA IN THE
IDEOLOGY OF THE “HASMONEAN COVENANT”

The negation of Galut by the Hapoel Hamizrachi, it has been argued above, was linked to the ideology of Torah Va'Avodah and was substantially influenced by attitudes which were prevalent in the secular Labor Movement. But there were also religious Zionists, active during the Yishuv period, whose negation of Galut was affected mainly by the attitudes of the Revisionist Movement. This approach was exemplified by a group called the 'Hasmonean Covenant' that combined adherence to traditional Judaism with a radical-messianic nationalism. The Hasmonean Covenant was established in 1937 by students of the Merkaz Harav Yeshiva in Jerusalem which was founded by Rabbi Avraham Yitzhak Kook. The group was affiliated to the religious branch of the 'New Zionist Organization' of the Revisionists. Most of its members joined the extremist underground organizations—IZL (National Military Organization) and LHI (Fighters for the Freedom of Israel)—although most of them returned to the moderate Haganah organization after a time.

While the Torah Va'Avodah movement emphasized the insularity and lack of productivity of Galut Jewry, the Hasmonean Covenant were critical of its submissiveness, subordination and powerlessness. As is evident in the group's name, the ancient Hasmoneans were their revered heroes, their preferred role-models for the entire nation.²⁸

The Hasmoneans were their chosen model since they represented the ideal combination of the God-fearing, Torah-observing Jew and the military hero, who is deeply devoted to his people and country. In an article published in 1943 in the group's organ *The Hasmonean*, it was claimed that the lesson to be learnt from the Hasmonean revolt is that the national struggle must be directed not at the mere abrogation of one decree or another, but at the complete liberation of the nation from the shackles of servitude to foreigners. The struggle will be resolved by the strength of the sword. The battle must be waged

“in the form of armed warfare and in a revolutionary way. Not by building and ploughing and sowing well . . . will we achieve . . . freedom, but by producing . . . by decisive means, the decisive fact: Who is the only ruler here.”²⁹

The Hasmonean Covenant regarded the negation of Galut as a religious principle. Under no circumstances “could Galut be accepted nor . . . servitude in the Land of the Forefathers. Exile and servitude under foreign rule were not only tragic and shameful . . . but also sinful and a desecration of God.”³⁰ In the same article, published in 1945, an allusion was made to the Holocaust, suggesting that it had been a form of punishment because they had come to terms with the Galut, which is the gravest of transgressions. The atonement for such sacrilegious behavior “is harsh and agonizing.” “This is the reason for the pre-messianic tribulations,” which “are the troubles which have struck the Jewish people in exile in order to aggravate the yoke of Galut so that the Jews will be obliged to repent and seek redemption.” The conclusion, therefore, is that everything must be done to urge the people “to strive actively for redemption, which is the atonement for the sin of exile.”

Like the Revisionists, the Hasmonean Covenant stressed the prime importance of military heroism. They called on the people and particularly on the youth to take part in an uncompromising struggle for national freedom and the liberation of the entire Land of Israel. And yet their intensely militant nationalism created something of a dilemma for them. How were they to reconcile their position with the passive approach of traditional Jewry, particularly in regard to its reluctance to utilize force in its relations with other nations? To some extent, of course, other religious Zionists faced a similar dilemma. It was, nevertheless, considerably more acute for a militaristic, ultra-nationalistic group such as the Hasmonean Covenant.

The spokesmen for the Hasmonean Covenant attempted to resolve the problem by blaming Galut conditions for the passive mood prevailing amongst the Jewish people and for their retreat from the pre-Galut heritage of military heroism exemplified by the Hasmoneans and other Jewish liberation fighters. An article in *The Hasmonean* declared that “heroism and pride were traits which were originally deeply-seated in the nature of the Jewish people.” The Biblical belief in “You have chosen us” represents the main source for this national quality of “supreme heroism.” Contrary to common opinion, “the Torah of Israel does not preach capitulation and weakness. It is the source of strength and pride.” However, “the distortion and confusion” caused by the exile created the “distortion of the attitude to heroism.”³¹

It was also claimed that in the period of Jewish monarchy the

paragons of the Jewish people were “perfect in every aspect,” i.e., they represented an ideal combination of spiritual greatness and warrior bravery. Lamentably, “the imperfection of Galut,” drove the leaders of the Jewish people to devote themselves exclusively to spiritual matters. Hence, unlike Biblical heroes like Avner and Yoav, the traditional Diaspora leaders were “unable to set an example for other highly significant values, such as heroism in battle. The movement for national revival makes it imperative to begin “educating once again for the realization of the Torah in its entirety, and recreating the ideal type of the pre-exilic integral Jew.”³²

An article published in 1939 in the Mizrahi’s newspaper, *Hatzofeh*, also expressed the view that Diaspora conditions were responsible for the decline of authentic Judaism’s heroic tradition. The writer raised the question: how did it happen that weakness and cowardice developed into typical features of the Jewish nation, although this same nation was admired in ancient times for its heroism in battle and courageous spirit? It was the close contact between the people of Israel and its land, the writer suggests, that instilled the qualities of bravery and courage—qualities evident in the the Maccabean struggle against the Greeks and in the revolts against the Romans. These heroic features, so dominant when the Jews lived in their own land, were profoundly undermined when they lost contact with their land and went into exile.

While the people of Israel dwelt in its own land, it amazed the world with its heroism and courage . . . and its victories. A handful of priests-farmers . . . dared to declare war on the tyrant Antiochus. . . . They fought and were victorious . . . However . . . once Israel went into exile we became a cowardly people. . . . The reason is that a nation dwelling in its own land draws strength and power from the earth. The living contact with the earth of the Homeland gives it the strength and courage to defend it.³³

During the Yishuv period, the opinions of the Hasmonean Covenant were not broadly popular in religious circles. Where anti-Galut attitudes did gain currency, it was in the labor-Zionist version of Torah Va’Avodah. After the establishment of the State of Israel, however, the influence of the Torah Va’Avoda ideology within the religious camp was considerably diminished, following the sharp decline in the fortunes of Zionist Socialism—the Yishuv’s erstwhile dominant ideology. A related and for our purposes highly significant change was the general retreat from the negation of Galut attitude. At first this transformation was manifested mainly in the ranks of religious Zionists, but at a latter stage it became even more influential in secular Israeli groups.

The Holocaust of European Jewry played a significant role in this process of change. In addition, the spread of the ‘Canaanite’ position among the young generation in Israel—with its radical dissociation of the Israeli experience from Diaspora Jewry and the religious Jewish tradition—also provoked the counter-tendency to see the Diaspora in a more positive light.³⁴ The Israeli political and cultural elite was alarmed by the dangers of Canaanism. To counter its effect, the then Minister of Education, Zalman Aran, initiated a ‘Jewish Consciousness’ program in education. But it was especially religious groups that emphasized the need to ward off the Canaanite danger by educating the youth to identify anew with the Jewish people of the Diaspora and their traditional culture.

The deteriorating relationship between the religious and secular communities in the first years following the establishment of the State contributed as well to the change of religious-Zionist attitudes toward the Diaspora. Regaining national sovereignty and the victories of the War of Independence were perceived by religious-Zionists as manifestations of the “beginning of redemption” and as a radical departure from Galut existence. Nevertheless, the vehement struggles that erupted over issues of state and religion and the concomitant rise in militant secularism strengthened the religious community’s feeling of “a minority under siege.” Not only in ultra-Orthodox circles but also among religious-Zionists there were those who believed that the State had not, in fact, freed its Jewish citizens from the Galut situation. In an article published (1950) in the *Journal of the Young Hapoel Hamizrachi* the following queries appeared:

Is this the longed-for country? Have generations upon generations in poverty, suffering and distress wished for this? Not for this did we fight . . . the people of Israel has not yet been redeemed, it continues living in Galut as long as it does not live a true Israeli life.³⁵

The feeling of “Galut within the State of Israel” did not penetrate the ranks of religious Zionists, as it did the ultra-Orthodox ‘Haredi’ community.³⁶ Accounting for this, at least in part, was the establishment of an authoritative ‘status quo’ standard as the practical *modus vivendi* for problems of religion and state in Israel. As a result, there was a partial amelioration in the relationship between secular and religious Jews. There was also a certain retreat from the militant-secular attitude which characterized wide circles in Israeli society in the first years of statehood.³⁷ These processes helped enhance the self-confidence of religious Zionists—especially among the youth. Their identification with the state as well as their integration into Israeli society grew proportionately.

In the wake of the Six Day War, these developments were instru-

mental in the reemergence of an anti-Galut attitude among religious-Zionists. At this point in time, the Negation of Galut position emerged, in a renewed form, from the messianic-Zionist 'school' of Rabbi A. Y. Kook—especially from the teachings of his son, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda Kook. The rise of the Gush Emunim Movement, which was founded after the Yom Kippur War, strengthened even further the influence of the messianic school within the ranks of religious-Zionism.

Gush Emunim has much in common conceptually with their predecessors from the Hasmonean Alliance. This is evident in the way the two movements relate to Galut. (Nevertheless, the differences between them are quite apparent. The Hasmonean Alliance was a group with only marginal influence on Jewish [including Jewish religious] society in Israel. By contrast, Gush Emunim became a crucial factor in religious Zionism after the Yom Kippur War and its influence was felt throughout Israeli society). The teachings of Rabbi Zvi Yehuda Kook are the main source for Gush Emunim ideology in general and for its attitude toward Galut in particular. Rabbi Zvi Yehuda's assessment of Galut was formulated in articles mostly written soon after the Holocaust and during the early years of statehood. Yet his views on Galut, as on other subjects, did not rouse significant public notice until after the Six-Day War.

GALUT AS THE "GENTILES' WORLD" IN RABBI Z. Y. KOOK'S TEACHINGS

Rabbi Zvi Yehudah Kook shared the negative attitude of his father Rabbi Avraham Yitzhak Kook toward Galut. However, Rav Zvi Yehuda's negation of Galut was far more radical and consistent. In his view, the dispersion, weakness and dependence of the Jews in the Diaspora deprived them of a real national existence. "The prolonged dispersion in the Diaspora made us forget . . . the value of our integral unity . . . we were no longer a nation, but merely a collection of ethnic groups."³⁸

Hence, after the establishment of the state only Israeli Jews and not those who continue to dwell in the Diaspora, can be considered the true representatives and perpetuators of Jewish national existence. In a symposium held in 1963, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda declared that "any Jew immigrating to Israel . . . is observing a law of the Torah," even if he is completely secular in his beliefs and way of life. Conversely, "any Jew living outside Israel, be he religious or not, violates the law and this violation is sinful." The Rabbi added that:

To be a Jew today—one must first and foremost live in Israel. Each Jew who returns to Israel brings with himself—to Zion—part of the

Divine Presence accompanying the nation in the Diaspora. Each Jew who comes to Israel, every tree that is planted in the ground of Israel, every rifle that is added to the Israeli army represents another real spiritual stage, another step towards redemption, as do the glorification of the Torah and the establishment of many Talmudical colleges (Yeshivot).³⁹

On Independence Day, shortly before the outbreak of the Six-Day War, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda proclaimed that “the only true Israel is the redeemed Israel: the kingdom of Israel and the army of Israel, the nation as an integrated whole and not as a series of Diasporas.”⁴⁰

It should therefore be apparent that Rabbi Zvi Yehuda’s conception of the Diaspora stresses the contrast between those Jews living in Israel and those living outside it. Interestingly, this aspect of his approach was shared by many militant secularists in Israel. One of Rabbi Zvi Yehuda’s students goes so far as to claim that “he even finds positive elements in the Canaanite Movement.” Rabbi Zvi Yehuda himself explained this ostensible anomaly by saying that “their [the Canaanites’] basic idea is very true, meaning that a Jew in Israel must be totally different from a Jew in the Diaspora.”⁴¹

The extremely negative image of Diaspora Jews in Rabbi Zvi Yehuda’s teachings is clearly manifested in his sharp condemnation of their way of life and attitudes. He is particularly severe in regard to what he sees as their self-degradation, their lack of Jewish national pride. “The basic tragedy of Galut is the fact that the pride and heavenly majesty of the Jewish people were taken away from them.”⁴² This is reflected, Rabbi Kook asserts, in the way that Jewish leaders interact with Gentiles. “The typical pattern of Shtadlanut [Jewish influence peddling that was common in the Diaspora] is basically a humiliation of the Jewish spirit.”⁴³ Rabbi Zvi Yehuda thus shares with the secular Zionists the perception of Galut as an inferior, defective and humiliating form of existence. Jews must redeem themselves by actively struggling for political independence—independence that will renew their pride as a nation.

Whatever the similarities between them, however, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda and the secular Zionists differ both in their analyses of the Galut situation itself and in regard to the political implications of national emancipation. In the view of classic secular Zionists, it is the sheer lack of territory and political sovereignty that exposes Diaspora Jews to the hostility of their neighbors and forces them to preserve their national existence through physical segregation and cultural insulation. In this view, the return of the Jews to their land and the reestablishment of political independence signifies, in itself, the release from the depredations of the Diaspora and the re-entry as equals into the family of nations.

By contrast, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda believes that Jewish suffering in the Diaspora reflects an hostility that is inherent in the relations of gentiles to Jews. This hostility is a product of the essential difference, the irreducible antagonism that exists between the Jews and other nations. In Rabbi Zvi Yehuda's view, the Dispora is the "world of the gentiles," a world that is, in all respects, light-years distant from the Jewish people. The antagonism between Israel and the nations is not, therefore, a simple result of the Galut situation, and it will not be abolished by the establishment of a Jewish state. On the contrary, whereas Galut is characterized by proximity to the non-Jewish world, the return to Zion symbolizes a radical break from the gentile nations and reassertation of the distinct and unique status of the Jewish people. In an article written about a year before the establishment of the state, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda defined the return of the Jews to their homeland and the renewal of their political life as: "the renewal of our national existence as a nation that is like a proud lion dwelling apart from other nations."⁴⁴

Rabbi Zvi Yehuda's conception of Galut, his understanding of Jewish-gentile relations and his total negation of the Galut as the hostile world of the gentiles come across dramatically in his interpretation of the Holocaust. The Holocaust was for him the ultimate manifestation of the wickedness of the gentiles. It marks the total uprooting of the Jewish people from the Galut and its complete detachment from the gentile world. It is "the total destruction . . . of Jewish life in the Diaspora, of the very possibility of continuing to live in dispersion."⁴⁵ Hence, the Holocaust reinforces the awareness of the fact that Israel is the only place for the Jewish people and its Torah. "The destruction of the Diaspora . . . adds real evidence to the fact . . . that true observance of the Torah can only take place in our country which has been intended for us exclusively."⁴⁶

From this point of view, the terrible tragedy of the Jewish people can be seen as having a positive result. The Holocaust is a form of "negation which calls for the positive act of national renewal . . . in the ancestral Homeland".⁴⁷ That the Diaspora centers of Jewish learning, which were destroyed in Europe, have been transferred to the Land of Israel, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda sees as particularly significant:

The tragic uprooting . . . in which synagogues and centers of learning in the Diaspora were destroyed . . . as opposed to the ingathering of our exiles and the settling of our land, reveal . . . the greatness of God's power which redeemed us from the desert of nations . . . As it is written—"you will not find ease among the nations" . . . The total destruction of the Diaspora is manifested in the removal of the holy institutions that existed there . . . without which there can be no Jew-

ish life and their reestablishment in the Land of Israel, where they truly belong⁴⁸

The Holocaust manifests Jewish powerlessness and humiliation *in extremis*. Conversely, the struggle to establish the state and the battle to defend it, so soon after the Holocaust, signify the recovery of Jewish national pride and power. “At the peak of our national struggle, of our national pride, the final aspect of Galut is revealed: mockery, and scorn.”⁴⁹ The shift away from purely spiritual activities—one of the hallmarks of Diaspora life—toward the use of weapons can, therefore, be viewed as a positive development.

The establishment of a Jewish army constitutes the completion of our national renewal process. We are no longer simply the Galut-ridden ‘People of the Book’ as we have been depicted by the gentiles of the desert [the Arabs], but also the people of God, a holy nation for whom ‘the book and the sword descended simultaneously from heaven’.⁵⁰

The impact of Rabbi Zvi Yehuda’s thought on Israeli Orthodox Jewry has been considerable. Its influence has been especially great since the Six-Day War, most particularly for the ideology of the Gush Emunim Movement, which was established in 1974. Gush Emunim arose in the wake of the Yom Kippur War and has since become an important political and social organization.⁵¹ Many of the Movement’s leaders were students of Rabbi Zvi Yehuda at Merkaz Harav Yeshiva in Jerusalem. Even those Gush Emunim followers who were not from Merkaz Harav, indeed, even some secular adherents of the movement, revered Rabbi Zvi Yehuda as their spiritual and ideological leader.

Rabbi Zvi Yehuda’s writings are stylistically convoluted and substantively difficult—particularly for those not skilled in traditional Jewish discourse. Consequently, many of his followers have little first-hand knowledge of them. It is surely not the first time that those unacquainted with the writings of a thinker were influenced by the ideas disseminated by his disciples. A study of Gush Emunim literature and that of groups associated with it indicates that the dominant motifs draw on the teachings of Rabbi Kook, the son. This is true as well for his views on the Galut issue, although they are known to a lesser degree than his opinions on political and security matters.

It should be noted here that the position of Rabbi Zvi Yehuda and his disciples on the Galut issue is integrally linked with their views on Israeli foreign and defence policies. This linkage is explicable on several levels. First, the negation of Galut by Rabbi Zvi Yehuda and Gush Emunim is indissociable from the elevation of the State of Israel along with the Land of Israel to a truly sacred status. Opposition to relinquishing Israeli sovereignty over the entire Land of Israel is the

obvious consequence. Rabbi Zvi Yehuda's emphasis on the irreconcilable antagonism between Jews and gentiles only reinforces the point. Because he rejects any form of Jewish existence amidst the gentiles and, moreover, because he harbors profound distrust towards them, it is not surprising that he has little interest in taking their advice and opinions into account in the process of Israeli policy-making.

The 'here-and-now' radical messianism of Rabbi Zvi Yehuda and Gush Emunim understands the Zionist enterprise and the state it created as part of the Divine process of redemption. It is decreed and directed from on High and cannot be halted. Not only are the ultimate goals defined in messianic terms; the means utilized to achieve these goals are also so defined. Hence, they tend to be seen as free from the normal constraints imposed by mundane reality. The entire Jewish people must answer the Godly voice which calls out to them through historical events; they must actively participate, to the very limits of their abilities, in the process of Messianic redemption.

Central to Messianic redemption are both the preservation of the Land of Israel's territorial integrity and the ingathering of the exiles. The two are morally and religiously incumbent upon the Jewish people. There can be no accommodation with retreat from the Land of Israel. Similarly, the continued presence of Jews in the Diaspora is entirely unacceptable. There can be no compromise in regard to the ingathering of all Jewish exiles to Israel. That mass immigration would also aid the 'demographic problem' involved in the retention of Judea-Samaria and Gaza, only strengthens Gush Emunim's argument.

Despite its practical demographic implications, Gush Emunim's anticipation of mass immigration from the West is an integral part of their messianic approach. It is worth noting that Gush Emunim expends considerable energy in promoting immigration from the affluent West and from the Soviet Union as well as in channeling new immigrants to settlements in Judea-Samaria and Gaza. Nevertheless, despite their efforts and messianic ardor, the attempt to attract mass immigration has met with far less success than has their drive to establish settlements in the territories. This may well be one of the reasons that Gush Emunim's approach to the Diaspora has not enjoyed the same support as has its policies on settlements in the Greater Land of Israel.

To be sure, many of Gush Emunim's sympathizers do not identify with Rabbi Zvi Yehuda's messianic outlook. They see no grounds for believing that a mass immigration of Diaspora Jewry to the territories is either likely or possible. They argue simply that political and security realities make it mandatory that all the territories conquered in the Six-Day War be retained. They are convinced that the constraints of

Israel's geo-political reality leaves no alternative but to remain in control of the territories.

Whatever their deepest convictions may be, practical considerations play an inevitable role in the strategy of messianic movements. Notably, Gush Emunim spokesmen are careful not to press the negation of Galut argument in the radically disparaging terms of their spiritual mentor, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda Kook. They prefer instead to avoid overly critical remarks about Diaspora Jews (on whose support they count) while stressing the pragmatic benefits of increased immigration.

GALUT AS THE ABANDONMENT OF JUDAISM IN THE WRITINGS OF H. FISCH

Within the ranks of contemporary religious Zionism, Harold (Harel) Fisch occupies a unique position. Fisch, an accomplished literary critic and one of the founders of The Greater Israel Movement, presents a sharply critical assessment of Diaspora Jewry that merits attention.⁵² Although Fisch is a sympathizer of Gush Emunim, his position on the 'Diaspora issue' does not represent the consensual view prevailing among the movement's adherents.

In some respects Fisch's ideas are an updated version of Rabbi Zvi Yehuda's. Like Rabbi Kook, Fisch rejects the Galut in the strongest terms. He vehemently denies the proposition that Diaspora Jews can survive as part of the Jewish people in their countries of residence. Like Rabbi Zvi Yehuda, although less outspokenly, Fisch links the Holocaust with the Jewish people's unique status as a nation in exile, a nation whose very presence inspires anti-semitic hatred.

Rabbi Zvi Yehuda published his views on the Diaspora in the years following World War II. Not surprisingly, he depicts the Holocaust as the total uprooting of the Jews from the Galut. It soon became evident, however, that most Western Jews chose to remain in the Diaspora. Indeed, Jews in the Western democracies actually enjoy equal rights and freedom, to say nothing of prosperity. Admittedly, the establishment of the State of Israel did not bring an end to anti-semitism as Herzlian theory claimed it would. But, as Fisch indicates, the Jewish State itself now draws much of the world's anti-semitic fire. Consequently, it cannot be the spectre of anti-semitism that motivates Jews to leave the Diaspora and immigrate to Israel.

On the other hand, Fisch continues, the choice of Israel as the target for anti-semitic attacks, signifies that Israel is representative of the Jewish people, i.e., it is responsible for its continued existence, for the maintainance of its uniqueness and for perpetuating its history. Hence, in Fisch's view, Jews need to be encouraged to settle in Israel

not in order to find a safe refuge from persecution but rather in order to share in the collective lot of their people—to take part in its struggle for national survival and development.

Jews who remain in the Diaspora have, in effect, relieved themselves of their responsibility for their nation. Fisch goes so far as to state that those Jews who continue to live outside Israel after the establishment of the State fail to share in the Jewish historical lot. Galut Jews cannot have a true affiliation to the Jewish people because they are not part of the unique fate and the historical goals rooted in the biblical covenant with God. Jews living in Israel carry a special burden of responsibility while those who remain in the Diaspora decline to carry this burden. Hence, they do not share in the same national experience.

Israel is, therefore, unable to serve as a unifying cultural rallying point for Diaspora Jewry—in the manner associated with the teachings of Ahad Ha'am. The contrary is true; Israel's existence actually distances Israeli Jews from their Diaspora co-religionists. It creates different political, social and cultural experiences that divide rather than unify. The Jewish people in Israel and in the Diaspora, Fisch claims, are undergoing a process of dividing into two different nations.

Intriguingly, there is a dramatic difference between Fisch and other theorists who also support the 'two nation' thesis. This difference focuses on the basic question: which of the 'two nations' will be the true perpetuator of the historical Jewish people? In his book, *The End of the Jewish People?* published in 1965, the celebrated French sociologist, Georges Friedmann, argued that the State of Israel signals the end of the historical Jewish people because its citizens, especially its youth, have completely detached themselves from Jewish sources.⁵³ Fisch denies this argument by claiming that contemporary Israeli youth are, in fact, "more acutely Jewish than their counterparts in the Diaspora." Jews living in Israel, Fisch contends, are much more deeply imbued by "the sense of belonging to a people subject to a special Jewish fate which differentiates it from other peoples."⁵⁴

It is interesting to compare Fisch's view with that of A. B. Yehoshua.⁵⁵ Both Fisch and Yehoshua are extreme negators of Galut but their attitudes are based on profoundly contrasting assumptions. Yehoshua argues that one of the primary tasks of the State of Israel is 'normalizing' Jewish existence. By providing the Jewish people with territory and political sovereignty, Israel supplies the basic requisites for a 'normal' national life. Nevertheless, true 'normalization' will not be possible, in Yehoshua's opinion, for so long as Jews continue to live in the Diaspora. As long as they resist assimilating into the majority culture, as long as they preserve their attachment to the State of Israel,

Diaspora Jews will arouse the hostility of their host nations—hostility both toward Jews in general and the State of Israel in particular. The Galut must, therefore, be eradicated to save the Jewish people from its tragic fate and enable it to be fully accepted into the family of nations.

Fisch's negation of Galut, by contrast, is aimed not at the 'normalization' of the Jewish people, but to ensuring its unique historical continuity. In his view, it is the seductively affluent existence of the Western Diaspora that fosters 'normalization,' not life in Israel. Yehoshua's 'normalization' is, in fact, precisely what Fisch finds pernicious and reprehensible in contemporary Israeli culture. Indeed, he would root out the prevalent Western influences on Jewish life in Israel by having the State actively foster what he understands to be the distinctly Jewish cultural and historical destiny—a destiny that, lamentably, has been abandoned by Diaspora Jewry. According to Fisch, then, the reestablishment of Jewish national sovereignty in Israel is a shift away from 'normalization' and a fitting turn toward a renewal of the Jewish people's unique status.

Fisch's approach turns Canaanism on its head. He shares the Canaanite view regarding the process of separation between Israelis and Diaspora Jews.⁵⁶ The Canaanites argue that a new nation is being formed in Israel. The legacy of the past—Jewish history and tradition—is rejected by the Canaanites as a negative Diaspora phenomenon that ought to be discarded by the new Israel. Fisch, on the contrary, maintains that it is Israeli Jews who remain loyal to the Jewish destiny, while Diaspora Jews have abandoned Judaism for the sake of 'normalization.' Do they not link their destiny to that of other nations, Fisch asks rhetorically, so as to free themselves from the Jewish lot of suffering and isolation, from the burden of the Jewish destiny?

The divide separating Israeli Jews from their Diaspora brethren has widened following a number of recent events that emphasized Israel's singularity, to wit, its exclusive responsibility for the preservation of Jewish national existence. The Yom Kippur War (the immediate inspiration for Fisch's book) was particularly responsible for accentuating the split between Israeli and Diaspora Jewry. Unlike the Six-Day War,

this was an experience which divided rather than united. It served to divide those who identified themselves fervently with the Jewish lot from those who did not . . . There has been a polarization of Jewish identity.⁵⁷

Whatever may be Israel's singularity, Fisch does spare the rod when he analyses the manifestations of alienation from Judasim prev-

alent among Israeli Jews. Nonetheless, in his view, the Jewish state is the only authentic arena for the battle against these phenomena—a battle that is impossible to wage in the Diaspora. Jews in Galut are overwhelmingly exposed to and saturated by Western culture—and, whether they choose to admit it or not, they have effectively abandoned the arena of battle by the very fact that they continue to live amidst foreign nations.

It should be noted that despite his radical negation of Galut, Fisch vigorously opposes classical Zionism's negative attitude toward the culture and way of life of traditional Diaspora Jewry. He protests against the attempts made by Ben-Gurion and his followers to transform the memory of the Holocaust into a ceremony of courage, and to depict, for the Israelis, the Ghetto fighter as a model of heroism atoning for the cowardice and degradation of the beaten Diaspora Jews. Fisch sharply condemns this attempt to replace the Galutic "Yaakov," who could not hold his own, by the valiant and victorious "Israel." "The fact that Jacob has his own special dignity, his own moral superiority to evil, was ignored."⁵⁸

CHANGES IN THE CONCEPT OF GALUT WITHIN RELIGIOUS ZIONISM AND IN ISRAELI SOCIETY

As we noted above, Fisch's approach is not mainstream, even within his own community of Gush Emunim adherents. Still, certain aspects of his approach reveal the substantial changes that have taken place in the concept of Galut that dominates both the religious and secular camps in Israel. In classical Zionism, 'Galut' symbolized the culture and life-style of the traditional East-European 'Ghetto Jews'. But the mass immigration of East-European Jews to the United States on the one hand, and the Holocaust of European Jewry on the other hand, changed this stereotypical image. The center of Jewish Diaspora existence shifted from Eastern Europe to the Western democracies, notably to the United States.

This radical demographic-geographic shift has been responsible for transforming the Israeli image of the Diaspora Jew. For many Israelis, these Jews are no longer the object of derision and hostility; they have become a model to be emulated. They are regarded no less positively than the Western culture into which they are integrated. Moreover, it has become ideologically difficult for Zionists—religious and secular alike—to place Western Jews in the same category of 'Galut Jews' that were so denigrated by the classical negators of the Diaspora.

This does not mean, of course, that the negation of Galut idea

has disappeared from Israeli society. It signifies rather that both the concept 'Galut' and the sort of public from which it draws support have been transformed. The new concept of Galut is today advocated mainly by religious Zionists and right wing 'neo-traditionalists.' It presents Galut as an intense exposure to Western influences that are alien to the spirit of Judaism. Among these corrupting influences are evils such as permissiveness and materialism, hedonism and lack of authority, selfishness and excessive individualism. The destructive effect of these Western influences, this view charges, can be seen clearly in the Diaspora Jews' lack of willingness to preserve their unique culture and national identity. Predictably, they succumb to the values and way of life of their host societies.

To be sure, the negation of Galut among religious-Zionists, especially those affiliated with Gush Emunim, also reflects a contempt for certain stereotypical Galut characteristics such as weakness, submissiveness, passivity, cowardice and the lack of national pride. In this regard at least, many contemporary religious Zionists share the attitudes and images prevalent in classical Zionism. But the classical secular Zionists, alongside their condemnation of passivity and submissiveness, also rejected the Diaspora Jew's tendency to self-segregation and insulation from non-Jewish society and culture. Furthermore, the secularists charged that it was the Jewish religious tradition that was to blame for the Diaspora Jews' 'negative' characteristics.

In sharp contrast, religious Zionists denounce as 'Galutic' not the insularity of Diaspora Jewry but rather its over-exposure to alien Western culture. These foreign influences, and not Jewish religious tradition, are also responsible for the 'negative Galutic' traits enumerated above. Parenthetically, this same 'Galutic' mentality' is seen by many right-wing religious Zionists as responsible for the typical ideas and programs of left-wing groups in Israel.

The editorial reaction of *Hatzofeh* (the daily newspaper of religious Zionism) to the Pollard affair is quite instructive in this regard. *Hatzofeh* sharply condemned the apologetic reaction of American Jewry to Pollard's arrest. American Jewry, the editorialist claimed, "was revealed . . . in all its weakness, its cowardice and its Galutic approach of self-denial and of apologizing for issues in which it is not involved." This behavior reflects "the failure of all the attempts to delete the term 'Galut' in the context of American Jewry." Hence, "the change of name [from 'Galut' (exile) to 'Tfutzta' (Diaspora)] will not be able to change the harsh and bitter reality, that Jews living outside Israel dwell in Galut with all its implications".⁵⁹

As was noted parenthetically above, the pejorative use of the term 'Galut' in contemporary Israel is not directed only toward Diaspora

Jews. In fact, its main use is in the context of internal political polemics. It serves Israelis of various political persuasions in order to deride the ideas and actions of their ideological rivals. Most frequent among the term's many utilizers, however, are the religious Zionists and their right-wing allies. Historically, this represents quite a remarkable terminological shift because the use of 'Galut' as a derogation was the province of the militantly secular Zionists in their polemic against traditional Jewry.

Today, by contrast, the dismissive use of the terms 'Galut' and 'Galuti' (Galut-like) is directed most often against those positions on foreign and defence policy that are conventionally referred to as 'dovish.' A second and related polemical use of the term seeks to denigrate the penetration of Western life-styles into Israeli culture; these influences, it is argued, reflect the intrusion of Diaspora corruption into the Holy Land. Some radical members of Gush Emunim go further still. They attack democratic liberal concepts such as tolerance, pluralism and the respect for minority rights as symptoms of 'Western influences' that are both alien to the spirit of Judaism and born of the Galutic inclination to 'imitate the gentiles.'

A leading proponent of this approach, Mordechai Nissan, argues that "the concept of Galut includes any particle of an idea, norm or spirit that is taken from foreign cultures and does not belong independently to the Jewish people." Assimilating the concepts and values of Western democracy constitutes, for Nissan, a "dragging of the Diaspora's Trojan Horse into the Land of Israel." The responsibility for this regrettable development, Nissan charges, should be laid at the feet of classical Zionism which "has locked Zionists in the prison of an alien philosophy, which has no real connection with either the Jewish people or the Land of Israel."⁶⁰ Although such extreme anti-liberal sentiments are rare, attacks on the prevalence of Western influences are voiced quite frequently by Gush Emunim and its followers. To be very sure, this anti-Western animus has a relatively small following when compared with the public support enjoyed by the Gush Emunim's political and security policies. Understandably so, since the greater part of Israeli society is intensively exposed to the West and is both unwilling and unable to isolate itself from this influence.

While the negation of Galut, in its original sense, continues to be supported by individuals from a great variety of ideological positions, it is the religious Zionists, especially those attached to Gush Emunim, that give the anti-Galut doctrine its most vehement expression. The continued existence of Jews in the Diaspora is, in their view, practically indefensible, morally repugnant and religiously illegitimate. This conclusion is corroborated by the findings of public opinion surveys:

religious, traditional and right-wing circles show the greatest support for the 'negation of Galut' position.⁶¹

In fairness, however, it should be noted that even among the religious and the right-wing this anti-Galut position does not enjoy unequivocal support. It is arguable, in fact, that the primary reason for its increased saliency in religious circles is less a simple and spontaneous identification with the approach and more a reaction of disapproval to its rejection by the secular Israeli left.

It can be said in conclusion, that the changing perceptions of the Diaspora among Israeli Jews are related to transformations of content and 'significance in the concept 'Galut' (or as Israelis now prefer to call it—'Tfutzá'). In contemporary Israel, Galut is linked with the culture and life-style of the Western world far more than with those of traditional Jewish society. This change explains the seemingly odd 'migration' of the negation of Galut doctrine from the Labor movement, its classical stronghold, to the religious and right-wing Zionist camp.

These changes of attitude are also linked to processes of structural transformation that Israeli society has undergone in recent decades. These changes include a significant weakening of commitment to collective values and goals as well as an erosion in the authority and leadership qualities of Israel's political elite. The striking decline of the Zionist socialist ideology (along with other versions of the secular-Zionist position) is, no doubt, a deep underlying cause as well. The attempt of these secularist world-views to supplant Jewish religious tradition as the legitimizing system of values for Israeli society has largely failed—with important consequences for how the Diaspora is perceived.⁶² These factors, together with the process of Diaspora Jewry's Westernization, have contributed to important shifts both in the self-image of Israeli society as well as its image of Diaspora Jewry. Most Israelis simply find it difficult any longer to regard their country as a 'model state' for Diaspora Jewry.

The development of Gush Emunim represents, *inter alia*, a counter-reaction to these processes. The negation of Galut, once a weapon of the secular Zionists in their struggle against traditional Jewry, has become an anti-Western and anti-secular weapon in the hands of the religious and the right-wing nationalists. And yet, Gush Emunim's banner, inscribed with the 'negation of Galut' slogan, remains a dissenting position that runs against the current of the Israeli mainstream. It has succeeded neither in becoming a dominant force in Israeli society nor yet a realistic alternative for the tarnished secular versions of Zionism. For all of its attractiveness to contemporary religious and right-wing sensibilities, the negation of Galut argument

cannot make inroads in a population for whom the West represents their cultural standard of reference.

BAR ILAN UNIVERSITY

NOTES

(All references are in Hebrew, unless marked by an asterisk.)

1. For an extensive discussion of the various approaches taken towards the Galut issue within the context of Zionist thought, see Nathan Rotenstreich, *Contemporary Jewish Thought* (Tel-Aviv, 1966), Vol. 1, pp. 160–215. See also Eliezer Schweid, “Two Approaches to the ‘Negation of the Diaspora’ Concept in Zionist Ideology,” *Hatzionut*, Vol. 9 (1984), pp. 21–44; Yosef Gorni, “The Attitude of the Poalei Zion Party in Mandatory Palestine towards the Diaspora,” *Hatzionut*, Vol. 2 (1977), pp. 74–84; Arnold Eisen, **Galut* (Bloomington, 1986).

2. For Rabbi Reines’ concept of Zionism see my article, “Ideology and Policy in Religious Zionism: The Zionist Philosophy of Rabbi Reines and the Policy of the Mizrahi under his Leadership,” *Zionism*, Vol. 8 (1984), pp. 103–146. For Rabbi Reines’ stand on the Galut question see pp. 126–129.

3. See Yaakov Katz, “The Historical Character of Zvi Hirsh Kalisher,” *Jewish Nationalism: Essays and Studies* (Jerusalem, 1979), pp. 285–307.

4. “More on the Ideological Principles of the Mizrahi,” *Hator*, Vol. 14, No. 44, (10.8.1934), pp. 4–5.

5. See my article, “Conceptions on Zionism in Orthodox Jewish Philosophy,” *Zionism*, Vol. 9 (1985), pp. 84–92.

6. See Avraham Yitzhak Hacohen Kook, *Lights* (Jerusalem, 1950), pp. 108–115.

7. *Ibid*, p. 108.

8. *Ibid*, p. 62.

9. *Ibid*, p. 84.

10. See, for example, Nathan Rotenstreich, *On Contemporary Jewish Existence* (Tel-Aviv, 1972), pp. 152–166; Eliezer Schweid, “Saying ‘Yes’ to the Negation of the Diaspora,” *Kivunim*, Vol. 12, p. 24.

11. G. Levin, “The Nature of the Mizrahi Pioneer”, cited in a collection of sources edited by Aryeh Fishman, *Hapoel Hamizrachi: 1921–1935* (Tel-Aviv, 1979), pp. 160–161.

12. *Ibid*, p. 152.

13. *Ibid*, p. 153.

14. See Shabtai Don-Yehiya, *Pioneering Admor: The Immigration to Israel of Yeshayahu Shapira* (Tel-Aviv, 1961).

15. Fishman, *Ibid*, p. 59.

16. *Ibid*.

17. Eliyahu Rotstein, “Our Return to the Source”, Fishman, *Ibid*, p. 39.

18. See Itamar Even-Zohar, “The Growth and Consolidation of a Local

and Indigenous Hebrew Culture in Israel, 1882–1948,” *Katedra*, Vol. 16, (July, 1980), p. 165; Yaakov Shavit, *From Hebrew to Canaanite* (Jerusalem, 1984), pp. 31–42.

19. *Ibid*, p. 49.

20. M. Rosenblum, “To Clarify Our Method”, *Ibid*, p. 83.

21. Shmuel Chaim Landau, “For the Hapoel Hamizrachi Movement,” *Hator*, Vol. 17, (19.3.1926), pp. 3–4.

22. Shmuel Chaim Landau, “To Clarify Our Method,” 1926, quoted in Fishman, *Ibid*, p. 162.

23. Shmuel Chaim Landau, “On the the Task of Young Mizrachi,” *Katavim* (Jerusalem, N. D.), p. 30.

24. *Ibid*, pp. 32–33.

25. *Ibid*, p. 331.

26. *Ibid*.

27. Landau, “For the Hapoel Hamizrachi Movement,” *op. cit.*

28. See Mordechai Bar-Lev, “The Ideological Principles of the Hasmonean Alliance,” to be published in the collection *Religion and Underground* (publication of The Institute for the Research of Underground Movements, Bar-Ilan University), p. 11.

29. B. Duvdevani, “Is this the Beginning of the Revolt?,” *The Hasmonean* (December, 1943), p. 2.

30. “Chapters of the Hasmonean Covenant: The Messiah and the Complete Redemption,” *Ibid* (July, 1945).

31. “Chapters of the Hasmonean Covenant,” *The Hasmonean*, (April, 1947).

32. *Ibid*, (April, 1946).

33. *Hatzofeh* (16.12.1939).

34. See Baruch Kurzweil, “The Nature and Origins of the ‘Young Hebrews’ (Canaanite) Movement,” in his *Modern Hebrew Literature: Revolution or Continuity?* (Jerusalem, 1967), pp. 270–300.

35. The writer, Yaakov Bazak, currently holds the office of District Judge in Israel. His words are quoted in an article by Rabbi M. Z. Neriya, first published in 1953, “Religious Jewry in Israel,” Moshe Samet (ed.), *Religion and State* (Jerusalem, 1971), p. 45.

36. For the Galut concept of the ultra-Orthodox see: Aviezer Ravitzki, *Exile in the Holy Land: The Dilemma of Haredi Jewry,” in Peter Medding (ed.), *Israel: State and Society, Studies in Contemporary Jewry*, Vol. 5 (Oxford, 1989), pp. 89–121.

37. See Charles Liebman and Eliezer Don-Yehiya, **Civil Religion in Israel* (Berkeley, 1983).

38. Rabbi Zvi Yehuda Kook, “And They Shall Not Be Counted Among the Nations,” *Hatzofeh*, (July 12, 1946), Reprinted in *To the Pathways of Israel* (Jerusalem, 1979), Vol. 1, p. 78.

39. The Symposium—chaired by Geula Cohen—was published in *Maariv* (April 8, 1963). It was published in a collection of sources and articles edited by Aryeh Strikovsky, *The State in Jewish Philosophy* (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 211–213.

40. These words were widely publicized after the war. “Psalm 19 for the

State of Israel”, *Hatzofeh* (June 23, 1967). Reprinted in *Pathways*, Vol. 2, p. 160.

41. Rabbi Menahem Foreman, “They Are Not Getting Free,” *Emdah*, Vol. 26 (November, 1989), p. 18.

42. “The Pride of Our Strength,” *Hatzofeh* (May 10, 1946). Reprinted in *Pathways*, Vol. 1, p. 74.

43. *Pathways*, Vol. 1, p. 75.

44. “The Faith of Our Times,” *Hatzofeh* (August 15, 1947), *Pathways*, Vol. 1, p. 100.

45. *Ibid.*

46. “Jewry of the Torah—The Claim for a Jewish State,” *Hatzofeh* (January 11, 1946); *Pathways*, p. 68.

47. “The Faith of Our Times,” *Hatzofeh* (August 15, 1947); *Pathways*, Vol. 1, p. 100.

48. “The Holy Stronghold for the Jewish People and Its Land,” *The Synagogue* (December, 1945); *Pathways*, Vol. 2, p. 152.

49. “Safeguarding the Jewish People,” *Jewish Law Relating to the Land of Israel* [booklet] (May, 1948). Reprinted in *Pathways*, Vol. 1. p. 112.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 113.

51. See my article, “Jewish Messianism, Religious Zionism and Israeli Politics,” *Middle Eastern Studies* (1987), pp. 215–234.

52. A. Harold Fisch, *The Zionist Revolution* (London, 1978).

53. Georges Friedmann, *The End of the Jewish People?* (New York, 1967).

54. *Ibid.*, p. 100.

55. See A. B. Yehoshua, *For the Sake of Normalization* (Tel-Aviv, 1980), pp. 70–71.

56. On the Canaanites see Ya’akov Shavit, *The New Hebrew Nation* (London, 1987); James S. Diamond, *Homeland or Holy Land? The “Canaanite” Critique of Israel* (Bloomington, 1986).

57. *Ibid.*, pp. 101–102.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 109.

59. “A Debate with the Association of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations in the U. S.” (editorial), *Hatzofeh* (March 16, 1987).

60. Mordechai Nissan, *The Jewish State and the Arab Problem* (Tel-Aviv, 1986), p. 38.

61. Especially relevant are two surveys conducted under the auspices of the American Jewish Committee. The first was conducted in 1983 by the ‘Smith Research Center.’ See Hanoch Smith, “Israeli Attitudes Towards America and America and American Jews,” *Tefutsot Yisrael*, Vol. 22, No. 1 (Spring, 1984), pp. 29–62. The second was conducted in 1986 by the Dahaf Institute, under the direction of Mina Tzemach, “Israeli Attitudes Toward Judaism, American Jewry, Zionism and the Israeli-Arab Conflict,” (unpublished).

62. See Liebman and Don-Yehiya, *Civil Religion*, *op. cit.*