

## Farming the land on three continents: Bilu, Am Oylom, and Yefe-Nahar\*

ISRAEL BARTAL

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, Israel*

*E-mail: bartalir@yahoo.com*

**Abstract.** Jewish agrarianization projects in Eastern Europe began in the late eighteenth century. This article compares three such movements that emerged in the Russian Empire: the colonization of the southern Ukraine that took place in the early decades of the nineteenth century, and, later, in the 1880s, the initiatives known as *Am Oylom* and *Bilu*. The founders of the colonies in the Ukraine combined the ideology of the Enlightenment with Russian imperial considerations, while the later movements were part of a radical Jewish avant-garde that aimed to create a “new” Jew, who would be a hardworking farmer and live in a cooperative community. Yet these visions could be realized only in a new land free of old, anti-Jewish political systems. Thus the place of social and economic rebirth would be “New Russia,” the United States, or Palestine, and regardless of location or time, the initiators of these enterprises all adopted a consistently productivist rhetoric. In addition, the settlement projects all unknowingly advanced the expanding colonialist interests of the governments of Russia, North America, and Palestine.

In January 1882, about half a year after pogroms had broken out in the southern part of the Russian Empire, a group of young Jews in Kharkov decided that one way to relieve the distress of Russian Jewry, was to establish cooperative agricultural colonies in Palestine. A few months later, a few members of this group—subsequently known as Bilu [Hebrew abbreviation for *Beit Ya'akov lekhu ve-nelkha*, House of Jacob, come ye and let us go forth (Isaiah, 2:5)]—arrived in Palestine, where they took part in founding two farming communities, initiating that period in the history of the Jewish national movement known as the First Aliya.<sup>1</sup> The Bilu members were not the first to try alleviating the economic and social distress of the Jews' of the Pale of Settlement through communal agrarianization. During the pogroms (May 1881), a movement of Jewish students and artisans formed in the port city of Odessa with a very similar vision. Their sights, however, were set on the United States of America, not the Jews' ancient ancestral homeland.

\* A revised version of this paper was presented at the international conference “Beyond Eastern Europe: Jewish Cultures in Israel and the United States”, Rutgers University, March 2007.

This movement, known as Am Oylom or, by the modern Hebrew version of “Am Olam,” dispatched several groups of settlers overseas, and founded four cooperative agricultural colonies scattered throughout the United States.<sup>2</sup>

### Common goals, different sites for agrarianization

The connection between Bilu and Am Oylom—two settlement movements with similar backgrounds and ideological motivation—underscores the ties between emigration from Eastern Europe to Palestine and the United States. Anyone familiar with the history of Russian Jewry recognizes both the synchronic and the diachronic dimension here.

Numerous attempts at settlement from the first partition of Poland in 1772 until the assassination of Czar Alexander II in 1881 preceded the agrarianization movements that sprouted in the Pale of Settlement after the pogroms. The first were agricultural colonization projects organized and designed to solve the “Jewish problem” following the governmental changes in the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania, which caused the displacement of tens of thousands of Jews. In 1808, about 75 years before the members of Bilu and Am Oylom set sail, convoys of Jews left White Russia to settle lands in southern Ukraine, which Russia had captured from the Ottoman Empire in the 1780s. Once on the land, they established several agricultural colonies populated by hundreds of families.<sup>3</sup> One of them, Yefe-Nahar (*Yefe-Nagar* in Russian), was described for posterity by the *Haskalah* writer Joseph Perl in his satire *Bohen Tzadik* (Prague, 1838). Perl depicted the colony in idyllic terms as a remedy for the ills of East European Jewish society

Yefe-Nahar was built on the shores of the Ingul River. It is home to close to fifty families, who work their land diligently in the best possible manner. From Sunday morning until Friday afternoon, the eve of the Holy Sabbath, they work in the fields. Those whose fields are far from the village prepare their food in the field. Their wives and daughters help them in their work, standing alongside them at harvest time as well ... Everyone has five or six heads of cattle, two oxen, two horses, sheep, and various domestic fowl in large numbers. The butter and cheese that they make are very good; even the Christians buy them and they pay more for them than for the butter and cheese made by [non-Jews, I. B.] In short, they do all their work diligently without cease, and they are faithful in

everything they do; this was especially true when I saw their tremendous hospitality.<sup>4</sup>

Two features of the early 1880s indicate the direct relationship between the synchronic and the diachronic dimensions of agricultural colonization movements in Eastern Europe. The pioneers of the First Aliya knew of the significance of Jewish agricultural settlement in the Russian Empire. In the public debate that preceded the founding of Petah Tikva (1878), the subject was brought up repeatedly as proof that Jews could survive the social and psychological changes inherent in becoming farmers. Moreover, Jewish farmers in Eastern Europe were thought of as a pool of qualified potential recruits for the colonies in Palestine.<sup>5</sup> Yechiel Michel Brill, a Jewish journalist and community activist who worked as an agent of Baron Edmond de Rothschild, traveled to Russia and brought over a group of Jewish farmers to settle in the colony of Mazkeret Batya.<sup>6</sup>

The second feature of the link was embodied by a personal connection, and sometimes a family relationship, between members of the Bilu and Am Oylom movements. In the months following the pogroms, most of the people in these first associations dedicated to emigration and rural settlement had no clear destination, and they vacillated between emigrating to Palestine or America. The founders of the association *Kibbutz Nidhei Yisrael* (Minsk, 1882), who supported Jewish agrarian emigration, wrote explicitly in the sixth clause of their by-laws:

The society resolves not to commend either Palestine or the “New Land” [*erets ha-hadasha*] (America) at the moment so as not to get in the way of national unity and cause a total split between hearts, since opposing winds are now blowing regarding this question and its resolution.<sup>7</sup>

Am Oylom and Bilu were ostensibly part of the radical *avant-garde* among “enlightened” young Jews of Eastern Europe, which wanted to create a new Jew, a farmer who lived by his labor in a cooperative community.<sup>8</sup> In both movements, the idea of working the land fused with an utopian vision of redeeming the Jewish people and rectifying the existing social and economic order. This vision could not be achieved in Europe; it could only be realized in a new land, free of old political systems and anti-Jewish prejudices. The United States of America and Palestine seemed like ideal places for establishing model colonies of Jewish farmers. They had the apparent advantages of low population density and substantial geographical distance from the

emigrants previous homes. Consequently, it was thought that agricultural settlement in the United States and Palestine would keep Jews from reverting to their traditional, allegedly exploitative occupations, ones that inevitably infuriated non-Jewish farmers.

In retrospect, Jewish pioneers to Zion and America constituted an advanced stage of a process that began more than a century earlier in large agrarianization projects in southern Ukraine. In all three cases, the organizers intended to sever Jews from their old occupations, with the added benefit of convincing some skeptics that agrarianization would protect local populations that had supposedly been exploited by their Jewish neighbors. Moreover, agriculture was meant to provide a livelihood to broad segments of the Jewish population, which had suffered from changes in the social and economic order. The rhetoric used by the initiators of the three projects, together with the arguments employed to recruit members and obtain aid, bridged geography and time periods.

To the modern observer, emigration overseas seems fundamentally different from migration to territories that had recently been annexed by the Russian Empire. But to Jews living in the late eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century, resettlement on land a few hundred miles from Minsk to the steppes along the northern tier of the Black Sea (which had recently been captured from the Turks) was comparable to crossing an ocean. A Lithuanian Jew who became a farmer in the Ukrainian steppes in 1808 arrived in an unknown land—perhaps more foreign to him than Palestine, about which he at least knew—or thought he knew—something from religious texts. The writer Shalom Jacob Abramowitsch (Mendele Moykher Sforim) compared the trip from Lithuania to the southern regions of the Russian Empire in pre-railroad days to a journey to America or the Ottoman Empire

In the old days, when there were no decent roads and railroads did not yet exist anywhere in the world as they do today, a trip that would now take a few hours by train took several days with horses. At that time Volhynia was like America and Kherson was like the land of Ishmael [the Ottoman Empire, I.B.] across the seas, far off in the imaginations of the people where I lived. Both were pictured in their minds as great wonders.<sup>9</sup>

## Telling the story of agrarianization

Until recently, historians studying the mass emigration from Eastern Europe focused mainly on the discriminatory policy of the Czarist regime in Russia vis-à-vis the Jewish masses and the economic hardship that compelled these Jews to leave the regions where they had lived for centuries.<sup>10</sup> These historians, like other shapers of collective memory, were following in the footsteps of the political discourse that had molded the consciousness of East European Jewry in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. They wrote in the shadow of later traumatic experiences—such as the First World War, the revolutions of 1917, and the wars of 1919 and 1920—all of which devastated Jewish communities in the Pale of Settlement. These twentieth century horrors affected the emotions and perceptions of the writers of history, who retrojected them onto nineteenth century historical processes. Consequently, a mix of ideology, politics, and economics greatly determined how the early stages of the mass migration movement would be etched in the Jewish collective memory.

The course of modern Jewish history has been chronicled many times by scholars, reinvented frequently in the speeches of politicians, and reshaped periodically in school curricula, literary works, films, and mass media. Influential ideologies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries provided the context for the story. Similar to the historiography of emigration, Jewish socialist and nationalist movements fashioned the memory of the past based on the hardships of the present and attached their aspirations for a better future to what had (supposedly) existed before. Moreover, the physical location of the shapers of this historical narrative—together with the culture, not to mention the language, in which the images of the recent past were recorded and disseminated, the context of the regime in the country under discussion, and the bonds between Jews there and those elsewhere—have all affected Jewish remembrance; and this is regardless of whether we are speaking of present memory or the way what happened less than 200 years ago will be remembered in the future.<sup>11</sup> The scholars of the *Wissenschaft* in mid-nineteenth century Germany, widely considered the founders of modern Jewish historical writing, believed that the rise and triumph of rationalist thought in western and central Europe, coupled with the granting of equal legal rights to the Jews, formed the two main axes of modern Jewish history,<sup>12</sup> which they defined as the time when the light of reason banished prejudice and

superstition and after which, Jews were recognized as members of civil society with equal rights and obligations.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century, when anti-Semitic influences grew throughout Europe and the advent of emancipation appeared unlikely for Jews in the Russian Empire, these two axes of the historical narrative seemed completely divorced from reality. In Eastern Europe, a new Jewish historiography began to emerge,<sup>13</sup> whose narrative was based on a view of the Jews as an “other”, their ethnic uniqueness, and the struggle against a hostile regime.<sup>14</sup> This change brought with it a drastic revision in the image of the Pale. The Jews in that vast region in the western part of the Russian Empire where almost five million Jews lived by about 1900 were no longer perceived as residents of a dystopia that embodied all the flaws of the east European Jew. They were rather a huge human reservoir of vitality, power, and cultural and artistic creativity.<sup>15</sup>

Perceptions of the emigration of millions of Jews from the Pale underwent significant changes with this historiographic shift. Until the 1880s, many *maskilim*, just like the Russian authorities, believed that mass emigration out of the Pale of Settlement emigration was a positive demographic development that was consistent with the aspiration for equal civil rights and which could advance the goal of cultural integration, as well as political co-optation. A change occurred beginning in the 1880s. Henceforth, emigration was portrayed by many Jews in the Russian Empire more as a means of rescue and survival, or as a search for a suitable alternative to integration into Russian society, which had not materialized by that time.

The image of agricultural settlement by groups of emigrants from the Pale underwent a corresponding change of emphasis. Until the 1880s, *maskilim*, like many Russian officials, believed the Pale of Settlement was overcrowded with Jews who had no proper occupations, and they agreed wholeheartedly that many of their brethren earned their living in objectionable ways. This issue of the moral, cultural, and economic improvement of the Jews through adoption of a productive occupation did not vanish, but it became increasingly subordinated to the need to “save” Russia’s Jews, preferably somewhere outside of Russia. One Bilu member, Chaim Chissin, wrote in his diary (in Russian!) a few moments after his ship raised anchor in the port of Odessa

The *Russia* [the name of the vessel, I.B.] is carrying me away from Russia, full steam ahead .... Sadness descended upon me when I remembered that I was leaving behind all my ties and aspirations; all my dreams and ideals—everything that has

filled my life until now—is buried here. Here I grew up and became a man, here my emotions developed and my love blossomed. But you have sent me away, dear homeland! You replied to my signs of affection with cruel, cold fury. Oh, my fate is a hard one—sowing every day and never reaping. Instead of thanks, I get insults and scorn .... But enough of these negative thoughts! No more living in the home of strangers! It's time to build a home for me, too!<sup>16</sup>

These words were written in the spirit and style customary among members of the Russian–Jewish *intelligentsia* who adopted radical nationalist thinking toward the end of Czar Alexander II's reign. Chaim Chissin, who had been a member of Am Oylom before joining Bilu, published these excerpts from his diary in the Russian–Jewish journal *Voskhod*, whose regular contributors at the time included the historian Simon Dubnow, one of the most influential shapers of collective memory following the events of 1881. Letters from Dubnow's brother Ze'ev in Palestine, also a Bilu member, were printed as well. Thus not only did an overlap exist among the different settlement movements, but the political discourse of the times was closely related to the historiography.

### **Agricultural settlement in the emigration whirlwind: images and realities**

Most of the Jewish agricultural pioneers in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries came from the Pale of Settlement, and their destinations paralleled those of other Jewish migrants. For example, the agricultural colonies founded beginning in 1808 in southern Russia were just a small percentage of the new communities founded in that region by Jews from Lithuania, White Russia, or from across the Austro-Hungarian border in Galicia. Likewise, Jewish rural communities in the United States arose mainly in the years when Russian Jews flooded the slums of various American cities. In Palestine too, most members of the First and Second Aliya flocked to the long-standing urban communities in Jerusalem or Jaffa, despite the more heroic image of agriculture promoted by Zionist ideology.<sup>17</sup>

The founding of Jewish agricultural colonies and the general contours of migration shared significant common ground. Agrarianization was ideologically motivated and in many cases planned, regulated, and steered in a particular direction. But, at least at first glance, the

mass migrations of the *fin-de-siècle* seemed to be spontaneous and uncontrolled. If rural settlement in the Russian Empire, the United States, or in Palestine was perceived as part of an economic, social, and cultural effort to “improve” East European Jewry, immigration in general was associated with a contradictory variety of images of the future. Migration to the big city (be it Odessa, Kishinev, London, New York, or even Jaffa), constituted a radical change for Jews from the *shtetls* and small towns of the Pale. But this change, which evoked opposition from rabbis and activists in the Orthodox community, fired the imagination of thousands of prospective emigrants who dreamed of integrating into the big city and its urban culture. In the minds of those who regarded Odessa as an accursed place, where hellfire burned for seventy miles around, the United States, too, was a *treifene medina* (non-kosher country)<sup>18</sup> and Jaffa a frivolous city, where no God-fearing person would live.<sup>19</sup>

By contrast to gloomy visions of the city, the Jewish agricultural colony was pictured as an incubator for generations of farmers who would earn their living far differently from their more urban forefathers and contemporaries in the Pale. The idea was not only to resolve Jewish demographic or economic problems, which had resulted from rapid population growth in the western parts of the Empire, but also to eliminate the parasitic image of the Jews so common in Russian public discourse.<sup>20</sup> Isaac Baer Levinsohn (known as Ribal), a founder of the *Haskalah* movement in Russia, already pictured such things in the 1820s

[Agrarianization] will make the nations among which we dwell respect us; they will no longer scorn us and regard us as a disgrace, but will instead speak with us in the gates. Who does not see or feel the scorn and ignominy that our brethren suffer daily when they say, “For they are a nation bereft of counsel, a nation devoid of understanding”?<sup>21</sup>

The Am Oylom pioneers who founded the colony of Cremieux, South Dakota wrote (in Hebrew!) to Peretz Smolenskin, editor of the journal *Ha-Shahar* in the winter of 1882, “The trials and tribulations that we encountered in our ancestral land convinced us to carry out our old idea, give up commerce, and work the land. This is why we came to America.”<sup>22</sup> Similar statements abound in the writings of the founders of the first *Hibat Zion* associations in the early 1880s. One of the clauses in the bylaws of *Kibbutz Nidhei Yisrael* that same year stated:

It is the opinion of the entire society that the primary duty of all Jews is to support their brethren who seek to earn their

living by working the land, for only by working the land can a nation strike roots there. This is clear to anyone familiar with the lives of nations, and this law is verified by the history of the Jewish people. By means of this work, our nation will be rejuvenated and will gain strength, both emotionally and physically.<sup>23</sup>

Utopian ideas did not always compensate for the realities of life in the colonies. Harsh living conditions, poor soil, and the lack of suitable infrastructure, along with the preexisting habits and inclinations, led many settlers, originally bent on agriculture, to join the majority of immigrants in the big city, often nearby the fledgling agricultural colony's site. In this light, and despite contradictions and contrasts, we may speak of a symbiotic relationship between spontaneous migration to the (capitalist) city and the pre-planned agricultural colony.

The principal dilemma that ideologues and agricultural settlers alike failed to appreciate was their desire for Jews to embrace an anachronistic east European economic model rooted in outdated thinking. Immigrants flocking to Odessa, New York, and even Jaffa—ostensibly devoid of any historical consciousness of the land—were linking their destinies to what was then viewed as the march of social and economic progress. This made of the supposed radicals who founded the agricultural colonies, in fact, conservatives, while the religiously observant migrants who moved to the big cities unwittingly became the harbingers of radical change in the traditional East European society. The goal of agricultural colonization in southern Russia, the United States, and Palestine was to forge a “new Jew”. Reality proved that the economic practices of traditional East European Jews were better suited to the urban, capitalistic world than to the agrarian life that *maskilim* and other advocates of Russian-style agrarian socialism envisioned.

### **Merging interests: Jewish “rebirth” and colonial needs**

Until 1900, Russian imperial policy did not necessarily quash the desire of eastern European *maskilim* improve Jewish society. From the second half of the eighteenth century, the Czarist government encouraged Europeans from several countries to settle the southern regions of the Empire. At the same time, they sought to move “unproductive”, surplus ethnic groups (primarily Jews) from densely to sparsely populated areas. This Russian policy echoed Britain's colonial practices: exiling

criminals and encouraging settlement by impoverished freemen. Similarly, Czarist legislators thought of Jewish agricultural colonies on the imperial borderlands as a multi-purpose solution: a new Jewish presence would improve the character and behavior of people who were essentially regarded as criminals. To some extent, agricultural colonies fulfilled a function analogous to that of conscription into the armies of enlightened despots, which was to educate and upgrade members of certain social classes. This was, in effect, human engineering on a large scale. However, this approach of the Russian state toward Jewish agrarianization changed toward the end of the nineteenth century, once it ceased regarding Jews as agents for disseminating imperial culture in conquered territories. At this same time, the enthusiasm of the *maskilim* for Czarist governmental methods also cooled drastically.

Notwithstanding the decline in motivation, the colonization movements to the Americas and Eretz Israel nonetheless retained much of the original vision of Jewish agrarianization. Bilu and Am Oylom, for example, adopted nearly the full measure of the *maskilic* discourse (and the parallel one of Russian officials) about the harmful nature of Jewish occupations and the hoped-for remedy to be achieved through agrarianism. Moreover, the new movements retained the old idea that colonization could transform desolate steppes controlled by semi-savage, nomadic tribes into settled arable lands that would benefit an expanding empire.

Paradoxically, this idea was exported from the Russian Empire by members of radical and opposition groups who felt alienated from the state. Agricultural colonists in Palestine found themselves, almost unwittingly, in the company of exiles from religious-ethnic groups in the Russian Empire (such as Circassians and Chechens a few years before the First Aliya) who settled on a desert frontier and on land controlled by nomadic Bedouin tribes. Indeed, immigrants from Eastern Europe founded several *moshavot* (colonies) next to colonies settled by foreigners from other empires who were welcomed by the Ottoman authorities. Such colonies, whose populations had arrived in Palestine but a few years earlier, were to be found nearby Rosh Pinah, Yesod Ha-Ma'alah, and Metulah in the Upper Eastern Galilee, as well as near colonies in the Lower Galilee and in the northern coastal valley.<sup>24</sup> Those who were unwanted in one empire were welcomed in another, provided they did not demonstrate insular or separatist tendencies, but acted as a stabilizing force to the regime's benefit.

The idealists of Bilu and Am Oylom who wished to improve the world, create a new breed of Jewish farmer, and heal their people's

distress, transplanted an old solution from the colonies of southern Russia to new worlds. More than a decade before Theodor Herzl wrote in *The Jewish State* that the Jews rejected by Europe should carry its spirit, culture, and scientific achievements to other continents, something similar occurred in North America and the semi-arid plain on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, Eretz Israel. As a result, bits of a Russian presence were “planted” in foreign, faraway lands, albeit for a short time. A few decades earlier, the founders of Yefe-Nahar had, however consciously, played a similar role in the Russian Empire as it spread to the South and East. These pioneering Jews, rejected and virtually expelled to steppes controlled by nomadic, non-European tribes, established islands of a Russian presence in the service of the Empire.

## Notes

1. On Bilu see Shulamit Laskov, *Ha-Bilu'yim* (Tel Aviv 1989); Jonathan Frankel, *Prophecy and Politics, Socialism, Nationalism and the Russian Jews, 1862–1917* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1981), 90–97.
2. A. Menes, “The Am Oylom Movement”, *YIVO Annual of Jewish Social Science*, 4 (1949), 9–33; Has’ya Tortel, “Tnu’at Am Olam”, *He-Avar* 10 (1963), 124–143.
3. V. I. Nikitin, *Evrei zemledeltsy* (St. Petersburg, 1887); S. Y. Borovoy, *Evreiskaya zemledelcheskaya kolonizatsiya v staroy Rossi* (Moscow, 1928); J. Shatzki, *Geshikhte fun der Yiddisher kolonizatye in Rusland* (New York, 1926); A. Ettinger, Im haklaim yehudim ba-tefutsot (Merhaviah, 1942), 18–57, 70–109; Z. Livne ed., *Haklaim yehudim be-arvot Rusyah* (Merhaviah, 1965), 15–128; M. Levin, *Erkhey hevra ve-kalkalah ba-ideolog’ya shel tkufat ha-haskalah* (Jerusalem, 1975), 187–211; J. D. Klier, *Russia Gathers her Jews, The Origins of the ‘Jewish Question’ in Russia, 1772–1825* (Dekalb, 1986), 136–143.
4. Joseph Perl, *Bohen Tzadik* (Prague, 1838), 97–98. For an English updated summary of Perl’s political and literary activity see: Dov Taylor, “Introduction”, in Dov Taylor, *Joseph Perl’s Revealer of Secrets, The First Hebrew Novel* (Boulder and Oxford, 1997), xix–lxxv.
5. Israel Bartal, “Petah Tikva: beyn shora’shim ra’ayonim li-nesibut ha-zman”, *Cathedra* 9 (October 1978), 58–60. One of the advocates of this idea was Abraham Moshe Lunz, who published his settlement projects some years later (1881–1882) in the Hebrew press.
6. On Brill’s operation see his book *Yesod ha-ma’alah* (Mainz 1883) (republished with an introduction by G. Kressel, Jerusalem, 1978).
7. Bylaws of Kibbutz Nidhei Yisrael, *Ha-Shahar*, 10, no. 11, (1882), special supplement.
8. Jonathan Frankel, “Shorshey ha-sotsyalizm ha-yehudi (1882–1890): Me-amoniyyut (*narodnichestvo*) yehudit le-kosmopolitivyut,” *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, 16–21 August 1981: Panel Sessions* (Jerusalem, 1984), 21–33.

9. Mendele Moykher Sforim, "Lo Nahat Be-Ya'akov," [first published in *Pardes* 1 (1892), 37–56] *Kol Kitvei Mendele Moykher Sforim* (Tel Aviv, 1949/50), 393. A Yiddish version of the same appeared in *Der Hoyz Fraynd*, 4 (1895), 1–24 ("Di Alte Maynse," *Ale Verk fun Mendele Moykher Sfroim*, vol. 13 [Warsaw 1928], 3–33). For a somewhat different Yiddish version of the cited text see: "Di Entdekung fun Volin" [first published in 1903], *Ale Verk fun Mendele Moykhe Sforim*, vol. 16 (Warsaw, 1928), 15–16. On Jewish migration within the boundaries of Eastern Europe see: S. Stampfer, "Patterns of Internal Jewish Migration in the Russian Empire," in Y. Ro'i, ed., *Jews and Jewish Life In Russia and the Soviet Union* (Ilford, 1995), 28–50.
10. Studies by Gur Alroey and Shaul Stampfer show that emigration from parts of Eastern Europe that were less afflicted by pogroms was much larger than from the southern provinces of the Russian Empire, where the 1881–1882 anti-Jewish riots took place. See, for example Shaul Stampfer, "The Geographic Background of East European Jewish Migration to the United States before World War I," in Ira A. Glazier and Luigi De Rosa, eds., *Migration Across Time and Nations* (New York, 1985), 220–230; Gur Alroey, *Ha-maha'pekha ha-shketah, ha-hagirah ha-Yehudit me-ha-imperyah ha-Rusit ve-shinuy pney ha-olam ha-Yehudi, 1870–1924* (Jerusalem, 2007, in press).
11. On the way Jews have remembered Eastern Europe see: Israel Bartal, *The Jews of Eastern Europe, 1772–1881* (Philadelphia, 2005), 1–13; Steven Zipperstein, *Imagining Russian Jewry: Memory, History, Identity* (Seattle, 1999).
12. Ismar Schorsch, *From Text to Context: the Turn to History in Modern Judaism* (Hanover and London, 2003).
13. On the emergence of East European Jewish Historiography, see Benjamin Nathans, "On Russian Jewish Historiography," in Thomas Sanders, ed., *Historiography of Imperial Russia: the Profession and Writing of History in a Multinational State* (Armonk, N.Y. and London, 1999), 397–432; Avraham Greenbaum, *Prakim ba-historiografya shel yahadut Rusya* (Jerusalem, 2006).
14. The current debate over the relevance of emancipation and acculturation to the shaping of Jewish reconstruction of the Imperial Russian past is well demonstrated in the words of Benjamin Nathans: "Excluded from what appeared to be European Jewry's Faustian bargain of emancipation in return for assimilation –so the [historians' —I. B.] argument runs –substantial numbers of Russian Jews were driven to pursue a different modernity." (*Beyond the Pale. The Jewish Encounter with Late Imperial Russia* [Berkeley, 2002], 7).
15. As the Zionist historian Ben-Zion Dinur depicted it in his seminal article, "Dmutah ha-historit shel yahadut Rusya ve-ba'ayot ha-heker bah," in B. Z. Dinur, *Dorot u-reshumot* (Jerusalem, 1977), 202–228.
16. Chaim Chissin, *Mi-yoman ehad ha-Biluyim* (Petah Tikva, 1967), 19.
17. Gur Alroey, *Immigrantim: ha-hagirah le-erets Yisrael be-reshit ha-me'ah ha-20* (Jerusalem, 2004).
18. Arthur Herzberg, "Treffene Medina-Learned Opposition to Emigration to the United States," *Proceedings of the Eighth world Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, August 16–21, 1981*, Panel Sessions; Jewish History (Jerusalem, 1984), 1–30.
19. For the image of Jaffa as the center of the non-traditionalist Jewish culture in late nineteenth century Palestine see Y. Kaniel, "Ha-ma'avak beyn Yerusha'la'yim le-Yafa ba-yishuv bi-tekufat ha-aliya ha-rishonah ve-ha-shni'yah (1882–1914)," in

- Y. Kamil *Be- Ma'avar, ha-Yehudim be-erets Yisrael ba-me'ah ha-19* (Jerusalem, 2000), 289–318.
20. Shmuel Etttinger, “Ha-diyun ba-nitsul ha-yehudi be-da’at ha-kahal ha-Rusit shel reshit shnot ha-shmonim la-me’ah ha-19,” in *Studies in the History of Jewish Society in the Middle Ages and the Modern Period, Presented to Prof. Jacob Katz on his 75th Birthday* (Jerusalem, 1980), 287–307; Israel Bartal, “Toratam umanutam? Al hevrah ve-kalkalah ba-yishuv ha-Yehudi ha-trom tsioni be-erets Yisrael,” *Iyunim Bitkumat Israel* 14 (2004), 35–53.
  21. Issac Bear Levinsohn (Ribal), *Te’udah be-Yisrael* (Vilna-Horodna, 1828), 152. On Ribal’s haskala ideology see: Emmanuel Etkes, “Te’udah Be-Yisrael: beyn tmurah le-masoret,” in Isaac Bear Levinsohn, *Te’udah Be-Yisrael, Photocopy of the 1828 Edition* (Jerusalem, 1977), 3–19.
  22. *Ha-Shahar*, no. 10 (1883).
  23. Alter Druyanov, *Ketavim le-toledot Hibbat Tziyyon*, vol. 1 (1918/19), no. 4.
  24. Not much has been written on the impact of non-Jewish agricultural settlement of Western Palestine on the early stages of Jewish settlement (with the exception of the German colonies). The only available systematic depiction of this colonization in the nineteenth century by immigrant Moslems was published only recently. See David Grossman, *Ha-okhlus’ya ha-aravit ve-ha-ma’ahaz ha-yeudi* (Jerusalem, 2005), 53–77. For a broader perspective see Norman N. Lewis, *Nomads and Settlers in Syria and Jordan, 1800–1980* (Cambridge, 1987); and, Eugene L. Rogan, *Frontiers of the State in Late Ottoman Empire, Transjordan* (Cambridge, 1999), 21–94.