RA05

ZIONISM: ORIGINS, MOVEMENTS & OPPOSITION

Programmes, institutions and competing futures

COMPLETE SOURCE-BASED STUDY

A source-based comparison of national programmes, their critics and Beter’s claims.

1882–1948 · National home · statehood · citizenship · rights

Tempus omnia revelat.

First edition · 11 October 2026 · v1.0

Contents

What this volume examines . . . 3
Method, access and limits . . . 4
01 / One word, several questions . . . 5
02 / Pinsker: from emancipation to self-help . . . 5
03 / Herzl: state, company and public law . . . 6
04 / Basel: what the adopted programme contains . . . 7
05 / Ahad Ha’am: culture is not merely a preliminary to statehood . . . 7
06 / Borochov: class, nation and territory . . . 8
07 / The Bund and Lenin: disagreement within the left . . . 9
08 / Reform platforms: 1885 is not 1937 . . . 9
09 / Montagu: anxiety about citizenship . . . 10
10 / Reines: religious support without a simple formula . . . 11
11 / The Three Oaths and religious anti-Zionism . . . 11
12 / Blackstone: non-Jewish support and its own aims . . . 12
13 / Institutions, women and practical activity . . . 12
14 / Balfour: one letter, two different rights formulations . . . 13
15 / The Mandate: institutions and rights in one text . . . 14
16 / Palestinian objections must be read directly . . . 14
17 / The Iron Wall: force, consent and promised equality . . . 15
18 / Biltmore: an explicit statehood objective . . . 16
19 / Magnes and Ihud: statehood was not the only model . . . 16
20 / 1948: a declaration and people without homes . . . 17
21 / What exactly does anti-Zionism oppose? . . . 18
22 / IHRA and JDA: acknowledging agreement and difference . . . 18
23 / Beter: naming a faction is not historical proof . . . 19
24 / Conclusion: a history of programmes, not one secret will . . . 20
Comparing programmes and questions . . . 21
Claims register / C01–C05 . . . 22
Claims register / C06–C10 . . . 23
Chronology . . . 24
Glossary . . . 25
Reader’s procedure and edition notes . . . 26
Source register / S01–S29 . . . 27

What this volume examines

RA05 examines the origins and different forms of modern Zionism through selected programmes, essays, governmental documents and contemporary objections. It belongs to Research & Analysis, distinguishing Peter David Beter’s historical archive from our explanations and independently examined context.

The main period is 1882–1948. A current religious position and two frameworks concerning antisemitism are explicitly identified later additions. This is not an account of the present war or an assessment of all current parties. Contemporary events belong to the separately dated RA12.

Readers receive three distinct layers: what a historical text asserts, what it actually establishes, and which analytical questions remain open. National life, sovereignty, inhabitants’ rights and specific political methods are examined separately.

The study contains the complete editorial treatment for this edition. The illustrated guide condenses it without strengthening its conclusions. Both languages share structure and source identifiers. This is a first editorial edition, not a peer-reviewed scholarly monograph.

Method, access and limits

A primary source is an actor’s statement or official record, not an automatic guarantee of every assertion. A programme strongly documents a formulated aim but weakly documents its implementation. Later archival or scholarly interpretation is therefore identified as another layer.

Sources S01–S29 are registered at the end. We use available English texts, original Slovak paraphrases and identified translations, not new critical translations of German, Hebrew, Russian or Arabic originals. Some sources are excerpts. Particular access limits accompany every entry.

Beter’s AL50 and AL67 were read as web transcripts of selected passages, not as a newly authenticated audio edition. Bird’s-Eye View is a later publisher’s digest. Newspaper evidence Beter invokes is not independently confirmed merely because he mentions it.

The study’s evaluative framework is explicit: equal human dignity, rejection of collective guilt and scrutiny of power through specific evidence. It is not presented as every historical actor’s voice. Context may explain a troubling position without morally justifying it.

The claims register emphasizes proportionality: documented wording, necessary qualification or an unproven causal relationship. Silence in selected sources does not absolutely prove nonexistence; equally, it does not license inventing an unseen organization as fact.

01 / One word, several questions

Reused atmospheric AI illustration from the series — not a reconstruction of this event

Here Zionism is examined as a family of modern programmes for Jewish national life, not as a synonym for Judaism. Comparing the Basel Programme, Ahad Ha’am and Magnes already reveals different ideas of a home, cultural centre and political arrangement. A shared attachment to Palestine does not by itself establish a common constitution, method or timetable. [S03, S04, S19]

A working definition must make differences examinable. For each text we therefore ask who is speaking, what they propose, where, under what legal arrangements, and with what rights for the other inhabitants. Labels such as political, cultural, socialist, revisionist or religious become useful only after these questions.

We also distinguish a person’s convictions from organizational membership and a particular government decision. A statement about a political programme cannot describe all Jews without further evidence. Nor does a critic’s Jewish ancestry decide whether the argument is sound.

The following chapters are not a vote for one side. They compare answers to questions of safety, national belonging, citizenship and power. A text can identify one injustice persuasively while inadequately addressing other people’s rights. Both findings can be true at once.

> **What exactly does “Zionism” mean in the sentence being examined?**

Sources / source notes: S03, S04, S19

02 / Pinsker: from emancipation to self-help

Pinsker’s Auto-Emancipation of 1882 interprets anti-Jewish hostility as a reason for national self-help, beyond formal emancipation. His concluding territorial possibilities include Palestine and North America rather than one settled project. His language of allegedly hereditary or incurable phobia belongs to a nineteenth-century argument; it is not adopted here as a clinical finding. [S01]

Reading political ideas requires separating the diagnosis from the proposed remedy. Discrimination does not logically entail just one institutional solution. Civic equality, autonomy, emigration and statehood each require a separate argument about feasibility and consequences.

Pinsker’s text also resists the retrospective assumption that every author started with the same territorial programme. Where an author is still comparing locations, an open question cannot be converted into evidence of a detailed advance plan for the later state.

National self-help nevertheless leaves another question: how should a refuge relate to people already living in the chosen place? The urgency of protecting one group cannot replace agreement about another’s rights. This is our analytical question, not wording inserted retrospectively into Pinsker’s text.

> **A documented problem does not automatically establish one uniquely correct answer.**

Sources / source notes: S01

03 / Herzl: state, company and public law

In The Jewish State of 1896, Herzl distinguishes a political organization from an economic company, considers Palestine and Argentina, rejects theocracy, and envisages religious liberty and linguistic diversity. Political security for the territory is not to be merely the sum of private land purchases. [S02]

The proposal therefore cannot simply be converted into a plan for rabbinical government or the finished later Hebrew-speaking state. Nor does its economic company establish a Bolshevik economy. Institutions must be compared by function rather than by their common use of the word organization.

Critical reading must also retain troubling language. In the Palestine passage, Herzl imagines a European civilizational outpost against barbarism. This is the author’s hierarchical imperial vocabulary, not a neutral classification of the region’s inhabitants. [S02]

A commitment to liberty and an unequal image of civilization can thus occur in one work. The questions are what mechanisms would secure equality, who would decide on settlement, and who could refuse. Our analysis examines these tensions without converting every proposal into an accomplished act.

> **Programme, authority and implementation require separate examination.**

Sources / source notes: S02

04 / Basel: what the adopted programme contains

The Basel Programme of 1897 seeks a publicly and legally secured home for the Jewish people in Palestine. Its means include settlement, Jewish organization under the laws of respective countries, national consciousness, and government consent. The encyclopedic reproduction used here separates this short programme from commentary on its implications. [S03]

The term home should neither be reduced to a private association nor automatically rewritten as the precise borders and constitution of 1948. A public-law guarantee is a political objective; further documents must establish its intended institutional form.

The list also identifies what historical research should seek: statutes, congress decisions, diplomatic correspondence, financing and local administration. Public organizations do not prove that confidential negotiations never occurred. They do not, however, justify replacing particular institutional histories with an undocumented single secret centre.

Separating programme and effects prevents two shortcuts. An adopted commitment does not prove fulfillment. A later actor’s deed cannot automatically be transferred to every participant at an earlier congress. Chronology and specific responsibility are essential to comparison, not obstacles to criticism.

> **Read the adopted wording separately from later interpretation.**

Sources / source notes: S03

05 / Ahad Ha’am: culture is not merely a preliminary to statehood

In his 1897 essay, Ahad Ha’am challenges the idea that creating a state would quickly solve the material difficulties of the Jewish masses. He advocates a cultural centre that would also sustain diaspora life, not the immediate migration of everyone, and fears political power detached from cultural substance. [S04]

Criticism of political Zionism therefore need not reject Jewish national life in Palestine. Disagreement may concern cultural priorities, economic feasibility or the moral content of the proposed society. Erasing these distinctions removes the internal debate we are trying to understand.

A cultural centre and a sovereign state possess different kinds of power. Schools, language and publishing can connect people without the coercive jurisdiction of a state. Cultural activity alone, conversely, does not settle security or political rights. Comparison should identify both what a proposal addresses and what it leaves unresolved.

The essay is not used as an idealized portrait of faultless predecessors. It documents disagreement within a national project. To judge implementation, particular institutions and their relations with other communities would need investigation, rather than reliance on appealing formulations.

> **Disagreement with one version does not imply rejection of every form.**

Sources / source notes: S04

06 / Borochov: class, nation and territory

In 1905 Borochov distinguishes national conditions of production from class relations of production. The available excerpts on Zion and territory connect nation, culture and homeland while arguing against territorialism without the same priority for Palestine. This is a socialist Zionist’s argument, not the programme of every socialist movement. [S05, S27]

The example separates the social and national dimensions of politics. A person can seek both class emancipation and a national centre, or social equality while rejecting such a state. The word socialist alone establishes neither a shared organization nor common leadership or foreign-policy objectives.

Nor does a political theory prove itself by invoking necessity. If an author treats social processes as inevitable products of class structure, the researcher must test the assumptions and observations behind the claim. The word scientific in a period polemic cannot replace evidentiary examination.

Borochov matters here as a concrete distinction between currents. A detailed history of labour institutions and the exclusion of other workers would require employment rules and case archives. We neither derive that history from a single theoretical essay nor dismiss its importance.

> **A similar social vocabulary does not establish common political direction.**

Sources / source notes: S05, S27

07 / The Bund and Lenin: disagreement within the left

Reused atmospheric AI illustration from the series — not a reconstruction of this event

YIVO’s archival guide describes the Bund through social democracy, Yiddish culture and national-cultural autonomy, while also recording later splits and Communist factions. It cannot therefore be equated with one unchanging Bolshevik body. [S07]

Lenin’s 1903 article attacks both the Bund and Zionism and rejects the national principle he attributes to them. His assimilationist position and evaluative vocabulary document a political stance; they are not this study’s prescription for Jewish identity. [S06]

These records do not prove that no contact ever occurred between any two groups. They do establish a difference that a single-axis theory must explain. Calling it merely apparent because it conflicts with expectations is insufficient. A hypothesis of centrally managed conflict needs its own positive evidence.

We therefore record four distinct items: social aims, national programmes, organizational membership and date. A common identity among some members does not establish a common party. Nor does one faction’s later move justify projecting its politics onto every earlier member.

> **A common-axis theory must confront records of explicit disagreement.**

Sources / source notes: S06, S07

08 / Reform platforms: 1885 is not 1937

The 1885 Pittsburgh Platform describes its authors as a religious community rather than a nation and does not expect a return to Palestine. In 1937, Columbus combines civic loyalty in countries of residence with support for Palestine as a Jewish homeland, refuge and cultural centre. [S08, S09]

The difference is directly documented. Pittsburgh also predates the Basel Congress: it cannot answer an organization not yet created. It can document an earlier understanding of religious identity and expectations against which later national programmes positioned themselves.

Comparison does not mean that every member changed opinions on the date of adoption. An institutional text records the formulated position of its adopting body. Membership practice, decision-making and dissent would be needed to establish its wider effects.

For the larger inquiry, Jewish rejection of Zionism is real, but not the only possible intra-Jewish position. Selecting one historical declaration cannot establish the eternal view of an entire religion. The same limitation applies to a document supporting a national home.

> **A historical position needs an author, a date and a defined constituency.**

Sources / source notes: S08, S09

09 / Montagu: anxiety about citizenship

In his memorandum of 23 August 1917, Edwin Montagu opposes British support for Zionism. He fears that Jews will be treated as foreigners in their countries of citizenship and raises the position of Palestine’s Christian and Muslim inhabitants. The memorandum’s polemical title calls the government approach antisemitic; that is Montagu’s assessment. [S10]

The source shows that opposition to a national project could arise from defending Jewish civic equality, not hostility to Jews. One minister’s opinion is nevertheless not automatically the voice of all British or European Jews.

Montagu’s concerns must be read as argument and prediction. The document does not establish that every anticipated consequence occurred or that his alternative would resolve every kind of discrimination. Testing consequences requires further records and specific countries.

The dispute reveals a tension between protection through a national centre and protection through full equality where people live. Neither concern should be reduced to a dishonest motive. We need to understand why contemporaries could find each persuasive, then examine their outcomes separately.

> **A prediction in a memorandum does not prove its own fulfillment.**

Sources / source notes: S10

10 / Reines: religious support without a simple formula

Yosef Lindell's textual study examines Rabbi Yitzhak Yaakov Reines and Mizrachi, founded in 1902. His interpretation stresses practical refuge and a distinction between political action and messianic redemption, without removing all religious meaning from Reines's thought. We use Lindell's interpretation and cited translations, not an independent complete reading of Reines's Hebrew books. [S11]

Arguments within religious support must therefore be separated. A project might be justified as permissible protection, spiritually significant renewal, or a direct component of redemption. These rationales do not automatically have identical political consequences.

The relationship between conviction and public power remains a separate question. A believer's participation in a national movement does not establish theocracy. Personal piety likewise cannot guarantee equal rights for citizens of other faiths. The particular institutional proposal matters.

One case study cannot represent the complete history of religious Zionism. Its precise role in RA05 is to challenge the assumption that religious affiliation dictates a single answer to a modern political project. Later currents and their governmental policies require examination in their own periods.

> **Religious motivation is not a single political programme.**

Sources / source notes: S11

11 / The Three Oaths and religious anti-Zionism

In its own explanation, Torah Jews rejects Zionist statehood before messianic redemption and invokes the oath tradition in Ketubot 111a. The passage quoted on its page also includes an obligation on the nations not to oppress Jews excessively. This documents the organization's position, not the number or views of all Orthodox Jews. [S12]

The earlier text, its interpretation, its religious authority within a community, and the political conclusion are distinct steps. A researcher need not settle the theological dispute to describe precisely where the disagreement lies.

Rejecting a state's foundation must also be distinguished from attitudes toward its present inhabitants. A religious objection cannot be read as a desire for violence without evidence. Nor can it automatically validate an entirely different theory of covert financial or ethnic direction.

The observation that Jews also criticize Zionism matters because it reveals diversity. It does not excuse every statement labeled anti-Zionist. Each claim's truth and any collective generalization still require assessment on their own terms.

> **One community's testimony does not speak for an entire religion.**

Sources / source notes: S12

12 / Blackstone: non-Jewish support and its own aims

Blackstone's 1891 petition asks for international support for a Jewish home in Palestine. It connects persecution with biblical and historical entitlement and addresses the powers as potential implementers. The available transcription lists signatures, whose authenticity is not audited here. [S13]

The chronology also matters: support did not come exclusively from Jewish authors or wait for Herzl's book. This does not establish one objective shared by all Christians. Philanthropy, theology and a vision of international order can coexist in a petition.

The powers' claimed authority is itself a critical question. Who can decide the future of a territory inhabited by others? A signatory's religious conviction is not the inhabitants' consent. Protection of a threatened group and the means chosen to provide it require separate assessment.

Nor is a prominent businessperson's signature evidence of directing every later organization. If authentic, a signature establishes support for the petition; subsequent conduct requires separate documentation. Detailed financial connections belong in RA06, not in imagined arrows on a family tree.

> **Support, financing and direction are three different relationships.**

Sources / source notes: S13

13 / Institutions, women and practical activity

Hadassah's institutional history associates its 1912 founding with Henrietta Szold and records sending two nurses to Palestine in 1913. This limited example identifies women's organization and medical activity in a Zionist setting. Promotional evaluations and present membership figures are not adopted. [S26]

A movement's history should therefore not consist exclusively of male speakers and diplomatic letters. Education, care, voluntary work, fundraising and local services also

matter. Such activities can provide practical infrastructure and identification with a national project.

Humanitarian work is not, however, a universal exoneration of a political programme. A hospital does not determine sovereignty or the rights of those rejecting the national objective. Conversely, political disagreement cannot justify denying specific medical assistance.

A detailed case study would examine funding, governance and nondiscriminatory patient access separately. Here the institutional account establishes founding and early activity, not a complete measurement of historical quality or equality. That boundary permits recognition of constructive work without turning the study into promotion.

> **Neither particular assistance nor particular injustice should be replaced by a totalizing label.**

Sources / source notes: S26

14 / Balfour: one letter, two different rights formulations

Reused atmospheric AI illustration from the series — not a reconstruction of this event

The letter of 2 November 1917 states British support for a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. It adds safeguards for the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities and the rights and political status of Jews elsewhere. Addressed to Lord Rothschild, it does not create his family’s ownership of Palestine. [S14]

The wording contains an asymmetry: a national objective for the Jewish people, civil and religious rights for non-Jewish communities. This is a visible difference of categories, not an invented secret clause. It should be examined rather than obscured by claiming that everyone received an identical political guarantee.

A home in Palestine must likewise be distinguished from an assertion that this letter already fixed the exact state form of all Palestine. It is a government commitment, not a complete constitution, map, mechanism of popular consent or proof of successful implementation.

Analysis therefore places three questions together: what the government promised, what institutions it subsequently created, and their effects on different inhabitants. Neither a declared good intention nor criticism of the wording answers all three.

> **A textual asymmetry can be examined without inventing a secret supplement.**

Sources / source notes: S14

15 / The Mandate: institutions and rights in one text

The 1922 Mandate connects the national home with self-governing institutions and protection of civil and religious rights. Article 4 provides a role for a Jewish agency, Article 6 addresses assisted immigration and settlement subject to safeguards, Article 7 citizenship, and Article 15 protection against religious or racial discrimination. [S15]

A publicly identified agency documents institutional standing, not unlimited command over the mandatory administration. Conversely, protective clauses do not prove that every decision was equitable or that rights were effectively enforced.

A legal instrument and political consent are different questions. Adoption by an international body is a real historical act; it cannot substitute for asking how inhabitants viewed the arrangement and who could participate in decisions. Delegations' objections must therefore be read alongside the Mandate.

This is a historical reading, not binding legal advice about the present. Implementation, land relations and the conflict require fuller treatment in RA08. Already here, however, neither the national objective nor its protective conditions should be selectively erased.

> **A legal document, consent and practice are not identical categories.**

Sources / source notes: S15

16 / Palestinian objections must be read directly

In the 1922 correspondence, the Palestine Arab Delegation rejects the national home and demands representative government. Its demands include religious equality and minority protection; its June letter refers to representation of Muslim, Christian and Jewish inhabitants. These are the delegation's formulations, not proof of future implementation. [S16]

Reading only British and Zionist texts would portray other inhabitants merely as objects of others' plans. A direct source identifies political questions: who constitutes the represented

public, who decides immigration, and how majority government relates to minority protection.

The same critical discipline applies here. The correspondence also generalizes about some immigrants as being of a Bolshevik type. We record this as the delegation’s polemic, not a verified description of immigration. A legitimate question about self-government does not make every accompanying characterization factual. [S16]

The British policy statement in the same collection rejects a wholly Jewish Palestine and invokes economic absorption capacity for immigration. [S16] This does not end the dispute: a limiting formulation does not itself establish consent. Majority rule likewise needs enforceable minority protections. We compare actual proposals and their unanswered questions, not supposedly hereditary national traits.

> **The inhabitants’ own voice must be included and critically examined.**

Sources / source notes: S16

17 / The Iron Wall: force, consent and promised equality

In The Iron Wall of 1923, Jabotinsky rejects the prospect of voluntary Arab consent to colonization. He interprets Arab resistance through national interests, not simple bribability, and proposes protection by independent force followed by later agreement. He also rejects expulsion and declares equality. The text contains hierarchical civilizational language, which is not adopted here. [S17]

These simultaneous elements constitute the analytical problem. It is inaccurate to omit coercion and discuss only equality, or to conceal stated commitments and replace them with different wording. The question is how promised equality relates to implementing a project without the other group’s prior consent.

The strategic expectation that resistance will end and agreement follow is a prediction. Subsequent history, not the author’s confidence, must test it. Future agreement is not consent already granted by present opponents.

Jabotinsky provides important specific evidence about political method. His argument cannot automatically serve as the verbatim programme of every Zionist, even when he attributes similar practice to others. His own generalization also needs evidence rather than repetition.

> **A promise of future agreement is not present consent.**

Sources / source notes: S17

18 / Biltmore: an explicit statehood objective

The May 1942 Biltmore Programme calls for a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine and a decisive Jewish Agency role in immigration and development. It places this in the war against Nazi aggression and a future democratic order. Its final point uses “new world order”; that sentence alone does not establish a covert world government. [S18]

Comparison with Basel tracks the changing explicitness of objectives. Every earlier reference to a home should not automatically be treated as precisely the same programme. Equally, a clearly stated later statehood objective must not be reduced to vague cultural activity.

Analysis of “new world order” begins with its meaning in the sentence. The same words may refer to a postwar settlement or to a much stronger allegation of covert direction. The latter needs evidence of actors, powers and conduct, not a collection of phrase matches.

Wartime context also has two distinct dimensions. Persecution can explain the urgency of seeking safety without itself settling territorial implementation or other inhabitants’ rights. Rejecting that shortcut does not minimize persecution; it prevents an explanation of motivation from becoming unlimited political entitlement.

> **A phrase documents usage, not automatically a conspiracy.**

Sources / source notes: S18

19 / Magnes and Ihud: statehood was not the only model

At the July 1947 UNSCOP hearing, Magnes advocates a binational arrangement for Ihud, parity and shared decision-making. He also considers international arbitration and immigration mechanisms. The record establishes an alternative, not its general acceptance or practical feasibility. [S19]

Parity is not the same as simply counting individual votes. It aims to protect two national groups against mutual domination, while raising questions about deadlock, group membership and citizens who do not fit the pair.

The proposal also shows why the labels Zionist and anti-Zionist can obscure disputes unless their object is specified. Support for Jewish cultural and national life need not mean exclusive sovereignty for one national group. Opposing a constitutional form need not reject the inhabitants’ right to live there.

We do not present this alternative as an easy solution that history could have accepted without resistance. That would be an unsupported counter-story. It matters because it enlarges the set of actual proposals and permits comparison of rights-protection mechanisms, not merely moral slogans.

> **An alternative is historical evidence even when it did not become the outcome.**

Sources / source notes: S19

20 / 1948: a declaration and people without homes

Reused atmospheric AI illustration from the series — not a reconstruction of this event

Israel’s declaration of 14 May 1948 proclaims a Jewish state and promises equal social and political rights irrespective of religion, race or sex. It is a founding document with its own historical narrative, not independent evidence that every promise was fulfilled. [S20]

USHMM’s postwar overview describes Jewish survivors facing destroyed communities and antisemitism, and emigration to several countries. This explains the urgency of refuge without establishing identical politics among all refugees. [S28]

Bernadotte’s report, signed on 16 September 1948, meanwhile records approximately 360,000 Arab and 7,000 Jewish refugees needing aid and calls for return, security and property compensation. This is an interim report estimate, not the final number displaced during the war. [S29]

State formation therefore cannot be described solely through constitutional promises. People expelled from or compelled to leave their homes constitute a separate historical question. Particular causes, military decisions and the Palestinian Nakba belong in RA08; their importance must neither be erased nor misrepresented as fully investigated here.

Protection of one group and harm to another are not moral entries that cancel out. Specific responsibilities and every person’s rights require assessment. Documented trauma creates neither hereditary guilt nor unlimited authority for a subsequent generation.

> **Promises of equality and experiences of displacement must both remain visible.**

Sources / source notes: S20, S28, S29

21 / What exactly does anti-Zionism oppose?

For this study, anti-Zionism denotes opposition to a specified form of the Zionist project. This is a working distinction, not a claim that every author uses the word identically. We must identify whether the objection targets a national ideology, a state, its constitution, its foundation or one policy.

Pittsburgh, Montagu and Torah Jews illustrate different grounds: religious community, civic equality and redemption. The Palestine Arab Delegation stresses representative government and inhabitants' standing. These arguments are not interchangeable. [S08, S10, S12, S16]

Not identifying with a movement is also not necessarily active opposition. Someone may be indifferent to a national programme, support people's safety without ideological identification, or judge individual decisions differently. A stronger position should not be attributed without evidence.

Political criticism must be assessed through its evidence. Collective accusation based on ancestry is a different kind of claim. Substituting Zionist for Jew does not resolve the distinction if the argument still assigns hereditary guilt, secret omnipotence or uniform intent without specific evidence.

The practical procedure is to preserve the exact statement, identify its target and scope, and test its argument. Only then can we distinguish a historical objection, a political opinion, an unsupported allegation and a hostile generalization.

> **First the exact statement and evidence; only then its classification.**

Sources / source notes: S08, S10, S12, S16

22 / IHRA and JDA: acknowledging agreement and difference

IHRA's 2016 working definition is non-legally binding. It distinguishes comparable criticism of Israel from antisemitism, while contextual examples include denying Jewish self-determination and double standards. The 2021 Jerusalem Declaration expressly permits criticism of Zionism and different constitutional arrangements while protecting equal Jewish life. Both reject collective blame. [S21, S22]

The frameworks should not be presented as identical. Different examples may produce different assessments of particular political speech. Treating one formulation as a universally binding verdict would conceal the debate.

This is not an unavoidable choice between political silence and tolerating hatred. Research can examine specific state conduct openly, explain its criteria and reject unsupported guilt assigned by identity.

This publication is not a court and does not determine legal liability. For disputed statements we provide wording, context, target and reasons for assessment. Freedom of inquiry does not require pretending an unsupported accusation is true. Rejecting collective hatred does not require concealing documented wrongdoing.

> **The evaluative criterion must be visible, not hidden in a label.**

Sources / source notes: S21, S22

23 / Beter: naming a faction is not historical proof

AL50 links militant Zionism to alleged Khazar continuity and intergenerational retaliation. AL67 distinguishes ordinary American Jews from criticized leaders, yet also connects ancestry, political objectives and global power. The available transcripts therefore contain distinctions as well as collective genealogical allegations. [S23, S24]

Bird’s-Eye View attributes the origins of both Zionism and Bolshevism to Rothschild interests. This 1983 digest is not new independent archival evidence or automatically a verbatim record of a particular tape. [S25]

The historical programmes examined show multiple objectives, explicit disputes and changing positions. These challenge a simple model of unchanging unified will. They do not mathematically prove that no actors ever cooperated. Such a relationship nevertheless requires specific correspondence, funding, decisions or other verifiable records.

We therefore do not judge Beter’s whole character from one sentence. We assess claims individually. His distinction concerning ordinary people must be recorded; his attribution of inherited hostile purpose cannot be excused merely by calling it anti-Zionism. Ancestry does not establish intent.

Our sources do not establish a chain from medieval conversion to command of modern movements. Not demonstrated is more accurate than imaginatively supplying missing links. The collected examination of Beter’s axis belongs in RA11.

> **An exact quotation proves what an author said; its substance needs further evidence.**

Sources / source notes: S23, S24, S25

24 / Conclusion: a history of programmes, not one secret will

Reused atmospheric AI illustration from the series — not a reconstruction of this event

This volume does not supply one timeless definition for everyone called a Zionist. It presents documented differences: political security for a home, a cultural centre, social reorganization, religious justification, statehood and a binational alternative. [S02, S03, S04, S05, S06, S11, S18, S19]

Opposition likewise has no single origin. The examined sources include intra-Jewish religious, civic and socialist objections and the Palestinian demand for representative government. Their existence must not be erased; their particular claims remain open to criticism. [S06, S07, S08, S09, S10, S12, S16]

The strongest methodological boundary separates documented conduct from an assertion of collective will. Names, kinship, shared phrases or coincident dates may suggest a question; they do not establish command. War or historical trauma cannot automatically transfer guilt to present people.

Rights commitments must be read alongside evidence of violations and policy consequences. Objectivity does not require equal shares of blame. It requires conclusions proportionate to evidence and willingness to identify responsibility where documented.

RA05 remains a study of selected sources, not the complete history of every party, war or religious current. Later volumes examine finance, revolution and Israel’s creation more closely. Stating this boundary is not evasion: it prevents expansive claims from appearing already proven.

> **Explain, compare and test — without hereditary guilt or a predetermined verdict.**

Sources / source notes: S02, S03, S04, S06, S16, S19

Comparing programmes and questions

Author / model	Core proposal	Open question / sources
Herzl / Basel	Political security for a home and its institutions.	Who grants authority, and who consents? [S02, S03]
Ahad Ha’am	A cultural centre and its diaspora relationship.	How do cultural influence and sovereignty differ? [S04]
Borochov	National space and social emancipation.	How does a national aim relate to class interests? [S05, S27]
Reines (Lindell)	Practical protection with religious reasoning.	What is permissible action, and what is redemption? [S11]
Jabotinsky	A national objective secured by force; promised later agreement.	How is equality secured without consent? [S17]
Ihud / Magnes	A shared arrangement, parity and arbitration.	Who decides a deadlock? [S19]
Montagu / Bund / Torah Jews	Different, non-interchangeable objections.	What is each author’s object and reason for opposition? [S07, S10, S12]
Palestine Arab Delegation	Representative government and minority guarantees.	How are majority government and equal minority rights combined? [S16]

This is an editorial comparison, not a hierarchy of peoples or a genealogical scheme.

Claims register / C01–C05

C01 / Zionism is simply another word for Judaism.

Assessment: Incorrect conflation. Different Jewish religious and political positions are directly documented. [S08, S09, S10, S12]

C02 / All early authors demanded the same state in the same territory.

Assessment: Contradicted by the compared texts. Territorial choice, a cultural centre and a public-law home are not identical programmes. [S01, S02, S03, S04]

C03 / A socialist Zionist, Bundist and Bolshevik are interchangeable.

Assessment: Incorrect simplification. Different national programmes and explicit polemics require separate treatment. [S05, S06, S07]

C04 / Orthodox Jews have a single position on Zionism.

Assessment: Unsupported generalization. Examples of support and opposition establish neither a uniform programme nor their numerical proportions. [S11, S12]

C05 / The Balfour letter gave ownership of Palestine to the Rothschilds.

Assessment: Contrary to the wording. The addressee is not the recipient of a private territorial property deed. [S14]

Claims register / C06–C10

C06 / A safeguarding clause proves that rights were implemented.

Assessment: Invalid evidentiary step. A written commitment and evidence of enforcement must be examined separately. [S14, S15, S20, S29]

C07 / All opposition to Zionism was merely religious hatred.

Assessment: Sources show wider grounds. Citizenship, representation, national autonomy and theology are different arguments; this does not excuse particular stereotypes. [S06, S10, S12, S16]

C08 / The phrase “new world order” alone proves a covert axis.

Assessment: Invalid evidentiary step. Meaning within a programme and a further hypothesis of command require different evidence. [S18, S25]

C09 / Jewish anti-Zionism proves that every anti-Zionist statement is free of prejudice.

Assessment: Invalid generalization. Criticism is assessed by target, content, context and evidence, not the author’s identity alone. [S21, S22]

C10 / These documents establish Beter’s Khazar–Bolshevik–Zionist continuity.

Assessment: Not demonstrated in this source set. Different programmes are documented; a chain of common command is not. No absolute claim about every possible contact is made. [S03, S06, S19, S23, S24, S25]

Chronology

Rok / Year	Udalosť / Event
1882	Pinsker: self-help and open territorial possibilities. [S01]
1885	Pittsburgh: a Reform religious-community platform. [S08]
1891	Blackstone petition: non-Jewish support for return. [S13]
1896	Herzl: The Jewish State, political and economic institutions. [S02]
1897	Basel Programme and Ahad Ha’am’s critique. [S03, S04]
1902–1905	Mizrachi; Lenin’s polemic; Borochov’s essays. [S05, S06, S11]
1912–1913	Hadassah: founding and early medical work. [S26]
1917	Montagu’s memorandum and Balfour Declaration. [S10, S14]
1922	Mandate and Palestine Arab Delegation correspondence. [S15, S16]
1923	Jabotinsky: The Iron Wall. [S17]
1937	Columbus: a changed Reform formulation on Palestine. [S09]
1942	Biltmore: a Jewish Commonwealth and postwar order. [S18]
1947	Magnes before UNSCOP: a binational proposal and parity. [S19]
1948	Israel’s declaration; Bernadotte’s refugee report. [S20, S29]
1979–1983	Selected Beter transcripts and the later Reference Digest. [S23, S24, S25]
2016 / 2021	IHRA and JDA: two frameworks identifying antisemitism. [S21, S22]

This is an editorial comparison, not a hierarchy of peoples or a genealogical scheme.

Glossary

Sionizmus / Zionism

A working umbrella for modern programmes of Jewish national life connected with Palestine; specify each author’s meaning.

Antisionizmus / Anti-Zionism

Opposition to a specified form of the project; identify what is opposed and which inhabitants’ rights are recognized.

Nesionistický postoj / Non-Zionist position

Not identifying with a Zionist programme need not mean active opposition.

Domov / National home

A political formulation in a particular document, not automatically a full constitution or state map.

Suverenita / Sovereignty

Supreme political authority over territory; not the same as private landownership.

Diaspóra / Diaspora

Communal life outside a historical or symbolic centre; it does not determine citizenship or political loyalty.

Teritorializmus / Territorialism

In the debate examined, prioritizing a suitable autonomous territory, not necessarily Palestine exclusively.

Parita / Parity

Institutional balancing of two groups’ representation; potentially different from numerical proportionality.

Binacionalizmus / Binationalism

A proposal for two national communities within a shared political arrangement; mechanisms differ.

Mesiášske vykúpenie / Messianic redemption

A religious expectation whose relation to political action receives different interpretations.

Antisemitizmus / Antisemitism

A subject of specific definitions and examples; never a biological test of Semitic ancestry in this study.

Pramenná kritika / Source criticism

Examining authorship, date, genre, transmission, scope and reliability of a particular record.

Reader’s procedure and edition notes

Edition v1.0 · 11 October 2026. Editorial text and explanatory diagrams were created with AI assistance. Atmospheric images are reused from RA02; they are not archival photographs, authenticated portraits or precise reconstructions of the events discussed.

Source references concern the accessible wording checked during preparation. This is not an audit of every historical archive, financial connection or contemporary community. Assessments are not legal advice.

Corrections should identify the chapter, source code and specific evidence. A later edition may revise findings; an uncomfortable result is not itself grounds for accepting or rejecting it.

The series follows RA01 (Khazars), RA02 (communities, identity and languages), RA03 (religious texts) and RA04 (ancestry and Koestler). RA06 examines finance, RA07 revolution, RA08 Israel’s creation and RA11 Beter’s combined theory. These are references to the series plan, not claims that further volumes have already been published.

Source register / S01–S29

Sources accessed on 11 October 2026. Each entry identifies the extent used; URLs point to the source, not a copy made by us.

S01 / Leon Pinsker · Auto-Emancipation

1882

Argument o svojpomoci / self-help; záverečné návrhy územia / concluding territorial proposals

https://jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/pinsker.html

English web transcription. Selected passages used; the translation is not a new critical edition of the German original.

S02 / Theodor Herzl · The Jewish State

1896; English edition reproduced by Project Gutenberg

The Plan; Palestine or Argentine?; The Jewish Company; Language; Theocracy

https://www.gutenberg.org/files/25282/25282-h/25282-h.htm

The author’s text is distinguished from the later introduction and biography. The electronic edition identifies translation and reprint layers; it is not treated as a facsimile of the 1896 edition.

S03 / Basel Programme · reproduced by Gotthard Deutsch, Jewish Encyclopedia

1897; encyclopedia 1901–1906

Program: cieľ a štyri prostriedky / aim and four means

https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/2612-basel-program

Programme wording and the near-contemporary encyclopedic commentary are used separately. The original congress minutes were not inspected.

S04 / Ahad Ha’am · The Jewish State and Jewish Problem

1897

Ekonomická kritika a kultúrne centrum / economic critique and cultural centre

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Jewish_State_and_Jewish_Problem

English transcription read. The page states that it is not backed by a scanned edition; it is used as an available transcription, not a collated original.

S05 / Ber Borochov · The National Question and the Class Struggle

1905

Úvodné rozlíšenie národnej otázky a triedneho boja / opening theoretical distinctions

https://www.marxists.org/archive/borochov/1905/national-class.htm

English translation in the Marxists Internet Archive; selected arguments used without adopting its Marxist premises.

S06 / V. I. Lenin · The Position of the Bund in the Party

1903

Polemika s Bundom, sionizmom a národnosťou / polemic on the Bund, Zionism and nationality

https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1903/oct/22a.htm

Available English translation of a political article. Evaluative language belongs to Lenin, not this study.

S07 / YIVO Archives · Bund Archives, RG 1400

Archival finding aid

Administrative/Biographical History

https://yivoarchives.yivo.org/index.php?id=33762&p=collections/controlcard

Archival finding aid and institutional history. Not a direct reading of the complete archive or one unchanging Bund programme.

S08 / Reform rabbis · Pittsburgh Platform

1885

Point 5

https://www.ccarnet.org/rabbinic-voice/platforms/article-declaration-principles/

Historical platform reproduced by CCAR. Evidence of its authors' position, not a census of all Jewish opinion.

S09 / CCAR · Guiding Principles of Reform Judaism (Columbus Platform)

1937

Israel; Palestine and citizenship

https://www.ccarnet.org/rabbinic-voice/platforms/article-guiding-principles-reform-judaism/

Platform text on the CCAR website; comparison with 1885 is not generalized to every individual.

S10 / Edwin Montagu · Memorandum on the Anti-Semitism of the Present Government

23 August 1917

Úvod a námietky k štátnej príslušnosti / opening and citizenship objections

https://jewishvirtuallibrary.org/montagu-memo-on-british-government-s-anti-semitism

English memorandum transcription. Montagu's predictions and polemical title are distinguished from subsequent documented events.

S11 / Yosef Lindell · Toward a More Pragmatic Redemption: The Practical Zionism of Rabbi Yitzhak Yaakov Reines

Conversations, issue 37

Výklad Reinesových textov / interpretation of Reines's writings

https://www.jewishideas.org/article/toward-more-pragmatic-redemption-practical-zionism-rabbi-yitzhak-yaakov-reines

Author's textual study with embedded translations read. The complete Hebrew books were not independently read.

S12 / Torah Jews · The Three Oaths

Web statement; accessed 11 October 2026

Argument organizácie a citovaná pasáž Ketubot 111a / organization's argument and cited passage

https://www.torahjews.org/the-three-oaths

Primary evidence of the organization's own religious-political position. Not a representative survey of Orthodox Judaism or a critical Talmud edition.

S13 / William E. Blackstone and signatories · Blackstone Memorial

1891

Petícia a sprievodný list / petition and covering letter

https://www.lifeinmessiah.org/blackstone-memorial

Web transcription hosted by a Christian missionary organization. Petition wording used; signatures were not authenticated against originals.

S14 / British government · Balfour Declaration

2 November 1917

Celý krátky list / complete short letter

https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/balfour.asp

Transcription in Yale Law School’s Avalon Project. Evidence of wording and date, not of fulfillment.

S15 / League of Nations · Mandate for Palestine

1922

Articles 2, 4, 6, 7 and 15

https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/palmanda.asp

Historical mandate text. Discussion is documentary and historical, not legal advice on contemporary disputes.

S16 / British government and Palestine Arab Delegation · Cmd. 1700 correspondence and policy statement

1922

English columns: letters 1 and 6; policy statement; PDF pp. 9–12, 37–44 and 1–7

https://monbalagan.com/images/sources/1922_Livre_blanc_Churchill_EN_FR.pdf

Selected English pages of a bilingual re-typeset PDF, visually checked. Not an original facsimile or independent verification of every delegation or government assertion.

S17 / Vladimir Jabotinsky · The Iron Wall; Ethics of the Iron Wall

4 and 11 November 1923

The Iron Wall, especially equality, consent and force

https://jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Zionism/ironwall.html

English web transcription with some visible textual corruption. Coherent passages used chiefly in paraphrase; silent repairs are not presented as quotations.

S18 / Biltmore Conference · Biltmore Programme

11 May 1942

Points 3, 6–8

https://content.ecf.org.il/files/M00057_BiltmoreProgram1942English.pdf

Two-page English reprint visually checked. Point 3 contains a marked omission; not represented as a complete critical edition.

S19 / Judah L. Magnes / Ihud · Testimony before UNSCOP, A/AC.13/P.V.30

14 July 1947

Selected opening pages and discussion of parity, immigration and arbitration; printed pp. 7–10, 19

https://www.marxists.org/subject/israel-palestine/ihud/ihud-testimony-un.pdf

Selected pages of a digitized official record on a mirror host. Not represented as a reading of all 74 hearing pages.

S20 / People’s Council · Declaration of the Establishment of the State of Israel

14 May 1948

Vyhlásenie štátu a odseky o právach / proclamation and rights paragraphs

https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/israel.asp

English transcription of the founding document. Its historical assertions and normative promises are distinguished from implementation.

S21 / IHRA · Working Definition of Antisemitism

26 May 2016

Definition, contextual examples and criticism-of-Israel qualification

https://www.aseca.gov.au/resources/defining-antisemitism

IHRA text reproduced on the Australian government’s ASECA page, not its claims about current uptake. The definition describes itself as non-legally binding.

S22 / Jerusalem Declaration on Antisemitism

25 March 2021

Guidelines 6–15 and accompanying explanation

https://jerusalemdeclaration.org/

Declaration and its authors’ explanation. Not a judicial ruling, the position of all scholars, or an opinion poll.

S23 / Peter David Beter · Audio Letter 50

30 September 1979

Topic 3; passages on militant Zionism, Khazars and religious opposition

https://www.peterdavidbeter.com/docs/all/dbal50.html

Web transcript used. Neither the audio recording nor the newspaper advertisement mentioned in it was independently checked for this study.

S24 / Peter David Beter · Audio Letter 67

25 August 1981

Passages distinguishing American Jews and Zionist leaders; claims of shared origins and power

https://www.peterdavidbeter.com/docs/all/dbal67.html

Selected transcript passages, not a forensic audit of the complete audio series.

S25 / Audio Books Inc. · Bird’s-Eye View, excerpt from Audio Letter Reference Digest

1983

Údaj o vydavateľovi; tvrdenie o Rothschild interests / publisher note and Rothschild-interests claim

https://www.peterdavidbeter.com/docs/all/dbeye.html

Later editorial summary, not additional independent historical verification or automatically a verbatim Beter statement.

S26 / Hadassah · Our History

Institutional historical account

Our Story; Hadassah Founding

https://www.hadassah.org/about/history

Organization’s own historical account; only founding and early medical activity used, not current membership or promotional assessments.

S27 / Ber Borochov · The Question of Zion and Territory

1905; translated excerpts

Rozlíšenie teritorializmu a sionizmu / territorialism and Zionism

https://www.marxists.org/archive/borochov/1905/zion-territory.htm

Explicitly identified as excerpts from an undated Habonim Dror pamphlet. Not the complete essay.

S28 / United States Holocaust Memorial Museum · Displaced Persons

Historical overview

Opening; Zionism; Emigration

https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/displaced-persons

Used for postwar displacement and different emigration destinations, not to infer every individual’s later political motives.

S29 / Folke Bernadotte · Conclusions from Progress Report of the UN Mediator on Palestine, A/648

Signed 16 September 1948

Seven Basic Premises; Assistance to Refugees, VI

https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/decad170.asp

Report excerpts through a contemporary US diplomatic publication and Avalon. Figures are interim report estimates, not the final total of the war.