Tal Elmaliach

Jewish Radicalism as a Liminal Space

HaShomer haTza'ir between Zionism and the New Left, 1967 – 1973

Introduction

During the second half of the 1960s and the early 1970s, a new phenomenon became apparent in the main centers of diaspora Jewry – North America, Latin America, and Western Europe. It was defined by the people of that era, as well as scholars, as "the Jewish New Left."[1]

This term came to describe the activity of thousands of young Jews who tried to shape their particular ethnic identity, while being involved in the universal political and ideological trend called the "New Left."[2] At the same time, a local version of the New Left developed in Israel. The Israeli New Left faced similar dilemmas to the Jewish New Left regarding its loyalty to the Zionist project and the

universal values with which it identified.[3] This chapter focuses on the tension between Zionism and the New Left, as it was expressed in organizations which were affiliated with one of the prominent centers of the Jewish New Left – the movement of HaShomer haTza'ir.[4] The chapter describes this phenomenon in several locations – the United States, France, Argentina, and Israel – between the years 1967–1973, when this tension reached its peak.

Current research about the Jewish New Left focuses, naturally, on the biggest center of Jewish youth in the 1960s – the United States, where there were at that time about 350,000 Jewish students. Nathan Glazer examined the prominent role of Jews in the American New Left. He described how the year 1967 marked the turn of the universal New Left against Israel as a result of the Six-Day War and the rise of a conflict between Afro-Americans and Jews in the United States. After it, he argued, Jews developed a particular Jews-only movement, although they still had some connections to the universal New Left.[5]

Yosef Gorni also studied radical Jews in the United States during those years. He claimed that at the beginning of the 1960s Jews were alienated from their Jewish roots and that their national consciousness rose as a result of the war, as well as disappointment with the New Left and the hostility of Afro-Americans.[6] Other scholars, such as Jack Nusan, Peter Dreier, Arthur Liebman, and Percy S. Cohen, also argued that until the Six-Day War Jews were involved in the New Left without a declared connection to the fact they were Jewish. They also hang the emergence of the Jewish New Left on the feelings of loneliness of Jews and the sense they were betrayed by the universal New Left during and after the war.[7]

---

3 Adi Portugez, "Tnuat Smol Israeli Hadash: Smol Hadash Be-Israel," *Israel* 21 (2013): 225–252; Tal Elmaliach, "The Israeli Left between Culture and Politics: Tzavta Club and Mapam 1956–1973," *Journal of Israeli History* 33, no. 2 (2014): 169–183.

4 See note 3 and Yair Oron, *Kulanu Yehudim Germanim – Radicalim Yehudim Be-tzarfat Be-shnot Ha-shishim Ve-ha-shivim* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, the University of Tel Aviv and the University of Ben Gurion, 1999), 105, 107, 110; Beatrice D. Gurwitz, "From the New World to the Third World: Generation, Politics, and the Making of Argentine Jewish Ethnicity 1955–1983" (PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2012); Leonardo Senkman, "Repercussions of the Six-Day War in the Leftist Jewish Argentinian Camp: The Rise of Fraie Schtime, 1967–1969," in *The Six-Day War and World Jewry*, ed. Eli Lederhendler (Bethesda, MD: University Press of Maryland, 2000), 167–187; Avraham Schenker, "Progressive Zionism in America," in A*gainst the Stream: Seven Decades of HaShomer haTza'ir in North America*, ed. Ariel Hurwitz (Givat Haviva: Yad Yaari, 1994), 273–295; Amichai Geva, "A Time for Expansion," in Hurwitz, *Against the Stream*, 125–142.

5 Glazer, *American Judaism*, 151–186.

6 Gorni, *Collective Identity*, 111–132.

7 Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 536–587; Nusan and Dreier, *Jewish Radicalism*, xvi–iiv; Percy S. Cohen, *Jewish Radicals and Radical Jews* (London: Academic Press, 1981), 14–84.

Rejection by the universal New Left was also perceived as the main reason for the rise of the Jewish New Left in research about the two next biggest centers of Jews in the diaspora in the 1960s – France (with 20,000 Jewish students) and Argentina (15,000).[8]

Yair Oron showed how the Six-Day War aroused Holocaust awareness among the young generation of Jewish radicals in France, and how this led to their identification with the State of Israel and the Jewish people.[9]

Paula Hyman and Judith Freidlander also described a process through which the Jewish Left in France assimilated after the Second World War, but this transformed after the Six-Day War into a Jewish pride and growing ties to the Jewish tradition.[10]

The research about the Jewish New Left in Argentina also sees it as a result of rejection, although it dates its rise to an earlier period. Beatrice Dora Gurwitz claimed that this phenomenon, which she defines as "ethno-radicalism," emerged after the wave of anti-Semitism that followed the kidnapping by Israel of Adolf Eichmann (1906–1962) from his hideout in Argentina (1960), as well as the disappointment with Latin-American hostility toward Israel during the first tri-continental conference in Havana in 1966.[11]

Another description of the role of rejection in the rise of the Jewish New Left in Argentina was made by Leonardo Senkman. Senkman saw signs of feelings of rejection as early as the 1950s, as a result of anti-Semitism in the Communist party of Argentina as well its hostility towards Israel before the Six-Day War.[12]

The historical convention about the Jewish New Left, which emphasizes feelings of rejection as the prominent source for its rise, suits the traditional convention regarding radical Jews as a broad historic phenomenon. This traditional convention says that from the early stages of the universal Left, Jews wished to be part of it, and that they could integrate inside it as long as they assimilated, or at least did not emphasize their particular Jewish origins. But the emergence of different elements of rejection – such as anti-Semitism, pogroms, or disap-

---

8 *American Jewish Year Book* 70 (1969), 73; Leon Peretz, *Matzavo Shel Ha-noar Ha-yehudi Be-Argentina*, 1961, archived in Humanities Library – the Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Oron, *Kulanu Yehudim Germanim*, 18; Tfuzot Israel – Sherut Meida Al Chayei Ha-yehudim Ba-olam, Shana Chet, Hoveret He (Jerusalem, Ha-va'ad Ha-yehudi Ha-americani Be-Israel, 1970).

9 Oron, *Kulanu Yehudim Germanim*, 131–140.

10 Judith Freidlander, "The Six-Day war and the 'Jewish Question' in France," in Lederhendler, *The Six-Day War*, 125–160; Paula Hyman, *The Jews of Modern France: Jewish Communities in the Modern World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 193–214.

11 Gurwitz, "From the New World to the Third World," 68, 97.

12 Senkman, "Fraie Schtime."

pointment with the non-Jewish Left – stopped the process of assimilation. It forced the Jews to develop a particular framework which embraced the ideas of the universal Left and implemented them in the Jewish world. Jewish nationalism and the universal Left did not suit one another and therefore the Jewish New Left arose as a result of the clash between them.

In this chapter I wish to challenge this convention and offer an alternative explanation for the rise of the Jewish New Left. This relies on current historic research about Jewish radicalism, the theoretical discussion about the creation of ethnic identity, and a specific historic test case. My explanation sees rejection feelings, especially those that followed the Six-Day War, as a catalyst for the rise of the Jewish New Left, but not as a turning point which marked its emergence.[13]

As I will show, the Jewish New Left was another expression of a built-in combination, and not contradiction, between Jewish nationalism and the universal Left, which had been part of these movements' history since they emerged. This argument relies on a hypothesis which is based on the scholarly discussion regarding ethnic solidarity among minorities living in multi-cultural societies.[14]

It says that modernization has not made ethnic solidarity unnecessary, since it is an efficient tool to confront different challenges in modernity, such as secularization, urbanization, immigration, and political and economic instability. The combination between Jewish nationalism and the universal Left was, therefore, based on the benefits that these two movements provided to Jews. Supporting them both, as I show below, not only was not a paradox but is actually self-explanatory.

Jewish Radicals between Nationalism and Universalism

The attempt to combine a Jewish national self-definition and the ideas of the universal Left is an historic phenomenon that emerged in the mid-nineteenth century. Its first signs were seen with the activity of Jews in left-wing movements, of whom Moses Hess is considered to be the "ideal type."[15]

---

13 See Staub, *Torn at the Roots*, 131–132.

14 François Nielsen, "Toward a Theory of Ethnic Solidarity in Modern Societies," *American Sociological Review* 50, no. 2 (1985), 133–149.

15 See for example Isaiah Berlin, "The Life and Opinions of Moses Hess," in *Essential Papers on Jews and the Left,* ed. Ezra Mendelsohn (New York: New York University Press, 1997); Shlomo

In the second half of the nineteenth century, it seemed that the combination between Jewish national particularism and ideas of the universal Left, of the type that Hess and others offered, did not receive significant attention. However, at the end of the century and in the first years of the twentieth century, two mass movements based on this combination were established: the Bund and Socialist-Zionism.[16]

A third movement – the Communist movement – was cosmopolitan and clearly non-Jewish, but until the 1930s its Jewish members had the opportunity – which they fulfilled – to keep their particular culture and heritage and combine it with their involvement in the general revolutionary project.[17]

Between the three movements were significant differences regarding the "Jewish question," meaning how and where Jews should live in order to make them part of the modern world. However, they also shared the basic combination of the particular and universal and from this point of view they were somewhat similar. As a result, supporters of these movements often moved from one movement to another.[18]

Research of the relationship between Jewish nationalism and the universal Left went through several developments throughout the years. These developments can be described through three perspectives, which I define as the "contradiction thesis," the "dialectic thesis," and the "built-in combination thesis." The contradiction thesis was the traditional historiographical perspective about Jewish radicals, which was developed by historians such as Simon Dubnow, Ben-Zion Dinur, Raphael Mahler, and Shmuel Ettinger and was dominant from the beginning of the twentieth century to the 1960s. It saw a complete contradiction between Jewish nationalism and the universal Left and described a permanent struggle between them. Jews who supported the universal Left, they argued, tended to assimilate, but confronted anti-Semitism which stopped this process.[19]

Avineri, *Moses Hess: Prophet of Communism and Zionism* (New York: New York University Press, 1985).

16 For further discussion see Jonathan Frankel, *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

17 Kenneth B. Moss, *Jewish Renaissance in the Russian Revolution* (Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 2009); Benjamin Pinkus, *The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority* (Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

18 See for example Anita Shapira, *Ha-halicha Al Kav Ha-ofek* (Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim, 2001).

19 Jonathan Frankel, "Hitbolelut Ve-Hisardut Be-kerev Yehudei Eropa Ba-Me'a Ha-19: Lekrat Historiografia Hadasha?" in *Leumiyut Ve-politica Yehudit: Prespectivot Hadashot*, ed. Gideon Shimony, Yosef Shalmon and Yehuda Reinhertz (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center and Boston: Tauber institute in Brandeis University, 1996), 23–56.

Anti-Semitism was therefore the driving force behind Jewish nationalism, and in the case of Jewish radicals, behind the establishment of frameworks which combined, as a compromise, Jewish nationalism and the ideas of the universal Left.

The dialectic thesis was developed mainly by Jonathan Frankel and Michael Graetz. Although they both saw the relationship between Jewish nationalism and the universal Left as a contradiction, they were aware that there was an interaction between them. Regarding the Jewish labor movement in Eastern Europe, Frankel described a dialectic move from traditional life to emancipation and a development of a synthesis of auto-emancipation[20]; Graetz, writing on French Jewry, showed how the organized attempt to encourage the assimilation of the Jews actually developed their national awareness.[21] Although, in a comparison with the contradiction thesis, they presented a more complicated perception, they actually also explained the source of the dialectic process by the rejection that Jews experienced from the Left. Frankel argued, for example, that Moses Hess developed his Socialist-Zionism after the Damascus affair (1840) and that in Russia Jewish radicals began their affiliation with Jewish nationalism mainly after the pogroms of 1881–1882.[22]

Graetz also described, regarding Hess and his Jewish roots, a route of "alienation, rejection and returning" and argued that this comprised the common roots of many Jews in that time.[23]

The driving force behind the dialectic thesis was, therefore, that the contradiction led to a combination between Jewish nationalism and the universal Left, but not intentionally.

The contradiction thesis and the dialectic thesis are inconsistent with arguments of other scholars, who see the relationship between Jewish nationalism and the universal Left as a built-in combination. Moshe Mishkinski, for example, who studied the Jewish labor movement in Russia, claimed that "the common perception, which sees only the contradictions between these two trends, is one-sided and false. Actually, there was a constant two-way interaction between

20 Jonathan Frankel, "Ha-mashber Ke-gorem Merkazi Ba-politica Ha-yehudit Ha-modernit: 1840 and 1881–1882," in *Solidaryut Yehudit Leumit Ba-et Ha-hadasha*, ed. Biniamin Pincus and Ilan Troen, (Sde-Boker: Ben Gurion Institute, 1988), 31–46.

21 Michael Graetz, *Ha-periferia Haita Le-Merkaz: Prakim Be-toldot Yehudei TZarfat Ba-Me'a Ha-yod-tet* (Jerusalem: Bialik institute, 1987).

22 Frankel, "Ha-mashber Ke-gorem Merkazi," 32–42.

23 Michael Graetz, "Le-sheivato Shel Moshe Hess La-yahadut: Ha-reka Le-chibur 'Romi ve-Yerushalaim," *Tzion*, Mem-He, Bet (1980): 133–153.

them."[24] Phyllis Cohen Albert, who examined the Jews of France, argued that they were affiliated at the same time with their Jewish roots and emancipation, without contradiction between the two. Although Albert explains this combination as a result of the insecurity that Jews felt, he still saw it as built-in and not as some interaction between two contradictory poles. He also helped to dismantle the claim of Graetz about the common root of alienation, rejection, and returning, by showing that anti-Semitism sometimes led to further assimilation and did not necessarily emphasize the national element.[25]

The built-in combination thesis was supported by other scholars as well: Eric Hobsbawm, for example, presented Jewish nationalism not as a result of rejection but as an attempt to imitate the European national movements[26]; elsewhere, Yoav Peled argued that the Bund combined national and class perspectives as a result of the special role of Jews in the labor structure of Eastern Europe.[27]

The built-in combination thesis is also supported by the current theoretical discussion about the construction of ethnic identity. During the first decades of this discussion, ethnic identity had been perceived as a primordial and permanent cultural pattern. As such, it suited the contradiction thesis and the dialectic thesis, since they both saw Jewish particularism and the universal Left as two separate elements. However, in recent years, ethnicity has been described as undergoing constant changes and reshaping.[28]

Different scholars argued that self-definition of ethnic groups is actually flexible, so when a group (such as the Jews) face some contradiction (such as between the particular and the universal), it can eliminate it by redefining its borders and characteristics.[29]

---

24 Moshe Mishkinski, *Reshit Tnu'at Ha-poalim Be-rusia: Megamot Yesod* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University and Hakibbutz Ha-me'uchad, 1981), 9.

25 Phyllis Cohen Albert, "Etniut Ve-solidaryut Yehudit Be-tzarfat Ba-Me'a Ha-19," in Shimony, Shalmon and Reinhertz, *Leumiyut Ve-politica Yehudit*, 47–73.

26 Eric J. Hobsbawm, *Nations and Nationalism since 1780* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 47–48, 76.

27 Yoav Peled, *Class and Ethnicity in the Pale: The Political Economy of Jewish Workers' Nationalism in Late Imperial Russia* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989).

28 Fredrik Barth, ed., *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969); Andreas Wimmer, "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory," *American Journal of Sociology* 113, no. 4 (2008): 970–1022; Joane Nagel, "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture," *Social Problems* 41, no. 1 (1994): 152–176.

29 Martin Japtok, *Growing Up Ethnic Nationalism and the Bildungsroman in African American and Jewish American Fiction* (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2005), 52; Shaul Magid, *Post-Judaism: Identity and Renewal in a Postethnic Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).

One way to do this is by creating a "hybrid identity," which means a new identity that includes several identities which carry a mutual relation of "that and also the other."[30]

Another way in which a new identity that combines different elements can be constructed is by establishing a "liminal space," which means "in-between" the two elements.[31]

According to the scholarly discussion that deals with the role of liminality in construction of identity, every change in the self-definition of a group includes three steps: pre-liminal, liminal, and post-liminal. The most significant stage is the liminal one, since this is where the process of change actually takes place. It relies on the creation of a social group, called *communitas*, which carries special characteristics that constitute the needed conditions for the process of change. It includes, for example, a supportive atmosphere which allows the members of the *communitas* to lose their former connections with social structures, norms, and behavioral barriers.[32]

Liminal space constitutes a proper theoretical framework for the current discussion for two reasons: it has been already used, successfully, to analyze the phenomenon of Jewish radicals[33], and it includes a tighter combination than the hybrid form, since its original elements become one and do not exist side by side. However, using the term of liminal space in this article requires some adjustments.

The classic theory of liminal space actually only suits the contradiction thesis. It presents a situation in which Jews, who are in the liminal space, lose their connections with their roots, and move towards assimilation in a linear process. Liminality, therefore, is a temporary stage in this process, which is a result of the clash between Jewish particularism and universal ideas. However, the current scholarly discussion of liminality developed the classic theory and defined a new perspective about it. It claims that in many cases the liminal space is not

---

30 Flocel Sabaté, *Hybrid Identities* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2014); Keri E. Iyall Smith and Patricia Leavy, *Hybrid Identities: Theoretical and Empirical Examinations* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).
31 Nic Beech, "Liminality and the Practices of Identity Reconstruction," *Human Relations* 64, no. 2 (2010): 285–302.
32 Ruth C. Hill, "Liminal Identity to Wholeness: A 'Biracial' Path to the Practice of Cross-Cultural, Jungian Psychotherapy," *Jung Journal: Culture & Psyche* 4 (2010): 16–30; Jeffrey Rubenstein, "Purim, Liminality, and Communitas," *AJS Review* 17, no. 2 (1992): 247–277.
33 Joshua Harold, "Institutionalizing Liminality: Jewish Summer Camps and the Boundary Work of Camp Participants," *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1, no. 3 (2015): 439–453; Jordana Silverstein, "We're Dealing with How Do We Live and Work with this Memory and What Are We Supposed to Do About It," *Borderlands* 9, no. 1 (2010): 1–17.

a stage but becomes permanent.[34] The reason is that liminality suits the conditions of modernity, which is characterized by constant change and identity fluidity. In the specific case of Jews, it has been also claimed in research that Jews are a natural example of permanent liminality.[35]

Indeed, one can see permanent liminality as a synthesis between two former identities, as the dialectic thesis claims, but that assumes there is a contradiction between those elements, which is not always the case. As we will see, the test case of HaShomer haTza'ir reveals permanent liminality neither as a result of a contradiction nor a dialectic process, but as a built-in combination from the start.

HaShomer haTza'ir as a Case Study

HaShomer haTza'ir was the first Zionist youth movement, established in Galicia on the eve of the First World War. It constitutes a classic test case of the way in which Jewish radicals combined their national-Jewish and leftist-universal identities through permanent liminality. Indeed, in the first years of its existence, when it was only a youth movement, HaShomer haTza'ir did not yet have a clear political world view. However, it did include an educational-social liminal space. The members of the movement operated in a *communitas* and developed an independent space which rejected the traditional norms of the Jewish world. But they did not move towards assimilation. Through the liminal space they created a new identity which combined Jewish nationalism, European romanticism, and utopian socialism, all integrated in model of a "new man."[36]

In the 1920s, the first graduates of the Hashomer Hatza'ir youth movement immigrated to Palestine and soon established new kibbutzim. This was followed by a turn from romanticism and utopian socialism to Marxism. The reasons for this turn were the political organization that Marxism offered, the way it differ-

---

34 Arpad Szakolczai, "Living permanent liminality: the recent transition experience in Ireland," *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 22, no. 1 (2014): 28–50; Christian Garmann Johnsen, "'It's capitalism on coke!' From temporary to permanent liminality in organization studies," *Culture and Organization* 21, no. 4 (2015): 321–337.
35 See: Vincent Brook, ed., *You Should See Yourself: Jewish Identity in Postmodern American Culture* (New Brunswick, New Jersey and London: Rutgers University Press, 2006).
36 Matityahu Mintz, *Havley Ne'urim: Ha-tnua Ha-shomrit 1911–1921* (Jerusalem: Ha-sifriya Ha-tzionit, 1995); Rina Peled, *Ha-adam Ha-hadash Shel Ha-mahapecha Ha-tzionit Ve-shorashav Ha-eiropim* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2002).

entiated HaShomer haTza'ir from other socialist-Zionist organizations, and the fact that it suited the general *Zeitgeist*.[37]

The theoretical combination of Zionism and Marxism was made possible by the thesis of Ber Borochov (1881–1917). Borochov argued that every ethnic group needs a territory in order to develop the labor relations that will constitute the basic conditions for a class revolution.[38]

His thesis was developed by the thinkers of HaShomer haTza'ir into a more detailed plan which was called "the stages theory." It was included in the platform of the Kibbutz movement that HaShomer haTza'ir established in 1927 – Hakibbutz Haartzi (the nationwide Kibbutz). It said that the Jewish people should first establish a national home, and only after that turn to class struggle, which should include cooperation of Jewish and Arab workers. Hakibbutz Haartzi also offered a plan for a bi-national state.[39]

The ideological contribution of Borochov's thesis and the stages theory to the creation of the liminal space in which HaShomer haTza'ir operated was dramatic. It actually combined the two main dreams of Jewish youth of that time: a Jewish national home and the revolutionary desire for the "world of tomorrow." This combination benefited the movement with an impressive recruitment ability: on the eve of the Second World War HaShomer haTza'ir was the biggest Jewish youth movement in the diaspora, with tens of thousands of members around the world, 20,000 of them in Poland.[40] Its branch in Palestine also included a youth movement of thousands of members and its graduates, established until 1943, as well as 39 Kibbutzim where 8,381 people lived.[41]

Jewish Radicals after the Second World War

In the years after the Second World War, a significant change took place in the way Jews integrated in the global Left. Of the movements mentioned before, two

37 For further discussion see Elkana Margalit, *HaShomer haTza'ir: Me-adat Ne'urim Le-marksizm Mahapchani 1913–1936*, (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hemeuchad, 1971); Shapira, *Ha-halicha*.
38 Dov Ber Borochov, *Ktavim Nivharim, vol. 1, Le-heker She'elat Ha-yehudim* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1943); Dov Ber Borochov, *Ktavim, vol. 1–3* (Tel Aviv: Sifriat Poalim and Hakibbutz Ha-meuchad, 1955–1966).
39 David Zayit, *Halutzim Ba-mavoch Ha-politi: Ha-tnu'a Ha-kibutzit 1927–1948* (Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, 1993), 13–33.
40 For further discussion see Eli Tzur, *Lifnei Bo Ha-afela: HaShomer haTza'ir Be-Polin Ve-Galitzia 1930–1940* (Sede Boker: Machon Ben Gurion; Givaat Haviva: Yad Yaari, 2006).
41 "8381 Nefesh Be-Kibbutzei Ha-kibbutz Ha-artzi," *Al Hamishmar*, May 14 1944.

almost ceased to be a framework for Jewish radicals. The Bund suffered a severe blow as a result of the destruction of the European Jewry during the Holocaust. The creation of the state of Israel, which it opposed, also reduced its relevancy dramatically. At the same time, from the early 1950s, the Soviet Union turned against Soviet Jews and the state of Israel. As a result, communism also became a less relevant alternative for Jewish radicals.[42] The combination of Jewish nationalism and socialist radicalism could exist, therefore, mainly in the only trend that not only was less harmed by the Holocaust and by the changes in the Soviet Union, but which received great prestige for establishing the Israeli state: socialist Zionism.

Since Israel was the center of operation of socialist Zionism, most of the frameworks of Jewish radicals were operated after the war by the Israeli Labor movement, and especially through the Kibbutz movement. That meant that those frameworks were receiving resources from the state, the labor union organizations (especially the Histadrut), and the Kibbutzim, which made them more capable of organizing people. HaShomer haTza'ir was the most leftist and radical segment of the Israeli Labor movement, and this, along with its organizational power, made it one of the most effective ideological and political forces among Jewish radicals. In the 1950s, after the Jewish diaspora was stabilized, it had new groups of target audience, which all wished to combine pioneer-Zionism and radical socialism without making *Aliyah* (immigration to Israel). One was of graduates of the youth movement who wished to stay in their home countries, but kept their affiliation with the HaShomer haTza'ir world view; a second was of ex-Bundists and ex-communists. They did not become full Zionists and did not think of *Aliyah*, but wished to support Israel while keeping some of their former orientations. Naturally, they found HaShomer haTza'ir the most tolerant framework for this. The third was a group who were neither communists nor Zionists, mostly American Jews, who admired HaShomer haTza'ir because of its progressiveness and its implementation in Jewish and Arab relations, cooperative economics, education and more. These groups were different from each other in many aspects, but they all shared the built-in combination thesis which saw pioneer-Zionism and universal Socialism as one.[43]

In the mid-1950s HaShomer haTza'ir began establishing new frameworks for these new target audiences. In 1953 a new organization – called "the Juventud Mordejai Anilevich" (Mordechai Anielewicz Young Brigade) – was established

---

42 For further discussion see Yirmiyahu Yovel et al., eds., *New Jewish Time: Jewish Culture in a Secular Age – an Encyclopedic View* (Jerusalem: Lmada, 2008), 2, 18–62.

43 Senkman, "Fraie Schtime"; Schenker, "Progressive Zionism."

in Latin America, operating in Uruguay, Chile, and Argentina. Its members were university students, active both in the local Left and in Zionist organization[44]; in 1954 a new organization – Americans for Progressive Israel (API) was established in the United States as a merger of two former organizations which were established in 1946–1947. It was also based on pro-Zionist and socialist Jews who did not make *Aliyah*, although it was aimed at people over 35.[45]

In the same year, a new organization – called "Le Cercle Bernard Lazare" (Bernard Lazare Circle) was established in France. It was aiming at the same public as the API, but also had a young brigade, similar to Anielewicz brigade, called *Mishmar* (Guard).[46] All these organizations were operated by emissaries of Hakibbutz Haartzi and its political party – the United Workers Party (Mapam) – in partnership with local leadership, mostly graduates of the youth movement of HaShomer HaTza'ir. They enlisted members of the local Jewish communities and operated social and cultural activity (lectures, seminars, and conferences), political campaigns related to Israel, the Jewish community and the local and global Left, and fundraising for Mapam and Hakkibutz Haartzi. These frameworks did not become mass movements and each comprised only between several dozen to a few hundred active members; however, their main significance was conceptual, since they offered a new framework of permanent liminality for Jewish radicals in the diaspora. Now it was a matter of other developments which were to introduce this built-in combination to a broader public.

Jews and the New Left

In the early 1960s the New Left became the dominant political and ideological trend among the young generation in the West. The background to this was their disappointment with communism as well as with the social-democratic

---

44 Noar Mordechai Anilevitz – Pirsumim Pnimi'im Hinuchi'im, no. 1, June 1953 and different reports, 1966; HaShomer haTza'ir Archive, (3029)1.17.1–2; 5–9.2., 6)12.31 ;(3)1–17.2 ;(2)1–17.2). For further discussion see Yerach Grinfeld, "Ha-hativot Ha-tzioniot Sotzialistiot Be-Argentina Be-shnot Ha-shishim: Havnayat Hashkafat Olam," (M.A thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2006).

45 Schenker, "Progressive Zionism."

46 Correspondence between Bernard Lazar circle and the world Brit of Mapam, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive, (1405) 93.54(1), (1405) 93.54(4).

welfare state. Young Jewish radicals played a notable role in the New Left, in its leadership, and as rank and file members.[47]

Seemingly, it was a continuation of the historic connection of Jews and the Left. But, unlike in the first half of the twentieth century, Jews were now part of the surrounding society in a way that had not been seen before. This made their involvement in the New Left seem like a push to their universal identity and a blow to their Jewish one. As a result, the Zionists and the Jewish establishment became very worried. Following the contradiction thesis, they saw universalism as a slippery slope towards complete assimilation of the young generation, and as a danger to the future of the Jewish diaspora.[48]

Despite the pessimistic impression of the establishment of that time, the image of assimilation of the young generation of the 1960s in the West is controversial. First, as Michael Staub claims about the case of American Jewry, the 1960s were characterized by such a high presence of Jewish values, ideas, and figures that the whole decade can be called "the Jewish 1960s."[49]

Second, the baby boomers actually grew up in a time when the Jewish diaspora was rebuilt and flourished, and the relationship with the state of Israel was one of its main core values.[50]

Popular culture – such as the book *Exodus* (1958) and the movie based on it (1960), *the Anne Frank Diary* book (1952), play (1955), and movie (1959), and Elie Wiesel's first book *Night* (1960) – also presented Jewish history and Zionism to the Jewish masses in the Western diaspora in a way that strengthened their af-

---

47 For an overview of the research of the role of Jews in the New Left see Phillip Mendes, '"We are all German Jews': Exploring the Prominence of Jews in the New Left," *Melilah: Manchester Journal of Jewish Studies* (2009/3): 1–17.

48 Summary of the first world convention of Jewish youth (Jerusalem: department of youth and pioneers in the World Zionist Organization, 1958), 41, 152, 190; Protocols of the 26th Zionist Congress (Jerusalem: World Zionist Organization, 1964), 3, 142, 384, 643, 679; Summary of a conference for emissaries, department of youth and pioneers in the World Zionist Organization, October 10 1964, Central Zionist Archive, DD1/1267; Israeli Knesset meeting, January 12 1966. See http://main.knesset.gov.il/mk/government/documents/gov13.pdf (accessed March 1 2017); Eliezer Livneh, *Yahadut Artsot-ha-Berit ve Yisrael: ha-mifneh: sikume-biḳur, Novermber-Detsember 1966* (Jerusalem: ha-Merkaz li-tefutsot, Musad le-Keshrai Tarbut ʿIm Yahadut ha-Tfutsot, 1967). See also Michael A. Agronoff, Judith Kerman, Moriss U. Schappers, "Jewish Identity: Dialog with Jewish Youth," *Jewish Currents*, July-August 1965.

49 Michael E. Staub, *The Jewish 1960s: an American sourcebook* (Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press; Hanover: University Press of New England, 2004).

50 Glazer, *American Judaism*, 106–128; Emily Alice Katz, *Bringing Zion home: Israel in American Jewish culture, 1948–1967* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015).

filiation with their Jewish roots.[51] The Eichmann trial (1961) was another way in which Jews around the Western world became familiar with the Holocaust and the Zionist narrative.[52]

In the mid-1960s the struggle for soviet Jewry began, and the young generation in the West played a prominent role in it, showing a strong ethnic solidarity.[53]

The Jewish element was also prominent in the most universalistic struggles of the Left – such as support for Algerian independence and the civil rights movement in the United States. In both, there were Jewish leaders who claimed that their obligation to strive for freedom and equality came from the Jewish tradition and religion.[54] During those years there was also a clear expression of Jewish nationalism among Jewish radicals who were affiliated with the frameworks of HaShomer haTza'ir. The members of the Mordechai Anielewicz brigade, API, Bernard Lazare circle, and Mishmar were supporters of Israel and fellow travelers of Hakibbutz Haartzi Mapam, and at the same time participated in local and global Left campaigns.[55] Although they constituted a fear of assimilation, the early 1960s showed a growing role of the combination between Jewish nationalism and universal socialism.

From Partnership to Tension

In the mid-1960s, the first signs of tension between Jews and the New Left were seen. The background was changes in the attitude of the New Left towards Israel as well as the general radicalization it went through. In 1965 the civil rights movement in the United States, one of the main fields of activity of young Jewish

---

51 Leon Uris, *Exodus* (New York, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1958); Anne Frank, *The Diary of a Young Girl* (New York, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1952); Elie Wiesel, *Night* (New York: Hill and Wang; London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1960).

52 Hasia R. Diner, *The Jews of the United States, 1654 to 2000* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004), 264.

53 Avi Weiss, "Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry (SSSJ)," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, ed. Michael Berenbaum and Fred Skolnik, vol. 19. 2nd edition (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007(, 269.

54 See the involvement of Rabbis in the Civil Rights Movement, *American Jewish Year Book* Vol. 65 (1964), 77; the early stages (1966) of what later become 'Jews for Urban Justice' (JUJ); and also the influential book of Albert Memmi, *The Liberation of the Jew* (New York: Orion Press, 1966). For further discussion see Staub, *Torn at the roots*, 45 – 75.

55 API report for 1965 – 1967, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive, 3886(1)94.3; summary of the API council, May 27 – 28 1967, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive, 3883(4)91.93; report of Anielewicz brigade, 1966, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive; (2)1 – 17.2; (3)1 – 17.2; (6)12.31.

radicals, started to have a separatist character. The Afro-American activists demanded the leadership of their struggle for equality themselves, and started to push out white activists, many of them Jewish. This trend worsened when, in the second half of the decade, the Afro-American activists started to attack the white majority, including the Jews. They refused to accept the Jewish attempt to cooperate as two ethnic minorities. The cooperation of the early 1960s was replaced by severe interracial tension which reached its peak in 1968.[56]

At the same time, the state of Israel also began to attract more attention from the New Left. At the end of the 1950s and the early 1960s, the Palestinian struggle movement consolidated, starting to operate attacks on Israeli targets in the mid-1960s. Against this background, as well as clashes over water sources on the northern border of Israel, the tension between Israel and its neighboring countries increased and reached a new peak in 1965–1966. The third world countries identified with the Arabs and marked Israel as an imperialist aggressor.[57]

The New Left, which saw itself as the protector of the oppressed, embraced this perspective. It defined the Palestinian struggle as guerrilla warfare against a colonial state, such as the one that took place in Algeria and later in Vietnam. It also saw the struggle of the Arab countries against Israel as part of a broad Arab revolution which aimed at the collapse of the old regime that the imperial powers had forced on the region. The radicalization of the civil rights movement, the third-world-ism ideology and the developing crisis in the Middle East created a broad front of anti-Zionists in the New Left, under which Afro-Americans, white radical socialists (some of them anti-Zionist Jews), and Arab students established a strategic alignment.[58]

The rise of the tension between the New Left and the Jews pushed HaShomer haTza'ir to action. What was seen as a growing contradiction was for them an opportunity, since young Jewish radicals now looked for a new way to combine their Jewish national sentiment and the support of the ideas of the Left. Already in 1964 the world conference of HaShomer haTza'ir decided to increase its work

---

56 Intergroup Relations and Tensions in the United States, *American Jewish Year Book,* Vol. 70 (1969), 71–100.

57 Benjamin Rivlin and Jacques Fomerand, "Changing third world perspectives and politics towards Israel," in *Israel in the Third World*, Michael Curtis and Susan Aurelia Gitelson, eds. (New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Books, 1976), 325–360.

58 Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 586; Pamela Pennock, "Third world alliance: Arab – American activists in American universities, 1967–1973," *Mashriq & Mahjar* 2, no. 2 (2014): 55–78.

with Jewish students in the diaspora[59]; however, a more significant development came in 1966, when the API decided to establish a young guard under the name of "Young Americans for Progressive Israel" (YAPI).[60] The mission statement of YAPI was to attract Jewish radicals who were not happy with the trends of the New Left, and wished to combine their activity in the Left with a pro-Israeli affiliation. This act came out of a recognition of the capability of the built-in combination thesis to enlist new supporters, at a time when it actually seemed harder.[61]

The Jewish New Left after the Six-Day War

The Six-Day War (and the waiting period before it) turned the tension between Jews and the New Left into a real rift. The anxiety that followed the threats of Arab leaders to exterminate Israel led many Jews around the world to focus their attention on Israel, and its astonishing victory gave rise to a wave of pride and support that affected many.[62] Young Jewish radicals were also part of this wave, but confronted a hostile attitude from their peers. A major sign of this came a few weeks after the war, in the first formal gathering of the American New Left. The gathering, which was called "The National Conference for New Politics," approved a resolution that condemned Israel for its responsibility in the emergence of the war.[63]

The radical Left in Western Europe and Latin America embraced a similar position.[64]

The hostility of the New Left to Israel placed Jewish radicals in what seemed a dramatic identity crisis, which was characterized even as a new "Jewish Prob-

---

59 HaShomer haTzair 5th world convention. See Levi Dror and Israel Rozenzweig, eds., Sefer HaShomer haTza'ir, vol. 3 (Merchavia: Sifriat poalim, 1964), 466.

60 Young Americans for Progressive Israel – Progress report, November 19 1966, HHA 105.93(2) 3897.

61 Background materials, Moetza Rashit, 30 March – April 2 1964; report on the semi-annual national council, May 20–22 1966, HHA 3897(2)105.93; Jewishness and Socialism: conflict or compatibility, April 27 1967, HHA 3003(1)95.1

62 Sergio Della Pergola, Uzi Rebhun, and Rosa Perla Raicher, "The Six Day war and Israel-Diaspora relations: an analysis of quantitative indicators," in Lederhendler, *The Six-Day War*, 11–50.

63 Text of the resolution of the Black Caucus adopted by the National convention for new politics, Chicago, September 1967. Hoover Institute Archive, New Left Collection, box 36, folder 2; "'New Politics' Convention Modifies Its Indictment of Israel," *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, September 6 1967.

64 Shindler, *Israel and the European Left*, 232–241; Senkman, "Fraie Schtime."

lem".[65] On the one hand, they continued to identify with the general goals of the New Left, which in 1968 reached a new peak with the student revolt in Europe, the worsening war in Vietnam, and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia; on the other hand, they refused to agree to the biased perspective of the New Left regarding the Middle East crisis. Young Jewish radicals felt under pressure from both sides: the anti-Zionist Left operated an organized campaign against Israel, describing it as a colonial state which represented the West[66]; and the supporters of Israel attacked back, blaming the New Left for being anti-Semitic and "socialism of fools". Jews who supported the New Left's criticism of Israel were often presented as "self-hating Jews."[67]

The dilemmas and troubles of the young Jewish radicals who wished to combine support of Israel and loyalty to New Left ideas pushed HaShomer haTza'ir into action again. Already before the war, emissaries from different Kibbutz movements developed a plan for encouraging the young generation in the diaspora to affiliate with Zionism and even make *Aliyah*. This was done through emphasizing the built-in combination between Jewish nationalism and the universal Left as it was expressed in the Israeli Kibbutz. The plan, called the "America plan," included dedicating more funds and emissaries to work with the target audience of young Jewish radicals. It was approved right after the Six-Day War.[68]

In addition to that, in the first months of 1968, the character of YAPI, the young brigade of "Americans for Progressive Israel," was changed. A leadership from the young Jewish activists of the New Left was recruited, and it also changed its name to "the Jewish Liberation Project" (JLP), which sounded more suitable for the new times.[69] The activities of the JLP included seasonal

---

65 Sol Stern, "My Jewish problem – and ours," *Ramparts,* August 1971. See also Nusan and Dreier, *Jewish Radicalism.*

66 See for example Hal Draper, "Zionism, Israel, & the Arabs: the historical background of the Middle-East tragedy," Independent socialist clipping books; no. 3, 1967; "Zionism and the Arab Revolution – the myth of progressive Israel," The Young Socialist Alliance, August 1967; Peter Buch, *Burning Issues of the Middle-East Crisis* (New York, NY: Merit Publishers, 1969); George Novack, *How can the Jews Survive? A Socialist Answer to Zionism* (New York, NY: Pathfinder, 1969).

67 See for example Mordechai S. Chertoff, ed., *The New Left and the Jews* (New York: Pitman, 1970).

68 Haika Grossman to Avri Fisher, June 22 1967, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive 2943(2)35.1; Ministers Mordechai Bentov and Israel Barzilai in Israel government meeting, July 2 1967, Israel State Archive, 16718/1-ג; Israel Pinchasi to Shaikeh Veiner and others, July 27 1967, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive 2943(2)35.1; Israeli emissaries letter to the Kibbutz movements centers, November 17 1967; and a letter from Israel Pinchasi and Yaakov Gali to Golda Meir, November 18 1967, Yad Tabenkin Archive, 1/6/21–5.

69 API administrative committee meeting report, September 9 1968, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive 3886(1)94.3 .

seminars and permanent study groups in which the ideas of socialist-Zionism were studied, participation in New Left campaigns against the war in Vietnam and in favor of the civil rights movement, and a close connection to the daily political life in Israel. At the end of 1968 the JLP started to publish a newspaper called *the Jewish Liberation Journal*, which soon became one of the most influential newspapers among pro-Zionist Jewish radicals. It followed a line, which was present also in the other dozens of radical-Zionist newspapers which began to be published at the same time, of a critical view of the policy of the Israeli government in several fields, while supporting the right of Israel to exist and to defend itself.[70]

The JLP was supported by the API and the Zionist establishment (under the "America plan"). Although its counter-cultural style attracted criticism from the older generation, it was clear to the establishment that the contribution of such an organization to the fight for the hearts of the young Jewish radicals, who were torn between Zionism and the New Left, was extremely valuable.[71]

Parallel to the foundation of JLP, the tactic of creating a liminal space in order to absorb the confused youngsters was fully adopted by the establishment. As part of that, the state of Israel began working through the World Zionist Organization (WZO) and the Jewish Agency in establishing and encouraging a framework similar to that of the JLP all over the diaspora.[72]

Two graduates of HaShomer haTza'ir were appointed to lead this endeavor: Mordechai Bar-On (1928-) as the head of the department of youth and pioneers in WZO and Abraham Schenkar (2017–1918) as the head of the department for *hasbara* ("propaganda") in the Jewish Agency.[73]

Bar-On and Schenkar provided the radical-Zionist groups with funds and constituted an important connection between the field activists and the establishment. This collaboration was very fruitful, and between the years 1969–1971 dozens of new groups were formed. In addition to this, a young radical-

---

70 *Jewish Liberation Journal* copies in Tamiment Library and Wagner Labor Archives, box: 1, folder: 32; see also Jewish Student Press Service files, American Jewish Historical Society Archive.

71 API administrative committee meeting report, December 2 1968, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive 3886(1)94.3.

72 Israel Pinchasi to HaShomer haTza'ir emissaries in North America, December 2 1967, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive, 2943(2)35.1.

73 Author interview with Mordechai Bar-on, Jerusalem, December 29 2016; Mordechai Bar-On memories, unpublished (available at Yad Ben Zvi, Jerusalem); Abraham Schenkar, *Zehut Ve-Hishtaichut* (Jerusalem: Bialik institute, 2003).

Zionist leadership was consolidated under the umbrella of The World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS).[74]

Winning the hearts of Jewish radicals by creating liminal spaces which combined support of Zionism and the Left was seen also in two other sites: France and Argentina. In France the reaction of the Jewish public to the Six-Day War was similar in many aspects to what happened in the United States. This was somewhat surprising, since the Jews of France were considered as almost completely assimilated.[75]

Indeed, in the late 1950s and the early 1960s there was a mass immigration to France of North African Jews, who were loyal to their Jewish origins and constituted many of the supporters of Israel after the war.[76]

But most of the newcomers did not participate in New Left activities. It was mainly the second generation of former immigrants from Eastern Europe, who came to France around the Second World War, who seemed to make the turn from assimilation to developing a Jewish identity.[77]

Some of them, whose turn was seemingly even more dramatic, were even activists in the French communist party. But this view was not accurate. The Bernard Lazare circle and Mishmar had already been operating for more than a decade, combining Zionism and affiliation with the global Left. Similar to what happened in the United States, the existence of the liminal space that HaShomer haTza'ir established was permanent, but its social and political role was a changing matter. That was a result of external catalysts, such as the Six-Day War.

After the Six-Day War, HaShomer haTza'ir became, in France too, the main organizer of radical Zionists. Its tactic, supported by the Zionist establishment, was similar to what was done in the United States, meaning founding new organizations to absorb confused and troubled Jewish radicals who wished to combine their affiliation with the New Left and Zionism. This was parallel to an increase in the activity of the Bernard Lazare circle and Mishmar. In 1969, the main organization for that issue was established by an emissary of HaShomer haTza'ir from Israel under the name of Organisation Juive Revolutionnaire (the Jewish revolutionary organization), or OJR. The members of the OJR, about 100 in num-

---

74 Matthew Kalman, *The Kids are alright – Chapters in the history of the World Union of Jewish Students* (Jerusalem: the World Union of Jewish Students, 1986), 46 – 100.

75 Shlomo Avineri, *Tnu'ot Ha-mecha'a Ba-universitaot Ve-hashlachotihe'en al Ha-kibbutzim Ha-yehudi'im* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1970), 20 – 28; *American Jewish Year Book*, Vol. 70 (1969), 182.

76 Hyman, *the Jews of Modern France*, 193 – 214.

77 Judith Freidlander, "The Six-Day war and the 'Jewish Question' in France," in Lederhendler, *The Six-Day War,* 125 – 160.

ber, were not graduates of HaShomer haTza'ir youth movements in France, but young activists of the French Left who opposed its anti-Israel line.[78]

As in the United States, this organization was much more radical than the establishment that founded it, until there were sometimes questions as to whether it should receive support. But its effectiveness was clear and it continued. Apart from the OJR, another organization was established in France – a women's circle after the name of Haviva Reick. It was intended to organize the parents (the mothers in this case) of young Jewish radicals and teach them the foundational ideas of HaShomer haTza'ir's radical Zionism.[79]

Another framework that HaShomer haTza'ir helped to establish in France was "Le Cercle Gaston Crémieux" (Gaston Crémieux circle). It was different from the pro-Zionist groups since it was not Zionist, although supportive of Israel. It included around 150 intellectuals, some of them prominent in the Jewish community, who wished to develop the cultural aspects of Jewish life in France.[80] The fact that HaShomer haTza'ir was involved in a non-Zionist organization appeared to be surprising, but it actually suited the definition of liminal space. As we have seen, the whole meaning of this space was to contain different identities and to find new definitions to eliminate the contradictions between them.

In Argentina, HaShomer haTza'ir was operating in liminal space through the organization it established in the 1950s – the Mordechai Anielewicz young brigade. The Anielewicz brigade became one of the most prominent bodies in the Jewish New Left in Latin America after the Six-Day War. The reason that HaShomer haTza'ir did not have to establish new organizations (such as the OJR in France and JLP in the United States) in order to emphasize the combination between Zionism and New Left ideas was that the combination between nationalism and the Left was already one of the core ideas of the Latin American Left.[81]

The members of the brigade even introduced the ideas of Ber Borochov to the leaders and thinkers of the Latin American Left, seeing it as an important contribution to the connections of the Zionist and the universal Left.[82]

---

78 Oron, *Kulanu Yehudim Germanim*, 109–110.
79 Telephone Interview with Levanah Frenk, Historian and former activist in HaShomer haTza'ir in France, May 30 2017.
80 Freidlander, "The Jewish Question' in France" Hyman, *Jews of Modern France*, 200.
81 Luis Alberto Romero and James P. Brennan, *A History of Argentina in the Twentieth Century* (Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, 2013), 181–190.
82 Leonardo Cohen, "Lectura e identidad: la teoría marxista de Ber Bórojov en el contexto del judaísmo latinoamericano (1951–1979)," *Cuadernos Judaicos*, Nº 29 (diciembre 2012): 1–36.

The activity of the Anielewicz brigade did not cover the whole ideological range among young Jewish radicals in Argentina after the Six-Day War. Unlike the United States and France, in which Yiddish culture and the heritage of its main political movement – the Bund – almost disappeared by the 1960s, in Argentina this trend was still present in the public. That means that similar to France, which had a vital communist party, anti-Zionist Argentinian Jews also had a political home after the Second World War.[83]

After the Six-Day War, however, many of them became supportive of Israel, and HaShomer haTza'ir was there to absorb them in its satellite organizations. It helped to establish a new organization – called Fraie Schtime (Free Voice) – which included mainly ex-members of a socialist Yiddishist non-Zionist organization which was affiliated with the communist party – Idisher Culture Farband (IUCF). These members wished to oppose the anti-Israel policy of the Argentinian Left after the war; however, they could not do so under their organization, so they established a new one. Since they were still non-Zionist, HaShomer haTza'ir was the only option for collaboration for them.[84] Like the Gaston Crémieux circle in France, it also showed the freedom that the liminal space of HaShomer haTza'ir (and following it, the Zionist establishment) allowed its members and followers.

The Israeli New Left

Israel, like the rest of the Western world, experienced the results of the baby boom in the 1960s. As an outcome, the higher education system developed significantly at that time, and the number of students in Israel reached 40,000 at the end of the decade.[85] At the same time, Israel reached a similar level of progress to the Western world with the same lifestyle.[86] Consequently, some of the Israeli young generation developed patterns which expressed normalization of life and a growing relation to the outside world. They embraced counter-cultural characters, expressed in disobeying the commands of the national leadership and in establishing new arenas of individualism. Many of the high school stu-

---

83 Lawrence D. Bell, "Bitter Conquest: Zionists Against Progressive Jews and the Making of Post-War Jewish Politics in Argentina," *Jewish History* 17, no. 3 (January 1, 2003): 285 – 308.
84 Senkman, "Fraie Schtime."
85 Statistical Abstract of Israel: http://www.cbs.gov.il/archive/shnaton/shnatonh21.pdf (accessed July 25 2017), 565.
86 Nachum Gross, "Kalkalat Israel 1954 – 1967," in *Ha-asor Ha-sheni*, ed. Zvi Tzameret and Hanna Yablonka, (Jerusalem: Yad Itzhak Ben-Zvi, 2001), 30 – 46.

dents quit participating in youth movement activities, and some of them developed a bourgeois culture which included listening and dancing to rock and roll music, and dressing in what seemed a pretentious style.[87] The older ones were eager to finish their army service and afterwards turn to university studies, professional occupation, and financial consolidation. Towards the middle of the decade, the Israeli establishment and the older generation were troubled by the effects of the "empty Western culture" and the Americanization of the youngsters.[88]

The worry about the Israeli young generation worsened as a result of the first signs of the creation of a local version of the New Left in these years. This was expressed by several phenomena, which concentrated mainly around HaShomer haTza'ir's youth movement, the Kibbutzim, and the party. In the middle of the 1960s, young people in the Kibbutzim began to criticize the social and ideological life of the Kibbutz, claiming that it was materialistic and spiritually poor.[89]

At the same time, they began to oppose the labor movement-led Israeli government for its military policy; this was accompanied by an intense struggle of the young against the movement's "historic leadership".[90]

Meanwhile, the cultural apparatus of the movement (which included magazines and cultural clubs) embraced the counter-culture and the New Left messages and methods.[91]

After the Six-Day War, the Israeli New Left reached its peak. From 1967 onward, most of Hashomer Hatzair's young generation took a radical stand against the government's policy regarding the occupied territories and criticized what seemed as a lack of will to reach a peace agreement. In 1969 Mapam established a shared list with the Israeli Labor party for the coming elections. This led to a split among its members and voters. Some of the most prominent young political activists left the party and established, along with students from Tel Aviv University and the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, a new political movement called the "New Israeli Left" (Siach – acronym for Smol Israeli Chadash).[92]

---

87 Oded Heilbronner, "Resistance through Rituals – Urban Subcultures of Israeli Youth from the Late 1950s to the 1980s," *Israel Studies* 16, no. 3, (fall 2011): 28 – 50.

88 For further discussion see Tal Elmaliach and Anat Kidron, "Mecha'a Tzeira Bein Tarbut Lepolitica 1967 – 1977," *Iyunim Bitkumat Israel* 11 (2017): 78 – 101.

89 Alon Gan, "Ha-siach shegava: tarbut ha-sichim ke-nisayon le-gibush zehut me-ya-chedet ba-dor ha-sheny ba-kibbutzim," (PhD Dissertation, Tel Aviv University, 2002).

90 Tal Elmaliach, "Ketz ha-hanhaga ha-historit: kalkala, chevra ve-politica ba-Kibbutz Haartzi ve-Mapam 1956 – 1973", *Iyunim Bitkumat Israel* 24 (2014): 306 – 331.

91 Elmaliach, "Tzavta."

92 Portugez, "smol Israeli."

Siach struggled mainly against the Israeli occupation through demonstrations, gatherings, and pamphlet distribution, later joining a political list called "Moked" which ran in the 1973 elections. Siach had a close relation with Jewish radicals around the world, especially with members of the JLP in the United States, OJR in France, and Anielewicz Brigade in Latin America, who saw it as their twin movement.

Although the Israeli and the diaspora Jewish New Left that was affiliated with HaShomer haTza'ir had the same ideology of radical Zionism, the attitude of the establishment towards them was completely different. While the establishment encouraged the operation of the Jewish New Left organizations in the diaspora and was tolerant of the liminal character of their ideology and politics, it did not allow the same for Israeli youth. From its first day, Siach was under a constant process of de-legitimization, as were the other expressions of the Israeli New Left.[93]

One of the greatest fears of the national establishment was that a student revolt would emerge in Israel, following what was happening in the United States and Europe. Siach, and the Israeli New Left in general, also received this kind of attitude among the older generation in Hakibbutz Haartzi and Mapam, who described the young rebels as no less than "traitors" and "cancer".[94]

Indeed, some of Siach's members (not from the Kibbutzim) defined themselves as non-Zionists, but this organization was far different from the main anti-Zionist movement of that era – Matzpen. While Matzpen was collaborating with the anti-Zionist campaign of the New Left, Siach was one of the forces which fought against it. Although Siach was highly critical of the Israeli government and followed many of the characteristics of the global New Left, it was still following the borders of the liminal space, which included the built-in combination of Zionism and leftist ideas. However, with regard to Israeli youth, the establishment was not willing to confront the risks, unclear attitudes, and confusion which the liminal space involved. Unlike the flexibility it showed while dealing with the Jewish New Left in the diaspora, in the case of the Israeli New Left it implemented the contradiction thesis. The counterculture and the criticism were perceived as a slippery slope towards a complete alienation of the young

---

93 See for example Menachem Arnoni, "Ha-smol Ha-chadash Ve-ha-tzivilizatzia Ha-amricanit, *Al Hamishmar*, February 6 1970; Menachem Arnoni, "Ha-smol Ha-chadash – Bna Shel Tabut Me-hagrim," *Al Hamishmar*, February 13 1970. See also Elmaliach and Kidron, "Mecha'a Tzeira."
94 Mapam executive meeting, June 18 1973, HaShomer haTza'ir Archive (4)79.90. See also articles by Meir Yaari in *Al Hamishmar*, October 27 1969; Peretz Merchav in *Al Hamishmar*, July 20 1970; and Dov Bar-Nir in *Al Hamishmar*, December 4 1970.

generation from its historical role. Every troubled thought or confusion was a danger, so the New Left activists were hunted, oppressed, and silenced.[95]

Conclusion

As this chapter shows, the Six-Day War was not the beginning of the Jewish New Left and also not its main source, but was only a catalyst in its rise. As an idea that was translated to political organizations and activity, it was another phase of the historical built-in connection between Jewish national particularism and the universal leftist ideas, which also took place in the Jewish "Old" Left. What was changing with time was not the idea and its core logic, but the public support it received and its effect on new crowds.

HaShomer haTza'ir was one of the main organizers of the Jewish New Left since historically it was shaped by the built-in combination thesis and preserved it in times when the interest in it was low. This combination, as we have seen, was not a matter of synthesis, since it was not created through the tension between Zionism and the New Left. On the contrary, the tension was what raised the need in a combination which would cancel what seemed to be a contradiction. It was also not a hybrid formula, which allowed one to be Zionist and a follower of the New Left. What HaShomer haTza'ir was providing was of a deeper internal logic, which saw the two elements as one, following the stages theory.

Already in the mid-1950s HaShomer haTza'ir's people recognized the need to establish new frameworks for diaspora Jewish radicals who wanted to follow the built-in combination identity. In the 1960s, when it seemed that the young generation was assimilating during its activity in the New Left, these organizations provided the base for a further endeavor which was expressed in the establishment of YAPI in the United States. After the Six-Day War, the need to reconcile what seemed an identity crisis made the built-in combination of Zionism and the New Left even more acute, and that pushed HaShomer haTza'ir to establish new organizations such as OJR in France, and to be involved in others like the Gaston Crémieux circle and Fraie Schtime. This liminal space was supported by the HaShomer haTza'ir leadership and the Israeli and the Zionist establishment. However, in Israel the local New Left was oppressed and this shows us the differences between the way Jewish youth was perceived and treated in Israel and in the diaspora. These differences are a matter for further research.

---

95 Elmaliach and Kidron, "Mecha'a Tzeira."

The case study of HaShomer haTza'ir shows that the activity of Jewish radicals in the liminal space challenges the historical convention in another way. Jewish radicalism is often perceived as an attempt to "solve" the tension between particularism and universalism. However, the built-in combination thesis, which does not see any tension or contradiction, actually dismantles the term of a "problem". Jewish radicalism can be seen, therefore, not as an historical anomaly that took place as a compromise or as an unplanned synthesis during a one-directional route from particularism to assimilation, which was disrupted by rejection. On the contrary, Jewish radicalism, as a liminal space, seems to define more properly the modern existence of large segments of the Jewish people, in Israel and in the diaspora, who are in a constant situation of "in-between".

Works Cited

Albert, Phyllis Cohen. "Etniut Ve-solidaryut Yehudit Be-tzarfat Ba-Me'a Ha-19." In *Leumiyut Ve-politica Yehudit: Prespectivot Hadashot*, edited by Gideon Shimony, Yosef Shalmon and Yehuda Reinhertz, 47–73. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar center and Boston: Tauber institute in Brandeis University, 1996.

Avineri, Shlomo. *Tnu'ot Ha-mecha'a Ba-universitaot Ve-hashlachotihe'en al Ha-kibbutzim Ha-yehudi'im.* Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1970.

Avineri, Shlomo. *Moses Hess: Prophet of Communism and Zionism.* New York: New York University Press, 1985.

Barth, Fredrik, ed. *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.

Beech, Nic. "Liminality and the Practices of Identity Reconstruction." *Human Relations* 64, no. 2 (2010): 285–302.

Bell, Lawrence D. "Bitter Conquest: Zionists Against Progressive Jews and the Making of Post-War Jewish Politics in Argentina." *Jewish History* 17, no. 3 (January 1, 2003): 285–308.

Berlin, Isaiah. "The Life and Opinions of Moses Hess." In *Essential Papers on Jews and the Left,* edited by Ezra Mendelsohn, 21–57. New York: New York University Press, 1997.

Borochov, Dov Ber. *Ktavim Nivharim, vol. 1, Le-heker She'elat Ha-yehudim.* Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1943.

Borochov, Dov Ber. *Ktavim, vol. 1–3.* Tel Aviv: Sifriat Poalim and Hakibbutz Ha-meuchad, 1955–1966.

Brook, Vincent, ed. *You Should See Yourself: Jewish Identity in Postmodern American Culture.* New Brunswick, New Jersey and London: Rutgers University Press, 2006.

Buch, Peter. *Burning Issues of the Middle-East Crisis.* New York, NY: Merit Publishers, 1969.

Chertoff, Mordechai S., ed. *The New Left and the Jews.* New York: Pitman, 1970.

Schenkar, Abraham. *Zehut Ve-Hishtaichut.* Jerusalem: Bialik institute, 2003.

Cohen, Leonardo. "Lectura e identidad: la teoría marxista de Ber Bórojov en el contexto del judaísmo latinoamericano (1951–1979)." *Cuadernos Judaicos*, Nº 29 (diciembre 2012): 1–36.

Cohen, Percy S. *Jewish Radicals and Radical Jews*. London: Academic Press, 1981.

Della Pergola, Sergio, Uzi Rebhun, and Rosa Perla Raicher. "The Six Day War and Israel-Diaspora Relations: An Analysis of Quantitative Indicators." In Lederhendler, *The Six-Day War*, 11–50.

Diner, Hasia R. *The Jews of the United States, 1654 to 2000*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2004.

Elmaliach, Tal. "The Israeli Left between Culture and Politics: Tzavta Club and Mapam 1956–1973." *Journal of Israeli History* 33, no. 2 (2014): 169–183.

Elmaliach, Tal. "Ketz ha-hanhaga ha-historit: kalkala, chevra ve-politica ba-Kibbutz Haartzi ve-Mapam 1956–1973." *Iyunim Bitkumat Israel* 24 (2014): 306–331.

Elmaliach, Tal, and Anat Kidron. "Mecha'a Tzeira Bein Tarbut Le-politica 1967–1977." *Iyunim Bitkumat Israel* 11 (2017): 78–101.

Fomerand, Jacques. "Changing Third World Perspectives and Politics Towards Israel." In *Israel in the Third World*, edited by Michael Curtis and Susan Aurelia Gitelson, 32–360. New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Books, 1976.

Frank, Anne. *The Diary of a Young Girl*. New York, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1952.

Frankel, Jonathan. *Prophecy and Politics: Socialism, Nationalism, and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Frankel, Jonathan. "Ha-mashber Ke-gorem Merkazi Ba-politica Ha-yehudit Ha-modernit: 1840 and 1881–1882." In *Solidaryut Yehudit Leumit Ba-et Ha-hadasha*, edited by Pincus, Biniamin and Ilan Troen, 31–46. Sde-Boker: Ben Gurion Institute, 1988.

Frankel, Jonathan. "Hitbolelut Ve-Hisardut Be-kerev Yehudei Eropa Ba-Me'a Ha-19: Lekrat Historiografia Hadasha?" In *Leumiyut Ve-politica Yehudit]*, edited by Shimony, Shalmon and Reinhertz, 23–56.

Friedlander, Judith. "The Six-Day War and the 'Jewish Question' in France." In *The Six-Day War and World Jewry*, edited by Eli Lederhendler, 125–160. Bethesda, MD: University Press of Maryland, 2000.

Gan, Alon. "Ha-siach shegava: tarbut ha-sichim ke-nisayon le-gibush zehut me-ya-chedet ba-dor ha-sheny ba-kibbutzim." PhD Dissertation, Tel Aviv University, 2002.

Geva, Amichai. "A Time for Expansion." In A*gainst the Stream: Seven Decades of HaShomer haTza'ir in North America*, edited by Ariel Hurwitz, 125–142. Givat Haviva: Yad Yaari, 1994.

Glanz, David. "An Interpretation of the Jewish Counterculture." *Jewish Social Studies* 39, no. 1/2, American Bicentennial: II (1977): 117–128.

Glazer, Natan. *American Judaism*. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

Gorni, Yosef. *The State of Israel in Jewish Public Thought: The Quest for Collective Identity*. New York: New York University Press, 1994.

Graetz, Michael. *Ha-periferia Haita Le-Merkaz: Prakim Be-toldot Yehudei TZarfat Ba-Me'a Ha-yod-tet*. Jerusalem: Bialik institute, 1987.

Graetz, Michael. "Le-sheivato Shel Moshe Hess La-yahadut: Ha-reka Le-chibur 'Romi ve-Yerushalaim." *Tzion*, Mem-He, Bet (1980): 133–153.

Grinfeld, Yerach. "Ha-hativot Ha-tzioniot Sotzialistiot Be-Argentina Be-shnot Ha-shishim: Havnayat Hashkafat Olam." M.A thesis, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2006.

Gross, Nachum. "Kalkalat Israel 1954–1967." In *Ha-asor Ha-sheni*, edited by Zvi Tzameret and Hanna Yablonka, 30–46. Jerusalem: Yad Itzhak Ben-Zvi, 2001.

Gurwitz, Beatrice D. "From the New World to the Third World: Generation, Politics, and the Making of Argentine Jewish Ethnicity 1955–1983." PhD Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 2012.

Harold, Joshua. "Institutionalizing Liminality: Jewish Summer Camps and the Boundary Work of Camp Participants." *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1, no. 3 (2015): 439–453.

Heilbronner, Oded. "Resistance through Rituals – Urban Subcultures of Israeli Youth from the Late 1950s to the 1980s." *Israel Studies* 16, no. 3, (Fall 2011): 28–50.

Hill, Ruth C. "Liminal Identity to Wholeness: A 'Biracial' Path to the Practice of Cross-Cultural, Jungian Psychotherapy." *Jung Journal: Culture & Psyche* 4 (2010): 16–30.

Hobsbawm, Eric J. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Hyman, Paula. *The Jews of Modern France: Jewish Communities in the Modern World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Iyall, Keri E. Smith, and Patricia Leavy. *Hybrid Identities: Theoretical and Empirical Examinations*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

"Mapam 1956–1973." *Journal of Israeli History* 33, no. 2 (2014): 169–183.

Japtok, Martin. *Growing Up Ethnic Nationalism and the Bildungsroman in African American and Jewish American Fiction*. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 2005.

Johnsen, Christian Garmann. "'It's Capitalism on Coke!' From Temporary to Permanent Liminality in Organization Studies." *Culture and Organization* 21, no. 4 (2015): 321–337.

Kalman, Matthew. *The Kids are alright – Chapters in the history of the World Union of Jewish Students*. Jerusalem: The World Union of Jewish Students, 1986.

Katz, Emily Alice. *Bringing Zion home: Israel in American Jewish culture, 1948–1967*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2015.

Liebman, Arthur. *Jews and the Left*. New York: Wiley, 1979.

Livneh, Eliezer. *Yahadut Artsot-ha-Berit ve Yisrael: ha-mifneh: sikume-biḳur, Novermber-Detsember 1966*. Jerusalem: ha-Merkaz li-tefutsot, Musad le-Keshrai Tarbut ʻIm Yahadut ha-Tfutsot, 1967.

Magid, Shaul. *Post-Judaism: Identity and Renewal in a Postethnic Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013.

Margalit, Elkana. *HaShomer haTza'ir: Me-adat Ne'urim Le-marksizm Mahapchani 1913–1936*. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hemeuchad, 1971.

Memmi, Albert. *The Liberation of the Jew*. New York: Orion Press, 1966.

Mendes, Phillip. "'We are all German Jews:' Exploring the Prominence of Jews in the New Left." *Melilah: Manchester Journal of Jewish Studies* (2009/3): 1–17.

Mintz, Matityahu. *Havley Ne'urim: Ha-tnua Ha-shomrit 1911–1921*. Jerusalem: Ha-sifriya Ha-tzionit, 1995.

Mishkinski, Moshe. *Reshit Tnu'at Ha-poalim Be-rusia: Megamot Yesod*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University and Hakibbutz Ha-me'uchad, 1981.

Moss, Kenneth B. *Jewish Renaissance in the Russian Revolution*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press, 2009.

Nagel, Joane. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." *Social Problems* 41, no. 1 (1994): 152–176.

Nielsen, François. "Toward a Theory of Ethnic Solidarity in Modern Societies." *American Sociological Review* 50, no. 2 (1985): 133–149.

Novak, Bill, and Robert Goldman. "The Rise of the Jewish Student Press." *Conservative Judaism* 25, no. 2 (1971): 5–19.

Novack, George. *How can the Jews Survive? A Socialist answer to Zionism*. New York, NY: Pathfinder, 1969.

Oron, Yair. *Kulanu Yehudim Germanim – Radicalim Yehudim Be-tzarfat Be-shnot Ha-shishim Ve-ha-shivim*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, the University of Tel Aviv and the University of Ben Gurion, 1999.

Peled, Rina. *Ha-adam Ha-hadash Shel Ha-mahapecha Ha-tzionit Ve-shorashav Ha-eiropim*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 2002.

Peled, Yoav. *Class and Ethnicity in the Pale: The Political Economy of Jewish Workers' Nationalism in Late Imperial Russia*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.

Pennock, Pamela. "Third World Alliance: Arab – American Activists in American Universities, 1967–1973." *Mashriq & Mahjar* 2, no. 2 (2014): 55–78.

Pinkus, Benjamin. *The Jews of the Soviet Union: The History of a National Minority*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Porter, Jack Nusan, and Peter Dreier, eds. *Jewish Radicalism: A Selected Anthology*. New York: Grove Press, 1973.

Portugez, Adi. "Tnuat Smol Israeli Hadash: Smol Hadash Be-Israel." *Israel* 21 (2013): 225–252.

Prell, Riv-Ellen. *Prayer & Community: The Havurah in American Judaism*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.

Romero, Luis Alberto, and James P. Brennan. *A History of Argentina in the Twentieth Century*. Pennsylvania: Penn State University Press, 2013.

Rubenstein, Jeffrey. "Purim, Liminality, and Communitas." *AJS Review* 17, no. 2 (1992): 247–277.

Sabaté, Flocel. *Hybrid Identities*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2014.

Schenker, Avraham. "Progressive Zionism in America." In A*gainst the Stream: Seven Decades of HaShomer haTza'ir in North America*, edited by Ariel Hurwitz, 273–295. Givat Haviva: Yad Yaari, 1994.

Senkman, Leonardo. "Repercussions of the Six-Day War in the Leftist Jewish Argentinian Camp: The Rise of Fraie Schtime, 1967–1969." In Lederhendler, *The Six-Day War and World Jewry*, 167–187.

Shapira, Anita. *Ha-halicha Al Kav Ha-ofek*. Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim, 2001.

Shindler, Colin. *Israel and the European Left – Between Solidarity and Delegitimization*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2012.

Silverstein, Jordana. "We're Dealing with How Do We Live and Work with this Memory and What Are We Supposed to Do About It." *Borderlands* 9, no. 1 (2010): 1–17.

Staub, Michael E. *Torn at the Roots: The Crisis of Jewish Liberalism in Postwar America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Staub, Michael E. *The Jewish 1960s: An American sourcebook*. Waltham, Mass.: Brandeis University Press; Hanover: University Press of New England, 2004.

Szakolczai, Arpad. "Living Permanent Liminality: The Recent Transition Experience in Ireland." *Irish Journal of Sociology*, 22, no. 1 (2014): 28–50.

Twersky, David. "Entering the 1970s: Habonim and the Jewish Student Movement." In *Builders and Dreamers – Habonim Labor Zionist youth in North America*, edited by J. J Goldberg and Elliot King, 213–218. New York: Herzl Press, 1984.

Tzur, Eli. *Lifnei Bo Ha-afela: HaShomer haTza'ir Be-Polin Ve-Galitzia 1930–1940.* Sede Boker: Machon Ben Gurion; Givaat Haviva: Yad Yaari, 2006.

Uris, Leon. *Exodus.* New York, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1958.

Weiss, Avi. "Student Struggle for Soviet Jewry (SSSJ)." *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, eds. Michael Bernbaum and Fred Skolnik, vol. 19. 2nd edition. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007.

Wiesel, Elie. *Night.* New York: Hill and Wang; London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1960.

Wimmer, Andreas. "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries: A Multilevel Process Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 113, no. 4 (2008): 970–1022.

Yovel, Yirmiyahu, ed. *New Jewish Time: Jewish Culture in a Secular Age – an Encyclopedic View.* vol 2. Jerusalem: Lmada, 2008.

Zayit, David. *Halutzim Ba-mavoch Ha-politi: Ha-tnu'a Ha-kibutzit 1927–1948.* Jerusalem: Yad Yitzhak Ben-Zvi, 1993.