

No. 21, May 1997

CONTENTS

Editor:

Dr. Mordecai Naor

English Section:

Judy Krausz

Hebrew Copy Editor:

Moshe Or

Designer:

Amnon Katz

Dr. Theodor Herzl, Journalist / Shalom Rosenfeld — 2e

English Abstracts of Hebrew Articles:

The Schnitzer Case — 6e

Theodor Herzl: Statesman, Journalist and Editor

Herzl and the Press: From "Sword of Steel" to Cable Newspaper / Rafi Mann — 8e

Herzl as Foreign Correspondent / Ya'akov Rabi — 10e

Herzl and Nordau as Critics of the Press / Gideon Kouts — 11e

The Global Media and the Media in Israel: Changes in Approach to Defense-Related Topics / Yaron Katz — 11e

Cultural Media in Transition: From the Traditional Sermon to the Jewish Press / Menahem Blondheim — 13e

Mirthful Pessimism: The Yiddish Humorous/Satiric Press in Poland Between the World Wars / Marian Fuks — 14e

Manfred Georg and the Mukacevo "Juedische Revue," 1936-38 / Daniel Mueller — 16e

The Holocaust in the Juvenile Press in the Yishuv and Israel, 1940-74 / Etti Paz — 18e

"Hagalgal," The Radio Magazine, 1943-48 / Akiva Zimmerman — 19e

Dov Sadan as Editor / Nurit Govrin — 20e

"Hasadeh" — An Agricultural Monthly that is Israel's Second-Oldest Periodical / Aharon Yaffe — 21e

A Journalist on Three Continents: Morris Vinchevsky's Career in Russia, Prussia, England, the U.S. and Palestine / Mussia Lipman — 22e

The Rise and Fall of "Herut" / Ahuva Botser — 24e

Contributors to This Issue — 151

English Cover: The celebratory cover of the 1945 victory edition of *Hagalgal*, the radio magazine published by the British Mandate in conjunction with the Hebrew programs of Voice of Jerusalem during 1943-48. See Akiva Zimmerman's article on this topic, p. 19e.

Hebrew Cover: Theodor Herzl, statesman, journalist and editor, Plate 3 in David Tartakover's book *Proclamation of Independence: 21 Plates on the Declaration of Independence* (Tel Aviv: Modan, 1988, Hebrew). The Star of David on Herzl's jacket reflects the logo of his newspaper, *Die Welt*.

Typesetting and Production: Mofet-Rosemarine

Editorial and Administrative Offices: Journalism Studies Program, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv 69978.
Tel: (03)6413404, 6408665. Fax: (03)6422318.

DR. THEODOR HERZL, JOURNALIST

Eulogizing Herzl at the Seventh Zionist Congress in Basel on July 25, 1905 — the first congress to convene after Herzl's death — Dr. Max Nordau, his assistant and right arm, psychiatrist by profession, philosopher by inclination and journalist by temperament, whose books evoked sharp debate in the intellectual community worldwide, said:

It was once humorously asked what would have become of Liszt and Paganini if they, with their special genius, had come into the world before the invention of the piano and the violin. Herzl supplies the answer to this question. He was actually a "Liszt" or a "Paganini" born before the invention of the instrument by which alone his genius could be revealed. Herzl was a born statesman of the first water, without a state, without an organized people, without a single one of those assets with which one can engage in practical politics.... His case is not unique. This ancient Jewish people from time to time continues to produce statesmen for whose talents it has no use. Many, nevertheless, create their own sphere of action, but it lies outside Jewry.

Nordau's esteem for Herzl is depicted, inter alia, by Prof. Ben-Zion Netanyahu in the wide-ranging introduction to his book *Max Nordau to his People* (Tel Aviv: Hotza'ah Medinit, 1936, Hebrew; New York: Scopus, 1941, English):

Nordau, more than anyone else, understood the secret of Herzl's greatness. What is genius, Nordau asks in his study on genius and talent, his reply evoking bold conclusions. For Nordau, the highest category is the political genius — the statesman, followed by the scientist, and then the poet. Newton was subordinate to Napoleon, Shakespeare subordinate to Cromwell. In Herzl, whom Nordau depicted as "greater than Disraeli," he saw the political genius of the Jewish people, that is, the supreme type of personality that the Jewish people could produce.

Nordau, in the segment of the eulogy for Herzl quoted at the start, was both right and wrong. Herzl did not have a state at his disposal, he did not have a coalesced people behind him, he had no organizational structure, and he had no money. Nevertheless, he possessed a single powerful tool that cannot be overestimated and that helped

him attain most of the other means necessary to transform him from a prolific, if not particularly brilliant, playwright and writer (whose books were not the ones that left a definitive imprint on his times) to a world-class political leader and statesman during his short lifetime. He wrote dozens of plays, some of them in collaboration with noted professionals, yearning for the applause and recognition of that segment of the public for whom the theater was the ultimate measure of talent and social and political self-expression. He gained such applause once or twice in Vienna's prestigious Burgtheater. Several of his plays were also produced in theaters in Berlin and Prague, with varied degrees of success, and one was produced in New York as well, but he did not reach the level of the popular Scandinavians, Ibsen and Strindberg, or of the Viennese Johann Nestroy. He wrote several volumes of clever philosophical short stories, some of them autobiographical, as well as sparkling *feuilletons* — feature articles, but he never produced the great novel he dreamed of, except for *Altneuland* ("Old New Land"), which did indeed attain immortality, although not for literary reasons.

The powerful tool that he did possess was his journalistic talent, which he began to exercise as early as age 17 when he started contributing to the largest German-language newspaper in Budapest, *Pester Lloyd*, and which he later honed as a reporter, columnist, lead-article writer and literary editor. This talent, together with his phenomenal willpower and capacity for work, opened the doors to the palaces of emperors, kings, princes of the Church, intellectuals, heads of state, politicians and diplomats as if by a magic wand. Today, we are sensitized to the influence of this magical tool in nearly all areas of life, from entertainment to politics. All that is necessary is to substitute for the word "pen" such terms as television, radio, computer or even "rating." Herzl, however, with brilliant intuition, perceived this power clearly in his own time when, alongside his lust for the theater, he struggled tenaciously to attain the professional goal that he regarded as second to none in importance then: a position in the press, and especially in the moderate, liberal *Neue Freie Presse* owned by two assimilated Jews, Eduard Bacher and Moritz Benedikt — the newspaper of the elite not only of Vienna but of all Central Europe. The pen in the hand of the virtuoso Herzl was Liszt's piano and Paganini's violin,

in Nordau's apt analogy. Or, if you will, Herzl became the rightful journalistic heir of another famous Jewish political reporter in Paris — Heinrich Heine.

Herzl achieved his goal. But at what price? The same Herzl who somewhat arrogantly turned down job offers from several important newspapers in Germany and Austria simply because their owners requested that he start on a trial basis, proposed to the *Presse* on his own volition that they take him on on just such a basis, even though the paper had actually published several of his articles and *feuilletons* already, and these had been well received by the readership. He was that determined to be taken on by the *Presse*, and that certain of his chances of success — a self-confidence that was indeed borne out.

Dr. Alex Bein, in the introduction to his book *From Boulanger to Dreyfus* (Jerusalem: Zionist Library, 1983, Hebrew), a compilation of Herzl's cables and articles from Paris, cites written guidelines laid down by the *Neue Freie Presse* editor, Eduard Bacher, to Herzl upon his appointment as Paris correspondent. First, he was to supply news reports and surveys of French domestic and foreign policy, as well as international developments as reflected in the French press. In addition, he was to include all other aspects of Parisian life in his articles, namely the stock exchange, finances, literature, theater, local events and social issues. Inasmuch as he was to report on a wide variety of topics, the formats he used had to be necessarily varied as well, from urgent brief telegrams to *feuilletons* and essays. Telegrams were to be sent very early in the morning so as to make the paper's evening edition deadline. The rest of the day and night were to be devoted to gathering material for the following morning edition. The editors and the readers expected to receive updated reports immediately after the occurrence of important events, and even hourly, or half-hourly reports while events were unfolding, thereby heightening anticipation and increasing demand. "First and foremost, fodder for the gaping jaws of curiosity," Bacher writes Herzl in December 1892. "Even if there is no time for cooking, for God's sake supply the raw material, even the rawest of material!"

Being the sole correspondent in Paris for so influential a newspaper demanded attendance at important political, social and artistic events, from sessions of parliament

to performances of the Comedie Francaise, ceremonies at the Academie Francaise when a new "immortal" was inaugurated, diplomatic receptions, evenings at literary salons, and meetings with local politicians and foreign diplomats. I would like to see the journalists' union today that would agree to a writ of enslavement such as that. But Herzl accepted the conditions without protest. He knew well what a newspaper was, and in particular what the *Neue Freie Presse* was. The secrets of the profession were evident to him from his close contact with newspaper editors and senior reporters, whether with the *Neue Wiener Tageblatt*, the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, the *Berliner Tageblatt*, the humoristic *Floh* ("The Flea") or other papers and periodicals throughout Europe to which he contributed impressions of his travels, after having discovered the "poetics of travel."

Several times he initiated negotiations to establish a new newspaper of his own, once he had immersed himself in political work, and was proficient in the smallest details of the publishing field, from budget to content, from lead articles to humor columns and cartoons. It was practically self-evident that not only would he write the first lead article for the weekly that he established for the Zionist Organization, *Die Welt* ("The World"), but that he would even design the title and the logo. His own paper, at last. Yet with all his pride in establishing it, he harbored fears that the adventure would cost him his position at the *Presse*. This did not happen. The *Presse* even ran an advertisement (paid?) announcing the appearance of Herzl's new weekly. But I am jumping ahead.

To return to his work as a reporter in Paris, Herzl knew that as exhausting as it would be, it would serve as a springboard in his journalistic career. Indeed, upon his return to Vienna he was appointed editor of the paper's literary supplement, an especially prestigious post that prompted even the greatest writers of the times to hang on his every word. Even if he could not foresee all the connections that he would make as a result of his journalistic standing, and the adventures he would have, and certainly not the amusing episode during an audience with the Turkish sultan when that potentate proposed a sizable, if undignified, "subsidy" for the *Neue Freie Presse* in order to acquire the support of the paper at a time when Turkey was the subject of widespread disparagement, he well understood what this stage in his career could grant him not only in his profession but far beyond. Moreover,

it was in Paris that the idea of seeking a political solution to the distress of the Jewish people, planted in his mind much earlier — after all, he lived with anti-Semitism all his adult life — ripened. The Dreyfus trial, and the attendant cries of "Death to the Jews!" apparently were the catalyst in this process.

The long hours and vast extent of the work did not daunt him, but he did fear that quantity would come at the expense of quality, which for him was unacceptable. Journalistically, he held up precision and style as supreme. He was a master of the *feuilleton*, the popular genre of essays and articles offering philosophy and commentary presented with subtle irony and barbed turns of phrase that appeared on the front page "below the fold," a genre much in demand in Europe and especially in Vienna. He could not allow himself any sloppiness or superficiality in his writing. Moreover, and perhaps as a result of his absorbing new post, he knew that the first imperative for a reporter as well as for a feature writer was to "be there" and to photograph in writing the moments of drama and the people who made the events. He did not allow himself to miss a single session when parliament was sitting, and certainly not the parliamentary repartee in the best French *esprit*, including exchanges below the belt. Skimming through the three volumes of Herzl's parliamentary reports, the reader today cannot but be impressed with his nuanced depictions of each movement and tremor by the famous French politicians of the day. His articles are filled with parenthetical observations, such as "prolonged derisive laughter," "screaming at the right," "loud noise" and so forth. With no television or radio, the public in the late nineteenth century relied on the reporter for faithful descriptions of all that occurred in parliamentary sessions, a field in which Herzl excelled. Beyond parliament, whenever a political event, a gripping criminal incident, or a court case of special interest took place, he hurried to the scene in order to provide an eyewitness report and commentary — "new journalism" at its best. All this was accomplished within the parameters of the rigid deadline imposed by a demanding editor and under the technologically backward communication conditions of the time. Herzl often worked 14-16 hours daily, and had only a single assistant — a distant relative who handled mostly administrative matters.

He had the good fortune to be in France during a turbulent and interesting period, as reflected in the apt title of the compilation of his work: *From Boulanger*

to *Dreyfus*, i.e., from General Boulanger, the radical nationalist accused of plotting the overthrow of the government and exiled from his homeland, to Dreyfus, the Jewish officer charged with spying for the Germans and sentenced for treason as the result of a base libel. In between were several public scandals, the most famous being the Panama scandal, in which Jewish public figures and financiers were also apparently involved. Additionally, a wave of sociopolitical anarchism swept over Paris during his time there, bringing terrorism in its wake. The anarchist chapter is particularly instructive, as it gave Herzl an opportunity not only to convey exciting descriptions of the hunt for the terrorists and their court trials — especially of arch-terrorist Ravachol (whose real name was Francois Koenigsburg), who became a larger-than-life legend, or of August Vaillant, who threw a bomb into the National Assembly ("the exceedingly ugly and frightening feature in his generally not unpleasant face was the eyes, sunk deep under thick brows, their glance piercing") — but to air his views on anarchy and on the rule of law and order.

The anarchists active in Paris then included, besides Frenchmen, Spaniards, Austrians, Germans and inevitably Jews, such as Rubinstein of Austria and Alexander Cohen of Holland, both of whom were expelled from France.

Herzl, a sensitive individual with a heightened sense of perception, attempted to understand or at least explore the terrorist ideology that involved blowing up coffee shops and murdering women and children at random, but clearly he was convinced that anarchism and terror constituted a grave danger to the rule of law and democratic governance, which precluded sentiments such as mercy or understanding in dealing with them. In an article published in the *Neue Freie Presse* on April 29, 1892, he wrote:

Whoever becomes emotional about the anarchists is a traitor to the state. Whoever judges them with mercy might be a good person but is a bad citizen. Whoever fears to judge them justly because he is afraid for his own hide, is not fit to fill the position he holds, even in cases where there is no danger. A democracy that tolerates incompetent office-holders is in essence already monarchistic. It lacks only the absolute ruler. And he will be found.... Today, the weak depend on the strong for protection. We should have sought a specific format for such protection. That format is called a social order. And we fight you [the anarchists] specifically in the name of the

very weak, on whose behalf you claim to act. So long as we, the law, are stronger, we shall pursue you dispassionately and mercilessly, and we shall destroy you.

In the very same article, Herzl the "new journalist" reappears, chasing down rumors of a new confrontation:

Midnight came. The trial [Ravachol's] was far from over. A rumor spread in the hall that a police station in another part of the city had been blown up. We rushed out immediately to get clear information. The route leads over a bridge on the Seine. The eye affectionately scans the nightscape of the old city with pointed spires, beautifully graduated roofs, delicately figured balconies, and beyond to the broad streets of the contemporary period flooded with new light. Gay people, at least by appearance happy, are coming out of the theaters. A city with an ancient, subtle culture, rich in arts, filled with exquisite treasures that are irreplaceable, such as the church windows that were shattered during the explosion at the Lobau barracks. And all this they want to destroy, those madmen.

Coincidentally, I conclude my discussion of Herzl the journalist with the above lines. Herzl's nearby neighbor on Berggasse in Vienna — Prof. Sigmund Freud — would have probably found an explanation for this coincidence. The two never met face to face, but Anna Freud relates that her father admired Herzl, saw his play *The New Ghetto*, and even dreamt about him twice. On Nordeau's

recommendation, Freud sent Herzl a copy of his book *The Interpretation of Dreams* when Herzl was the editor of the *Presse* literary supplement. The two were depicted by one of Herzl's biographers as "two prophets listening to very different voices" (Ernst Pawel, *The Labyrinth of Exile* [New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1989]).

This issue of *Qesher* is dedicated to Herzl the journalist on the occasion of the centenary of the First Zionist Congress in Basel, an institution entirely the product of his towering vision; his boundless energy and organizational ability, including his nearly obsessive attention to detail; and not least his latent talent as a theatrical director, which until then had not been realized. The cover painting by David Tartakover and a series of three articles by Rafi Mann, Ya'akov Rabi and Gideon Kouts present a particular aspect of Dr. Theodor Herzl — a portrait of the founder of the Zionist movement as journalist and editor. Notably, these articles, and the three sources cited in my remarks above, constitute only a small fraction of the books and essays written over the years about the father of political Zionism.



Head of the Journalism Studies Program
and Institute for Research of the Jewish Press

THE SCHNITZER CASE

On March 24, 1997, the Israel Prize Committee decided to award the prestigious prize in the area of print journalism to veteran journalist and former editor in chief of *Ma'ariv* Shmuel Schnitzer.

The decision evoked criticism that centered on an article written by Schnitzer in August 1994 titled "Import of Death" criticizing the immigration to Israel of the Falash Mura (Ethiopian Jews who converted to Christianity), an article that prompted the convening of two sessions of deliberations of the legal division of Israel's Press Council.

The importance of this journalistic issue and its varied implications merit a review of the unfolding of the affair over a period of three years.

Chapter One: Shmuel Schnitzer's Article, "Import of Death," *Ma'ariv*, August 19, 1994.

The article makes reference to Ministry Health data that the Falash Mura immigrants from Ethiopia have a high level of incidence of Aids, as well as of tuberculosis, information which the Ethiopian immigrant community, the writer asserts, would like to keep unpublicized. Schnitzer reviews the debate in Israel over whether to permit the Falash Mura to immigrate to Israel at all under the Law of Return (which applies to Jews only), referring to them as "people for whom Judaism is a sort of dirty shirt to be taken off or put on as convenient." Terming the affair "one of the gravest cases of irresponsibility in memory," he charges that the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption "brought into Israel hundreds of people carrying dangerous infectious diseases," and then attempted to "cover up" this irresponsibility by withholding publication of information directly relevant to public health.

Both diseases in question — "and who knows if there are not additional diseases that have not yet been revealed to us" — he points out, are fatal. "Whoever [finally] publicized this matter may have hurt the feelings of one community but performed a great service for a whole public and deserves recognition for his good deed."

Why, Schnitzer asks, were "several thousand disease-carrying apostates allowed into the country"? Citing but dismissing certain obvious explanations — negligence regarding public health, pressure by Ethiopian demonstrators (who in any event are "ignorant of the term apostate") for family reunification, "sheer stupidity" or ignorance of the

fact that "every country in the world places restrictions on immigrants who carry infectious diseases" — Schnitzer finds a deeper, more disturbing reason: a "national complex that causes us to act not according to logic or to our own interest, but according to what some international tribunal will say about us, composed primarily of the righteous of Bosnia,... Rwanda, and perhaps the radical Muslim leaders of the blacks in America, before whom we demonstrate our flawless decency, our revulsion at anything tainted by racism."

Immigration to Israel, he charges, is no longer the "privilege of Jews: it is an opportunity to prove to our judges that blacks, too, can immigrate. An apostate can, too, and a consumptive, and a person with AIDs."

Chapter Two: Deliberation by the Court of Ethics of the Press Council, March 26, 1995.

Mr. Gidon Spiro of Jerusalem, a private citizen, brought a complaint to the Press Council of Israel against Shmuel Schnitzer and *Ma'ariv* for publication of the article titled "Import of Death," which Mr. Spiro claimed was racist.

The Press Council's Court of Ethics rejected the complaint by a majority vote. One of the three panelists on the court held that the writer's criticism was directed at the Ministry of Immigrant Absorption, not at a "race." Moreover, harsher views than his had been published in the press regarding various communities in Israel, for example, the Russians, he stated. A second panelist, acknowledging that a particular community had been sullied to some extent, was convinced that this was not done for racial motives but out of what the writer perceived to be a threat to public health, a perception based on grounded suspicions. The third panelist demurred, pointing out that non-factual data had been presented by the writer as fact, and that he had attributed dangerous diseases to an entire community, exacerbating this slur by the repeated use of derogatory terminology.

Chapter Three: Deliberation by the Press Council Court of Appeals, February 26, 1996.

Gidon Spiro did not desist, and appealed the decision of the Press Council's Court of Ethics to the Council's Court of Appeals. Their deliberations resulted in a reversal of

the first decision by a majority of three to one, finding that Schnitzer's article "constitutes a violation of the requirements of journalistic ethics."

The president of the body, Prof. Ze'ev Segal, defined the issue as one of drawing a line between freedom of expression, and the limiting of that freedom in order to prevent a communal, ethnic or racial slur. This involves not merely the narrow definition of racism, but a broader recognition of the right of the individual to his dignity as a human being. Both textually and in spirit, the article in question, said the court president, makes unsupported accusations of a racial and communal nature and engenders denigrative sentiment toward the Ethiopian community, a line of expression "far exceeding what is required to highlight the government's responsibility to the maintenance of public health and welfare."

Chapter Four: The Israel Prize for Journalism is to be Awarded to Schnitzer, March 24, 1997.

The members of the Israel Prize Committee in the field of print journalism — Justice Gavriel Strassman (chairman), attorney Micha Yinon and journalist Gidon Lev-Ari — were apparently unaware of the decision by the Press Council's Appeals Court on the matter of the article "Import of Death," and decided to grant the prize for 1997 to Schnitzer for his Zionist body of writing and consistency of viewpoint over a 50-year period.

Chapter Five: President Weizman Intervenes, Schnitzer Relinquishes the Prize and Then Reneges.

The announcement of the award to Schnitzer evoked public debate. The Ethiopian immigrants protested that the Israel Prize was being granted to a "racist," a charge supported by journalists and public figures.

President Ezer Weizman spoke with Schnitzer and told him that he could not award him the prize at the ceremony to be held at the close of Independence Day unless Schnitzer apologized for harming the Ethiopian community. Schnitzer replied that he had no intention of apologizing, and that he was prepared to relinquish the prize, to which the president responded: "Then you have relinquished it." However, Schnitzer subsequently rescinded this concession.

Chapter Six: Schnitzer Responds to his Critics.

In an article published in *Ma'ariv* on April 11, 1997,

Schnitzer expressed his firm conviction that he deserved the prize despite his article of 1994 and the decision by the Press Council Appeals Court regarding it. He related that the outpouring of support that he received for his stand convinced him that the prize was awarded not so much to him personally as to the views he had consistently expressed — views that are not popular with the establishment. Therefore, he wrote, he had no right to concede the prize. He pointed out that the Israel Prize was being awarded to him as a journalist, not as a politician. His task, as he saw it, was to express his views honestly, even if they did not conform with the "will of certain individuals."

Chapter Seven: The Case Reaches the Supreme Court.

Member of Knesset Addisu Massala, of Ethiopian origin, petitioned the Supreme Court to prevent the awarding of the Israel Prize to Schnitzer. Minister of Education and Culture Zevulun Hammer, coming to Schnitzer's defense, stated that even though he felt that Schnitzer had erred in his article of 1994, his credentials as a journalist and editor were manifold and he was deserving of the prize.

The Supreme Court decided on April 24, 1997, that the Prize Committee should reconvene and deliberate on three points: the article "Import of Death," the decision of the Press Council Court to convict Schnitzer of a breach of ethics, and Schnitzer's present stand.

Chapter Eight: Renewed Deliberations by the Israel Prize Committee for the Media Award.

In anticipation of the renewal of deliberations by the Prize Committee, a discussion was held between Schnitzer and Dr. Dov Goldberger, aide to the minister of education on the Israel Prize awards. Schnitzer declared that he did not regret writing the article "Import of Death," but "if anyone was hurt by the article that I wrote, I regret this very much. My only intention was to criticize the policy of the government on this topic."

The Prize Committee convened at length on May 5, 1997, but its three members failed to reach unanimity, and in light of the regulations regarding the selection of the prizewinner, the committee decided not to award the prize to Schnitzer.

HERZL AND THE PRESS: FROM "SWORD OF STEEL" TO CABLE NEWSPAPER / Rafi Mann

Theodor Herzl, a lawyer by training, was a journalist by profession and worked as literary editor and editorial writer for the Viennese *Neue Freie Presse* until the day he died (at age 44). He retained this work even at the height of his Zionist endeavors, when he was perceived by many as "king of the Jews," organizing the first Zionist Congresses, championing the movement's cause in the face of internal and external opposition, serving as its spokesman in the courts of the mighty and its chief publicist in print.

A direct link is discernible between Herzl's journalistic background and his Zionist work in the use he made of his vocation to further the Zionist cause, for he viewed the press as a tool which could serve the goals of the Zionist movement.

While still a law student, Herzl began writing both plays and feature pieces — *feuilletons*. The plays that were produced received mixed reviews, but the feature articles were consistently well received, leading Herzl to a career in journalism. The *feuilleton* occupied an important place in German journalism of the turn of the 20th century, which favored the subjective and the literary over the factual. Herzl's career was initiated during a visit to Berlin in late 1886, where he met with the editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt* — that city's leading paper — and was hired to write a weekly report from Vienna (Herzl's home), which was published for a period of years. He also wrote features and sketches from various other European cities that he visited for other papers, and in 1887 became feature editor of the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*. In 1891 he was offered a position by the *Neue Freie Presse* — the leading newspaper in the Austro-Hungarian Empire — as its correspondent in Paris.

The position in Paris, which constituted an excellent springboard for the young journalist, provided him with an education on two planes: it sensitized him to the full extent of anti-Semitism, as exposed during the Dreyfus affair, and it equipped him for his future political role. Meanwhile, he spent several years there as a prolific journalist covering all facets of French political and cultural life in news reports, analysis and features.

Returning to Vienna in 1895 to become the literary editor of *Neue Freie Presse*, Herzl was dismayed to discover that the (Jewish) publishers of the paper would not allow

him to air his Zionist views, which he had crystalized by then, in his articles. Moreover, they tried to dissuade him from publishing his *Der Judenstaat* in Vienna. Later, the Zionist weekly that he founded in 1897, *Die Welt* ("The World"), evoked his employers' anger, and while the first Zionist Congress convened that year in Basle was covered widely throughout the world, the newspaper with which Herzl was affiliated as a senior editor pointedly ignored it, a policy that was sustained until he died.

The paper's anti-Zionist hostility occupied Herzl greatly. He feared antagonizing his employers to the point that they would dismiss him, and although this did not happen, he was forced to contend with constant ridicule by them of his ideological cause. With the passage of time, when he was received by heads of state and royalty as spokesman of the Zionist cause, yet had to earn his living at a workplace where he kept a low profile, the psychological dichotomy of the two aspects of his life embittered him. Still, his position with the newspaper granted him a sense of independence from reliance on the Zionist movement for a living, a prospect that he refused to countenance.

For all his concern over his status at the *Neue Freie Presse*, he utilized his senior editorial position with the prestigious paper to maximal advantage in his efforts to establish contact with people in high places, such as Baron Maurice de Hirsch, former chancellor of Germany Bismarck, Prime Minister of Austria-Hungary Ernst von Kraber, and the Turkish sultan. Yet the paper's editorial criticism of the sultan at one point caused Herzl considerable agitation, as he was in the midst of negotiations with the Turkish court. Similarly, editorial criticism by the paper of British Colonial Secretary Neville Chamberlain was distressing at a time when Herzl was seeking his aid in exploring the possibility of Jewish settlement in the Sinai Peninsula.

From the start of his Zionist work, Herzl was convinced of the centrality of the press in advancing the Zionist idea, and of the need to gain control of at least one newspaper toward this end. In 1895 he acted on this plan and acquired shares in the parent company of the *Stierer Tageblatt*, investing all of his monies as well as funds of his family. The plan failed, but Herzl continued to seek an alternative along these lines, preferably a paper not overtly identified with the Zionist movement, which would make

for a more credible platform to reach a broader public. Acquiring the *Neue Freie Presse* would have been ideal, in his view, but he could not raise the necessary funding.

In the end, he resorted to setting up his own paper, *Die Welt*, a weekly launched in Vienna in 1897 shortly before the first Zionist Congress and funded out of his own pocket. Although he produced and backed the paper until 1903, when it was transferred to the ownership of the Zionist movement, his name was purposely not listed as publisher, and, under pressure from his employers at the *Neue Freie Presse*, he signed his articles "Benjamin Ze'ev." *Die Welt* constituted an important tool for him, especially with the intensification of internal conflict within the movement. Published in German, it lasted until 1914. A Yiddish edition, which Herzl favored, was begun in 1900 but lasted only a year.

In Herzl's mind, the importance to the movement of controlling a newspaper was twofold: to inculcate its aims among Jews, and to advance its political goals in the diplomatic arena. Without this tool, he wrote, he felt that he was fighting his political battles with a sword of wood. What he required, he said, was a sword of steel to aid him in forging international relations. Even after he founded *Die Welt*, he continued his quest to raise funds for the takeover of an existing daily, which he remained convinced was a political necessity. Several possibilities arose, but none came to fruition.

Die Welt, therefore, was his only personal tool, and he used it maximally to gain international leverage, for example, making known to the sultan that he would provide him with a supportive editorial platform in his newspaper in exchange for political rewards, especially in light of the widespread international criticism of Turkey for its brutal suppression of the Armenians.

Acutely aware of the public relations value of the press, Herzl sought to be interviewed both by Jewish and general newspapers. During these interviews, moreover, he extracted information from his interviewers wherever

possible regarding political developments relevant to his movement. He tracked every report that appeared in the press about himself, analyzing its potential benefit or harm and following up with appropriate steps. While these exacting efforts resulted in only partial success during his lifetime, Herzl had managed to lay the foundations for the concept of a Jewish state that was to become entrenched later on.

Another aspect of Herzl's conception of the press was reflected in his utopian novel *Altneuland* ("Old New Land"), published in 1902, envisioning the future Jewish state. The state would have an unusual newspaper, he wrote, run on a cooperative basis. Moreover, this paper would operate telephonically by means — prophetically — of an underground cable system connected to every home, a depiction that bore out contemporary reviews of the book referring to its author as "the Jewish Jules Verne." Other prescient views he held regarding the press in the future state included an insistence not only on freedom of the press but on the need for the journalist to maintain his integrity, and the importance of dealing with ethical issues that arise in the field of journalism. Additionally, he assigns to the press the task of ombudsman regarding abuses by public officials of their authority.

The press occupied Herzl both professionally and, with the passage of time, even moreso as a vital tool for implementing his program, reflecting his strong belief in the power of the printed word to influence events. This perception was shared by the intellectual European world at the turn of the 20th century generally, reflected most graphically in the effect of Emil Zola's article "*J'accuse*" on the Dreyfus affair. Herzl, however, saw the press as something even more — as a "steel sword" to be utilized to the fullest in order to promote his cause. It was this highly professional approach that differentiated him from his colleagues in the Zionist struggle and contributed to his success in reaching a broad public.

HERZL AS FOREIGN CORRESPONDENT / Ya'akov Rabi

While Theodor Herzl has long been viewed by the Jewish people, and the world, as a figure who made history by envisioning the Jewish state, emerging meteorically as the leader of the Jewish people, his contemporaries outside the Jewish world saw him solely as a writer and journalist, as reflected, for example, in the brief obituary on him in *Le Figaro* on July 4, 1904. As for his devotion to the Zionist cause, it was probably perceived then as an obsession, best left discretely unmentioned.

A misconception of another kind exists regarding his period in Paris as a foreign correspondent (1891-95), which is widely cited as the catalyst that prompted his fateful conclusions regarding the redemption of the Jewish people and his role in it, in light of his exposure to French anti-Semitism and the trauma of the Dreyfus trial. Presumably, this turned Herzl almost overnight from a sworn assimilationist to a nationally conscious Jew who had found the solution to the distress of his people.

In fact, his ideological development was gradual. Even before his arrival in Paris, the Jewish question troubled him, and while in Paris he toyed with various solutions to it, including, fleetingly, mass conversion to Christianity, or the promise of socialism, both of which he then rejected. His play *Ghetto* (1895; later, *The New Ghetto*) was another attempt to deal with the issue. However, the mass of telegrams, articles and features that he dispatched to his employers in Vienna, the *Neue Freie Presse*, during his time in Paris (collated in Hebrew translation in a three-volume work) do not point to any imminent change in focus.

Herzl emerges from this material as intensely absorbed by his work, to which he applies himself virtually night and day. His attitude toward France is generally admiring on the human and cultural level, especially as regards the views of its progressive thinkers, although he censures the terrorist activity of the anarchists in Paris, which runs counter to his sense of civic responsibility and intrinsic respect for law and order. Herzl observes and records the tumultuous political, social and economic scene unfolding in the barely stabilized Third Republic without becoming overly involved with it. He is an outsider.

Only one arena of French life truly captivated him — parliament, where the drama and spectacle of rhetorical

give and take, with all its calculated nuances of tone and style, appealed to the dramatist in him. He covered this area avidly and in lyric detail. Similar rhetorical and dramatic events appealed to him as well, for example, court sessions, and the ceremonies at the French Academy marking the immortalization of a new members. Later, when organizing the Zionist Congresses, he would insist on ritual and formal attire.

His articles from Paris did deal with Jews as well — especially Jewish dignitaries, along with the question of anti-Semitism generally and French anti-Semitism in particular. In fact, these articles were rather too frequent for his Viennese employers' liking. He reported in detail, for example, on the parliamentary debate over the question of the ostensible "Judaization" of the French government, which obviously agitated him.

In the matter of the Dreyfus trial, he at first (November 2, 1895) tended to accept the probable guilt (for treason) of the captain in the French GHQ, conceivably because the anti-Semitic overtones in the case were not yet evident. He covered the daily developments in the trial in great detail, gradually revealing some doubt about the captain's guilt, until, in a dramatic description of the humiliating ceremony at the Invalides Park in which Dreyfus was stripped of his rank while maintaining his dignity and insisting on his innocence, the reporter was plainly agitated. Curiously, the widespread historic version of this event, which Herzl later reiterated in an article in 1899, has the crowd shouting at that moment: "Death to the traitor!" "Death to the Jews!" Yet the article that appeared in the *Neue Freie Presse* on January 5, 1895, omits the key words: "Death to the Jews!" Was this because Herzl could not bring himself to transmit so loathesome a sentiment, or because his newspaper in Vienna deleted it as contrary to its policy? Equally curious, Herzl's reports in the paper do not mention Dreyfus' Jewish identity until two months after his arrest. Again, did the editors delete this?

In any event, Herzl's reports of the trial do not point to any turning point experienced by him then. Rather, this appears later in his diaries, his extensive correspondence and his Zionist editorials.

What is revealed, however, is the intensive pace he had to keep up during his four years as a foreign correspondent

in order to meet the extreme demands of his employers in Vienna, to be followed by nine more years of relentless

pressure back home. Little wonder that in his pursuit of events, and in their pursuit of him, his heart gave out.

HERZL AND NORDEAU AS CRITICS OF THE PRESS / Gideon Kouts

A survey in late 1902 by the French weekly *La Revue Politique et Littéraire* (later renamed *La Revue Bleue*) requested present and former foreign correspondents from European states who were based in Paris to assess the French press. The replies to this question, published in December 1902, were largely in agreement: Paris newspapers were exciting and well written but contained little information.

Two of the respondents happened to be two of the outstanding leaders of political Zionism then, who had in fact first met in Paris when both were foreign correspondents there: Theodor Herzl (1860-1904), who by 1902 was the leader of the Zionist movement, served as foreign correspondent for the Viennese *Neue Freie Presse* during 1891-95, and still worked for that paper in Vienna; and Max Nordau (1849-1923), author, philosopher, physician and journalist, still based in Paris as foreign correspondent for the Berlin *Vossische Zeitung*.

Curiously, neither the Jewish identity nor the Zionist activity of these two respondents is mentioned by the editor

of the *Revue*, nor, even more significantly, are these aspects referred to by the respondents themselves. Both Herzl and Nordau replied purely as representatives of the "German" world. Yet at the time, only weeks had passed since the mysterious death of Emil Zola; the Dreyfus affair was still fresh and had not yet ended formally; and Zionist activity was at a fevered pitch. Herzl's nostalgic reminiscence in particular is a pointed reminder of the double lives that both men led in order to earn their livelihood as journalists vis-a-vis their intense Zionist involvement.

Nordau, in an elegant and subtle brief reply, praises the Paris newspapers for their literary brilliance and colorful local reportage but suggests that their foreign coverage is both skimpy and biased. Herzl, in a rambling, sentimental piece, gives essentially the same reply, adding comparisons with the English press (accurate world coverage) and the German press (world coverage, but ponderous).

Nowhere in this context does the Jewishness of these journalists emerge, conceivably because in both cases their consciousness of their Jewish identity had only recently been heightened.

THE GLOBAL MEDIA AND THE MEDIA IN ISRAEL: CHANGES IN APPROACH TO DEFENSE-RELATED TOPICS / Yaron Katz

The advent of global communications has led to a change in Israeli policy regarding state security, as well as to a change in the perception by the public of the role of the media. This process of change reached a climax with the exposure in 1995 of the names of the heads of Israel's

Secret Service and its Mosad — traditionally unpublicized — although signs of change were evident as far back as the post-Yom Kippur War period. The altered consensus between the political realm, the public and the media regarding the new media reality in Israel is reflected in

a new censorship agreement reached between these three elements giving wide freedom to the media.

Israel, in contrast to its neighbors, has always granted complete freedom of expression to the media in every area save state security, which, in light of the country's long history of war and exposure to terrorism, prompted the imposition of military censorship. This censorship system is based on defense rulings from the British Mandate period along with an agreement drawn up between the Israel Defense Forces and the national Editors' Committee. Ultimately, the system proved viable because of the "defense culture" that has typified the country, stemming from the widespread perception of security as being of paramount importance. The country has rightly been portrayed as a society "on call," in that the entire population, and not just the military, is prepared to serve the national interest as defined by the government.

With this, the need to reconcile a free press, on the one hand, with national security needs, on the other, is a topic that has long occupied Israeli society. Debate has focused on the imperative of providing full coverage of events even during wartime or some other security threat, while not harming state security; the dilemma of whether or not to publicize events that might elicit violence or weaken morale; and the goals of credibility, the airing of diverse views, and a balance between the public's right to know and the restrictions of censorship.

The traditional national consensus in Israel on the importance of censorship, which stemmed from society's fortress mentality, gradually changed after the Yom Kippur War of 1973, with open adversity between the press and the censor surfacing during the Lebanese War of 1982-85. This development resulted from growing domestic pressure for greater freedom of access to security information,

heightened, in the 1990s, by society's total access to the global media through international cable television.

The last few years have witnessed a change in the approach of the Israeli media to defense-related issues as a result of the exposure of Israeli society to the international media, particularly the electronic media, and the accessibility of information both to Israelis and to the rest of the world. Access to global communications that are not bound by local censorship restrictions has forced a compromise regarding Israel's security interests. This new reality has also engendered a change in the relationship between the media and the defense establishment. A Supreme Court judgment in 1988 reduced the authority of the censorship apparatus and obliged a new balance between freedom of expression and state security by its finding that the sole criterion for censorship is near certainty that a particular report will cause actual damage to the security of the state.

These changes have been reflected in a gradual but ongoing reduction in the freedom, and legitimation, to withhold information on defense-related issues from the public. Moreover, as a result of exposure to global media, the local Israeli media have focused on a new societal reality of reduced local political influence and heightened international economic influence. This development has dovetailed with changed attitudes toward national security as a result of the peace agreements with Egypt, Jordan and the Palestinians, and consequent reduced defense spending. A lowering of the motivation to serve in the Israel Defense Forces is one byproduct of this change. All these issues, as reflected in the Israeli media, demonstrate the major role that the media play in molding social, political and cultural trends both on the local and the global levels.

C
T
M

The
whic
late
Jewi
The
Jewi
by
indi
need

S
prin
that
is
peri
shar
that
leve
corr
edit
edit
Fur
app
they
bro
to
con

E
of
reli
me
and
add
whi
bec
rea
mo
reg
cor
mo
dic
cor

CULTURAL MEDIA IN TRANSITION: FROM THE TRADITIONAL SERMON TO THE JEWISH PRESS / Menahem Blondheim

The origins of the Jewish press, a relatively recent medium which can be assumed to have first emerged in the late 17th century, may lie in older and more entrenched Jewish institutions, especially that of the public sermon. The sermon, one of the oldest and most widespread Jewish institutions, is nevertheless not clearly prescribed by religious commandment and its origins are unknown, indicating that it sprang from a basic social and cultural need, filling an important role in Jewish communal life.

Similarly, the periodical press spread rapidly once the print medium was developed in the 15th century, suggesting that it, too, filled a societal need. Even though the sermon is a vocal medium in a communal context and the periodical a print medium in a wider social context, they share significant commonalities. Both address audiences that are variegated, representing a mix of ages and social levels. Both also highlight the centrality of the professional communicator — the trained scholarly preacher, or the editor (witness major periodicals that were named for their editors, e.g., *Harper's*, *Collier's*, *Barron's* and *Forbes*). Furthermore, both media are periodic, i.e., they occur or appear at fixed intervals of the calendar. Additionally, they each have set formats (in the case of the sermon, broadly: an opening Halakhic question or *midrash*, its link to the weekly Torah portion, and its relevance to the contemporary time and place).

Even the apparent contradiction between the centrality of changing actualia in the periodical vis-a-vis abiding religious truths in the sermon is only ostensible, for both media in fact function as a link between current events and the basic cultural norms of the society that each addresses. Of all religious genres, the sermon is the one which addresses contemporary change. This is so, firstly, because the sermon is an ephemeral medium, delivered in real time and aimed at a particular audience at a given moment. Additionally, the audience is heterogeneous as regards age, gender, educational level and occupation, its common denominator being the shared experience of the moment. Moreover, the very periodicity of the sermon dictates the use of fresh material, with the changing reality constituting an important source.

The periodical, similarly, surveys and provides a context for actualia, first by the very process of selection and editing of the materials printed, and then by means of the editorial column.

The similarity of the two media may be illustrated by two disparate examples. The first is the 19th century New York *Herald*, which built its reputation on providing the latest, up-to-the-minute news. Seeking new sources of interest to its readership in the 1840s, it began publishing a weekly summary of Sunday sermons by leading preachers in major churches in the city, widening out the column to out-of-town sermons and eventually to sermons from Europe acquired at considerable expense by trans-Atlantic cable. Significantly, the *Herald* was the archetype of the "secular" paper, often criticized for its sceptical and even derisive attitude to religion. The news aspect of its sermon column lay, in fact, on how current political issues were treated by the preachers, who were quoted with the same interest as political figures. Editorials, too, were devoted to such sermons. Later, coverage of sermons became widespread throughout the American press and abroad for the same reason. The Jewish press, too, covered Sabbath sermons widely.

The second, quite different example illustrating the similarity between the two media lies in the religious press, which during the 18th and especially the 19th centuries essentially constituted a vehicle for the transplanting of the sermon from the oral to the print medium. Today, dozens of Orthodox synagogue periodicals are distributed in synagogues each Sabbath, their content a mix of Torah commentary and ethics alongside in-depth analysis of actualia, reproducing the essential function of the sermon: bridging the ritual of the synagogue with the mundane events of the world.

The sermon and the periodical also share nearly identical societal roles, namely surveillance of events in society, correlation of fragments of information, transmission of cultural heritage, entertainment, and mobilization for the purpose of fulfilling societal goals through propaganda and persuasion.

During periods of social change, both the sermon and

the media change too, adapting themselves to new needs. The sermon has undergone changes in format, frequency, delivery and style in response not only to religious and intellectual developments but to changing circumstances within society. In times of communal crisis, the demand for the sermon as a surveyor, correlator and mobilizer rises. Examples are the very emergence of the institution of the sermon during the Jewish encounter with Hellenism; the crisis resulting from the destruction of the Temple during the Roman period; and, to make a large historic leap, the transplantation to America, where the sermon rose in importance as compared to its previous status. Internal crisis within the community also enhances the role of the sermon. During periods of tension between the religious authorities and the population, for example, preachers adopt a firmer didactic approach in an effort to mend society's ways. Other examples of the alteration of sermon formats are to be found during the Enlightenment period and the rise of Reform, in the emergence of Hasidism, in the Mussar movement, and among the propagators of Zionism.

The sermon as an institution was, therefore, flexible, as was the medium of the press. Once Jews began to spread out geographically, following the discovery of the new world, the modernization of transportation, and a relaxation of political restrictions on movement, their link with their core communal culture was no longer oral. Furthermore, such revolutionary movements as the Enlightenment, Hasidism, socialism and Zionism cleaved the local Jewish community itself and rapidly engendered new organizational structures. Additionally, the political and social emancipation of the Jews of Western Europe,

and the entrenchment of the Enlightenment and of Reform there highlighted the marginality of the Jewish community, on the one hand, and the problem of the integration of Jews as individuals and as a group, on the other.

These major developments combined to generate the Jewish press and a process of role transition from the institution of the sermon to that of the press. The press began to serve as the bridge between the Jewish centers and the remote periphery, while also linking the various ideological movements and trends that emerged in the Jewish world with their far-flung adherents. In addition, a rabbinic and Orthodox press emerged to unify traditional segments of the Jewish population in Western Europe who found themselves marginalized in an increasingly assimilationist society. Lastly, the Jewish press helped reinforce the Jewish consciousness of Jews not formally identified with the community.

The Jewish press thus expanded greatly from the mid-19th century onward, appearing in a multiplicity of formats and languages to fill new needs.

The press as a medium of communications may be viewed not only as a conveyor of information but, on a deeper level, as a matrix for the community, reflected in the closeness of the words communication and community. In the latter, communal, sense, the press embraces the element of ritual, a basic communal component that serves to bind a population together. In this sense, too, the press is a continuum of the sermon and plays a significant role in the research of Jewish history in its function as interpreter of the present in light of the inherited cultural norms of the past.

MIRTHFUL PESSIMISM: THE YIDDISH HUMORISTIC/SATIRIC PRESS IN POLAND BETWEEN THE WORLD WARS /

Marian Fuks

The Yiddish humoristic/satiric press in Poland occupies a special place in the history of Jewish journalism there, reflecting a rich mixture of traditional Jewish humor, benign sarcasm that at times was closer to tears masked by laughter, an incisive perception of current events and sociopolitical issues, and the influence of the great tradition

of humor of the Yiddish classic writers, including Y. L. Peretz, Shalom Aleichem, Shalom Asch and Mendele Mokher Seforim. This press also constitutes an invaluable source for research of the history of the Polish Jewish community, reflecting many of the issues and facets of Jewish life there.

At least 80 Yiddish humor periodicals were published in Poland between 1918 and 1939 (a complete listing is given at the end of the Hebrew article), although most were one-time efforts, often issued at holiday time. The lack of sustained periodicals in this genre was most likely due to the competition presented by the Jewish daily press, which regularly included a humor page in weekend (Friday-Saturday) editions. Examples include the Warsaw *Haynt* ("Today," 1908-39), whose humor page was titled "*Der Kolboyunik*" ("Catchall"), edited by Pinhas Katz; *Der Moment* ("Moment," 1910-39), which published a weekly humor column titled "*Der Kroomer Shpiegel*" ("The Crooked Mirror"), skillfully edited by Der Tunkeler (Joseph Tunkel); and the popular *Unzer Express* ("Our Express," 1926-39), with its weekly humor section "*Der Shed*" ("The Demon").

The initiators of humoristic periodicals were generally known satirists, some of whom were staff members of the daily Yiddish press in Warsaw, such as Joseph Tunkel, Abraham Rosenfeld (Bontshe), Joseph Simon Goldstein ("Der Lustiger Pesimist" — The Merry Pessimist), Pinhas Katz, Moshe Nudelman, David Ber Kutscher, Moshe Marmorek and Menahem Kipnis.

The earliest Jewish humoristic periodicals emerged in the later 19th and early 20th centuries. In Poland, this genre was called "*yom-tov bletelakh*" (holiday bulletins), appearing during 1862-1915. One example was *Die Been* ("The Bee"), edited by Shmuel Yatzkan, which published 13 issues of 10,000 copies each in 1906.

A longer-lasting humoristic weekly, *Der Bluffer*, edited by Pinhas Katz, was published from June 23, 1926, to August 15, 1930. Katz (b. 1891 in Lodz) was a veteran journalist and satirist who entered the world of the Jewish press at age 16 and published humoristic and satiric pieces in *Erev Shabbat* ("Sabbath Eve"), *Der Moment* and *Haynt*. His goal was to establish an ongoing humoristic periodical, which he first realized in 1919 when he put out 19 issues of *Der Mehabel* ("The Terrorist"), revived in 1924 with four more issues and appearing sporadically thereafter from 1928 to 1936. *Der Bluffer* was to prove a more sustained effort and typified the humoristic-satiric press of the interwar period, as reflected in a statement of intent in its first issue:

During these times, when the whole world bluffs mercilessly, when "bluff, bluff above all" has become the motto of half of humanity, when there is hardly a home that doesn't have a liar, when lying is a matter of honor, when someone who doesn't lie isn't worth having his hand shaken, when the gravest, most embarrassing thing is to be

an honest person... in such times does *Der Bluffer* appear — jolly, satiric, merry, alive, defending you... yes, yes, *Der Bluffer* is the only honest, open, straightforward bluffer, with no disguise! He is the only bluffer in the world who calls himself by his true name and does not demand that you call him, instead, "righteous," "seeker of justice"... Therefore, we shall not deal with any socially [beneficial] activity,... the "saving of humanity," the "dissemination of ideas," "lighting up the darkness"... Our task shall be the dispersal of the heavy atmosphere created by the *nudniks* [tiresome bores] of the Jewish community. And along the way we'll try to catch a few of the fine young men proficient in the Talmud.

Bluffer covered a wide range of topics — ethical, spicy and even erotic, although pride of place went to political satire of current events and especially of the condition of the Jews of Poland. The editor was well-attuned to Jewish traditional humor, which he incorporated into the periodical both directly, in columns devoted to it, and indirectly in parodies of current events. Special editions appeared at holiday time — Passover, Rosh Hashanah, Succot and especially Purim.

One of *Bluffer's* favorite targets for ridicule was Poland's first prime minister after the May revolution of 1926, Kazimir Bertel, an overt anti-Semite. Other anti-Semitic politicians were also the subject of satire. The highly factionalized Jewish and Polish labor movements also came in for ridicule, as did the country's election campaigns and its sick fund clinics.

Bluffer also ran serialized translations of foreign works, such as segments of Boccaccio's *Decameron* and pieces by Mark Twain, Chekhov and Cocteau. Numerous cartoons and caricatures were also included, although many were unsigned. Part of the humor was sophisticated, but a good deal of it was on a low level, apparently out of a need to cater to varied audiences.

Another weekly of this genre, *Tararam* ("Tumult"), was edited by two outstanding satirists, Joseph Shimon Goldstein and Moshe Nudelman, in April 1934, although its level fell below that of *Mehabel* and *Bluffer*. Interestingly, a column of biographies of noted personalities that it ran included Urke Nachalnik, the Jewish ex-convict who became a best-selling novelist (see *Qesher* 18, May 1996). *Tararam*, like the other periodicals noted, reflected the condition of the Jewish population then, which was in economic crisis as a result of harsh government policies. It sold at the extremely low price of 10 groszy, and published 11 issues only.

MANFRED GEORG AND THE MUKACEVO "JUEDISCHE REVUE," 1936-38 / Daniel Mueller

The German-language monthly *Juedische Revue* was published in Mukacevo, then Czechoslovakia, from June 1936 to September 1938, with a final October-November 1938 issue published when that city was annexed to Hungary in November 1938.

The beginnings of the periodical may be said to go back to 1933 when its editor, Manfred Georg (1893-1965), a doctor of law, a Zionist and a known anti-Nazi, was ejected from his position as a journalist with the illustrated evening paper *Tempo*, in Berlin, probably on April 1, 1933, when a Nazi crowd raided the building of the paper's publisher, Ullstein. Georg, fearing for his life, left for Switzerland, meeting in Zurich with the publisher of the *Prager Montagsblatt* ("Prague Monday Newspaper"), for whom he had been writing since 1930 and who offered him a position with the paper in Prague. Accepting the proposal, Georg moved to Prague. There, in addition to working for the paper, he contributed articles to other newspapers in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere in Europe, wrote prose, including a novel published in Switzerland in 1937, and collected royalties from previously published books, screenplays and radio skits still current in Germany. He also traveled regularly in Europe, especially to Paris, where he worked at intervals of several months on the *Parizer Tagblat* ("Paris Daily").

Georg was long interested in Jewish life in the "wild east" of Czechoslovakia, namely, Carpathian Ruthenia. According to a Czechoslovakian census of 1930, the entire country had a Jewish population of close to 400,000 Jews. This population was highly variegated, consisting of a small Jewish community in Bohemia, who were mostly nonreligious and largely assimilated into Czech culture, although some were identified Zionistically; an even smaller community in Moravia with similar attributes as the Bohemian community; a large community in Slovakia made up of Hungarian Yiddish-speaking Jews, most of whom were religious; and a large community in Carpathian Ruthenia, most of whom identified themselves as Jews by nationality, spoke Yiddish as their mother tongue, and fostered a strong religious educational system with growing Zionist awareness. Many knew some Hebrew as well as other languages.

The Jewish community of Carpathian Ruthenia was intensely factionalized, immersed in seething rivalries between various Hasidic dynasties — the most famous of which was headed by the Munkacz rebbe, Hayim Elizer Spira (d. 1937) — and in parallel in a conflict between the Hasidim and the small Zionist community. The Zionists themselves were internally divided into the mainstream and a small but tenacious Revisionist minority within a minority. Furthermore, certain groups of assimilated Jews identified themselves as Czech by nationality and others as Hungarian, contributing to additional divisiveness. Yet another unsettling factor was widespread anti-Semitism both among the general population of the country and in the government, with officials actively inciting and discriminating against Jews.

Georg traveled to the city of Mukacevo, the center of Jewish cultural life in Carpathian Ruthenia, in February 1936 to deliver a series of Zionist lectures. There he met several of the local Zionist leaders, who, while representing a minority of the population as compared to the Hasidic majority, were highly active communally. One of them, Dr. Hayim Kugel, was one of the two elected representatives of the Jewish Party in the Lower House of the Czechoslovakian Parliament as well as principal of the first secondary school in Czechoslovakia to teach in Hebrew as the language of general instruction — the Hebrew Reform Gymnasium for the Sciences. Georg also met with the two directors of the Zionist publishing house in Mukacevo, "Nekudah" — Ignatz Deutsch and Moritz Goldstein, who, according to Georg's memoirs, proposed establishing the *Juedische Revue* with himself as editor.

Mukacevo had three major Yiddish weeklies at the time: *Yidishes Folksblat* ("Jewish People's Newspaper"), founded c. 1924 by the Belz Hasidim, who had fled their native Galicia with the outbreak of pogroms after World War I; *Yidishe Tsaytung* ("Jewish Newspaper"), established c. 1927 by the Belze rebbe's bitter rival — the Munkacz rebbe, in response to the Belz paper; and the mainstream Zionist *Yidishe Shtime* ("Jewish Voice"), published from 1929 by Nekudah. Another Zionist paper was issued by Jabotinsky's Revisionists, *Zsidó Néplap* ("Jewish People's

Newspaper"), published in Hungarian in the nearby city of Uzhorod.

Nekudah, a vigorous, well-equipped publishing enterprise which received funding from the American Joint Distribution Committee, reached out through periodicals and books to Jewish audiences in Hungarian, Hebrew, Yiddish, German, Czech, Slovakian, French and English. Receiving an affirmative response from Georg, Nekudah moved quickly to establish the monthly *Juedische Revue*, whose first issue was dated June 1936.

Its content was multifaceted and included news, scholarly articles, poetry, fiction, reprints of essays by such Zionist personalities as Ben-Gurion, Ben-Zvi and Jabotinsky, and reviews of books and periodicals from all over the world. Georg also managed to attract noted writers as contributors. Zionist in point of view, *Juedische Revue* was anti-assimilationist, consistently highlighting the achievements of the Jewish Yishuv in Palestine. It also maintained a running polemic with the Revisionists once they left the Zionist Organization.

Curiously, the magazine at first barely dealt with the Nazi issue, only gradually touching on it in 1937 and 1938 until finally attacking the Nazis directly and aggressively at the very end. This policy undoubtedly reflected necessary caution on Georg's part, although his self-portrayal much later as an uncompromising anti-Nazi fighter is difficult to reconcile with the evidence. Further, the periodical's consistently laudatory approach toward the Czech government, to the point of explicit denial of the existence of anti-Semitism in the country, seems excessive, especially in light of Dr. Kugel's consistent efforts in Parliament to expose and censure the flagrant anti-Semitism of government officials.

At its peak in late 1937 the periodical published 3,000-4,000 copies, with distribution spread over a large geographic region embracing the dispersion of German-speaking Jews during the 1930s. With the German invasion of Austria in March 1938, *Juedische Revue* began to

decline, its skimpy advertising falling off almost entirely. Immediately upon the invasion, Georg took immediate action to save himself and his family, arranging a visa to the United States, clandestinely leaving Prague — and the *Juedische Revue* — in April, and arriving in America in the summer.

Efforts to rescue the magazine from its financial straits in 1937 and, more desperately, in 1938, included widening out its content by publishing a series of booklets titled "Documenta Judaica" that were distributed with the periodical; attempts to obtain government subsidization, which were rebuffed; far-fetched business schemes; and proposals to relocate the periodical elsewhere. All of these failed, although the connections made by Georg in the process may have helped him in the next stage of his career, as editor of the New York-based German-language *Aufbau* from 1939 until his death.

The Sudeten crisis in September 1938 signaled the demise of *Juedische Revue*. By November, when Czechoslovakia was forced to turn over territory that included Mukacevo to Hungary (the city was from then called Muncács), a final double issue of the monthly (October-November) appeared, edited by Goldstein. Thereafter, the Hungarian authorities banned it, a reflection of the growing anti-Semitic policy adopted by the Hungarian authorities, especially in the arts, the media and the liberal professions. The Nekudah publishing house went into bankruptcy and its directors left for Palestine.

A small trickle of books continued to be published by Jewish publishing houses in Muncács until 1944. In April of that year, the Jews of the city and its environs were concentrated into two ghettos, and in May, all 27,000 inhabitants of these ghettos were transported to Auschwitz where they were gassed as part of the liquidation plan supervised by Eichmann. Muncács was declared Judenrein. It was captured by the Red Army in October 1944, its name reverted back to Mukacevo, and it was annexed to the Soviet Ukraine.

THE HOLOCAUST IN THE JUVENILE PRESS IN THE YISHUV AND ISRAEL, 1940-1974 / Etti Paz

The depiction of the Holocaust in the juvenile press in pre-state Israel and thereafter differs from its treatment in other media formats as a result of two widely held editorial imperatives: the entrenchment of the value of moral justice in children, and the reinforcement of national and Zionist consciousness. The articles and stories that were published were educational in nature, often ending with an operative message guiding the readers in terms of feelings and behavior. The heroes of the stories were generally children who endured danger and suffering and in the end were saved, with an emphasis on their courage, resourcefulness and tenacity.

Five juvenile periodicals were analyzed: *Davar Leyiladim* ("Davar for Children"), *Haboker Leyiladim* ("Haboker for Children"), *Ha'aretz Shelanu* ("Our Ha'aretz"), *Mishmar Leyiladim* ("Mishmar for Children"), and *Hazofeh Leyiladim* ("Hazofeh for Children"). All were sponsored by daily parent newspapers and reflected the gamut of sociopolitical thought in Israeli society during the period under review. The common denominator in the periodicals is the anchoring of the topic to the Zionist idea of the necessity of a national home. This is especially pronounced during the World War II period, the struggle for statehood that followed, and the early years of the State of Israel.

Clearly, the presentation of Holocaust material constituted an editorial challenge, which was handled by varying degrees of revelation of the horror, ranging from refraining from covering the Eichmann trial of 1961-62 entirely (*Mishmar Leyiladim*) to explicit depictions of events during the war (*Haboker Leyiladim*). Generally, however, the periodicals followed a policy of restraint and injected an optimistic overtone reflecting a constructive Zionist approach in order to blunt distress on the part of their young readers.

While the overall portrayal of the Jews in Europe was as victims of degradation and suffering, emphasis was consistently laid on the bravery of the fighters in the Warsaw Ghetto uprising and other such events, especially in the face of their desperate situation. The fact that they were the only group among all the peoples conquered by the Nazis to openly rebel, and that they did so unaided by their non-Jewish neighbors or by other states, was also highlighted. Uprisings by Jews in the concentration camps

were similarly depicted. Additional themes were the Jewish partisans operating in the forests, who combatted not only the Germans but also anti-Semitic gentile partisans and local villagers. Jewish soldiers in the Allied armies were also singled out. All these fighters were portrayed as heirs of the heroes in the Bible and in Jewish history, preserving the honor of the Jewish people and constituting a source of inspiration to the Jewish community in Israel as it faced its War of Independence and the wars that followed.

Attention was focused on children who actively fought or assisted adult fighters in the ghettos and forests, a theme that was undoubtedly more attractive to the readership than the suffering of child victims.

Another popular theme was the struggle of the survivors in Europe to reach Palestine when it was under the control of the British. In fact, both the victims and the survivors of the Holocaust were often portrayed as Zionists anxious to immigrate to Israel but prevented from doing so. The Jewish fighters' membership in Zionist youth movements was highlighted and their bravery was often attributed to the inspiration of the Haganah and the Palmah. Zionism was also presented at times as the means of the survivors' revenge for their suffering and loss and for the destruction of the six million. Broadly, the Holocaust was transformed into a Zionist theme in this press.

The theme of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising was used systematically not only to link the Holocaust with Zionism, but to link it as well with such holidays as Passover (the holiday of freedom) and Israel Independence Day, as well as with other momentous Jewish events. It was also cited as evidence that not all Jews were led "as sheep to the slaughter" by the Nazis.

The Holocaust was often presented as unique in Jewish history and in the history of mankind generally, thus accounting for the difficulty in grasping its horror. Analyzed as the product of the twisted ideology of the Nazis, it was contrasted with the acts of individual gentiles throughout Europe, and with the entire Danish people, who saved Jews at great risk to themselves. Side by side with its uniqueness, the Holocaust was also linked with attempts throughout history up through the present (e.g., just before the Six-Day War) to destroy the Jewish people and Israel while the world looked on.

The sense of guilt of Jews who had not been under threat, e.g., the Jewish community in Palestine, was aired as early as 1942 (*Davar Leyiladim*), with questions asked as to whether enough was being done by them to rescue their brothers. The thrust of this line of thinking during the war years was to encourage the Jewish population in Palestine to join the British army and other volunteer war efforts. Later, the juvenile readers were urged to welcome the survivors and help them feel at home in Israel.

A proportional analysis of Holocaust themes in the juvenile press shows that the motif of the Jews as rebels and fighters against all odds and without assistance from any source occupies first place. Undoubtedly, the impetus to project this image stemmed from the conflict between what happened to the Jews during the Holocaust and one of the ideological cornerstones of the Jewish state in formation — the creation of a proud, free "new Jew" prepared to fight until the end for national liberation. The focus on the Warsaw Ghetto uprising and other such heroic incidents, especially those that featured brave children, facilitated an identification between the readers and their brothers in distress and was even presented as a source of inspiration for the struggle faced by the Jews in Israel against their enemies.

Chronologically, the motifs in the press under review may be divided into three periods. During 1940-48, the

Holocaust theme appears most frequently, with the Jews of Europe portrayed primarily as rebels; the Holocaust shown as proof of the veracity of the Zionist idea; and the Jewish Yishuv demonstrating deep identification with the event.

During 1949-60, the theme of the Holocaust receded drastically and was dealt with primarily on Holocaust Day (or, in the case of the religious *Hazofeh Leyiladim*, on the fast of the 10th of Tevet) or in the context of Nazi war crimes trials or the German reparations issue. This was a period of intense preoccupation with the entrenchment of the new state and the integration of the massive immigration, which sidelined the issue of the Holocaust and also reflected a certain ambivalence about it in Israeli society.

During the 1961-74 period (the latter date represents the closure of the last of the periodicals reviewed, *Davar Leyiladim*), which began with the Eichmann trial, the juvenile press again dealt with the Holocaust theme extensively, starting with the trial itself. Significantly, the proportion of material on the Warsaw Ghetto uprising decreased, while that on the masses of victims who were destroyed, as well as on the survivors, rose, reflecting the powerful effect that the Eichmann trial had on the ability of Israeli society to deal with the reality of the Holocaust. Interestingly, the contributions of material on the Holocaust theme by children also increased at this time.

"HAGALGAL," THE RADIO MAGAZINE, 1943-48 / Akiva Zimmerman

In July 1943, at the height of World War II, a Hebrew magazine, *Hagalgal* ("The Wheel"), was initiated by the British Mandatory Government in Palestine, with the subtitle: "A biweekly devoted to world issues and to Kol Yerushalayim [Voice of Jerusalem — the Mandatory broadcasting station]." Shifting to a weekly format a year later, the magazine was published until April 1948, a month before the end of the Mandate, alongside two English-language radio periodicals (*Radio Week* and *Forum*) and one in Arabic.

Hagalgal had two functions: it presented a detailed description of the forthcoming week's radio programs

(an innovative practice at the time), and it constituted a general-interest feature magazine — "an illustrated biweekly devoted to information, literature and art," in its own words. Pointedly nonpolitical, its editorial approach, it announced, was approved by the Va'ad Le'umi (the representative body of the Jewish population in Palestine) and was geared to the needs of the Jewish public. It was edited by Jacob Koplewitz (later Yeshurun Keshet), a writer, poet and translator.

The first issue, printed on chrome paper with a color cover, immediately marked the magazine as the most qualitatively produced periodical in the country, inasmuch

as paper was at a premium. The "wheel" of the title referred to a reproduction at the beginning of the magazine of the zodiac as depicted in the mosaic floor of the ancient synagogue discovered in Bet Alfa, setting the tone for the essential content of the periodical — cultural and historic material centering on Israel and the Jewish people. Additionally, world current events, especially relating to the war, were covered.

The first article of the first issue was a transcription of the insightful weekly political analysis presented over the radio on Saturday night by Moshe Medzini (see *Qesher* 20, November 1996). Other contributors included distinguished professors and literary figures. A feature covered the Sieff Research Institute at Rehovot (later the Weizmann Institute of Science). Books, plays, exhibits and concerts were reviewed, establishing a content format that was to be followed for the next five years.

DOV SADAN AS EDITOR / Nurit Govrin

Dov (Stock) Sadan, distinguished Hebrew and Yiddish writer and scholar during a half-century in Palestine and Israel, was also a talented editor whose first effort in this area was in coediting a literary supplement for the Lvov Hebrew weekly *Hehalutz* ("The Pioneer"), titled *Itonenu* ("Our Newspaper"), with Yisrael Cohen in 1924 at age 22.

Later, after immigrating to Palestine in 1925, Sadan joined the staff of the daily *Davar* and in 1933 became the editor of its literary supplement, molding it into a model of excellence in its field. Today, this supplement constitutes a major reference source on virtually every area of cultural and literary endeavor in Jewish life both in the Jewish Yishuv and in the Diaspora during the period of his association with it (1933-39).

Besides editing the supplement, Sadan wrote many of its columns, both anonymously and pseudonymously, including those devoted to coverage of literary developments throughout the world. By virtue of his immense energy and creative integrity, he turned the supplement into a cultural and literary forum for veteran and fledgling writers alike, unknown talent, immigrant and foreign writers, and women. He was especially devoted to supporting the last

The second issue covered the history of the Kadoorie Agricultural School and offered biographies of Theodor Herzl and Hayim Nachman Bialik. Issues that followed featured Prof. Samuel Hugo Bergman on "Economics and Morality"; Yehuda Burla, the writer; poet Jacob Fichmann; Ilya Ehrenburg; Tel Aviv Mayor Israel Rokach and Jerusalem Deputy Mayor Daniel Auster discussing their cities; pieces on Safed, the winery at Rishon Lezion, Kibbutz Merhaviva and, in time, virtually every point of interest in the country; a column on medicine in Israel; translations of English poetry; and extensive coverage of intellectual, cultural, historic and diplomatic facets of Israeli and Jewish life.

The magazine was a qualitative and uniquely nonpolitical addition to the Hebrew press and attracted a loyal readership whose subscriptions covered nearly the entire publishing cost.

of the Hebrew writers in Poland, who viewed him as their patron.

Each issue was fresh, original and multifaceted, blending the old and the new and conveying to the reader a sense of immediacy and of involvement with Hebrew, Yiddish and world cultural and literary life. Sadan's eclecticism was to remain a consistent trademark.

Davar, from its very first issue in June 1925, included literary pieces in its contents and by September of its first year began issuing a literary supplement on weekends and holidays. The newspaper's founder and editor, Berl Katznelson, was, simultaneously, the first editor of the supplement, a role to which he gave the highest priority and which was viewed as the most prestigious. The very choice of the modern Hebrew word for supplement — *mussaf* — which may have been originated by Sadan himself, is taken from the term for the traditional "additional" prayer service on Sabbath and holidays, a reflection of the near-religious reverence for Hebrew literature then.

Fiercely loyal to the paper, Sadan, as editor of the supplement, jealously guarded its standards and its good name, viewing any switch by a regular contributor to a

competing paper as an act of ideological betrayal and personal injury. For example, when in 1934 poet Nathan Alterman left *Davar* for *Ha'aretz*, Sadan made use of the rhymed satiric genre popularized by Alterman to settle accounts with the "traitor" in a biting piece with allusions to the Book of Job, titled "I Sit in Ashes."

However, with the passage of time, and especially with the return of Alterman to *Davar* in 1943, where he was to write the rhymed satiric column that was to become an institution — "The Seventh Column" — the relationship

between the two resumed and their mutual esteem was enhanced, expressed in various published formats. Sadan consistently lauded Alterman's poetry, citing him after his death as the successor to Hayim Nachman Bialik and as one of the luminaries of Hebrew literature. Alterman, for his part, commemorating Sadan's 60th birthday in a rhymed column in *Davar* in 1962, praising the "phenomenon" Dov Sadan for his broad erudition, extensive qualitative output, and the man he was — "a living landscape and at the same time a nature preserve."

"HASADEH" — AN AGRICULTURE MONTHLY THAT IS ISRAEL'S SECOND-OLDEST PERIODICAL / Aharon Yaffe

The establishment in the late 19th century of agricultural settlements in Palestine as a basis for Jewish immigration was an idealistic plan that initially proved nearly unworkable. The settlers were largely untrained in agriculture, and the few who had farmed in Eastern Europe were unused to the arid climate, scant water resources and unfamiliar type of soil. Their main source of farming information came from neighboring Arab farmers.

The conquest of Palestine by the British at the end of World War I, however, elicited hope that the socioeconomic crisis brought on by the war, which resulted, inter alia, in the collapse of many of the agricultural settlements, could be overcome through economic, professional and human rehabilitation. One of the methods implemented toward this end was the systematic dissemination of agricultural information and the intensification of research in this area in order to raise the level of agriculture, increase yields, and introduce innovations based on local and worldwide research findings.

Convening in the country's veteran Mikveh Yisrael Agricultural School in May 1920, the Hapo'el Hatza'ir (Young Worker) Party decided, at the initiative of Eliezer Yaffe, Ya'akov Uri and Shlomo Zemah, to publish *Hasadeh* ("The Field"), a monthly devoted to the mixed agricultural farm, according to its subtitle (mixed farming was initially widespread in Israel's kibbutzim and moshavim). When, at

the close of that year, the Histadru' — General Federation of Labor was founded, *Hasadeh* became its agricultural organ.

The aim of the monthly was to inform farmers about the results of ongoing agricultural research in local institutes devoted to this field, as well as the results of extension instruction, so that they could implement the latest methods. Research and innovations from abroad were also covered, as were economic and political aspects of agriculture.

For a time, the format of the magazine was simply an eclectic anthology of articles. By the late 1940s, it had acquired a defined departmental structure, beginning with a "Field Crops" section, adding new departments in response to changing needs. With the massive immigration following the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, and the streaming of many of the newcomers to agriculture, *Hasadeh* added a vowel instructional section for new Hebrew readers. Later additions included departments on agricultural economics, information and computer systems, agricultural legal updates and an Internet department.

The first editor of the magazine was Eliezer Yaffe (1882-1944), father of the moshav movement. He was soon succeeded by Shmuel David Yaffe, who filled the role during 1921-58, followed by Yosef M. Margalit until 1996. The magazine grew from a slim booklet to 100-120 pages per issue in the mid-1970s and reached approximately 160

pages in the early 1990s. Since then, it has run 80-90 pages per issue.

With articles limited to a maximum of four pages each, the need arose within a few years of the establishment of *Hasadeh* to initiate a publishing operation for agriculture books in order to provide more comprehensive coverage of the field. This publishing venture functions side by side with the magazine. *Hasadeh* also elicited spinoff periodicals: *Hasadeh Lano'ar* ("The Field for Youth"), begun in 1948 and lasting 10 years; *Teva Va'aretz* ("Nature and Land"), founded during the 1950s, cosponsored with the Society for the Protection of Nature in Israel in the late 1960s, and eventually taken over entirely by the SPNI; *Meshek Ha'ofot* ("Poultry Farm") and *Gan Venof* ("Garden and Landscape"); and *Mikhun Hakla'i* ("Agricultural Mechanization," later "Mechanization and Engineering for Agriculture") from 1957. Two English-language versions for international distribution were attempted in 1989-90 and 1995-96, based

on advertisement revenue, but were discontinued.

Hasadeh remains a highly professional source for both research and extension information in varied agricultural branches. Israeli agricultural research institutes, led by the Agricultural Research Authority and the Faculty of Agriculture of the Hebrew University (Rehovot), regularly publish research findings in it, as do Israel's other universities, the Technion and the Weizmann Institute of Science.

The shrinking of the agricultural community in Israel has been reflected in a loss of readership and advertising, while at the same time competition has developed in the form of numerous periodicals, bulletins and newspaper columns devoted to agricultural instruction, along with a wide range of seminars and demonstrations and instruction on the electronic media. Gone are the days when *Hasadeh* was practically the only source of information in this field. However, the magazine keeps modernizing, retaining the loyalty of thousands of subscribers.

A JOURNALIST ON THREE CONTINENTS: MORRIS VINCHEVSKY'S CAREER IN RUSSIA, PRUSSIA, ENGLAND, THE U.S. AND PALESTINE / Mussia Lipman

Morris Vinchevsky, born Lipa Benzion Novakhovich in Yanova, Lithuania, in 1856, was an early Jewish socialist journalist and author who spent a lifetime expounding the socialist cause, yet remained true to his Jewish roots.

He was exposed to Haskalah ("Enlightenment") thinking at a young age by his father's Haskalah colleagues, including Avraham Mapu, but was also given a traditional *heder* education, followed by several years of study in a Russian state school, where he excelled in Russian. At the age of 14 he went to work at the Oriole branch of the Feinberg Bank in Russia, remaining there for several years. During this period he read the works of revolutionary Russian writers and of Karl Marx and became a socialist, influenced in particular by the German Jewish writer Ludwig Berne.

Vinchevsky began writing for the Hebrew-language

Hamagid in 1873, at the age of 17, later translating works from German and Russian into Hebrew when he relocated to the bank's main office in Kovno.

In 1876, at age 20, he began contributing articles to Aaron Lieberman's pioneering Hebrew-language socialist newspaper *Ha'emet* ("The Truth"). The following year he was transferred to the bank's branch in Koenigsberg, Prussia, where he came into contact with Jewish Haskalah and socialist students associated with *Ha'emet*. The newspaper, however, was shut down by the authorities and Lieberman was arrested, whereupon Vinchevsky began writing for the Hebrew *Hakol* ("The Voice"), edited by Michael Halevi Rodkinson, and for yet another Hebrew socialist paper published by Rodkinson, *Asefat Hakhamin* ("Assembly of Sages"), dedicated to continuing the work of the defunct *Ha'emet*. Vinchevsky edited this new paper

and wrote a good deal of its content pseudonymously, also writing poetry that reflected his socialist ideas. His writing was romantic in style, focused on a quest for righteousness, brotherhood, an absence of exploitation, and love of labor. With this, he emphasized his Jewishness consistently, confessing in a conversation with Moses Leib Lilienblum in 1877 that despite his love for all mankind, he could not honestly say that "whether it was a Jew or a non-Jew who was being hung made no difference to him."

Asefat Hakhamim closed after eight issues in 1878 with the passage of anti-socialist legislation in Bismarck Germany. At the same time, Lieberman was arrested in Vienna, and letters from Vinchevsky found in his possession led to his arrest as well. Released through the intercession of Feinberg, his employer, Vinchevsky was expelled from Prussia to Denmark in 1879, spent time in Paris, and reached England, where he submitted articles and essays to *Hakol* and its Yiddish supplement, *Kol Ha'am*, in Koenigsberg.

He soon became active in socialist circles in London, where he worked as a bookkeeper at a bank, and was a founder in 1884 of *Der Poilisher Yiddel* ("The Little Polish Jew"), which he edited, later renamed *Die Zukunft* ("The Future"). In it he wrote editorials, short stories, essays, poetry, novels and translations pseudonymously. In 1885, friends funded the publishing of a booklet by him, *Yehee Or*. Following the closure of *Zukunft* that year, Vinchevsky began to write for *Der Arbayer Fraynd* ("The Worker's Friend"), as well as for English-language social-democratic newspapers. Together with several colleagues, he published a monthly in 1891-92, *Die Fraye Velt* ("The Free World"), which contained many of his essays and poems. He also began to publish a humorous dictionary; contributed to *Der Veker* ("The Awakener"), published by the Socialist Workers Organization; wrote *Ha'alef-bet Shel Tradeunionismus* ("The ABC of a Trade Union"), published by the Tailors, Machinemen and Pressers Union; and translated Ibsen's *Doll's House* into Yiddish.

In 1884 he moved to the U.S., where he continued working as a bookkeeper while writing for the daily *Abend Blat* ("Evening Paper"), published by the weekly *Arbeiter Tsaytung*. He edited the weekly *Der Emes* during 1895-96, contributed to the *Forward*, and wrote for *Sotsial-Demokrat*. Criticizing the approach of the *Forward's* Abe Cahan, he wrote for *Die Warhayt* ("The Truth"), edited by Louis

Miller, for a short while. In 1907 he became editor of *Die Zukunft* (until 1909), publishing portions of his memoirs in it. He also contributed to *Die Nye Velt* ("The New World").

In 1912 he met with Jacob Zerubavel, an editor of the Palestine-based socialist *Ha-ahdut* ("Unity") who was visiting the U.S., and at the latter's request wrote an open letter to the paper highlighting his deeply felt Jewish identity and his longing to speak in Hebrew to Hebrew workers. *Ha'ahdut* later published segments from Vinchevsky's 1885 *Yehee Or* in which he anticipates the emergence of a pioneering role on the part of the Jewish people, as well as translations into Hebrew by the writer Joseph Hayim Brenner of Vinchevsky's credo that had appeared in *Nye Lebn* ("New Life") in 1911.

Vinchevsky was sharply criticized by at least one colleague, Kalman Marmor, for being a socialist who was in the process of becoming a Zionist. Deeply affected by the Balfour Declaration (1917), he became associated with various Zionist bodies, wrote several pro-Zionist articles in *Forward* under the heading "*Die Yidishe Haym*" ("The Jewish Home"), traveled to London as a representative of the American Jewish Congress (despite the fact that the Jewish Socialist Federation, in which he was active, delegitimized the Congress), and served as a member of the Jewish Commission from the U.S. (together with Louis Marshall and Nachman Syrkin) to the Peace Conference in Paris. He was stirred by the Jewish Legion, by Chaim Weizmann, and by the notion of productive Jewish pioneers in Palestine. Colleagues claimed that he had "strayed temporarily from the proletarian path."

In 1924, Vinchevsky, by then known as the "grandfather" of Jewish socialism, was invited to the Soviet Union and was even granted a pension there. Hebrew-speaking Russian Jewish socialists who encountered him were moved to hear him address them in Hebrew (which by then was forbidden in the Soviet Union), evoking memories of a time when socialism was preached in Hebrew.

His continuous identification with the Hebrew language, Hebrew literature and the Jewish heritage was manifested in the many articles he wrote in Hebrew throughout his life for such periodicals as *Havazelet*, *Hahozeh*, *Hayom*, *Lu'ah Ahi'avar*, *Hamodi'a Lehodashim*, *Ha'olam* and *Hatoren*.

Vinchevsky died in the U.S. at age 77 in 1932, penniless, having long since cut his ties with socialist groups. His papers were conveyed to the Labor Archive in Tel Aviv.

THE RISE AND FALL OF "HERUT" / Ahuva Botser

On 23 July 1948, following the establishment of the State of Israel, the Herut political movement, a continuum of the underground Etzel (acronym for Irgun Zva'i Leumi, or "National Military Organization"), launched a newspaper titled *Herut* ("Freedom"). Initially, it consisted of a series of small pamphlets containing articles by Etzel members who had just emerged from the underground, becoming a full-fledged daily on October 3, 1948, with the subtitle: "For the Wholeness of the Homeland — For the Ingathering of the Exiles — For Social Justice — For the Freedom of Man."

At first, *Herut* competed with the older *Hamashkif* ("The Observer"), sponsored by the Revisionist movement, with both papers advocating similar nationalistic positions, until *Hamashkif* closed in May 1949. Another competitor was the Liberal Party's *Haboker* ("The Morning"), which was also rightist. This paper provided the services of its printing press to *Herut*, but press workers sometimes initiated breakdowns to delay the distribution of the competing *Herut*, and press time was fixed earlier than for other papers, which put *Herut* at a disadvantage.

Herut's goal was to familiarize the public with the names and views of the heretofore mysterious Etzel leaders in light of the forthcoming first elections to the Knesset. Members of its staff had had experience in producing the underground *Herut*, printed in wall-poster format, and Etzel activists had briefly published a paper under the same title in besieged Jerusalem. In 1948, however, the aim was to establish a major daily that would have a serious impact on the Israeli press and would appeal to the public as a whole, not only to Herut Party members.

During that period, the Israeli public was intensely preoccupied with politics, and the paper attracted an array of eager journalists and ideologists of the right. The initiators of the paper included Dr. Jacob Rubin and Dr. Yohanan Bader. David Grossbard, a former Etzel commander, became chairman of its board. Part of the new staff moved over from *Hamashkif*, while others were Revisionist journalists who had been associated with nonparty newspapers, including Shalom Rosenfeld, a founder and editor of *Ma'ariv*, who was brought in by Bader to assist in establishing the paper during its first months and who contributed a regular column. Friday's

columns were written by prominent Herut ideologists and supporters such as Menahem Begin, Abba Ahimeir, Bader, Dr. Yehoshua Heschel Yeivin and Ya'akov Meridor.

The first issue contained articles by the most prominent leaders and supporters of the Herut movement, including Begin, Bader, Meridor and Arthur Koestler. An editorial on page one surveyed *Herut's* origins as an underground organ, pointing out with irony that before the establishment of the state, it had been illegal but free of British censorship, while in its present form it was published legally but could not be termed a free newspaper, as it was obliged to submit to Israeli censorship. No paper, the editorial asserted, could call itself free so long as it was subjected to censorship of any form. *Herut* would nevertheless remain true to its political principles, even in the face of proliferating "white sections" (created by deleted text, the work of the censor). These principles consisted of the whole (i.e., greater) homeland, the integral link between the homeland and the ingathering of exiles, and the equally close link between social justice and the freedom of man. An editorial column on page two voiced the paper's commitment to freedom of expression, which would be reflected in the publishing of varying points of view.

The paper was received enthusiastically, with some 20,000 copies sold the first day. Making good on its promise to present opposing points of view, it published columns by leftists alongside those of rightists, confident that it would not lose the support of its followers and hoping thereby that it would attract a broad readership. Political news reportage was unbiased. The goal was to be able to finance the paper through sales and advertising, not through party funding. However, the initial enthusiasm soon waned as the readership dropped to approximately 8,000, and later 5,000 — all Herut supporters. Simultaneously, the columns expressing opposing views shrank and eventually disappeared. Writers and staff members left to return to, or join, other papers, which lowered the morale of those who remained. Salaries and employment conditions were poor, and only their ideological commitment kept the remaining staff at their jobs.

Like the other party newspapers, *Herut* became a subsidized paper, constituting a major drain on the Herut

Party's finances virtually from the start. Advertising was inadequate, with most of it emanating from the goodwill, or the sense of obligation, of sympathizers. Following the elections of 1961, Menahem Begin, head of the movement, personally initiated a concerted campaign to increase subscriptions to the paper within the movement, which indeed produced encouraging results. They were, however, short-lived.

The newspaper closed at the end of 1965, after 17 years of publication, largely due to an absence of financing. Other exacerbating factors were party pressure on the editors to fill the paper with a large proportion of party speeches and party news items; the unwillingness of the party leaders, and especially its members of Knesset, to convey inside information to the paper (with the exception of Begin and Bader, they preferred being interviewed by other, more widely read, papers); and the rapid evolution of the paper into a purely party organ, in contravention of its original manifesto. A possible additional factor in the context of that highly politicized period of Israeli history

was the unwillingness of all but stalwart supporters of the movement to be seen reading the paper of the hated opposition party. More broadly, the heyday of the party newspaper in Israel was on the wane from the end of the 1950s, as the public was no longer interested in this type of press.

Despite its constant struggle for existence, however, *Herut* managed to nurture a new generation of journalists by establishing *Herut Lano'ar* ("Youth *Herut*") as a kind of training school for writers who were later to become prominent, including Eytan Haber, Dan Margalit and Sarah Frankel.

With the merger of the *Herut* and the Liberal Parties into the new Gahal Party in 1965, a decision was made to merge both parties' dailies as well, in the hope that the pooled resources would result in the emergence of a single robust newspaper. The new daily that was created, *Hayom* ("The Day"), appeared early in 1966, shortly after the closure of its predecessors.

המחברים

פרופ' מריאן פוקס: אוניברסיטת וארשה. מחבר הספר "העתונות היהודית בווארשה, 1823-1939, (פולנית), וארשה 1979.

דניאל מולר: אוניברסיטת דורטמונד, גרמניה.

אתי פז: מורה ביחידה להוראת העברית ותלמידת תואר שני בהיסטוריה של עם ישראל, אוניברסיטת תל-אביב.

עקיבא צימרמן: חוקר תולדות המורשת היהודית, נושאי דת וחזנות.

פרופ' נורית גוברין: החוג לספרות עברית, אוניברסיטת תל-אביב. אהרן יפה: תלמיד מחקר, החוג לגיאוגרפיה, האוניברסיטה העברית, ירושלים.

מוטיה ליפמן: ארכיונית ראשית לשעבר, מכון לבון, תל-אביב.

אהובה בוצר: בוגרת התוכנית ללימודי עתונות, אוניברסיטת תל-אביב.

שלום רוזנפלד: ראש התוכנית ללימודי עתונות והמכון לחקר העתונות היהודית בעולם, אוניברסיטת תל אביב. ממייסדי "מעריב" ועורכו הראשי, 1974-1980.

רפי מן: ראש דסק החדשות ב"מעריב". מרצה לעתונות באוניברסיטה העברית, ירושלים, ובבית הספר "כותרת". מחבר הספר "גלי צה"ל כל הזמן" (עם ציפי גון-גרוד).
יעקב רבי: עתונאי וסופר. חבר מערכת "על המשמר". נפטר ב-1988.

ד"ר גדעון קרן: מרצה בכיר לתקשורת והיסטוריה יהודית, אוניברסיטת פריז 8. כתב "קול ישראל" בצרפת.

ד"ר ירון כץ: מרצה לתקשורת המונים במרכז לחינוך טכנולוגי, חולון.

ד"ר מנחם בלונדהיים: מרצה לתקשורת, החוג למדעי המדינה, אוניברסיטת בר-אילן.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Shalom Rosenfeld: Head of Journalism Studies Program and the Institute for Research of the Jewish Press, Tel Aviv University; a founder of *Ma'ariv* and its editor in chief, 1974-80.

Rafi Mann: News desk chief, *Ma'ariv*; lecturer in journalism, Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Koteret School of Communications; co-author, *Army Radio all the Time* (1991, Hebrew).

Ya'akov Rabi: Late journalist and author; staff member, *Al Hamishmar*; died in 1988.

Dr. Gideon Kouts: Senior lecturer in Jewish media and history, University of Paris 8; Kol Yisrael correspondent in France.

Dr. Yaron Katz: Lecturer in mass communications, Center for Technological Education, Holon.

Dr. Menahem Blondheim: Lecturer in communications, Political Science Department, Bar-Ilan University.

Prof. Marian Fuks: University of Warsaw; author, *The Jewish Press in Warsaw, 1823-1939* (1979, Warsaw, Polish).

Daniel Mueller: University of Dortmund, Germany.

Etti Paz: Teacher, Unit for the Teaching of Hebrew, and master degree candidate in Jewish history, Tel Aviv University.

Akiva Zimmerman: Researcher of Jewish heritage, religion and liturgy.

Prof. Nurit Govrin: Department of Hebrew Literature, Tel Aviv University.

Aharon Yaffe: Research student, Geography Department, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Mussia Lipman: Former chief archivist, Lavon Institute, Tel Aviv.

Ahava Botser: Graduate, Journalism Studies Program, Tel Aviv University.