

Journal of Media and Communications History in Israel and the Jewish World  
 The Andrea and Charles Bronfman Institute for the Study of Jewish Press and Communications at Tel Aviv University  
 Tel Aviv University, P.O.B. 39040 Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel; Tel. 972-3-6408665; Email: presstau@post.tau.ac.il  
<http://www.tau.ac.il/humanities/bronfman>

**Head of The Institute and Managing Editor of *Keshet*:** Prof. Yosef Gorny  
**Founder of The Institute:** Shalom Rosenfeld  
**First Editor of *Keshet*:** Dr. Mordecai Naor

## No. 37, Spring-Summer 2008

## CONTENTS

### Editor

Prof. Gideon Kouts

### Editorial Board

Prof. Yosef Gorny, Prof. Dan Caspi,  
 Prof. Eliezer Don-Yihya,  
 Dr. Mordecai Naor, Prof. Yoram Peri,  
 Dr. Orly Tsarfaty,  
 Dr. Baruch Leshem, Dr. Uzi Elyada

### Editorial Assistant

Daphna Kanner Cohen

### Hebrew Copy Editor

Herzlia Efrati

### Proofreading

Herzlia Efrati

### English Section

Naftali Greenwood

### Graphic Editor

Michal Semo-Kovetz

### Cover Design

Yael Kfir

### Print

A.R.T. Offset Services Ltd.

### Annual Subscriptions:

2 issues a year  
 USA:\$45 ; R.O.W: €40  
 Please forward a check  
 On Time Ltd.  
 P.O.Box 10012,  
 Haifa Bay 26110, Israel  
[ontime@ontime.co.il](mailto:ontime@ontime.co.il)  
<http://www.ontime.co.il/>

<b>Editorial / Yosef Gorny</b>	2e
<b><i>Keshet 37</i> / Gideon Kouts</b>	3e
<b>Shalom: A Friend, a Journalist, a Teacher / Mordechai Naor</b>	5e
<b>From Weekly to Daily – <i>Ha-Tsvi</i> the First Daily Newspaper in Palestine / Uzi Elyada</b>	9e
<b>Eliezer Ben-Yehuda in Paris and the “French Model” of the Press (1878-1881) /Gideon Kouts</b>	9e
<b>The Dreyfus Affair In The Hebrew Press In Palestine / Yosef Lang</b>	10e
<b>A Press “On the Baron’s Account” / Mordecai Naor</b>	12e
<b>Ahad Ha’am and His Circle against the “Expansion of Hebrew” Policy / Nurit Govrin</b>	13e
<b>The Sephardi Rabbis and the Press / Yitzhak Bezalel</b>	14e
<b>On The Crossroads: The Yishuv Newspapers and the Young Turk Revolution / Yuval Ben Bassat</b>	14e
<b>The Establishment of the Hebrew Cultural Center: A Century for the Book Publishing Industry in Eretz Israel (1908/9-2008/9) / Motti Neiger</b>	15e
<b>The Revisionist Tempest: Realization vs. Reality / Yoni Aviv</b>	15e
<b>Two Media Systems By or For Two Minorities in Israel / Nelly Elias and Dan Caspi</b>	15e
<b>The Attitude of America’s Jewish Community To The Eastern European Jewish Immigration, 1881-1924, As Reflected In The Jewish Press / Robert Rockaway</b>	16e
<b>Bukharan Jewish Newspapers In Central Asia, 1910-1938 / Zeev Levin</b>	16e
<b>Greetings with Flowers from the Homeland / Haim Grossman</b>	17e
<b>The Contributors to this issue</b>	18e
<b>Book Reviews</b>	
<b>Research Reports</b>	

## EDITORIAL

### Yosef Gorny

This edition of *Kesher* is thematically unified by two events fifty years apart: the debut in 1908 of *Ha-Tsvi*, Palestine's first daily newspaper, edited by Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, and the sesquicentennial of Ben-Yehuda's birth and his proclamation by the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), as worthy of international recognition and commemoration for his unique contribution to humanity.

To mark these two occasions, an international conference was held in Paris at the initiative of the Andrea and Charles Bronfman Institute for the Media of the Jewish People at Tel Aviv University and the Department of Hebrew at the Université Paris 8. The cooperation between these two institutions, apart from its academic contribution, reflects the symbolic relationship between Paris and Zionism—one that Ben-Yehuda helped to create.

Eliezer Ben-Yehuda reached Paris in 1878 for the purpose of medical studies. There he wrote his famous article, "The Burning Question," which the author Peretz Smolenskin renamed "The Weighty Question" and published in his newspaper, *Ha-Shahar*. During the 130 years that have elapsed since then, the Jewish national question has ceased to be "burning," as Ben-Yehuda would have it, but it remains "weighty," following Smolenskin's definition.

This question, influenced by the national movement in the Balkan countries, preceded the Hibbat Tsiyyon movement, which came into being following the pogroms in Russia in 1881–1882. Its "burning" content inspired me to a symbolic reflection: just as Herzl established the **Jewish state** in

1897 as an idea and, in Basel, as an organization, Ben-Yehuda targeted the Hebrew language twenty years earlier as the premier medium of the Jewish people's national and communications revival in its homeland.

By saying this, I do not mean to suggest that Ben-Yehuda revived the dead Hebrew language. After all, from the perspective of cultural history, Hebrew had never died. Its vibrancy and vitality had shifted from the Bible to the Mishna and the Talmud and thence to the prayers, the responsa of the Middle Ages, the classical Hebrew maskilim, the Hebrew-language press, and the writings of the progenitors of the national revival, Ben-Yehuda's contemporaries.

Thus, Ben-Yehuda's contribution was not in reviving the language but in making it a vernacular for daily life and, in turn, an important instrumentality in shaping the modern Hebrew Jewish national consciousness. It became a political movement that evolved into the act of returning to the nation's historical and cultural source, the Land of Israel. Ben-Yehuda was the first to draw a connection between the "return" of the Jews and the "revival" of the language. By stating in his aforementioned article that "We can revive the Hebrew language only in a land where Jews outnumber Gentiles," Ben-Yehuda presaged the thinking of the leaders of the Zionist Movement before the establishment of the State of Israel. This, then, was Ben-Yehuda's main contribution to answering the "burning question."

It follows that one should also note the symbolic significance of the connection between the "weighty question" and the city of Paris at the time these remarks were written. Indeed, when

*Kesher*, a scholarly journal devoted to the history of the press and media in the Jewish world and in Israel, is published twice yearly by the Andrea and Charles Bronfman Institute for the Study of Jewish Press and Communications at Tel Aviv University. *Kesher* seeks to publish original research articles and academic reviews on all subjects relating to the history, endeavors, and influence of Jewish media and media people, from a multidisciplinary perspective. All articles are peer reviewed blindly by experts, members of the Journal's Advisory Board and, if necessary, externally. Articles should be submitted in Word to [presstau@post.tau.ac.il](mailto:presstau@post.tau.ac.il). A reply will be given within three months. Articles should not usually exceed 8,000 words. The bibliography and notes should appear at the end of the article. Citations should follow the conventions of your discipline.

The editorial board invites reviews of new books in the journal's areas of interest and proposes such reviews itself. *Kesher* also publishes a list of recently approved doctoral dissertations and master's theses along with abstracts of no more than 250 words in length (for master's theses) and 500 words in length (for doctoral dissertations).

relating to his national views, Ben-Yehuda stressed the fact that “I wrote these remarks from the city of Paris, the center of **freedom** of all of Europe [. . . They] emerged from the depths of my heart as I dwelled in the center of freedom, because while I was in this center I inhaled, together with the spirit of freedom, the spirit of modernism among the world’s nations, and I sensed that an enterprise as enormous and difficult as the re-creation of a scattered nation entails strong national government.” What he meant was a national leadership that enjoyed stature at home and political validity abroad.

Thus, even though the Jewish intelligentsia in Paris rejected Ben-Yehuda’s ideas, the two are connected. The connection lies in the rapid historical transformation of the principles of the French Revolution from the basically individual to

the collective. What I mean is that freedom and equality for individuals became the entitlement of nations and the standard of all national movements. It is important to state with emphasis, especially in our times, that Ben-Yehuda reached this conclusion not as the result of pogroms against the Jews, which one may construe as unique and transitory phenomena, but on the basis of the universal principled awareness that every ethno-cultural group has the right to demand political, national, and cultural self-determination even when—as has indeed happened over the course of history—one nation’s entitlement infringes upon that of another. The inescapable conclusion, then, is that the historical process points not only to struggle among nations but also to welcome compromises among them. And European history is indicative of both.

## ***KESHER 37* – INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

### **TWO DATES, ONE FIGURE: THE TRIUMPH OF ELIEZER BEN-YEHUDA**

#### **Gideon Kouts**

This edition of *Keshet* centers on two important dates in the history of the Hebrew press, both related to the year 2008 and both associated with one distinguished figure. This figure, born 150 years ago, is Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, “reviver of the Hebrew language” and founder of the first Hebrew journalistic “empire” in Palestine, the empire that gave this country a free commercial press that is also inherently sensationalist. A hundred years ago, Ben-Yehuda’s “empire” sired the first Hebrew-language daily newspaper in Palestine, *Ha-Tsvi* (*Ha-Zevi*). Actually, it was shaped by Ben-Yehuda’s son and successor, Itamar Ben-Avi, the patriarch of the sensationalist press in Eretz Israel. For many years, Ben-Yehuda was the rejected representative of a Hebrew press that the molders of Hebrew cultural models in the Yishuv, and afterwards the State of Israel, tried to paper over as best they could. If we contemplate Israel’s daily press today, however, should we not conclude that the long-term victory belongs to Ben-Yehuda, for better and for worse? Eliezer Ben-Yehuda was proclaimed “cultural personality” of the year by the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and *Keshet* participated in organizing a conference about him in Paris. *Keshet* also co-sponsored another seminar in

Tel Aviv on the centennial of the daily press in Eretz Israel, devoted to the late editor of *Davar*, Hannah Zemer, on the fifth anniversary of her passing, and is planning additional events.

It is by no means serendipitous that 1908 marked the start of a historical process in the Hebrew and Jewish media. The Young Turks rebellion was a pivotal event in processes elsewhere around the globe that delivered, among other things, freedom of the press to the Ottoman Empire, including Palestine. The Second ‘Aliya press, which introduced the rival cultural and media model of a mixed political-party press, gave Ben-Yehuda a difficult run for the money along with his other competitor, the conservative Orthodox circles of the Old Yishuv. It all began at that time, the first decade of the twentieth century, but it had been shaped earlier, in the late nineteenth century in Europe and Palestine, and it carried on in the first half of the twentieth. Therefore, most of the articles in this edition attempt to tackle this focal year in the broadest possible way, both retrospectively and prospectively. Due to the thick tie that binds most of the articles, we chose this time to do without a special “*Keshet’s cover story*”.

Uzi Elyada surveys the circumstances of the founding and

the career of Palestine's first daily newspaper, alternately named *Ha-Tsvi* and *Ha-Or*, in 1908–1914. The story of Ben-Yehuda the journalist, however, began even earlier, in the late 1870s, when he was a student and correspondent in Paris. Gideon Kouts describes the young Hebrew journalist's encounter with the French Republican media model, which was taking shape in those very years. Yosef Lang, Ben-Yehuda's biographer, analyzes the way Ben-Yehuda and his competitors in Palestine covered the Dreyfus affair, which enflamed both the model country and the tiny Yishuv. Mordechai Naor describes the dialogue that took place, and did not take place, between Ben-Yehuda and the Yishuv's great benefactor, Baron de Rothschild, who was also an important agent of French culture in Palestine. Nurit Guvrin writes about Ben-Yehuda's opponents, the East European Hebrew-speaking intellectuals and journalists, foremost Ahad Ha'am and his circle, and the Socialist press of the Second 'Aliya. Yitzhak Bezalel recounts the role of a group on the other side of the divide, the Sephardi rabbis, in the formative Hebrew press in Palestine. Yuval Ben-Bassat surveys the attitudes of the various currents' newspapers toward the most current of current events in 1908, the Young Turks rebellion. Mordechai Neiger identifies 1908 as the onset of secular Hebrew publishing in Palestine and notes that since the representatives the Hebrew cultural centers in Europe found an infrastructure in Palestine, they did not step into a cultural wilderness, notwithstanding the conventional myth. Yoni Aviv discusses a continuing story: the struggle among leaders of the Revisionist movement for control of Itamar Ben-Avi's newspaper, *Doar ha-Yom*.

This year's editions of *Kesher* also wish to exploit the "round" date in the history of the daily press to discuss its current and future problems. An example of such a problem

is the crystallization of a sectoral press. This edition calls the reader's attention to the "Russian" sector and the entity known today as the CIS, without forgoing the historical perspective. Dan Caspi and Nelly Elias develop a model of media "of" and "for" minorities in contemporary Israel and do not hesitate to offer a reasoned comparison, in this context, of the "Russian minority" with the Arab one. Robert Rockaway discusses Russian and East European Jews who did not make their way to Palestine and the attitude of American Jewry, as reflected in its media, toward the immigrants from Russia in 1881–1924. Zeev Levin offers us a glimpse at a little-known Jewish press that took shape in Bukhara, in Russian and later Soviet Central Asia, in 1910–1938. Our next edition will continue to deal with sectoral press and gender press. Finally, before our regular departments, we provide a bit of nostalgia that comes with a dash of optimism in Haim Grossman's illustrated article about the time when Israeli children, with government encouragement, sent postcards with flowers to the Diaspora instead of text messages about how to respond to those who hate us.

Before we sent this edition to the printer's, our spiritual father passed away in ripe old age. Shalom Rosenfeld, םר Israel Prize laureate, founded the Institute for the Study of Jewish Press and Communications and took the initiative that created *Kesher*. Nearly all of our editions are still imbued with his spirit, intellect, and journalistic and research ethics. The first editor of *Kesher* and its founder's associate, Mordechai Naor, presents memorial remarks at the front of this issue. In the future, too, we will strive to sustain his hopes upon the reinstatement of *Kesher* and to be worthy of the encouragement that Shalom gave us.

We will meet again in our next issue,

## SHALOM: A FRIEND, A JOURNALIST, A TEACHER / Mordecai Naor

Shalom Rosenfeld, who passed away in April 2008, was a doyen of the Israeli press for decades. He held every possible position in the print media—from field correspondent to editor-in-chief—and did not flinch from dabbling in other media such as radio. All his life, too, deliberately and *en passant* as he went about his work, he was a journalism teacher who performed this task with sublime kindness.

Rosenfeld was privileged with a long life. Born in 1914 in Poland, he joined the Betar movement in his teen years. In 1934, he moved to Palestine in order to attend the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His studies were short-lived because he was drawn into the political and journalistic world of that pre-statehood era, a time of protracted struggle conducted in every possible arena, including the media. Among other things, he commanded a Betar platoon in Rosh Pina, wrote for and edited the Revisionist journals *Ha-Yarden* and *Ha-Mashkif*, authored the underground posters of the Irgun (IZL), and ran the organization's clandestine radio station. To make a living, he joined the staff of correspondents of what was then, in the early 1940s, a new evening paper: *Yedioth Ahronoth*. The British placed his name on their blacklist and arrested him several times.

In 1948, with the War of Independence in full swing, he joined the senior staff members of *Yedioth Ahronoth* who seceded from the paper together with its editor, Dr. Azriel Carlebach, and established *Ma'ariv*. He did this with severe misgivings. After the fact, he related, "Personally, I didn't like it [the surreptitious, putsch-like manner of the departure]. I thought, and I told my friends the same, that we ought to approach Mozes [Yehuda Mozes, publisher of *Yedioth Ahronoth*] and tell him: in this kind of climate, with such a newspaper, we can no longer carry on." In his opinion, the group of "rebels" should have put Mozes to the test by demanding improvements that would have transformed *Yedioth Ahronoth* into a real newspaper; otherwise, "We would part as friends or not as friends."<sup>1</sup> Rosenfeld's comrades convinced him that it could not be done and that the group had to secede and tell the publisher after the fact. Rosenfeld joined them and became one of the founders of *Ma'ariv* and, for more than thirty years, its leader.

Rosenfeld held a long series of posts at *Ma'ariv*, at the editorial board building and elsewhere. He was a reporter, an editor, the head of the newspaper's Jerusalem branch, and a Knesset correspondent. In 1974, he succeeded Arye

Dissenchik as editor-in-chief, eighteen years after the latter had taken up the post following the sudden death of the founder and editor in chief, Azriel Carlebach. Rosenfeld served as editor-in-chief of *Ma'ariv* for six years, until his retirement in 1980. For the next twenty years, he continued to write for *Ma'ariv* almost every week.

### Journalism Studies, Enrichment, and an Information Center

In 1983, Rosenfeld embarked on what he called the "adventure of my life": the establishment and direction of a program of journalism studies at Tel Aviv University. After having spent his entire life swimming in the turbulent waters of the media, he found himself in the no-less-turbulent waters of the world of academia. He visited the United States to learn from up close how journalism was taught at Columbia University in New York; afterwards, he set up a one-year (two-semester) certification program that trained journalists and holders of bachelors' degrees. Chairing the program for more than ten years, he broadened its scope and annexed to it the Institute for the Media of the Jewish People.

Shalom Rosenfeld played the role of teacher-journalist as an act of love. He prepared his lessons from A to Z and was unforgiving toward teachers who failed to do the same. In particular, he took up the cudgels—in his mannerly way—with journalists and editors, some of whom were high-ranking and well known, who believed that their professional experience alone entitled them to be the lecturers and educators of the new generation of journalists. Thus, they did not always "do their homework" and their students noticed this, to his distress.

Rosenfeld thought it insufficient to impart the profession to journalism students and practicing journalists who visited the university to recharge their batteries. He also inaugurated a special program for senior journalists in Israel. In this "enrichment program," as Rosenfeld termed it, several dozen leading print-media journalists and editors—stars of the Israeli media galaxy—gathered at the university every Friday morning to hear edifying lectures from professors, authors, major business executives, and outstanding personalities in the worlds of research and medicine. This exposed them to fields that were unfamiliar to them and seldom appear in newspaper columns.

Rosenfeld pursued two additional projects at Tel Aviv

University during his involvement with the journalism studies program: the Institute for the Media of the Jewish People, which researched Jewish press activity in Israel and abroad, and the journal *Kesher*. The institute was an empire in miniature, its tentacles reaching in many directions: conducting research, gathering data on the tens of thousands of Jewish newspapers that have been published around the world since the late seventeenth century, recording and transcribing interviews with Jewish journalists and editors in Israel and the Diaspora, and doggedly collecting every word and mention that appeared in newspapers, and, insofar as possible, that were broadcast on radio and television on diverse topics of concern to the Israeli media.

The institute's information center, established at Rosenfeld's initiative and directed for more than ten years by Carmen Oszi, soon gathered thousands if not tens of thousands of items on Israeli and Jewish media themes. Every day one could see lecturers, students, visitors from abroad, and people with an interest in the Israeli media availing themselves of the Institute's steadily expanding treasures. The Israeli media learned to utilize this inexhaustible source, and no one was happier than Shalom Rosenfeld to behold the center's vibrant activity and its assistance to researchers and journalists in Israel and beyond. Rosenfeld himself was involved in the center's activities. Almost every day, he delivered press clippings and recordings of radio and television programs (mainly news) "for posterity," he would say.

Over the years, the wealth of information at the Institute for the Media of the Jewish People has served as the basis for numerous masters' theses and doctoral dissertations by scholars from Israel and foreign countries such as Germany, France, and the U.S.

Shalom Rosenfeld often went head-to-head with the leaders of the university and various interested parties who believed that the institute was stepping on their toes. Acting to his merit were his immense knowledge, far-reaching relations in Israel and abroad, and phenomenal fundraising ability. For several years, he maintained contact with institutions, organizations, and individuals in Israel and abroad, collecting—sheqel by sheqel, dollar by dollar—a enormous sum of money that placed the institute a solid financial footing in accordance with the university's statutes.

### ***Kesher***

Another initiative of Shalom Rosenfeld's was the establishment of *Kesher*—an academic journal devoted

to the Jewish and Israeli press from the historical and contemporaneous perspectives—as part of the program of activities at the Institute for the Media of the Jewish People. In early 1987, he approached this writer and invited him to edit the journal, which was to appear each spring and autumn. Shalom was personally associated with the journal in its first twelve years, as evidenced in the forewords that he inserted in each of the twenty-four editions. Every piece in this opus was an intellectual gem of journalistic writing, broad horizons, and communication of messages that he thought especially deserving.

The titles of these 500, 1,000, and even 2,000 word forewords speak for themselves: "What is a Jewish Newspaper?" "The Press and History," "The Prophet of Doom Syndrome," "Censorship—an Ongoing Story," "Freedom and Responsibility—from Sokolow to Barak," "In Memoriam (Newspapers)," "In Praise of the Newspaper of the Day before Yesterday," etc. Shalom Rosenfeld usually expressed himself politely and always did so clearly, but sometimes he lost his patience with the deterioration that the press underwent in the late twentieth century. In his article, "The Press between Basel and Sheinkin—from *Altneuland* to Youngpunkland,"<sup>2</sup> he inveighed ferociously (for him) against the coarseness that had overtaken over the country and its press and wrote with overt sorrow about the domination of the "mammon aristocracy" and profit calculus over other personalities and topics, and how Herzl's vision of the Jewish state as an "aristocratic republic" was being in set aside in quality of thought and action. All his life Shalom was an "intellectual aristocratic" and a Zionist. Never, even for a day, did he conceal his conviction that Zionism should remain central in Israeli national life. He regularly quoted the first editor of *Ma'ariv*, Dr. Carlebach, who, referring to a new and controversial government economic policy in the country's early days, said: "Ben-Gurion has announced a new economic policy [. . .]. The editors have decided to continue to let me try to calm things down, although the sincerity of the performance has no credibility whatsoever [. . .]. At the news desk and in the article, I'll recount the program's merits until reality itself will be distorted. My journalistic conscience is unclean; my Zionist conscience is clean."<sup>3</sup>

When Israel's jubilee year came around, he expressed a pessimistic conclusion: "The press today, much more than in the past, is a full-fledged commercial business, an industrial brand to which business rules apply: make money—you survive; lose money—you're gone, as has indeed happened

to us more and more often in recent years.”<sup>4</sup> He found this and other phenomena in the Israeli print media displeasing, to put it mildly. Asked what could be done to make things better, he would raise his hands and say, “I’ve done my part, now it’s others’ turn. May they succeed.”

Occasionally he relived his professional childhood by writing reportage and articles on journalistic and historical themes. An example was his article, “Squad of Soldiers Comes to Delay Publication of ‘*Al ha-Mishmar*.”<sup>5</sup> The piece concerned a hitherto unknown episode in 1948, when the formative censorship service of the “state-in-the-making” frequently clashed with newspaper editors and senior correspondents and tried to toughen the rules even though its people—at this time they were “volunteer censors” who were called “press auditors for the security forces”—did not yet have real authority. “As I can attest for my experience as a news editor for two newspapers in those times,” Rosenfeld wrote, “occasionally there were disagreements between the editors and these volunteers [. . .] but they rarely led to crises.”<sup>6</sup> Until the ‘*Al ha-Mishmar*’ affair broke open in early April 1948, that is. The ‘*Al ha-Mishmar*’ newspaper published a photograph of Kastel village, on the way to Jerusalem, that these censors had approved at an earlier phase. Later on, they claimed that changes on the battlefield had disqualified the photo for publication, making its publication a grave breach of censorship. Therefore, a squad of members of the Hagana (the IDF was not established until two months later) visited the printing facility to halt distribution.

Sometimes Rosenfeld addressed himself to matters of principle. An example is his lengthy article in 1991, replete with quotations and references, titled “Journalese—the Journalists’ Language.”<sup>7</sup> He praised several journalists and editors and fiercely criticized others—most members of the profession, in fact—for irresponsible use of language. “Unfortunately, one finds among the public of journalists, alongside *artists of expression*, journalists who excel in the dangerous combination of ignorance and *contempt*. At the newspapers, this combination breeds interchangeably dreariness, distortions, shallowness, and even *linguistic criminality*.”<sup>8</sup>

Rosenfeld’s articles in *Keshet* form another link in the chain that connects the virtuoso journalist and the teacher of journalism who wishes to send his messages to the readers, especially journalists among them.

### Author, Editor, and Translator of Books

During his years of media endeavor (print, radio, and

even some forays into television), Shalom Rosenfeld also contributed to the world of books. Probably no one remembers it today, but on V-E Day, May 8, 1945, *Yedioth Ahronoth* published a booklet that Rosenfeld wrote—*Those Six Years (1939–1945)*—describing the events of the war. Its seventy-seven pages explain the demarches of the war and note the bitter fact that although victory had been achieved such Jews as survived displayed no joy.

In the 1950s, Rosenfeld was involved as a journalist in the tumultuous events of the time. One of the most conspicuous of them was the Kasztner trial. Shortly after covering the trial from beginning to end, Shalom published a comprehensive book-length oeuvre on the topic, *Criminal Case 124*,<sup>9</sup> which covered in minute detail the unfolding of the trial that jolted Israeli public opinion and politics. He also translated books on current affairs, such as *Cairo to Damascus* by the American journalist John Roy Carlson, about the Arabs’ war against Israel in 1948, and an economics tome written in Polish, Jozef Wigrin’s *The Doctrine of Perfect Capitalism*.

His first book was published in the late 1930s: *The Shlomo Bar-Yosef Book*, recounting the first Jew to be hanged in Mandatory Palestine. Shalom Rosenfeld had been Bar-Yosef’s commander in the Betar platoon at Rosh Pina. The book was initially published in Poland in 1939, in Hebrew, Yiddish, and Polish, and only one copy survived and made its way to pre-state Israel. A mimeographed edition was produced from this copy for the IZL’s use, and this “second printing” was photocopied and reappeared in 1979 after being newly edited by Shalom Rosenfeld. The book calls attention to Rosenfeld’s activities in the IZL as far back as the 1930s in both Palestine and Poland. Even then, it seems, he held relatively moderate political views, as manifested in his remarks at the Third World Conference of Betar in Warsaw, in September 1938, which was attended by Jabotinsky. Countering extreme utterances by the young Menachem Begin and others, to which Jabotinsky also took exception, Rosenfeld urged those in attendance to beware of “irritability” and “hysteria” and not to overdo it by shouting “Only revolution.” He also inveighed against those who regarded suicide on behalf of “a nice page in history” as an exalted goal and called for “liberation from the era of romanticism, of ecstasy, and of turn of phrase,” in favor of an era of “growing up.”<sup>10</sup>

Several of his books were born in the aftermath of his satirical newspaper columns. Indeed, in addition to all his other virtues, Rosenfeld was gifted with a special sense of humor and his satires fired in all directions. Examples of

these opuses are *Among Us* (1962), *Acute Angle* (1983), and *Definitely Personal* (1962). The last-mentioned book was the product of short personal programs that were broadcast on Voice of Israel radio in the early 1960s, all in a glib, caressing, but also occasionally piercing spirit.

Shalom Rosenfeld took journalistic writing seriously and publicistic writing even more seriously. The choice of Rosenfeld as winner of the Israel Prize for journalistic and publicistic writing (1986) was meant to express the public's appreciation of this form of writing, which has deteriorated over the years. In his light writing, in contrast, he allowed himself to loosen up a bit. In the preface to his book *Acute Angle*, he wrote: "The columnist [in *Ma'ariv*, whence the excerpts were gathered] has no pretensions of being a historian [. . .]. The goal that he set for himself was to accompany the footsteps of grand history with allusions, winks of the eye, chuckles, and naughtiness [. . .]. Now and then we got angry and, not sparing ourselves, cracked the whip of sarcasm against those personalities who deem themselves worthy of admiration [. . .]. Sometimes we allowed something more serious, even sentimental, to sneak in among those lighthearted pages."<sup>11</sup>

### Shalom Rosenfeld's Love Affair with Radio

Rosenfeld's love affair with radio began back in the 1940s, when, as noted, he was in charge of the content side of the IZL's underground broadcasting station, the "Voice of Fighting Zion." The affair resumed, with even greater passion, in the second half of the 1950s, when Yitzhak Shimoni invited him to take part in a new radio show called "Three Men in a Boat." What happened afterwards, as the cliché has it, was a milestone in history of the Israeli radio.

As a permanent member of the program staff—along with Dahn Ben-Amotz, Gavriel Zifroni, the moderator Yitzhak Shimoni, the songwriter Dan Almagor, and many other worthies—Rosenfeld soon became a cultural hero. Each of the three leading participants represented something: effervescent Israeliness (Ben-Amotz), "Yiddishkeit" (Zifroni), and cultural and intellectual refinement (Shalom Rosenfeld). Rosenfeld's witticisms originated in his sense of humor and limitless

knowledge in all cultural and current affairs. Later on, he complained that the phenomenal success of "Three Men in a Boat" sometimes overshadowed his journalistic work, which he regarded, after all, as his main calling.

\*\*\*

If we were to sum up a lengthy and full life such as Shalom Rosenfeld's, we would say that he was an artist of the word. He would probably waive the honor, since he was a modest man who did not like to receive complements in public. The millions of words that he wrote, however, were definitely part of his soul. In one of his writings, he explained:

Ever since I first clutched a pen, I have been enchanted by the mysterious potency of words. I regard the word not only as a means of expressing ideas or views but also as a living creature, a creature that has a body, a soul, a nature, desires, caprices [. . .] Words also have the ability to jolt empires, make rulers tremble, lead men into battle, enflame the masses, sow terror, ennoble and humiliate, repress and uplift [. . .]. The word grips you in an iron vise.<sup>12</sup>

### Notes

- 1 Shalom Rosenfeld, "Carlebach's Teachings and the Founding of *Ma'ariv*," *Kesher* 30, Nov. 2001 (Hebrew), p. 97.
- 2 *Ibid.*, No. 23, May 1998, pp. 2–9.
- 3 *Ibid.* p. 5.
- 4 *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- 5 *Kesher* 4, pp. 50–54.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 50.
- 7 *Kesher* 10, Nov. 1991, pp. 58–70.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 59; bold in the original.
- 9 *Criminal File 124—the Gruenwald-Kasztner Trial*, Tel Aviv, 1955 (Hebrew).
- 10 In regard to the conference, its speakers, and the views expressed there, see Yosef Heller, *Lehi—1940–1949, A.*, Jerusalem, 1989 (Hebrew), pp. 57–60.
- 11 Preface to *Acute Angle*, Tel Aviv, 1983 (Hebrew), p. 5.
- 12 Shalom Rosenfeld, *Among Us* (Hebrew), Tel Aviv, 1962, p. 2.



## *English Abstracts of Hebrew Articles*

### **FROM WEEKLY TO DAILY – HA-TSVI THE FIRST DAILY NEWSPAPER IN PALESTINE / Uzi Elyada**

Palestine's first daily newspaper, *Ha-Tsvi*, with Eliezer Ben-Yehuda as editor-in-chief and Itamar Ben-Avi and Hemda Ben-Yehuda at his side as editors in charge, marked its centennial in 2008. Why did Ben-Yehuda decide to publish a daily paper and how did he keep it going steadily for five years? These questions rest at the forefront of this study.

Ben-Yehuda's daily newspaper was not created *ex nihilo*; it developed gradually and as an organic outgrowth of his weekly journal. Therefore, the article first examines the conditions under which Ben-Yehuda did his publishing before 1908, i.e., to assess the long-term reasons for the transformation of the paper from a weekly to a daily. This part of the investigation centers on the paper's target readership. It shows that Ben-Yehuda tried to have it both ways for some fifteen years, attempting to publish a newspaper that appealed both to the community in Palestine and to pro-Zionists in Europe. Since the target populations had different areas of news interest, this bidirectional approach was his undoing. By the late 1890s, Ben-Yehuda was forced to choose the domestic readership because he had failed to compete with the European Hebrew press for the affections of Hebrew readers abroad.

From the moment the local community became his

preferred target, the ground was readied for a newspaper that would appear with increasing frequency and adapt itself to a society that was acquiring growing purchasing power and becoming increasingly modern and secular.

The second part of the study examines the immediate factor behind the advent of the daily paper, the Young Turks' revolution, which led to the liberalization of freedom of expression and publishing. It shows how, in the aftermath of this revolution, Ben-Yehuda assigned the editing of the Yishuv's first-ever daily newspaper to his son and wife. It examines the target population of the paper, its circulation, and how it was distributed.

The third part examines the new daily's editorial strategy. It shows that Ben-Avi and Hemda stressed the use of the sensation strategy, creating an entertainment spectacle that appealed to emotion and lust and served itself up in a long-term way by covering events in installments. It shows how *Ha-Tsvi* covered the counterrevolution in the Turkish capital in the spring of 1909 and, by the same token, tried to sustain public interest in itself by launching a journalistic crusade against an important personality in local public life.

### **ELIEZER BEN-YEHUDA IN PARIS AND THE "FRENCH MODEL" OF THE PRESS (1878-1881) / Gideon Kouts**

Eliezer Ben-Yehuda's stay in Paris from the autumn of 1878 to that of 1881 could not but leave its imprint on his journalistic training and his ideological and professional outlook in this field. Ben-Yehuda—"Oulianov"—Perlman—arrived from the centralized, limited, and censored press and media system of imperial Russia, far from its status and achievements in the liberal and democratic world of the West. Although his mentor in the intricacies of French politics and media was actually a Russian journalist, he was immediately exposed to an unfamiliar model of communications and to the beginning of the period in French press history that its scholars term the "golden era"—which began dramatically just then, following the resignation of President Patrice de Mac-Mahon and the onset of the "true" Third Republic in early 1879.

The parliamentary committee that was chosen in late 1877 to prepare a new press law, chaired by the distinguished French journalist Émile de Girardin, took until February 1879 to start working intensively and continued to convene until January 1881. After being debated in the National Assembly and the Senate, the bill was passed into law on July 29, 1881, and then gazetted. The new statute, considered the most liberal in the democratic world of the time, would complement the exertions of the French Revolution by heralding the advent of full freedom of the press in France. It was a formative event in the history of the global press. Ben-Yehuda lived through those historical days in the place where they occurred and was able to follow from up close the processes and the problematics that beset the coalescence of press freedom until it triumphed.

The experience definitely dealt him a culture shock. It also, however, allowed him to form an impression and to criticize the events as they unfolded from the perspective of a sober observer and to try to use them to reinforce views and ideology that were jelling inside him during this time. The press, of course, would serve Ben-Yehuda as a main instrument for the dissemination of and struggle for his political and sociocultural views. The French press would continue to serve him, and his son and successor Itamar Ben-Avi, as a source and a basic model for the first journalistic “empire” of its kind that he would establish in Palestine. The two of them, in Palestine, would absorb withering criticism from rivals in all directions—Jewish-Orthodox and, especially, Socialist—all along the way. Interestingly, during his stay in France, these players and their press (in their French manifestations) were precisely the camps that Ben-Yehuda found hostile to the Republic and the Republicans, whom he supported overtly. (This similarity amplified, and would further amplify, his tendency to “compare” the principles and achievements of the French Revolution with those of the revolution that he wished to ordain in the Jewish world and in Palestine.)

To follow textually Ben-Yehuda’s first encounter with the French media model of the early “golden era,” we call on a series of “political” articles from Paris that Ben-Yehuda published in the Jerusalem weekly *Havatselet* from the second half of 1879 to early 1880. Each article appeared two weeks to one month after being written.

What was engraved then in the conscience of young Ben-Yehuda, who has discovered the free, or liberated, world of

the Parisian press?

- The fighting partisan press.
  - The popular press that, in order to sell copies, kept the public supplied with sensations but did not flinch from social investigation.
  - The use of the press for ideological propaganda.
  - The shrill tone of voice, ultimately also adopted by the serious press that wished to promote its ideas.
  - Hostilities in the world of the press and the need for solidarity.
  - The newspaper’s role as a promoter of political, social, and philanthropic enterprises.
  - The importance of the newspaper in creating public opinion and influencing public and governmental leaders, even if its sources were limited and the information it published was not necessarily credible.
  - A press more noteworthy for expressing opinions than for obtaining and **providing** information.
  - The educational role of the newspaper in disseminating ideas and progress, (including centralized language policy) and the importance of disseminating it everywhere, but also the need for prior education so that it could be used....
- An initial study of Ben-Yehuda’s media policy in the press that he established in Palestine shows that the answer to the ironic question that he asked (in his fourth article), “It is an honor for the Hebrew writer to emulate the feats of the writers of Europe. Isn’t it?” is: Indeed, it is. But this, of course, is a topic for further research.

## THE DREYFUS AFFAIR IN THE HEBREW PRESS IN PALESTINE / Yosef Lang

Between 1894 and 1906, France was embroiled in tumult over various treason trials that took place on its soil, known collectively as the “Dreyfus Affair” whose hero was the French-Jewish military officer Alfred Dreyfus. Dreyfus, who denied the accusation categorically, was prosecuted anyway, sent to Devil’s Island, brought back, and retried again and again. Others were put on trial as well, foremost Émile Zola. The affair enflamed and divided the country, nearly brought on a civil war and the destruction of the regime, and threatened neighboring monarchies.

The Jewishness of the main player in the affair attracted racist anti-Jewish elements and antisemitic reactions that confounded the Jews of France and fellow Jews everywhere,

including Palestine.

Many Jews in Palestine had studied French and gained an acquaintance with French culture from the 1860s onward while attending the institutions of the Alliance Israelite Universelle. After Baron Edmond de Rothschild extended his patronage to the *moshavot* (Jewish farming communities of Palestine) in the 1880s and assigned their management to officials who had been raised on French culture, French was also taught in these communities’ schools and outstanding pupils were sent to France for further studies. Even after the *moshavot* were handed over to ICA in 1900, they remained under French influence due to the inspiration of Tsadok Cohen, Narcisse Leven, and Emile Meyerson. Relations between Ottoman

Palestine and France were also grounded in occupational (agriculture) and commercial interests. Zionist societies and associations that stayed in touch with Palestine (where the Yishuv, the Jewish community, was 50,000–60,000 strong at the time) were established in Paris and other cities.

During these years, two regular weekly newspapers (*Havatsheet* and *Ha-Tsvi*) appeared in Jerusalem; several journals came onto the scene later. *Havatsheet* made little reference to the Affair, whereas Ben-Yehuda, owner of *Ha-Tsvi*, *Ha-Or*, and *Hashkafa*, and a passionate Francophile who was incomparably committed to France and its culture, found it an important matter to agonize over.

From January 1895 onward, *Ha-Tsvi* covered the events in France surrounding Dreyfus and the trials in special departments such as “What Happened to Dreyfus” and “Trial of the Army Officer Dreyfus.” Ben-Yehuda sided with Dreyfus from the outset and trusted that the officer’s innocence would be proved. He strove to persuade his readers that the French army was not tainted with antisemitism and published reportage that sought to blur and obscure the bitter truth that had come to light in France. He soon realized, however, that the enlightened French nation had committed a terrible blunder and hoped that it was merely a passing nightmare occasioned by the actions of a few bad seeds.

Ben-Yehuda, like many Jews, vacillated about what stance to take. Obviously, supporting Dreyfus was tantamount to accusing the French army and state of misconduct. For this reason, he tried to skirt the events in France for a while and turned the spotlight toward Austria and the successful election campaign of the antisemite Karl Luger.

Ben-Yehuda was concerned about the antisemitism that threatened the Jews of France and Europe at large; he feared that it would also attack the Rothschild family, patron of the Yishuv. Rothschild, however, held his silence. When the failed assassination of Baron Alphonse de Rothschild became known, the moshavot celebrated, prayed for the family’s wellbeing, and feted the Rothschild brothers.

Public opinion crossed its watershed with the publication of Bernard Lazare’s book *A Judicial Error—the Truth about the Dreyfus Affair* (November 1896), which transformed the Affair into a markedly Jewish cause. As Lazare viewed the matter, Dreyfus was tried not as a traitor but as a Jew; he demanded that the Jews be given collective autonomy. Ben-Yehuda lauded Lazare, of course, especially since Senator Scheurer-Kestner had just proved that the charges against Dreyfus were groundless. Abraham Ludwipol, correspondent

of *Ha-Tsvi* in Paris, described the connection between the Affair and Herzl and his *Judenstaat* and celebrated Lazare as the savior of French Jewry.

Since many were afraid to speak out, the newspapers of Jerusalem offered an alternative by shifting the attention from France to the struggle being waged by young Jews against missionaries in Jerusalem in view of reports about blood libels and antisemitic manifestations in the cities of France and Algeria (1897–1898).

On January 13, 1898, Zola addressed his open letter, “J’accuse,” to President Félix Faure on the pages of *L’Aurore*, protesting the injustice that had been done to Dreyfus. In the wake of the letter he was prosecuted, found guilty of libel, and sentenced to a prison term and a fine. Zola’s trial made it easier for many to speak freely about the injustice that Dreyfus had suffered, and Zola himself, the non-Jewish hero of the Republic, became a widespread object of empathy.

Ben-Yehuda was initially horrified by the prosecution of a towering personality such as Zola and regarded it as evidence of grave moral decline. He issued leaflets about Zola’s sentencing in his newspapers and distributed them in the streets. To keep abreast of developments in France, he introduced a new transmission technology to his newspaper. Learning about Zola’s eventual exoneration, he wrote, “Let us not despair; justice will ultimately appear and Dreyfus will also be acquitted. After all, he was punished solely for being Jewish.” Intellectuals in the towns and the moshavot were thrilled by Zola’s miraculous deliverance and raised funds in order to send him a gift as an expression of their gratitude. The money was collected at the offices of Ben-Yehuda’s newspaper.

Later on, Ben-Yehuda met with Clemenceau in Paris (1899) and, “in the name of all the Jews in Palestine,” thanked him for his efforts on Dreyfus’ behalf. During his visit he also met with Bernard Lazare, who had been occupied with the Dreyfus Affair. When he found out about Dreyfus’ release (September 19, 1899), Ben-Yehuda wrote to his wife, “What amazing things are happening in France right now! How far the truth has come from the time of Zola’s trial to the present! Zola [...] was a true prophet [...] in the land of freedom of the press! Happy is [that land], a hundred, a thousand times over, happy is she!” (November 1899).

Ben-Yehuda’s exultation was premature. In his retrial in Rennes, which was expected to mark the end of the embarrassing affair, Dreyfus was re-convicted but pardoned. “Dreyfus was released,” *Havatsheet* wrote, “but justice was

not done.”

Ben-Yehuda's newspaper, reappearing after a hiatus of several months' duration (November 17, 1899), was convinced that "The silver in the firmament has begun to glow [. . .] with the rays of the dawn of justice." Little did the publisher know that it would take six additional years for justice to truly appear. After the Supreme Court acquitted Dreyfus, Ben-Yehuda, writing on behalf of the Francophiles in Palestine, described July 13–14, 1906, as "days of total victory for truth and justice in France and among humankind at large."

The public tumult ignited by the Dreyfus affair and its offshoots in France and elsewhere, and their effects on the French regime and the neighboring monarchies, did not engage the passions of the Jews of Palestine, as the newspapers of the time attest. The affair, which had suspended such a dark cloud over the Jews' loyalties to the authorities in the lands of their dispersion and had kindled antisemitic sentiments and actions, left them somewhat indifferent. Ben-Yehuda, horrified by the affair in its first few years, packed his newspapers—*Ha-tsvi* and *Hashkafa*—with an uninterrupted flow of information and opinion (his own) in the belief that the Yishuv's intellectuals would find them of interest. In contrast, J.D. Frumkin, the publisher of *Havatsalet*, and his successor, his son Gad, kept a low media profile and kept their views to themselves. The readers of both papers hardly reacted to the violation and miscarriage of justice that had been revealed and preferred to wait for the affair to end. The readers of *Havatsalet* were probably much more apprehensive about the fate of East

European Jewry than about that of the Jews of France and northern Africa. Still, the question remains: were they afraid to speak out because they feared that this would inflict harm on the Jews of France or of Palestine, or did they refrain from responding so as not to anger the Baron, "Alliance," ICA, and other organizations? We found no unequivocal answer. From the standpoint of the Jews in Palestine, the "positive" heroes of the affair were Zola and Lazare. Dreyfus himself refrained from speaking publicly about his national and Jewish sentiments and his attitude toward Zionism and Palestine was reserved and vague. One could rather easily identify with the moral personalities and actions of Zola and Lazare, relate to the affair through them and take strong positions that were difficult to express against the conduct of government and military officials and personalities who served pronouncedly internal French causes amid the blemish of antisemitism. This may explain why these two men served as natural focal objects of empathy in Palestine and elsewhere. The fate of the Rothschilds served as an indirect channel of expression; it allowed the Jews of Palestine to express support, empathize with the persecution of Jews at large, and articulate their disgust with the hostile climate in France. The affair seems to have preoccupied a small group of intellectuals as opposed to the public at large. The following remark by Itamar Ben-Avi illustrates this well: "Our home, of course, was full of noise and commotion most of Friday night and the following day on the occasion of Ben-Yehuda's articles about this great event. The whole town—Jews, Arabs, and also Christians—took part in the debates."

## A PRESS "ON THE BARON'S ACCOUNT"/ Mordecai Naor

### Baron Edmond de Rothschild and His Relations with Eliezer Ben-Yehuda

Baron Edmond de Rothschild was an aristocrat and a tycoon, the scion of the French branch of the renowned Rothschild family. From 1882 onward, he pledged himself to restoring the Jewish presence in the Land of Israel by establishing farming communities and helping agriculture and industry in the faraway and neglected Palestine of the late Ottoman era. For this, he is considered one of the founding fathers of the State of Israel.

Eliezer Ben-Yehuda was another founding father, the so-called reviver of Hebrew, which for centuries if not millennia had been considered a dead language suited to prayer and religious study at the most.

Ben-Yehuda needed material assistance and Baron Edmond de Rothschild provided it in the form of regular subventions for the publication of the newspapers in which he inserted the Hebrew words that he had newly coined. "The Baron" also helped him to publish his great dictionary, the *Dictionary of the Hebrew Language, Old and New*.

The relationship between these men, or at least between Ben-Yehuda and Rothschild's agents, took shape during Ben-Yehuda's visit to Paris in late 1886. The young Jerusalemite (aged 29 at the time), was well acquainted with the City of Light. He had spent nearly four years there (1877–1881) in the course of his lengthy journey from Lithuania to Jerusalem, had absorbed the French culture, and had become an avowed Francophile.

Baron de Rothschild's assistance to Ben-Yehuda lasted for decades. He also extricated Ben-Yehuda from a legal entanglement after rabbis in Jerusalem denounced him for sedition. Rothschild even subventioned the publication of Hebrew textbooks. Unlike his administrators, most of whom advocated the force-feeding of French culture in the farming

communities, Rothschild seems to have been adamant about concurrently developing the Hebrew culture and language and regarded Ben-Yehuda as the first and most important of the modern Hebrew prophets, who wrote and spoke in the old-new language.

## AHAD HA'AM AND HIS CIRCLE AGAINST THE "EXPANSION OF HEBREW" POLICY / Nurit Govrin

"Don't call them *marhivim* [expanders] but *mahrivim* [destroyers]!" as in Isaiah 49:17—"Your destroyers and those who laid you to waste." This lethal sentence, penned by J.C. Ravnitsky against Eliezer Ben-Yehuda's "word factory" and the shrill style of his newspapers, appeared in an article in *Kaveret*, a literary collection edited by Ahad Ha'am, in 1890. Ahad Ha'am and those of his circle—Ravnitsky, Druyanow, Bialik, S. Benzion, et al.—were among the opponents of Eliezer Ben-Yehuda's policy of expanding the Hebrew language and dreaded its outcomes. Deep down, Ahad Ha'am was a proponent of development but not of revolution, step-by-step progress and not headlong leaps, "like the Siloam spring, which flows slowly." He frowned on the "word factory" and the linguistic inventions of the Ben-Yehuda school and feared the danger that this linguistic policy contained. Here we mention only a smidgen of this complex, fascinating issue, which centered on a deeply respectful attitude toward the Hebrew word and language and, concurrently, the vast importance of literature and its ability to influence readers, especially members of the young generation.

### The Danger of Expanding Hebrew and the "Word Factory"

Concern about "ruining the Hebrew language" is as old as renewed Jewish settlements in Palestine, the onset of living Hebrew speech in the mouths of children, and the country's literature. Two feuilletons by S. Benzion, published in the journal *Ha-'omer* that he edited, illustrate this concern well: "Those Who Make the Revival Blossom" (No. 1, Adar 5667 / Spring 1907), under the byline "Offspring of the Zamzumim"; and "In the Footsteps of the Hebrew *Hushma*" (Vol. 2, No. 1, Tishre 5669 / Autumn 1908), bylined "Hayyim Sofer Stam."

### The Danger of Slang and Borrowing

Disapproval of Hebrew slang is as old as Hebrew literature in Palestine. The following example is also associated with *Ha-'Omer*. S. Benzion made strenuous efforts to have the

material in the journal exude a Land of Israel ambiance: "handsome works imbued with the spirit of Eretz Israel, i.e., vibrant and lyrical descriptions of the sites of the country and the lives of its past and present inhabitants." This condition was so strong that the editor, vacillating between an important work by a well-regarded author against a Diaspora background and a less important work by an unknown writer but against an Eretz Israel background, chose the latter. Only thus could he publish a Palestinian-Jewish journal with which he was at piece.

To convey a genuine sense of the reality in Palestine "from the lives of Arabs, "from the lives of workers," "from the lives of peasants," "from the lives of watchmen," etc., his contributors inserted words, expressions, concepts, and customs that were drawn from this reality. Without flooding their articles with neologisms of the Ben-Yehuda school, they inserted "Arabisms" in order to produce a believable account of the world described.

**Joseph Klausner**, in his criticism column "Hashash" (*Ha-Shiloah*, Vol. 13, Tevet 5668 / Winter 1908), protested this at once. What was it that concerned him so? The stories indicate "that the Russian-born Jews in the Land of Israel are sinking roots in the old-new soil." Consequently, however, "everything that happens in the country affects them, interests them, and influences them," and "new inhabitants such as these cannot but observe the old inhabitants' lives and the old inhabitants cannot but influence them somewhat." Klausner is afraid of "excessive" influence, especially when he reads "descriptions from the lives of Jews in Palestine by authors from Russia who have lived in Palestine for a long or short time [...] because in every account I get a stronger and stronger sense of the Arabs' powerful and direct influence on the 'new Jews.'" This influence is evidenced in "the profusion of Arabic words that the writers of Eretz Israel use when they wish to describe the lives of the people in the farming communities." It pleased Klausner to see a new type of Jew, different from his Diaspora

counterpart, was taking shape in Palestine: not cowardly, not idle, close to life in nature, etc. “And what strange pleasure they get from describing every Eretz Israel Jew as speaking Arabic and resembling an Arab!” The Jews, however, says Klausner, should by no means “imitate the Arabs and the Bedouin, i.e., be influenced by a primitive culture that, along with its virtues, has so many huge deficiencies.” More would be lost than gained if the Jews, instead of imitating a foreign

culture in Europe, would find themselves imitating foreign culture in Asia. The hope of being “masters in the land of our forefathers” is based on the Jews’ cultural advantage over the Arabs and the Turks; imitating the country’s inhabitants and their culture makes this goal harder, not easier, to attain. Klausner warns especially against the influence of “the Arabs and Bedouin culture

## THE SEPHARDI RABBIS AND THE PRESS / Yitzhak Bezalet

The involvement of Sephardim in Ottoman Palestine generally, and their rabbis in particular, in the country’s newspapers and journals still awaits a conclusive debate in the research literature and the public discourse.

Some estimable researchers have even claimed that the Sephardim took no interest in any kind of press. This article, which discusses the matter for the first time, refutes this proposition emphatically by noting that Sephardim published at least fifteen journals and newspapers during the period at issue only. It gives a detailed account of their actions in this domain as publishers, editors, and writers of articles in Hebrew and Ladino.

The article notes five rabbi-publishers, the most prominent of whom were D. Mitrani and B.Z. Cuenca, and six lay Sephardim, most conspicuously S. Razilai and M. Azriel. It also mentions five rabbis who were editors, notably the publishers mentioned above, and nine lay Sephardi editors, most conspicuously O. Benvenisti, S.Y. Shirizli, A. Almaliah, H. Ben-Attar, and Dr. S. Moyal.

An even larger number of Sephardi rabbis—some thirty, including twenty-one chief rabbis—took part in the secular press in Palestine. Several were among the greatest rabbis of the community. The article speaks in detail of the writings of sixteen of them, including the Hakham Bashi of Jerusalem, Rabbi T.D. Hazan; R. Yehuda Alcalay, R. Eliahu Hazan; the Hakham Bashi of Tripoli and later of Alexandria, R. Yehuda Halevi, the Chief Rabbi of Jaffa; the Hakham Bashi of Jerusalem, Y.S. Eliashar; the Rabbi of Hebron, Suleiman Mani, who also published prose and poetry; Rabbi Y.M. Toledano, who published research writings, memoirs, and numerous publicistic articles; the Hakham Bashi of Jaffa, Rabbi B.Z. Ouziel; the Hakham Bashi of Tiberias, Rabbi H. Abulafia; and Rabbi S.T. Gagin.

Their articles discussed the problems of the Yishuv, Zionism, Hebrew-language education, Jewish identity, relations between Sephardim and Ashkenazim, and the Arab problem, to name only a few.

## ON THE CROSSROADS: THE YISHUV NEWSPAPERS AND THE YOUNG TURK REVOLUTION / Yuval Ben Bassat

This study examines the reactions within the *yishuv* to the Young Turk Revolution of 1908, as reflected in four contemporaneous Hebrew newspapers published in Palestine between 1908 and 1910: *Havatselet*, *Ha-Tsvi*, *Ha-Poel ha-Tsair*, and *Ha-Herut*. The case of the *yishuv*, which was highly diverse in nature and included many sectors, provides a unique opportunity for exploring the relationships between the Ottoman Empire and the minorities remaining within its shrinking borders following this seminal event. The article argues that the distinct socio-political background of the various subgroups within the *yishuv* influenced their attitude towards the new regime, as expressed in the factionalized

Hebrew press. The Revolution and the reintroduction of a parliamentary regime initiated a heated debate within the *yishuv* regarding its future policies. Many realized that in order to achieve representation in the Ottoman institutions and to be able to influence the Empire’s Palestine policy it was crucial to obtain political unification, convince Jewish immigrants to accept Ottoman citizenship, and better integrate into Ottoman society. But efforts to unify the *yishuv* did not materialize quickly as each sector adhered to a different agenda. However, pursuing Jewish nationalism while concomitantly remaining loyal to the Ottoman Empire became the dominant stand within the *yishuv*. Many perceived Ottomanism, despite

its many disadvantages, as a framework for continuing the Jewish national enterprise. Finally, for the first time, the issue of future Jewish-Arab relationship in Palestine became

salient on the *yishuv's* agenda. The Arab political awakening following the Revolution puzzled the *yishuv*, which debated its repercussions for the future.

## **THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HEBREW CULTURAL CENTER: A CENTURY FOR THE BOOK PUBLISHING INDUSTRY IN ERETZ ISRAEL (1908/9-2008/9) / Motti Neiger**

This article presents the "Mediators of Culture" – institutes and individuals between the creative writers and the readers – in the process of establishing the publishing industry in Eretz Israel (the land of Israel) and the founding of an independent literary-cultural center. In this process we can distinguish between two main periods: The first one, setting the prerequisites for the establishment of the cultural center in Eretz Israel (1863-1908), and the second one, the establishment of the center (1908-1914). This center developed significantly after World War I and in the early 20's but its roots grounded in the establishment of Eretz Israel as a cultural center before the war. Among the "Mediators of Culture" that developed in the first period we can mention the establishment of Hebrew

newspapers, the seeds of the publishing industry, the rise of Hebrew readership and the founding of public libraries. In the second period, starting in 1908-1909, we may add the immigration of many poets and novelists, among them key figures as S.Y. Agnon and Y.H. Brener, the pivot of the new cultural center; The establishment of labor parties newspapers and literary reviews; the beginning of the press industry in Jaffa, the "second Aliya" and the cultural center integrated in Tel Aviv. The publishing industry nourished by those developments and nourishes them, as the emblem for the establishment of the cultural center in Eretz Israel and as its consequences.

## **THE REVISIONIST TEMPEST: REALIZATION VS. REALITY / Yoni Aviv**

The topic of this article is the work of Abba Ahimeir (1897-1962) on the (Revisionist) newspaper *Doar Hayom* and his relationship with Jabotinsky. In August 1928 Ahimeir joined *Doar Hayom* as a reporter and published his articles under the title: 'From the Notebook of a Fascist'. Several of these showered accolades on the leadership of Jabotinsky and expressed overt support for a dictatorial regime. Under pressure from Jabotinsky, who had been appointed editor-in-chief of the paper, Ahimeir removed the provocative title. The relationship of Ahimeir with the editors of the paper in practice fluctuated following differences in opinion about the content of the articles.

*Doar Hayom* did not stand up to the financial and administrative problems. On February 20, 1931 the last issue was published. The heads of the Revisionist movement began frantic action to publish another newspaper. In short, Ahimeir's power at *Doar Hayom* stemmed from his talents as a publicist who attracted a large readership, whereas Jabotinsky enjoyed great prestige not because he had the last word on determining the nature of the paper but because he was the leader of a national movement. It was convenient for everyone to oppose the radical positions of Ahimeir, with the result that he very soon lost his influence on the editorial board.

## **TWO MEDIA SYSTEMS BY OR FOR TWO MINORITIES IN ISRAEL / Nelly Elias and Dan Caspi**

The present pioneer study presented in the article attempts to differentiate between two main paradigms of ethnic minority media – media *for* and media *by* minorities. To evaluate the quality of each media system, we will rely on a series of twelve criteria which clustered into three major

categories. The first comprises four criteria that address "Medium initiative and design" – the initiative behind establishment of the medium, the nature of its ownership and the identity of its personnel and executives. The second is more functional, offering five criteria for different types of

"Medium behavior" - its attitudes towards the host society versus country of origin, medium's agenda, media leaders' reference groups and community's access to the medium. The third and final category consists of three types of "Control" criteria - political, economic and public.

As the minority language is often common to both systems, it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between them.

Nevertheless, the distinction between the two paradigms of ethnic minorities media is implying important theoretical and practical consequences, not only in mediating between the two communities - the hosts and the hosted - but also in their differential ability to serve as a common public space for debating issues as well as to represent the minority and guarantee its self-expression and empowerment.

## **THE ATTITUDE OF AMERICA'S JEWISH COMMUNITY TO THE EASTERN EUROPEAN JEWISH IMMIGRATION, 1881-1924, AS REFLECTED IN THE JEWISH PRESS / Robert Rockaway**

In 1880, the Jewish population of the United States numbered approximately 250,000. Most of them had come – or were descendants of men and women who had come – from German-speaking lands. Over a period of fifty years, these German Jews had acculturated socially and religiously, and were comfortably adjusted, politically and economically to America. By 1914, America's Jewish population totaled 3,000,000. This rise resulted from the massive immigration of more than two million Jews from Eastern Europe, most of them from Russia. The reaction of America's native community to this influx was ambivalent. They recognized that they had an obligation to assist their less fortunate brethren who had experienced horrifying persecution. At the

same time, the community's leaders worried that the arrival of large numbers of impoverished Jews placed a serious burden on their charities. But their apprehension resulted from a deeper concern than the economic one. They feared that this mass of Orthodox, impoverished, unkempt, Yiddish-speaking coreligionists posed a danger to the good name of and status of Jewish Americans and might generate a rise in anti-Semitism. The reaction of America's Jewish leaders is reflected in the country's English-language Jewish press. These leaders, as well as the newspapers' editors, reflected the thinking of most native Jewish Americans. By examining these newspapers we can gain insight into the attitudes of the American Jewish community regarding the immigrants.

## **BUKHARAN JEWISH NEWSPAPERS IN CENTRAL ASIA, 1910-1938 / Zeev Levin**

This article describes the history and developments in Bukharan Jewish press in Central Asia in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The first Jewish printed newspaper *Rakhamim* was issued on May 1910 in Russian Turkestan in Skobelev (Fergana valley). It was printed on Judeo-Tajik using Hebrew script. Judeo-Tajik was using Hebrew script at least since the late 18<sup>th</sup> century and substantial volume of books was printed out since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century in Jerusalem.

The importance of that paper was less in the fact that it was the first printed mater that was published on that language in Central Asia, but that it was the first time when an attempt was undertaken to write on general – not religious topics. This newspaper existed at least till 1916.

Second newspaper was initiated soon after the Communist Revolution it was titled *Rost* - which stood as an acronym for "Russian Telegraph Agency". It was printed in Tashkent as a

wallpaper from 1920-1922. This newspaper used to translate top news from Russian press about government activities its circulation was limited and probably was not distributed in other cities part from Tashkent.

A third newspaper *Roshnohi* – light was initiated in late 1925 in Samarqand. It started with circulation of 200 copies which were distributed among the Jewish residents of Samarkand, but soon its popularity grew so it was noticed and absorbed by the Communist Party in 1926. In 1930 the editorial was transferred to Tashkent and renamed to *Bairoqi-Mikhnat* – Banner of labor.

Between 1928-1932 the language of Bukharan Jews faced great transformations which were initiated by the Central government as part of a general effort to socialize and to culturize Eastern languages and to raise literacy rates among their peoples. Within this process the writing system was Latinized and the language was infolded with Russian-



International terms whereas words with Cultural-Religious syntax were wiped out.

The article focuses on the developments in Bukharan-Jewish language, development and growth in papers circulation, government supervision, its funding and the dialogue it held with the readers.

*Bairoqi Mikhnat* was shut down by the government in

1938. It was claimed that Bukharan Jews had reached a level of cultural development which does not require any more an existence of "national language" nor newspaper of their own, they were expected to assimilate in what was called "Soviet Culture" which could be expressed in Russian, Uzbek or Tajik languages.

## **GREETINGS WITH FLOWERS FROM THE HOMELAND / Haim Grossman**

"Operation Flower," in which children in Israel sent postcards to children in the Diaspora, was the first in a lengthy series of institutional demarches that aimed to affix the customs of Israel Independence Day in Israel's Jewish calendar. In 1951, the chair of the Committee for the 1951 Independence Celebrations approached Keren Hayesod and asked it to issue a colorful postcard for the upcoming Independence Day that would be sold to the public in Israel and the Diaspora. This led to another project: publishing a double-format booklet carrying a blessing from children in Israel, embellished with a dried plant, for the honor of the State of Israel. Educators and counselors were mobilized to make the project successful and, under their inspiration, pupils played an active role in this Zionist educational enterprise that brought the pleasant sensation of Israel to the children of the Diaspora.

Thus, the permanent tradition of publishing graphic material for the Diaspora was given an additional and doubly "authentic" dimension: not only an establishment oeuvre but also, and mainly, a genuine and sincere endeavor on the part of Israel's children, who sent out an authentic piece of nature from the country's soil. Thus, the project added an aspect of practical education in the form of preparation and effort, which was considered a very worthy value in the structuring of the Israeli child, who surely internalized the significance of the advantage derived from his/her act. After all, this child, positioned on the best and most worthy side of the Jewish-Zionist equation, on the soil of the homeland, would

be sending a gift of love from that soil to h/her Diaspora counterparts.

It is difficult to estimate the significance of the gift for the child in the Diaspora who received it. Lacking explicit data, one can only presume that the addressees did receive the gift by means of their schools or community institutions and were pleased with the greetings from Israel and their floral ornamentation. As for the Israeli youngsters who prepared and sent out the cards, one presumes that this was another successful step in the development of pride in Israeli nationhood. Instructing children to pick a flower in the field, dry it out carefully, fill in the information requested for the card, add the decoration, and prepare the postcard as part of an entire group – all these actions strengthened their pride in the land and State of Israel.

The Six-Day War brought on a big change that was echoed in the appearance of the stay-in-touch postcard to children in the Diaspora. After the victory, the Jewish National Fund issued a new postcard that was distributed in schools so that it could be filled out and mailed. The revised card was embellished with a picture of IDF soldiers dancing joyously at the Western Wall and carried the following message: "To my Diaspora friend, greetings from undivided Jerusalem." The flowers of our country seem to have faded a bit, surrendering their primacy to the holy places, foremost the Western Wall, that henceforth would be familiar and consensual Israeli-Jewish symbols even in institutional graphics.

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

**Dr. Uzi Elyada:** Head of Department of Communication, Haifa University

**Prof. Gideon Kouts:** Head of Jewish Media and History Studies, University of Paris 8, France. Editor of *Kesher*

**Dr. Joseph Lang:** Educator researcher of the History of the Jewish People

**Dr. Mordecai Naor:** author, researcher of Israeli media and history; first editor of *Kesher*

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

**Dr. Yitzhak Bezalel:** researcher of History & Literature, First Editor of *Peamim*

**Dr. Yuval Ben-Bassat:** Department of Middle Eastern History, University of Haifa

**Dr. Motti Neiger:** School of Communication, Netanya Academic College, Chair of the Israel Communication Association (ISCA)

**Dr. Yoni Aviv:** Department of Jewish History, Bar-Ilan University

**Dr. Nelly Elias:** the Department of Communication, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

**Prof. Dan Caspi:** Chair of the Department of Communication, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

**Prof. Robert Rockaway:** Jewish History Department, Tel Aviv University

**Dr. Zeev Levin:** School of Historical Studies, Tel Aviv University

**Dr. Haim Grossman:** Researcher of Hebrew Folklore and Culture

**Dr. Baruch Leshem:** The School of Communications, Sapir Academic College

**Mr. Dror Segev:** PhD Student, the Haim Rosenberg School of Jewish Studies, Tel Aviv University