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ABSTRACT

Horace Kallen, Judah Magnes, and American Liberal Zionism in the Early 20th Century

A thesis presented to the Department of Near Eastern and Judaic Studies
Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Brandeis University
Waltham, MA

By Eli Cohn

This paper examines the contribution to Zionist thought of two Americans: Horace M. Kallen and Judah L. Magnes. Each was involved in the Zionist movement in the early 20th century, Kallen mostly during World War I and Magnes for nearly the first 50 years of the 1900s. Independently of each other, these two thinkers fused the American ideas of liberalism and democracy with Jewish nationalism to create a distinctly American Zionism. In this paper we explore how Kallen and Magnes define democracy, and how they utilize this concept in creating a Zionism that would be positively perceived by a broad swath of American Jews.
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INTRODUCTION

In a 1919 issue of *New Republic* Morris Cohen issued a challenge to the American Zionist movement. He wrote, “though most of the leaders of Zionism in America are sincerely and profoundly convinced of the compatibility of Zionism and Americanism, they are none the less profoundly mistaken." Cohen accused Zionists of giving preferential treatment to one ethnic group, and in doing so they violate America’s founding liberal principles. For this reason good Americans could not support Zionism. In “Zionism: Tribalism or Liberalism?” Cohen challenged American Zionists to define Jewish nationalism in a way that co-existed with American liberal and democratic ideas.

In this paper I examine how two American Zionists, Horace M. Kallen and Judah L. Magnes, respond to this challenge. Before looking at Kallen and Magnes, in this introduction I explore the political theory that serves as the backbone of this debate. Kallen and Magnes view sovereignty through a particular political lens, and our understanding this framework is essential for our understanding of Kallen and Magnes. After the introduction we should also have a better sense of the assumptions that underlay Morris Cohen’s challenge to American Zionists.

In Chapter 1 I focus on how Kallen and Magnes understand democracy. Both thinkers define democracy using language from America’s founding documents. In this

---

1 Cohen, Morris. "Zionism: Tribalism or Liberalism?" *New Republic* (8 Mar. 1919), 182
chapter I show how Kallen and Magnes define democracy, followed by a demonstration of how they applied democracy to their thinking about the Jewish superindividual. I show that both Kallen and Magnes believed that the Jewish superindividual should be democratic both internally and externally. That is, the processes that govern the Jewish superindividual should be democratic and the Jewish superindividual should treat other superindividuals democratically.

Chapter 2 examines how Kallen and Magnes envisioned the Jewish superindividual. There is ample evidence that each believed nations formed a national individual. Kallen and Magnes extrapolate lessons from their views on the American Melting Pot and apply them to their views on the relationship between superindividuals. Further, both thinkers believed that Jewish sovereignty in Palestine would deeply impact Jewish life around the globe. Global Jewry would have democratic control over the personality and workings of a national superindividual, and in turn the actions of that superindividual would help define the personalities of individual Jews.

Finally, in Chapter 3 I offer some comments on the current state of liberal Zionism in America. In particular I highlight Open Hillel and J Street as cases where modern liberal Zionists have challenged to assert more control over the Jewish superindividual. Just as Kallen and Magnes became alienated from the Zionist movement due to their heavy reliance on American ideas, today’s Jewish community threatens to alienate many American Jews who rely on similar liberal principles.
The Problem of Nationalism and the Superindividua

In his argument, Morris Cohen reflects a broader concern about the relationship between liberalism and nationalism. In Western political thought liberalism is defined as the equality of individuals. In America, liberal principles are enunciated most clearly when we say that all people are created equal and are therefore entitled to certain inalienable rights. Cohen argues that nationalism grants privileges to the members of one nation at the expense of others. In doing so nationalism denies the principles of equality contained in documents like the Declaration of Independence that are so central to the American consciousness. This is the problem of nationalism that American Zionists needed to respond to.

Another way to consider the problem of nationalism is to conceive of the nation as an individual, an idea that goes back at least as far as Thomas Hobbes. In his classic Leviathan, Hobbes refers to the state as a commonwealth that by definition serves the common good of all its citizens. In his introduction Hobbes says that people “create that great LEVIATHAN called a COMMON-WEALTH, or STATE, (in latine CIVITAS) which is but an Artificiall Man; though of greater stature and strength than the Natuall, for whose protection and defence it was intended and in which, the Soveraignty is an Artificiall Soul, as giving life and motion to the whole body.” Hobbes compares the individual to the sovereign state. According to Hobbes the state is an artificial man that has a personality, appendages, and is vulnerable to disease. For example, the state has bureaucrats that “may

3 Ibid., 81
fitly be compared to the organs of Voice in a Body naturall.4” The state also has hands, eyes, ears, and other parts. Finally, just as people die so too can dissolution of the commonwealth come about through “internall diseases...intestine disorder...[other] infirmities.5” Each defines its own personality through its own particular actions, laws, leaders, and systemic problems that lead to disease. Furthermore, each state forms a distinct individual based on the powers it invests in these bodies.

Modern political philosophers have also referred to the state as an individual, with two examples being Ninian Smart and Ghia Nodia. Smart calls the nation as “a performative transubstantiation whereby many individuals become a superindividual.6” Smart thinks of the superindividual as a parallel to Hobbes’ conception of the sovereign nation as an artificial man. In becoming a state, a national group performs this transubstantiation and becomes a superindividual. Given this sovereignty, the nation can shape its own personality. Ghia Nodia is another modern thinker who argues that nations are the collective expression of group self-determination, and that nations take on aspects of human personality. For example Nodia believes that nations, like individuals, define themselves against some form of Other.7 For both Hobbes and these modern thinkers a group becomes a superindividual when it becomes sovereign. Modern thinkers usually think of nation-states, however the sovereign group need not be a nation to form a superindividual.

4 Ibid., 293
5 Ibid., 363
6 Ibid., 24
To return to Morris Cohen’s argument, one might imagine a variety of personalities that a national superindividuation could embody. Some superindividuals favor equality, treating other superindividuals with respect and ensuring their basic rights. Cohen fears an alternative, which is an egoistic superindividuation. In fact, Cohen implicitly assumes that superindividuals are egoistic in his argument. The egoistic superindividuation cares only about its own members at the expense of the other individuals or superindividuals it interacts with. Cohen claims that a liberal superindividuation is the only type of moral superindividuation, with this type being exemplified by America. The Jewish superindividuation, however, violates these liberal principles; it does not treat other nations equally since it favors Jews. The Jewish superindividuation is selfish. Presumably for Cohen any superindividuation that favors one particular ethnic or national group would be problematic on the same grounds.

There are modern political theorists who also question the compatibility of certain types of nationalism and liberalism. Robert Goodin is one such theorist, although he believes there are certain cases where nationalism and liberalism can co-exist. Goodin argues that most nationalisms are based on cultural truth claims. These truth claims reflect arbitrary cultural practices and norms, not metaphysical claims to absolute Truth. Nations can become tolerant by recognizing that each other’s truth claims are culturally dependent. Goodin argues that there are types of nationalism, however, that are unable to reach this mutual understanding. These nationalisms express claims to absolute Truth rather than cultural truth claims. Two examples are religious-based nationalism and history-based nationalism. Thus, for Goodin two types of national superindividuation are problematic:

---

religious superindividuals, and superindividuals claiming absolute historical knowledge. In other cases superindividuals can promote equality and liberalism.

Francis Fukuyama also demonstrates ways in which nationalism and liberalism can coexist. He argues that, “nationalism can coexist quite well with liberalism as long as the former becomes tolerant.” By this Fukuyama means that national identity must be kept in the realm of private life, and it must be easily adoptable by others if they choose. If national identity becomes the basis of citizenship then minority rights can become compromised. Fukuyama argues along similar lines to Cohen that superindividuals that inherently favor one ethnic or national group are problematic.

Thus American Zionists were challenged to create a Zionism that rejected the assumption in Cohen’s argument. The Jewish superindividual could not be egoistic, rather it must find ways to integrate liberalism and a sense of equality into its religious personality. While only Kallen responded directly to Cohen, both of these thinkers actively imbued their Zionism with American ideas. Kallen and Magnes both viewed the nation as a superindividual and, as a result, they needed to integrate Zionism and liberalism due both to their personal convictions and in order to make Zionism more palatable to an American audience. Kallen and Magnes utilize similar ideas to create a liberal Zionism based on the American idea. Namely, both rely on equality, the democratic character of the Jewish superindividual, and American terminology in defining the Zionist project. While each thinker employs these concepts differently, the basic themes are the same.

CHAPTER 1: DEFINING DEMOCRACY

Horace M. Kallen and Judah L. Magnes both viewed democracy as an essential aspect of American liberalism. For each, democracy reflected the principles of equality that were essential to good government. Both authors believed that there should be democracy in the Jewish state, and that the fulfillment of Zionism would promote democracy globally. While Kallen believed in democracy as the positive pole of a binary, for Magnes democracy was closely tied to the treatment of Palestinian Arabs and to internal Jewish politics. In this chapter I will give some background information on both Kallen and Magnes, then detail how they define democracy and utilize it in their conceptions of the Jewish superindividual.

Kallen: Democracy vs. Autocracy

Sarah Schmidt has been the most prolific Kallen researcher. She credits Kallen with being the ideological father of American Zionism from 1914-1921. During most of this time Louis D. Brandeis served as president of the Provisional Executive Committee for Zionist Affairs and was the head of the American Zionist movement. Schmidt believes that Kallen’s synthesis of American liberalism and Jewish nationalism alleviated Brandeis’ concerns about dual loyalty, and that Kallen provided the ideological vision behind

Brandeis’ leadership. Kallen was able to accomplish this because he approached Zionism from an American rather than a Jewish perspective. Indeed, the belief among European Zionists that Kallen’s Zionism expressed too much American idealism led to his resignation from the world Zionist movement in 1921. By this time the feelings of antagonism between Kallen and the Europeans were mutual. The Europeans would not accept Kallen’s Americanism and Kallen rejected a Zionism not based on the American idea. Nonetheless, during World War I Kallen’s ideas dominated American Zionism, culminating in the 1918 Pittsburgh Program.

Kallen’s father was an Orthodox rabbi, although Kallen rebelled against his father and stopped identifying as Jewish in his teens. Kallen was living as a secular student at Harvard when he was reintroduced to the possibilities of integrating Judaism and modernity by two of his professors, Barrett Wendell and William James. Wendell believed that the Old Testament was the foundation of the American Idea, defined most clearly in the Declaration of Independence. Schmidt says that if Wendell is correct, “then Zionism, the means of re-creating another state dedicated to these Hebraic ideals, was highly compatible with Kallen’s commitments as an American.” Kallen was also influenced by William James’ ideas about the validity of the many, which he believed gave him access to the

---

11 Ibid., 57. See also Schmidt, Sara S. ““Americanized’ Zionism: The Forgotten Role of Horace M. Kallen.” *Forum: on the Jewish People, Zionism, and Israel*. Vol. 56 (Summer 1985). 66-7
14 Horace M. Kallen, *Prophet of American Zionism*, 21
15 Messianic Pragmatism: the Zionism of Horace M. Kallen, 219
“group personality” called Jew within the American cultural landscape. James’ influence is more obvious in Kallen’s conception of cultural pluralism, which I will explore in Chapter 3. Together, Wendell and James enabled Kallen to achieve a hyphenated identity—he could be a Jewish-American.

Kallen’s combination of American and Jewish identity manifested itself in the Zionist movement. As early as 1904 Kallen was publishing poems calling on the American Jewish community to rise to the challenge of Zionism. Naomi Cohen has pointed out that the American Zionist movement at this time can be differentiated from Herzlian political Zionism by its emphasis on democratic ideals rather than on practical steps such as aliyah or obtaining a political charter. Kallen’s Zionism blended elements of what he viewed as the two dominant streams of European Zionism, political and cultural. He rebelled against practical Zionism (which we now call cultural Zionism) because it focused on the slow process of immigration and culture building in Palestine. Kallen viewed practical Zionism as flawed because he believed there could be no cultural center for Jews without a political center. Following Judd Taylor, Schmidt describes Kallen’s blend of political and cultural Zionism as messianic-pragmatic Zionism. She says that, “messianic pragmatism synthesized the concept of Palestine as asylum with that of Palestine as Utopia.”

16 Horace M. Kallen, Prophet of American Zionism, 23
18 Kallen, Horace M. “The False Hope.” The Maccabaean Vol. 7 (December, 1904), 293
20 Kallen, Horace M. “The International Aspects of Zionism” in Schmidt Prophet of American Zionism, 147
21 Horace M. Kallen, Prophet of American Zionism, 43
22 Messianic Pragmatism: the Zionism of Horace M. Kallen, 217
saw the Zionist project as an opportunity for Jews to develop their culture by creating a model democracy in Palestine.23

Kallen viewed World War I as a historic battle between two types of government: democracy and autocracy. Kallen expressed this idea in two articles in *The Maccabaeans* in 1918.24 The first, published in April and May, was called “Constitutional Foundations of the New Zion,” and the second, published in July, called “Democracy, Nationalism, and Zionism.” *The Maccabaeans* was a journal founded by the Federation of American Zionists to bring increased awareness of Zionist issues to the American Jewish community. In these two articles Kallen espoused his belief that democratic regimes embrace liberalism while autocratic regimes try to impress a singular religious or cultural identity on their citizens. Another way to characterize the difference is to say that democracies value liberalism over nationalism, while the opposite is true for autocracies. The democracy/autocracy binary opposition motivated Kallen to envision a Jewish superindividual that would have a democratic rather than autocratic personality.

In “Constitutional Foundations of the New Zion,” Kallen describes the close relationship between democracy and liberalism. He declares, “the true meaning of democracy is the liberation, encouragement and perfection of differences among men, the increase of human individuality and spontaneity, and hence of human co-operation.”25 Kallen believes that at the heart of democracy are both the freedom to be different and the celebration of difference. Democracy stands opposed to autocratic forced assimilation and

---

23 Kallen, Horace M. “Constitutional Foundations of the New Zion.” *The Maccabaeans* Vol. 31 (April and May 1918), 98
25 Constitutional Foundations of the New Zion, 99
cultural uniformity. Kallen cites the American Declaration of Independence as the exemplar of the democratic idea, and as we will see he integrated many of the Declaration’s ideas into his Zionist philosophy.\textsuperscript{26} Significantly, Kallen saw the Allied victory in World War I as indicative of democracy triumphing over autocracy for all time.\textsuperscript{27}

That article was followed up with “Democracy, Nationalism, and Zionism,” published in July in the same volume. In this edition Kallen goes into more detail about the differences between democracy and autocracy, and he argues that the Zionist project falls into the democratic category. The fundamental difference between autocracy and democracy is that autocratic regimes are those that insist that everyone conform to one ethnic group, while democratic regimes encourage differences and cooperation between ethnic groups. Kallen views autocratic regimes as problematic because they merge natural and artificial communities. An example of a natural community is nationality, which Kallen defines in biological terms.\textsuperscript{28} On the other hand artificial communities are voluntary, with examples including religious affiliations, labor organizations, and states (citizenship).\textsuperscript{29} For most of world history autocracy took the form of religious imperialism, where religious identity was imposed on citizens. This era ended with the separation of church and state in many countries. In the years preceding World War I autocratic regimes were characterized by cultural rather than religious imperialism, best exemplified by Protestant Germany.

Kallen made his commitment to American democracy apparent in his writings on behalf of the American Zionist movement. Kallen contributed to this body of work most significantly with the Pittsburgh Program. Kallen authored the Program, a Zionist

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{26} Ibid., 99
\item \textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 97
\item \textsuperscript{28} Democracy, Nationality, and Zionism, 175
\item \textsuperscript{29} Ibid., 176
\end{itemize}
manifesto adopted by the newly formed Zionist Organization of America, in 1918. The first article of the Pittsburgh Program calls for political and civic equality for all the inhabitants of the new country. As we have seen, Kallen gave priority to establishing an American-style democratic regime rather than an autocratic state with an explicitly Jewish character. In doing so he directly reflects the belief he expressed in a memorandum shortly before the Pittsburgh Program: “the Zionist Movement has been from its inception a movement to establish such a homeland on the principles of a social justice that will actually secure to each man his life, his liberty, and his happiness.” This passage serves as another reminder of Kallen’s direct reliance on the American idea.

Kallen’s Zionism was more than an attempt to recreate America in Palestine, however. He believed the future state would express a Jewish character in two ways. First, Kallen followed his professor at Harvard Barrett Wendell, who believed that the Jewish prophetic tradition was the intellectual source of American democracy. Kallen believed that this link gave the Jewish people an increased stake in promoting democracy around the world. Second, Kallen believed Jews would constitute a demographic majority in Palestine. As we will see, Magnes differed sharply from Kallen on this point. Nonetheless, Kallen believed that without a sovereign majority, diaspora Jews could contribute to their host national cultures, but Jews as a collective could only contribute to world culture when they had their own state. In a letter to British Zionist Jacob de Haas, Kallen wrote: “I do

---

30 Horace M. Kallen, Prophet of American Zionism, 117
31 Zionism and World Politics, 301
32 Horace M. Kallen, Prophet of American Zionism, 158-9
33 Constitutional Foundations of the New Zion, 98
34 Zionism: Democracy or Prussianism?, 313
not think we ought to bother about 'Jewish points of view and Jewish policies.' Jews working together will have these automatically.35"

Thus Kallen responds directly to Morris Cohen. Jewish nationalism and Americanism are compatible since both are committed to democracy and the freedom of individuals to be different. By making this claim Kallen rejects the embedded assumption in Cohen’s argument. Zionism is a selfish movement only insofar as it expects Jews to have a demographic majority in their own state. The state will still guarantee equal rights to all minority groups, just like in America.

Magnes: Democracy and Equality

Judah Magnes was an American rabbi from California. He received his rabbinic training at Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati before studying for his Ph.D. in Germany. Following his time in Germany Magnes returned to America, where he served as a rabbi at multiple Reform synagogues in New York. Additionally, he was an active voice in the pacifist movement during World War I, as well as being an influential voice in a variety of Jewish organizations in New York. He and his family moved to Palestine in 1922.36 He is perhaps best known as the first Chancellor and later the President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.

Magnes was a lifelong Zionist, which was a rarity in America during his time. His views on democracy are similar to Kallen in some respects while containing sharp

35 Letter to Jacob de Haas “Americanized” Zionism: The Forgotten Role of Horace M. Kallen, 72
contrasts at other times. It is clear, however, that Magnes saw democracy as central to American life and as central to the Zionist project. The way Magnes viewed the role of democracy in the Zionist enterprise changed when he moved to Palestine in the 1920s. Whereas in the United States he was focused on the democratic character of the Jewish community, in Palestine his concerns about democracy took the form of concern for the rights of both Jews and Arabs.

Contrary to Kallen, Magnes was firmly in the Cultural Zionist camp. He developed his position while studying in Germany, where he was greatly influenced by thinkers such as Ahad Ha’am and Martin Buber. Magnes viewed the building of the Jewish nation in Palestine as creating a spiritual and cultural center for Jews around the world. For Magnes this was not dependent on the Jews constituting a demographic majority in Palestine. As long as the Jews were sovereign they could fulfill the Zionist ideal, while a demographic majority would threaten the Arabs’ ability to express their own sovereignty. As a consequence Magnes advocated for a Swiss-style model of Jewish and Arab cantons.

Late in his life, after World War II, Magnes defined democracy and the import it had on him. In doing so he returned to the American language of his upbringing. In 1946 Magnes wrote about the tensions he felt between American liberalism and the direction of the Jewish national project in Palestine:

I am religiously a Jew….I am politically an American. I feel this the more deeply since the outbreak of this war. I have felt it keenly in recent years, more especially because of the distance that seems to yawn between my political views and those of the Zionist leaders in Palestine and abroad. By ‘politically’ I mean that the American (and English) tradition of democracy has had a great influence

---


upon me—the political institutions of voting and parliamentary government; free speech, and a free press; freedom of religious conviction and worship; the idea of the equality of all men, black and white, great and small; the possibility of men of all races and origins and creeds living together cooperatively; the feeling of the individual responsibility for the welfare of the community, for the proper and honest working for the democracy.\textsuperscript{39}

We can therefore see the close relationship between democracy and liberalism in Magnes’ thinking. In fact, the two concepts are basically identical. Both are based on the principle of the equality of individuals. Magnes appears to rely more on the Bill of Rights than the Declaration of Independence in defining democracy, but the dependence on America’s founding documents is the same as with Kallen.

In other places Magnes does distinguish between liberalism and equality. At the end of World War II, Magnes wrote \textit{In the Perplexity of the Times}, a call for an increase in democratic values after the War. In recalling the French Revolution Magnes laments the fact that liberty rather than democracy was enshrined as the chief value of the Revolution.\textsuperscript{40} Magnes views liberty as creating laissez-faire economic policy, and therefore leading to unbridled capitalism and the erosion of equality. Similar to Kallen’s views about World War I, Magnes viewed the Second World War as having the potential to promote democracy and reject autocracy (in the form of Hitler’s totalitarian fascism) for all time. However, for this to be the case nationalism needs to be suppressed in favor of international cooperation. In Magnes’ words “The peace of the world can be furthered by Empire if it be democratic.”\textsuperscript{41} Here Magnes recalls Fukuyama’s conception of tolerant nationalism.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Dissenter in Zion}: Document 98, 379
\textsuperscript{40} Magnes, J.L. \textit{In the Perplexity of the Times}. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1946, 45
\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ibid.}, 51
As we see from the above quotations Magnes viewed democracy as necessary for free expression. In his Zionist idea this idea manifests itself in his commitment to representative democracy and by his desire to keep the American Zionist movement democratic and apolitical. Magnes showed a commitment to democracy even at a young age. As a voice often in dissent, Magnes wanted to ensure that every voice was heard on an issue even as a young student at Hebrew Union College. This is early evidence of the way Magnes internalized principles of American democracy and the liberal ideal of equality.

Within the Zionist movement Magnes promoted this style of democracy by pushing for the inclusion of all Zionist factions in the Federation of American Zionists. As a member of the American Jewish Committee he opposed the creation of the American Jewish Congress, fearing that this would divide rather than unite American Jewry. Indeed, a rift developed between Magnes and American Jewish Congress leader Louis Brandeis over the role of democracy in the Jewish community. For a brief time Magnes joined Brandeis’ Provisional Executive Committee for General Zionist Affairs, but he resigned because he felt the movement was becoming partisan. By this he meant that Brandeis, in advocating for certain political views, would necessarily leave some American Jews feeling like outsiders. The only way for the Zionist movement to unite American Jewry was by maintaining a commitment to democracy, not expressing a political stance, and including all voices.

Once in Palestine, Magnes began to focus on democracy as it related to the relationship between Jews and Arabs. For Magnes this commitment was rooted in what he viewed as the injustice of minority suppression during World War I. Magnes viewed

42 An American Radical, 52
43 Ibid., 173
44 Ibid., 241
minority expression as essential for democracy, which parallels Kallen’s views on the subject.\footnote{Ibid., 273}

Magnes differs from Kallen in that Magnes did not advocate for a Jewish majority in Palestine. Rather he supported numerical parity between the Jewish and Arab populations, making this a central feature of his testimony before the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine.\footnote{Magnes, J.L., Reiner, M., Lord Samuel, Simon, E., Smilansky, M. Palestine—\textit{Divided or United?: The Case for a Bi-National Palestine Before the United Nations}. Jerusalem: IHUD (Union) Association, 1947, 9} For Magnes, the idea of numerical parity between Jews and Arabs was both practical and ideological. Practically, he viewed the creation of a majority Jewish state as inevitably leading to war with the Arabs, a result that for Magnes was unacceptable. Ideologically, numerical parity was the best way to secure minority rights and democratic practices. Further, numerical parity would ensure self-determination for both groups, which itself was a way to further democracy.

\textit{An American Zion}

As we have seen both Kallen and Magnes define democracy with American concepts. Each relied on America’s founding documents in understanding democracy and its relationship to equality. While each had a different view on Zionism and especially the demographic balance in Palestine, both Kallen and Magnes viewed democracy as central to the justice of the Zionist cause. In relying on democracy they are able to reject Morris Cohen's idea that the Jewish superindividual is egoistic. Rather, the Jewish superindividual
is centered on the highest principles of equality. Americans no longer needed to worry about the compatibility of liberalism and Jewish nationalism.
CHAPTER 2: THE NATURE OF THE SUPERINDIVIDUAL

In this chapter I explore more specific ways that Kallen and Magnes utilize the concept of the superindividual. For both thinkers the creation of the Jewish superindividual meant a revitalization of world Jewish culture as well as the global legitimation of Judaism based on liberal principles. Further, in defining the Jewish superindividual they rely heavily on American terminology. In using American terminology they demonstrate an obvious reliance on using America as the model of democratic values that the Jewish state should emulate. Not only did both thinkers rely heavily on American language, but on concepts related to democracy and liberalism in particular.

Cultural Pluralism and Zionism

Kallen explored his thoughts on the Jewish superindividual through the lens of cultural pluralism, his best-known contribution to the American philosophical lexicon. Kallen originally described cultural pluralism without naming it directly in “Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot” in 1915. He elaborated on the concept more fully in a series of essays published in 1921 as *Culture and Democracy in the United States*. While Kallen used cultural pluralism to describe America, we can also apply his ideas to sovereign

---

superindividuals. From this perspective we can see the relationship between domestic cultural pluralism and promoting liberalism and democracy on the global stage.

Kallen developed cultural pluralism to contrast the idea of the melting pot that was dominant in American sociology. In the melting pot, immigrant groups lose their previous national identity as they become Americanized. This process is intended to obliterate the differences between national groups. Kallen identifies the Know-Nothing party and the Ku Klux Klan as potential autocratic alternatives to cultural pluralism. By favoring native-born Americans these groups threaten to establish a country that favors one ethnic group over others. Americanization is also represented by what Kallen describes as an Orthodox attitude against immigration. We can describe Americanization as autocratic, since the melting pot emphasizes the need for one dominant national or cultural ideal.

Cultural pluralism stands as a democratic alternative to the melting pot. Cultural pluralism celebrates rather than eliminates differences among national groups. Kallen views democracy as a system that both conserves and perfects differences among nationalities, and cultural pluralism was a way of promoting global democracy. Kallen also saw differences between national and social groups are necessary for social growth. As he states:

Cultural growth is founded upon Cultural Pluralism. Cultural Pluralism is possible only in a democratic society whose institutions encourage individuality in groups, in persons, in temperaments, whose program liberates these individualities and guides them into a fellowship of freedom and cooperation.

---

48 Ibid., 12-13
49 Ibid., 137
50 Ibid., 61
51 Ibid., 43
Proper democratic regimes not only acknowledge cultural differences, they use these differences to foster cooperation between groups. This is one reason why Kallen is so apt to use terms like “commonwealth” or “commonwealth of nationalities” in describing cultural pluralism.\(^5^2\)

Kallen also uses the metaphor of an orchestra or symphony to illustrate cultural pluralism. In this social orchestra each ethnic group is an instrument, and the group’s culture is the melody it plays. By playing together, all ethnic groups “make the symphony of civilization.”\(^5^3\) The symphony of nations is an image of sovereign superindividuals working together to create a global commonwealth of nationalities. Kallen most clearly describes this symphony of nations in “Judaism, Hebraism, and Zionism” found in his collection *Judaism at Bay*:

> Culture thus constitutes a harmony, of which peoples and nations are the producing instruments, to which each contributes its unique tone...It is this culture, so conceived, which is the standard whereby any nation or race is judged for conservation or destruction. A human group is moral, socially valuable, entitled to continued life, only in so far as it has a distinct nature that produces an individual note, a note that enriches and changes the harmony.\(^5^4\)

A few pages later Kallen links the symphony with the Zionist cause:

> Zionism is the solution of the Jewish problem because, if the past is any warrant for the future, there is every reason to believe that with the Jews as a free people in Palestine or elsewhere, that unique note which is designated in Hebraism has a chance to assume a more sustained, a clearer and truer tune in the concert of human cultures, and may genuinely enrich the harmony of civilizations.\(^5^5\)

In Kallen’s eyes the success of the Zionist project serves as a bell weather for democracy. Global democracy will increase as the Zionist project gains legitimacy.

---

52 Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot, 219  
53 Ibid., 220 See also *Culture and Democracy in the United States*, 124  
55 Ibid., 41
Noam Pianko has pointed out that Kallen was equally concerned with the extension of liberal principles from the individual to the group.\textsuperscript{56} Kallen provides much evidence to support this thesis, both in his writings about cultural pluralism and in his writings about Zionism. In *Culture and Democracy in the United States*, Kallen stresses the link between individual and group liberation. His anti-melting pot views stem from his belief that the individual will not be respected until the group is respected.\textsuperscript{57} He lamented the failure of liberalism in Europe, in so far as equality was granted to individuals but not to national groups.\textsuperscript{58} The relationship between individual and group liberation is also present in “Zionism: Democracy or Prussianism?” In this article Kallen argues that the creation of a Jewish state will liberate Jews as a nation in their own state of Palestine, and also “clear up the ambiguity” of Jews living in other host countries.\textsuperscript{59}

Kallen’s attitude demonstrates a progression toward applying cultural pluralism to the international arena. Indeed, this idea was not unique to Kallen even during World War I. In his discussion of Kallen’s cultural pluralism Sidney Ratner argues that, “during World War I, a liberal international approach to American nationalism was regarded by Wilsonian liberals as the domestic equivalent or complement of a federated world.\textsuperscript{60}” In this way Ratner compliments Kallen’s ideas about nations as democratic superindividuals. America represents the ideal democratic regime because it encourages cooperation across differences. As President Wilson presented plans for increased national recognition and a
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\item \textsuperscript{60} Ratner, Sidney. "Horace M. Kallen and Cultural Pluralism.” *Modern Judaism*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (May 1984), 193
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global League of Nations, it was a natural step to extend American ideas about democracy to the global stage. Cultural pluralism can be applied to individuals and to sovereign superindividuals, which are encouraged to cooperate as in American democracy. Just as America forms a domestic commonwealth of nations, so the international community can serve as a commonwealth of national superindividuals.

For Kallen cultural pluralism was more than a portrayal of American democracy, it was a way of granting legitimacy to the Zionist project. Cultural pluralism served as both a descriptive analysis of the American social landscape and a normative claim about the benefits of democracy. Kallen describes the failures of the American melting pot to achieve its goal of Americanizing immigrant populations. By contrast, cultural pluralism is a way of recognizing the validity of different ethnic groups and liberating the individuals who belong to those groups. The Zionist project promotes democracy by giving the Jews a sovereign, metaphysical group identity that can interact with other sovereign group identities. At the same time the legitimation of Jews as a national group entails the liberation of Jewish individuals in any country they live in.

Finally, there is evidence that Kallen saw Zionism as the process of creating a Jewish superindividual. In September of 1915 he wrote that, “Zionism asks...the same freedom for the Jewish people to realize its national individuality as a people that is demanded by all European peoples for themselves.” Kallen believed that this Jewish hope was transformed into a reality by the San Remo conference, a post-World War I meeting of the Allies in April, 1920. At San Remo the Allies divided the Ottoman Empire into different international mandates, and the 1917 Balfour Declaration was included as part of the British Mandate

over Palestine. Paralleling Ninian Smart’s language, Kallen wrote that San Remo “effects what is practically a magical change, what is tantamount to a metaphysical transvaluation in the character and significance of the Jewish people.” Kallen viewed the San Remo treaty as enshrining the Jewish right to become a sovereign superindividual in international law.

Even more specifically, Kallen understood that the Jewish superindividual would have a personality, and that Jews were responsible for creating it. *Judaism at Bay* was compiled and published well after Kallen became alienated from the Zionist movement. Nonetheless, Kallen expressed his continued belief that the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine was necessary for continued Jewish survival and solidarity. Further, he states, “A people, like an individual, has a personality which is focused in some particular ideal. Its whole life, like an individual’s life, consists in the unremitting struggle to maintain this personality, to pursue the ideal.” For Kallen there can be no doubt that the ideal of the Jewish people was a democratic Jewish state.

Finally, Kallen’s views on the democracy/autocracy binary influenced his Zionist philosophy. Kallen saw democracy as imperative to the success of the Zionist project, especially since autocracy was being completely destroyed in World War I. This meant the future Jewish state must support minority rights and that the international community must recognize Jewish rights as a national superindividual. This last point is crucial, since Kallen viewed democracy as promoting national liberation and international cooperation. This can only be accomplished by tolerant nationalisms that recognize the truth claims of
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other national cultures, including the Jews. Kallen’s response to Morris Cohen thus reflects his belief that Jews constitute a superindividual, and that the creation of the Jewish state will legitimate the Jewish presence in both Palestine and the diaspora.\textsuperscript{64}

\textbf{The Superindividual and Jewish Values}

Magnes displays some similarities to Kallen in how he regards the Jewish superindividual and his American influences. Notably, Magnes also rejected the melting pot in favor of an idea similar to cultural pluralism. Also like Kallen, Magnes combined aspects of cultural Zionism with Americanism in shaping his Zionist philosophy. Finally, Magnes was stronger than Kallen in his belief that the creation of a Jewish superindividual would have a two-way effect. That is, the Jewish superindividual’s personality would be controlled by the Jewish masses, but the identity of the Jewish masses would also be impacted by the Jewish superindividual.

Magnes thought of the American melting pot in a way similar to Kallen, although he expressed this belief before Kallen and in a more nebulous way. In 1909 Magnes delivered a sermon from the pulpit of Temple Emanuel in New York where he flatly rejected the idea of the melting pot, favoring instead a concept he referred to as the “refining pot.\textsuperscript{65}” He elaborates in language that is nearly identical to that which Kallen would use a few years later:

\textit{The harmony of a symphony, however, is produced by a variety of distinct sounds blending into music under the artist’s hand. The symphony of America must be written by the various nationalities}

\textsuperscript{64} Zionism: Democracy or Prussianism?, 312

\textsuperscript{65} Goren, Document 9, 104
which keep their individual and characteristic note, and which sound this note in harmony with their sister nationalities.66

Here Magnes clarifies the manner in which America promotes democratic values. America embodies democracy in that it accepts the differences among nations and brings them into harmony. This is the same ideal that Magnes preached with regard to the Arabs living alongside the Jews in Palestine.

Magnes also believed that the principles of democracy could be applied to the international stage. In a letter to American Jewish leader Maurice Hexter, Magnes wrote about different manifestations of democracy. He claimed that in America democracy was based on the idea that all individuals are equal. In multinational countries such as Palestine, however, democracy should be based on the equality of nationalities.67

Magnes promoted Zionist before World War II by claiming that national sovereignty increases global democracy. For example, in 1911 he stated that Zionism reflected the preservation of nations, or what he called internationalism.68 Following World War I the Versailles Treaty brought increased awareness to issues of minority national rights and the effort to increase sovereignty for smaller nations. While later Magnes viewed the Versailles Treaty as negatively impacting global democracy, his support for the Jewish national project and its prospects for peace never wavered.69 Despite his skepticism about the increase in global nationalism Magnes wrote in a letter to Gandhi in 1939 that self-determination should be granted to Jews as to all people, basing his argument on the idea
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that national self-determination should be applied to all groups in order to promote democracy.\textsuperscript{70}

Based on this view Magnes believed that the most important test facing the Jewish superindivudual was its relationship with Palestine’s Arab community. In 1930 Magnes wrote a letter to Stephen S. Wise, the prominent American Reform Rabbi. In this letter Magnes says that he is not surprised that his version of the Zionist idea appeals to American liberals.\textsuperscript{71} He reiterates his belief that liberalism should encourage co-existence between Jews and Arabs and he argues that liberal principles should be used to find a just solution for both groups in Palestine. Ultimately this single issue will go the farthest in defining the personality of the Jewish superindivudual: “What is the nature and essence of Jewish nationalism? Is it like the nationalism of all the nations? The answer is given by our attitude toward the Arabs.” Further, this point shows the way the Jewish superindivudual affects individual Jews as “the Arab question is not only of the utmost political importance; it is also the touchstone and test of our Judaism.\textsuperscript{72}”

This notion of reciprocity was central to Magnes’ thinking about Zionism. Not only did individual Jews shape the character of the Jewish superindivudual, the Jewish superindivudual impacted the character of individual Jews. Magnes expressed this idea most clearly in his thoughts on the Hebrew University. The University became Magnes’ life’s work even before it opened in the 1920s. Writing to Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann in 1913, Magnes wrote that he hoped “that a Jewish university would give to Judaism, as

\textsuperscript{71} \textit{Dissenter in Zion} Document 67, 286
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much as to the Jews, new and fresh values.73” Further, Daniel Kotzin argues that the University was Magnes’ attempt to fuse Jewish and American ideals at an institutional level.74

Magnes expressed the two-way impact of Jewish sovereignty from the pulpit of Temple Emanuel in 1909. In the same sermon where he described America as the “refining pot” he spoke about the way Jewish sovereignty would impact Jewish life in America. While maintaining that he did not anticipate mass Jewish migration to Palestine he said that “It is our duty and our privilege to preserve and develop Judaism in America to the utmost of our powers. The difficulties are great. That does not excuse our ceasing to try. What we cannot do here, Zion will help us do—revive and develop our national life and make it fuller and finer than it ever was.75” Thus while the Jews would only self-determine in Palestine, the impacts would be felt in Jewish communities around the globe.

Magnes was more concerned than Kallen about the way the Jewish superindividual would impact individual Jews. He believed that the Hebrew University was central to this process, which is why he dedicated so much of his life to developing that project. In his rejection of the melting pot, Magnes expresses almost identical ideas to Kallen, as both believed that the nature of American democracy encouraged differences among ethnic groups. This view of America led them both to believe that Zionism would create a Jewish superindividual that promoted democratic values and celebrated difference. Thus the Jewish superindividual was committed to allowing all nations to express their sovereign
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rights, rejecting Morris Cohen’s notion that a selfish Jewish superindividual would violate liberal principles by suppressing others.

Notes on Naming and Terminology

Finally, both Kallen and Magnes import the American idea into the names they use to describe the future Jewish state. Kallen uses the term “commonwealth” repeatedly in describing ideal nations as well as in describing the relationship between nations. Magnes also utilized the term commonwealth, although in this area his contribution can be seen more directly in later writing when he offered specific proposals for the Jewish state in Palestine, including its name.

As we saw earlier, Kallen believed that Utopia was strongly rooted in the American democratic tradition. One way this is apparent is in Kallen’s use of American democratic language and specifically the term “commonwealth” to describe the Zionist enterprise. Kallen describes America as a “commonwealth of nationalities,” by which he means that each nation provides an essential piece of the American social fabric.76 Schmidt notes that Kallen would have preferred the term commonwealth to homeland in the 1917 Balfour declaration, and he used the word commonwealth often to describe the Zionist project in his writings from 1918-21.77 One place where Kallen uses commonwealth to describe the
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Jewish enterprise is in a memorandum written before the Pittsburgh Platform.\textsuperscript{78} In other places he equated the ideas of statehood and of commonwealth, primarily to show that a state’s physical land was the property of all its citizens and therefore its commonwealth.\textsuperscript{79} In 1921 Kallen described the future Jewish state as a commonwealth in \textit{Zionism and World Politics}, as well as in an article leading up to the book’s release.\textsuperscript{80}

This is another case where Magnes shows similar thoughts to Kallen. Throughout his life Magnes used the term commonwealth in relation to the Zionist project. In his late life Magnes gave a speech where he described the Zionist aim as the creation of a Jewish state or a Jewish commonwealth.\textsuperscript{81} Magnes implies that the ideas of state and commonwealth are closely related. Also like Kallen, Magnes used the term commonwealth in describing the relationships between nations and superindividuals. For example Magnes believed that following World War II the Jewish mission was “to establish a moral society, a cooperative commonwealth of the nations.”\textsuperscript{82} Even years before, when Magnes defined America as a refining pot in 1909 he also described America as a “republic of nationalities.”\textsuperscript{83}

Perhaps more striking is the name Magnes suggested for a federated Arab and Jewish state in Palestine. Late in his life Magnes expressed more concrete proposals for a bi-national state. In 1948 he wrote a letter to the editor of \textit{Commentary} in which he made
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his case for Arab and Jewish cooperation. In choosing a name for the commonwealth, Magnes decided that, “The...United States of Palestine is proposed as being somewhat analogous to the name United States of America. Here there are sovereign states whose sovereignty is nevertheless limited by their adherence to the Federal Union.84"

By relying so heavily on this terminology Kallen and Magnes again demonstrate their commitment to the American idea. They could not conceive of a liberal state except by using America as their basis. In borrowing terms such as commonwealth and United States we see just how deep this commitment was. The foundations and most outward facing aspects of the Jewish superindividual are defined in almost uniquely American terms.
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CHAPTER 3: AMERICAN LIBERAL ZIONISM TODAY

Case Studies: J Street and Open Hillel

As we have seen Kallen came to Zionism only through his studies at Harvard. He had already repudiated all other aspects of Judaism. As a result Kallen imported American idealism into his Zionism, which is reflected in his commitment to Zionism promoting democratic regimes and his use of cultural pluralism to legitimate the Zionist project. Ultimately Kallen resigned from the Zionist movement because these same American liberal tendencies alienated him from more mainstream European Zionism. The democratic principles that Kallen considered the foundation of the Zionist project were assigned a lower priority by European Zionists. The European Zionists were either focused on obtaining political legitimacy from the international community or on defining the Jewish character of the new homeland.

The rift between Kallen and the Europeans can be seen as a reflection of the difference between European and colonial nationalisms more broadly. Jaroslav Krejci has argued that one reason American nationalism is different from European nationalism is that ethnic differences are less significant in America because there is an abundance of
ethnic groups.85 As a result, Kallen became distanced from a European nationalism that recognized the need for international Jewish legitimacy but did not share Kallen’s concerns about cultural pluralism within the future state. Kallen thus became removed from Zionism, his single attachment to the Jewish community.

Magnes seemed to prefer to be the minority opinion. Even as a university student at Hebrew Union College he was a dissenter, and maintained this attitude throughout his lifetime of Zionist activity.86 Although his views were never accepted by a majority of Zionists he remained committed to the Zionist cause. He had a direct role in one of the key institutions of the Zionist state-building project, the Hebrew University, for over 20 years. He was deeply committed both to Judaism and to American liberalism, and he firmly believed that he could live this hybrid identity. He offers a minority opinion that continues to have a role in American life today.

The Jewish community continues to struggle with questions of liberalism, Zionism, and inclusivity nearly 100 years after Morris Cohen threw down the gauntlet before American Zionists in New Republic. In 2010 Peter Beinart wrote an often-cited piece in The New York Review of Books in which he claims that “for several decades, the Jewish establishment has asked American Jews to check their liberalism at Zionism’s door, and now, to their horror, they are finding that many young Jews have checked their Zionism instead.87” Beinart expresses concern that modern Jews continue to be alienated by Israel and by American Jewish discourse about Israel. He assumes that young American Jews are

86 An America Radical, 49
liberal and that this liberalism will distance them from autocratic Israeli policies. His concern raises the fundamental question of who shares sovereignty over the Jewish national superindividudal. This debate continues to be prescient in the American Jewish community in the areas of politics and Jewish education, as particular groups push the Zionist establishment to be more tolerant of American democratic ideals.

In politics, the Jewish community has seen the appearance of groups demanding a more democratic Israel. The political organization J Street has lobbied the U.S. government with the intention of basing Israeli policies on American-style democratic values, while the university activist group Open Hillel advocates for a more democratic Israel discourse within the American Jewish community. A quick glance at the About Us section of the J Street website makes clear its commitment to Kallen’s and Magnes’ principles of democracy. For example, the website states that J Street is the home for Americans “fighting for the future of Israel as a democratic homeland of the Jewish people,” not those fighting for an ethnically Jewish nation-state.\(^88\) At the same time J Street’s uniquely American perspective is clear. Even though the organization represents Jewish and democratic values it is open to all Americans. They also hold that they “have the responsibility to fix the broken politics in America around Israel.”\(^89\) J Street thus does not claim to share sovereignty in Israel, but they do advocate using the American superindividudal to impose American democratic principles on the Israeli Jewish superindividudal.

J Street has caused a rift in the American Jewish community. This was seen most recently when J Street tried to join the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish


\(^89\) Ibid., my emphasis
Organizations, a conglomerate of the heads of several American Jewish organizations. Acceptance would have been a huge symbolic win for J Street, but their bid was rejected was in April 2014.\textsuperscript{90} The controversy around J Street is evidenced by the amount of coverage the decision received in the Jewish and national press.\textsuperscript{91} The J Street case shows how the Zionist establishment continues to be skeptical of American democratic idealism.

Open Hillel is an example of an organization that agitates for democratic values within the American Jewish establishment. Hillel International is an organization that seeks to enrich the lives of Jewish students through affiliate chapters on university campuses.\textsuperscript{92} Hillel International has guidelines for its member chapters’ campus Israel activities. These guidelines begin by stating that: “Hillel is steadfastly committed to the support of Israel as a Jewish and democratic state with secure and recognized borders as a member of the family of nations.” The guidelines also express Hillel’s desire for political pluralism and inclusivity while at the same time identifying specific behaviors and political platforms that prohibit certain groups from partnering with Hillel chapters. These behaviors include supporting the boycott of, divestment from, or sanctions against Israel (BDS).

In November 2012 the Harvard College Progressive Jewish Alliance (a group with Hillel affiliations) published “An open letter to the Hillel community,” thus launching the Open Hillel movement.\textsuperscript{94} The letter was prompted by an incident at Harvard in which the
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Progressive Jewish Alliance was prohibited from co-sponsoring an event in the Hillel building with the Harvard College Palestine Solidarity Committee. The Progressive Jewish Alliance’s letter to the Hillel community articulated their concern that preventing groups that advocate BDS from co-sponsoring with Hillel will “prevent public dialogue and alienate people from Hillel.” The letter concludes with a call for Hillel to withdraw its Israel guidelines and open its doors to all speakers and events regardless of their political affiliations.

Since its founding Open Hillel has seen peaks and valleys in communal interest. As a student-run coalition they face a basic challenge of communal recognition, but they have remained active since the writing of the Open Hillel letter in 2012. Recently they held the first Open Hillel conference at Harvard in October 2014. The conference featured speakers from a variety of academic and political backgrounds, including both Palestinians and Jews. Open Hillel has not received as much press coverage as J Street, even though both groups are advocating for democratic principles. Open Hillel promotes democratic dialogue on University campuses that they feel are hampered by the autocratic tendencies at Hillel International. Their issue is both that Hillel International limits the type of dialogue on campus and that Hillel International supports one type of Israel dialogue in particular. Open Hillel points to Hillel International’s partnership with AIPAC as particular evidence of autocracy, as AIPAC is viewed as another organization that does not promote pluralistic dialogue. Open Hillel members thus continue to feel disenfranchised and alienated from the Hillel community and potentially from the broader Jewish community as well.

\[95 \text{Ibid.}\]
It is not clear whether or not American Jews are distancing from Israel, making it difficult to formally evaluate Peter Beinart’s hypothesis. In 2012 *Contemporary Jewry* dedicated an entire issue to a debate on the issue. The results were inconclusive, as one group of experts found evidence to support distancing while another found no evidence in support of distancing. What is apparent is that there is still tension in the American Jewish community around commitment to Israel. 100 years ago these concerns were expressed over fears of dual loyalty, where Jews were afraid that a commitment to Jewish nationhood would risk their standing as Americans. In the modern case the concern seems to be going another direction. Jews are expected to express loyalty to Israel, and are charged with dual loyalty by expressing a simultaneous commitment to American liberalism.

I find it fascinating that the voices that made Zionism acceptable to Americans are so rarely mentioned in conjunction with that fact. Kallen and Magnes went farther than anyone in creating a Zionist ideology that would alleviate concerns over dual loyalty and spread a democratic message in the Zionist movement. Further, while Kallen’s contribution was short-lived and Magnes had a longer engagement with the Zionist movement, neither was accepted into the Zionist mainstream for any extended period. In the modern case it is not clear how long movements like J Street and Open Hillel will have influence in the American Jewish community, or if they will have greater success integrating themselves


with more mainstream Zionist movements. But when we look at the cases of Kallen and Magnes and we see that they were not accepted in the Zionist movement despite their brilliant contributions, we have to wonder what modern voices are being alienated who might otherwise make significant contributions to the Zionist cause.

Before concluding I want to offer a proposal for future research in this area. Both Kallen and Magnes claimed that Jewish sovereignty would have an impact not just on Jews living in the future state but also on Jews living in the diaspora. They conceived of the relationship between the identity of individual Jews and the Jewish superindividual going in both directions. As in Hobbes’ description of the artificial man, individual members of the nation shape the personality of the Jewish superindividual. Unlike Hobbes, however, Kallen and Magnes believe that the Jewish superindividual impacts the identity of individual Jews. It would be worth someone’s attention to explore the nature of the relationship between individual Jews and Jewish sovereignty. Does this relationship in fact go two directions? Do individuals exert a greater influence on the superindividual or vice versa? How are uninvolved Jews impacted by Jewish sovereignty? These questions deserve greater exploration, particularly in light of modern concerns about distancing.
CONCLUSION

Horace Kallen was active in the Zionist movement only until 1921. Although he lived to see the fulfillment of the Zionist dream he was not a part of the sovereign project that gave him access to the “national individuality” called Jew. Kallen relied heavily on American ideas in shaping his vision of Jewish nationalism. His insistence that the Jewish state be based on American democratic principles alienated him from the mainstream, European Zionist movement. Kallen’s reliance on American ideas is primarily seen in his importation of language from the Declaration of Independence and his use of cultural pluralism to grant the Zionist project international legitimacy. Aligning Zionism with American democracy was important because of the democracy/autocracy binary that shaped Kallen’s worldview. Kallen’s Zionism had to be democratic rather than autocratic both ideologically and practically. Ironically, Kallen’s American idealism was also the source of his alienation from the Zionist movement.

Magnes parallels Kallen on many of these points. Though the two had markedly different backgrounds and Jewish experiences they relied on similarly blended American and Jewish identities in shaping their Zionist idea. Magnes had a longer involvement with the Zionist movement, and while he never became formally alienated in the way that Kallen did his ideas were never accepted into the Zionist mainstream either. His strong
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commitments to liberalism and democracy were always apparent in the Zionist movement as a dissenting voice but they were not the core ideals that the Jewish state was founded on. Magnes in particular viewed the Jewish state as a source of renewed Jewish identity and values in the modern world, and his idea that the Jewish superindividual would exert influence on individual Jews is one that deserves more scholarly attention.

American Jewish discourse on Israel continues to struggle with the role of American liberalism. This is shown in the controversy around the recent rise of J Street and Open Hillel. Both groups have tried to bring American liberalism and democratic ideas into the Israel discourse. J Street hopes to use the American superindividual to promote a more democratic regime in Israel. Open Hillel tries to bring democracy and pluralism to the Jewish communal conversation around Israel. Both groups have faced opposition from the mainstream Jewish establishment. The establishment threatens and attempts to sideline these voices, just as the World Zionist Organization sidelined Kallen. These cases represent a continued test of the Zionist establishment’s toleration of American democracy.
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