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The scarcity of published material on the Zionist movement in the Orient has generally led to denials that oriental Zionism ever existed. Yet, if its impact on the popular masses and its degree of realization are any measure of the ideological force of a political movement, it would appear—although variation in the possibilities of immigration make proper comparison impossible—that Zionism was in actual fact a greater success among the oriental Jewish masses than among their western co-religionists. The mass return of the ‘oriental’ communities to Israel demonstrates just how decisive and compelling was the Zionist ideal: the Return of the Exiles to Zion. It should therefore be recognized that notwithstanding the absence of theorists and ideologues, oriental Zionism constituted a concrete historical fact, different from, yet complementary to European Zionism. Its definitive expression was manifested through a massive collective emigration—hamlets, villages and entire regions emptied of their Jews—over less than two decades, a phenomenon which the anti-Jewish events, contemporaneous with that exodus, cannot wholly explain.

It is evident that oriental Zionism was structured in its modalities by the socio-political Judeo-Arab environment in which it took shape and developed, the essential elements of which may be summarized as follows: limitation on the free movement of ideas and a complete absence of freedom of expression in the Ottoman and Arab environments; conflict between Arabism, Pan-Islamism and Zionism; economic and socio-cultural effects of the dhimmi status from which the communities were barely beginning to emerge during the colonial era and which remained in force in all its severity until 1948 in Yemen; the policy of the colonial power towards the Zionists which oscillated between tolerance and hostility; and the summary executions of Zionists by independent sovereign Arab governments. To this local context should be added one further factor, namely the policies of the Zionist Executive, the range of whose options was, until 1948, dictated by the conditions of European Jewry.

No general history of Zionism can afford to ignore oriental Zionism, which was neither another version of European Zionism, nor even an adaptation of it, but a living historical force having both an internal coherence and a real objective existence of its own. Unfortunately, the suddenness with which the exodus took place, the fact that most of the communities’ archives were destroyed or had to be abandoned in Arab countries, and the secretiveness still surrounding a movement which was at times forced to operate and expand
underground, all serve as a deterrent to research and publication.

The statistics indicate a trickle of immigrants entering Palestine from 1919 to 1948, followed by mass immigration from 1948 onwards. The explanation for this contrast is to be found in the control of immigration during the two periods, the chief selective criteria of which were twofold: the rescue of those Jewish communities most greatly endangered and the absorptive capacity of the economy. The first criterion required the urgent emigration of eastern European rather than oriental Jewry, whose situation under the protective wing of the colonial powers did not, except in the Yemen, seem to call for immediate action. With the rise of Nazism, it was the German Jews whose applications for immigration certificates were given priority. This provisional, ethnically-based immigration policy was determined by political contingencies quite external to the oriental Zionist movement.

The second criterion was more complex. Vague, imprecise, it served the mandatory power as a valve by which to regulate the inflow of immigrants and could moreover be adjusted in response to Arab pressures. A precondition of this economic absorption was the maintenance of full employment, which in turn was linked to agricultural and industrial expansion. The immigrants were therefore drawn from among the Jewish peasant masses and skilled manual laboueurs, an occupational bias that further restricted immigration from oriental Jewry, as that diaspora was predominantly urban, made up very largely of tradesmen, artisans, peddlers and unskilled workers. A mass exodus became possible only after Israel’s independence, when all restrictions on immigration were abolished, along with the selective criteria which had necessarily accompanied them.

The oriental Zionist movement took shape and evolved within the sociological and cultural mould of the respective Jewish communities, which must now be examined more closely. Despite the fact that from the Mediterranean littoral to the Persian Gulf regional variations differentiated the various communities, we can discern some general characteristics common to them all during the first decade of the twentieth century. Taken as a whole, the communities were patriarchal, traditionalist and strongly influenced by Arab-Muslim customs. The mass of the people lived in dire poverty, under the autocratic rule of a small class of wealthy notables. Under the stimulus of French and English Jewry, schools were established by the Alliance Israélite Universelle and the Anglo-Jewish Association; some communal institutions were created, which prepared the way for organizational reforms of a democratic nature and for the development of the economic and cultural structures of a petty bourgeoisie. In the 1940s this rising class, still a minority, was divided in its political options between Zionism, Communism and assimilation—either to the colonial power or to the Arab-Islamic majority. The mass of the Jewish population, on the other hand, hardly influenced by European culture, brought to their understanding of Zionism a messianic fervour born of national traditions kept intensely alive through religious observances.

The evolution of Zionism in Egypt with which this article primarily deals, appears to fall into three phases determined by the adjustments of Egyptian Judaism to the domestic and foreign policy of Egypt. The final phase, which began roughly in the middle forties—when Zionism went more and more underground—coincided with the disintegration and disappearance of Egyptian Judaism. The disintegration deserves a more detailed analysis than is here possible. These modifications of the Zionist movement were not the result of a free ideological development; they merely demonstrate the ties of dependency which bind a minority to the majority that encircles it. It is for this reason that the actual forms which Zionism assumed, whether official or clandestine, appear to have been dictated more by Islamic Pan-Arabism than by the European-based Zionist Executive, whose influence was negligible.

The statistical records for 1897 show that the Jewish population in Egypt, by far the larger part of which was concentrated in Cairo and Alexandria, numbered 25,200. To the old indigenous community, whose members continued to form the majority, had been added, particularly in cosmopolitan Alexandria, Ashkenazi elements of disparate origins. Disagreements between the two communities arose on matters concerning religious services and
education, especially in Cairo; these were later to leave their mark on Egyptian Zionism.

In Cairo, a few notables belonging to the Cattaoui and Mosseri families wielded unlimited power over the community, mainly as a result of their wealth. Their economic pre-eminence was matched by their political power, since as Court Jews they were the only channel through which the community could communicate with the authorities. Their intermediary role brought on a conflict of interests between the community’s quest for emancipation and the desire of the notables to retain their privileges. It was a fact that the community’s economic and cultural progress strengthened indigenous Christian anti-Semitism as well as the veiled hostility of the Islamic masses which—albeit controlled by the English colonial apparatus—exploded brutally in sporadic uprisings. Thus, apprehension that a wider, more generalised animosity might force the government to reduce the financial and political advantages they enjoyed, drove the Court Jews to slow the emancipation of their co-religionists and either to minimize or ignore acts of anti-Jewish hostility. It was this assimilationist tendency of a marginal group, based on class interest, which determined the anti-Zionist stance of Moïse Cattaoui, as president, when faced with a rebellious community amongst whom Zionism was gaining ground even as this obstinate struggle was taking place.¹

The first phase of Egyptian Zionism—corresponding to Egypt’s pharaonic period during the early years of the British protectorate—was one of exuberance. An exuberance attested to in every sphere of Jewish life by a blossoming—often ephemeral—of philanthropic institutions, literary reviews, newspapers and cultural associations, which in its historical context was a harbinger of the community’s nascent spiritual and economic emancipation. Egypt’s entry into the European orbit gave an impetus to cultural development, opened up contacts with Europe and western Jewry and, above all, offered the possibility of satisfying an intellectual curiosity that had long been stifled. These new horizons awakened a revolutionary atmosphere within the Cairo Jewish community. Some outspoken members, aware of the general degradation of the masses and the inadequacy of the educational, philanthropic and medical institutions, began to challenge the negligent autocracy of the ruling elite and its uncontrolled administration of public funds. It was in this period of renewal, of disorderly impetuosity, that Zionism had its modest beginnings.

In 1896, Joseph Marco Barukh arrived from Bulgaria and began preaching the return to Zion in the synagogues, streets, cafés and private houses of Cairo. He lived frugally on what his friends were able to provide. After a long day of preaching he would return to the Café Universel to pass the night there in the company of the caretaker, with two tables for a bed. His faith and determination gained him a few followers from among the disinherited and the humble: a clerk, two tailor’s apprentices, a shoemaker, a typesetter, a delivery boy. Every evening, Barukh called a meeting, and when the number of his disciples exceeded a dozen, the richest among them provided a meeting-place for the new Bar Kokhba society—a corner of the only room he and his family occupied on a balcony in the Mousky quarter. His successor, Moïse Benrubbi, organized a meeting with the help of a few Jewish intellectuals and rented a dark and empty hall. Their meagre resources obliged them to bring their own chairs and lamps. Despite publicity, only 40 more persons turned up. Disappointed but not disheartened, the Zionists persevered and with the benevolent collaboration of the B’nai B’rith Lodge their influence increased. In 1906, the Bar Kokhba society was dissolved, destroyed by internal wranglings. Its activities had included canvassing and recruiting new members, fund-raising, representing Egypt at various Zionist Congresses and welcoming foreign Zionist personalities passing through Egypt. The Bar Kokhba society welcomed Herzl, for example, when he visited Egypt in 1903 and presented him to some of the notables who received him with indifference or not at all.²

Nevertheless, Zionism did succeed in attracting some converts if we are to judge by the mini-groups which sprang up in Cairo each year: Bene Zion (1900), Association Littéraire Hébraïque (1905), Association Sioniste Moriah du Caire (1906), Ahavat Zion (1906), Va’ad ha-Merkaz ha-Zoni le Kaira (1909), Bene Zion Kadimah (1910), Association Yalde Zion (1911), le Cercle National Juif (1912), Yalde
Herzl (1913). *Le Cercle Herzl* (1912) gave free courses in Hebrew, Jewish History and Zionism. At Alexandria, the Zionist movement made a slower start. On 3 August 1901, at a meeting attended by 400 people, a local branch was established by a visiting Bar Kokhba delegation from Cairo. Other associations followed: *Tiqvat Zion* (1904), *Po'ale Zion* (1906), *Bene Zion* (1906) and the *Tiqvat Zion Association* which embraced all three. Behor Eliahou Hazan (1888–1908), chief rabbi of Alexandria, set up an emergency committee for the victims of the Kishinev pogroms. As president of the committee, he also collected gifts from the Alexandrian community to be sent to the *Yishuv*. In 1908, the Alexandrian *Bene Zion* association adopted the programme of the First Basle Congress (1897). In 1910, it merged with another Zionist association, *Zeire Zion*, which had been created in 1909 by Russian émigrés in Egypt.

Mass demonstrations at the Beilis affair (1911), collections for the *Yishuv*, conferences, galas and public meetings served to swell the numbers of supporters. In the communities of Cairo and Alexandria, those who organized Jewish activities often assumed a variety of functions, so that at this period Zionism and the Jewish cultural renaissance were often associated.

The Jewish press boasted various newspapers and journals, some of which had but a brief life limited to a few issues. Those published in Alexandria were *Le Messager Sioniste* (1901)—the organ of the Bar Kokhba society—which in 1902 became *Mebassereth Zion* and the *Revue Israélite d’Égypte* (1912–18), published by Pro Cultura Hebraica; and in Cairo a Ladino publication called *Mizraim* (1903), *La Renaissance Juive* (1912) and *La Revue Sioniste* (1917), edited first by Leon Castro, then by Jack Mosseri. These two periodicals exercised a considerable influence on Jewish opinion.

In the years 1914–15, the arrival in Alexandria of 11,227 Russian Jews expelled by the Turks from Palestine provoked a great surge of solidarity throughout the Jewish population and indirectly acted as a stimulus to Zionism. These refugees arrived in Alexandria in a state of complete destitution, without shoes, clothes or linen. Immediately, Egyptian Jewry created a *Comité de Secours aux Réfugiés Russes de Palestine*. This committee organized the disembarkation of the Russian Jews, providing lodging, food, clothing and hygiene. With the approval of the Egyptian government and the help of the British Army, the refugees were given shelter in camps at Gabbary, Chatby and Mafroussa. The committee was able to supplement the funds it had itself raised with material aid from the Egyptian government and from local Christian and foreign charitable organizations. The Alexandrian Jews organized teams of doctors and teachers, social assistants and women sponsors to help with jobs and employment problems, as well as a repatriation-to-Palestine commission.

Within the camps themselves, Hebrew-language schools were established to teach the normal Palestinian programme of studies. For more advanced students, the committee created, at its own expense, a Hebrew school for 320 pupils, directed by Dr Bogratchoff, head of the Hebrew secondary school in Jaffa. In March 1915, the Russian consul requested the British authorities to proceed with the repatriation to Russia of all Jewish refugees fit for military service. The Jewish community, alarmed by antisemitic Russian policies, delegated a committee of notables—led by Edgar Suarès, the president of the Alexandrian community—to intercede with the British High Commissioner on behalf of the young refugees.

The committee proposed—as an alternative—the formation of a Jewish legion of Jewish volunteers to serve on the Palestinian front under British command. A meeting was arranged by Moïse Cattaoui Pasha, the president of the Cairo community, between General Maxwell, commander-in-chief of the British troops in Egypt, and a delegation comprising J. Trumpeldor, Z. Levontzin, Z. Gluskin, M. Margolies and V. Jabotinsky. Empowered to recruit only Englishmen into his force, General Maxwell suggested that the delegation should form a detachment of muleteers who, under the command of Colonel Patterson, seconded by Joseph Trumpeldor, would be responsible for supplies and provisions. It was in this way that in April 1915 the Zion Mule Corps, a unit made up of 600 men of whom 500 were volunteers—350 from the Palestinian refugees and 150 Alexandrian Jews—came into being. The flag, the soldiers’ helmets and the
medical corps all bore the emblem of the star of David. In his long address to his Jewish troops, Colonel Patterson declared:

'It is 2,000 years since any Jew was recognized as a regular soldier, and that is why today the eyes of the world are turned on the Zion Corps. It is not sufficient that those who form the Zion Corps should do their duty like British soldiers; every soldier must do more than his utmost to show that the Jew is a soldier and a man, capable of fighting and of vanquishing in order to win a homeland in his Promised Land.'

The preparation of this battalion—the first Jewish military detachment of modern times—and its departure for Gallipoli and the Dardanelles were occasions for ceremonies of moving solemnity.

In March 1918, a Jewish regiment, formed in London and into which had been integrated a part of the Zion Mule Corps, passed through Alexandria where it was given an enthusiastic welcome. The boys and girls of the Maccabi scouts and the Asmonéens marched alongside the troops with a flourish of bugles, followed by a solemn religious ceremony held at the principal synagogue to honour the soldiers. All these celebrations were national in character, having as their focal points the regiment’s Jewish emblem and flag, Hebrew choirs and Zionist declarations. On 12 August 1918, a Pro Palestine Committee was organized in Alexandria and there, two days later, Weizmann arrived to a rapturous welcome. Substantial sums of money destined for the Yishuv were placed at the disposal of the Committee.

The news that the Balfour Declaration had been incorporated into the peace treaty with Turkey reached Cairo on 26 April 1920 and spread through the city like wildfire. People began to gather from all quarters of the city and in the evening, on an improvised podium in the grounds of the Maccabi club, M. Léon Castro, the vice-president of the Zionist Organization, introduced to the assembled crowd H. Djaen, a delegate from the World Sephardi Federation. Djaen spoke of the historic mission of oriental Jewry, which, because of its links to the Arabs through customs and language, could form a bridge between them and western Jewry. Djaen then asked oriental Jewry: ‘Are we prepared, organized? Do we have a common ideal? What have we done? What have we contributed to the great movement of national rebirth?’ The speaker finished by exhorting oriental Jewry to collaborate with the Ashkenazim in the task of national reconstruction.

Delegations from the Cairo and Alexandria communities and from Egyptian Jewish organizations paid a visit to the High Commissioner to express the great hopes of Egyptian Jewry for the future of the National Home. During Gheoulah week, there were festivities to celebrate the event. In the illuminated Haret el Yahoud, one speaker after another addressed the delirious crowds. Groups of Muslims cried: ‘Long live the Jewish Nation!’ and the Jews reciprocated with: ‘Long live Free Egypt!’ A Muslim and a Copt each congratulated the Jewish people on behalf of their delegations. In the euphoria of the general rejoicing, the Jewish bourgeoisie and common people joined together in celebrating the promise of a Jewish State. Apart from Cairo, the communities of Alexandria, Mansourah, Mehalla, Zagazig, Zefta and Kom Ombo also held celebrations during Gheoulah week. Substantial sums were raised by the Zionist organisations of Alexandria and Cairo and placed at the disposal of the ‘Palestine Restoration Fund’. At Alexandria, an information bureau was set up to help Jewish refugees making a temporary halt on their way to Palestine. Passports for emigrants from eastern Europe being valid only as far as Alexandria, the Egyptian Zionist organizations assisted immigrants to reach Palestine. From 28 April 1920 to 30 November 1927, large donations were provided by Pro Palestina and other Jewish and Zionist organizations to feed and assist 12,000 immigrants. This activity was to continue, albeit underground, almost until 1948.

The Zionists intensified their activities. To attract the lower classes, free Hebrew lessons were held in several areas: Ismailia, Daher, Mousky and Helipolis. When Chaim Weizmann and Colonel Kisch arrived in Cairo at the end of December 1922, 5,000 people turned out to welcome them enthusiastically. Weizmann was borne in triumph outside the station where a huge crowd gave him a passionate ovation. The car carrying
Weizmann and Joseph Cicurel, president of the Zionist Federation, was pushed by a chanting crowd acclaiming Weizmann. In front of the hotel where he and Colonel Kisch left the car, the crowds shouted: 'Long live Doctor Weizmann! Long live Zionism! Long live Balfour! Long live Herbert Samuel!' and then sang the Hatikvah. Weizmann's visit was the occasion of various banquets and speeches. At the Thirteenth Zionist Congress in Carlsbad (1923), Rabbi Abraham Abikhzir of Alexandria represented Egyptian Zionism.

During the twenties, the Zionist message was spread by means of cultural, artistic, musical and sports events, and historical sketches. Collections, balls, lotteries and galas were organized to raise money for organizations in Palestine. Artists, athletes and politicians passing through Egypt maintained a constant flow of information between Palestine and Egypt. At public rallies, Jewish and Muslim personalities stood side by side beneath a portrait of Herzl surrounded by Egyptian and Jewish flags. When the council of the Cairo Community proposed the chief rabbi of Turkey, Haim Nahoum, for the post of chief rabbi in Cairo, it was obliged first to promise that the candidate, an anti-Zionist and supporter of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, would not oppose Zionism. Only on the surety of this promise was Haim Nahoum accepted unanimously by the community.

From 1924 onwards, the Keren Kayemeth in Alexandria became a body of considerable importance, with a network of cells covering several quarters of the city: the Philonia group at Moharem-Bey, Guemilouth Hasidim at Midan, Binou in the Greek quarter, Ibrahimieh at Ramleh and the Maccabi Boy Scouts' group. Each group nominated delegates to the Executive Committee of Keren Kayemeth. Hatehiah was another Zionist youth movement.

In 1933, the Alexandrian Jews subscribed the sum of £E15,000 towards the purchase of land in Palestine—Kfar Yedidjah—which was to be used to settle German refugees. In March 1933, the Egyptian B'nai B'rith Lodge, wishing to set up a League Against Antisemitism and Nazism, organized a massive meeting at the Israélite Orphanage in Cairo. On a protest being lodged by the German Ambassador, the Minister of the Interior banned the demonstration. Haim Nahoum transferred the meeting to the synagogue where it took place in the presence of several thousands.

In Cairo, the Union of Jewish Youth (1923) organized literary, Zionist and musical activities. In 1925, the Society of Jewish Historical Studies was founded; followed, in 1930, by the Jewish Youth Club at Alexandria. Between 1925 and 1935 several groups were formed, among them Moedon Haivri (for the teaching of Hebrew), Wizo, the Hebrew Children's Institution, the Brith Trumpeldor and the Egyptian Society of Friends of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The revival of the Jewish press was led by the review Kadima (Cairo, 1935–37), Al-Shams (in Arabic, 1934–48) and Israel (1919–39), the organ of the Ha-Shomer ha-Za'ir, founded by Albert Mosseri and continued after his death by his widow Mathilde. A weekly, Israel, was published in Hebrew, Arabic and French. The Hebrew edition enjoyed only a very brief period of existence, while the Arab edition continued for 14 years and the French edition provided detailed reports on the rise of Nazism. Despite its initially favourable attitude towards the elite of the Cairo community, Israel succeeded in gaining the public's respect by its fervour, its Zionist convictions and its great courage. For anyone wishing to understand the disparities between western theoretical Zionism and the realities of the Judeo-Arabic environment of that period it is still essential to read Israel systematically. Of no less interest is the weekly L'Aurore, which, like Israel, appeared simultaneously in Cairo and Alexandria. Established in 1924 by Lucien Sciuto, it passed in 1931 into the hands of Jacques Maleh, surviving only with difficulty; a sponsorship committee under Simon Mani removed the threat of closure for a time. L'Aurore, which continued to appear until 1941, managed to reveal between the lines the conflictual anxieties which beset a Jewish enclave within an Arab majority. L'Illustration Juive (1928) was founded in Alexandria by the chief rabbi David Prato, a convinced Zionist. Of a high literary standard, it published entire articles or extracts from contemporary European Jewish works.
presented within a framework of Zionist national and cultural renaissance. *La Voix Juive* was first published by Albert Staraselski in Cairo, then in Alexandria (1931–34); it was revisionist-inspired and received the support of David Prato and the Alexandrian notables. In *La Tribune Juive* (1936–48), founded by Jacques Rabin in Alexandria, it is possible to trace, from within Egyptian Jewry, the development of those external elements, which caused the community’s disintegration two decades later. The veiled exhortations to its readers, the allusions deliberately inserted into its news reports and the silence imposed on it by the censor— which a modern reader must interpret in the light of events—make this newspaper the best indicator of Jewish public consciousness of the coming collective destruction.

This period of Zionist exuberance testifies primarily to an awareness of the collective degradation which had hitherto been borne with resignation and represents an effort to remedy the consequences of the *dhimmi* condition, as well as the internal disintegration of the Jewish communities.

The Sephardi community in Cairo continued to be divided into two opposing factions. On the one side were the notables who gravitated around the president of the community: anti-Zionist and assimilationist and so far removed from Judaism as to have appointed an exclusively Christian teaching staff to the community’s schools. They tried to retain a control over the community which would secure their privileged representative position vis-à-vis the authorities. Dejudaiized as a consequence of having been educated by missionaries and in some cases converted, cautious like all privileged people, these notables did their utmost to neutralize any evolutionary process.

On the other side, centred on the Cairo *B’nai Brith* Lodge, was a dynamic group which had for the first time become conscious of a national Jewish destiny. Its activities were pursued at two levels, the communal and the Zionist, but in the same perspective of Jewish renaissance. Finally, in 1925, after years of internal struggle, democratization of the community’s statutes cleared the way for better coordination and, particularly, for greater freedom of expression. The efforts to improve or establish cultural, educational, health and charitable organizations were aimed at bringing back to the fold the dejudaiized young bourgeoisie, the future leaders of the community, and to halt the steady degeneration of the masses. This prodigious attempt to improve cultural and social life by means of a reassertion of the Jewish national and spiritual heritage appears the most judicious form of Zionism, taking into account the realities of the time. Perhaps it was the only possible way for a Jewish minority which was apolitical both by necessity and by tradition. Surviving in an Arab ocean and suffering the dual alienation of both Islam and colonialism, it was still emerging from the effects of the traditional *dhimmi* status.

In the Alexandrian community, which had been put on a better organizational footing by the chief rabbi, Behor Eyahou Hazan (1888–1908), the notables were united in support of the efforts of his successor David Prato, for whom Judaism’s only chance of survival lay in an ‘equal emphasis on all its constituent elements’. “The Jewish question cannot be solved without Eretz Israel, which is a primordial force”, he wrote, but in his view it was not enough to have a ‘sense of being bound together nationally, economically, socially, professionally or cooperatively, if the spiritual element is lacking”. If the spiritual heritage received stronger emphasis, it was largely because cosmopolitan Alexandria and its materialistic climate tended to encourage alienation from and indifference to the Jewish religion, even to the point of conversion.

The leaders of Egyptian Jewry were more aware than western Zionists of the ambiguities of Judeo-Arab coexistence and, being also far from the nerve-centres of European diplomacy, their principal concern was to halt communal disintegration and infuse into a demoralized Jewry the grandeur of their nation’s history. Zionist values were thus channelled into a process of social and cultural recovery for communities only just emerging from *dhimmi* servitude. In contrast to the Cairo community, a significant section of the elite in Alexandria committed itself to this task: the Rolo, Green, de Menasce,
Nadler, Aghion, Piha and Goar families, for example. The Rolo sons joined the Jewish Legion; Jack Goar’s two sons and other Egyptian Jews volunteered for the British army during World War II.

But the disagreements with the Zionist Executive were growing more acrimonious, on matters both of form and of principle. For example, the European Zionists were extremely reluctant to see funds invested locally which they considered should have been directed to the Yishuv, whereas the heads of the communities declined to sacrifice pressing local needs at a time of selective and limited immigration. For them to have financed the development of the Yishuv, access to which was primarily, if not exclusively, reserved for Ashkenazi Jews would have meant to condemn Egyptian Jewry to disappear by a double process of disintegration: through assimilation and conversion (already rife among the élite) and, at the other end of the social scale, as a result of the ignorance and indigence of the masses. Basically, the divergence of views was ideological in character. The political atheistic Zionism of the socialist leaders, which had grown out of the socio-cultural Judeo-Christian symbiosis in Europe, represented, at the cultural and socio-political levels, something entirely alien to the reality of a Jewish minority in an Islamic country under colonial rule. With regard to the Jewish communities in Egypt, this dejudaized Zionism ran exactly counter to fundamentalist Zionism, grounded as it was in national and religious values.

The repercussions of these disagreements made themselves felt in various ways in the relationship between the native communities and the newer Ashkenazi elements, who, although Zionist, differed in their attitude towards Aliyah, and had come to Egypt either as temporary refugees or to seek their fortune. Alien to the established indigenous communities and dissociated from their past or future, these newcomers busied themselves translating and disseminating among the local Jewish population the meagre supply of Zionist literature in Yiddish or in German furnished by the Zionist Executive. The overriding aim of their activities was not to lose the Jewish youth educated in the schools of the Alliance Israélite Universelle. The chief goal of all these efforts, pursued over a period of some 40 years, may be summarized as follows: moral and financial support for the Yishuv, a declared solidarity with the Jewish people and the rehabilitation, socially and culturally, of the indigenous masses—aims conceived as a necessary prerequisite for a national renaissance. The impact of these efforts on the communities can only be determined by a study of the size of Egyptian Aliyah and its sociological stratification.

To complete this brief survey of the communal situation, we must also briefly consider the Jewish minority’s relations with its environment: i.e. the Muslim majority, the Christian minority, and the colonial power. As regards the Muslim population, traditional anti-Jewish animosity was neutralized by the colonial power, which until World War I operated with nominal Ottoman consent. The Egyptian Islamo-nationalist movement was organized against England and also against the Pan-Arab movement, whose Decentralisation Party—probably under French inspiration—had been set up in Cairo by Syrian Christians. In comparison with these struggling forces, the small Jewish community—only recently liberated de jure from centuries of servitude and paralysed by divisions within its own ranks as well as by the attitude of its financial leaders who still behaved like the frightened humiliated rayas—seemed inoffensive and insignificant.

On the other hand, Egyptian Jewry became a target for the Christian communities, who, having first been emancipated and then treated preferentially as a result of the pro-French policies of Mehemet Ali and his successors, were now looking to eliminate an economic rival. At the political level, the Arab press, which was principally in the hands of Syrian Christians, circulated among the masses a virulent brand of Christian anti-Zionism and anti-Judaism which was adopted by the monks and nuns of the schools where the Jewish middle-class was educated. Recent memories of periodical accusations of ritual murder and acts of aggression against both individuals and synagogues—by and large the responsibility of groups of Levantine hooli-
gans, mainly Greeks and Maltese living in the ports—prompted a few vindictory publications in Arabic by Jewish writers.

During these years of Zionism's gestation in Egypt, when it was seeking to redefine itself in new formulae adapted to local socio-cultural characteristics, the overall picture appears to have been as follows. Egyptian Jewry was entering a transitional phase which was the direct result of international contingencies. Having emerged from the bondage of the past towards emancipation under colonial rule, it seemed to be ceding ground to its more powerful rivals—the Christian communities—who were benefiting both politically and educationally from European support. Indicative of its weakness was the fact that it relied on foreign succour: witness the interventions by representatives of western Jewry and the Alliance Israélite Universelle with the administrative authorities, and also its dependence on the Zionist Executive in Europe. Stability, economic growth and the modernizing reforms introduced by the British protectorate in Egypt combined to undermine and break down the archaic socio-religious structures which had ensured the communities' survival in a traditional Islamic society. However, these socio-economic improvements brought with them many problems both internal and external. In effect, emancipation and the incursion of European customs were having the same corrosive effect on Jewish life as on Muslim society. What had once been orthodox and patriarchal communities were now transformed into congregations which, ignorant of their past, continued, off-handedly, the ritual of religious observance. In an environment suffering the disruptive effects of colonisation, Egyptian Jewry began to seek new answers to the question: 'How is it possible to live a Jewish life in a non-Jewish society?' Thus within Judaism itself and underlying this period of Zionist exuberance, which served in a sense as an escape-valve, can be discerned a profound process of change in manners and attitudes. To this internal confusion Zionism contributed its own regenerative ideological stimulus, a stirring hope of messianic national dimensions. But how did this new element present itself to oriental Jewry in practical terms?

On the whole, the political attitudes of the Zionist Executive towards Turks and Arabs were inevitably based on alleged 'Islamic tolerance'. In part through ignorance, in part through political sagacity, this slogan not only went against the evidence of Oriental Jewish (and Christian) history but also misrepresented the Jewish (or Christian) condition in Islamic territory. Furthermore, it implied that the formula, 'a dominant majority/an oppressed Jewish minority' was applicable only in the West; as the Zionist responses to these problems were concerned with or derived from that context, it was assumed that, since oriental Jewry rejoiced in the most benign tolerance at the hands of Islam, it could not define itself politically within the oppression/liberation dynamic which applied exclusively to western Jewry. The decision to stake everything in political terms on Arab 'tolerance' was an important factor in the historico-cultural alienation of oriental Jewry, which regarded Zionism as the solution to the plight of western Jewry, although in fact it proved to be the principal solution to its own condition. Moreover, by denying the origins of the adamant pan-Arabic opposition to Zionism, European Zionists had perforce to ignore or temporarily dismiss the fundamental problems of oriental Jewry. Thus, on the one hand they calmed the community with assurances of Judeo-Arab harmony and, on the other, exhorted them to abandon jobs and possessions in order to emigrate en masse to a country where immigration was not only restricted but selective. Such paradoxes scarcely helped young Jews to achieve a realistic assessment of either their present situation or their future. Zionist propaganda methods indicate a similar psychological defectiveness. Activities in cultural circles and clubs continued to revolve around Europe. Discussions were given over entirely to the problems of the Jews in Europe and the history of Polish or Russian Judaism, as if Egyptian and oriental Judaism, which was only rarely a topic of conversation, did not exist. The dances consisted of horas, tcherkassies, polkas and
rondas, totally alien, even shocking in the oriental environment. Similarly, the language and the propaganda itself were quite beyond the grasp of the orientals and reflected the preoccupations of foreign cultures. 'Masses', 'proletarians' and 'class-struggles' were concepts devoid of any concrete reality for small communities in the process of *embourgeoisement*, still patriarchal in their customs and permeated with the class prejudices common to the Arab world. The different religious communities were distinctly separated from one another, and within each community the barriers separating the social classes were no less strict. Zionism, a socialist ideology preaching sexual equality and glorifying agricultural and manual labour, was both original and revolutionary but ran flagrantly counter to the traditional values of Arab society.

In view of such factors, it is scarcely surprising that the activities of the Zionists failed either to penetrate beyond the surface of Egyptian Jewish life or to merge with it. For oriental Jews steeped in Arab culture, with only a superficial acquaintance with Western values, what solution could a Zionism impregnated with Russian culture bring to their particular preoccupations? A Jewish minority living in the heart of a Muslim world (itself engaged in a national and religious struggle), and already culturally alienated by a European education incompatible with Arab society, could not but see in this facet of Zionism a Jewish form of alienation, trying to superimpose patterns of thought and actions entirely at odds with its own basic mental structure. Moreover, oriental Zionists, more religious in their inspiration and impregnated by the orthodoxy of communal attachment, reproved the socialist atheism of their western brethren. Indisputably, the irreligious attitude of the Russian and Polish leaders aroused within the local communities an antipathy which expressed itself on a political level. Moreover, these communities were brought into disrepute by the subversive activities of Communists, mostly Jews of Russian extraction, some of whom were Soviet agents. Notwithstanding the violent anti-Zionism of these Communists, Egyptian Jewry tended to lump together all Russians, due to an ignorance of the internal struggles taking place within Russian Jewry and confused by their common origin and similar socialist convictions. Thus, as much from the necessity of survival as by ideological choice, the leaders of the Egyptian Jewish communities were inclined to steer away from Russian currents, whether anti-Zionist, Bolshevik, Zionist-atheist, and to seek their own way of manoeuvring between the reefs of Pan-Arabism.

In the thirties, Islam and Arabism played a predominant role in political developments in Egypt. Whilst the campaign for national independence fuelled animosity towards England and the Balfour Declaration, the penetration of Western customs provoked a xenophobia which had its roots in Islamic fundamentalism. Zionism was thus forced into a period of retreat conditioned by the advance of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Arabism, both strongly influenced by fascism and anti-Jewish agitation in Palestine. It was against the Islamic xenophobia of the one and the Arab-Christian anti-Judaism of the other, with its political and theological elements that Egyptian Jewry was obliged to defend itself at a moment when the Zionist Executive was preoccupied with rescuing European Jewry.

Measures of support for the *Yishuv* were however, still openly undertaken. A farm to introduce kibbutz-life was created near Cairo by Victor Pilosof; other farms existed on the Toriel estate near Alexandria and, from 1937, on that of Elie Shama. An Aid Committee for Jews from Germany provided money to house immigrants at Wadi-Hawareth and near Petah Tikvah. Zionist balls, fundraising and many other activities were discreetly organized. By virtue both of its geographical situation and its history, Egyptian Jewry was indeed, destined more than any other community, to experience simultaneously the traumas affecting Palestinian Jewry and the convulsions of the Arab world. Incapable of establishing a common language with the Zionist Executive and excluded from the Pan-Islamic orbit, into which the Arab world with which it still retained so
many links was being drawn, it remained troubled and uncertain, although not inactive. At the beginning of the thirties, the Egyptian Jewish press, employing the weapons of information and boycott, launched a sharp offensive against the Nazi regime. This irritated Germany as well as Arab and Egyptian nationalists. In response, the Nazis set up a German League to counter the Jewish campaign and distributed free pamphlets to doctors, lawyers and civil servants. The Cahiers Juifs was seized, actions were brought in the courts, and pamphlets published by the Jewish-Egyptian League attacking German antisemitism were confiscated. Yet the Protocols of the Elders of Zion were sold or distributed free of charge along with other antisemitic material. Umberto Jabès sued van Meeteren, the honorary consul of Latvia and the Nazi leader in Egypt, for libel of and injury to the Jewish people. In 1937, a campaign to boycott German goods, sponsored by Jewish elements and supported by the Jewish press and public meetings, met with a large measure of success among the Jewish population. Even scouts from Zionist organizations called on families to inform them of the plight of European Jewry.

However, the anti-Nazi struggle, adherence to the Balfour Declaration and aid to Jewish immigrants and Zionist bodies merely compromised Egyptian Jewry still further; yet such activities were insignificant when compared with the effort required to ward off the dangers inherent in Islamic Pan-Arabism which threatened to split it asunder from within. The community’s attitude was determined by two factors: the insecure legal status, which limited its rights, and the general political climate in Egypt.

True, a tiny minority of Jews had succeeded, with much difficulty, in obtaining Egyptian nationality after the 1929 Nationality Act but the great majority, although of Egyptian stock, remained stateless. Their striving for citizenship was inevitably complicated by the display of overt militant support for a nationalism already regarded in Egypt as hostile. It was by no means on the political plane alone that Zionism found itself at odds with Arab nationalism. In the economic sphere, it demanded a total commitment to the economic development of the Yishuv; yet the developing Egyptian economy required an equal commitment by all Egyptians irrespective of religion. A Jew who had recently acceded to Egyptian nationality or who aspired to it could scarcely boycott his own country’s goods in favour of those from Palestine, when (in order to dispel suspicions about his allegiances) he was expected to manifest a greater measure of loyalty to his Egyptian homeland. When it came to allocating charitable funds there was no less embarrassment. Should they be invested in local projects intended to alleviate the poverty and hardships of the native Jewish population or should they be redirected to Palestinian institutions?

There is no doubt that Egypt’s changing attitude towards Zionism justified communal fears. If, in the early years of the century, Egyptian nationalists had considered the Palestinian question secondary to Egypt’s struggle for independence, by the 1930s the situation had changed. To be sure, independence remained the primary objective, but from then on Egypt considered itself a ‘Muslim and Arab land’. The broad spread of political options which had previously allowed Zionism to develop was now noticeably contracting. In particular, Egypt’s progressive commitment to Arabism narrowed the scope of Zionist activity. Both Egyptian religious circles and Arab nationalists were becoming intensely interested in the Palestinian question and were of the opinion that Zionism was a threat to the security of the Arab Muslim fatherland’. Cairo became a centre of religious nationalism from which missionaries were sent out to various places such as the Sudan, Japan and India; this proselytism harboured an undercurrent of xenophobia as a result of which Egyptian Jewry was made consciously aware of each phase in the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine. Newspapers and periodicals daily published articles and analyses of Islamic Pan-Arabism. The appearance of a number of books glorifying Islam galvanized a religious mood of exhilaration which the parties in power used for their own demagogic ends. In 1935, the first contacts between the
Palestinian Arabs and the Muslim Brotherhood party were established. The Brotherhood procured arms and money for the Palestinians, gave them military training and even joined in attacks on Jewish villages in Palestine.

In Egypt, the active anti-Jewish propaganda of the Muslim Brotherhood took the form of speeches, pamphlets and turbulent demonstrations. Between 1937 and 1939, a number of paramilitary organizations sprang up, inspired by Nazi and fascist models. The violence they preached only served to aggravate the insecurity of a sub-proletariat which had emigrated from the countryside to the industrial shanty-towns. Between 1936 and 1938 wave upon wave of strikes sparked off a series of bloody confrontations with the police. From October 1938, a succession of Arab and Muslim Interparliamentary Congresses for Palestine were held in Cairo and Alexandria. Fascist and Nazi influences, stimulated by the close collaboration between the Third Reich and the Mufti of Jerusalem, isolated Egyptian Jewry even further. Nonetheless, even during the war, when Egypt was encircled by Axis troops, the Jewish community continued to proclaim its Anglophile, pro-Allied and pro-Zionist feelings.

The Jewish press gives us a glimpse of the contradictory tendencies that were paralysing Egyptian Jewry. *L'Aurore*, the paper which best mirrors the Egyptian Jewish conscience, advised Jews to exercise the greatest caution ‘in view of certain recent declarations and articles’ and, like any minority under violent attack, it published a profession of loyalty. The silence on political events at home was occasionally broken to permit an allusion to the ‘ignoble insinuations to which Egypt is lending an ear’. Later, Nazi successes and Rommel’s advance to the gates of Alexandria encouraged acts of violence against the Jews. One journalist, breaking the conspiracy of silence, wrote an obscure and passionate article which concluded: ‘I cannot say anything further on this matter in the present circumstances’; he knew that his readers would understand his underlying warnings.

Discreet references were made to past events and to the troubled present which required prudence and which further conditioned Egyptian Jewry’s negative attitude to Zionism. Silent fear can be read between the lines in every page of the Jewish press. The Zionists complained of dwindling membership and of being made to feel unwelcome; the young people who collected money for the KKL were finding doors shut in their faces. The charge of divided loyalties was a serious threat to a community, the majority of which was stateless, in a country that was now gripped by fervid xenophobic nationalism. In 1937, pamphlets appeared calling for the murder of Jews. Discreetly, because it would have been dangerous to attract attention, the President of the Cairo community intervened and the pamphlets were seized. In September 1937, at the League of Nations in Geneva, the Egyptian delegate announced that his country was opposed to the partition of Palestine proposed by the Peel Commission, and officially confirmed that Egypt supported the Pan-Arab movement.

One month later, during the court case brought against Maurice Fargeon, author of ‘Hitler, tyran moderne’, the tribunal reminded defence counsel that Egypt was Germany’s friend.

It was without doubt this growing climate of fear which moved the Association of Egyptian Jewish Youth in November 1937 to publish a manifesto challenging Jews to take part in the great work of Egyptian national renaissance. The manifesto was significantly entitled: ‘Egypt is our homeland, Arabic our language’.

But the following month, the former Vice-President of the Cairo Zionist Organization was vigorously taken to task by the Zionists for having spoken approvingly of a possible integration of a Palestinian Jewish minority into an Arab state and for having expressed support for the ‘anti-Zionist and anti-Jewish’ Pan-Arabic movement. Illustrated tracts appeared entitled: ‘Any Muslim who shoves a knife into the guts of a Jew will be sure of a place in paradise’.

In May 1938, during the anti-Jewish disturbances in Palestine, Egyptian Jewry nonetheless found the courage to associate itself publicly with the *Yishuv*, despite the turbulent political climate and its own vulnerability. At a time when azharists were running through the streets of Cairo and
Alexandria shouting: ‘Down with the Jews!’ and voices in the Senate were heard calling for steps to be taken against the ‘Jewish usurers’.

42 The Presidents of the communities of Cairo and Alexandria wrote a letter to the Egyptian prime minister on behalf of the Jews of Egypt, living ‘in a land essentially Muslim’. Each phrase of the petition in favour of the Yishuv was couched in the most circumspect terms possible, for fear of appearing presumptuous or arrogant; at the same time, reassurances were given that Palestinian Jewry would never desecrate the Holy Places.

43 In a parliamentary speech on 21 December 1938, the former minister Ismail Sidky Pasha praised the Hitlerite and fascist regimes; in 1939 increasing anti-Jewish hostility broke out in a spate of leaflets, threats, street demonstrations and bomb incidents in synagogues and Jewish shops in Cairo, Mansourah, Mehallah and Assiut. In 1940 the prime minister, Ali Maher, expressed his intention of declaring the gates of Cairo open to the advancing German troops.

44 In these troubled days, the Zionists were divided among themselves. The New Zionist Organization in Cairo, Alexandria and Heliopolis represented the party of Jabotinsky’s revisionists. Bitterly, but discreetly, in view of the unstable political situation, they criticized Jerusalem’s stubborn refusal to invest money and energy on behalf of Zionist propaganda in Egypt. They regretted that the Jerusalem Zionist Executive made a habit of requesting financial assistance from Egypt without being prepared to finance propaganda work there. They complained about the poor working conditions, the indifference bordering on hostility shown by communal leaders, the poverty of what little material was available and the difficulty of obtaining immigration visas for Palestine. They deplored the fact that a generation of enthusiastic and idealistic young people was being deprived of Zionist instruction out of sheer negligence. Nevertheless, a wide and varied range of activities was still provided: Hebrew lessons, the history of Judaism and Zionism, the economic and geographical history of Palestine and information about current events in Palestine. There were farms where young people were given an introduction to kibbutz life, but the sanitary and working conditions there were so deplorable that two trainees died. In addition, help continued to be given, secretly, to illegal immigrants from Europe striving to enter Palestine.

45 In this context, Weizmann’s charge that there was no such thing as Zionism in Egypt indicated a lack of understanding of the oriental Jewish reality. At a time of collective insecurity for Judaism as a whole, the oriental communities were content merely to gain a little time and to maintain the status quo as far as possible by means of a subtle blend of submissiveness and compromise, an attitude inherited over centuries. Any inopportune and discordant declaration from Zionists, at a time when there was no available refuge, would have endangered the security of a community already deprived of its national rights, which lived among a Muslim population violently hostile to Zionism and a prey to extreme nationalistic outbursts of xenophobia. Until the situation cleared, it was necessary to concentrate on the everyday requirements of the indigent Jewish population and attend to their religious, educational and medical needs. It was in this atmosphere, already highly charged with religious xenophobia and nationalistic demands, that the explosive passions ignited by the Israeli-Arab conflict were nourished. These facts serve to illustrate just how difficult were the conditions with which Egyptian Jewry had to contend, inhibited by its psycho-cultural structures and blocked by the socio-political configuration whose essential elements we have here tried to trace. Indeed, it is amazing to contemplate the courageous spirit shown by this small community (65,000–75,000) which manifested, at a critical period of its existence, such remarkable qualities of Jewish solidarity.

46 During World War II, close bonds were forged between Palestinian Jewish soldiers stationed in Egypt and the Jewish communities. The president of the Zionist Federation, perturbed by local anti-Jewish violence, renewed his appeals to the Yishuv to help organize Egyptian Jewry’s emigration. Two delegates were despatched and with the
assistance of Palestinian soldiers they were able, from 1943 onwards, to do a useful, even if ephemeral, work. Militant activity was centred on Cairo and Alexandria: there it was possible to find help for agricultural training, illegal immigration and locally printed Zionist literature. In the youth clubs, Zionists and Communists came face to face; several Communists even became Zionists and emigrated to Palestine. During Passover 1945 a hundred young men and women emigrated to Palestine, dressed in British uniforms lent them by Palestinian soldiers. Arab fishing craft secretly conveyed immigrants to their destination. The collective use of false passports and a down-payment of £40 were intended to guarantee the traveller's return. The Egyptian immigrants created new kibbutzim: Bror Hagil, Nakhsimon, Yogeve.

After the pogroms on 2 November 1945 by Arab bands during which 10 Jews were killed and 350 wounded in Egypt (and 130 killed and 450 badly injured in neighbouring Libya), soldiers from Palestine instructed young Egyptian Jews in the techniques of self-defence and the use of firearms. In the event of an attack on the Jewish quarter, these youngsters were immediately to inform the soldiers. A few young Egyptian Jews went to Palestine in 1946 for a short course of training in the Haganah, which later proved fruitful. When, in 1948, the most destitute section of the Jewish population was besieged by the Arab mob in its millenary-old ghettos, it proved not only able to defend itself but even put its attackers to flight, discouraging further assaults by the strength of its small but effective resistance.

In the winter of 1947–48, Hillel Schwarz, an Ashkenazi Jew who had been a founder-member of the Egyptian Communist Party, established the Jewish League Against Zionism, which was, however, dissolved after only a few weeks for lack of Jewish members.

In conclusion to this essay, it should be recalled that in May 1948, having been warned secretly of an imminent wave of arrests, all the Palestinian Zionist delegates managed to escape from Egypt, leaving the local Zionists helpless and leaderless on the eve of the destruction of Egyptian Jewry.