

4-26-2016

Adding Insult to Injury: Zionist Cultural Colonialism. In response to Gish Amit's *Eks libris: his toryah shel gezel, shimur ye-nikus ba-Sifriyah ha-le 'umit bi-Yerushalayim* (Ex Libris: Chronicles of Theft, Preservation, and Appropriating at the Jewish National Library). Yerushalayim: Mekhon Van Lir bi-Yerushalayim, 2014. 220 p., 79 New Israeli Shekel. ISBN 9789650207069. [Hebrew]

Zeev Gries

Ben Gurion University of the Negev, zeevgries@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ajlpublishing.org/jl>

Recommended Citation

Gries, Zeev. 2016. "Adding Insult to Injury: Zionist Cultural Colonialism. In response to Gish Amit's *Eks libris: his toryah shel gezel, shimur ye-nikus ba-Sifriyah ha-le 'umit bi-Yerushalayim* (Ex Libris: Chronicles of Theft, Preservation, and Appropriating at the Jewish National Library). Yerushalayim: Mekhon Van Lir bi-Yerushalayim, 2014. 220 p., 79 New Israeli Shekel. ISBN 9789650207069. [Hebrew]." *Judaica Librarianship* 19: 73-92. doi:10.14263/2330-2976.1170.

Adding Insult to Injury: Zionist Cultural Colonialism.
In response to Gish Amit's *Eḵs libris: hiṣṭoryah shel gezel, shimur ye-nikus ba-Sifriyah ha-le'umit bi-Yerushalayim* (*Ex Libris: Chronicles of Theft, Preservation, and Appropriating at the Jewish National Library*).
Yerushalayim: Mekhon Van Lir bi-Yerushalayim, 2014.
220 p., 79 New Israeli Shekel. ISBN 9789650207069.
[Hebrew]*

This review is dedicated to the memory of my late colleague Prof. Aryeh Leo Motzkin, brother of Prof. Gabriel Motzkin, head of the Van Leer Institute, on the ninth anniversary of his death. Aryeh regarded himself as the heir and continuer of the legacy of his grandfather, of the same name, one of the leaders of the Zionist movement. My friend Aryeh was an outstanding Orientalist and student par excellence of Prof. Shelomo Dov Goitein—by virtue of the latter serving as a member of the Board of the L. A. Mayer Museum of Islamic Art in Jerusalem. He was also an expert in philosophy as one of Prof. Leo Strauss's stellar students, whose mastery of the primary and secondary literature extended from classical Greek philosophy through medieval Hebrew philosophy up to general European philosophy (in its original Latin and subsequent vernacular forms). He mastered numerous languages and literatures, ancient and modern alike, in an inimitable fashion that few scholars could match, leading him to devote himself at the end of his life to translating poetry—work that yielded a stream of masterpieces that yet await publication.

MIGRATION AND COLONIALISM

In the preface to the Hebrew translation of Samuel Noah Kramer's *History Begins at Sumer* (Kramer 1982),¹ the French scholar Jean Bottéro observes that the flourishing of the Sumerian empire drew many immigrants to its territory and culture, exerting such an influence that the Akkadian they spoke replaced the local Sumerian. The fact that Sumerian culture nonetheless continued to thrive for centuries denotes a phenomenon that characterizes every developed human civilization: it becomes a magnet for immigrants. Gish Amit, however, only recognizes the kind of migration that was prompted by colonial conquest—a form of colonialism that originated in Christian Europe and the Zionist pioneers adopted its *modus operandi* as they sought, according

* Editor's note: This review essay is a translated and annotated version of Zeev Gries's talk, given in Hebrew at the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute (February 12, 2015) on the occasion of the publication of Gish Amit's book. A video recording of that public event (Hebrew only) is available at <http://www.vanleer.org.il/en/event/ex-libris-chronicles-theft-preservation-and-appropriating-jewish-national-library> (Gries's talk is the third).

¹ The Hebrew translation is based on both Kramer's 1956 original book and the 1957 French translation, *L'histoire commence à Sumer* (Paris: Arthaud), prefaced by Jean Bottéro.

to Amit, to invent a new, fabricated identity. Amit seems blissfully unaware of ancient Islamic ideology, rising again recently and spreading its wings like a phoenix from the ashes. This ideology, dividing the world into regions Islam has conquered and those it has yet to capture, is feeding those who butcher fellow Muslims for belonging to improper branches of Islam (Hitti 1937, 138, cf. Lammens 1929, 62–63; Kister 1991, especially pp. 276–285).²

The other side of Muslim colonialism, of which Amit also appears to be ignorant, lies in Islam's significant contribution to world culture. Islam thus perpetrated the very same "crime" that Amit laid at the door of Zionism—i.e., the collection, preservation, and rescuing of cultural treasures in the lands Islam conquered during the first centuries of its expansion. It was from this Islam that the vast Ottoman Empire arose. It controlled huge swaths of territory between the sixteenth and twentieth centuries and finally collapsed simply because, like an old man whose bones no longer have sufficient calcium, it could no longer sustain itself.

Gish Amit seems to be unaware of any form of migration unassociated with war, such as migration that is brought on by the hope to find a better life or save oneself from death, starvation, or disease. This type of migration marked the history of Sumer and of Europe at the end of the nineteenth century. United States absorbed millions of Italian, Irish, and over two million Eastern European Jewish immigrants after the 1879 famine in Ireland, the 1891/2 famine in Russia, and the pogroms against the Jews, inspired by the Russian authorities. This type of migration inherently involves the abandonment of property: houses, land, belongings, and cultural artifacts, including books (Gartner 1982, 343–383).

The Jewish immigration to Palestine, or Eretz Israel, was of a different order. The first and second waves of immigration were small, with most of the immigrants' compatriots preferring America as their destination. Those who came found a barren, arid land with no natural resources. Here, the members of the Second *'Aliyah* in particular established the institutions and infrastructure for a nation-state and homeland for the hundreds of thousands of Jewish immigrant refugees who followed them. Amongst the latter was a large sector of German Jews, who immigrated to Palestine because they found no welcome elsewhere between 1933 and 1939 in their attempt to escape the Nazi regime (Margaliot 1986; Gelber 1990). Another, significantly larger group consisted of Jews from Muslim countries, who made their way to Israel after the War of Independence, followed by the mass immigration of Russian Jews during the 1970s and 1990s. The latter immigration denoted not only a wish to escape Russia, but also a desire for a better life in the State of Israel, well-developed thanks to Jewish settlement there (Laskier 2013, 415–431; 2006, see bibliography; Meir-Glitzstein 2012, see bibliography; Saadon 1998, 2000; much material may also be found in Peters 1984, 33–71; For the migration of the Russian Jews, see Pinkus 1983).

² Prof. Meir Kister noted that during the first years of Muslim conquest, Muhammad's followers were encouraged not to establish themselves on the land conquered but to continue fighting the holy jihad until Islam had spread across the globe.

Within these immigration waves, the position held by Muslim immigration to Palestine was and is quite considerable (Peters 1984, 221–325). Today, many of these immigrants seek to make the perilous voyage to Europe or Australia, risking being exploited and robbed by rapacious smugglers who, far from being European colonizers, are both Muslims and pirates. Will this also be called an organized “colonial mission”—a quiet invasion intended to destroy Europe and Australia from within?

THEOLOGICAL UNDERPINNING FOR THE DEGRADATION OF THE PALESTINIAN REFUGEES

According to Gish’s academic “hocus-pocus” methodology, particularly in the preface and epilogue of his book, Zionism adopted the views and *modi operandi* of European Christian orientalism in order to destroy the self-esteem of diaspora Jews and their right to an independent, prosperous spiritual and material life, and in order to violate the rights of Palestinian Arabs and Yemenite Jews migrating to Israel (Said 1978).³ Following this argument, we may claim that the Arab states—sister-states of the Palestinians—adopted Christian theology and utilized it to suppress the Palestinians.

Christian theology justifies the existence of Jews after the Church has become the new *Verus Israel* by propounding that Jews serve as a perpetual witness to Christianity’s victory by virtue of their abject status within Christendom.⁴ The Arab states embraced not only this theology with respect to the Jews but also applied it to the Palestinian refugees, turning them into perpetual witnesses of the Arab defeat and Zionist crimes by condemning them to refugee camps and refusing to improve their plight or assimilate them. Rather than integrating the Palestinian refugees into their cultures and societies, the Arab states thus employed them as political pawns in their ideological struggle against the Jewish State. Just as Christian policies played a key role in creating a Jewish national consciousness by degrading Jewish citizens, Arab policies also played a decisive role in forging a Palestinian national consciousness by forcing the Palestinians to remain in refugee camps. In both cases, the assumption is that Jews and Muslims are incapable of developing national aspirations unless they are despised and humiliated.

THE “DIASPORA TREASURES” PROJECT AND THE EVIDENCE PROVIDED BY AMIT

Amit’s book is divided into three unequal chapters that discuss the ostensible plunder and theft of books by the Jewish National and University Library (JNUL). It is filled with lengthy diatribes

³ Said’s seminal book was harshly critiqued by Bernard Lewis (1982); compare to Amit, *Ex Libris*, pp. 17–25, especially p. 21.

⁴ This theology exerted a huge influence upon Christian literature and art, finding expression *par excellence* in the figure of the *Ecclesia et Synagoga*; see Katz 1980; Flusser 1979, 448–455; Simonsohn 1991, especially Chapter 1.

against the Zionist cultural enterprise, supported by secondary research literature, virtually all of which was produced by scholars who adhere to his line of thought, whether in Israel—e.g. Idith Zertal, Anat Matar, Baruch Kimmerling—or abroad (e.g. Rashid Khalidi), or journalists such as the Italian Gad Lerner. It also provides very little information regarding the nature of the books plundered, thus neglecting the broader cultural context in which the theft is alleged to have taken place.

1. WAS PRIMO LEVI A SELF-HATING JEW?

Consider, for example, the motto of Chapter 1 (p. 31), taken from an interview between Gad Lerner and Primo Levi. Here, Primo asserted: “As a diaspora Jew, who feels much more Italian than Jewish, I would prefer the center of gravity of Judaism to stay outside Israel ... Jewish culture itself, in particular Ashkenazi Jewish culture, is much more alive elsewhere, in America, for example, where it is in a sense dominant” (Levi 2001). Here, Amit omits the context of the interview: like the proceeding interview in the book, made with Giampaolo Pansa, it was conducted after the revelation of the Phalange’s atrocities against Palestinians in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps during the first Lebanese War in 1982. This massacre brought hundreds of thousands Israeli protestors out into the streets in demonstrations that led to the establishment of a national committee of inquiry by then Prime Minister Menahem Begin and the subsequent resignation of the then Minister of Defense, Ariel Sharon, in face of the charge that the IDF had stood by and failed to intervene. Lerner also sharply criticized his Italian colleague Magdi Allam, a secular Muslim from Egypt (who had converted to Christianity in 2008) and deputy editor of the well-known Italian newspaper *Corriere della Sera*, when Allam published his *Viva Israele* praising Israel (2007). Allam tells his readers that, having grown up with anti-Israel and anti-Jewish prejudices, he gradually came to realize that Arab educators taught schoolchildren to hate the “Israeli devil” in order to unite the people and distract them from the internal state of their countries. Lerner was so outraged by this book that he wrote a vehement piece for the Italian *Vanity Fair* in which he asserted that Magdi had no real conception of his own identity.

Journalist Pansa made an attempt to recruit Primo Levi to his animosity towards Israel in an interview published prior to Lerner’s interview printed in *La Repubblica* soon after the massacre in September 1982. In response to Pansa’s observation: “[S]ome say, and even here in *La Repubblica*, we wrote that the worst enemy of the Jews and the people of Israel is precisely the existence of the state of Israel,” Levi asserted: “That seems rather harsh to me, and also rather generic. It might stand at best as a comment on a brief moment, on this moment today” (Levi 2002, 283).

These facts clearly evince that Primo Levi was shocked and horrified that the IDF had stood by and let the massacre take place, especially in light of everything he had experienced in the Holocaust. Despite my love and respect for Levi, his words attest that he felt himself more Italian than Jewish and that in his eyes the center of Jewish gravity should have passed to the United States rather than Israel after the war. His remark that Ashkenazi culture is more alive outside of Israel sounds ridiculous and inappropriate for such a great man as himself—whom one would have expected to understand that most of the wealth of Ashkenazi creativity was revived after the

Holocaust in Hebrew and studied most extensively in Israel, where more students learn in Torah institutions than in all the pre-Holocaust—and certainly post-Holocaust—*yeshivot* in Europe and the United States.

2. WHAT SHOULD HAVE HAPPENED TO THE BOOKS LEFT IN EUROPE AFTER THE HOLOCAUST?

Amit's first chapter describes how the JNUL librarians plundered hundreds of thousands of books from Europe after World War II. Most of these books were collected by the Nazis (headed by Alfred Rosenberg) in order to fulfill Hitler's vision of a Jewish museum which would preserve some memory of the Jewish culture eradicated in the Holocaust. The books were owned by men and women who went up in the flames of the crematoria of the extermination camps together with their children—the future and guarantee of the continuation of this culture (Schidorsky 2008, 176–184, 517: Index entry “Rosenberg, Alfred”). Amit accuses Judah Leib Magnes, chancellor of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and Gershom Scholem, one of its top-ranking professors—both Berit Shalom members dedicated to a bi-national state for Jews and Arabs in Eretz Israel—of joining forces with the colonial Zionist enterprise and plundering and appropriating books, uprooting them from their life-soil, as it were, rather than helping the surviving remnant and the “enlightened” European states on whose soil the Jews had been murdered rehabilitate Jewish life on the continent and reconstruct their lives and communities. Amit writes as though he is unaware that the European countries made no effort to rehabilitate their Jewish citizens and retrieve their property. He appears to assume that the few survivors indeed sought rehabilitation in the countries where many of their fellow gentile citizens had cooperated with the Nazis in seizing their property and feed the anti-Semitic devil that built a nest within their souls.

The majority of the books that were in Jewish possession and gathered by the Nazis and their collaborators were Hebrew sacred books (*sifre kodesh*). Representatives of the large Jewish organizations, most of them in the United States and Israel, thus discussed how to take these out of Europe and divide them. We ought to admire the prescience on the part of Gershom Scholem, Avraham Yaari, Shlomo Shunami, and their colleagues—especially since at the time of the “Diaspora Treasures” project there were only 600,000 Jews in Palestine—as they understood that the imminent State of Israel would serve in the future as a world center of Jewish spiritual life. Today, according to the data of the Central Bureau of Statistics, there are 6,250,000 Jews in Israel.

According to Amit, Israel lost its status as the world Jewish center to the United States immediately following the war, America already then being home to at least five million Jews. We must remember, however, that most of the work performed by American Jews in nation-building was dedicated to making the United States into a place in which they would first and foremost be loyal and equal citizens. The American Jews had no intentions of building a new sovereign, independent, Jewish nation on American soil. This position contrasted sharply with the inhabitants of Palestine prior to and following the formation of the State of Israel, who viewed themselves—as Jews in Israel do today—as constituting a sovereign Jewish presence on their ancient soil while simultaneously feeling responsible for the rest of the Jewish people scattered across the globe

and for the preservation and maintenance of the Jewish cultural legacy and heritage. Only in Israel did Hebrew again become a living language, the vehicle of a renewed culture.

Every schoolchild knows that the State of Israel has fulfilled the dream of rescuing the books that survived on European soil after their owners were murdered. Only in Israel do these books support a full, sovereign form of Jewish life that promotes the creation of Jewish identity and a sense of commitment to the Jewish community worldwide, for those who study them. Anyone who enters a large library in Europe or the United States that holds an extensive collection of Hebrew books is instantly aware that they are very rarely used. It is thus not coincidental that the total and absolute number of scholars and academics who use them in Israel, within diverse framework created within the State, is ten times greater than all the students of Hebrew books in the world. We may conclude without any hint of exaggeration that Gershom Scholem and his colleagues became the greatest preservers of Jewish culture in modern times by bringing the surviving Hebrew books on European soil to Israel.

Amit also fails to inform the reader that it was no accident that the shock of witnessing the destruction of European Jewry brought about an intimate connection between Scholem and Hannah Arendt. To be sure, Arendt's objections to Zionism were published in a biting article in 1945 (Arendt 1945), before the magnitude of the destruction of European Jewry became known and also before Arendt herself was appointed Secretary of the Jewish Cultural Reconstruction Organization, with Scholem serving as one of its vice presidents (Arendt and Scholem 2010, 91–112; Schidorsky 2008, 226–237). Their correspondence evinces both their collaboration and their agreement upon the precedence to be given to bringing books to Israel on the principle that any book found on European soil of which no copy existed in the JNUL should be sent to Jerusalem, extra copies being distributed to other locations with Jewish Libraries.

The bond between Arendt and Scholem also involved romantic feelings that were beautifully expressed at the end of one of Arendt's missives, dated November 27, 1946: "My heart goes out to you [English original]—i.e., in no need of passport, money, or 'holiday,' it obtains a ticket and sails serenely tourist class to Palestine. And you'll stand on the dock in Haifa and ensure that it won't be let in" (Arendt and Scholem 2010, 141–142).

General Lucius D. Clay, Deputy Military Governor of the American Zone of Occupation, was also moved by the discoveries about Holocaust atrocities. Being in charge of the appropriated Jewish property intended for Hitler's museum, he sought to make it as easy as possible for Jews who wished to come to an agreement on the distribution of books to settle their claims. He thus turned a blind eye to the theft of five crates that included valuable books and manuscripts Scholem organized in a large storeroom in Offenbach (Schidorsky 2008, 212–226, 363, 368). Scholem was aided by an American Jewish chaplain, Robert Friedman, who hid the collection in an extensive shipment of crates belonging to Chaim Weizmann, then president of the World Zionist Organization and subsequently first President of the Jewish State.

While Amit describes these events in brief, they are treated elaborately by Noam Zadoff (2015, 261–272). Amit should have been familiar with Zadoff’s research, as the latter’s book is based on a doctoral dissertation (Zadoff 2010) submitted to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem several months after Amit’s submission of his own dissertation to Ben-Gurion University (Amit 2010). I read Zadoff’s research close to the time at which it was approved, when it arrived in the Scholem Collection at the National Library of Israel. Zadoff treats with great sensitivity the psychological crisis Scholem experienced when he returned to Palestine after having spent several months in Europe, and providing important descriptions of each affair and the contents of each crate (Zadoff 2010, 269–270). These details are all missing in Amit’s volume.

3. DAVID BEN-GURION’S PLOT: THE NATIONALIZATION OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY

Amit quotes (p. 50) Samuel Hugo Bergman’s critique of Ben-Gurion as cited in Joseph Heller’s book on Berit Shalom and Yehudah Leib Magnes (2003, 24), alleging that Bergman condemned Ben-Gurion for having “copied the worst of the chauvinistic models in Europe.” On looking through Heller’s work, I could find no mention of Bergman; Heller rather quoting from Michael Keren’s *Ben-Gurion and the Intellectuals* (1983, 153–154) in order to dispute with the latter. Neither Heller nor Keren mention Bergman.

Later in that chapter (p. 57, but also on p. 30), Amit alleges that Ben-Gurion devoted himself first and foremost to the establishment of the State of Israel and thereafter to the nationalization of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem in order to harness it to the needs of the fledgling homeland. Here, he builds on Uri Cohen’s study of the Hebrew University’s history (2006, 171).⁵ An examination of the broad historical context of the university’s development leads to very different conclusions than those drawn by Cohen, however. Up until the 1940s, the Hebrew University perceived itself as a research institute along the lines of the German model, without any commitment to the society in which it existed. Thus it had, until this point, established none of the professional schools necessary for existence in a civic society: the School of Education, the Faculty of Agriculture, or the university’s law school were established later. Contrary to Cohen’s claim that the Hebrew University played a central role in constructing the State of Israel during its initial years, it was in fact a very marginal institution—as I have pointed out in an article analyzing Ben-Gurion’s activities (Gries 2009, 139–147).

More importantly, and despite the urging memoranda of Prof. Ernest David Bergman, who served as the head of the government security system research institutes (and also as a part-time professor of organic chemistry at the Hebrew University), Ben-Gurion had no intention of turning Israeli universities into a government agency. On the contrary, Ben-Gurion worked tirelessly to establish a system of government research institutes, both open and covert, independent from university budgets, plans, or staff.

⁵ Had Amit checked, he would have found out that Cohen relates at length to Ben-Gurion’s relationship with the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

The struggle to retain the autonomy of the Council for Higher Education of Israel (CHE) and keep it free from political interference ensued, and successfully spearheaded by Prof. Nathan Rotenstreich, as soon as the CHE was founded in 1958 (Bareli and Gorny 2007, 3). At the time, there were only few universities in the country: the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Tel Aviv University, the Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, and the Weizmann Institute of Science. Today, there are twenty-five members in the CHE, including the above universities and Bar-Ilan University, the University of Haifa, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, and the Open University of Israel, as well as numerous colleges.

As fate would have it, Israeli university faculty members succeeded in transforming the CHE into a body governed by internal university politics and university vs. college conflicts as the latter sought academic approval—to the point at which the CHE’s activities were compromised and university administration was brought into line with the recommendations of the Maltz Committee.⁶ These changed the way in which universities were run, passing them over into the hands of an ostensibly public representative—i.e. politicians and their henchmen.

Amit’s book also errs in its account of Yad Vashem as rivaling the Hebrew University and JNUL in seeking to obtain books from postwar Europe (p. 44).

4. THE RETRIEVAL OF JEWISH COMMUNAL ARCHIVES FROM GERMANY

The circumstances surrounding the retrieval of Maḥzor Worms and its shipment to Israel, as well as the momentous efforts made by the State of Israel to retrieve archives of Jewish communities destroyed during the Holocaust, in particular in Germany, are obscured in Amit’s report (p. 58).

For example, the municipal archivist of Worms, who was not Jewish, saved the community’s archive at great personal risk, together with the oldest and most beautifully illustrated *maḥzor* in Germany, hiding them in the Wormser Dom (Worms Cathedral). Prof. Malachi Beit-Arié’s article on the history of the Maḥzor Worms relates this affair in detail (Beit-Arié 1985.), but Amit appears to be unfamiliar with this account, describing the negotiations to retrieve the Worms communal archive.

Israeli officials challenged the German authorities, claiming that in recompense for the Nazi treatment of German Jewish citizens, the communal archives that survived the war should find a home in the new Jewish state, together with all Jewish books and other cultural assets Jews had donated to German libraries and museums (Schidorsky 2008, 526–527). Among the items claimed by the Israeli officials was the Munich Talmud, the oldest full existing manuscript of the Babylonian Talmud (1342), which is kept at the Bavarian capital. However, the claim was

⁶ Chaired by the Supreme Court judge Mr. Jacob Maltz, this committee was nominated by the Israeli government in order to “improve” the management of Israeli universities. It submitted its decisions and recommendations on June 1996.

denied. This struggle to save the surviving Jewish communal archives led to the rapid development of the Central Archives for the History of the Jewish People (CAHJP), on whose executive committee I have been privileged to serve in recent years. Unfortunately, as with other cultural projects not sufficiently funded by the State of Israel, the CAHJP has been kept open only thanks to private donations. Currently, the CAHJP is being incorporated into the National Library of Israel as part of its renewal process.

Regrettably, Amit is also not familiar with the work of Elisabeth Gallas, a German scholar who since 2008 has published numerous articles as well as a whole monograph following the accounts of Jewish books that survived the Holocaust (Gallas 2013).

5. THE CATALOGING FAILURE OF THE “DIASPORA TREASURES” BOOKS: WAS IT INTENTIONAL?

The most significant omission in Amit’s book relates to the contents of the “Diaspora Treasures” collection and the fact that the books retrieved from Europe after the Holocaust, or their owners, were never described in detail. It seems to me that as a rule, library projects are chronically underfunded, both historically and geographically. For example, when the Catholic Church decided to censor books in the mid-sixteenth century, it provided neither the necessary financial resources nor the manpower to achieve this goal.⁷

This was also true with regard to the funding that had to be sought in Europe, Israel, and the United States for processing the millions of books left after World War II. In Israel, where up until the passing, in 2007, of the National Library Law, the Hebrew University’s library functioned as a national library and did not have a statutory status. It thus lacked any legal standing as a national institution funded and maintained by state budget to ensure its existence, development, and expansion. The task of cataloging hundreds and thousands of books and valuable manuscripts, which arrived at the library right at the outbreak of the War of Independence in 1948, could not have been undertaken because of lack of manpower; nor was it possible to assign these books a “Diaspora Treasures” tag. Situated on Mt. Scopus, the Hebrew University and its library were also cut off on the eastern side of the city in 1948, many of the books thus being stored in various parts of Jerusalem, including the Terra Sancta building, leased by the Hebrew University from the Franciscan Friars. Even after the library relocated to the Givat Ram campus in the early 1960s, the funding challenges persisted, as they persist today with cataloging backlogs. The JNUL thus lacks an orderly, detailed catalog of the books of the “Diaspora Treasures” project—but not because of any plotting or conniving on the part of librarians or staff at the JNUL.

⁷ Raz-Krakotzkin (2007) does not address the question of funding, however. See Prebor 2007, 2008 for the most significant forms of censorship in the Sixteenth century, conducted by the convert Dominico Yerushalmi. His difficulties in supporting himself were instrumental in preventing many Jewish books from coming to harm.

6. WHERE DID THE AMSTERDAM ETS HAIM COLLECTION DISAPPEAR AFTER ITS ARRIVAL AT THE JNUL?

The intriguing account of the Sephardi *beit midrash* Ets Haim of Amsterdam and the arrival of its library in Israel is reported neither in Schidorsky (2008) nor in Amit's book. This Jewish library, the oldest synagogue library still in operation, has one of the most impressive book collections in the world, including rare sixteenth-century books of which the JNUL did not have any copies. The major part of the rare collection, namely books printed in the sixteenth century, was sent out from Amsterdam to the JNUL for an exhibition (Weiser and Kaplan 1980), however it seems that the JNUL officials who were involved in transporting the collection intended it to remain in Jerusalem. The library remained in the JNUL for several years after the exhibition had closed, its items being cataloged and marked with the Hebrew letters 'Avin Het to indicate their origin (Hebrew acronym of Ets Haim). When a member of the Dutch Jewish community alerted the library to the fact that collection materials were still missing, the library requested them back, in accordance with Dutch laws that prohibit the export of national cultural assets. The JNUL microfilmed the rare books not available in Jerusalem and gave the library back to the Ets Haim. To the best of my knowledge, the Israeli government did not object this act, despite the fact that the Dutch authorities had played a significant role in delivering Dutch Jews to the Nazis, leaving only a very small post-war Dutch Jewish community. When visiting the Ets Haim Library in Amsterdam, I found out that no one was using the small library next to the Great Portuguese Synagogue, many of the books being stored away. This forms a prominent example of the preservation of culture and the renewal of Jewish life in the Netherlands.⁸

ABANDONED PALESTINIAN BOOKS: PLUNDERED OR RESCUED?

Unlike the "Diaspora Treasures" collection described in the first chapter of Amit's book, the second and third chapters refer to so-called plundering of a much smaller scope: a collection of books abandoned by Palestinians in 1948 and a collection of books that belonged to Yemenite Jews.

1. PALESTINIAN LIBRARIES BEFORE THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

Not informing his readers of the nature of Palestinian libraries prior to the War of Independence, both private and public, Amit fails to engage in a serious discussion regarding the data presented in Ami Ayalon's volume (2004) on reading and literacy amongst Palestinian Arabs during the first half of the twentieth century. Ayalon demonstrates (45–46, 94–96) that on the eve of the War of Independence, private collections of wealthy Arabs or mosque libraries outnumbered

⁸ A similar incident took place under Ehud Olmert's government. The new Russian authorities following the fall of Communism demanded the return of Russian assets the Israeli government had held since the State of Israel was established, not regarding the previous regime as legally licensed to take charge of property from the days of the Czarist empire. The Israeli government returned Beit Sergei, on the edge of the Russian Compound in the center of Jerusalem, none of its representatives taking the time to check whether the Israelis could make any counter claims. Had they done so, they would have discovered that, prior to the Revolution, a Russian Zionist entrepreneur had acquired (at full price) the collection of Baron David Ginzberg, which contained the earliest Jewish manuscripts in Europe. Missing the opportunity to negotiate in order to restore it to Israeli hands, it remains in Russia to this day.

the public libraries in Arab Palestine. The number of books in public libraries was miniscule in comparison with public libraries of the Jewish *yishuv*, despite the fact that the Arab population of the country was double the size of the Jewish populace. According to Ayalon, the YMCA library (25,000 titles) was the largest Arab public library in Jerusalem at that time. None of the other small libraries held more than 3,000 books. Schidorsky adduces the same data in his seminal 2012 article about Muslim and Christian libraries of the late Othman period. In other words, we learn neither from Ayalon nor from Amit who cited him (p. 79) about the serious lack of institutionalized popular education through public libraries amongst the Arab populace—which does not appear to have imitated the *yishuv* in this regard.

Ayalon referred in his book to the challenges posed by the *yishuv* to the Palestinian inhabitants of the land, prompting them to define their own identity and claim national rights on the country. However, Ayalon does not tell his readers that Arab identity-formation depended in part upon the network of public libraries spread across the *yishuv*—a network comprised of the workers' libraries set up by *Histadrut ha-'ovdim ha-klalit be-Eretz Yiśra'el* (General Federation of Hebrew Workers) and the civic network established in virtually every town and settlement. Schidorsky (2008, 13–147) has examined these in depth, but Amit fails to address it.

2. THE MUSLIM RULING AGAINST PRINTING BOOKS AND ITS EFFECT ON FUTURE GENERATIONS

In the preface to his 2004 book, Ayalon was excited to describe the pedagogical and intellectual quantum leap evident within the Palestinian community at the beginning of the twentieth century with respect to the printed word. Whether in book or newspaper form, this print revolution that developed in Europe over centuries helped educate the Arab masses in Palestine in a matter of mere decades. Ayalon failed to note, however, that unlike their Jewish and Christian counterparts, Islamic jurists issued a decree in the mid-fifteenth century prohibiting the printing of Arabic books in Muslim countries. Consequently, the appearance and use of Arabic books in Muslim lands was significantly delayed for three hundred years, until the mid-eighteenth century. It is easy to understand the implications of such a ruling upon future generations of Muslim society and culture; the staggering of the education system, for example, and resistance to the processes of modernization and change, including the status of women. In other words, it constituted a cultural and social disaster whose effects can still be felt today (Gries 2007b, 4–5).

None of these facts found their way into Ayalon's book (2004), not to mention Amit's. In Christian Europe, the print revolution became a drive and a means for religious and social reforms through confrontation with the ossified Catholic Church and its institutions. By the same token, the Reformation also sparked great developments within the Catholic Church. Luther and Calvin's fight against Catholicism led to the emergence of the *Protestant Ethic* of Weberian fame (Weber 1930). Weber demonstrated that the economic, educational, and scientific development Europe experienced owed a great debt to the religious revolution that accompanied the print revolution. At the same time he failed to highlight, as did his critics, the fact that the view the new world took of the religious reformation heavily influenced the shaping of the modes of education, study, and dissemination of knowledge within the Catholic Church and its institutions

(Gries 2007a and extended references). I thus have to wonder why neither Amit nor Ayalon appear to understand that a significant aspect of the Palestinian cultural transformation during the first half of the twentieth century was in response to what Palestinians witnessed among their Jewish neighbors.

3. SELF-PRINTING AND IMPORTED BOOKS

Most of the books in the Palestinian community were imported from Egypt and Lebanon, for the same reason that the *yishuv* imported sacred books (*humashim*, *gemarot*, and prayer books) in great numbers from Europe up until the outbreak of World War II: it was not cost effective to print them in Palestine (Gries 2007b).

The printing of sacred books was thus weak among both populations in Palestine. In contrast, the shift of Hebrew printing houses from Europe to Tel Aviv in the 1920s led to a secular print revolution, which in turn had an effect on demand for secular books in the *yishuv*. Publishers such as Dvir, Omanut, Stiebel, and later Schocken, who specialized in printing Modern Hebrew literature (original and translated), textbooks, and other secular printed materials, altered the culture in Jewish Palestine (Shavit 1994; 1999). Together with the numerous newspapers that emerged at this time—here, too, primarily in Tel Aviv—this development created a huge impression on the Palestinian populace, playing a seminal role in its revival. Printing served as a vehicle for articulating Palestinian national hopes and aspirations and expressing creative energies. The printing center of Jewish traditional literature, or sacred books, shifted to Israel in the wake of the destruction of European Jewry, after both authors and readers had perished in the gas chambers.

4. THE CONTENTS OF THE PALESTINIAN COLLECTION AT THE JNUL

Amit fails to provide any adequate account or assessment of the books and manuscripts that constitute the Palestinian collection, although the NLI has a detailed catalog of these holdings. Such evaluations are easily made based on catalog records. For example, about sixteen years ago, I was asked to check an inventory of a collection of similar scope that was put up for sale for two million dollars. It was a story published in an American daily newspaper that prompted Prof. Avishai Braverman, then President of Ben-Gurion University, to look into this collection of 30,000 Jewish books stored in Vilnius, brought there after the destruction of Lithuanian Jewry in World War II. Prof. Braverman raised the funds needed for this acquisition from Lord Weidenfeld and sought the help of his assistant, Dr. Zvi Stauber, in sending a university delegate to Lithuania to look at the collection. I informed Dr. Stauber that such a trip was unnecessary; all I needed was a list of the oldest books. The list was faxed to me and I was able to ascertain that the collection was a random assortment of books gathered from synagogues and *bate midrash*. The books were printed multiple times in Eastern Europe since the beginning of the nineteenth century; numerous copies of them existed in every research library in Israel. I thus recommended that the purchase of this collection will not be pursued.

Like Amit, I talked with Uri Palit (personal communication, 2015) and Efrayim Wust (personal communication, 2015), now retired catalogers who cataloged the Palestinian collection at the JNUL. From the former I learned that with respect to the books, the collection is not impressive, many items being common and dated textbooks. The manuscripts, on the other hand, appear to contain some important texts—although not equal in quality to the NLI Arabic manuscript collection, donated by Prof. Abraham Shalom Yahuda. According to Itzhak Gilo (personal communication, 2015), another library staff member, the NLI holds additional copies of the few Palestinian books gathered from abandoned homes. It should be emphasized that all the materials in the Palestinian Collection are marked as Absentee Properties (AP). This small collection assembled from abandoned Arab homes thus never contained treasures the library lacked or sought to appropriate. The NLI, in this case, is holding this collection for the Custodian of Absentee Property unit at the Israeli Ministry of Finance. The books may be returned if their owners are located, but it does not fall under the NLI's jurisdiction: upon future political agreements, it is for the State of Israel and the future Palestinian State or other Arab states to decide the fate of these books, as well as a great number of abandoned Jewish assets left in Arab states.

5. THE FATE OF THE JAFFA PUBLIC LIBRARY AND THE ABANDONED ARABIC BOOKS

Strikingly, Amit also neglects to refer to Aviv Der'i-Wexler's Master's thesis submitted recently (2013) to the Department of Middle East Studies at Ben-Gurion University (titled in English: ("Alternative Orientalist Knowledge and a Vision of Integration in the Local Arab Space: Dr. Yisrael Ben-Ze'ev, the Arab Library in Jaffa and the Struggle Over 'Abandoned' Palestinian Books"). Der'i-Wexler makes more careful use of colonial theory, arguing—in the wake of new research—for the need to perceive conqueror-conquered relations as a dynamic two-way process. Focusing on Jerusalemite old *yishuv* circles led by the Ashkenazi Dr. Israel Ben-Ze'ev (Wolfenson) and the Sephardi Bechor-Shalom Shitrit of Tiberias, Der'i-Wexler seeks to characterize the group members as scholars and public figures proficient in Arabic language and literature, living their whole lives in a mixed Jewish-Arab society. These culture heroes, she contends, wished to revive the Arab-Jewish coexistence they had experienced in their childhood and adolescence. Der'i-Wexler maintains that it was no coincidence that Ben-Ze'ev initiated a book collection project for Arab books found abandoned in Jaffa and, with the encouragement of Bechor Shitrit, then Minister of Minority Affairs, succeeded in opening a public Arab library for Tel Aviv-Jaffa residents. The thousands of books collected across the city became the basis for this library, meant to provide a cultural center for both Jews and Arabs. According to Der'i-Wexler, the intellectual elite in Jerusalem fiercely rejected this activity of Ben-Ze'ev and Shitrit: the faculty of the Hebrew University, the JNUL staff, and European-born Orientalists were uninterested in Jewish-Arab coexistence; the idea was foreign to them and they wanted the books at the JNUL. These intellectuals fought to shut down the Ministry of Minority Affairs, put Ben-Ze'ev out of office, and dissolve the Jaffa library, transferring its books to the JNUL. Der'i-Wexler's research also addresses the colonial discourse that ostensibly recognizes the possibility of Jewish-Arab coexistence in Israel, on condition that it is modeled after Mandatory Palestine period, as if violence, riots, and bloodshed were not part of it or did not lead to the establishment of a sovereign Jewish State.

6. CUSTODIANS OF ABSENTEES PROPERTIES

The Israeli legislation regarding abandoned property, as well as law enforcement and restitution issues, are beyond the scope of this review. Not dissimilar to the law in other, so-called advanced countries, the Israeli law justly regards abandoned property as lost by its owners, who experience great difficulty in retrieving it from various state authorities.

Three government agencies handle abandoned property in Israel:

1. The National Unit for Location and Management of Property office within the Administrator General and Official Receiver unit at the Ministry of Justice manages abandoned real estate, such as land, houses, and financial deposits.
2. The Custodian Absentees Properties unit at the Ministry of Finance manages property abandoned by Arab residents who fled during the War of Independence. This unit handles primarily real estate as well.
3. The Company for Location and Restitution of Holocaust Victims' Assets is a private company that handles real estate and deposits.

To the best of my knowledge, no government agency manages collections of abandoned books, the only exception being the two small collections held at the NLI: the Palestinian collection and the Eilat Collection of Yemenite Jewry.

THE PLUNDER OF YEMENITE JEWISH BOOKS AND MANUSCRIPTS

Books and manuscripts belonging to members of the Yemenite Jewish community were shipped to Israel by sea while their owners were flown during Operation Magic Carpet (June 1949–September 1950). The owners were promised that they would be able to reclaim their property on their arrival, but some of the books and manuscripts were never claimed. They were thus sent to the JNUL, where they were cataloged collectively under the Eilat Collection. The origin of this name remains unclear, as Eilat was a small, insignificant naval base at the time, and no cargo could have been stored or unloaded there.

1. THE CONTENTS OF THE PRINTED YEMENITE JEWISH BOOK COLLECTION

Here, too, Amit fails to analyze the content of the collection or examine its quality or importance. Unfortunately, as in the case of the Diaspora Treasures project, I have not been able to find any separate catalog or finding aid that describe the books comprising the Eilat Collection. Nevertheless, one of the catalogers who worked on the Eilat Collection, Shlomo Zuker, communicated to me (personal communication, 2015) that to the best of his memory it contained no books of importance.

2. THE CONTENTS OF THE YEMENITE MANUSCRIPTS COLLECTION

The NLI catalog holds 815 manuscripts in the Eilat Collection. On checking the catalog records, I discovered that they include no indication of ownership and most of the manuscript colophons are undated. As any scholar of Hebrew manuscripts knows, less than a quarter of all known Hebrew manuscripts bear information about the owner or writing date. A large portion of these items are handwritten Passover Haggadot, other items consist of liturgical and biblical fragments, or talismanic pamphlets with added texts from the writings of Maimonides or the eighteenth-century *Sefer shivḥe ha-Ari*. Virtually none of the manuscripts is old or has an established date, but Amit's description (pp. 161–162) is general and has no pretensions to evaluate the collection.

Amit appears not to be aware of the severe shortage of printed books in Yemen (Habemann 1968, 167–169; Gries 2006, 245n29, 246n33), a reality that explains the large number of handwritten Haggadot. The practice of copying from printed editions was widespread in Yemen as well as in North African Jewish communities. It was also prevalent in nineteenth century Eastern Europe, where poor *melamdim* (tutors) copied deluxe print editions for their own libraries from the superior libraries of their wealthy employers (Gries 2007a, 115). It is evident that Amit's claims are based here, too, on secondary sources and on accusations disseminated via *Afikim*, a quarterly published by the Yemenite community in Israel, rather than upon the primary source materials in the Eilat Collection. Just as the authors of the brief reports in *Afikim* fail to properly present reliable data in support of their claims, so Amit is guilty of the same malpractice (p. 140; 185–186).⁹

3. THEFTS FROM THE YEMENITE BOOKS AND MANUSCRIPTS COLLECTION: POSSIBLE CLARIFICATIONS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Books may well have disappeared from the crates of books and manuscripts destined for the JNUL, either on their way to the library or after their arrival, because the JNUL suffered for many years from a chronic shortage of skilled librarians who could have processed backlogs, as noted above. This was the case, for example, with regard to the 40,000 books donated to the JNUL by Prof. Martin Buber, who failed to secure their cataloging and safekeeping in his will. In contrast, Prof. Gershom Scholem, whose collection was similar in size to Buber's, took pains to negotiate the terms of his collection acquisition with the Hebrew University. The resulting contract, signed in Scholem's lifetime with the Hebrew University in tandem with the JNUL, stipulated everything that Buber had failed to. The Scholem Collection thus now serves scholars and students from all over the world while Buber's library has been scattered to the wind, some items remaining within the library, others finding their way elsewhere. Buber's son Rafael told me many years ago (personal communication, 1985) that he had been informed that rare books from his father's and great-grandfather's library (Buber inherited the library of his grandfather, Solomon Buber) had been sold at public book auctions in Amsterdam.

⁹ The references listed on pp. 185–186 are two articles published in *Afikim* 97–98 (Elul/August 1991), 11–13 (by Dov Levitan) and 14–16 (by Amos Nevo). The accusations leveled therein attesting to an organized and institutional attempt to steal books and manuscripts are unsubstantiated.

In this monograph, Amit adduces three case studies in order to climb the peaks of the colonial mountain and reveal the Zionist crimes concerning the plunder of the Diaspora and appropriation of the assets of its murdered members, the looting of Palestinian cultural property, and the pillaging from the Yemenite community. The colonial mountain turns out to be a molehill.

SOURCES

Allam, Magdi. 2007. *Viva Israele: dall'ideologia della morte alla civiltà della vita: la mia storia*. Milano: Mondadori.

Amit, Gish. 2010. "Beit ha-sefarim ah-le'umi voha-universitai 1945–1955: mif'al hava'atam le-Yiśra'el shel sifre korbenot ha-shoah, 'isuf ha-sifriyot ha-Falastiniot be-milhemet 1948 ve-'isuf sifre mehagrim me-artsot ha-Islam" (The Jewish National and University Library 1945–1955: The Transfer to Israel of Holocaust Victims' Books, the Appropriation of the Books of Jewish Immigrants from the East and the Collection of Palestinian Books During the 1948 War). PhD diss., Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. [Hebrew]

Arendt, Hannah. 1945. "Zionism Reconsidered." *Menorah* 2: 162–196.

Arendt, Hannah and Gershon Scholem. 2010. *Der Briefwechsel, 1939–1964*. Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag im Suhrkamp Verlag.

Ayalon, Ami. 2004. *Reading Palestine: Printing and Literacy 1900–1948*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Bareli, Avi and Yossef Gorny, 2007. "An 'Inside Intellectual': Remarks on the Public Thought of Nathan Rotenstreich." In *Zionism: Past and Present*, edited by Nathan Rotenstreich, 1–46. New York: SUNY Press.

Beit-Arié, Malachi. 1985. *Worms Maḥzor: MS. Jewish National and University Library Heb. 4° 781/1*. Vaduz [Liechtenstein]: Cyelar Establishment. Posted on the National Library of Israel's website, accessed October 8, 2015, http://web.nli.org.il/sites/NLI/Hebrew/collections/treasures/shapell_manuscripts/mikra/worm/Pages/default.aspx.

Cohen, Uri. 2006. *ha-Har yeha-giv'ah: ha-Universiṭah ha-'Ivrit bi-Yerushalayim bi-teḳufat terom ha-'atsma'ut ye-reshit ha-medinah* (The Mountain and the Hill: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem during Pre-Independence Period and Early Years of the State of Israel). Tel Aviv: 'Am 'oved. [Hebrew]

Der'i-Wexler, Aviv. 2013. "Mizraḥanut alṭernatiivit ve-hishtalvut ba-merḥav ha-'Arvi ha-meḳomi: Dr. Yisrael Ben-Ze'ev, ha-sifriyah ha-'Arvit be-Yafo voha-ma'avak 'al sefarim Falastiniyim 'neṭushim', 1948–1952" (Alternative Orientalist Knowledge and a Vision

of Integration in the Local Arab Space: Dr. Yisrael Ben-Ze'ev, the Arab Library in Jaffa and the Struggle Over 'Abandoned' Palestinian Books). MA thesis, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev. [Hebrew]

Flusser, David. 1979. "Jewish-Christian Relations in the Past and Present." In *Yahadut u-me-korot ha-Natsrut: mehkarim u-masot*, edited by David Flusser, 448–455. [Tel Aviv]: Sifriyat po'alim. [Hebrew]

Gallas, Elisabeth. 2013. "*Das Leichenhaus der Bücher*": *Kulturrestitution und jüdisches Geschichtsdenken nach 1945*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Gartner, L. 1982. "The Great Migration of European Jews, 1881–1914." In *Migration and Settlement in Israel and Other Nations*, edited by A. Shenan, 343–383. Jerusalem: Shazar Centre. [Hebrew]

Gelber, Yoav. 1990. *Moledet hadashah: 'aliyat Yehude merkaz Eropah u-keliṭatam, 1933–1948* [New Homeland: The Immigration and Absorption of Central European Jews, 1933–1948]. Yerushalayim: Yad Yitshak Ben-Tsevi. [Hebrew]

Gries, Zeev. 2006. "The Book as a Cultural Agent from the Beginning of Printing to the Modern Period." In *Study and Knowledge in Jewish Thought*, edited by Howard T. Kreisler, 237–258. Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University Press. [Hebrew]

———. *The Book in the Jewish World: 1700–1900*. Oxford/Portland: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

———. 2007b. "The Role of Nineteenth-Century Printers in Jerusalem in the History of Jewish Printing." Review of *Sifre Yerushalayin ha-rishonim*, by Shoshanah Halevi. *Cathedra* 125: 162–168. [Hebrew]

———. 2009. "Spiritual Authority and Political Power: The Case of David Ben-Gurion." In *Ḥayil be-ruah: biṭahon u-maḥshavah ḥinukhit bi-teḳumat Yiśra'el: mugash le-Ḥayim Yiśre'eli be-hagi'o li-gevurot* (Might by Spirit: Defence and Educational Philosophy in the Heritage of the State of Israel—In Honour of Haim Israeli on his Eightieth Birthday), edited by Yiśra'el Rozenson, Haim Israeli, 'Oded Yiśre'eli, and Ḥanah Zinger, 90–147. [Tel Aviv]: Miśrad ha-biṭahon, ha-hotsa'ah le-or. [Hebrew]

Habermann, Abraham Meir. 1968. *ha-Sefer ha-'Ivri ba-hitpathuto: mi-simanim le-otioyot umi-megilot le-sefer* (The History of the Hebrew Book: From Marks to Letters, From Scroll to Book). Jerusalem: R. Mas. [Hebrew]

- Heller, Joseph. 2003. *Mi-Berit shalom le-Ihud: Yehudah Lib Magnes yeha-ma'avak li-medinah du-le'umit*. Yerushalayim: Hotsa'at sefarim 'a. sh. Y.L. Magnes, ha-Universitah ha-'Ivrit. [Hebrew]
- Hitti, Philip, K. 1967. *History of the Arabs from the Earliest Times to the Present*. London: Macmillan.
- Katz, Jacob. 1980. *From Prejudice to Destruction: Anti-Semitism, 1700–1933*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Keren, Michael. 1983. *Ben-Gurion and the Intellectuals: Power, Knowledge, and Charisma*. DeKalb, Ill: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Kister, Meir Jacob. 1991. "Land Property and Jihād: A Discussion of Some Early Traditions." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 34 (3): 270–311.
- Kramer, Samuel Noah. 1982. *ha-Historyah mathhilah be-Shumar*, with preface and notes on the first edition by Jean Bottéro, translated by N. Ben-Ami; edited by R. Givon. 2d ed. Tel Aviv: Sifriyat po'alim. [Hebrew]
- Lammens, Henri. 1929. *Islam: Beliefs and Institutions*, translated by E. Denison Ross. London: Routledge.
- Laskier, Michael M. 2006. *Yisra'el yeha-'aliyah mi-Tsefon Afrikah: 1948–1970* [Israel and Jewish Immigration from North Africa 1948–1970]. Sedeh Boqer: Mekhon Ben Guryon le-heker Yisra'el, ha-Tsiyonut u-moreshet Ben Guryon. [Hebrew]
- . 2013. "Le départ des juifs du monde arabe." In *Histoire des relations entre juifs et musulmans des origines à nos jours*, edited by Abdelwahab Meddeb and Benjamin Stora, 415–431. Paris: A. Michel.
- Levi, Primo. 2002. *The Voice of Memory: Interviews 1961–1987*, edited by M. Belpoliti and R. Gordon. New York: New Press.
- Levitan, Dov. 1991. "Rekhus ve-sifre qodesh she-nilkehu me-'ole Teman: mabat pahot simpati 'al 'aliyat 'al kanfe nesharim" [Property and Holy Books taken from Yemenite Immigrants: A non Sympathetic View of the 'On Eagle Wings Immigration']. *Afikim* 97–98, Elul/August, 11–13. [Hebrew]
- Lewis, Bernard. 1982. "The Question of Orientalism," *New York Review of Books*, June 24.

- Margaliot, Abraham. 1986. "Emigration—Planung und Wirklichkeit." In *Die Juden im Nationalsozialistischen Deutschland* (The Jews in Nazi Germany, 1933–1943), edited by Arnold Paucker, Sylvia Gilchrist, and Barbara Suchy, 303–316. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Meir-Glitzstein, Esther. 2012. *Yetsi'at Yehude Teman: mivtsa' koshel u-mitos mekhonen* (The Exodus of the Yemenite Jews: Failed Operation and Formative Myth). Tel Aviv: Resling. [Hebrew]
- Nevo, Amos. 1991. "Kakh shadedu et ha-'olim" [Thus the Immigrants Were Robbed]. *Afikim* 97–98, Elul/August, 14–16. [Hebrew]
- Peters, Joan. 1984. *From Time Immemorial: The Origins of the Arab-Jewish Conflict over Palestine*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Pinkus, Binyamin. 1983. "National Minorities' Migration from the Soviet Union During the Post-Stalin Period: A Comparison of Jews, Germans and Other Minorities." *Shvut* 9: 30–55. [Hebrew]
- Prebor, Gila. 2007. "From Jerusalem to Venice: The Life of Domenico Yerushalmi, His Writings and His Work as a Censor." *Pe'amim* 111–112: 228–237. [Hebrew]
- . 2008. "Sepher Ha-Ziquq by Domenico Yerushalmi." *Italia* 18: 21–23. [Hebrew]
- Raz-Krakotzkin, Amnon. 2007. *The Censor, the Editor, and the Text: The Catholic Church and the Shaping of the Jewish Canon in the Sixteenth Century*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Saadon, Haim. ed. 1998. *Ha-'aliyot ha-gedolot me-artsot ha-Islam* [The Great Waves of Immigration from Muslim Countries]. Yerushalayim: Mekhon Ben-Tsevi le-ḥeker kehilot Yiśra'el ba-Mizraḥ. [Hebrew]
- . ed. 2000. *Open and Secret: The Great Waves of Immigration from Muslim Countries (1948–1967)*. Jerusalem: Ministry of Education/ Yad Ben-Zvi. [Hebrew]
- Said, Edward W. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Schidorsky, Dov. 2008. *Geyilim niśrafim ye-otiyot porḥot: toldotem shel osfe sefarim ye-sifriyot be-Erets-Yiśra'el ye-nisyonot le-hatsalat śeridehem be-Eropah le-aḥar ha-Sho'ah* (Burning Scrolls and Flying Letters: A History of Book Collections and Libraries in Mandatory Palestine and of Book Salvaging Efforts in Europe After the Holocaust). Yerushalayim: Hotsa'at sefarim 'a. sh. Y.L. Magnes, ha-Universiṭah ha-'Ivrit. [Hebrew]

- . 2012. “Muslim and Christian Libraries in Late Ottoman Palestine.” *Cathedra* 144: 35–74. [Hebrew]
- Shavit, Zohar. 1994. “The Rise and Fall of Literary Centers in Europe and America and the Establishment of the Center in Eretz Israel.” *Iyunim bi-teḳumat Yiśra’el: me’asef li-ve’ayot ha-Tsiyonut, ha-Yishuv u-Medinat Yiśra’el* 4: 422–439. [Hebrew]
- . 1998. “Ma’avar ha-merkazim shel ha-tarbut ha-‘Ivri me-Eropah le-Erets Yiśra’el” (The Transfer of the Centers of Hebrew Culture from Europe to Eretz-Israel). In *Beniyatah shel tarbut ‘Ivrit be-Erets Yiśra’el* (The Construction of Hebrew Culture in Erets Israel), edited by Zohar Shavit, 43–56. Yerushalayim: ha-Aḳademyah ha-le’umit ha-Yis’re’elit le-mada‘im: Mosad Byalik. [Hebrew]
- Simonsohn, Shlomo. 1991. *The Apostolic See and the Jews: History*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- Weber, M. 1930. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, translated by T. Parsons. London: Unwin.
- Weiser, Raphael, and Yosef Kaplan. 1980. *Treasures from the Library Ets Haim Livria Montezinos of the Portugees Israëlietisch Seminarium Ets Haim, Amsterdam: Exhibition = Mi’ozerot sifriat Ez-Ḥayyim Montezinos: leyad beyt hamidraš heyehudi haportugali “Ez-Ḥayyim”, Amsterdam: ta’aruḳah. Jerusalem: Jewish National and University Library.*
- Zadoff, Noam. 2010. “mi-Berlin li-Yerushalayim u-vaḥazarah: Gershom Scholem bein Ísra’el ve-Germaniyah” (From Berlin to Jerusalem and Back: Gershom Scholem Between Israel and Germany). PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem. [Hebrew]
- . 2015. *mi-Berlin li-Yerushalayim uva-ḥazarah: Gershom Shalom ben Yiśra’el ve-Germanyah* (From Berlin to Jerusalem and Back: Gershom Scholem between Israel and Germany). Yerushalayim: Karmel: Merkaz Kovner. [Hebrew; see also the German edition: Zadoff, Noam. 2014. *Von Berlin nach Jerusalem und zurück: Gershom Scholem zwischen Israel und Deutschland*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co.]