

The war also helped to reinvigorate the NATO alliance, along with US power in Europe, which was closely associated with NATO. An editorial in the *Financial Times* summed up the matter this way:

The Kosovo crisis has confirmed the relevance of NATO—just as criminals confirm the relevance of policemen. Ten years ago, when the Berlin wall came down, it seemed destined to join its Warsaw Pact adversary in the dustbin of history. But the [Kosovo] crisis and Mr. Milošević's brutal ethnic cleansing of Albanians, have helped to confirm the continuing relevance of an international military force. (Buchan and Fidler 1999)

Western interventions in the Balkans thus established a post-Cold War relevance for both the Atlantic Alliance and US hegemony more generally, while the new language of human rights and genocide prevention—closely associated with the Yugoslav wars—helped legitimate later interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Libya.

**SEE ALSO** *Albright, Madeleine; Clinton, William Jefferson; Genocide; Human Rights; North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Buchan, David, and Stephen Fidler. "An Uneasy Anniversary." *Financial Times*, April 23, 1999.
- Burg, Steven L., and Paul S. Shoup. *The War in Bosnia-Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention*. Armonk, NY: Sharp, 1999.
- Gibbs, David N. *First Do No Harm: Humanitarian Intervention and the Destruction of Yugoslavia*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2009.
- Layne, Christopher. *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Owen, David. *Balkan Odyssey: An Uncompromising Personal Account of the International Peace Efforts Following the Breakup of the Former Yugoslavia*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt, Brace, 1995.
- Posen, Barry R. "The War for Kosovo: Serbia's Political-Military Strategy." *International Security* 24, 4 (2000): 39–84.
- Woodward, Susan L. *Balkan Tragedy: Chaos and Dissolution after the Cold War*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1995.

**David N. Gibbs**  
*Professor of History*  
*University of Arizona*

## ZIONISM

Zionism is Jewish nationalism, the aspiration for a Jewish collective. Zionism emerged in the nineteenth century in

conversation with the many other nationalist movements. Though it is rightfully seen as a precursor to the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, not all Zionists hoped for a Jewish state, nor was Zionism exclusively tied to the land of Palestine. Several proto-Zionist movements for Jewish peoplehood appeared in the mid-nineteenth century, such as Hibbat Zion in eastern Europe. Theodor Herzl (1860–1904), an Austro-Hungarian journalist, is the traditional founder of political Zionism. In the wake of the Alfred Dreyfus trial (1894) in France and rising antisemitism across Europe, Herzl published *The Jewish State* (1896). He argued that assimilation was neither possible nor desirable and that the creation of a Jewish state would be a solution to the twin problems of assimilation and antisemitism. Herzl did not consider initially that such a state needed to be in Palestine, and briefly pursued possibilities such as in Uganda. However, the powerful symbolism of the land of Palestine in the views of many of his supporters convinced him to concentrate on it.

In contrast to Herzl's belief in the power of a political entity, Ahad Ha'am (1856–1927, the pen name of Asher Ginsberg, meaning "one of the people" [Gen. 26:10]) argued that a slow cultural revival needed to precede the ability of Jews to flourish in any political entity. And where Herzl had hoped that the majority of Jews would relocate to the Jewish state, Ahad Ha'am envisioned a Jewish homeland as a center that would radiate outward to the Diaspora. European Zionist ideas were influential in the United States, though they were transformed in America. Ahad Ha'am's vision for the connection between a Jewish homeland and the Diaspora proved especially compelling, although Americans placed more confidence in a two-way exchange rather than a unidirectional influence from the national center outward. Israel Friedländer (1876–1920), who came to the United States to teach at the Jewish Theological Seminary in 1904, translated Ahad Ha'am's works for an American audience. Friedländer presented Ahad Ha'am as authorizing an ideology of "Zionism plus Diaspora, Palestine plus America." This opened up Zionism to focus on activities in the United States, even as they related to an imagined future in Palestine.

#### ZIONISM IN AMERICAN THOUGHT, PHILOSOPHY, AND POLITICS

While in Europe Zionism largely developed as an alternative to religious Judaism, for the most part Zionist Americans have argued that Jewish religion and nationalism are complements. Louis Brandeis (1856–1941) and Horace Kallen (1882–1974) argued that multiple loyalties are problematic only if they are inconsistent, but the

various forms of Jewish life are perfectly compatible with American democracy. For Kallen and Brandeis—who largely set a pattern for other Zionist Americans—the mechanism for harmonizing Jewish interests in Zionism with broader American patriotism is cultural pluralism. Martin Buber (1878–1965)—a Zionist who was born in Austria and immigrated to Israel—argued that Jews would not have needed a state if they had been emancipated in Europe as a group instead of as individuals. However, Zionist Americans believed there was still space for Jews to gain rights in America as a community—and that such rights would have important ramifications for non-Jewish Americans as well, allowing a fuller democracy to come into being during the twentieth century.

Horace Kallen argued that human experience could not be reduced to conformity to a single way: various groups had to be able to fulfill their own cultures and experiences without justifying themselves to a single universalist model. This idea, plus Kallen's sense that religion was human-made and not revealed, led him to argue that one only gained identity through group life, so the best political model would allow this group life to flourish. He saw the possibility for this in cultural pluralism. Kallen argued that secular cultural pluralism was the appropriate model for America and Israel. Louis Brandeis developed Kallen's argument for cultural pluralism as a response to the criticism of Jewish "dual allegiance," the idea that if Jews were loyal to Israel they could not be loyal citizens of other nations. He argued that multiple loyalties were only problematic if they were inconsistent, yet he believed most Americans already managed multiple loyalties—not only to nation, but state, city, family, trade, college, and so on. He fit Zionism into this model and suggested that, although he was already fully American and fully Jewish, striving to assist international Jews would allow the Jewish American community to further develop the best aspects of Jewishness and thereby benefit the entire American community by giving it the best the Jewish group could offer.

Religious Zionists tended to emphasize and expand similar importance of group rights along with an inextricable link between religion and Jewish nationalism, whereas Zionist nationalism served as religion or its alternative for many secularists. The Conservative Jewish leader Solomon Schechter (1847–1915)—who predated Kallen and Brandeis on the American scene—argued that Zionism would guard against Jewish assimilation, although assimilation and acculturation were not the same thing for Schechter. While nineteenth-century American Reform Jews had eschewed Zionism, believing it to undermine their security in America, Schechter offered a different

model for Jewish religion in America. He believed that maintaining Jewish identity even while adapting to American values (acculturation) was essential, and for him Zionism awoke this Jewish consciousness. He believed Zionism had already accomplished great things for Diaspora Jews—an argument Judah Magnes (1877–1948) continued. Magnes believed that peoplehood, Torah, and Israel constituted Jewish life. Although he did not believe the first two needed the third, like Schechter, Magnes argued that Israel could revivify Jewish peoplehood and Torah, as, for example, he believed that the revival of Hebrew had already accomplished.

These forms of American religious Zionism drew heavily on Ahad Ha'am's cultural Zionism rather than Herzl's political Zionism, though Zionist Americans transformed Ahad Ha'am as well. While Ahad Ha'am believed that Palestine would have to serve as a cultural center to the Jews of the Diaspora because most Jews would never be able to immigrate to Palestine, he also thought negatively of Jewish life in the Diaspora as culturally bankrupt. Yet Schechter and Magnes saw the Diaspora holding substantially more power for mutual benefit between Israel and the Diaspora, and encouraged the prospect for Jews to choose to remain in the Diaspora. Brandeis thought similarly—he believed Jews would establish their loyalty to America most clearly when they could choose to live there, and without a Jewish home state, their life in America was less clearly a choice. Combining cultural and religious renaissance with a greater sense of political freedom, Zionists argued that their commitment to Israel in no way undermined their loyalty to America but actually heightened it by cultivating their group's (and thus each individual Jew's) best qualities.

This framework for Jewish American identity represented an optimism that antisemitism was not incurable, an optimism shared with non-Zionists and anti-Zionists, indicating a larger theme of Jewish American identity beyond the group of early twentieth-century Zionists. Indeed, the founder of Reconstructionism, Mordecai Kaplan (1881–1983), argued that a culture built on despair would be traumatic as an educational paradigm for younger generations of Jews, and that Jewish identity could not be maintained by pointing to antisemitism. For Kaplan, the sense that Jewishness was a total civilization or way of life meant that Israel could help cultivate positive identity markers and practices. In Israel, he believed this civilization could flourish completely, but he initiated the synagogue center as a means for creating possibilities in America for all of Jewish life to take place within the Jewish community, rather than merely theology or religious worship.

## RESPONSES TO JEWISH ZIONISM

In addition to the many vectors of Jewish Zionism, Christian Zionism has also been a strong current in America. Specific readings of the Hebrew Bible that emerged during and after the Protestant Reformation led some Protestants to expect Jews to play an important role in the end of the current era on Earth and have contributed to the formation of Christian Zionism. Christian Zionism links expectations about roles for Jews, the land of Palestine-Israel, and messianic anticipation of a Second Coming of Christ. As a result, Christian Zionists have supported and at times even spearheaded contemporary political movements to bring Jews to the Holy Land. In the late nineteenth century, the American Christian Zionist William E. Blackstone (1841–1935), a premillennial dispensationalist, interpreted new settlements in Israel as the beginning of the end times. Blackstone urged politicians to support actions to restore Jews to Palestine, setting a lasting pattern for the role of Christian Zionism in the United States, and influencing much later figures, organizations, lobbies, and presidents, such as Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, and George W. Bush. Viewing themselves as a kind of contemporary Cyrus permitting Jews to reestablish a national religious home in Jerusalem, American Christian Zionists have supported political events from the 1917 Balfour Declaration (which the US government formally accepted in 1926) to the establishment of the State of Israel. Christian support for the State of Israel has expanded since the creation of the state and especially after the Six-Day War in 1967. Jewish and Christian Zionists have generally been aware of each other's differing motives, producing occasional ambivalence, but nevertheless they have often forged pragmatic cooperation.

Not all Jewish Americans considered Zionism a fulfillment of their understanding of the essence of Judaism or even compatible with either Judaism or American values. Taking the 1885 Pittsburgh Platform as representative of early Reform Judaism, many Reform Jews, especially rabbis, critiqued Zionism as inherently pessimistic about antisemitism or the idea that Jews were rightful citizens of the United States or other nations around the world. Reform Jews and other Jewish anti-Zionists typically supported Jewish rights to live as citizens in Palestine, but within a liberal democratic state rather than an ethnically Jewish state. As a movement, Reform Judaism remained aloof from Zionism until the 1930s. By then, many more American Reform Jews had begun to support some measure of Zionism, and the 1937 Columbus Platform created room for Zionism in Reform without explicitly endorsing Zionism. However, a minority of Reform rabbis

formed the American Council for Judaism to argue against incorporating conceptions of a separate Jewish nation-state into Reform ideology.

Many Haredi Jews have also rejected Zionism as a Jewish political framework. Prior to the nineteenth century, most Jews expected that the Messiah would come to Earth to reestablish the Jewish kingdom and nation in the land of Israel. Early secular Zionists argued that Jews need not wait for the Messiah to create a Jewish nation-state. Though many Jews in the United States and throughout the world have understood the new State of Israel in diverse connections to their range of religious positions, some Haredim—especially those from the Bobov and Satmar communities—have considered Zionism and the creation of a Jewish political state prior to the coming of the Messiah problematic and even contrary to the covenant with God. Some Satmar Hasidism so radically oppose the state that they hold anti-Israel rallies. These positions do not describe all Haredim and Hasidim, however, and Haredim constitute an increasing number of the residents of the contemporary State of Israel, though they have not always subscribed to all Zionist ideas or participated in the operation of the state, such as through military service.

Arab and Palestinian anti-Zionism should also be distinguished from Jewish anti-Zionism. Most Jewish anti-Zionists have opposed the creation of a Jewish state, though they have nevertheless advocated the right of Jews to settle in the land of Palestine/Israel under some other political framework. Jewish anti-Zionism has not necessarily been connected to any alternative activism for Arab or Palestinian rights in the region. Arabs, Palestinians, and others have participated in movements for various models of government since the nineteenth century from monarchism to Pan-Arabism to Palestinian nationalism to Pan-Islamism, only partially in reaction to Zionism. Many have rejected Zionism as a political framework and the existence or operations of the State of Israel. While some movements have sought to accommodate Jewish settlement in the region, some have seen Jewish settlement or land ownership as stifling the possibilities for Arab or Palestinian political rights and self-determination.

## ZIONISM IN AMERICAN PRACTICE

Focusing on the institutions, programs, and spaces designed in America by Zionists, such as the synagogue center, is central to understanding the significance of Zionism to Jewish American identity and practice. Because Americans argued that Zionism came out of their investment in life in America, it is important to see the ways the Americanization of Zionism meant an

Americanization of Israel. Jewish American politics, economics, gender norms, literature, and fund-raising left imprints on the development of the prestate settlement of Palestine and later the State of Israel. At the same time, Zionism deeply influenced America. The strength of American Zionism was neither solely nor centrally fund-raising abilities or political support for Israel, but in the programs it was able to create in America, which cultivated a sense of kinship among Jews in America, as well as a sense of responsibility for the international Jewish population, especially those in the land of Israel. Youth programs, education, and summer camps cultivated a sense of Jewishness among Jewish Americans. Zionism thus became an important influence or aspect of the practice of Judaism for many, and for some, Zionism was their practice of Judaism. Additionally, Zionist literature in America offered images of Jews compatible with American values of democracy, social justice, and gender norms. Images of muscular, healthy Jews working the land and tied to nature reinforced the sense that Jewish values and American values were completely compatible.

The measure of the success or strength of American Zionism must be gauged based on the tie between Zionism and other issues of Jewish concern in organizations and activities on American soil for Jewish Americans. Therefore, making *aliyah* (moving permanent residence to Israel) cannot be understood as the ultimate value of American Zionism. This measure comes out of the values of methodological European Zionism, but it should not be imposed on understandings of Zionism in America. Additionally, politics are not the only way to measure American commitment to creating a Jewish homeland in Palestine, nor should they be valued as necessarily having been the best way to achieve that goal. A substantial number of Jewish Americans invested in creating a Jewish presence in Palestine chose not to participate in American politics. Some, such as Stephen Wise (1874–1949) and Abba Hillel Silver (1893–1963), became rabbis and entered politics out of their understanding of the structures of power in America and their understanding of the link between the religious and political realms influenced by the Social Gospel and American progressivism.

#### ZIONIST-AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS

In 1898, the Federation of American Zionists (FAZ) was founded in New York as an affiliation of an unknown number of individual Zionist societies. Yet, in total, the organization was small, representing a minority of Jewish Americans. Prior to World War I (1914–1918), though these affiliated societies joined the federation, they would not consent to complete

centralization of authority in the FAZ. Louis Brandeis came to the front of the organization's leadership in 1914. His administration united Zionists with eastern and western European heritage, as well as eastern (New York) and midwestern (Chicago) Zionists. In addition to this reconciliation, Brandeis brought progressive followers who were attracted to the democratic principles of the FAZ. Under Brandeis, in 1918, the FAZ was reorganized as the Zionist Organization of America (ZOA), when leadership was centralized.

The ZOA was the largest men's Zionist American organization; however, many women's organizations, such as Hadassah, the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW), the women's auxiliary to the Workmen's Circle, and Pioneer Women, believed they gained a certain amount of power by remaining outside of politics and the Jewish men's organizations that declared political commitments to parties or platforms in America and Israel. By refusing to take such political stances, women maintained leadership over their own organizations; they were able to reach larger audiences and accommodate a wider range of ideological commitments, allowing them to grow in larger proportions than men's organizations; they were able to start programs on the ground, such as hospitals, schools, and wellness/nutrition programs in Palestine, without first having to resolve political debates, thereby creating a foundation for Jewish life in Palestine regardless of statehood; and finally, they avoided violating gender norms that suggested women did not belong in politics. Women believed their programs were more pragmatic than the efforts of men, which became bogged down in the political process and required that Jewish politics be subject to the opinions of non-Jews to a greater extent. Women's organizations—especially, for example, the NCJW, which chose to join the American League of Women Voters rather than the Women's International Zionist Organization (as Hadassah did)—were certainly pulled by their commitment to upholding American values. But this commitment to broader American values may not have exerted the same level of pressure or authority on the NCJW's ultimate right to define their organization's goals for themselves.

While Revisionist Zionists in America were more tied to political commitments in prestate Palestine and openly declared their commitment not only to establishing a Jewish state but also a strong Jewish military presence in that state, some Revisionists, such as Peter Bergson (1915–2001, the pseudonym of Hillel Kook), felt more freedom in America by remaining aloof to American politics. While Silver and especially Wise had to tailor their demands and ideology to political programs of the non-Jewish American political figures they were lobbying, Bergson more easily declared radical commitment to

Jewish plans for statehood—a commitment largely shared with Wise and Silver. Further, Bergson could use more creative means to garner American Jewish support for both the Jewish state—such as public relations campaigns drawing on the celebrity power of members of Hollywood and arts circles, like Ben Hecht (1894–1964)—and attempts to rescue Jewish Holocaust victims, including the illegal transfer of munitions.

On the one hand, the history of American Zionism is a history of arguing the compatibility and even fusion of American and Jewish politics. On the other, it is also a history of how these two realms have at times been understood to be separate. Groups such as the NCJW argued a conjunction of American-Jewish-Palestine interests that suited their understandings of themselves as middle-class Jewish American women, but which grew problematic when they encountered lower-class, Yiddish-speaking immigrants with commitments to labor concerns. Such Yiddish-speaking women were rejected by the NCJW and therefore joined Pioneer Women. While Pioneer Women attempted to hold the same parlor meetings and fund-raising parties that the NCJW held, these were typically overshadowed by their labor concerns and slogans, such as “Let’s hear it for women workers!” While members of the NCJW could theoretically tolerate Yiddish-speaking, lower-class immigrants’ presence in Palestine, the presence of such immigrants in America actually undermined many middle-class women’s understandings of Jewish American identity.

Men’s political conflicts might be understood within a similar paradigm. Jewish Americans displayed a tension or ambivalence between their desire to see themselves as completely American and their understanding of important distinctions between Jews and non-Jews in America, and they experienced conflict when their ideological identities did not conform to their practical experiences in America. Jewish group interactions illuminate these narratives and show how these groups’ power and powerlessness arose out of the forms of Jewish American Zionism they constructed.

SEE ALSO *Balfour Declaration (1917)*; *Holocaust*; *Judaism*; *Protestantism*; *United Nations*; *World War I*; *World War II*

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ariel, Yaakov. “An Unexpected Alliance: Christian Zionism and its Historical Significance.” *Modern Judaism* 26, 1 (2006): 74–100.
- Bernstein, Deborah S., ed. *Pioneers and Homemakers: Jewish Women in Pre-State Israel*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.

- Brinner, William, and Moses Rischin, eds. *Like All the Nations? The Life and Legacy of Judah L. Magnes*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.
- Cohen, Naomi. *The Americanization of Zionism, 1897–1948*. Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press, 2003.
- Davidson, Lawrence. *America’s Palestine: Popular and Official Perceptions from Balfour to Israeli Statehood*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2001.
- Dawisha, Adeed. *Arab Nationalism in the Twentieth Century: From Triumph to Despair*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Dawson, Nelson L., ed. *Brandeis and America*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1989.
- Eisenberg, Robert. *Boychiks in the Hood: Travels in the Hasidic Underground*. New York: Harper Collins, 1995.
- Friesel, Evyatar. “Ahad Ha-amism in American Zionist Thought.” In *At the Crossroads: Essays on Ahad Ha-am*, edited by Jacques Kornberg, 133–141. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.
- Greenstein, Howard R. *Turning Point: Zionism and Reform Judaism*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Gurock, Jeffrey S., ed. *American Zionism: Missions and Politics*. London: Routledge, 1998.
- Halpern, Ben. *A Clash of Heroes—Brandeis, Weizmann, and American Zionism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Heilman, Samuel. *Sliding to the Right: The Contest for the Future of American Jewish Orthodoxy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Hertzberg, Arthur, ed. *The Zionist Idea: A Historical Analysis and Reader*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1997.
- Hyman, Paula. *Gender and Assimilation in Modern Jewish History: The Roles and Presentations of Women*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1995.
- Kaplan, Dana Evan, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to American Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Kaufman, Menachem. *An Ambiguous Partnership: Non-Zionists and Zionists in America, 1939–1948*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1991.
- Kolsky, Thomas. *Jews against Zionism: The American Council for Judaism, 1942–1948*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990.
- McCune, Mary. “Social Workers in the *Muskeljudentum*: ‘Hadassah Ladies,’ ‘Manly Men,’ and the Significance of Gender in the American Zionist Movement, 1912–1928.” *American Jewish History* 86, 2 (1998): 135–165.
- McCune, Mary. “*The Whole Wide World, without Limits*”: *International Relief, Gender Politics, and American Jewish Women, 1893–1930*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 2005.
- Medoff, Rafael. *Militant Zionism in America: The Rise and Impact of the Jabotinsky Movement in the United States, 1926–1948*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2002.
- Merkley, Paul. *The Politics of Christian Zionism, 1891–1948*. London: Frank Cass, 1998.

- Meyer, Michael. *Response to Modernity: A History of the Reform Movement in Judaism*. Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press, 1995.
- Raider, Mark A. *The Emergence of American Zionism*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.
- Raider, Mark A., Jonathan D. Sarna, and Ronald W. Zweig, eds. *Abba Hillel Silver and American Zionism*. London: Frank Cass, 1997.
- Raphael, Marc Lee. *Abba Hillel Silver: Profile in American Judaism*. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1989.
- Reinharz, Shulamit, and Mark Raider, eds. *American Jewish Women and the Zionist Enterprise*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2004.
- Shapiro, Yonathan. *Leadership of the American Zionist Organization, 1897–1930*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.
- Shenhav, Yehuda. *The Arab Jews: A Postcolonial Reading of Nationalism, Religion, and Ethnicity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Urofsky, Melvin. *A Voice That Spoke for Justice: The Life and Times of Stephen S. Wise*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1982.

**Jessica Carr**

*Assistant Professor in Religious Studies  
Lafayette College*