

**Document A: “Chaim Weizmann: A Biography”, Norman
Rose (1986)**

[Herbert] Samuel’s behavior was also giving Weizmann much cause for concern. In March 1921, he had appointed Haj Amin al-Husayni as Mufti of Jerusalem, a post that carried not only spiritual authority but also great financial and political power. Haj Amin, an incurable anti-Zionist, had been tried *in absentia* for his part in the 1920 riots and sentenced to fifteen years’ imprisonment. He had fled Palestine. Now he returned covered with glory. This was a monumental blunder on Samuel’s part, but, at that time, Weizmann was more concerned by Samuel’s decision to temporarily suspend immigration in the wake of the May 1921 disturbances and, still more, by his June speech, which placed a most limited interpretation on the Balfour Declaration. ‘Honour him, but suspect him,’ he advised, choosing as his text a popular Hebrew proverb. But he refrained from criticizing Samuel in public, not wishing to exacerbate relations with the British government. He consoled the Zionist Congress: never forget that ‘Samuel is the High Commissioner for Palestine and we are High Commissioners for *Erez Israel* [the Land of Israel]’. In private, however, he wrote ‘openly and with a brutal frankness.’ He told Herbert Samuel that there had been ‘a shifting of political values ... which momentarily obscure the vision of British statesmen.’ He hoped this was a passing phase, but the tendency to ignore the Balfour Declaration and the San Remo decisions ‘destroys the political foundation on which we have been building. ... It seems that everything in Palestinian life is now revolving round one central problem – how to satisfy “and to pacify” the Arabs. Zionism is being gradually, systematically and relentlessly “reduced.”’

Source: *Chaim Weizmann: A Biography*, Norman Rose, Elisabeth Sifton Books, Viking Penguin Inc., New York, 1986, p. 216-217.

Document B: “Lone Wolf”, Shmuel Katz (1996)

[“Article in *Di Tribune*”, Vladimir “Ze’ev” Jabotinsky, March 23, 1921]

Politically we have achieved a great deal, and those responsible have earned the eternal gratitude of the nation. But great political mistakes have been made: there has been too much rejoicing, too much thanksgiving, and too little exploitation of the promises given (by the British). There is a danger that even now, with the text of the Mandate known to all, and everybody has seen how beautiful are the principles and how weak the guarantees they are giving us, an attempt will be made to get the Jewish people once more to shout “hurrah!” – and to give thanks, instead of declaring openly and honestly that if we are expected to perform a major work of colonization we must be given substantial political rights ...

For two years we allowed the previous English administration to become accustomed to the idea that a serious anti-Semitic policy could be pursued in Palestine without risk to the career of the anti-Semites. When the cry went forth from Palestine that a pogrom against the Jews was being quite openly prepared the reply from “above” was always that these were only hysterical noises and that General X and Colonel Y were our best friends.

We must make it clear once and for all that the true cause of the corruption of the previous administration and of the catastrophe was not merely its own anti-Semitism but our eternal “all right.” ...

There are already signs that despite the influence of Herbert Samuel the feeling among many of the English officials has remained the same as in Allenby’s day ... Now as then they feel that the Jew is incapable of safeguarding his rights, and until killing actually starts he continues to say “all right.” Without a healthy opposition in the country, without hard daily resistance to every injustice, to every rude remark about Jews, no normal political atmosphere can be created anywhere in the world, and Palestine is no exception.

Source: Lone Wolf: A Biography of Vladimir “Ze’ev” Jabotinsky Vol. 1, Shmuel Katz, Barricade Books, New York, 1996, p.698-699.

Document C: “The Jabotinsky Story”, Joseph B. Schechtman (1961)

[“Memorandum to Zionist Executive”, Vladimir “Ze’ev” Jabotinsky, November 5, 1922]

Our movement can only thrive in an atmosphere of clearness. It was the policy of drift and bluff that has brought us to the present situation. This policy – avoid a straight talk with the government for fear that they have up their sleeve a ready and unpleasant reply, and at the same time to tell the Jewish public that everything is in perfect order – this policy can no more be countenanced. With great reluctance I must even say that it will no more be possible to carry on this policy unless the Executive is prepared to face an open split in its own ranks.

Source: *The Jabotinsky Story: Rebel and Statesman*, Joseph B. Schechtman, Thomas Yoseloff Books, New York, 1961, p. 426

Document D: “*Jabotinsky: A Life*”, Hillel Halkin (2014)

In November 1923, he traveled to the Baltic states to drum up subscriptions for *Razsviet*. The trip was to prove a fateful one. While in Riga he delivered a lecture on the need for a more “activist” Zionism, after which he was approached by some students in the audience, members of a German-style Jewish dueling fraternity named the Hasmonean. He sat up with them till late at night, drinking beer and singing student and Zionist songs, and they proposed launching a movement to be headed by him that would put “activist” Zionism into practice.

The young Hasmoneans caught Jabotinsky’s fancy. Even in their carousing, they seemed different from other young Zionists he knew – less argumentative, less concerned with ideology and its fine points, more prepared to act as a cohesive body. Mutual aid was a supreme value from them. At the railroad station as he prepared to leave Riga, he witnessed a fraternity member, recognizable by his cap, struggling with two heavy suitcases. At once a fellow Hasmonean left the girl he was talking to and hurried across the platform to help. A simple, even trivial incident, it struck Jabotinsky as something he would never have seen in his own student years.

He returned to Berlin full of enthusiasm. He had met, he wrote in a letter, a new Jewish youth,

One thirsting for discipline and strong leadership – something that didn’t exist in my own generation or in the generation of the war. It’s had a decisive effect on me. I’ve made up my mind to return to [the sphere of] action rather than [limit myself to] writing – that is, to do whatever is necessary to found a movement that will encompass [Zionist] activists from all over the world.

A Yosef Trumpeldor Organization for Activist Zionist Youth was established in Riga, and Jabotinsky founded a League of Zionist Activists in Berlin. This was the beginning of Betar, which did not start out as a centralized or even single organization. ...

If Labor Zionism had its heroic ideal of the pioneer, so would he – and the Betarnik would be more noble, more iron-willed, more self-mastering and

self-transcending than the Zionist prole of the socialist commune. The missive continued:

Betar is also austereness; guard the purity and grandeur [*tif'eret*] of your lives like the Nazarites of old. Let this be your credo: grandeur in everything – in your speech and behavior, in your relations with friends and enemies, with Jews and Gentiles, with women and children and the elderly. Treat your work (whether behind a desk or outdoors, in a private or public capacity) as something sacred; be a weapon, strong and sharp, in times of danger; be exemplars of courtesy and honesty in your daily lives in society.

Eventually, Jabotinsky found the “clear, simple word” he was looking for. It was the Hebrew *hadar*, which replaced the *tif'eret* of his 1928 missive. *Hadar* had no exact equivalent in English. “Majesty,” “dignity,” “pride of bearing” – there is something in it of each. For Jabotinsky, it embraced a comprehensive code of behavior that would rehabilitate the new Jews from the maiming effects of Diaspora life. In his manifesto “The Idea of Betar,” written in 1934 when the movement was nearly seventy thousand strong, he devoted a section to *hadar* that stated:

Although it is important that everyone strive for *hadar*, it is particularly important for us Jews. The life of exile has greatly weakened in us the healthy instincts of a normal people, above all, in relation to the outer forms of our existence. We all know, and sometimes complain to ourselves, that the average Jew considers it superfluous to pay attention to his manners and appearance. ... [Yet] Just as everyone should attend to his personal hygiene, not because of what others will say if he doesn't but – even if he lives on a desert island – as a matter of self-respect, so every word he utters and every movement he makes should reflect a higher consciousness of his “lordliness.” Every man must be a lord unto himself, the Jew especially. ... We Jews are the most “aristocratic” people on earth. ... Behind every one of us stand seventy generations of ancestors who could read and write, and who spoke about and inquired into God and history, peoples and kingdoms, ideas of justice and integrity, humanity and its future. Every Jew is in this sense a “prince.” It is bitter irony, the consequence of exile, that Jews are regarded everywhere, even by themselves, as lacking the social graces of a nursery school child.”

Source: *Jabotinsky: A Life*, Hillel Halkin, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2014, p. 147-148.

Document E: “The Jabotinsky Story”, Joseph B. Schechtman (1961)

“*Alea jacta est*,” Jabotinsky announced with mock pomposity to this writer on November 6, 1924: “I am again in the field, and I am going to do my damndest to launch a truly Herzlian movement. The foundation conference of this movement, so often postponed, will this time take place not later than next spring. You can count on it.” The name of the movement was the object of lively discussion among the Paris group that was in charge of the preparatory work. Several suggestions were offered: “Activists,” the “*Rasswyet Group*,” etc. “And why not ‘Revisionists?’” timidly asked one of the younger zealots, Y. Yeivine. Jabotinsky liked the suggestion. It tallied with his concept of the mission he was about to undertake: to revise the program and tactics of the Zionist Organization ...

In an article, “Political Tasks of the Conference,” which appeared in the *Rasswyet* on April 19, 1925, Jabotinsky insisted that “it is time to proclaim aloud and clearly” that the aim of Zionism is the establishment of a Jewish State.

Vocabulary

Alea Jacta Est: (“The die is cast”) is a Latin phrase attributed by Suetonius to Julius Caesar on January 10, 49 BC as he led his army across the Rubicon river in Northern Italy.

Source: *The Jabotinsky Story: Fighter and Prophet*, Joseph B. Schechtman, Thomas Yoseloff Books, New York, 1961, p. 37-38

**Document F: “The Jabotinsky Story”, Joseph Schechtman
(1961)**

On December 23, 1929, two days before his departure from Palestine, Jabotinsky spoke in Tel Aviv before six thousand people. He subjected the policy of the Zionist Executive to devastating criticism and decried it continuing in office. He warned against concessions to the Arabs which lead nowhere, and presented a clearly defined program of demands to be submitted to the Mandatory Power. ...

Some time after his departure, officials of the Palestine Government had a “friendly talk” with Jabotinsky’s political associates and plainly hinted that his return to Palestine would be most unwelcome: his speeches and articles had been causing excitement and angering the Arabs. The Colonial Office informed Jabotinsky personally that the High Commissioner had been displeased with his speech. The answer was: if the speech contained something unlawful, the Palestine Government should arraign the orator or the paper that published the speech before a court of law. The Government did not take recourse to either of these legal steps. There was obviously little hope of obtaining a conviction even in a Palestine court. The speech was anything but inciting. The very moderate *Haaretz* later (September 17, 1931) bluntly said that “it would not make a single hair fall from anybody’s head.”

Nevertheless, when Jabotinsky, after a few months’ stay abroad, wanted to resume his work in Jerusalem, the Palestine administration refused to honor the reentry visa which had been issued to him prior to his departure.

...

There can be hardly any doubt that this banishment was an attempt to satisfy the wishes of both Arab nationalist agitators and anti-Zionist English politicians.

Source: The Jabotinsky Story: Fighter and Prophet, Joseph B. Schechtman, Thomas Yoseloff Books, New York, 1961, p. 125-126

Document G: “Chaim Weizmann: A Biography”, Norman Rose (1986)

[“Interview with Jewish Telegraphic Agency”, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, July 3, 1931]

I have no sympathy or understanding for the demand for a Jewish majority. A majority does not necessarily guarantee security. ... A majority is not required for the development of Jewish civilization and culture. The world will construe this demand only in one sense, that we want to acquire a majority in order to drive out the Arabs.

Source: *Chaim Weizmann: A Biography*, Norman Rose, Elisabeth Sifton Books, Viking Penguin Inc., New York, 1986, p. 290-219.

Document H: “Lone Wolf”, Shmuel Katz (1996)

[“Speech before 17th Zionist Congress”, Vladimir “Ze’ev” Jabotinsky, July 2, 1931]

[T]ruth has a purifying effect. Are we not all tired and are we not all nauseated by the constant evasions. Clearing the atmosphere is a political imperative – and it will be achieved if we tell the truth. Why should we allow the term “Jewish State” to be described as extremism? The Albanians have a state of their own, the Bulgarians have a state of their own, a state after all is a normal condition of every nation. If a Jewish State existed today nobody would say that this was not normal. And if we are aiming at normalization, it is permissible to say that this is extremism – and are we ourselves expected to say it?

Source: *Lone Wolf: A Biography of Vladimir “Ze’ev” Jabotinsky Vol. 2*, Shmuel Katz, Barricade Books, New York, 1996, p.1254.