zou moeten doen. En ook zijn houding tegenover het liberalisme is soms merkwaardig ingewikkeld, zoals we trouwens uit zijn brieven aan Groen al wisten. Aan de ene kant beschouwde hij het Belgische en Franse liberalisme van die jaren als ondermijnend; hij meende echter ook dat ’men de woeste kracht der heerschende begrippen niet door tegenwerking, maar door ze te regelen, meester zal worden’ (zoals hij op 21 maart 1831 aan C. J. van Assen schreef: 140 en cf. 145). En hij liet zich niet meeslepen door de ‘zelfverheffing der natie’ tijdens de tiendaagse veldtocht waar hij, evenmin als Groen, heil in zag.

Wat dit deel aantrekkelijk maakt naast de mogelijkheid om Thorbeckes lotgeval zo nauwkeurig te volgen zijn twee dingen: ten eerste, de informatie die zijn correspondenten hem verschaffen, zoals zijn oudere vriend J. de Vos over de stemming in Amsterdam en zijn generatiegenoot Schimmelpenninck van der Oye over de houding van de Gelderse katholieken in 1830 en 1831; ten tweede de emotionaliteit die ook nu weer zijn contacten met Duitse relaties bij hem losmaken. In het derde deel van het Thorbecke-Archief hadden we na 1828 geen levensteken meer aangetroffen van zijn opgewonden Dremsdese vriendin (zijn latere schoonmoeder), mevrouw Solger. In Hooykaas’ deel verschijnt ze weer in de zomer van 1831 maar pas uit 1833 is enige briefwisseling bewaard die de inleiding blijkt tot Thorbeckes zomerreis van dat jaar naar mevrouw Solger en haar dochters in Dresden en, op de terugweg, naar verschillende andere vrienden uit zijn Duitse periode. Mevrouw Solger en hij blijken trouw te zijn gebleven aan de geëxalteerde stijl die zij er ook in de vroege jaren twintig op na hielden. Het is een hoogst merkwaardig feit dat Thorbecke blijkbaar zonder zichzelf, zijn ironie en zijn kritische geest te verloochenen - hoe zou hij ook? juist deze maakten op mevrouw Solger zo’n indruk - in het Duits gemoedsbewegingen zoekt uit te drukken waar hij in zijn Nederlandse correspondentie over zwijgt. Tieck, de vriend en buur van mevrouw Solger, dankt hij, na zijn bezoek aan Dresden, uit Bonn voor de reine, schone, hartelijke en vrije omgang die hij opnieuw bij hem genoten heeft en die iets toevoegt aan zijn leven van Leids hoogleraar: ’Man wirkt wissenschaftlich und praktisch fort und verliert den Glauben an die Kraft, welche menschliches Zusammenleben zu einem Kunstwerk gestaltet. Sie berühren alles was Sie umgiebt, mit diesem Zauber …’. Maar van Bonn gaat hij niet, zoals hij eerst van plan was, naar Zwolle om zijn moeder op te zoeken die hij in al deze jaren slechts één keer ontmoet kan hebben: bij de begrafenis van zijn vader in 1832.

Natuurlijk zijn er ook in dit uitstekend verzorgde boek drukfouten blijven staan. Slechts één trof mij als hinderlijk: in de tweede regel van bladzijde 120 staat ‘erkaltet’ in plaats van ‘entfaltet’.

E. H. Kossmann


The events of the late nineteen century presented a sharp challenge to the Jewish people. A rising tide of anti-semitism was expressed both in the violent pogroms in Eastern Europe and in the potentially dangerous anti-semitism in Germany and France, where racism frequently replaced religion as its basic element. During this era of intense nationalistic feeling, Jewish thinkers attempted to come to grips with the crisis. Some saw a solution in assimilation or through conversion to Christianity; others, in adherence to socialism, or emigration to the New World. A minority dreamed of rebuilding the Jewish national home. The hope for redemption and national restoration had always been strong.
in Jewish religious tradition and liturgy, and at this time, the idea of a national restoration through human effort began to supplant exclusive reliance on divine intervention. While there had always been a Jewish presence in the Holy Land, comprised of religious Jews, a group of young Russian Jews who wanted to work the land and make it their own set ashore on this largely depopulated and barren wasteland, in the 1880's, before the establishment of what later became 'political Zionism'.

The most famous confrontation between the assimilated Jew and the new anti-semitism occurred in Paris, where Theodor Herzl, correspondent for the Viennese *Neue Freie Presse*, witnessed the Dreyfus trial, which began in 1894. Relating his personal reaction to the phenomenon of anti-semitism, Herzl wrote:

I was indifferent to my Jewishness; let us say that it was beneath the level of my awareness. But just as anti-semitism forces the half-hearted, cowardly, and self-seeking Jews into the arms of Christianity, it powerfully forced my Jewishness to the surface.

In 1896, Herzl published *Der Judenstaat*, calling for the establishment of a Jewish State, and in 1897, the First Zionist Congress was held in Basel, its program: to establish a 'home for the Jewish people secured by public law'. The root of the term 'Zionism' is the word 'Zion', a synonym for Jerusalem. The modern term, 'Zionism', first appeared in the late nineteenth century, denoting the movement whose goal was the return of the Jewish people to the Land of Israël. Subsequently a world movement came into being whose purpose was to advance and promote Jewish settlement of an area in the Ottoman Empire known as Palestine. Herzl's intention was that Zionism - in a real sense a prototype of a national liberation movement - would make it possible for Jews to build a new society and live honorably. At its inception the Zionist movement did not emphasize freedom from imperialism or colonialism but from the degradations, material and moral, which European society had imposed on the Jews through the ages. These had their roots in the early formation of Christianity, where for the nascent Church

anti-Judaism became a doctrinal necessity (from the time that it repudiated its first Judeo-Christian form); nothing was more certain: it could not show the truth of its faith without simultaneously denouncing the error and blindness of Israël, the old Israël.

From this theological assumption, a process began whereby the debasement of the Jewish people became an essential part:

the teaching of contempt leads to a system of degradation, it is a necessary justification for it, and the inverse is true: the system of debasement is necessary for the teaching of contempt, it is its logical consequence, it provides it with visible confirmation.

Some of the humiliations which the Jewish people suffered under Christian civilization included: torture and violence to persons and property, including mass murder and robbery, professional and occupational restrictions, e.g., exclusion from public office, relegation to money-lending and pawn brokering and later on, the *numerus clausus* at universities; expulsion from cities and countries; compulsory attendance at Christian sermons and public debates; the obligation to wear specifically identifiable Jewish dress, such as the badge and hat; occasional forced conversions; kidnapping and baptism of Jewish children (even in post-war Western Europe); demeaning stereotypes in art, literature, and in the popular mind, such as the devil, *Judensau*, or *foetor judaicus*; accusations of host-desecration, blood libels, and allegations of poisoning wells at the time of the Black Death (in the middle of the fourteenth century); public burnings of the Talmud; and compulsory residence in ghettos and in confined geographical districts. Thus, at the turn of the century, many Jews turned to Zionism as a means of liberating themselves from disabilities in this spirit. It may be a surprise, but the great emancipation for the majority of the Jewish people came not in the eighteenth century, but in the twentieth, with the Russian Revolution and recognition of minority rights at the Congress of Versailles. The Jews in several areas formerly belonging to the Ottoman Empire with large Muslim populations have yet to be legally emancipated.

The characteristics of the Jewish population in every part of the world are influenced to some extent by those of the peoples with whom they live. One of the basic features of European civilization has been the great cultural schism between Eastern and Western Europe. This tension is manifest in different religious traditions and historical experiences: the extent of cultural contact with the wider world and the degree to which it was welcomed, participation (or lack of it) in the Renaissance with its highly developed ideals of human dignity and esteem for individual accomplishment. Within the Zionist movement, the East-West conflict was expressed after World War I in the personal rivalry between Chaim Weizmann, leader of the World Zionist Organization, and Louis Brandeis, American Zionist leader and Justice of the United States Supreme Court, in their views on the organization of Jewish settlement in Palestine. This quarrel was referred to in partisan circles as Washington vs. Pinsk (Weizmann’s birthplace). Brandeis saw a more confined role for the embryonic government and advocated a consciously responsible approach in order to control wastefulness and alleviate disorganization. He objected to the use of philanthropic funds for purposes of investment preferring that it be promoted and carried out according to business principles and left to private initiative. Economic policy, Brandeis held, should be directed toward making the settlers self-reliant and self-supporting. Weizmann wanted a central administration where the World Zionist Organization would have a near monopoly on developing industry and would control economic


growth. The Weizmannites rejected the Brandeis group's principles of fiscal responsibility, accusing them of lacking Jewish feelings and soul. This Zionism of the head, instead of the heart, was contemptuously labelled, *Geschätzionismus*\(^10\). Weizmann and his followers defeated the Brandeis group\(^11\), and at a critical juncture in the development of Jewish settlement in Palestine, the most vital western influence in the Zionist movement was forced to the sidelines. Much of present-day Israël - as to government, economy, ideology, and social attitudes - may be traced to this triumph of Pinsk over Washington. In the debate, the Dutch Zionist leadership gave its vigorous support to the Brandeis group, and, thus, as a western Zionist movement, the development and history of Zionism in the Netherlands are of central importance, despite small numbers.

Dr. Ludy Giebels presents the history of the Dutch Zionist movement from its inception in 1899 until the early occupation, in 1941. The book is divided into six chapters: 'The Emergence of the Zionist Movement in the Netherlands'; 'Zionism and its Relationship with the Dutch Jewish Community'; 'The Netherlands Zionist Federation to the Balfour Declaration'; 'A New Jewish Future: Congress Demonstration, Balfour Declaration, Palestine'; 'The Netherlands Zionist Federation in opposition to the [World] Executive during the 'twenties'; 'The Netherlands Zionist Federation in the thirties. The Beginning of the Occupation'. Dr. Giebels describes the background in which the movement came into being, particularly the social structure of the Jewish community. She endeavours in good faith to describe the controversies of the times as well as the ins and outs of the concepts which were debated. In the Netherlands, the rabbinate largely opposed Zionism which it considered to be a-religious. Zionism found its largest following among the small middle class rather than amongst the masses of the Jewish proletariat, who were more attracted to socialism. The author describes the tension and feuding between the various groupings of the community and their relations with the wider world of Dutch Gentile society. She poses the question why the Jews did not assert themselves as a minority in Dutch politics and includes a frank discussion of anti-semitism in the Netherlands. Dr. Giebels also presents a brief but interesting consideration of the relations between the Jewish settlers in Palestine with the Arab population during the formative years of the 'twenties. Similarly, she devotes probing attention to the relations between the socially-established Dutch Zionist leadership and the 'Palestina Pioneers', Jewish youth, largely of Eastern European origin, who came to the Netherlands to prepare for emigration by learning farming skills. From her vantage point as an outside observer, dr. Giebels has contributed some valuable insights into Dutch Jewish communal life in the late modern era, the development of Jewish consciousness, and the place of the Jewish community in pre-war Dutch society. To this extent, she has made an original and worthy contribution to our understanding of the social history of the Jewish community and identified some of its particular characteristics which have persisted to the present, especially its strong sense of social hierarchy in its various manifestations.

G. I. Langmuir observed that with the Incarnation, the Jewish people ceases to be of importance in Christian historiography:

Before the first century A.D. the Hebrews were of great historical importance; thereafter the Jews are of little significance. The reign of a new truth had begun... After the emergence of Christianity, a reprobation falls on the Jews, a dark night of ignorance conceals their activities from the historical consciousness of most western society until Dreyfus, the Balfour Declaration, or Hitler once more draws historical attention to the Jews.¹²

That the author has devoted sustained attention to a Jewish subject such as this may perhaps be taken as a new willingness to treat the history of the Jewish minority in the Netherlands as a legitimate object of consideration within the broader framework of Dutch national history.¹³ This awareness may be viewed as closely associated with events of the recent past which have forced a reexamination of the place of the Jewish people in the world: the Holocaust (its historical roots and the experience of the Occupation); the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1947); the founding of the State of Israël (1948); and recent contributions to New Testament scholarship - particularly in the understanding of rabbinical literature - which have emphasized Christianity's profound debt to Judaism.

The work does suffer from a number of shortcomings. It lacks a sufficient introduction and its definition of the historical problem is unsound. The narrative ends in 1941 despite the fact that many developments were underway both in the Dutch and world Zionist movements which found their climax in the early post-war era. The author's periodization gives the misleading impression that the Nazi occupation brought an end to the Dutch Zionist movement. After the liberation, young radical Zionist activists who were marginal before the war rose to positions of influence in the Zionist movement and in the Jewish community as a whole. The experience of the Holocaust and this change in leadership resulted in an intellectual reorientation of the community toward Zionism as well as a relatively large emigration to Palestine (estimated at about 2,000 in a surviving population of 25,000-29,000)¹⁴. The Dutch Zionist Federation still exists and functions¹⁵. One would not know of it from dr. Giebel's account. Moreover, the suggestion in the conclusion that Zionist ideology was not decisive in affecting personal behaviour in the face of death, since Zionists participated both in the 'Joodse Coördinatie Commissie' (headed by mr. L. E. Visser, Justice of the Dutch Supreme Court which adopted a policy of principled opposition to the anti-Jewish measures) and the 'Joodse Raad' (the Jewish council which collaborated in the deportations of Jews), seems a bit lame. Her definition and this assertion exclude the activities of Joop Westerweel and the Palestina Pioneers in organizing the escape of some 150 to 200 young pioneers from the Netherlands, 'the only Jewish group

¹³. For a subject of related interest, see: Henriette Boas, 'Jewish Figures in Post-War Dutch Literature', Jewish Journal of Sociology, V (June 1963) i, 55-83.
which as a group adopted a policy of resistance\textsuperscript{16}. These two developments, which were omitted, point to an inadequate and formalistic treatment of the problem. At all events, each deserved to have been mentioned in the conclusion.

The book would have benefitted from a critical discussion of the different types of sources used and which would have indicated a more discriminating awareness of their differing nature. Although archival material was consulted, this work was heavily dependent on Jewish newspapers. For the earlier period reliance upon this type of source might have been unavoidable, but a more ambitious program of interviewing would have given greater insight into the historical background and spirit of the interbellum years. While it is evident that the author did conduct some interviews, the methods employed, if any, remain unclear. Also missing is a list of acknowledgements: a work such as this could not have been prepared without considerable good will, help, and suggestions from others. A notable omission from the bibliography is the classic: Adolf Böhm, \textit{Die Zionistische Bewegung} (2 vols, Berlin, 1937). Technically, the punctuation is somewhat weak, e.g., 38, where the title of a book is not set off; and occasionally there are slight duplications from chapter to chapter.

Generally, the quality and thematic development are somewhat uneven. The earlier chapters give the impression of being more carefully conceived and complete and having a better integration of factual and background material. This would have been a better work if the research had been deeper and the perspective broader. It may be faulted as lacking in workmanship and maturity. While it is a very welcome and useful contribution, it is not all that it could have been and is by no means the definitive work on the subject.

J. S. Fishman

