

The Pogroms of 1881 as a Part of the Historians' Personal experience and as a Building Block of the Collective Memory.

Jewish historiography as "Counterhistory"

Russian-Jewish¹ history as well as Russian-Jewish historiography has the special structural feature of being the historiography of a people that underwent a long period of collective subordination. This feature integrates Russian-Jewish historiography (dealing with only a limited time frame from the late 18th century on) vertically in the history of the Jewish People after the destruction of the Second Temple and horizontally in the historiography of other minorities in the Russian Empire in the late 19th Century. It thus speaks to historians of Jewish history and historians of the Russian Empires alike.² This structural feature caused Russian-Jewish historiography in the past to view the history of the Jews in Russia in a manner, that suggested, that Jews were the mere objects of Russian governmental politics.

Russian-Jewish historiography started with accounts of Russian legislation concerning the Jews. Most of those 19th century - Russian-Jewish lay historians were lawyers or at least juridically trained and examined the legal status of the Jews in Russia.³ This led to a kind of historiography writing "a history not of what the Jews did, but of what was done to them."⁴ Historiography in the 19th Century was mostly done from the point of view of political history. It was describing the historical events and deeds of states and states men (predominantly male) and very often foreign policy, the history of diplomacy and warfare, was in the center of interest. It was thus a problem writing the history of a stateless, non-territorial people. The great Jewish historians of the 19th Century with their master narratives tried to avoid this problem. Gräetz for example found the very essence of Jewish history within ist "history of suffering and learning". Suffering is still the part of history that describes "what was done to the Jews", but the history of learning changed the history of the Jews into a history of ideas without institutions or political or at least semi-political activities

¹ About the problem of calling the Jews of the Russian Empire Russian Jews: Lederhändler, Eli. Did Russian Jewry exist prior to 1917? In: Ro'i, Yaacov. Jews and Jewish Life in Russia and the Soviet Union. Portland 1995. S. 15 - 27. I will still use this notion because many of the Jews I am dealing with (f.e. Dubnov) had an identity as a Russian Jew. This is part of the problem I am dealing with.

² Vgl. Nathans, Benjamin. On Russian-Jewish Historiography. In: Historiography of Imperial Russia: the profession and writing of history in a multinational state. Hg. v. Thomas Sanders. New York 1999. S. 397-432. S. 397.

³ Vgl. z.B. I.G. Oršanskij. Russkoe zakonodatel'stvo o evrejach. Očerki i issledovanija. S. Peterburg 1877.

⁴ This critic was uttered against Gessen's work. Quotation from: R.Š. Ganelin and V.E. Kel'ner. Problemy istoriografii evreev v Rossii 2-ja polovina XIX veka - 1-ja četvert' XX veka. In: Evrei v Rossii: istoriografičeskie očerki. Moskva, Jerusalim 1994. S. 197.

or frameworks. Simon Dubnov started of from there, but for his final synthesis he found Gräetz insufficient. 1925 in "The Sociological View of Jewish History. Introduction to the Weltgeschichte" he criticizes Gräetz' history: "The main content of the entire life of the people was thus usually reduced to a history of literature, on the one hand, and to a martyrology on the other. The horizon of history was confined within these limits."⁵ He did not want to write a history of mere passive objects, but rather one of an autonomous people: "This nation, endowed with perennial vitality, fought always and everywhere for its autonomous existence in the sphere of social life as well as in all other fields of cultural activity."⁶ That made him the "cultural priest"⁷ of an important cultural and political movement among the Russian Jews: Jewish nationalism. Thus Dubnov's historiography can be seen as "Counterhistory"⁸, being not the history of mere passive historical objects but active historical subjects creatively designing their life as a people; and thus viewing the World History and especially Russian History from a totally different angle, shedding new light on the social reality of the subjects of the Russian Empire.

But for that very reason Dubnov did not omit the persecutions and deeds done to the Jewish people. Dubnov's historiography is also a "Counterhistory" in terms of blaming the tsarist regime for their ruthless politics against the Jews, the suppressed nation; showing the darkest side not only of Russian governmental politics but also of the xenophobia of Russian educated society. Dubnov, like his contemporaries, suffered from the status of being a rightless Jew in the Russian Empire. He and his fellow Jews were neglected by the ruling society in the Russian Empire. But is this the only reason, why Jewish nationalism arose at all? Is the rise of Jewish Nationalism a mere product of Russian anti-Jewish politics of the mighty tsarist regime and antisemitic sentiments in the cultural sphere? As a cultural historian I would argue for a more integrationist view on Russian-Jewish history. Even though I recognize the impact of despair of the Jewish cultural elite in Russia, I would like to look at the uprising of Jewish nationalism in Russia apart from the Russian-Jewish antagonism. Surprisingly enough Russian-Jewish history is still seen very often from the point of view of what kind of measures were placed upon the Jews by the Russian government and/or society and how the Jews reacted. I would like to claim that the emergence of Jewish nationalism,

⁵ Dubnov, S.M. *The Sociological View of Jewish History. Introduction to the Weltgeschichte.* (1925) English in: *Nationalism and History. Essays on Old and New Judaism by Simon Dubnow.* Ed. with an introductory Essay by Koppel S. Pinson. (Quoted as "Nationalism and History" in the following text.) S. 336-353. (Quoted in the following text as "Sociological View"). S. 338.

⁶ ebd.

⁷ Funkenstein, Amos. *Perceptions of Jewish History.* Berkeley 1993. S. 20.

⁸ Heschel, Susannah. *Jewish Studies as Counterhistory.* In: *Insider/Outsider: American Jews and Multiculturalism.* Hg.v. David Biale, Michael Galchinsky, Susannah Heschel. Berkeley 1998. S. 101-115.

even if it cannot be seen completely separated from the Russian anti-Jewish politics, is a movement that also arises from within. It is caused not only by an outer catastrophe, but also by cultural and political development within the Eastern European Jewish world itself.

I would also like to show, how Dubnov, the historian of the active autonomous Jewish people, linked the emergence of Jewish nationalism with the Russian oppression in his master narrative. This is especially interesting, because in his own biography it becomes clear how complex the way of "nationalization" is, and how oversimplifying it would be to see his "nationalization" only as an answer to Russian anti-Jewish politics.

The pogroms of 1881

It is a paradigm of Russian Jewish History that the Pogroms of 1881-2 are a "widely acknowledged watershed"⁹ in Russian Jewish History: "The year 1881 marks the outbreak of a wave of pogroms directed against the Jews of Russia and has come to be associated with a complex of ideological, cultural, and demographic changes which transformed modern Jewry profoundly and irrevocably."¹⁰ In other words the pogroms of 1881 are seen as break in the search of identity of the Russian Jews. During the 19th Century, especially from the era of the Great Reforms on, the Jews of the Russian Empire were encouraged to acculturate to the ideals of the high Russian culture. Many of them took this change in order to achieve at least individual acceptance within the Russian society, f.e. in terms of the privilege to move out of the pale of settlement, education and employment in academic professions.¹¹ The pogroms of 1881 marked a sharp break of this acculturation process. Russian Jews found out by those shocking and brutal events that the Russian society, they wanted to join, rejected them and even persecuted them in the worst manner. There would be no emancipation or equal acceptance no matter how "Russian" the Jews would become. Most of those Jews, who were in the middle of their personal acculturation progress, were already very much estranged from their traditional Jewish world in terms of religion. Enlightened and secularized as they were, they couldn't turn back to the traditional Jewish shtetl, to the world of Talmud and Thora. That is why they turned towards a worldly way of Jewishness. The rise of Jiddish literature, Jewish national, socialist and zionist movements is understood in this context. Therefore the revolutionary uprising of Jewish national movement with its different branches is mostly seen

⁹ Berger, David. Preface. In: *The Legacy of Jewish Migration: 1881 and its impact*. Hg. v. David Berger. New York 1983. (Im Folgenden als: *Legacy*) S. ix.

¹⁰ ebd.

¹¹ Vgl. z.B. Tejtel', Jakov L. *Aus meiner Lebensarbeit: Erinnerungen eines jüdischen Richters im alten Rußland*. (Neudruck) Teetz 1999. (1. Auflage 1929)

as a reaction to the hostility of the Russian society. Therefore the notion of 1881 being a "watershed" hints to the understanding of Russian Jewish history through the lense of the moving force of "what was done to the Jews"; the Russian Jewish antagonism.

It is true that any paradigm needs to simplify the complexity of events and any model, that is as complex as the world itself would not be sufficient, to describe this world, because we would get lost in this complexity. I do not want to contradict the convincing explanations Frankel and others gave about revolutionary impact of the pogroms of 1881-2 on Russian Jewish history¹², but in this paper I would like to confront the notion of 1881 being a "revolution" with the view on the "longue duree" of Russian Jewish cultural history.

These two approaches to "1881" become visible in the life and work of Simon Dubnov; in the tension between the man, whose intellectual development took place in the last decades of the 19th century, and the historian of the Jewish people, who "formed our contemporary image of the pogroms"¹³. I want to confront Dubnov's memoirs with his historical work. I am aware of the methodological problems to take an autobiography for "real personal experience": Especially Dubnov's "Kniga Žizni"¹⁴ is very stylized, his own life becomes a symbol and his spiritual development is given a distinct meaning. But on the other hand, it would also challenge the book, which he calls "Materials for a History of my time", to be confronted with Dubnov's "History" of his time. To avoid the risk of taking everything in his memoirs for granted, the "Kniga Žizni" is contextualised with other sources, such as Dubnov's early writings or a broader historical view on Russian-Jewish history in the 19th century.

Individual Experience: Dubnov's Biography and the Pogroms of 1881

Time of Fusion

When we take a look at Dubnov's personal experiences of 1881 and his reaction, we come to the conclusion, that at least for him 1881 was not a rupture. He rather fits in the context, Čerikover suggests, saying: "The ideological crisis of the Jewish intelligentsia was felt *before* the pogroms and, on the other hand, the turn to nationalism was not characteristic of *all*

¹² Vgl. z.B. Frankel, Jonathan. *Prophecy and Politics. Socialism, Nationalism and the Russian Jews, 1862-1917*. Cambridge u.a. 1981. S. 49-132. (Im Folgenden als: *Prophecy*.)

¹³ Lambroza, Shlomo. *Simon Dubnov and the Pogroms in Late Imperial Russia*. In: *A Missionary for History. Essays in Honor of Simon Dubnov*. Hg. v. Kristi Groberg and Avraham Greenbaum. Minneapolis 1998. S. 74-77. S. 73.

¹⁴ Dubnov, S.M. *Kniga Žizni. Materialy dlja istorii moego vremeni. Vospominanija i razmyšlenija*. S.-Peterburg 1998. (Im Folgenden als: *Kniga*.)

Russian-Jewish intelligentsia."¹⁵ Dubnov's early years were a time, when many young Russian Jews struggled for intellectual development in terms of russification¹⁶. In his periodical "Ha-Karmel" of 1866 Jehuda Leib Gordon wrote a Hebrew poem "Awake my people!", that was as much a signal for the Russian Jewish Youth as a symbol for the zeitgeist among them:

"Awake, my people! How long will you slumber?
The night has passed, the sun shines bright.
Awake, lift up your eyes, look around you -
Acknowledge, I pray you, your time and place
The land in which now we live and are born -
Is it not thought to be part of Europa?
Europe - the smallest of Earth's regions,
Yet the greatest of all in wisdom and reason.

This land of Eden [Russia] now opens its gates to you,
Her sons now call you "brother"!
How long will you dwell among them as a guest,
And why do you now affront them?

Already they have removed the weight of suffering from your shoulder,
They have lifted off the yoke from your neck,
They have erased from their hearts gratuitous hatred and folly,
They give you their hand, they greet you with peace.

Raise your head high, straighten your back,
And gaze with loving eyes upon them.
Open your heart to wisdom and knowledge.
Become an enlightened people, and speak their language.

Every man of understanding should try to gain knowledge;
Let others learn all manner of arts and crafts;
Those who are brave should serve in the army;
The farmers should buy ploughs and fields.

To the treasury of the state bring your strength,
Take your share of its possessions, its bounty.
Be a man abroad and a Jew in your tent,
A brother to your countrymen and a servant to your king."¹⁷

Those were the voices of the maskilim in Simon Dubnov's youth. He was born in 1860 in the small belorussian town Mtsislavl and raised in a traditional Jewish way. His grandfather

¹⁵ Cherikover, Elyohu. Revlutsyonere un natsyonale ideologyes. In: Ders. (Hg.) Geshikhte fun der yidisher arbeter bavegung in di fareynikte shtatn. 2 Bde. (Im Folgenden als: Geshikhte). Bd. 1. S. 149.

¹⁶ At least, this is how it is judged by the late, nationalist Dubnov. The term "assimilation" is used here as a term of Dubnov's contemporaries. Not everybody, who was called an "assimilationist" by nationalists or zionists, really struggled for mere "assimilation".

¹⁷ English Quotation after: Berk, Stephen M. Year of Crisis, Year of Hope. Russian Jewry and the Pogroms of 1881-1882. Westport 1985. S. 12-13.

Benzion was a Talmud scholar and Simon went his way through the cheder. Already at the age of ten he got in touch with the then forbidden books of the *haskalah*. He was reading proto-Zionist literature, like Abraham Mapu's "Love of Zion" and at the age of thirteen he was writing his first *haskalah*-pamphlet in Hebrew. He was reading the Hebrew journal of the *maskil* Perez Smolenskin and later on Jehuda Leib Gordens "Ha-Karmel". Also at the age of thirteen he started learning Russian and should stick to Russian as his literary language until the end of his life (with very few exceptions). In the spring of 1874 he went to one of the Uvarov governmental schools and started to learn French there. Being torn more and more into the world of "wisdom and knowledge" he found himself in opposition to his family, his grandfather and the Jewish community of Mtsislavl. With the closing down of the school in the fall of the same year Dubnov's struggle for worldly knowledge and education began. He was trying to achieve education in many of the state schools but was for different reasons rejected everywhere, so e.g. from the rabbinical seminary in Vilna. But he would never stop to struggle for *haskala* (enlightenment). Positivism and utilitarianism became his "new religion and ethics"¹⁸. He became absorbed by the writings of John Stuart Mill and Auguste Comte. With this spiritual turn to modernism he merged into the thought world of the Russian educated youth of the seventies of the 19th Century. In 1880 Dubnov went to St. Petersburg, where he lived illegally and finally started publishing in the Russian Jewish Press. The St. Petersburg Russian Jewish Press was owned and dominated mostly by the wealthy integrationist circles of St. Petersburg Jewry. Their politics found their institution in the "Society for the dissemination of enlightenment among the Jews of Russia" (*Obščestvo dlja rasprostraneniija prosveščrniija meždju evrejami v Rossii: OPE*). The main aim of the OPE was the dissemination of Russian literacy among the Jews and by that means the integration of the Jews in the economic life of the Russian Empire; a thoroughly utilitarian enterprise.

When in 1882 Ida Freidlin, a fellow struggler for *haskalah* from Mtsislavl came to join Dubnov in St. Petersburg because of trouble with her parents, they started living together without formalizing their relationship, because a religious ceremony did not seem suitable for the young freethinkers.¹⁹ Driven by only "love and hunger"²⁰, Dubnov still was struggling for the mankind in general. Jewish problems didn't effect Dubnov much though: "I was increasingly gripped by more general, "eternal" questions."²¹ Dubnov's way into Russian modernity is later described by his daughter:

¹⁸ Dubnov, S.M. *Kniga*. a.a.O. S. 71.

¹⁹ Vgl. for the zeitgeist on those questions: Engelstein, Laura. *The keys to happiness: sex and the search for modernity in fin-de-siecle-Russia*. Ithaca 1992.

²⁰ Dubnov, S.M. *Kniga*. a.a.O. S. 95.

²¹ Dubnov, S.M. *Kniga*. a.a.O. S. 90.

"It was a singular generation: they naively polarized "individual happiness" and the struggle for the good of humanity, and saw no contradiction between the egocentrism of the "critically thinking individual" and the altruistic postulates of serving the people. Vladimir Solovev once formulated the paradoxical credo of the men of the seventies with good-natured irony: "Man is descended from a monkey, therefore let us give up our lives for our kin." Dubnov was a typical child of his time, with ist idealism, ist rigorous moralism, and ist logical inconsistency."²²

Encouraged by his new religion of liberty, positivism and utilitarianism, with their promises of emancipation he strove to become "not only man, but rather Russian"²³. It was the time of the Great Reforms, of the "Policy of Fusion" as Dubnov described it in his "History" later.²⁴ The atmosphere also among the Russian intelligenzija was in favour of Jewish assimilation and emancipation:

"The blast of the reveille which had been sounded in the best circles of Russian society by such humanitarians as Pirogov, and such champions of liberty as Herten, Chernyshevski, and Dobrolubov, were carried through the air into the huge Jewish ghetto of Russia."²⁵

Reaction

But liberal spirit among the Russian Intelligentsia had already come to an end at least from the late sixties on. Brafman's "Kniga Kagala"²⁶ became a big success and made wide circles in Russia believe, that the Jews really formed a "state within a state"²⁷. Dostoevskij's "Diary of a writer"²⁸ proves, that this notion of the Jewish Kahal was also accepted among Russian influential thinkers. Beyond that the left movement, the "narodničestvo" (populists), came after the abolition of serfdom and the painfull existencial struggles of the peasants to the conclusion, that it was not as much the governmental politics towards the peasants, but rather the Jews in their traditional role as merchants and traders, that hindered the economic prosperity of the peasantry. This became known as "Jewish exploitation".²⁹ From the point of

²² Dubnov-Erich, Sophie. The life and work of S.M. Dubnov. Diaspora nationalism and Jewish history. Bloomington u.a. 1991. S. 73.

²³ and thus taking the enlightenment wrong, as he sees it later on: Dubnov, S.M. Die jüdische Geschichte. Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch. Frankfurt ²1921.

²⁴ Dubnov, S.M. History of the Jews in Russia and Poland. From the Earliest Times until the Present Day. 3 Bde. New York 1916. Reprinted 1975. (Im Folgenden als: History) Bd. 2. S. 157ff.

²⁵ ebd. S. 207.

²⁶ Brafmann, Ja. Kniga Kagala. 2. Auflage S.-Peterburg 1882. (1. Auflage: 1868)

²⁷ Vgl. z.B. Katz, Jacob. A State Within a State. The History of an Anti-Semitic Slogan. Jerusalem 1969.

²⁸ Vgl. z.B. Dostoevskij, F.M. Dnevnik pisatelja. Pariz 1946.

²⁹ Vgl. z.B. Mishinsky, Moshe. "Black Reparation" and the pogroms of 1881-1882. In: Pogroms: Anti-Jewish Violence in Modern Russian History. Hg. v. John D. Klier, Schlomo Lambroza. Cambridge 1992. (Im Folgenden als: Pogroms). S. 62-97.

view of history of ideas, the believe in modernity, positivism, liberalism and the ideas of enlightenment were in decline, not only in Russia in the second half of the 19th Century.

Early Jewish national trends

This kind of reaction did not remain unnoticed among all of the Russian Jewish intelligentsia. As Čerikover noted, the turn towards Jewish nationalism in various forms had already gained momentum rapidly from the mid-1870ies.³⁰ With a number of Jewish periodicals and also Jiddish and Hebrew literature, nationalization of Jewish life had several branches to develop along. For example Perez Smolenskin's fight "against the fanatics of orthodoxy in the name of European progress, and against the champions of assimilation in the name of national Jewish culture"³¹ started already in the late 60ies - early 70ies.

This different media of articulation also challenged the monopoly of control over inner-Jewish life until then held by the integrationist and wealthy circles of St. Petersburg Jewry and their politics of "shtadlanstvo", that proved unsuccessfull in the turmoil of pogroms in 1881.

Other protagonists of nationalization arose after the Odessa pogrom of 1871. Not only Michail Kulišer claimed, that the pogrom of 1871 changed the way he thought about Jewish-Russian interaction:

"beneath the apparently accidental and singular Odessa pogrom we discovered something of enduring importance, namely, that Judeophobia was not a theoretical error of some kind ...[but] ... a psychic attitude in which centuries and centuries of hate were reflected."³²

Also Leon Pinsker turned away from assimilation already in the 70ies. Zipperstein views the 70ies in Odessa:

"this decade may nevertheless be charcterized as the beginning of a new cycle in the cultural history of Odessa Jewry, during which local Jewish modernists - hitherto among the foremost exponents of Jewish enlightenment and Russification - began to reevaluate the nature of progress, enlightenment and modernity."³³

1881 nevertheless became a catalyst, in which different movements culminated, and those trends were enforced³⁴.

³⁰ Cherikover, E. a.a.O.

³¹ Dubnov, S.M. History. a.a.O. S. 234.

³² Kulišer, M. K 25-letiju so dnja smerti I. G. Oršanskago. In: Nedelnaja voschoda, 23.11.1900, S. 29. Zitiert nach: Zipperstein, Steven. The Jewish Community of Odessa 1794-1871: Social Characteristics and Cultural Development. Ann Arbor 1980. S. 270.

³³ ebd. S. 273.

³⁴ This is of course also the way, Frankel sees it. Vgl. z.B: Frankel, Jonathan. The Crisis of 1881-82 as a Turning

Dubnov's "antithesis" enforced

But Simon Dubnov was not among those, who reconsidered assimilation, neither before 1881 nor shortly after. His "estrangement was not cured by the national catastrophe" he did not "unite with his people over the fresh graves of our new national martyrs" (to quote himself after the pogroms of 1903).³⁵ After the pogroms of 1903 he recalls the period of 1881:

"As weak as my reaction was to the april pogroms of 1881, (I looked at them as a mere accidental by-product of the assasination of the Tsar on the 1st of March), as deeply was I moved by the new April era of blood-shedding pogroms."³⁶

Čerikover notes, that assimilationist impulses reasserted themselves strongly after 1882.³⁷ In this context we might have to place Dubnov's replique to Leon Pinsker's "Autoemancipation": "What kind of Autoemancipation do the Jews need?"³⁸

Dubnov pledges for reform

In response to the pogroms Dubnov considered in the traditional religion of the Jews to be the obstacle for the civil emancipation of the Jews. He even claims, that "the Jew does not have a religion, but only a system of rites, which are partially absurd; he charishes an entity, that controls all movements of his body, forbids him certain food etc."³⁹ He comes to the conclusion that religious reform is necessary, if the Jews want civil emancipation in terms of assimilation. With this article he embraced reform movements, that can also be seen as a response to the pogroms: the Spiritual-Biblical Brotherhood⁴⁰ founded in Rostov-on-Don in 1880 by Yakov Gordin, and New Israel⁴¹ formed in Odessa in 1882 by Yakov Priluker. Their objective was also the integration into Russian society and some of their ideas were inspired by populist thought (the strive for "productivness of the Jews" in response to the accusation of "Jewish exploitation"; again an utalitarian objective): farming communes were on the social

Point in Modern Jewish History. In: Legacy. a.a.O. S. 9-22. (Im Folgenden als: Crisis) S. 12.

³⁵ Dubnov, S.M. 9th Letter: A Historic Moment (The Question of Emigration). In: Nationalism and History. a.a.O. S. 199.

³⁶ Dubnov, S.M. Kniga. a.a.O. S. 241.

³⁷ Cherikover, E. a.a.O.

³⁸ Dubnov, S.M. Kakaja Samoemancipacija nužna Evrejam. (S'examiner - c'est progresser.) In: Voschod 3 (1883/5-6), S. 219-246. (Im folgenden als: Kakaja?)

³⁹ auch in Dubnov, S.M. Kakaja? a.a.O. Hier aber zitiert nach: Dubnov, S.M. Kniga. a.a.O. S. 103.

⁴⁰ Art. Duchovno-biblejskoe bratstvo. In: Evrejskaja enciklopedia, 1906—13. Bd. 7, Sp. 389—392.

⁴¹ Art. Novyi Izrail. In: Evrejskaja enciklopedia, 1906—13, Bd. 9, Sp. 769—771.

agenda, ideologically it was a mixture between Christianity and Judaism, a "back to the Bible"-movement, with a harsh rejection against rabbinical authorities, Talmud and tradition.⁴²

Also in his works on Jakob Frank in the *Voschod*⁴³ Dubnov pledges for reform. In the Frankists' opposition to the Talmud, he sees the justified longing of the people for a religious reform and criticizes harshly the rabbinic authorities in 18th Century Poland.

In his memoirs he recalls this period as being full of "Pathos of Negation", "Antithesis"⁴⁴: "I totally denied the national idea," and "came only in a later period of my life to "nationalization".⁴⁵

Dubnov on emigration

Of course we have to take a look at 1881 as the starting point of the "great Exodus" of the Jews from Russia (the "new Egypt"). Even though Yakov Leščinskij suggests, that Emigration to the United States already started in the 1870ies and that this emigration was part of the grand-scale migration processes within the Russian Empire for "immanent" (i.e. socio-economic trends) reasons, rather than "political" (which would be the pogroms, legislation etc.)⁴⁶, we have to note, that emigration in response to the hopeless situation during and after the pogroms were at least a big issue in the contemporary Jewish and non-Jewish public. Dubnov had a share in that. Contrary to the integrationist elite of the St. Petersburg Jewish Community, he promoted emigration as an instrument to help the Jews in their difficult economic situation. He believed that the emigration out of vastly overpopulated areas would ease this situation momentarily. He didn't see this as an overall solution to the Jewish question and remained in opposition to the Palestinophiles, but he still demanded: "The active elements of Russian Jewry can and must, to a considerable extent, lead in the organization of emigration."⁴⁷ In his position towards the economic situation of the Jews in the overpopulated pale as well as towards their "religious isolation", Dubnov is anticipating non-Jewish views on the situation of the Jews in the Russian Empire. Hostility towards the Jews is thus a product of their isolation in cultural and religious perspective, their economic situation under the living conditions of the Pale of Settlement (overpopulation, few Jews in "productive"

⁴² Vgl. auch Frankel, Jonathan. Prophecy. a.a.O. S. 56-57.

⁴³ Dubnov, S.M. Jakob' Frank i ego Sekta christianstvujuschich. Očerki iu istorii pol'sko-russkich evreev v XVIII veke. In: *Voschod* 3 (1883/1-2), S. 17-49, (1883/3) S. 71-93, (1883/4) S. 90-116.

⁴⁴ Dubnov, S.M. *Kniga*. a.a.O. S. 102.

⁴⁵ ebd. S. 103.

⁴⁶ Leshchinskij, Yaakov. Di yidishe imigratsye. In: Cherikover, E. *Geshikhte*. a.a.O. Bd. 1. S. 31.

⁴⁷ Dubnov, S.M. *Vopros dnja (ob emigracii v Ameriku)*. In: *Rassvet*, Nr. 34-35. Hier: Nr. 34, S. 1349.

professions etc.).⁴⁸ In his early writings he advises the Jews of Russia to alter their situation (in terms of reform or emigration) in order to gain civil emancipation.

The mass excitement about emigration was codified with some messianistic tones. The hopes were connected with international organisations and philanthropists. When proto-Zionists failed in fulfilling the hopes of the masses for emigration, they became criticized as "false prophets". This broad disappointment in the emigration idea, seemed to have reinforced Dubnov's "integration into the Russian society" - tendencies:

"With a remarkably good timing, Shimon Dubnov (who had fast grown sceptical of the Exodus idea) now began to publish his study in Voskhod, entitled: "Shabbatai Zvi and Pseudo-Messianism in the 17th Century"(Jonathan Frankel).⁴⁹

Dubnov's "nationalization"

But when did Dubnov's return to "his people" take place?

The second half of the 80ies Dubnov remembers as a time of a spiritual crisis, that finally results in his "Return to my people".⁵⁰ In 1890 Dubnov "returns to his people" at least in the mode of action. The increasing reaction caused in that year a strong insult against the leaders of the Mtsislavl Jewish community by the local administration. They were threatened with corporal punishment for "misbehaviour". The Jewish community was very nervous and upset about this incident. When Dubnov learned about it he wrote a sharp article in the "Chronika Voschoda" making the crude behaviour of the local administration towards the Jews public. Other newspapers reprinted it and one of the trespassers was called to St. Petersburg to take responsibility. This incident made Dubnov, who was until then considered an outcast and heretic by the Jews of Mtsislavl, a celebrated member of the Jewish community again. Even the tension with his grandfather, the Talmud scholar, came to an end. Dubnov describes their last meeting shortly after the incident:

"The old man's face lit up with joy when he heard my voice. Quietly my grandfather's words flowed forth, "I have heard, Simon, that you have done a good deed, you have defended the honor of Israel. They say of you, 'and there are those who will attain the kingdom of heaven in one hour,' but I think that in your heart you were never a stranger to our people. May God grant that you work to His greater glory!" Deeply moved, we said our farewells - forever. Grandfather Benzion died several months later."⁵¹

⁴⁸ Vgl. Klier, John D. The pogrom paradigm in Russian history. In: Pogroms. a.a.O. S. 13-38.

⁴⁹ Frankel, Jonathan. Crisis. a.a.O. S. 18.

⁵⁰ Überschrift des 6. Kapitels der deutschen (gekürzten) Ausgabe des Kniga Žizni: Simon Dubnov. Mein Leben. Hg. v. Elias Hurwicz. Berlin 1937. S. 72-87.

⁵¹ Dubnov, S.M. Kniga. a.a.O. S. 150-151.

But not only would Dubnov never become a believer (in the religious meaning of the word) again, but he also was intellectually not yet returned to his people. His "nationalization" was a process, in which his notion of "nation" and his search for identity would undergo certain different stages. While ideologically still a cosmopolitan, Dubnov gets in touch intellectually with the concept of "Jewish nation" through his reception of Heinrich Gräetz. While adopting his synthesis, Dubnov starts thinking about this concept within Jewish history. But following Gräetz "nation" is not a political or insitutional framework yet, but a cultural.⁵² For example in 1886 Dubnov indicates two different tendencies in the Jewish history of ideas: the national and the universal. At that time those concepts are literary or cultural categories.⁵³ Of course there is not a distinct border between a cultural and a political concept of nationhood, but rather we find in this early works evidence of how Dubnov's political nationalism develops in terms of a process. It fits to this observations, that Dubnov was not predominately a historian by that time, but rather a man of letters. It was not until 1892 that he became a "missionary for history"⁵⁴ as he called himself.

In Odessa, where he lives from 1890 "under the sign of historicism"⁵⁵, Dubnov becomes part of a literary circle of representativs of different national trends: Ahad Ha-am, Simon Frug, Sholem Aleichem, Mendele Moicher Sforim and others. He is already a "part of his people"⁵⁶ by that time but still on his way to, as he calls it, "synthesis" (1894).⁵⁷

I would argue that it is this intellectual environment that causes to a great extent Dubnov's "nationalization". The reasons and moving factors for Dubnov's "nationalization" would thus come from within the Jewish cultural world - at least to a great extend.

First of all I would like to mention Dubnov's polemics with Ahad Haam. The leading intellectual of "Cultural Zionism" was later on to become a lifelong friend of Simon Dubnov, but their first encounter was due to a review Dubnov wrote on "Kavvereth" (russ. "Ulej") about the ideas of M. Lilienblum (a palestinophile) and Ahad Haam. In his article "Večnye i efemernye idealy evrejstva"⁵⁸ he is claiming for Ahad Haam a "spiritual Nationalism" and later recalls, that he was not able to fill this notion, which was to become a keystone of his thinking, with meaningfull content by that time.⁵⁹ In a responding article "Slavery in Freedom" Ahad Haam is very critical about the western Jews, who are so appraised by

⁵² Vgl. z.B. Dubov, S.M. Kniga. a.a.O. S. 166.

⁵³ Vgl. dazu z.B. Seltzer, Robert M. Simon Dubnow: A critical biography of his early years. Ann Arbor 1973. S. 134-135.

⁵⁴ Dubnov, S.M. Kniga. a.a.O. S. 165.

⁵⁵ "Pod znakom istorizma": Dubnov, S.M. Kniga. a.a.O. S. 153-196.

⁵⁶ Vgl. z.B. ebd. S. 163. (our people's grief)

⁵⁷ ebd. S. 177-182.

⁵⁸ Dubnov, S.M. Večnye i efemernye idealy evrejstva. In: Voschod. Kn. 12.

Dubnov at that time. Dubnov works his way through arguments with Ahad Haam, but it is a hint, that he is only able to answer him with his theory of autonomism, which he calls in respond "Freedom in Slavery" when he is writing his "Letters about Old and New Judaism".⁶⁰ But Ahad Haam is not the only one, who challenges Dubnov's ideology. In the Odessa informal literary circle of friends he was also discussing with Ben-Ami, a fanatic nationalist who detested the Russians and so called "assimilationists" after 1881, S. A. Abramovič (Mendele Moicher Sforim) the author and head of a Talmud-Thora, who was critical about all branches of Jewish nationalism, the palestinophile Ravnitzkij, the famous writer Sholem Alejchem and others.⁶¹ "It was a circle of friends, but not of kindred spirits."⁶² That is why Dubnov had to argue and articulate his ideas there.

In this circle the growing hostility of Russian society and government is of course also discussed. The expulsion of the Jews from Moscow, seems to have a much stronger impact on Dubnov, than the pogroms of 1881:

"The terrifying details of the expulsion of the Jews from Moscow and the rumors about further repressions in St. Petersburg caused an atmosphere of panic. In Odessa we were awaiting an Easter pogrom and Abramovič would say with a bitter smile: 'My wife had already put small wheels on her big suitcase, in order to move it out of the apartment real quick at any time ...'"⁶³

In the midst of this circle Dubnov is really a part of "his people" awaiting the same fate as anybody else in the pale of settlement. A feeling, he could not have among the Jews of St. Petersburg. Through the prism of communication with his friends he shares the collective fate of his people.

This informal literary circle is also the beginning of the Odessa Committee of Nationalization, as Dubnov's daughter recalls later:

"The literary circle, formed in the beginning of the nineties and gradually enlarged by new members, became the nucleus of the Committee of Nationalization, of which Dubnov was chairman. [...] Some of his new colleagues became family friends - energetic and sociable Meir Dizengoff, later the mayor of Tel Aviv; the young rabbi Chaim Tchernowitz, a man of broad theological and philosophical culture; Hayyim Nahman Bialik"⁶⁴

This literary circle is a big stepping stone on his way to synthesis. This synthesis has formed an ideology in 1897 with the "Letters about Old and New Judaism". Dubnov regards the year

⁵⁹ Dubnov, S.M. Kniga. a.a.O. S. 155.

⁶⁰ ebd.

⁶¹ ebd. S. 157-159.

⁶² ebd. S. 176.

⁶³ ebd. S. 161.

⁶⁴ Dubnov-Erlich, Sophie. a.a.O. S. 119.

of 1897 as a beginning of a "new era" in Russian Jewish history: Herzl's Zionismus set out to conquer on the Jewish Streets and also the BUND was formed. "Among this movements, the ideology, I explained in the "Letters about Old and New Judaism", paved its way": - "the national-humanistic synthesis".⁶⁵

The year 1897 as a crucial point for Russian Jewish History is also underlined by Alexander Orbach:

"That year saw the appearance of a number of significant movements, studies or public expressions on the Jewish future, which, when examined, reveal a common organizing theme for a coherent study of Russian Jewry at the time."⁶⁶

I do not want to replace the date 1881 by 1897, but on the other hand, 1897 is probably the context of Dubnov's formulation of his national ideology, and beyond that, it marks the end of the process of his "nationalization".

Construction of the Collective Memory

After having a look at the influence of 1881 on Dubnov's personal "nationalization", I would like to describe, how 1881 is integrated in his construction of collective memory. I would like to convey to the reasons for my impression that Dubnov formed not only the image of the pogroms of 1881 being a "gouvernement institution"⁶⁷, but also the 'revolutionary' notion of 1881 being a "watershed".

The pogroms of 1881 as a "gouvernement institution"

Simon Dubnov as a contemporary and as a historian was the first one to synthesize the materials of the pogroms into a narrative. This narrative is put down in his scholarly work, f.e. in his "History of the Jews in Russia and Poland" and in the Collection "Materials on the History of the Anti-Jewish Pogroms in Russia"⁶⁸. One leading thesis of this narrative is the assumption, that the pogroms were planned and organized by the tsarist government, stirring up the existing anti-Jewish sentiments of the Russian people:

⁶⁵ Dubnov, S.M. Kniga. a.a.O. S. 197.

⁶⁶ Orbach, Alexander. The Development of the Russian Jewish Community, 1881-1903. In: Pogroms. a.a.O. S. 137-163. S. 138.

⁶⁷ Materialy dlja istorii anti-evrejskich pogromov v Rossii. Krasnyi-Admoni, G.A. (Hg.) 2 Bde. Petrograd 1919-1923. (Im folgenden als: Materialy.) Bd. 1: IXX, XI. Zitiert nach: Lambroza, Schlomo. a.a.O. S. 74.

⁶⁸ Vgl. Materialy.

"The regime for its own purposes has always tried to exploit the inexhaustible reserve of pogrom energy which was concealed in the depth of the Russian masses"⁶⁹

The evidence Dubnov finds is very weak and reminds (from today's point of view) itself on a conspiratorial theory:

"But the fact itself that the pogroms were carefully prepared and engineered is beyond doubt; it may be inferred from the circumstances that they broke out simultaneously in many places in the Russian South, and that everywhere they followed a routine characterized by well organized "activity" by the mob and the deliberate inactivity of the authorities."⁷⁰

The thesis, that the tsarist regime is responsible for the pogroms, by planning them and using them for their politics, is the main point in all of Dubnov's historical works about the pogroms. That is true not only for the pogroms of 1881, but also for the pogroms of 1905.⁷¹

With this thesis of the pogroms being a "government institution" Dubnov dominated the scholarly image, and by that means also the public image, of the pogroms and their reasons for a long time. Dubnov became the chief witness of those historians, who were later referred to as "lachrymose" school⁷². While in a broader collective memory that might as well still be the way the pogroms are remembered, researchers from 1971⁷³ on, revised Dubnov's thesis. For example Michail Aronson showed very convincingly that the tsarist authorities had no interest in violent upheavals in the Russian South and pledges for an analysis of the origins of the pogroms in a broader historical context.⁷⁴

Still by the long lasting influence of the "lachrymose" school, the impact of Simon Dubnov's historical work on the collective memory can be seen.⁷⁵

1881 as a "watershed" that transformed Russian Jewry profoundly and irrevocably

Even though for Dubnov himself, as we have seen, 1881 was not a turning point in terms of turning towards Jewish nationalism right away, he still implanted this understanding of 1881 as a revolution of inner-Jewish life in the Russian empire in the collective memory.

About the "Desillusionment of the Intelligenzia and the National Revival" he writes:

⁶⁹ Materialy. a.a.O. Bd. 1, S. XIV.

⁷⁰ Dubnov, S.M. History. a.a.O. Bd. 2. S. 248-249.

⁷¹ Vgl. z.B. Dubnov, S.M. Uroki strašnych dnei. In: Voschod, (ežened.) Nr. 47-50.

⁷² Greenbaum, Avraham. Bibliographical Essay. In: Pogroms. a.a.O. S. 373 - 386. S. 375.

⁷³ pioneering was: Rogger, Hans. The Jewish Policy of Late Tsarism. In: Wiener Library Bulletin 25 (1971). S. 45-51.

⁷⁴ Vgl. Aronson, Michail I. Troubled Waters: The Origins of the Anti-Jewish Pogroms in Russia. Pittsburgh 1990.

⁷⁵ Vgl. Lambroza, Schlomo. a.a.O. S. 73-77.

"The Catastrophe at the beginning of the eighties took the Jews of Russia unawares, and found them unprepared for spiritual self-defence.The intellectual young Jews and Jewesses who had passed through the Russian public schools made frantic endeavors, not only towards association but also towards complete cultural amalgamation with the Russian people. Assimilation and Russification became the watchwords of the day. [...] But suddenly, lo and behold! that same Russian people, in which the progressive forces of Jewry were ready to merge their identity, appeared in the shape of a monster, [...]. The government had changed front [...] This disillusionment found its early expressions in the lamentations of repentant assimilators. [...] in the healthy part of Russian Jewry this change of mind resulted in turning their ideals definitely in the direction of national rejuvenation upon modern foundations."⁷⁶

In his "History of the Jewish Soldier" he constructs 1881 as a watershed between two generations:

"I was born in the year of 1881. Finally I recognize the symbolic meaning of this leading date of my life: It was the year, when the era of pogroms began, and this pogroms followed me in many ways, from birth until death, which is waiting for me right now. [...] My father, a poor school-teacher, [...] an idealist-maskil of the 60ies, lived always in the joyful hope of his youth, struggled for "Enlightenment" and reform and looked astonished at the new, dark epoch of Jewish history, which was overshadowed by the middle ages. [...] He died with the naive thinking [of believe in Enlightenment; A.H.] in his heart, [...]"⁷⁷

Within the construction process of the collective memory, 1881 marks the point, where the universal ideas of enlightenment came to a sudden end. Not only the generation of maskilim retreated from the scene, but also the very essence of the idea of enlightenment, the faith in progress and thus a progressive understanding of history, proved to be wrong:

"Twenty-two years ago [that would be 1881; A.H.] we who believed in the idea of unilinear progress for the first time noted with fright and perplexity that the straight road of history had been flagrantly perverted and forced into a direction which was bringing us closer to the starting point, to the days of the past and its terrors." (after 1903)⁷⁸

Dubnov is constructing time: He views 1881 as a beginning of the era of pogroms: "The year 1881 inaugurated a new epoch"⁷⁹, he describes: "the entire 1881-1917 period as one long war by the authorities against the Jews."⁸⁰

This is also agreed on by Dubnov's contemporaries. They link 1881 and Dubnov's appearance on the literary stage with the painful beginning of a new epoch:

"To the 40th anniversary of the literary, scientific and political work of Simon Dubnov. [...] In a year that was very hard for the Russian Jews, Semen Markovic appeared for the first time in the arena of the Jewish Public. The year 1881 was such an experience, a great weakening and also the origin of a new social-Jewish consciousness. The year

⁷⁶ Dubnov, S.M. History. a.a.O. Bd. 2. S. 324-327.

⁷⁷ Dubnov, S. M. Istorija evrejskago soldata. Ispoved' odnogo iz mnogich. Petrograd 1918. S. 4.

⁷⁸ Dubnov, S.M. 9th Letter. In: Nationalism and History. a.a.O. S. 192.

⁷⁹ Dubnov, S.M. 9th Letter. In: Nationalism and History. a.a.O. S. 193.

⁸⁰ Greenbaum, Avraham. a.a.O. S. 377.

1881 is thus connected with the beginning of a new epoch in the life of Russian Jewry. How many experiences are connected with this notable year! How thorny and twisted was the way through the 40 years from 1881-1921! And the whole distance of this way, Simon Dubnov was fearlessly standing in the first row."⁸¹

This epoch showed the necessity and success of "national rejuvenation": "The past decades have taught us, that our fate depends not on our environment but on ourselves, on our will and our national effort."⁸² Thus the catastrophe gives rise to a national rebirth: "After every great catastrophe in the life of the people there would arise from the ruins a new vitality and a spiritual stock-taking."⁸³

Individuell experience and the construction of the collective memory

Amos Funkenstein writes about Jewishness: "A Culture, that does not take itself for granted is, by definition, a self-reflexive Culture. Historical Consciousness became the mode of Jewish Self-reflection."⁸⁴ In this sense Dubnov as a historian supports the Jewish struggle for identity, with his historical narrative he strengthens the collective memory of the "Jewish people", in his words: the Jewish Nation.

The existence of a "collective memory"⁸⁵ is for Dubnov "The Secret of Survival and the Law of Survival":

"Every generation in Israel carries within itself the remnants of worlds created and destroyed during the course of the previous history of the Jewish people. ...The soul of each generation emanates from the soul of the (collective) "body" of all preceding generations, and what endures, namely, the strength of the accumulated past, exceeds the wreckage, the strength of the changing present."⁸⁶

⁸¹ Archiv Instituta Vostokovedenija RAN (AV) SPbg, f. 85 (D. Maggid), op. 2, d. 182, l.12-13: "Jubilej S. M. Dubnova." [Unterzeichnende: Braudo, Bruckus, Ginzburg, Goldberg, Kaufman, Klejnman, Perelman, Sosis, Chasan etc.]

⁸² Dubnov, S.M. 9th Letter. In: Nationalism and History. a.a.O. S. 193.

⁸³ Dubnov, S.M. What Should One Do in Haman's Times? In: Nationalism and History. a.a.O. S. 354-359. S. 354-355. [Dies zitiert Dubnov von den Autoren von Oifn Sheydweg, und stimmt dem zu. In diesem Zusammenhang jedoch geht es ihm eher darum, daß die Juden sich nicht nach, sondern inmitten einer Katastrophe befinden. Für diese Situation plädiert Dubnov auf die Rettung durch Emigration, vgl. Ähnlichkeit zu seinen Thesen von 1881; Vopros dnja]

⁸⁴ Funkenstein, Amos. a.a.O. S. 2.

⁸⁵ Dubnov's notion of 'a collective body' is rather romantic. While I would not use the word collective identity in the sense of a 'collective soul', something every member of a collective has a share of, Dubnov quite obviously believes that.

⁸⁶ Dubnov, Simon. The Survival of the Jewish People: The Secret of Survival and the Law of Survival. [Hebrew Original in: Haetid Vol. IV (1912), Reprint: Haetid Vol. IV (1922) S. 111-120.] (Quoted in the following test as: Survival.) English in: Nationalism and History.a.a.O. S. 325-335. S. 326.

But where is the link, between the individual experience and the construction of the collective memory? I wanted to show, that the individual memory is not transformed into the collective memory without any changes.

Both, personal and collective memory, are primarily a projection of the present and its structure, composed of contents and symbols from here and now.⁸⁷

When the individual memory of the historian (as "a cultural priest"⁸⁸) is integrated into the construction of the collective memory, it is also transformed by the needs of the present; and, for Dubnov, the presence is a crisis and very much in need of a national reawakening:

"Our national catastrophe, which is as vast as the sea, must cure our estranged intelligentsia. It offers it a sacred and exalted ideal, will give meaning and purpose to its life.

May all the vital elements of our people, all those in whose souls "the spark of Judaism" is not yet extinguished, all those who strive for the preservation and revival of our nation, unite over the fresh graves of our new national martyrs!"⁸⁹ (1903)

I would like to conclude, that Dubnov's historical work on 1881 is shaped by a symbolic model of catastrophe - rebirth. Doing that, Dubnov uses the existing archetypical forms of the Jewish collective memory. In the course of its history which is rich in persecution and destruction, the collective memory has always tried to integrate new catastrophes into the meaningful fundamental myth by employing traditional narratives and interpretations. One archetypical form of interpretation is the dialectical relationship between destruction and redemption, like the saying goes: "The day the temple was destroyed, the messiah was born"⁹⁰. To remember (Zachor!⁹¹ = a biblical commandment) the national catastrophe is a form of the "creative survival" of the Jewish people in the diaspora.⁹²

The reawakening of the Nation out of the catastrophe is thus a common narrative structure, an influential "memory image": the very essence of nationalist evolutionary thinking⁹³ on one hand and Jewish tradition on the other lies within the struggle for existence through crises.

⁸⁷ Funkenstein, Amos. a.a.O. S. 8.

⁸⁸ ebd. S. 20.

⁸⁹ Dubnov, S.M. 9th Letter: A Historic Moment (The Question of Emigration). In: Nationalism and History. a.a.O. S. 199

⁹⁰ Quotation after: Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. Zachor: Erinnere Dich! Jüdische Geschichte und jüdisches Gedächtnis. Berlin 1996. S.36.

⁹¹ ebd.

⁹² "creative survival"; Friedlander, Saul. Memory, History, and the Extermination of the Jews of Europe. Bloomington, Indianapolis 1993. S. 121.

⁹³ evolutionary thinking; The discontinuity and changes the "Nations" had to face proved the existence of the collective, the crises became the struggle for survival for the collective and its development through this struggles became the very essence of the nation.

The assumption that the very essence of nationhood would lie within its development through times and ages, made the historian the expert for nationalism. Vgl. z.B. Geulen, Christian. Die Metamorphose der Identität. Zur "Langlebigkeit" des Nationalismus. In: Assmann, Aleida und Friese, Heidrun (Hrsg.) Identitäten. Erinnerung, Geschichte, Identität 3. Frankfurt 2 1999. S. 346-373. S. 370.

For Dubnov as a Jewish Nationalist, the "Strength of the collective body; the Jewish Nation" is the "Needs of the present". This "nationalization" of the Jewish people is the objective of his historical narrative. This need for "nationalization" shaped the integration of Dubnov's personal memory into his construction of a "collective memory".

This strengthening of the "Jewish nation" is in the circumstances of the Russian Empire emancipation. It is directed against the miserable status of the Jews in the Russian Empire and points its finger directly on the Russian government. Dubnov was one of those historians of Russian Jewish history, who "were for the most part men of action as well as scholarship, and their research was a weapon in their struggle for human and political rights for Russian Jewry."⁹⁴ Thus his work was the writing of "Counterhistory".

As a historian and politician Dubnov was always falling between all stools. He was a devoted enemy of the tsarist regime, but the soviet public would call him a "belogvardeez": "White Guardian"⁹⁵, and ban his work and influence from the academic scene in the Soviet Union. That led to the fact, that Dubnov is known almost only by Jewish Historians in today's Russia. He was murdered by the Nazis, but in Germany, where he lived and published from 1921-1933, he was forgotten after 1945. In Israel his work was not accepted by the Zionist historical school, because of his diaspora nationalism.

But his "History" is a still influential and thus powerful master narrative that created the image of history for many generations of Jews and Gentils in the diaspora and in Israel.

⁹⁴ Klier, John D. Russia gathers her Jews: The Origins of the "Jewish Question" in Russia 1772-1825. DeKalb 1986. S. XIII.

⁹⁵ Vgl. Jewish Telegraph Agency, J.T.A, Moskau 21. Juni 1929.