University of Glasgow

Bauer, Simon Carl Johan *Herzl's 'The Jewish State': nationalism and homeland in 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness.* [MA]

School of Social and Political Sciences

HERZL'S 'THE JEWISH STATE': NATIONALISM AND HOMELAND IN 'WESTERN' ASHKENAZI DIASPORIC JEWISHNESS

2063890

February, 2017

Word Count: 9779

Presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MA in Politics & Sociology

Abstract

This paper is a theoretical examination of Theodor Herzl's 'The Jewish State' as a response to the Jewish Question, and its consequences and implications on the subsequent conception of homeland in 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness. It conceptualises Herzl's work as a nationalist narrative through Bhabha, and conjoins it in homeland as constitutive of diaspora and diasporic collectiveness. Within this context, Jewishness is understood as a multi-directional, multifaceted, and representative of the various ways in which it can constitute itself within different contexts. It argues that inherent in the nationalist narrative is an antagonism between the Diaspora and the State of Israel. Through an exploration of 'The Jewish State' in the context of Political Zionism, it outlines the theoretical and practical implications of constructing the Diaspora as antithetical to the State of Israel. Thereby, it is argued that the narrative itself seeks to construct a Jewishness wherein Political Zionism is constitutional to understanding the self. This is then critiqued in looking at the fixedness of temporalities that neglects the sociospatial dimension of Diaspora and Eretz Yisrael. It further argues that homeland is a temporality and shared heritage in Diasporic Jewishness, a conception necessary to understand a Jewishness beyond the State of Israel.

The idea which I have developed in this pamphlet is a very old one: it is the restoration of the Jewish State. The world resounds with outcries against the Jews, and these outcries have awakened the slumbering idea." (Herzl, [1896] 1988: 69)

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

1. **Introduction**

The so called 'Jewish Question' is broadly understood as a way of logically making sense of the apparent singularity and lack of assimilation of the 'Jewish people' into their 'host societies' in the age of the rise of the nation state (Dawidowicz, 1975). In 1896, Theodor Herzl had the ambition to counter this through his political pamphlet 'The Jewish State', a first attempt at envisioning a nation State for the Jewish people. Through answering the Jewish Question with nationalism, he lay out the very foundations of what is here understood as 'Political Zionism', the strive for a Jewish homeland through a nation state. In an implicit try to unite the Jewish people under a singular nation, he believed that the oppression and antagonisms of anti-Semitism present in Europe would go away. However, in so doing, he also redefined the ending of the Golah, 'exile', or the Diaspora, an existence that under the logic of his nationalist narrative subsequently became to be branded as negative not only in its origins and consequences, but also in itself a position antithetical to a return to the promised land. This paper will critically examine this antagonism, between the Political Zionism in its nationalist narrative and the Diaspora. More specifically, it seeks to answer how Herzl's re-imagination of homeland in 'The Jewish State' through nationalism altered subsequent conceptions and expressions of 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness. The Ashkenazim are those who settled in Europe and Russia in the Diaspora. It will focus on the 'Western' Ashkenazim as this is the context within which Herzl was writing, and those whom he was addressing. The concept of Jewishness is here used as a way of understanding the multifaceted ways in which it can be expressed, experienced, and articulated. Furthermore, the linkage to a homeland, real or imagined, is understood as crucial to the constitution of a Diaspora (Safran, 1991). These discussions will provide a more direct account of Diaspora/State of Israel relations in relation to nationalism, as well as understanding the implications of diaspora reconfiguration within Herzl's work. This paper shall argue that through a nationalist narrative, homeland became both spatially and temporally fixed in the State of Israel, reconfiguring not only the idea of a homeland itself, but also the Diaspora and Diasporic Jewishness. It will do so in three parts.

The first chapter shall be concerned with the overarching theoretical framework. It starts with a thorough examination of the nation state, and nationalism as the narration which makes it possible. Thereby, it argues for this understanding in relation to a spatial and temporal fixedness, a context as well as a foundation which enables and directs the narrative from the past to the future, anchored in the present through its articulation. It will then examine the concept of diaspora and its positionality within transnational understandings of peoples and the world relational to spatial and temporal links. It thus seeks to outline the collectiveness of a diaspora in-itself, and the signifiers which are drawn upon when identifying both the self and the group in relation to this. After this, the concept of homeland will be examined more closely, situating it as relational and formational to diaspora. It highlights the idea of homeland as a floating signifier which needs to be called upon and examined to carry meaning. Thereby, homeland is here understood as always implicit within diasporas and diasporic collectives. Lastly, this chapter shall further this notion of identity in relation to Jewishness. It proposes that rather than employing 'Jewish identity' as a homogenous universal, Jewishness delineates a broader understanding of it as expressive, active, and relational.

The second chapter will examine Herzl's 'The Jewish State', and by consequence Political Zionism and its reconfiguration of 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness. Firstly, it puts 'The Jewish State' into the context of the previously outlined theoretical framework, looking at nationalism as implicit within the pamphlet, as well what it tells about homeland in relation to diaspora. Following this, it more closely explores Political Zionism and how it conceptualises the Golah as negative, and the effort to unite a collective Jewishness within the old-new nation state. Thereafter, the so called ingathering of the exiles, in particular aliyah, literally 'ascension', Jewish migration into Israel whilst taking up Israeli citizenship, shall be discussed. This shows a way in which homeland and diaspora are being reconfigured materially to negotiate a homogenous Jewishness relational to the State of Israel. Lastly, this chapter shall explore how the articulation of Political Zionism in itself seeks to reconceptualise Jewishness as directly linked to, and also constitutive of, the Jewish nation state. Thereby, the emancipatory

project of a Jewish nation state is creating and maintaining a new Jewishness, one that is directly linked to a return to the imagined homeland, antagonising the Golah.

The third and final chapter shall focus on the consequences of the nationalist narrative generated through 'The Jewish State' on Jewishness relational to homeland, and the antagonisms which it has created and continues to maintain. It shall do so through firstly looking at how the narration of the nation is directly dependent on a conceptualisation of both Eretz Yisrael, the land of Israel, and the Diaspora into fixed temporalities. Thereby it disregards how these spatiotemporalities are both always-already happening, thus changing and evolving within the same linear, irrevocable temporality as the Jewish nation state. After this, the chapter will discuss in particular the antagonism between US American Jewishness and the State of Israel, in order to highlight how the state is constructing itself as both the imagined homeland in Diasporic Jewishness and as an institutionalised nation state. Following on, Diaspora relations will be re-examined through its neglecting as necessary for the imagining of the Jewish nation state. Therein, it seeks to illuminate the construction of the Golah as unequivocally negative, thus rejecting its Jewishness as incomplete. Lastly, this chapter shall discuss the inter-relationality between the Diaspora and the State of Israel. It thereby problematizes the construction of Jewishness as dependent on the state, whilst also showing how it is necessary to think of the two as separate entities to be examined in their relationality.

This paper further argues that Diasporic Jewishness should be envisioned as having the possibility of being outside of Political Zionism, and thereby the State of Israel. Herzl's response to the Jewish Question created a homogenising potency which has forced its conception of Diasporic Jewishness to be relational to the State of Israel, appropriating it, and thereby appealing to the collective notion of the ancient homeland of the Jews, rendering the Diaspora obsolete.

3

2. Chapter One: Nationalism, Diaspora, Transnationalism, and Jewishness

In order to understand the consequences of Herzl's answer to the 'Jewish Question', it is necessary to critically deconstruct nationalism and by extension the nation. This chapter will provide a framework through which Herzl's 'The Jewish State' (1988) as a response to the Jewish Question, and its subsequent consequences, will be understood and analysed. It seeks to provide a holistic structure that can be used to understand the causes and consequences of the unravelling antagonism between Political Zionism and the Diaspora. Therefore, it will firstly explore nationalism and the nation through the work of Bhabha (2013), Anderson (2006), and Wimmer and Glick Schiller (2002). It seeks to trace the nation as a narrative practice that comes into being through an articulation within the present, dependent on the temporalities of the past and the future, conjoining them with spatial imaginations. Following, the chapter will explore diasporas and transnationalism, as bounded groupedness. Through a transnational perspective, diasporas are understood as independent of national borders, and dependent on an active imagining of the community as one. After these discussions this chapter shall trace the concept of homeland, as an imagined origin, within diaspora studies, especially through Safran (1991) and Cohen (1997). It is here situated in the context of nationalism, thus the reconfiguration of an idea of homeland into a nation state. Lastly, it will situate the ambiguous concept of identity in relation to 'Jewishness' as an expressive way of understanding the multiple modalities which it can take, both in relation to a perceived self, and a collective.

2.1 The Nation and Nationalism

The construction of a nation is possible through nationalism; a form of ontological narrative (Somers, 1994) which binds together a bordered group relational to spatial and temporal dimensions. Towards the end of the 19th century, the nation state was understood as the natural way of community in a teleological history of progress. It has further been argued that this is still the case to some extent in research, in assuming that

the nation state is 'natural', a fault labelled as 'methodological nationalism' (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002). Although organised forms of community had existed in the past, this was a new specific articulation of ideas, organising perceived 'peoples' into social units in specific spaces, argued as organically linked together by the necessity of history and 'culture' (Andersson, 2006). Socially constructed and organised in this way, the Nation became a unit from which other forms of social organisation could be, was, and is derived (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002). As such it is not 'natural', although it has come to be understood as 'primordial' by social agents in the sense that it is socially assumed as ontology (Geertz, 1996). Thereby, it serves to bind and separate groups of people through a collective imagining of the 'nation' as community (Anderson, 2006). Following this logic, the Nation itself can only come into existence through a narrative that binds together spatiality and temporality, making sense of the two in relation to each other, and separately (Bhabha, 2013); the spatiality of land and the time which the own group is supposedly linked to the same. Therein, it links together spaces with specific groups, conjoined with the necessity of a prolonged temporal dimension, be it imagined or real. Furthermore, the narrative in itself is temporally conditioned, as it is linking together the past and the future, but always articulated, and thus anchored, in the present. Understanding the nation in this way highlights the importance of the link(s), rather than the simultaneity of being within the space as crucial for the imaginative process (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002: 323). Thereby, the links themselves are the signifiers through which the nation can come into being as a spatiality. The very narration of the nation though is a force totalising the very links into coherence and rigidity (Bhabha, 2013: 3). This narration is nationalism, conjoining together myths and reality, making sense of a perceived self, relational to the links: groupedness, spatiality, and temporality. Nationalism is therefore the process through which the nation is formed, its existence modality, and how it is furthered through a re-articulation. Narration is a process to be reiterated and furthered over time, thereby there is no one single nationalism, as it is ever-changing in its articulation which is always in the present. As pointed out by Steele (2008), narration is furthermore the way in which the state is organised and understood (p. 72). Within this nexus, nationalism and the formation of the nation is understood as an ontological narrative (Somers, 1994). Thus, the nation comes into being and is made

sense of through narrative and is understood by social agents as the 'natural' container of social organisation.

2.2 Transnationalism and Diasporas

Tying into these links and nationalism itself not being dependent on the articulation being within the spatial dimension of imagination, is the idea of diaspora. It is a groupedness which is formed and formulated through interconnectedness, and a simultaneous being both here and there, and at both places at the same time (McHugh, 2000). Diasporas are bound together by a perceived common past, language, and culture. In this regard, it is close to what Meyers (1993) identifies as just culture in that they are shaping and structuring social realities (p. 16; 19) through their practices and commonality. However, the very concept of diaspora itself is both broader and more narrow. It is a structurally more rigid and controlling force, imagined in a way similar to that of the nation. Brubaker (2005: 5-7) argues for three main building blocks of diaspora: i) dispersion, a scattering from one space into multiple spaces; ii) homeland orientation, there needs to be an imagination and tie to the imagined homeland; iii) boundary maintenance, the diaspora itself needs to define and guard its borders, namely that which is not us, and that which is us, this process is further something which needs to go on for a longer period of time. That is to say, a diaspora is both processual and static. It is a collective which holds cultural and historical, real or imagined, signifiers through which the individual and the group can make sense of their selves. These are further collectively negotiated and bounded in accordance with loyalties and norms (Rotenstreich, 1993: 50). This 'collectedness' is contingent on whether "1. one consider oneself to be a collected, and 2. one is considered by the others to be a collected" (Kasher, 1993: 60). Albeit, intrapersonal identification relational to interpersonal connectedness is what in essence ties the collective together, identifications that create emotional bonds and a sense of importance in belonging (David & Bar-Tal, 2009: 358), links that can bring forth collective action (p. 356). As highlighted, because of the processional nature of this groupedness, "[it] must be understood as acontingent, emergent property, not an axiomatic given" (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000: 31). In order to fully make sense of these ties in relation to diaspora, it has been argued for special attention towards a transnational

6

perspective (Brubaker 2005; McHugh, 2000; Vertovec, 1999, 2004). Transnationalism can be said to refer "to multiple ties and interactions linking people or institutions across the borders of nation states […] Transnationalism (as long distance networks) certainly preceded 'the nation' (Vertovec, 1999: 447). That is to say, the nation is a boundedness which has been socially constructed and narrated, whereas the transnational networks and understandings are connections, over larger geographical areas, which are not restricted in a rigidity constrained by nations and borders. This is the way in which a diaspora enables a notion of being neither here nor there, but at both places at the same time. It is a collective bound together by the links that are deemed as important in being considered as collected, both intra- and interpersonally.

2.3 Homeland

Furthermore, the conception of 'homeland' within diaspora studies should not be conflated with a nation state per se, even though this could in some instances be the case. Rather, it follows the idea of an origin, an original space which the collective, and by extension the self, originates from. This has been argued to be central within diaspora formation and maintenance (Brubaker, 2005; Cohen, 1997, 2009; Safran, 1991). Therein, it is absolutely foundational in that homeland provides a universal which the group itself can strive towards and use as an identifier. However, it is important to note that not all theorists put the same emphasis on homeland in diaspora construction, although most agree that it does hold some significance (Brubaker, 2005). Safran (1991: 83-4) argues in particular for the multifaceted way in which homeland is maintained and utilised as a unifying factor for a diaspora itself. The spatial origin of the diaspora is retained through an integration of it into everyday ritual and thought. It is thereby an expression of the self in relation to the group, and that which separates the community from 'the other(s)'. Furthermore, in these expressions themselves the mind returns to that place of origin, the original home (McHugh, 2000: 84). It places the self and the collective in a transnational space, which is neither here nor there, yet at both places at the same time. Central to these formations is the so called myth of return (Safran, 1991). Through constructing the homeland in relation both to the past and the present, the place of residence is often put in comparison to an idealised homeland, which is desirable over the present. Albeit, this is

7

not to say that all diaspora is constructing the place of residence as negative, as diaspora itself is a contested process, dependent on time and the maintenance of boundaries (Brubaker, 2005: 7). With an internalisation of the place of residence and its wider community, identities can become altered, and merge into these third spaces of existence (Waldinger, 2016: 10), thereby somewhat erasing the links between origin and residence, a process separating these from an inherent relationality. These processes have been discussed by Cohen (2009: 121) as differentiating notions of homeland as 'solid', 'ductile', and 'liquid'. This conceptualisation follows a linear breaking up of the homeland into a postmodern experience of a floating existence, which in its expression is always contingent on a specific spatiotemporality. However, this contingency can also shift to totalise the importance and specific spatiality of homeland, thereby re-establishing it as a solidity. Notions of homeland are therefore ever-changing, and by no means fixed forever in any of these categories. Through this framework, diaspora-homeland relations can be diversified, breaking up the ways in which homeland is made sense of, a constant process which can only be fixed in the very present temporality of articulation.

2.4 Identity and Jewishness

Defining 'Jewish identity' is well beyond the scope of this paper, and it is an ongoing and ever changing debate. It has even been argued that "any attempted neutral definition of Jewish identity will be virtually void of meaningful content" (Shusterman, 1993: 291). However, for the purpose of analytical clarity, there is a need to bridge some of the debates, and establish a working definition. In regards to identity however, as argued by Brubaker and Cooper (2000), it tends to, as an analytical concept, be too broad in its analytical rigorousness. Rather, they argue a need to look at the specific signifiers which are made sense of in relation to the self and the group. Thereby, it is a fairly active process, processual and selective in its modalities. This is here understood in a similar fashion to Somers' (1994) layering of narratives that are used to make sense of the self; identity is the sum of an ongoing distinction and engrossment of narrative. Therefore, there is not one 'true self', but rather a making sense of the self in relation to others and intrapersonal processes (Goldberg & Krausz, 1993: 3). Thus, herein, identity will not be

used, understanding its social construction and limitations, as it obstructs analytical clarity. Furthermore, locating the Jewish Diaspora in relation to the overwhelmingly ambiguous concept of 'Jewish identity' calls from the very start for a distinction of what 'Jewish' may contain. To Herzl (1988), the Jewish people "is peculiar and unique, for we are bound together only by the faith of our fathers" (p. 146). Later, these distinctions and conjunctions have been explored further. It has been argued for a separation between Judaism as a religion and religious system and as a cultural entity, wherein a 'Jew' signifies a person who is connected to a tribe (Putnam, 1993: 108). In the aforementioned Herzl quote, there is not an explicit evaluation of the Jewish people as a tribe, however, he still refers both to the people and a religion. Moreover, it has also been argued in favour for 'Jewishness' as a better term for thinking about and researching 'Jewish identity' as it encapsulates the variety of ways that it can be made sense of (Butler, 2014; Kasstan, 2012: 162). Through not using the dichotomous interdependent signifiers 'tribe' and 'religion', Jewishness is more capable of encapsulating the diversity of the Jewish experience as such, both prior to and after the establishment of the State of Israel. It further escapes essentialisations such as 'ethnic Judaism' (Kasstan, 2012: 162). Following, in regards to the tribal-cultural aspects of 'Jewishness' it has been argued that, "the Jews are in fact a 'people of the land', originally a Hebrew and Hebrew-speaking people immersed in a close-knit community, whose 'Yaweh' [God] concept is pagan and manifests a religion in the cosmic sense, a religion of nature and of an imminent deity" (Hotam, 2013: 114). In this sense, the Golah is always relational to 'Eretz Yisrael', and thereby a transnational community, that is neither here nor there, but at both places at the same time (Baron, 2014). This is the scope within which 'Jewishness' is conceptualised and employed within this paper.

3. Chapter Two: 'The Jewish State' and Political Zionism

Having established these frameworks and understandings, this chapter will examine more closely 'The Jewish State' (Herzl, 1988), and by extension Political Zionism, and its implications for Diasporic Jewishness. Firstly, it leads on from the conceptualisation of nationalism, and situates Herzl's response to the Jewish Question therein. This discussion is further situated within the context of anti-Semitism. Following, the wider subject of Political Zionism will be briefly discussed. It is important to bear in mind that these debates are too extensive for the scope of this paper, but it is nonetheless important to try and further draw the link between 'The Jewish State' and Political Zionism. This is then further situated in relation to the Shoah, Holocaust, the ultimate trauma to define the Golah. Thirdly, this chapter will discuss the so called 'ingathering of the exiles' and 'aliyah', the moving of those deemed as Jewish by the State of Israel into Israel, taking on citizenship. Thereby, it illuminates the negotiation of Diasporic Jewishness in relation to the constructed homeland on a material level. Lastly, this chapter shall discuss the further implications of Political Zionism onto Diasporic Jewishness, wherein Political Zionism becomes conflated with Judaism, and the nationalist narrative that seeks to unite the Jewish people is also creating a Judaism that is directly dependent on Political Zionism. This chapter shows how the Herzl's reconfiguration of homeland is moulded by the past and the future, articulated in his present, and how this has had far stretching consequences for how the State of Israel is constructed in relation to Diasporic Jewishness. Thereby, the root of the antagonism between Political Zionism and the Diaspora is presented.

3.1 Herzl and the Jewish State

To Herzl (1988), the only way that the Jewish people could escape the ever-looming threat of anti-Semitism was through the establishment of a Jewish state. In a time where the nation state had become perceived as the 'natural' container of a people, it simply made sense that the solution to the Jewish Question would be through a refuge in the form of a nation state wherein the Jews would be in a majority. Political Zionism in this

way is a response trying to create and mould a new Jewishness, directly relating to territory in the form of a nation state (Rotenstreich, 1993). However, whilst arguing within 'The Jewish State' (Herzl, 1988) for the solution for the Jewish people to become a part of the family of nations, there is an awareness of the social construction of a nation state, a to Herzl very conscious, modern project. Writing in the context and aftermath of the Haskala, an intellectual movement primarily in 'Western' Europe concerned with 'enlightenment' thought from a Jewish perspective, the idea of Jewish autonomy was understood as crucial for survival (Birnbaum, 2012), and thus there was a certain degree of urgency to Herzl's project. Through arguing that it was a social matter (Herzl, 1988: 75), a project based on the social formation and work of a 'number of men' (p. 137), the concept of Jewishness seems to encapsulate the multifaceted way in which both the cultural and religious expressions of the Jewish people is articulated. Herein can be traced an appreciation of the diversity of the Jewishness that had developed during the Golah, imagining a people, albeit heterogeneous. Accordingly, Herzl separates the idea of Jewishness from his own European outlook, a scholarly perspective moulded in Haskala as well as 'enlightenment' thought. Within the Haskala, Jewishness became interlinked with its European context (Auerbach, 2001: 33), thus transformed from a totalising structuring of everyday life based on Torahic law, Halakha, into a private matter which separated the religious and the communal aspects (p. 35). However, in Herzl's call to the Jewish spirit, he alludes to religious practice and beliefs: "[t]he Jews have dreamt this kingly dream all through the long nights of their history. 'Next year in Jerusalem' is our old phrase. It is now a question of showing that the dream can be converted into a living reality" (Herzl, 1988: 82). Therefore, the narrative of the nation that is employed is directly linking the idea of people into a specific temporal-spatial nexus that is necessary for the envisioning of the same. The linkages are made sense of in relation to the context that it is arising within, utilising the past with an imagined future, anchored in the present understanding of 'peoples' and 'nations'. There is furthermore a particularism within the argument put forward, in which Herzl is stating that the Jewish people will not only form a state, but a model state, all by the specific characteristics and resources of the group itself (Herzl, 1988: 92). Furthermore, the connection itself between the Diaspora and Eretz Yisrael was envisioned as continuous over the temporal dimension of exile, and it

11

was now to be renewed (Troen & Rabineau, 2014: 164). Thus, Jewishness was imagined as a universal separated from the European spatiotemporality, and narrated into a homogenised nation; the logical conclusion of millennia of oppression, an imagined existence bound together by past and future, articulated through the present.

3.2 Political Zionism

Following 'The Jewish State' was the movement of Political Zionism, aiming to establish a Jewish state, preferably in what was then known as Palestine. It was highly contested but sought to unite the Diaspora, more precisely those resident in Europe, seeking a homogeneous Jewishness directed towards the Homeland, Zion (Beinart, 2013), through nationalist narration. By this, Political Zionism was in its articulations always contested (Silberstein, 1999: 56), full of different strands, cycles, and antagonisms (p. 179). The diverse ways in which Jewishness had been performed, articulated, and understood within Golah were not easily encapsulated under the paradigm suggesting a uniform nation. Through addressing and examining a supposed intrapersonal 'Jewish essence', it linked this together with the temporal dimension of 'return' and the spatial dimension of 'land', within which a new, or, here crucially, original Jewishness could be imagined and by extension realised (Hotam, 2013: 92; Piterberg, 1996: 131). Therein, it is exclusionary through its conceptualisation of that which is 'us' in opposition to that which is not, through its dependency on conceptions of a natural link between 'race, nation, and territory' (Cohen, 1997: 14). However, it still draws on religious and cultural narratives of the past, that cannot simply be reduced to a nationalism amongst others; its particularities are of uttermost importance in understanding its force. An example of this is the destruction of the second temple in 70 CE, as the origin of the dispersion, or *Galut*, the process of forced exile, imbuing Zionism with a messianic drive, and religious reasons for both the Golah and the return to Zion (Gorny, 2009: 243). Following, it is important to stress that Political Zionism is in part understood as a nationalism that is in part diasporic (Rabinovich, 2012). That is to say that its modality was still one of 'return' to the East, the mythical Zion, casting aside the particularities of Diaspora, overturning current existence (Troen & Rabineau, 2014: 166). In this regard, it was a multi-directional transnational movement, seeking to transnationally unite the Jewish Diaspora

within 'Europe', directing their gaze towards the mythical Zion. Although some have argued that the formation and articulation of Political Zionism can be seen as 'irrevocably and permanently Western' (ibid: 163), this might have been true in its initial phases, but the claim that it is 'irrevocable' and 'permanent' is totalising in assuming a static, wherein the ideas are and always will be one thing. As argued above, nationalism is as a narrative always anchored in the present temporality of its articulation, thus processual, as is the construction of culture (Arkush, 2014). However, Political Zionism did define the Galut and the Golah as negative, blocking the realisation of the 'Jewish essence' and its potential, whereas Zion became 'the unequivocal ideal' (Waxman, 1989: 29). However, crucial in reading this into a spatiotemporal context is the destruction of the majority of the Jewish communities in Europe in the Shoah, Holocaust, which permanently changed the dynamics of Jewish nationalism within the diaspora (Rabinovich, 2012; Zerubavel, 2002: 119). This became the final proof that the Jewish Question could only be solved through the establishment of a nation state, and Political Zionism became the supposed driving force of negotiating homeland in Jewish Diasporic Identity.

3.3 Aliyah, or The Ingathering of the Exiles

Integral to Herzl's (1988) idea of the establishment and furthering of a Jewish nation state was the social aspect, building a state on the conjoined efforts of those residing within (p. 137). By extension, this building was also conditioned on a prolonged effort of the so called ingathering of the exiles. This insertion of the people into the spatiotemporal dimension of the state enables a coherent narrative of the nation, furthered both from a wider nationalism and a response and insertion by individuals. Taking up Israeli citizenship and 'ascending' to Israel allows for a configuration of homeland in a very direct way. In essence, through aliyah, those defined as Jewish by the Israeli government are able to reconnect with the past, and materialise a conceived homeland, integrating it into their own Jewishness (Shusterman, 1993). In addition, the migration movement has been described as creative in its adaptability and inventiveness (Waxman, 1989), and it has recently been expanded through self-professed 'Aliyah Facilitators' such as Nefesh B'Nefesh (Amit & Riss, 2007: 293; 301). These serve to make the transition into life in

Israel itself smoother, and seek to inspire a further building of the state. This is because the experience of life in the State of Israel often differs from the expectations (Auerbach, 2001: 81; Milevsky, 2016: 28). Mendelson-Maoz (2010: 73) argues that Israel is often linguistically constructed as utopia, however the incongruence between the conditions within the state as citizen and the utopian narrative creates sense of Foucauldian heterotopia, showing the incongruence between Diasporic and Israeli Jewishness. The utopia is based off the construction and narration of a Jewish nationalism, the answer to the Jewish question through uniting under a single nation state. Furthermore, if the state is narration, then part of belonging becomes engrossing oneself and finding one's space within that narrative (Mayer, 2014). This further highlights the paradox within the aliyah narrative, that the Golah "is the very explicit precondition from which Jewish self-realization through *aliyah* is made possible" (Shusterman, 1993: 300, italics in original). This narrative is inserted into the wider narrative of nationalism, and becomes a link between the negation of exile and the settling process of building a new society (Mendelson-Maoz, 2010: 72). Although, as argued above, Political Zionism is to some extent 'Western' in its constitution and narrative, which was especially noticeable in relation to aliyah in the 1990s, in what is commonly referred to the Great Aliyah (Moore-Gilbert, 2014). This increased the population by over 20%, with Russian speaking migrants following the collapse of the Soviet Union. As the state struggled to facilitate the integration of these into its wider society, it became questioned whether the ingathering of exiles could be understood in purely ideological terms. Whilst ideology, herein Political Zionism, is important in the construction of the Jewish State, the ingathering of exiles itself is often dependent also on conditions experienced in the current place of residence, and that which is offered by Israel (DellaPergola, 2009: 223). Whilst the construction of the state is dependent on its social dimensions, it also wields material-institutional dimensions, yielding a more complex and paradoxical reality than that which is encapsulated within a singular narrative. Whilst Political Zionism and the ingathering of the exiles are seeking to construct a homeland for Diasporic Jewishness, it illuminates also those who are not constructed as part of the narrative.

3.4 Political Zionism as Jewishness

With the establishment of the State of Israel, the imagined homeland became a physical spatiality also. It has been described as "an idea with a place to back it up" (Baron, 2014: xii). Furthermore, arguably, because of this renegotiation of homeland, to some extent Nordau's, one of the founders of the World Zionist Organisation, claim that "Judaism will be Zionist, or it will cease to exist" (quoted in: Hotam, 2013: 165), has materialised at least in narrative form within some strands and conceptions of Jewishness. In the US American context, the overwhelming majority of those who make aliyah are Orthodox, proportionally consisting of some 80 percent in 2013 (Beinart, 2013: 163). At the same time, many have also chosen to study in a Yeshiva, or at another educational facility, within Israel before going on to university back in the US, if they even move back. Further research has suggested that Israel is seen as the best place to live for those who consider themselves as Orthodox Jews who have made aliyah, especially in terms of raising their children (Amit & Riss, 2007: 299). Herein, Israel is constructed as the natural space for those who are religiously observant, and the very act of moving to the 'homeland' becomes a ritual in itself. Following on, with the State of Israel established as the religious homeland of the past, the American Orthodox rabbinic leadership has often defined residing in Israel as religious norm (Waxman, 1995: 59). Thereby, they extract the consequences of Political Zionism in redefining homeland as a nation state, and make it integral to Judaism. However, it is important to emphasise that whilst Torah might be used in both religious and secular views of Israel, it carries different understandings of what it means (Baron, 2014: 159). Hereby, the aspects of the ancient homeland do not have to become part of the nationalist narrative if understood as a temporality and shared heritage. In this understanding, 'Israel' will carry different significance for different Jews. Furthermore, the construction of homeland as a fulfilment is directly dependent on the construction of diaspora as transient and empty, an existence which is always longing towards a return to Eretz Yisrael, where their Jewishness could fully materialise (Piterberg, 1996: 131). The spatial dimension of the Nation here becomes a teleological end point for the temporal one, an ideal to strive for. In this sense, the State of Israel provides a Jewishness that cannot exist within the Diaspora in the 'West' (Rotenstreich,

1993: 54). However, this is further dependent on a homogenising idea of what Jewishness entails, an antagonism within Herzl's attempt to construct it anew, relational to the Diaspora. In regards to the secular construction of Israel as not only nation, many non-observant US American Jews still go there. It has been argued that because of the clearly Christian culture in the USA, making aliyah becomes a clear way of expressing Jewishness, a 'secular fulfilment of Jewishness' (Shusterman, 1993: 292). The contested ways of expression of on the one hand a homogenising Political Zionism, and on the other hand diasporic resistance to the nationalist narrative highlights some of the problems within Herzl's answer to the Jewish Question. Herein, a direct consequence has been the construction of Judaism and Zionism as interdependent and to some extent the same.

4. **Chapter Three: Critiquing Nationalism, Critiquing Political Zionism**

Having described the process of nationalism as Herzl's answer to the Jewish Question, and its subsequent implications for the diasporic construction of Jewishness relating to homeland, this chapter will delve into the antagonism between Political Zionism and the Diaspora. Conceptualising Jewishness as separate from Political Zionism is necessary in order to understand how it operates in relation to the Diaspora, in constructing a supposed Jewishness bound to homeland. As such, "Zionism as an ideological and political movement was never supported by the majority of the Jewish people" (Gorny, 2009: 240), and therefore needs to be understood in this way. Rather, the power of defining a Jewishness needs to be understood as an intrapersonal construction of the self as self, and as part of, or relational to, a presupposed collective (Baron, 2014: 121). This is the centrality of the Diaspora-Political Zionism antagonism. This chapter follows Baron in seeking to discolour the claim made by the State of Israel on providing security for the Jewish people (ibid: 144), highlighting the highly contested construction of Diasporic homeland as a nation state. It will do so through firstly outlining the interrelation of temporality and spatiality, and how this constant processual change affects the heterotopic construction of nationalism relating to a material reality within Eretz Yisrael. Secondly, it will question and deconstruct in more detail the bounding of Political Zionism to Jewishness, heterogenising what Jewishness means, in relation to the construction of a collective. Thirdly, this chapter shall deconstruct the Diaspora, and how Political Zionism in its practice and theory neglects the it, giving way for antagonism and contestation. Lastly, this chapter will expand on the idea of what it means to construct a Jewishness that is bolstered by and appropriated by the State of Israel and Political Zionism. It thereby highlights how the altering of Diasporic Jewishness through nationalism is in its articulation and consequences an antagonistic practice.

4.1 Temporality and Spatiality; Change and Fixedness

The articulation of Political Zionism, and its nationalist parameters for the construction of ontology, is conditioned on a certain fixedness of the spatiotemporalities with which it is concerned; of Diaspora and of Eretz Yisrael. This however, is a false fixedness. Rather, there is a need to deconstruct these aspects of the narrative of Political Zionism, to see how these temporal conditionings play out. In relation to the Diaspora, even though it in practice had been multi-faceted, multi-locational, and transnational, thus incredibly diverse, it became constructed as unequivocally negative, and therein homogeneous, reliant on the notion of an "unbreakable link between race, nation and territory" (Cohen, 1997: 14). Its temporal fixedness is further constructed through the Holocaust, a logical conclusion of life in Galut (Zerubavel, 2002: 119), showing the fragility of life in exile, as opposed to life in the State of Israel. However, through letting Diaspora being wholly defined through the Holocaust, it fixes it into a certain temporality, ignoring the rest of the Golah, both prior to it and after. These temporalities are then continuously rearticulated through nationalism, signifying Israel as the completion of Jewishness in relation to the past, and the future. Simply, this further gives light to the idea that one cannot draw a necessary and organic link between peoples and homelands (Cohen, 2009: 123). Rather, it is an ever-changing process, constructed through narration, and collective identities. Another aspect of this construction of the Diaspora as temporally fixed along those lines is that it is wholly European in its spatiality. Therefore, many Mizrahi, 'Eastern', those who had resided in the Middle East and parts of North Africa, Jews had to abandon much of their cultural traditions when moving to the State of Israel, as it was constructed through the understanding of 'Western' Ashkenazi pasts and imagined futures (Silberstein, 1999: 179). In this way, Israel constitutes a very distinct Jewishness. Furthermore, relational to the spatiality of Eretz Yisrael, the imagined homeland of the past was no longer there. Even though there are explicit acknowledgements of this in relation to the social constitution and construction of the state within 'The Jewish State' (Herzl, 1988: 95, 100, 142-3), the land itself was often imagined as empty and transient, a devoid space where the Jewish people would 'make the desert bloom' (Reich, 2012). Therein, there is also a temporally conditioned spatiality which is being reimagined

through Political Zionism, a kind of 'imagined geography' (Said, 2000: 183; Troen & Rabineau, 2014: 176). This interplay of Political Zionism, its imagining of the past, and spatiotemporal fixedness presents an articulation of a universal which is not there, but is reimagined and performed as if it were, with material consequences. An example of this disparity between Herzl's vision, the narrative of Political Zionism and its practice, is the 1948 war and the creation of the Palestinian refugee problem (Morris, 1989), an issue which due to the length of this paper cannot be fully explored. Although, it sheds light on another critique that has been voiced against the construction of this particular nationalism, that "[n]o one can choose with whom to cohabit the earth" (Butler, 2014: 44), this is relational both to the Golah and the State of Israel. What this fixation of temporalities highlight, is that history and temporality in its constitution always is multi-locational. Thereby, in a sense the ancient Israel was no longer there. "It too had been transformed. History is, in that sense, irreversible" (Hall, 1990: 231). Thus, fixating temporalities in the articulation of nationalism will inherently give rise to disparities, that can be seen when deconstructing the nationalist narrative.

4.2 Jewishness and Critiquing Political Zionism

Leading on from the breaking up of nationalism, the very concept of Jewishness as employed in this paper enables a further exploration of how it can relate to Political Zionism, and the State of Israel, within the context of the Diaspora. This section looks in particular at the antagonism between US American Jewry and the State of Israel as constructed in the nationalist narrative. The antagonisms that it allows for through its heterogeneous constitution facilitates critical examination of its multidirectional expressions. Butler (2014: 14; 126-7) argues that whilst there could possibly be universal principles that could apply to each and every one, these will take different forms in each and every temporality in which they are articulated, and can thus never be seen to create a universal nature of social experiences, and especially not in such broad collectives as Jewishness. However, whilst being weary of the variety of expressions of such collectives, these will also be conditioned on context, and can thus be seen to take different forms depending on temporality and wider contextual structures. It has further been argued that even though there is widespread inscription of the State of Israel onto

19

'US American' Jewishness and its formation around it as homeland in different contexts, these individuals and groups are in general not as interested and knowledgeable about it as many would assume (Waxman, 1989: 107). This further highlights the relationality in constructing Jewishness, as it is also dependent on the assumptions put onto the collective. Thereby, it illuminates a central antagonism. As it is multi-directional and multi-composed in its construction, these discourses are a lot more complex than what the general narrative of Political Zionism, and indeed wider discourses on the relation between the State of Israel and the Diaspora shines light on (Baron, 2014: 120). In part this is due to the further construction of the Golah as the fallen realm, and the completion of Jewishness within the 'homeland' (Butler, 2014: 15). When perceived through this scope, life in the Diaspora is an antagonistic action in itself, as it is dependent on living together with the non-Jewish, casting away the linkage between nation and land. Further alienating US American Jewishness from the State of Israel is the occupation of the Palestinians (Beinart, 2013: 24), further separating Jewishness as constructed through Political Zionism from the experience of Jewishness as lived in the Diaspora. Although, within 'The Jewish State' there is potential for an emancipatory project, envisioning "no member of the Jewish state [as] oppressed, every man will be able and will wish to rise in it" (Herzl, 1988: 145). However, central herein is the idea of 'member' of the Jewish state, an institutional nationalism which separates and empowers people through citizenship (Waldinger, 2016). Thereby, the State of Israel is able to constitute itself as the homeland of the Jewish people, but at the same time separate itself structurally through being a nation state with citizenship. This double representation is in part the root of the antagonisms pointed out here.

4.3 Neglecting the Diaspora

Furthermore, inherent within the antagonism is on the one hand a neglect of the Diaspora, and on the other hand an appropriation of the same. The very narrative of Political Zionism is deeply dependent on the prolonged temporal and spatial dimensions of Golah. Integral to the composition of diasporas is the multi-locality that creates many different histories, communities and identifiers, a fluidity that defies fixedness in its composition (Vertovec, 1999: 451). With the establishment of the State of Israel, it had to be asked

whether life should "be lived in Zion, the old-new land of the Jewish people […] or in Torah, the portable homeland of Jews ever since their forced exile by the Romans" (Auerbach, 2001: 8). Homeland in this sense is conceived of with an emphasis on the temporality rather than the spatiality of its dimensions. However, with the material realisation of Political Zionism, there has been an insistence from the State of Israel to make those in Diaspora relate themselves, as communities and individuals, in some shape or form to it (ibid: 46). Thereby, Diaspora was believed to be negotiated as, either negated or approved by the State of Israel, or the Political Zionist movement, or indeed whether it could still be said that Jewishness constructed outside the State of Israel was 'exilic' (Gorny, 2009: 245). Relating to this notion is that when Israel tries to represent a global Jewishness, the Diaspora is going to respond in their own right (Baron, 2014: 143). However, it is of great import to construct a Diasporic Jewishness which is not constructed in direct dependency on the State of Israel, questioning the homogeneity proposed within Political Zionism. Constructing the 'New Jew of the Land of Israel' through a rejection of the Golah establish a dichotomous view of a bad and a good, a life in exile, and a life in Israel (Baron, 2014: 114, 140; Herzl, 1988: 146; Waxman, 1989: 29; Zerubavel, 2002: 116). It is in this sense not an end point in Jewish history or a holistic completion of Jewishness, as it neglects the importance of Jewish centres around the world, and how they constitute important dimensions of Jewishness in their own right (Baron, 2014: 22). This normative rejection of much of the history of Jewishness is antagonistic also in itself. Additionally, from the start, Golah is the pre-existing condition which enables aliyah, and the creation of an old-new Jewishness in the proposed homeland as nation state (Shusterman, 1993: 300). Through rejecting the fluidity of temporalities, the construction of nationalism is also rejecting the spatial implications of what Diasporic Jewishness means, in this sense attacking the self-construction of a Jewishness devoid of homeland as a definite fixedness. Attempts to construct a homogeneous Jewishness obstructs the reality of the relationships between Diaspora and the State of Israel (Auerbach, 2001: 81), an embrace on the one hand, and a rejection on the other, an unequal power relationship which Israel can opt out of on occasions where it does not matter in its self-construction (Baron, 2014: 171). Golah can, and must thus be made sense of as independent of the State of Israel in its construction of Jewishness, with

its sense of homeland being constructed as temporality. However, it is also important to examine the antagonisms and interconnectedness of the Diaspora and the State of Israel, in order to understand their multifaceted links and expressions.

4.4 Jewishness, Diaspora, and the State of Israel

Following on from these points, the very narration of the nation is public, and appeals to a collective to make sense of the same. In this fashion, the homogenisation of Jewishness through the nationalism articulated as Political Zionism, and by extension the State of Israel, is, as argued above, constructed in a way which appropriates the experience(s) of the Diaspora. This public construction has further implications for the Diaspora-State of Israel relations, forcing an interdependency which has to be navigated and negotiated. Herzl (1988) argued that even though Palestine itself was not the only possible locality for the Jewish state, it was certainly desired in its appeal to the collective memory of the historic homeland (p. 96). The subsequent welding of a national identity, although in this case entrenched with power relations and varying experiences relational to the diversity of spatiotemporally conditioned experiences within the diaspora, needs to on the intrapersonal level integrate and make sense of territorial meaning; culture in its expression, performance, and internalisation and; language as a uniting expressiveness (David & Bar-Tal, 2009: 366-9). However, relational to the Diaspora as being melded into the nationalist narrative, the homogenisation of Jewishness to some extent eliminates the cultural expressions that have been distinctive within Diasporic life. Even though these are just one part of Jewishness, it has been argued that there is a need to preserve, or at least make sense of these expressions, in order "to make people intelligible to themselves" (Meyers, 1993: 20). Thus, making sense of the past is an active way of creating something meaningful in relation to the self-construction and constitution (Shusterman, 1993: 306). However, with the narration of Political Zionism, Jewishness is a bounded signifier which is under the control of the State of Israel; "the state of all those who are held to be Jews by some incontrovertible Jews" (Kasher, 1993: 76). Jewishness is understood to be constructed in direct relation to the state, rather than being something which can be multi-faceted, multi-expressional, and multi-directional. Accordingly, those in Diaspora are being connected to the State of Israel, in part through education and

different collective practices, such as 'Birthright' (Kasstan, 2012), and the connection of the state with Jewishness is also an assumed link drawn by many non-Jews (Baron, 2014: 117). This is yet another way in which Jewishness in the Diaspora is more dependent on the State of Israel than vice versa, pulling the two in seemingly different directions (ibid: 171). However, being directly affiliated with the nation state, thus a citizen, might also be for purely instrumental gains such as better schools, pensions, and housing (David & Bar-Tal: 2009: 361). Furthermore, when speaking of the Jewish Diaspora, it is easy to forget also those who have moved from Israel, who are not necessarily dependent on Zionism as a defining factor in their own way of defining 'homeland' (Rebhub, 2009). The Diasporic experience and transnational connections are thus much more complex than expressed in the Political Zionist narrative. Echoing Herzl (1988), "[b]ut the Jews, once settled in their own State, would probably have no more enemies" (p. 153). Paradoxically, one of the enemies that the State has created might be considered to be the very Diaspora from which it originated.

5. Conclusion

To conclude, this paper has examined the way in which Herzl's re-imagination of homeland in 'The Jewish State' through nationalism altered subsequent conceptions and expressions of 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness. This re-imagination was understood as a response to the so called 'Jewish Question'. It argued that through a nationalist narrative, homeland became both spatially and temporally fixed in the State of Israel, reconfiguring not only the idea of a homeland itself, but also the Diaspora and Diasporic Jewishness. It thereby further argued that Diasporic Jewishness should be envisioned as having the possibility of being outside of Political Zionism, and hence the State of Israel. It did so through firstly conceptualising the formation of nationalism as a narrative dependent on structuring temporalities of the past and the future, articulated through the present. This gives weight to the understanding of Herzl's redefinition of homeland as a nation state, which was, and still is to some extent, perceived as the natural way of organising 'peoples' around the world. This further illuminated the way in which nationalism serves a fixedness of temporalities in regards to spatialities, obstructing alternative narratives and ideas of that which is being appropriated in its construction. This was then set into relation to diaspora studies, arguing for thinking about diaspora as a way of grouping together a perceived collectiveness dependent on a shared common past, which is reiterated over time. It is thereby not bound together by a nation state, but rather a transnationality, where the collective is imagined as coherent over a larger geographical area not restricted by borders. They are however relational to a perceived homeland, an origin which is formative in self and collective construction. It is imagined and narrated as a place to return to, uniting the diaspora, as well as upholding the boundaries relational to the perceived 'other(s)', those who are not deemed as collected. Establishing homeland as 'origin' rather than as a nation state allows for a breaking away from methodological nationalism, thus reiterating nationalism and the nation state as socially constructed. Within this understanding, this paper then went on to examine and argue 'identity' in relation to Jewishness. Rather than simply employing the broad concept of 'identity' and thinking of Judaism as binary religious and cultural, or tribal, expressions, it was argued for the use of Jewishness as a more useful categorical tool.

This is because it encapsulates the varying ways in which it can be articulated and made sense of, as well as enabling it as a process, something which is not fixed in itself, escaping essentialist notions of what it means to 'be Jewish'. This is also useful in its application to both the experience of being within the Diaspora as well as within the State of Israel, when thinking about Jewishness not as an a priori category, but rather something that must be made sense of and expressed.

After having established these analytical frameworks, the paper went on to explore Herzl's 'The Jewish State', and the subsequent development of Political Zionism. Thereby, it sought to show how the nationalism as narrative redefined and reconceptualised homeland within 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness into a nation state. In the discussion of 'The Jewish State' itself, it was highlighted how Herzl's project sought to unify and create a coherent Jewishness from the Golah, linking together the spatially dispersed in a commonality in their imagined temporally coherent experiences; origin, dispersion, and return. It also showed how the category of Jewishness is consistent with this rethinking of the Diaspora as processual and ever-changing, since Herzl appreciates that the unifying factor for the Jewish people is the past as envisioned and expressed through their faith. However, in the establishment of Political Zionism, and the political struggle for a nation state through nationalism, the Diaspora was reiterated and imagined as the fallen realm, wherein Jewishness could never constitute a holistic whole, but rather fractured, transient, and empty. This led onto a discussion of the so called ingathering of exiles, showing the conscious attempt and process through aliyah to recreate the Jewishness that was lost in Galut. Thereby, the homeland becomes something understandable as attainable through citizenship. It was also shown and argued that the nationalism was not enough to explain movement to and from the State of Israel, and that it therein had developed a distinct Jewishness. In this understanding, the narrative provided through Political Zionism can be said to have defined in its materialisation a new Jewishness; it is however when this is stated and appropriated as a universal that the antagonism between the Diaspora and Political Zionism is unveiled. The last section of the second chapter was discussing this conflation of the State of Israel as nation and Jewishness, because of the way in which the diasporic homeland had now been

reconfigured through nationalism, leading up to contention in 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness in regards to their diaspora formation.

Therefore, the last chapter deconstructed this antagonism further, in order to fully understand the linkages and fixations manifested through nationalism. It firstly stated that central to making sense of this narrative is the fixation of temporalities which it manifests itself around; Eretz Yisrael and Golah. In homogenising and totalising these experiences both in their social and material forms, it gives rise to antagonisms in that which it is neglecting. This is manifested through the double representation of the State of Israel both as envisioned the homeland of the Jewish people, and as a nation state with citizenship. Thereby, the question of constituting homeland becomes also an administrative question, which was illustrated by the example of the US American Jewry. With the inscription of an assumed connection to the State of Israel onto this collective, there is an assumption that they are one and the same; Jewishness is Political Zionism. However, through a rejection of the Diaspora as fallen, and everyone not making aliyah, these centre are maintained as independent, outside of a construction of Jewishness in a nation state context. Following on, the appropriation of Jewishness and homogenisation of the history of the Jewish people stems from a plethora of experiences, expressions, and spatialities. In so understanding, homeland can within 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness be assumed as a temporality and a shared heritage rather than a state in itself. Thereby, there is a relationality in regards to the State of Israel, but they are not to be understood as uniform and the same. The relationality was further examined in the final section of chapter three, through the offering of a Jewishness by the state, a set narrative which is publicly articulated and responded to. In the understanding of 'Zion' as origin, the connection to the past is manifested through practices, that might however be offered by the State of Israel. Arguably, the multiplicity of different forms and expressions of Jewishness is further highlighted with emigres, who are interlocked in the spatiotemporal nexus of homeland as provided by Political Zionism, but however construct it not in relation to it, but rather through citizenship, and other expressions through choosing to live in the Diaspora.

Thus, this paper has shown that 'The Jewish State' through its re-imagination of homeland provided the basis for a nationalist narrative which has altered 'Western' Ashkenazi Diasporic Jewishness in its expressions, constitutions, and assumptions. However, the homogenising force is not to be understood as totalising. Through not reading Jewishness in Political Zionism as a universal, it is possible to see a construction of the same outside of the State of Israel. This is important whilst thinking of Diaspora-State of Israel relations, in that it enables for a representation which adds up to the experiences of those in Golah. It is also important in that it highlights the diverse history and constitution of Jewishness all around the world. Herzl's response to the Jewish Question and anti-Semitism became thereby a force in itself for oppression of the Jewish people, rather than the emancipatory project which he envisioned.

Bibliography

Amit, K. & Riss, I., 2007. The Role of Social Networks in the Immigration Decision-making Process: The Case of North American Immigration to Israel. *Immigrants & Minorities,* 25(3), pp. 290-313.

Anderson, B., 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Spread and Origin of Nationalism.* Rev. ed. London: Verso.

Arkush, A., 2014. Cultural Zionism Today. *Israel Studies,* 19(2), pp. 1-14.

Auerbach, J. S., 2001. *Are we one? Jewish Identity in the United States and Israel.* London: Rutgers University Press.

Baron, I. Z., 2014. *Obligation in Exile.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Beinart, P., 2013. *The Crisis of Zionism.* New York: Picador.

Bhabha, H. K., 2013, Introduction: Narrating the Nation, Bhabha, H.K. 2013, *Nation and Narration*, Taylor and Francis. Available from: ProQuest Ebook Central. [23 January 2017].

Brubaker, R., 2005. The 'Diaspora' Diaspora. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 28(1), pp. 1-19.

Brubaker, R. & Cooper, F., 2000. Beyond "Identity". *Theory and Society,* Volume 29, pp. 1-47.

Butler, J., 2014. *Parting Ways: Jewishness and the Critique of Zionism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Cohen, R., 1997. *Global Diasporas: An Introduction.* 1st ed. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Cohen, R., 2009. Solid, Ductile and Liquid: Changing Notions of Homeland and Home in Diaspora. In: E. Ben-Rafael, Y. Sternberg, J. Bokser Liewerant & Y. Gorny, eds. *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the advent of the new (dis)order.* Boston: Brill, pp. 117-133.

Dawidowicz, L. S., 1975. *The War Against the Jews, 1933-1945.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

DellaPergola, S., 2009. International Migration of Jews. In: E. Ben-Rafael, Y. Sternberg, J. Bokser Liwerant & Y. Gorny, eds. *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the advent of a new (dis)order.* Boston: Brill, pp. 213-236.

Geertz, C., 1996. Primordial; Ties. In: J. Hutchinson & A. D. Smith, eds. *Ethnicity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 40-45.

Goldberg, D. T. & Krausz, M., 1993. The Culture of Identity. In: D. T. Goldberg & M. Krausz, eds. *Jewish Identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 1-12.

Gorny, Y., 2009. Is the Jewish Transnational Diaspora Still Unique?. In: E. Ben-Rafael, Y. Sternberg, J. Bokser Liwerant & Y. Gorny, eds. *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the advent of a new (dis)order.* Boston: Brill, pp. 237-249.

Hall, S., 1990. Cultural Identity and Diaspora. In: J. Rutherford, ed. *Identity, Culture, Community, Difference.* London: Lawrence and Wishart, pp. 222-231.

Herzl, T., 1988. *The Jewish State.* New York: Dover Publications Inc..

Hotam, Y., 2013. *Modern Gnosis and Zionism : the Crisis of Culture, Life Philosophy and Jewish National Thought.* London: Routledge.

Kasher, A., 1993. Jewish Collective Identity. In: D. T. Goldberg & M. Krausz, eds. *Jewish Identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 56-78.

Kasstan, B., 2012. Birthright: A Journey of Jewish Identity. *Durham Anthropology Journal,* 18(1), pp. 155-210.

Mayer, F. W., 2014. *Narrative Politics: Stories and Collective Action.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McHugh, K. E., 2000. Inside, Outside, Upside Down, Backward, Forward, Round and Round: a Case of Ethnographic Studies in Migration. *Progress in Human Geography,* 24(1), pp. 71-89.

Mendelson-Maoz, A., 2010. Amos Oz's Tale of Love and Darkness within the Framework of Immigration Narratives in Modern Hebrew Literature. *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies,* 9(1), pp. 71-87.

Meyers, D. T., 1993. Cultural Diversity: Rights, Goals, and Competing Values. In: D. T. Goldberg & M. Krausz, eds. *Jewish Identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 15-34.

Milevsky, A., 2016. Challenges and Psychological Adjustment of Religious American Adolescent Immigrants to Israel. *Israel Studies,* 21(2), pp. 27-49.

Moore-Gilbert, K., 2014. Aliyah and Identity in Israeli-Russian Literature. *Transnational Literature,* 7(1), pp. 1-11.

Morris, B., 1989. *The Birth of the Palestinian Refugee Problem, 1947-1949.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Piterberg, G., 1996. Domestic Orientalism: the Representation of 'Oriental' Jews in Zionist/Israeli Historiography. *British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies,* 23(2), pp. 125-145.

Putnam, H., 1993. Judaism and Jewish Identity. In: D. T. Goldberg & M. Krausz, eds. *Jewish Identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 108-115.

Rebhun, U., 2009. The Israeli Jewish Diaspora in the United States: Socio-Cultural Mobility and Attachment to Homeland. In: E. Ben-Rafael, Y. Sternberg, J. Bokser Liwerant & Y. Gorny, eds. *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the advent of a new (dis)order.* Boston: Brill, pp. 317-334.

Reich, B., 2012. *A Brief History of Israel.* 3rd ed. New York: Checkmark Books.

Rotenstreich, N., 1993. Identification and Identity. In: D. T. Goldberg & M. Krausz, eds. *Jewish Identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 50-55.

Safran, W., 1991. Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return. *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies,* 1(1), pp. 83-99.

Said, E. W., 2000. Invention, Memory, and Place. *Critical Inquiry,* 26(2), pp. 175-192.

Sheffer, G., 2009. A Reexamination of the Main Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Diasporas and Their Applicability to the Jewish Diaspora. In: E. Ben-Rafael, Y. Sternberg, J. Bokser Liwerant & Y. Gorny, eds. *Transnationalism: Diasporas and the advent of a new (dis)order.* Boston: Brill, pp. 375-396.

Shusterman, R., 1993. Next Year in Jerusalem? Postmodern Jewish Identity and the Myth of Return. In: D. T. Goldberg & M. Krausz, eds. *Jewish Identity.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 291-308.

Silberstein, L. J., 1999. *The Postzionism Debates: Knowledge and Power in Israeli Culture.* London: Routledge.

Somers, M., 1994. The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach. *Theory and Society,* 23(5), pp. 605-649.

Steele, B. J., 2008. *Ontological Security in International Relations: Self-Identity and the IR-State.* London: Routledge.

Troen, I. & Rabineau, S., 2014. Competing Concepts of Land in Eretz Israel. *Israel Studies,* 19(2), p. 162/186.

Vertovec, S., 1999. Concieving and Researching Transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 22(2), pp. 447-462.

Waldinger, R., 2016. A Cross-Border Perspective on Migration: Beyond the Assimilation/Transnationalism Debate. *Journal of Ethnic and Migrant Studies,* Volume DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2016.1238863.

Waxman, C. I., 1989. *American Aliya: Portrait of an Innovative Migration Movement.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press.

Waxman, C. I., 1995. In the End is it Ideology? Religio-Cultural and Structural Factors in American Aliyah. *Contemporary Jewry,* 16(1), pp. 50-67.

Wimmer, A. & Glick Schiller, N., 2002. Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences. *Global Networks,* 2(4), pp. 301-334.

Zerubavel, Y., 2002. The "Mythological Sabra" and the Jewish Past: Trauma, Memory, and Contested Identities. *Israel Studies,* 7(2), pp. 115-144.