The Outsider: Benzion Netanyahu and The Politics of Resentment

“We all owe everything to our parents” (Benjamin Netanyahu)¹

Three events, which shaped the political worldview of Benzion Netanyahu, the father of Israeli prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, are directly connected with violence, murder, and death: a violent demonstration in Mount Scopus in 1932, the murder of Haim Arlosoroff in 1933, and the death of Rabbi Nathan Mileikowsky, Benzion’s father, Benjamin’s grandfather, in 1935.

On June 22, 1934, Ze’ev Jabotinsky wrote to Mileikowsky:

My lord and friend, dear Rabbi Mileikowsky – what shall I write to you? … You are being cast as the main instigator of the rabbis’ protest. If they were right in blaming you for this – and I have heard that they are, in fact, right – you yourself still could not properly appreciate the righteousness of this act… The name of the Rabbi K. [Abraham Isaac Kook] became overnight a sublime symbol in the hearts of innumerable masses. And little me – had I not been ignorant in the Torah, afraid to open my mouth on a matter of religion, in this moment I would have publicly spoken out with a rallying cry I had dreamt of already in my youth: reinstating in our lifetime the title of the High Priest.²

Three weeks earlier, Jabotinsky wrote to him: “From one of my uncles, as an infant, I learned this saying: ‘People are mud; from mud one makes bricks; and from bricks one builds a house.’ Schwamm drüber [forget about it], my old friend! We shall overcome; everything, in everything, and over everything: and the defeated will rejoice in their hearts for our victory.”³

In these letters, the leader of the Revisionist movement stressed his strongest support to Mileikowsky, who enthusiastically joined the cause of the Jewish suspects in the murder of Haim Arlosoroff and recruited the Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook to the struggle.⁴ Two weeks

¹Benjamin Netanyahu, “We All Owe Everything to Our Parents,” Culture and Literature, Haaretz, April 1, 2016 [in Hebrew]. A eulogy Netanyahu wrote for Aharon Megged.
²Zeev Jabotinsky, “A Letter to Rabbi Nathan Mileikowsky,” June 22, 1934, in vol. 9 of Letters (Jerusalem: Jabotinsky Institute, The Zionist Library, 2007), 154 [in Hebrew]. On June 14, 1934, in an article in Davar titled “Creating ‘Public Opinion’ Against the Verdict,” Mileikowsky’s actions were criticized. “The revisionists are very active,” it was written, “their agents are working tirelessly with their hands and feet. The impression must be created, that ‘the Jewish people is against the verdict’! … It is enough for them to come to the angst-ridden settlements and tell, that here the ‘Reds’, God help us, want to kill a Jew that prays every day with tallit and tefillin and says Tehillim…We are told that the revisionists are now making new efforts to fish for signatures by different personalities in favor of Stavsky… Collecting the signatures is mostly the work of the revisionist Nathan Mileikowsky.” See “Creating a Public Opinion,” Davar, June 14, 1934 [in Hebrew].
⁴Nathan Mileikowsky (1879-1935) was a rabbi, educator and Zionist activist, made famous mostly due to his Zionist speeches. He was born in Kreva, in the Russian Empire (now Belarus), and in his childhood was sent to the Volozhin yeshiva, where he was ordained. He admired Herzl, despite opposing the Uganda Scheme, and frequently visited different Jewish communities across the Empire, and later in Poland, in order to persuade them
before the June letter, one of the suspects in the murder that shook the Yishuv, Abraham Stavsky of the Betar movement, was found guilty and sentenced to death by hanging.

Haim Arlosoroff, head of the Political Department of the Jewish Agency, was shot to death on the night of Friday, June 16, 1933, on the beach of Tel Aviv. After the murder, several rightwing activists were arrested, including Abraham Stavsky and Zvi Rosenblatt, who were indicted for the murder, and Abba Ahimeir, one of leaders of the far-right Brit HaBirionim movement (The Strongmen Alliance), who was indicted for incitement to murder. Ahimeir, Stavsky's roommate in a cabin in South Tel Aviv, was acquitted of these charges, but tried for his membership in Brit HaBirionim and sentenced to twenty-one months in prison. Rosenblatt was acquitted. Stavsky was found guilty due to the testimony of Arlosoroff’s widow, Sima, and was acquitted upon appeal one month later based on local evidence law, which dictates that one eyewitness testimony does not suffice for convicting a person of murder.

of the Zionist idea. In 1920, he immigrated to Israel with his family, including the eldest son, Benzion, who was then a ten-year-old boy (Mileikowsky and his wife, Sarah, had nine children: eight boys and a girl. Two of them were born after their arrival in Mandatory Palestine). After a short time as elementary school principal in Safed and Rosh Pinn, Mileikowsky returned to his activity as a Zionist propagandist, and embarked on recruitment journeys in Europe and North America on behalf of the Jewish National Fund and Keren HaYesod. In his final years, he was active in Histadut HaHalutzim (lit. Association of the Farmers), and even purchased land in Herzliya in a failed attempt to establish a farm. While he did not identify himself with any party or political movement, in his final months he joined the struggle for the Jewish defenders accused of murdering Arlosoroff, who were active in Betar. Mileikowsky signed several of his articles as “Nathan Netanyahu.” The son Benzion adopted the name “Netanyahu” as his surname and would sign most of his articles with the name “B. Netanyahu.” For Mileikowsky’s writing, see Nathan Mileikowsky-Netanyahu, Nation and State (Tel Aviv: Yedioth Achronoth Books, 1994) [in Hebrew], One of Benzion’s brothers, Saadya, wrote a book chronicling the family’s history; see Saadya Mileikowsky-Netanyahu, The Netanyahu Family Saga (Jerusalem: R.O.S., 2000). Ahimeir served about ten months in prison before his acquittal in May 1934. In July of the same year, he was sentenced to 21 months in prison after having been found guilty of belonging to an illegal organization. His sentence was later commuted to 18 months in prison, and in August 1935 he was released.

Shabtai Tevet, in his book on the Arlosorff murder, quotes from a letter written by David Ben Gurion to Yosef Ahimeir, the son of Abba Ahimeir, in which he explains his reasons for believing that Stavsky and Rosenblatt are guilty. Ben Gurion writes: “I do not think that your father had a part in this murder. However, I know who did murder… And how do I know? Regarding the wife of Arlosoroff, who was strolling with him on that night… She saw the man who shot Arlosoroff, and I have no reason to disbelieve her, as I know her, and she was present on that occasion and saw the shooter, and I have no reason to doubt her.” Following the publication of Tevet’s book, in 1982, the prime minister at the time, Menachem Begin, demanded the establishment of a commission of inquiry (the Bechor Commission), which determined that “there is no doubt that Stavsky and Rosenblatt had no part in the murder of Arlosoroff. There is no doubt that the entire aim of the police investigation was to bury the truth. On a matter such as this the prophet lamented: And he looked for judgment, but behold oppression (Isaiah 5:7).” See Shabtai Tevet, The Arlosoroff Murder (Tel Aviv: Schocken Publishing House, 1982), 268 [in Hebrew]. David Bechor, Max Kennet, and Eliezer Berkovits, The Commission of Inquiry into the Investigation of the Murder of Dr. Haim Arlosoroff: Final Report, (State of Israel, Jerusalem) 1985, 201 [in Hebrew].
The murder, the investigations, and the trials following them, affected the entire Jewish population in Palestine. The political tensions between left and right reached a peak, matched only a few decades afterwards, during the heyday of prime minister Yitzhak Rabin’s assassination in 1995. Because of the indictment against two of Beitar’s activists and the incitement against Arlosoroff prior to the murder, many members of the right-wing Revisionist movement felt persecuted. Most of them believed in the defendants’ innocence and in a conspiracy against them. One of them was Rabbi Mileikowsky, who initiated a campaign for Ahimeir, Stavsky and Rosenblatt. He organized petitions for their release, and because of his activity, he was attacked by the mainstream socialist newspapers and was depicted there as a wheeler-dealer, as a representative of the Revisionist movement. In contrast, Mileikowsky was admired by members of Brit HaBirionim. Ahimeir, in a chapter titled “Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness” in his book The Trial, described his encounter with Mileikowsky, who came to visit him and the two other defendants in prison:

And here, among the great masses, who came to ‘visit,’ one man stood out; about fifty years of age, his beard well kept, and his eyes seemingly on the verge of exiting their sockets, his mouth wide open and his tongue as if stuck to his palate. On this occasion, it appeared as if he were ‘preying’ on the three with his eyes; his brow wrinkled, his shoulders rising and sinking, his hands trembling and his feet failing.

- Who is this man? – Ahimeir asked Nechama Avniel.7

Nechama: Are you not acquainted with him? This is, of course, Rabbi Mileikowsky!


Ahimeir: It is a pleasure to make your acquaintance, my Rabbi. It is a pity that our first encounter takes place under such circumstances. Your son, the student, I have known for a long time, together we participated in the demonstration against Bentwich…

Rabbi Mileikowsky was of frail body, and despite his power resting in his mouth – he did not respond. Only his eyes – which, just moments ago, as if asked to roll out of their sockets, began wandering in tears.8

Whereas the son, Benzion, lived to an old age, and died, in April 2012, at 102, his father passed away at age 55, in February 1935. Thirty days after his death, HaYarden, a self-proclaiming

---

7Nechama Avniel (1898-1978) and her husband, Mordechai Avniel (1900-1989), were members of the Revisionist movement and close friends of Ahimeir.
8Abba Ahimeir, The Trial (Tel Aviv: The Committee for the Publication of Ahimeir's Writings, 1968), 180-183 [in Hebrew].
“political-Zionist” newspaper, which Netanyahu edited until the death of his father, published a string of eulogies, including essays written by Joseph Klausner and Rabbi Kook. “He was an orator, a speaker, magic in his mouth and lips,” wrote Rabbi Kook on Mileikowsky, “but he was not learned in the ‘wisdom’ of rhetoric, and did not use the power of his speech for a chicanery of toys, to amaze those listening.”

Klausner wrote: “Rabbi Mileikowsky is no partisan revisionist. He is a Zionist, a Zionist, period. That is enough for him. However, he admires Jabotinsky, for he sees in him a brave warrior for the messianic idea, for the complete fulfillment of the national calling, for complete redemption in the spirit of the Prophets and the Tannaim and their words of holiness.”

The two also did not overlook the influence of the Arlosoroff affair on his life: “I have known the pains of his soul in the face of every occurrence that he had seen in our lifetime, in which he saw estrangement from the holiness of the people,” wrote Rabbi Kook. “And here are members of Jabotinsky’s party being falsely accused of a murder plot, and are faced with forceful insistence, by any means, to carry through and strengthen this plot, the likes of which are unknown to Judaism!,” added Klausner, “And are those the fruits of the ‘sowing in tears’ that he for decades had sown? – And as the sentencing to death of Stavsky came out (in the first stage of the trial) he erupted in heart-wrenching tears: For this did we toil and sacrifice for an entire generation?! – Is there a tragedy more profound and terrible?!”

Even blunter was Klausner’s brother, Bezalel Elizedek, who, in a column signed with the pen name “B. Elizedek” and published in the same issue of HaYarden, wrote that the trial apparently brought about Mileikowsky’s death. According to him, Benzion’s father saw “suddenly that in the same land, which, in the future, should serve as a role model to the world - in this land Jews are being vilified by Jews for a very lofty goal: Demolishing an entire party and building up

---

10Joseph Klausner, “Those Sowing with Tears,” ibid.
11Ibid.
from its ruins... How would his heart, which was already weakened by his great work throughout the days of his life, not break at the sight of his glorious dreams being ruined?"12

It is with these harsh feelings of rage and grief, and with the perception that the death of his father, Rabbi Mileikowsky, resulted from the Arlosoroff affair, that the first chapter in the shaping of Benzion Netanyahu’s worldview came to an end.13 In it, as mentioned above, three significant events are worth mentioning: the death of the father, the Arlosoroff affair, and the demonstration against Norman Bentwich during the inauguration of the Chair for International Law of Peace mentioned by Ahimeir. Netanyahu’s hawkish stances strengthened and solidified in their wake, and his resentment toward the left, the Zionist establishment and the academia of his time only deepened. During these years, Netanyahu was on the far fringes of Zionist politics. Decades later, he became one of the fathers of the Israeli right, both figuratively and literally.

Norman Bentwich (1883-1971) was the son of Jewish-British lawyer Herbert Bentwich (1856-1932). The father was a friend of Chaim Weizmann and legal counsel to the Zionist movement.

12Alongside the articles by Klausner, Rabbi Kook and B. Elizedek, the page also featured eulogies written by Yehoshua Heschel Yevin (titled “The Warrior”), B. Gitlin (titled “The Orator,” translation of an article originally published in English in 1925), and others. On page 4 of the same edition, two articles by Mileikowsky were also published: “Our Victory” and “The Balfour Declaration” (all in Hebrew).

He had eleven children, including Joseph Bentwich, winner of the Israel Prize for Education, and cellist and pedagogue Thelma Yellin. The son Norman continued in the path of his father and became a renowned legal scholar. He was affiliated with Brit Shalom and with the first chancellor and president of the Hebrew University, Dr. Yehuda Leib Magnes, of whom he wrote a biography.\textsuperscript{14}

In the 1920s, Bentwich served as Legal Secretary of Mandatory Palestine. He insisted on neutrality despite his sympathy for the Zionist idea, and was therefore hated by both Arabs, who saw him as a Zionist, and Jews, who saw him as anti-Zionist. “Mr. Bentwich used to sit between two, maybe three chairs,” wrote Arlosoroff in his diary. “The Arabs blamed him for being an unrestrained Zionist; the British forsook him as he is Jewish; for the Jews, he is an example of the kind of Jew that wants to be objective so much that he would rather do wrong by his people than raise the suspicion of injustice toward others.”\textsuperscript{15} In 1929, he survived an assassination attempt in Jerusalem, when an Arab janitor, working in the local police headquarters, shot him with a pistol and injured his thigh.

The same year, the Chaim Weizmann Chair for International Law of Peace was established in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{16} Bentwich was selected to hold it, and the subject of the inaugural lecture, set to February 10, 1932, seven years after the university’s founding, was “Jerusalem – the City of Peace.” In an interview published before the lecture in \textit{The Jewish Chronicle}, and, translated into Hebrew a few days after it took place in \textit{Doar HaYom}, Bentwich said: “I think that the greatest evil of our day is that nationalism is being turned into a religion. Judaism has a mission to fulfill is this respect, in teaching the world how both the national and the religious sense can be directed to universal ends. For in Judaism religion and nationality

\textsuperscript{14}Norman Bentwich, \textit{For Zion's Sake: A Biography of Judah L. Magnes} (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1957) [in Hebrew].

\textsuperscript{15}Haim Arlosoroff, \textit{Jerusalem Diary} (Tel Aviv: Mapai Publishing House, 1949), 209 [in Hebrew]. Arlosoroff described Bentwich in his journal on February 11, 1932, a day after the incident in the university.

have been intimately combined, and yet we have never lost our ideal of serving the whole of humanity.”

In his lecture, Bentwich wrote: “The university is like a sister to the Temple. We may therefore see the university as the most striking live expression of the ideal that perceives Jerusalem as the City of Peace. One of its more frequent goals should be a wide distribution of knowledge among the Jews on the culture and literature of the Arabs. From a more broad perspective, the university could strive to do so, to serve as a mediator between the East and the West.”

For the nationalist students and members of Brit HaBiryonim, Bentwich, the pacifist, the friend of Weizmann and Magnes, represented the ultimate enemy, the complete antithesis to their aspirations and vision: he opposed a Jewish national state, the idea of Hebrew labor (Avoda Ivrit), which excluded non-Jews, and the exclusive right of Jews to the Land of Israel. He supported compromise and understanding with the Arabs, and believed in the high importance of international law and the League of Nations, which was established after the First World War and signified to him “a change in the regime of humanity… forming before our eyes despite the narrow national senses, which again and again erupt anew.” According to him, “We must examine the big question of the development of the Land of Israel not just from the perspective of our demands, but also from a perspective of searching for ways to cooperate with the other nations living in the land. We should make this into the basis of our political thought, and to consider the benefit of the entire land no less than we consider the progress of our settlement in it.”

---

17A Professor of Peace, – Interview with Norman Bentwich,” Doar HaYom, February 6, 1932 [in Hebrew]. See also: A Professor of Peace, Interview with Norman Bentwich, The Jewish Chronicle, February 5, 1932.
18Norman Bentwich, Jerusalem – The City of Peace (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1932), 20 [in Hebrew].
20Norman Bentwich, introduction to Our Historical Legal Right to the Land of Israel, by Reuven Gafni (Weinshenker) (Jerusalem: Tora VeAvoda Library, 1933), 3-4 [in Hebrew]. Bentwich further notes in the introduction (ibid.) that “there is no doubt that for us, the Jews, it is highly important to know the historical and moral foundations and justifications for our claim to return to Zion. This we truly regard as appropriate. But at the same time, it is also important to know, and to listen to, the historical and moral claims of this land’s other
Several members of the university leadership were present in the lecture, such as Magnes, as well as prominent Zionist leaders, including Menachem Ussishkin, Arthur Ruppin, Meir Dizengoff and Arlsoroff. However, shortly after the lecture began, “the Chair for Peace became a battleground,” as written in Doar HaYom on February 11, 1932. “Bentwich came up to the stage and began reading his lecture from paper. His voice was weak and his Hebrew accent English. As he just began to speak a stink bomb was exploding in the hall. The explosions were accompanied by a cry from one of the nationalist young men: Go to the Mufti with your international chair!”

At the center of the commotion stood Ahimeir: “‘I arrest you by the power of the law,’ the officer addressed Abba Ahimeir, whose movements were constantly tracked by two undercover policemen,” as portrayed in Doar HaYom. “Ahimeir resisted police efforts to remove him by lying flat on the ground. The police carried him into another room wherein other detainees greeted his entrance by singing Jabotinsky’s Smol HaYarden (East of the Jordan),” which claims sovereign control over Transjordan. The poem features the refrain: “Two Banks has the Jordan – This is ours and, that is as well”. Netanyahu had a central role in the attempt to prevent Bentwich from speaking. He drafted the pamphlets against the lecture that were published before the demonstration, and was one of residents, and we are too accustomed to ignoring this… The Land of Israel is not in the present, nor will it be in the future, a purely Jewish land, as Jews and Arabs together reside in it and will continue to do so in the future. And this reality should not be regretted.” For the differences between the view of Brit Shlaom and those of Weizmann’s, see Gideon Shimoni, The Zionist Ideology (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1995), 351-361 [in Hebrew]. The personal relations between Bentwich and Jabotinsky were murky in addition to the ideological conflicts between the two. In 1926, Bentwich refused to allow Jabotinsky to deliver a speech at the Hebrew university, with the explanation that political gatherings should not take place there. On October 20, Jabotinsky wrote to him: “In my opinion, no place in Jerusalem should be closed before me. Jews have false habits and a terrible memory. These two faults should not be encouraged. I am sorry, but a boycott leads to an appropriate response.” See Shmuel Katz, Jabo: A Biography (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1993), 655 [in Hebrew]. “Zeev Jabotinsky to Norman Bentwich,” October 20, 1926, Letter #4903, the Jabotinsky Institute Archive [in Hebrew].

21“The Chair for Peace Turns to Battlefield,” Doar HaYom, February 11, 1932 [in Hebrew].
22Ibid.

23Netanyahu, who in his youth studied in Beit HaMidrash LeMorim, the college of education founded by David Yellin in Beit HaKerem, Jerusalem, continued after graduating to study in the Hebrew University, and was a student and follower of Joseph Klausner. With Klausner’s supervision, Netanyahu edited the newspaper HaYarden and the journal Betar, and years later also edited for him his magnum opus, A History of Modern Hebrew Literature, and edited under his direction several volumes (numbers 2-8) of the Encyclopaedia Hebraica
its organizers. His brother, Elisha, later professor of mathematics at the Technion, prepared the stink bomb. On February 8, a few days before the lecture, a pamphlet renouncing it was published, signed by the student organizations of the right: El Al, Hulda (whose ranks included Avraham Stern), and The Revisionist Students Section in the Hebrew University, which included Netanyahu as one of its leaders. The pamphlet read: “Not us, the defenseless, those deprived of the right to self-defense, it is not us who now need preaching on matters of the international peace”. The text went on to protest the establishment of such a chair as “an ironic, aggravating answer to the great suffering, the spiritual inquisition to which the Jewish student in the world is subjected,” as well as an attempt to strengthen the standing of Brit Shalom, “which was one of the most significant causes for the ideological and political crisis of Zionism.” In the pamphlet, the student organizations attacked Bentwich and contended that “the Hebrew University has no place for a professor who seeks to diminish it within the borders of anti-Semitism.” “We know,” it was written, “of his extreme, ongoing resistance to the fulfillment of an actual Hebrew University… The nationalist student cannot agree to this, and expresses his protest vehemently.”

Following these events, the university conducted an internal investigation and demanded clarifications from the organizations regarding some sentences in the pamphlet. Haaretz,

---

24 “Why Are the Nationalist Students Opposed to a Chair for International Peace?,” a pamphlet by the nationalist student associations in the Hebrew University, February 8, 1932 (the Hebrew University Archive) [in Hebrew].

25 The university demanded clarifications from the student organizations regarding the following sentences in the pamphlet: (1) “The chair serves as a mere cover for political schemes” (2) “We see this (the establishment of the chair) as an ironic, aggravating answer to a great suffering” (3) “The Hebrew University has no place for a professor who seeks to diminish it within the borders of anti-Semitism.” Netanyahu and the heads of other student organizations sent, on February 26, a letter addressed to Magnes with the following clarifications - regarding the first sentence: “The whole essence of this sentence deals exclusively with the large universities that are mentioned there, which have no relation to our university. And regarding the Hebrew University, it is stated there that ‘this chair has no practical significance to us.’”; regarding the second sentence: “The world ‘ironic’ is not intended to add a suffix to the stated, and it is to be interpreted in the context, meaning that the establishment of this chair is being greeted by Jewish students in the world with irony.”; regarding the third sentence: “Prof. Bentwich expressed his opinion that the Hebrew University should not serve as a new opening for Jewish students suffering from numerus clausus outside, and that there is no need for practical studies in the Hebrew University, but rather that it should be limited to abstract research. What follows from this is that the Hebrew
which previously covered riots by anti-Semitic students in universities in Europe, stood by
Bentwich and published the lecture in its entirety on the same week it took place. Dr. Moshe
Glickson (1878-1939), the newspaper’s editor at the time, who did not share the legal scholar’s
pacifist positions, harshly condemned the demonstrators and the infringement of the freedom
of speech. “The concept of ‘sacrilege’ of the lack of public and national sentiment of respect
has apparently lost its validity and meaning in our days,” he wrote, “it is our pain and shame
that we learn the ways of the modern barbarians in twentieth century Europe. It appears that the
conduct of the Nazi students pose a shining example to a minority among our young.”

On February 19, “Abba Sikra,” one of Ahimeir’s pen names, responded to Glickson’s
comments and mocked him in Hazit HaAm, the extremist, outspoken newspaper of Brit
HaBirionim: “The ‘gray’ newspaper, which is edited by the man of the ‘however’ and the
‘nevertheless,’ the doctor of philosophy [Glickson], rushed to print the entire speech given by
Norman Bentwich… The newspaper acquired a reputation in journalism for its ‘quickness’ and
‘altertness’, and now… the editor achieved an indelible reputation for being a ‘polite’ person.”

For Ahimeir, Bentwich was an extreme example of an assimilated Jew, whose positions
endangered Zionism and threatened its very existence. In Ahimeir’s eyes, his lecture on
Jerusalem was, in fact, Christian missionarism, anti-Jewish for opposing national identity and
equating it with war, while preaching for universalism and cosmopolitanism. “Even the
smartest missionary could not have exerted such a degree of influence, to the point that this ode
to Christianity would see light in a newspaper purporting to be Zionist!,” cried Ahimeir.

---

26 Moshe Glickson (M.G.), “On the Agenda," Haaretz, February 12, 1932 [in Hebrew]. In the days preceding the
demonstration on Mount Scopus, and on the day on which it was reported, Haaretz also covered anti-Semitic
riots in the universities in Vienna (January 29) and Berlin (February 11), as well as in other cities in Europe.
Also published in a collection of Ahimeir’s writings, see Abba Ahimeir, Brit HaBirionim (Tel Aviv: The
Committee for the Publication of Ahimeir’s Writings, 1972), 195-199 [in Hebrew].
“Magnes resign!” read on that day the main headline of Hazit HaAm, “This is the demand of the Yishuv and the Jews, who cannot reconcile themselves to the Communist methods in the persecution of Zionists, which reign with a heavy hand over Mount Scopus.” Arlosoroff, who, in Hazit HaAm, was called a wide range of derogatory names, was also blamed on its pages for being the one who summoned the policemen, with Magnes’s approval, to disperse the demonstration on “Mount Traitors,” seat of “The Gang of Traitors.” “The de facto police chief was Dr. Haim Arlosoroff,” it was written, “for whom the role of head of policemen was not enough, as he also filled the role of policeman, in beating [demonstrators].”

Arlosoroff, for his part, wrote a letter to Magnes directly after the demonstration: “It is needless to say how much I, and the entire administration of the Agency, are saddened with him for the incident that took place yesterday in the university, which constituted a desecration of its honor and the honor of our whole people,” he wrote, “however, I must mention, that I could not free myself of the feeling that part of the guilt lies also with those responsible for organizing the lecture, for not having found necessary to consult on this matter with the administration of the Agency.”28 In his journal, Arlosoroff described the demonstrators as a marginal and violent group, as a “small gang of crooks, who know no limits,” and added, “I was ashamed to the bottom of my heart… As we left Mount Scopus, I was so embarrassed and depressed that I was wondering if I should go on that same evening to the Government House.”29

---

28 Haim Arlosoroff, Letter to Y.L. Magnes, February 11, 1932 (the Hebrew University Archive) [in Hebrew].
29 Haim Arlosoroff, Jerusalem Diary, 207 [in Hebrew]. In the same entry from February 10, 1932 (pp. 206-207) he added: “I came to the university, to Bentwich’s inaugural lecture on ‘Jerusalem – The City of Peace.’ Dr. Magnes did not inform us that something is ‘cooking’ and did not prepare us for what might take place, and I was therefore unprepared for something extraordinary. I got the first hint as I was told, upon entering the hall, about three pamphlets that were distributed this morning signed by different student organizations. It was already too late to do anything. Bentwich just started his lecture, and a scandal erupted and turmoil took over, until British policemen were called, who detained about fifteen of members of Hanoar HaLeumi (lit. The National Youth), lead by Abba Ahimeir. Whoever did not see this sight, will never know the degree of ugliness and distaste to it. The English did not care a thing; the Arabs will rejoice; people from outside will see this as an ordinary university scandal and that’s it!... The claim about the police, that it should not be allowed in the university – is not acceptable to me. As long as there are hooligans in the universities – there will also be policemen! I cannot agree with the moral of anti-Semitic university heads, who declare the university buildings a holy site, without considering the crimes taking place within them. However, the method that fights against controversial opinions through rioting is horrible, and even more horrible is the sight of a crowd standing helpless before acts of terrorism… On the other hand, it seems to me that they did not take care of anything, if
Hazit HaAm, which also raised donations for “the prisoners of the protest,” did not shy away from expressing harsh criticism against Klausner, a friend of Bentwich, and presented him as a coward and as “Magnes’s clerk.”\textsuperscript{30} Netanyahu, on the other hand, admired him, and his worldview in those years alternated between being loyal to his spiritual father, his ally in the university, and maintaining his honor, and his draw to his spiritual brother, Ahimeir, who, while more extremist, was ideologically within touching distance from him. Ahimeir and other protestors, who were not students, were tried in court and sentenced to a few weeks in prison.

Noah Ben-Tovim, one of Netanyahu’s partners in the Revisionist Students Section, and some students from other associations, including David Raziel, were suspended from studies after arguing with the university leadership during the investigation. On February 14, the university announced that it does no longer recognize these organizations, which were involved in distributing the pamphlet, and took disciplinary action against additional students. On the same day Netanyahu sent a letter to the university administration. In it, he, on behalf of the Section, backed their suspended peers. “Everyone is equally responsible for the public statement by the nationalist students and identifies with their position,” he wrote.\textsuperscript{31} In Hazit HaAm, a headline stated that “Magnes issues an inquisitional verdict on Zionists.”\textsuperscript{32} Even Glickson, in a piece in Haaretz published a few days later, criticized the punishments imposed by the university on the students.\textsuperscript{33}

Two weeks later, Hazit HaAm reported on a student gathering that discussed the incident. Ben-Tovim worded the position of the Section as such: “Among the students there are two camps. The degenerating, Brit Shalomian camp, with Magnes as its leader. This camp includes also the

---

\textsuperscript{30} The Professor Klausner, “Hazit HaAm, February 19, 1932 [in Hebrew].

\textsuperscript{31} Benzion Netanyahu, Letter to the University Administration, February 14, 1932 (the Hebrew University Archive) [in Hebrew].

\textsuperscript{32} “After the Riots in the College, Magnes Issues Inquisitionary Verdict for Zionists,” Hazit HaAm, February 16, 1932 [in Hebrew].

\textsuperscript{33} Moshe Glickson, “On the Agenda,” Haaretz, February 17, 1932 [in Hebrew].
people of Mapai, and opposed to them is the nationalist camp. No peace shall reign between
the two camps. We at the university are an avant-garde of a huge Zionist youth movement.
Behind us stands the entire, unsold Jewish people. We have known to fight against corrupt
institutions, and we shall not be deterred in our war against the decay on Mount Scopus.
Magnes, in favor of ‘the peace,’ relinquished the entire Land of Israel, but for the peace did not
relinquish one lecture.”

For the young Netanyahu, the demonstration in the university became a source of pride, an
occasion where, on one winter day in 1932, nearly all of his enemies gathered in one hall:
Bentwich, Magnes, Weizmann figuratively, after whom the chair was named, Arlosoroff, and
the idea of eternal peace, which Bentwich tried to promote in his lecture. From this point
onward, he was mostly a man of words, and in the years 1933 and 1934 he devoted most of his
time to writing, and mostly editing, for the newspaper HaYarden and the journal Betar.

Under the big logo of HaYarden, in the center of which lies an illustration of the Land of Israel
with the two banks of the Jordan river, were featured the names of Netanyahu’s spiritual fathers:
Klausner, the “executive editor,” whom Netanyahu defined as “the flag-bearer of the Hebrew
renaissance,” and Jabotinsky, whose regular contribution was a source of pride for the
newspaper.

HaYarden (The Jordan) was relatively reserved in comparison to vociferous newspapers such
as HaAm (The People, 1931) and Hazit HaAm (The People’s Front, 1932-1934), which

34“General Assembly of Students in the College,” Hazit HaAm, March 1, 1932 [in Hebrew].
35Ari Shavit, in an article following Benzion’s death, wrote: “In one of our meetings we uncovered a sensitive
topic. Benzion recounted to me proudly that one of the political acts of which he is the proudest is the disruption
of Brit Shalom member Bentwich’s lecture. In that bold act, he met Tzila, and thus came their family into the
world. The problem: Bentwich was the dear, beloved brother of my grandfather. I could not spare the professor
this sensitive, subversive information. For a moment, an uncomfortable silence filled the room. He looked and
me and I looked at him, but in the end, both of us smiled.” See Ari Shavit, “In the Shadow of History,” ibid. The
Netanyahu family came to the world in a later stage: Tzila first
married Netanyahu’s companion in the Section,
Ben-Tovim, and moved with him to London. After a few years, she left Ben-Tovim and Britain, and reconnected
with Netanyahu. The two married in New York in 1944. Yoni, their eldest, was born in 1946, and Benjamin in
1949. The youngest son, Iddo, was born in 1952. See Ronit Vardi, ibid., 47-60.
compared Hitler, Stalin and Ben Gurion.\footnote{After the failure of the attempts to turn the newspaper Hazit HaAm, which was published from 1932, to the official daily newspaper of the Revisionist movement, it was decided in the institutions of HaTzohar, and approved by Jabotinsky, to establish HaYarden. Its first issue came out in April 1934, and Netanyahu, who previously edited the journal Betar, was appointed to serve as the newspaper’s editor for several months. HaYarden found itself in debts already from its beginning. It was shut down in May 1935 by the British authorities, and shortly after its relaunch in August of the same year, it transitioned to a weekly format until its closure in May 1939, when it was absorbed by the newspaper HaMashkif. For Netanyahu’s activity in HaYarden, and the reasons for the newspaper’s founding, see Ch. Ben-Yerucham, Book of Betar (Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Jabotinsky Institute, 1975), vol. 2, 102-105 [in Hebrew]. For the leaders of the HaAvoda Movement’s criticism of the newspaper, see David Ben Gurion, Memories: Second Volume 1934-1935 (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1972), 113, 213, 244 [in Hebrew]. See also Mina Graur, The Voice of a Party: The Revisionist Movement and Its Press (Jerusalem: Jabotinsky Institute, 2002), 110-130 [in Hebrew].} It published news reports from Palestine and the world, especially ones following events in Germany, and also pieces by Jabotinsky and Klausner. Other revisionists also wrote for it, as did authors and poets affiliated with the Revisionist movement: the leaders of Brit HaBirionim, Ahimeir (1897-1962), who published excerpts from his prison journal in it, Yehoshua Heschel Yevin (1891-1970), author and translator, who wrote Jerusalem Is Waiting and edited Hazit HaAm, and Uri Zvi Greenberg (1896-1971), one of the most important political poets in Hebrew poetry, if not the most important of them.\footnote{For a discussion of Uri Zvi Greenberg’s thought, see Dan Miron, Prolegomena to U.Z Greenberg (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2002) [in Hebrew]. For a discussion of political poetry in Israel, see Yochai Oppenheimer, The Right to Say No (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2003) [in Hebrew].}

Among the newspaper’s contributors were also other fascinating and remarkable personalities, if lesser known than Ahimeir and Greenberg, such as Wolfgang von Weisl (1896-1974), who edited HaAm in 1931. Von Weisl wrote books on Islam and countless opinion pieces, as well as a novel titled “The Battle in the Gilboa,” which was serialized in HaYarden. Protesting a wave of arrests by the British in 1946 (“Black Saturday”), von Weisl, who was one of the detained, went on a twenty-eight day hunger strike, and documented this period in his journal;\footnote{Ze’ev von Weisl, Ninety-Two Days of Detention and Fast (Tel Aviv: Tversky Publishing House, 1947) [in Hebrew].} Kalman Katznelson (1907-2000), who, in 1964, caused a storm following publication of his ultra-provocative book, The Ashkenazi Revolution, in which he called for a separation between Ashkenazi and Mizrahi Jews;\footnote{Kalmen Katznelson, The Ashkenazi Revolution (Tel Aviv: Anach, 1964) [in Hebrew].} or Joseph Schechtman (1891-1970), Jabotinsky’s close
associate, who composed a biography of the latter and dealt throughout his life with questions regarding population transfer as well as the status of Transjordan. In 1965, Schechtman wrote a book titled “The Mufti and the Führer,” and claimed that “it is no coincidence that the physical systematic annihilation of European Jewry began, to a great extent, with the arrival of the Mufti in the camp of the Axis powers – first in Italy, and afterwards, 10 days later, in Germany.”

Additionally, HaYarden also employed a close friend of Netanyahu at the time, poet Uriel Heilperin (1908-1981), who on the newspaper’s pages used for the first time the pen name “Yonatan Ratosh.” In 1937, Ratosh was appointed editor, but was later terminated due to his unique Canaanite views.

Netanyahu was editor of HaYarden for a short but significant period in 1934, until the death of his father, and in this time the Arlosoroff affair and the “blood libel” against the revisionists overshadowed all else. “It seems that the blue and white flag, the symbol of fraternity and national unity, that Herzl, our godly captain, waived, is gradually being filled in the 1930s by a foreign color, the color of the flag of those bearing the class ideology, those bearing the internal disintegration and animosity,” wrote Netanyahu in an essay in Betar before the Eighteenth Zionist Congress, which took place after Arlosoroff’s murder; this, as the “Revisionism won a rain of unceasing spit and the honorable title of ‘destructive radicalism.’”

In 1980, Netanyahu retrospectively addressed the days of Arlosoroff's murder, “which served as a grounds for the leftwing parties in Zionism to spread the libel that the revisionists, or a few of their extremist friends, plotted the murder and even carried it out.” In an essay published in the book The Black Prince, dedicated to Yosef Katznelson – one of the leaders of Betar, who, according to Netanyahu, was the one who spoke to his father’s heart and persuaded him to join
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41 For a biography of Ratosh, see: Yehoshua Porath, The Life of Uriel Shelah (Tel Aviv: Machbarot LeSifrut, 1989) [in Hebrew].
the struggle for the establishment of the Public Committee led by Rabbi Kook – he wrote that, in those days, “our movement, HaTzohar, had posed a target for persecution and slander, for acts of violence and malicious libel, the likes of which no movement in Israel has known,” and emphasized that he believes that in this period “the fate of Zionism” was determined.43

The name “Netanyahu” is even mentioned in testimonies from the trial, as a person who met Ahimeir in Jerusalem on the eve of the murder. David Luchinsky, who wrote a poem that was published on the same day in Hazit HaAm under the pen name “Eldad,” testified that he was strolling along Jaffa Street. According to a May 1934 article covering the trial for Davar newspaper, Luchinsky said: “I passed by the Steimatzky store. There was a light in the window. People were standing by it. Among them I recognized Ahimeir, Avnieli and Netanyahu. I did not know the fourth person. Ahimeir greeted me and said: We have printed your poem in today’s edition. I told him that I was displeased, as there are typing errors and some lines are missing, and these are highly important for a poem. Netanyahu has long hair.” In Doar HaYom, which favorably covered his court testimony, Ahimeir appeared “weak and very thin, his face pale as if after a sickness… at times he is resting his hands on the table, and at times on the partition of the judge’s table. He is handed a hat, he wears it in a makeshift manner, and legally swears that he will tell the truth.” Ahimeir testified: “On Jaffa street, I stopped for a moment by Steimatzky’s newspaper window. I saw people there. The lawyer Avnieli and Netanyahu were there. Then, to my recollection, Netanyahu had long hair.”

“Ch. Ben-Yerucham,” the pen name of Chen Melech Merchavia, who was a member of Brit HaBirionim and wrote extensively on the Revisionist movement, notes in The Book of Bethar and in his book on the Arlosoroff affair, The Great Libel, that apart from articles signed under “B. Netanyahu” and many other articles published anonymously, Benzion used pen names,

including “B. Soker” and “Nitay” (the son Benjamin shortened his name to “Ben Nitay” in central years of his life in the United States). Netanyahu was not unusual in doing so; many in his generation, of both the left and the right, utilized pen names. Ahimeir, as previously mentioned, signed with the name “Abba Sikra,” but also with many other names, such as “A. Asir Zion,” “A. Kore” and “Stam Makshan,” among others.

In some of his columns in Betar and HaYarden, and on other platforms, Netanyahu wrote about Klausner’s language research and thought; about settlement in the village compared to settlement in the city, and about “Hebrew labor” and the danger of “the spreading Arab labor”; however, the principal share of his criticism was directed at the leadership of his time, and especially at Weizmann and his associates, “the distorters of Zionism,” who, instead of initiating and promoting the interests of the Jews, bring about destruction and “a politics of Zionist liquidation”; at the mainstream press, which “has the concern, how to get out of its deep and ugly hole of blood libel, which its bearers dug out of blindness and malice and a fraternal hatred that knows no limits”; and at anything resembling the left, cosmopolitanism, socialism, communism and other isms.

According to Netanyahu, all of these ideologies blind the masses and lend a hand to a suicidal and dangerous plan to destroy Zionism. “It is a neat ending that is being prepared for you here – and this ending is called: An Arab state in the Land of Israel,” wrote “B. Netanyahu” on June 6, 1934.

46Benzion Netanyahu, “Our Path in the Question of Hebrew Labor,” HaYarden, November 9, November 22, November 23, 1934 [in Hebrew].
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Land of Israel without the rule of the leftwing dictatorship.”

“The idea of a people's liberation and its political resurrection, the idea of the establishment of a Jewish state, with all attributes essential to a state, with real state power etc., is unacceptable in the eyes of socialist Zionism,” wrote “B. Soker”, “such an idea seems too ‘chauvinistic’ and ‘imperialistic’ in the eyes of the ‘repairers of the world’… The only criterion for the moral validity of Zionism is, to them, the degree of benefit it brought to the Arab masses.”

“B. Soker” also wrote, in November and December of 1934, columns critical of the Hebrew University, titled “‘Our’ University,” which, in his perspective, was estranged from Jewish politics and national identity. It was ruled by the ideas of Ahad Ha'am, and has turned into “a center of that same system that for a long time had stuck as a bone in the throat of Zionism, the Brit Shalom method. A large part of the university’s professors and employees boast that they are non-national, but rather mere pure scientific workers, this, despite the ‘pure science’ not bothering them from intervening, in times in need, in favor of the Marxist parties in Zionism.”

According to “B. Soker”, “The ‘university hall’ is cold, and the blazing wind of a national liberation movement does not blow between its walls.”

As a student of Jabotinsky, Netanyahu believed that the “one and only” goal of Zionism is demographic – obtaining a Jewish majority in the Land of Israel.

---

51-Benzion Netanyahu (B. Soker), “How the Left Brings a Danger of Crisis for the Land of Israel,” HaYarden, January 24, 1935 [in Hebrew].
54-In his article on Yosef Katznelson (39-40), Netanyahu compares between the different attitudes of Katznelson and Jabotinsky in relation to a Jewish majority in the Land of Israel and to democracy: “As we know, no one emphasized as much as Jabotinsky the rights of the Jews to the Land of Israel. Despite this, he believed that our people shall be entitled to establish its self-rule in the land only after having achieved a Jewish majority in it. As such, he saw the creation of such a majority as the “final goal” of Zionism. Yosef opposed this outlook. He was of the opinion that there are two options: If the Jews have ownership rights over the Land of Israel, why should their rule over it be conditioned on the creation of a Jewish majority? Alternatively, if the democratic essence is so important that it could prevent such a rule, this in any case means that the right to rule would be given to the Arabs, that have constituted and constitute today the majority of the population. In short, Yosef opposed the outlook that conditioned Jewish independence in the land on the existence of a Jewish majority in it, and believed that the Jewish sovereignty should become reality regardless of the existence of a majority and a minority. I remember what Yosef told me, as he returned from one of the movement’s conferences, about the conversation he had with Jabotinsky on this matter and on Jabotinsky’s position on his belief that a Jewish majority is unnecessary as a condition for rule over the land. Jabotinsky did not concede one bit. The Jewish rule...
interest of the Mandatory government was the opposite, while the Zionist leadership remained helpless and blind. “We calmly observe how matters develop,” he wrote in November, 1934, “without understanding everything our very eyes see. But – the days are coming when this land, which today is as calm as a lake, will be as loud as a boiling depth… The day will come when the Hebrew settlement will suddenly recognize the true character of the humble sons of the desert, who today beg for a slice of bread before the gates of the Jewish farmer. The day will come when the Haurani, Bedouin and Druze masses will remind the Jewish settler, deprived of the sense of reality, of the real environment to which he is subject.”

Netanyahu’s writing on the need for a mass immigration of Jews to the Land of Israel was published at the time of the escalation of anti-Semitic incidences in Europe, and the rise of the National Socialist Party in Germany. In January 1935, a few months after Adolf Hitler became the autocratic leader of Germany, following the death of President Paul von Hindenburg, Netanyahu used the Hebrew word for “holocaust” (Shoah) to describe the degree of threat to Jews in Europe. In an article titled “In the Front of Hitler’s Fire,” “B. Netanyahu” wrote that “We stand before a terrible holocaust, of the kind that flooded the Jewish world in the times of the crusades.”

Netanyahu, who in those days began more and more to take interest in ancient and new anti-Semitism, frequently compared the persecution of Jews in the Middle Ages to the persecution

will be established, he said, only after Jews will be 51% of the population. History turned, of course, in a different direction. The Jewish rule over the land was established when the Jewish people was still a minority in its land.”

56 Benzion Netanyahu, “Facing Hitler’s Fire Front,” HaYarden, January 6, 1935. The use of the scriptural word “holocaust” (Shoah), which means “destruction,” was uncommon before the Second World War. However, Netanyahu was not the only one to use it in Hebrew literature and journalism in the context of the rise of anti-Semitism in Germany. Thus, for example, on March 17, 1933, Davar newspaper published an article titled “In Time of the Holocaust for the German Jewry.” Hayim Nahman Bialik, who used the word in his early poems, also used it in his writings several times during these years; one such example can be seen in “These Times” from May 12, 1933, in which he argued that “to my regret, I do not know if also today the German Jews and the rest of Judaism’s parts who are at a situation similar to theirs will learn a lesson from the events. However, something did shake them to their core. The holocaust today came on so suddenly!” In a letter from July 6, 1933, Bialik wrote to his friend Oscar Wolsfsberg: “Since the holocaust of Hitler took place upon the Jews in Germany, I did not distract my thoughts from you and your home.” See Hayim Nahman Bialik, Letters (Tel Aviv: Dvir, 1939), 244 [in Hebrew].
of Jews in the days of Hitler in Europe. To this end, he made mention of the *auto-da-fé*, the cruel and public ceremony in which the Spanish inquisition carried out the verdicts of those charged with heresy: “All of the huge territory from the Ural to the Rhine is an *auto-da-fé* platform that Europe is preparing for the Jewish people, and the sparks of this awesome fireland even beyond the Rhine, in France, England and the United States.”

Two years before, in an article titled “On the Eve of the Eighteenth Congress,” which was published in *Betar*, Netanyahu defined the Nazi regime as a “German Inquisition.” In an August 1934 article in *HaYarden*, “B.N.” wrote: “As the Arab savages would hunt Jews fleeing Spain on the rocks of Algiers, so are those fleeing the inferno of the diaspora being hunted at the gates of the homeland.”

On June 14, 1934, *HaYarden* published an opinion piece, signed “N”, with the title: “Comparison to the Middle Ages.” The writer addressed in the piece an “unexplained, unclear, mysterious and vague” phenomenon taking place within the Zionist movement. In order to explain this phenomenon, the writer draws a possible comparison between the persecution of Jews in Germany in the twentieth century and the persecution of Jews in Spain in the fifteenth century: “Hitlerian Germany – the Inquisition.” At its beginning, the writer explained that the comparison is baseless, or rather, “a multiple insult… to the Middle Ages!” due both to the persecution by the Nazis until that year paling in comparison to the persecution of the Middle Ages, and to the latter being characterized by a deep “internal belief […] which is much more deserving of forgiveness than the persecution of our times.” While the masses in the Middle Ages believed all of the blood libels, thereby giving their hatred a certain rational component, in the 1930s, “no German believes the blood libel of *Der Stürmer*, and in spite of this he would

---
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be willing to repeat this libel a thousand times a day, if only it would be proven that in this way
it would be easier for him to annihilate the Jews.”

However, the piece takes no interest in the Nazis, the Spanish Inquisition, or the non-Jewish
persecutors, but rather in the Jews and in Zionism. It begins by attacking some of the converted
Jews of the Middle Ages, who, in contrast to that certain logic of the non-Jews, “the destructive
drive that awoke in them was so strong, that, in the end, it brought them to destroy themselves.
This was a kind of suicide out of a crazed fervor of hatred.” “N” wrote further:

The Jewish converts of the Middle Ages excel in a special hatred, the likes of which were unknown to
the Middle Ages, a hatred that became known only in recent days… The main danger in the converts of
the Middle Ages is that they presented this dark hatred to the service of the foreign power. All of the trials
conducted in the Middle Ages against the Jews, in order to prove that according to the Talmud they are
blood seekers, criminals and amoral…these converts managed them and supported them. We should
always remember that the converts legitimized the great persecutions both ideologically and practically.

“N” mentions two names: Johannes Pfefferkorn (1469-1523) and Paul of Burgos (1350-1435),
converted Jews who instigated against the Jews and persecuted them:

Throughout the entire fifteenth century, it is difficult to mention acts of horror against the Jews that
weren’t related to him [Paul of Burgos] and his descendants after him. This family has served as a vipers’
nes for the Spanish Jewry. They brought the Inquisition to Spain; they cause the acts of cruelty toward
Jews, and first of all toward the Anusim, throughout the fifteenth century. Torquemada [Tomás de
Torquemada, a monk who served as the Grand Inquisitor] and the other inquisitors were not but the last
stones in the pyramid of hatred established on the foundation that they had laid. And thus, the expulsion
of Spain’s Jews should, to a large extent, be credited to them. Not for solace, it should be mentioned that
the family eventually paid for its craze of hatred. Its fate was no different from that of those they persecuted
with fury: the dungeons of the Inquisition and the auto-da-fé.

However, all of these characters and historical allusions are mere supporting actors, serving as
a means of comparison to the 1930s. Toward the end of the piece, the writer returns to
contemporary times, which, in his eyes, are more dangerous than the Middle Ages, as the hatred,
which characterized a few converts in the past, has passed on to the “Pfefferkorns of today.”
Thus, he alludes, without mentioning them, to non-Zionist Jews, Brit Shalom associates and
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some of the leaders of the Zionist movement, enemies from within, that to “N” subvert the Zionist idea. “The Pfefferkorns were mere individuals, and lived outside of the people. The people itself had seen them as enemies from without… Today’s Pfefferkorns are a big camp, riding on the shoulders of the people, and at its expense.”

Thus, 1932-1935 were the years that shaped Netanyahu’s pessimism, his fields of interest and his hostility toward the left. The demonstration against Bentwich symbolized the struggle against the university, against Brit Shalom and against any Jewish criticism of nationalism; the Arlosoroff affair symbolized to him the persecution of the right by the unrestrained left, which he perceived as an enemy; and the death of his father was bound to the Arlosoroff affair and made the political personal. All of these followed him for the rest of his life and were passed on to the next generation.
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