

The Evolution of Redemption: An analysis of the ideologies of Redemption of Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook, Rabbi Tzvi Yehuda Kook, and Gush Emunim

Shiri Yadlin

Religion Honors Thesis

Washington and Lee University

April 6, 2012

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to explore the relationship between Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook, his son Rabbi Tzvi Yehuda Kook, and the contemporary Israeli settlement group Gush Emunim, for the purpose of tracing the evolution of the ideology of redemption and attaining a better understanding of the philosophy of these Israeli settlers. Central to Jewish thought as a whole, redemption lies at the heart of the religious ideology of the settlement movement, but the vision of redemption preached by Gush Emunim takes a different form than that of Abraham Kook, despite scholarly assertion that he is the source of Gush Emunim's ideology. Abraham Kook follows the kabbalistic model of redemption, in which redemption comes about slowly through penitence and individual religious observance. Gush Emunim, on the other hand, believe humans have a much more active role to play in the process. The restorative model, which their ideology follows, is also active and assertive, requiring collective human initiative to ensure its fulfillment. The disconnect between Abraham's passive, patient kabbalistic redemption and Gush Emunim's active, militant restorative redemption can be explained by the younger Rabbi Kook. Tzvi Yehuda Kook reinterpreted his father's message in light of political events and personal ambition, creating an entirely new vision of redemption, which Gush Emunim adopted.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Theories of Redemption.....	7
3. Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook and Redemption.....	14
4. Rabbi Tzvi Yehuda Kook and Redemption.....	24
5. Comparing Abraham and Tzvi Yehuda Kook.....	35
6. Founding of Gush Emunim.....	45
7. Ideology of Gush Emunim.....	51
8. Conclusion.....	59

Introduction

In a recent Huffington Post opinion piece, Laura Friedman, the Director of Policy and Government Relations for America's Peace Now, asserted the heavy symbolic and political importance of the Migron settlement, an outpost recently erected by settlers in the West Bank. Friedman argued that the fate of Migron would be indicative of the future of Israel as a whole, and the nation's potential for peace with the Palestinians.¹ While Friedman presents a valid and convincing argument, her analysis revolves entirely around politics and diplomacy, and her criticism of the settlement movement is founded solely on its violation of Israeli law. Another article, written by well-known American political commentator Joe Klein makes a similar argument in relation to West Bank settlements as a whole: that they must be abandoned because they pose a significant political threat to resolution of the conflict in the region, and are therefore not only unnecessary but harmful.² These articles are indicative of a common trend in American political commentary on Israeli settlements: failure to discuss the weighty religious significance of the settlement movement and the religious concerns that drive the settler's ideology.

American political commentators tend to view the issue from a purely legalistic standpoint, focusing on legality of the settlements according to international law, or the political strategy involved in the settlement of given areas.³ Similarly, the international community's view of settlement activity comes primarily from a human rights perspective, as evidenced by a recent

¹ Friedman, Lara. "As the Illegal Outpost of Migron Goes, So Goes All of Israel." *The Huffington Post*. 14 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Mar. 2012. <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lara-friedman/israeli-settlements-migron_b_1273726.html>.

² Klein, Joe. "What About the Settlements?" *TIME*. 3 Apr. 2012. Web. 3 Apr. 2012. <<http://swampland.time.com/2012/04/03/what-about-the-settlements/>>

³ Scobbie, Iain December. "International Law Is Clear: Israeli Settlements Are Illegal." *Los Angeles Times*. 16 Dec. 2009. Web. 18 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinionla/la-oew-scobbie17-2009dec17,0,2895217.story>>.

UN effort to open a study of the human rights implications of the settlements, which has been met with great opposition from the Israeli government.⁴ While concern for human rights is undoubtedly of the utmost importance, it is impossible to fully understand the situation without acknowledging the religious significance of the settlement movement. Because the settlers themselves are motivated primarily by religious concerns, as found in a study of the settlement motivations in the Gush Emunim movement conducted by sociologists David Weisburd and Elin Waring, this critical piece of the issue cannot be ignored.⁵ The Israeli government also approaches the matter most often without discussion of religion. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu tends to defend the settlements from the standpoint of security, arguing that without an Israeli presence in strategic areas of the West Bank, Israel will be vulnerable to attack from its hostile neighbors.⁶ He has asserted several times the political right the nation has to build where it wants.⁷

Because the settlement movement has been often recognized as one of the primary obstacles to peace between Israelis and Palestinians, another argument put forth by both Friedman's and Klein's articles, it is important to understand the settlers' ideology from all perspectives, leaving out no element of their message. Settlements and settlers cannot be

⁴ Kershner, Isabel. "Israeli Officials Denounce U.N. Rights Council Bid to Study Effects of Settlements." *New York Times*. 23 Mar. 2012. Web. 25 Mar. 2012. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/24/world/middleeast/israeli-officials-denounce-move-by-united-nations-human-rights-council-to-investigate-settlements-affect-on-palestinian-rights.html>,

⁵ Weisburd, David, and Elin Waring. "Settlement Motivations in the Gush Emunim Movement: Comparing Bonds of Altruism and Self Interest." *The Impact of Gush Emunim: Politics and Settlement in the West Bank*. By David Newman. New York: St. Martin's, 1985. 183-99. Print. 187

⁶ "Israel PM Benjamin Netanyahu Defiant on 1967 Borders." *BBC News*. 24 May 2011. Web. 25 Mar. 2012. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-13515226>.

⁷ Heller, Aron. "Israel Settlements: Netanyahu Defends Construction In East Jerusalem." *The Huffington Post*. 11 Feb. 2011. Web. 25 Mar. 2012. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/11/02/israel-settlements_n_1071013.html.

discussed without speaking of religion, and more specifically, the Jewish concept of redemption, which is the religious principle fundamentally driving the movement. The purpose of this paper is to trace the development of the settlement movement's ideology, focusing on the most prominent and vocal settlement group, Gush Emunim. This paper does not attempt to justify or condone settlement activity but rather provide a more comprehensive understanding of the motivation behind settlement, particularly the religious component, so that this critical group in Israeli political discourse can be more properly comprehended for both scholarly and political purposes.

Gush Emunim's founding and ideology can be traced to the teachings and writings of Rabbi Abraham Isaac Ha-Cohen Kook, Chief Rabbi of Palestine from 1904 to 1919, and his son Rabbi Tzvi Yehuda Kook.⁸ Scholars who have studied Gush Emunim place varying weights on the influence of the two Rabbis on the group's ideological development. Ian Lustick's analysis in *For The Land and For The Lord* divides the credit evenly between the two Rabbi Kooks. According to Lustick, political scientist at the University of Pennsylvania, while Abraham's acknowledgement of the validity of secular Zionism gave the movement its political ideology, Tzvi Yehuda's redemption theology gave the group its religious motivation. This is certainly an accurate analysis as far as it goes, but it completely ignores Abraham's ideology of redemption, which is important to consider because it presents an informative contrast to Tzvi Yehuda's ideology of redemption, and later, Gush Emunim's ideology of redemption. This will be expanded upon later in the paper.

The collection of articles in David Newman's *The Impact of Gush Emunim*, compiled in 1985, are antiquated, so it cannot be relied on to express Gush Emunim ideology as it stands

⁸ Lustick, Ian. *For the Land and the Lord: Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*. New York, NY: Council on Foreign Relations, 1988. Print. 29

today. These articles, like Lustick's work, discuss the Kooks superficially, without detailed analysis about their redemptive ideology, the primary focus of this paper. Some make no mention of either Kook (those written by David Schnall, Yosseph Shilhav, Gwyn Rowley, Efraim Ben-Zadok, Gershon Shafir, David Newman, and Chaim Waxman), and others discuss only the younger (those by Myron J. Aronoff and Naomi Nevo). Michael Feige, in *Settling in the Hearts*, focuses on Tzvi Yehuda much more heavily than Abraham, and only discusses Abraham in the context of Tzvi Yehuda's interpretation of his ideology. When Feige, an anthropologist at Brandeis University, does discuss Abraham's ideology, he provides an analysis that is at many points inconsistent with Abraham's actual writings. I believe Feige has misinterpreted Kook's ideology, making it seem much more in line with Tzvi Yehuda and Gush Emunim than the reality. Finally, Richard Hoch, from the University of California at Santa Barbara, also discusses Tzvi Yehuda's direct connection to Gush Emunim's ideology, in a very informative and insightful way, but almost completely disregards the influence of Abraham on the group.

Gadi Taub, Israeli historian and op-ed columnist, provides the analysis closest to the argument of this paper in his work *The Settlers*: that Gush Emunim's ideology is derived from the younger Kook's reinterpretation of the elder Kook's writing, in which the original message is at best closely related and at worst completely altered. However Taub neglects to acknowledge the similarities that do exist in the arguments of Abraham and Tzvi, namely the centrality of the land's sanctity and the interest in piety that the two share. Taub also fails to analyze more than superficially the impact of this reinterpretation: the development of Gush Emunim's ideology. No scholar has traced the development of ideology from Abraham to Tzvi Yehuda to Gush Emunim, with the focus on redemption and the varying forms of redemption emphasized by each party. Similarly, no one has explained how and why this reinterpretation happened: Why did

Tzvi Yehuda find it necessary to alter his father's message, and how did he end up with an ideology vastly different from that of his father? In this paper I propose that Tzvi Yehuda Kook reinterpreted the ideology of redemption held by Abraham Kook in light of the political climate in which he was living and the desire to achieve the kind of status his father had enjoyed. The consequence of that reinterpretation is the emergence of political groups like Gush Emunim.

Theories of Redemption

Crucial to understanding the motivation of Israeli settlers is an understanding of the Jewish concept of redemption, particularly the evolution of that concept, so it is clear how Abraham Kook, Tzvi Yehuda Kook, and Gush Emunim's conceptions fit into the historical progression of the idea. It is difficult to fully make sense of the contrast between the two Kooks and Gush Emunim without proper context. Because redemption is the focus of the settlement ideology professed by Gush Emunim and the common thread running from Abraham to Tzvi to Gush Emunim, it is critical to understand its centrality to Jewish thought as a whole.

Broadly defined by Eliezer Segal in his text *Introducing Judaism*, redemption is God's act of rescuing the Jewish people from any situation, institution, or community that places them in danger.⁹ This includes the understanding that what is in this world is temporary, and what is coming is a utopian era of peace and prosperity in which the Jewish people will suffer no more tragedy, but rule themselves in perfect tranquility. Stephen Wylen explains in his introductory text to Judaism, *Settings of Silver*, that all of Jewish history has consisted of the repeated cycle of exiles and redemptions, modeled after the exile and exodus of the Jews from slavery in Egypt. Time and time again, the Jewish people find themselves subject to the rule of an evil "Pharaoh",

⁹ Segal, Eliezer. *Introducing Judaism*. London [u.a.: Routledge, 2009. Print. 165

which causes them to call out to God for deliverance. God responds to this call with the act of benevolently freeing them from their exile.¹⁰

Though the cycle is continuous, it occurs within a macro-structure of three eras of redemption separating two periods of exile, which stretches over the entire length of the Jewish people's existence. Wylen explains that the first redemption was the exodus from Egypt, after which the Jews built the First Temple under King Solomon and settled in their land for 500 years. This was followed by the first exile, the Babylonian exile, which came to an end after only 70 years, with the building of the Second Temple under the benevolent rule of the Persians. This second era of redemption lasted 600 years, until the year 70, when the second exile began with the destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans. This is where the Jewish people remain today: stuck within the second exile.¹¹ Because the Jews are now waiting for the third redemption, they believe this will be the final and eschatological redemption, which will therefore bring about the end of the world as it currently exists. The Third Temple will be built and Jews will once again live in their homeland under their own self-rule.

There are four elements of the ultimate third redemption: ingathering of the exiles, restoration of the kingdom, rebuilding of the temple, and coming of the Messiah. These elements hold particular weight in the teachings of the Kooks, as will be seen. These elements are echoed in the *Amidah*, the central prayer in Judaism, offered three times a day at morning, noon, and night. This prayer contains 19 blessings: five are thanksgivings or praises to God, one asks forgiveness, and the others are petitions. The seventh blessing asks specifically for redemption; for God to "behold [the Jewish people's] affliction and wage [their battle]." The prayer goes on

¹⁰ Wylen, Stephen M. *Settings of Silver: An Introduction to Judaism*. New York: Paulist, 2000. Print. 165-6

¹¹ Wylen 166

in the tenth blessing to request the gathering of all exiles from the four corners of the earth. The fourteenth blessing calls on God to reestablish the “throne of David” and “rebuild Jerusalem,” while the next calls for the arrival of the son of David, who will be the messiah. And to complete the redemption, blessing seventeen asks God to restore the Temple and all services within it.¹² Thus each and every day, the Jewish people pray three times for the return of exiles, restoration of the Davidic Kingdom, the arrival of the messiah, and the rebuilding of the temple: all key components of the process of redemption. This daily prayer indicates the centrality of redemption to the Jewish faith.

While the component parts of the redemption are consistently accepted by most Jews, the details of how they will come about has historically been, and continues to be, a point of debate amongst Jewish thinkers. Throughout history the discourse about redemption has evolved, developing three major theories, which Jewish philosopher Gershom Scholem calls “apocalyptic,” “restorative,” and “kabbalistic” models of redemption. Scholem describes these strains in his work *The Messianic Idea in Judaism*, in which he writes that apocalyptic messianism focuses on the “catastrophic and destructive nature of the redemption,”¹³ while the restorative model attempts to alleviate fears of catastrophe by emphasizing renewal and transformation rather than absolute destruction,¹⁴ and the kabbalistic ties the redemption of the Jewish people to the redemption of the whole world and consequent restoration of the universe to the state it was in during creation.¹⁵

¹² " Translation of the Weekday Amidah." *Chabad*. Web. 06 Apr. 2012.
<http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/867674/jewish/Translation.htm>.

¹³ Scholem, Gershom G. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*. New York: Schocken, 1971. Print. 7

¹⁴ *ibid.* 26

¹⁵ *ibid.* 48

Because apocalyptic messianism plays little role in the ideology of either Kook or Gush Emunim, it will not be extrapolated upon here. In general, apocalyptic messianism holds that redemption will take place in two parts: destruction and restoration.¹⁶ First, a sudden catastrophic event will occur that completely uproots society and eventually destroys the world. But that terror is followed by a reconstruction of the world by the standard of ultimate perfection. The world must be destroyed in order for it to be rebuilt in the full, redeemed glory.¹⁷ This version is typically called passive redemption because it forbids “Pressing for the End” or any action that actively attempts to usher in the redemption.¹⁸ This will be contrasted with active redemption, to which both Tzvi Yehuda and Gush Emunim ascribe.

From the classical period through the Middle Ages, this apocalyptic form of redemption was the generally-accepted model amongst the majority of the Jewish community. Eliezer Segal notes, “It would appear that there were few eras in history when Jews did not believe that the redemption would arrive within a generation or two.”¹⁹ However, during the Middle Ages, “rational tendencies of Judaism” reopened the discussion about the redemptive process and shifted scholarly opinion towards support of a less destructive form of messianism: what Scholem calls restorative. This rationalism was fearful of the radical utopianism and sudden, inevitable destruction of the apocalyptic model and turned instead to the more easily digestible restorative model, where the world is reformed and renewed rather than catastrophically destroyed and completely rebuilt.²⁰

¹⁶ *ibid.* 7

¹⁷ Eisen, Robert. *The Peace and Violence of Judaism” From the Bible to Modern Zionism*. New York” Oxford UP, 2011 Print. 146

¹⁸ *ibid.* 147

¹⁹ Segal 166

²⁰ Scholem 26

Robert Eisen, a Judaic Studies scholar at George Washington University, explains this model well in his book *The Peace and Violence of Judaism*. Eisen writes that in contrast to the more passive apocalyptic messianism, humans take an active role from the outset of this redemptive process. Divine action starts the process, but human action moves it along. There is no cataclysmic event for them to fall victim to, but rather a gradual process with progress they can track, to which they can physically contribute. Eisen provides an example of this model: the restoration of the Judean kingdom after the Babylonian exile. Although an event outside of their control (the Persian conquest of Babylon) initiated the process, the Jewish people had to seize their opportunity to actively return to the land of Israel to complete their redemption.²¹ Thus, though restorative redemption starts with God's actions, it cannot be completed if humans do not take an active role in helping it continue. This role takes various forms, but in the context of the Israeli settlement movement with which this paper is concerned, it most often it consists of political action that enhances Jewish sovereignty.²²

The work of Maimonides, the Jewish philosopher of the late twelfth century, provides one of the earliest and clearest philosophies of restorative redemption. For Maimonides, redemption will begin with the coming of the Messiah. The Messiah's arrival will not be accompanied with flashing signs or grand miracles. Rather, Maimonides presents a list of indicators that suggest the presence of the Messiah:

If there arises a king from the House of David who meditates on the Torah and practices its commandments like his ancestor David in accordance with the Written and Oral law, prevails upon all Israel to walk in the ways of Torah and to repair its breaches...and fights the battles of the Lord, then one may properly assume that he is the Messiah.²³

²¹ Eisen 147

²² *ibid.* 148

²³ Maimonides *Mishneh Torah*, "Laws Concerning the Installation of Kings", quoted from Scholem 28

This Messiah will bring the restoration of the Kingdom of David. He will rebuild the temple, gather the Jews in exile, and reinstitute religious rituals such as sacrifices. All laws and commandments of the Torah will be reinstated and adhered to, and the messiah will “arrange” the world to serve God. For Maimonides, “if [the alleged Messiah] is successful in rebuilding the sanctuary on its site and in gathering the dispersed of Israel, then he has in fact proven himself to be the Messiah.”²⁴ This is important to note because this ideal of worldly adherence to God, restoration of the Kingdom and rebuilding of the temple are often cited by Abraham, Tzvi Yehuda, and Gush Emunim.

With the development of Kabbalah in the Middle Ages came yet another theory of what redemption looks like. Kabbalistic redemption is tied to the *Galut*, or exile, of the Jewish people. According to this theory, *Galut* extends beyond just the Jewish people, to an exile of the whole world. Therefore, the redemption of Israel became symbolic of a world-wide universal redemption.²⁵ The clearest explanation of this rationale comes from Rabbi Isaac Luria Ashkenazi, a Kabbalist living in the Palestinian city of Tsfat during the middle of the sixteenth century. According to Rabbi Luria’s understanding, the *Galut* of the Jewish people was analogous to the situation of the entire universe, which could be explained by the Kabbalist creation story. During the creation, God put his light in vessels, objects used to contain and transport the light to earth, so it could work on the creation of the world. However these vessels

²⁴ *ibid.*; While Maimonides and other later adherents of restorative redemption clearly argue that the Messiah has a role to play in the redemption, there is little clarity on precisely what that role entails. Sometimes the Messiah signals the beginning of the redemption, other times he ushers in the end. In some accounts there are two Messianic figures, one who comes with catastrophe and one who comes with paradise. Scholem says that the Messiah comes “suddenly, unannounced, and precisely when he is least expected or when hope has long been abandoned,” but when in the redemptive process this happens is not clear. All that is certain is that the Messiah has a key role to play in the messianic era (Scholem 11).

²⁵ Scholem 48

were not strong enough to hold the divine light so they shattered, scattering this light across the world. While some of the light reverted back to its heavenly source, much of it remained on earth in the form of sparks that imprisoned themselves in the objects of creation: animals, plants, rocks, and any other earthly object. The “breaking of the vessels” is an important event in the Kabbalist concept of redemption because it indicates the dramatic event that caused a situation of exile. The sparks are representatives of the light that was intended for a specific purpose (creation) but because the vessels broke, it did not fulfill its purpose. The plan of creation was disrupted and everything was scattered out of place. As explained by Scholem, “nothing is in the place appointed for it; everything is either below or above, but not where it should be. In other words, all being is in *Galut*.”²⁶

Thus, to follow Luria’s understanding, the Jewish people’s *Galut* is the contemporary manifestation of this cosmic situation of *Galut*. It is not a product of their behavior or of chance, but a characteristic of the universe. However, the Jewish people do have the ability to rectify their own *Galut* and in doing so, “repair the universal flaw.”²⁷ This is done through study of Torah and observing the commandments. Individual study of Torah, observance of commandments, and spiritual devotion work to release the divine sparks imprisoned within the world. When this is done collectively, the sparks return to their source and are effectively restored to their rightful place. As this cosmic negation of exile is slowly completed, so too will the negation of the Jewish people’s exile be completed, and vice versa.²⁸ When Jews observe religious doctrine authentically, they work to “free the imprisoned divine light and raise it to its

²⁶ *ibid.* 45

²⁷ *ibid.* 46

²⁸ *ibid.*

proper level, [and] liberate the sparks of Shekhinah.”²⁹ In doing so, they bring about the redemption of Israel, humanity, and all metaphysical realms at once. This redeemed world will actually be a return to the natural state of the world, no longer corrupted by the brokenness of sin and human fallibility.³⁰ In this way, the Jewish people are able to engage in productive activity that contributes to the completeness of the world that redemption seeks.

In this Kabbalistic understanding of redemption, like in restorative, the process occurs gradually. There is no single event that signals the start of the redemptive process. Rather, as the Jewish people continue to release the sparks trapped in earthly things, redemption draws nearer and nearer, until finally the process is complete, at which point the Messiah will finally come for himself, signaling the completion of the redemptive process. In this way, the Jewish people can avoid the catastrophe and destruction that the apocalyptic version of redemption insisted would occur. Says Scholem, “The transition from the state of imperfection to the state of perfection...will nevertheless take place without revolution and disaster and great affliction.”³¹

It is important to understand the evolution of the notion of redemption from apocalyptic to restorative to kabbalistic and the differences between the models so that the ideological shift between Abraham Kook, Tzvi Yehuda Kook, and Gush Emunim can be more clearly seen.

Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook’s Theory of Redemption

Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook’s works are extensive and complex, intended for an audience well versed in the intricacies of Jewish mystic ideas. His writing is therefore layered with meaning and can be difficult to interpret. In a brief essay summarizing Kook’s teachings, Paul B. Fenton writes, “Though he was a prolific writer, Kook never endeavored to develop a

²⁹ *ibid.* ; *Shekhinah* refers to divine presence

³⁰ Segal 172

³¹ Scholem 47

comprehensive system [of *tshuva* or “return”.] His style is characterized by a chain of successive reflections...around a conceptual core which embodies his mystical insights and intellectual outpourings.”³² What follows is an analysis that provides a likely explanation of his ideology of redemption. Kook’s understanding of redemption most closely follows the kabbalistic model of redemption, in which the redemptive process consists of releasing the divine sparks that have been imprisoned in the world, so that these sparks can be free to go back to their original source. As the sparks return to their rightful place, so too will the world return to its rightful place, and consequently the exile will end.³³ Thus, releasing sparks brings about redemption.

In *The Lights of Penitence*, Abraham Kook describes the ideal of penitence with language that closely parallels this process. According to Kook, acts of holiness release the piece of the divine, described as a light, that is trapped within each person, so that it may return to its source: God.³⁴ As the light returns to its source it creates a connection between the individual and God; between earthly manifestation and heavenly source. Kook writes, “Penitence is, in essence, an effort to return to one’s original status, to the source of life and higher being in their fullness, without limitation and diminution, in their highest spiritual character, as illumined by the simple, radiant divine light.”³⁵ All penitence is directed toward restoring man’s relationship with the divine, and eliminating the sin that acts as a barrier between man and God.³⁶ As this relationship is restored, so too is the world restored, and thus the overall goal of redemption is achieved.

³² Fenton, Paul B. "Rav Kook and the Return to Zion." *Thinkers and Teachers of Modern Judaism*. New York: Paragon House, 1994. 7-16. Print. 10

³³ *ibid.* 46

³⁴ Kook, Abraham Isaac. *Abraham Isaac Kook: The Lights of Penitence, the Moral Principles, Lights of Holiness, Essays, Letters, and Poems*. Trans. Ben Zion Bokser. New York: Paulist, 1978. Print. 59

³⁵ Kook, Abraham Isaac 87

³⁶ *ibid.* 61

Redemptive language is tied to Kook's definition of penitence: "Penitence is the aspiration for the true original freedom, which is the divine freedom, wherein there is no enslavement of any kind."³⁷ As was shown in the previous section, Kook and other theorists of redemption consistently link freedom and redemption. The Jewish people's desire to return from captivity in exile fuels their desire for redemption, both today and during exiles of the past. Daily prayers express the desire for the ultimate redemption, which will result in lasting freedom. Kook's message is consistent with this idea. This freedom of which Kook speaks is freedom from the burdens of sin and the restrictions of exile. He believes, "penitence is inspired by the yearning of all existence to be better, purer, more vigorous...Within this yearning is a hidden life-force for overcoming every factor that limits and weakens existence."³⁸ Exile weakens existence, so the goal is to overcome that exile; negate the *Galut* of the Jewish people. Though the Jewish people live in exile, "through penitence, all things are reunited with God."³⁹ It is through penitence that this negation of exile, one of the major components of redemption, occurs.

Kook believes that every Jewish person is "permeated...with holiness."⁴⁰ However that holiness has been alienated from God by sin, because when man is sinful, "the divine light does not shine on him."⁴¹ Kook refers to "sinful enslavement,"⁴² and writes, "sins serve as an obstruction against the bright divine light, which shines so brightly on every soul."⁴³ Removing sin is therefore analogous to "removal of an obstruction" that blocks man from God's divine

³⁷ *ibid.* 54

³⁸ *ibid.* 56

³⁹ *ibid.* 49

⁴⁰ *ibid.* 142

⁴¹ *ibid.* 47

⁴² *ibid.* 46

⁴³ *ibid.* 61

light.⁴⁴ Penitence, because it acts to remove sin, works to clear this obstruction, liberate man from the enslavement of sin, and reconnect him to God. It “will restore him to a more happy life” where he can engage in the Torah to its fullest extent, and subsequently develop spiritually.⁴⁵

This is all connected to redemption because the alienation from God that people plagued with sin experience is analogous to exile. They are distanced from God, the “source of life,”⁴⁶ so they are in a state of exile, just as the Jewish people as a whole are in a state of exile. But this exile is negated through removal of sin and the obstruction sin creates. Kook describes this process with interesting imagery: the bit of holiness that resides in each person has been blocked from God by sin, and it is through penitence that this holiness is freed to resume its connection with God. In Kook’s words, “When one is attentive to [the source of life]...the free stirring of holiness inside the soul will emerge from its imprisonment, and every sensitive spirit will begin to drink avidly from this exalted source of life.”⁴⁷ Penitent adherence to the source of life, God, releases the “stirring of holiness” from its “imprisonment.” Life under sin is enslavement, as has already been discussed, but through penitence, the Jewish person is freed from the burden of sins. “The purging away of every evil deed and its resultant evil effects, of every evil thought, of every obstruction that keeps us away from the divine spiritual reality” is the goal of penitence.⁴⁸ With the elimination of sin and evil, then, comes liberation for the “free stirring of holiness” that rests in the soul. As this holiness is liberated, it returns to God, reestablishing the connection between man and God and negating the exile the soul had experienced.

⁴⁴ *ibid.* 54

⁴⁵ *ibid.* 76-7

⁴⁶ *ibid.* 49

⁴⁷ *ibid.* 51-2

⁴⁸ *ibid.* 54

This language aligns with the Kabbalistic notion that releasing divine sparks in the world leads to redemption, and that perfection of the soul individually leads to redemption collectively.⁴⁹ “Through penitence,” Kook writes, “all things are reunited with God” and “returned and reattached to the realm of divine perfection.”⁵⁰ Precisely where this “realm” exists goes unexplained by Kook but he does write that this realm is “within the context of the holy order of the divine,” so presumably the “realm of divine perfection” is wherever God exists. Reunion with God is a goal of redemption, and in this passage Kook writes that penitence achieves this goal.

In his discussion of the outcomes of penitence, Kook alludes to the commonly-accepted characteristics of redemption: ingathering of exiles, restoration of the Davidic Kingdom, reconstruction of the temple, and return to Jewish sovereignty in the Holy Land. Kook writes that penitence brings with it

healing and sustenance and the *restoration of the exiles*, and a *renewal of the authority* of judges and counselors who are the pillars of this literature [the Torah] and its founders; evil will then be subdued; justice will ascend; the heart of the people will begin to beat mightily toward Jerusalem; a crown of a *fully sovereign nation* will appear and all the heart’s desires will be fulfilled, in accordance with the prayer of the upright, which abounds with the love of Him who sustains the universe, who promised and brought it into being.⁵¹ [italics added]

This description shares many characteristics with the conditions longed for in redemption, that are stated above, and they are all brought about by penitence: “prayer and outcries to God and penitence from the depth of the heart.”⁵² Similarly, once the holiness within each man is released from its imprisonment in the soul, “then there will be engendered and become revealed, as one

⁴⁹ Sherwin, Byron L. *Kabbalah: An Introduction to Jewish Mysticism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006. Print. 213-4

⁵⁰ Kook, Abraham Isaac 49

⁵¹ *ibid.* 78

⁵² *ibid.*

whole, knowledge and feeling, the enjoyment of life, a world outlook and a desire for national revival...the ordering of the political system and the love for the improvement of the community in good manners and tolerance.”⁵³ We see here again concepts linked to redemptive outcomes, most notably the “desire for national revival.” Penitence thus provides the very outcomes promised with redemption.

Once we have established the interconnectedness of penitence and redemption according to Kook, we can begin to formulate his understanding of what brings about redemption, from his description of penitence. Because the goals of penitence, as Kook has described them, are so consistent with the ideals of redemption, we can conclude that as Kook describes penitence he also describes how he believes redemption occurs. All the actions of penitence he outlines in *The Lights of Penitence* are also actions that work toward redemption.

Most abstractly, Kook writes, “From this source [penitence] will come the healing light by which to revitalize the community as well as the individual, to ‘raise the fallen tabernacle of David’ (Amos 9:11) and to ‘remove the humiliation of the people of God from all the earth’ (Isa. 25:8).”⁵⁴ In this passage Kook asserts that two of the three major characteristics of redemption are brought about by penitence: reinstatement of the Kingdom of David and restoration of Jewish confidence, which can be linked both to Jewish sovereignty and ingathering of exiles, because it deals with the Jewish people all over the earth. In this way the outcome of penitence is tied to redemption.

But what does this penitence entail? Kook answers that question as well: “To support these goals we need a conditioning of the human heart toward the true inner Torah, the mystical

⁵³ *ibid.* 51-2

⁵⁴ *ibid.* 52

meanings in the Torah.”⁵⁵ Though Kook does not explicitly define what he means by “the true inner Torah,” he provides clues to this concept in a letter, written to a fellow Rabbi in 1913. In this letter, Kook expresses concern that the Jewish people have “abandoned the soul of the Torah.” Even the most talented teachers and students focus only on the “practical aspects” of the Torah and neglect the “emotional” and “philosophical” aspects. These deeper understandings of the Torah are tied to “illumination of holiness, which bears within itself the mystery of the redemption—this they abandoned altogether.”⁵⁶ Because of the language used in this letter, it is likely that the “true inner Torah” Kook speaks of in *The Lights of Penitence* is related to these deeper meanings.

In another letter written to different Rabbi, Pinhas ha-Kohen, a few years earlier, Kook conveys a similar attitude about the necessity of a dedicated approach to Torah study at a deep level. In this letter he laments what he feels to be spiritual weakness among the Jewish people, which can be negated by return to Torah study:

The shepherds of our people are sunk in a deep sleep, not because of an evil disposition, but because of a weakness of soul, which for days and years and even epochs has not tasted truly nourishing food. This can come only from the illumination that emanates from the inwardness of the divine light of the Torah.⁵⁷

The spiritual renewal the Jewish people must begin with renewed devotion to Torah, most specifically the “inner Torah.” This conception of multiple layers of the Torah is evidence of the kabbalistic influence in Kook’s ideology. According to kabbalistic theory, there are four layers of Torah: garment, body, soul, and soul of the soul. As explained by Byron Sherwin in his introduction to *Jewish Mysticism*, the stories and narratives in the Torah are the garments, meant

⁵⁵ *ibid.*

⁵⁶ *ibid.* 354

⁵⁷ *ibid.* 349

to be read and interpreted but not to be confused with the “essential nature” of the Torah.⁵⁸ This “essential nature” comes from the deeper layers, which are reached by penetrating as deeply as the mind allows. Sherwin suggests these deeper teachings include “theological and moral teachings of the Torah, and more specifically...the commandments of the Torah.”⁵⁹

When Kook then refers to “conditioning of the human heart toward the true inner Torah,” he calls upon the Jewish people to be persistent in their study so they can reach the deepest layer. Dedicated study of the Torah, commitment to its teachings, and curiosity to uncover all the layers of teaching it provides are essential to performing effective penitence. Penitence requires “high vistas of contemplation, an ascent to the rarefied world that abounds in truth and holiness,” which are achieved “only through the pursuit of the deeper levels of Torah and divine wisdom concerning the mythical dimensions of the world.”⁶⁰ Reading the Torah as a mere storybook is not enough. “Physical purity” and “moral purity” are important for penitence, but “*prior to all these* must come study of the Torah, specifically the higher Torah for only this can break all the iron barriers that separate the individual and the community from their heavenly Father.”⁶¹ Such barriers include sin and evil, as was discussed above.

Although Kook believes that redemption begins with the Jewish people and their attentive Torah study, it is not limited to them. In fact, Kook believes the penitence of the Jewish people will bring about redemption for the whole world. “General penitence, which involves raising the world to perfection, and particularized penitence, which pertains to the personal life of each individual...they all constitute one essence,” because the actions of every individual are

⁵⁸ Sherwin 192

⁵⁹ Kook, Abraham Isaac 349

⁶⁰ *ibid.* 73

⁶¹ *ibid.* 74 [*italics added*]

connected to each other.⁶² Kook asserts that “the focus of [this] penitence must always be directed toward improving the future.”⁶³ He outlines this process quite clearly: “The people of Israel, because of their added spiritual sensitivity, will be the first with regard to penitence. They are the one sector of humanity in whom the special graces of penitence will become manifest.”⁶⁴ But, though “the light of penitence will be manifest first in Israel,” it will not stop there. Rather, “she will be the channel through which the life-giving force of the yearning for penitence will reach the whole world, to illuminate it and to raise its stature.”⁶⁵ Thus, for Kook, it is through Israel that the whole world will be redeemed.

This idea is echoed in Kook’s essay “The Works of Creation.” Kook expounds upon the role the people of Israel must play as a collective force in the renewal of the world. He writes of the “secret of penitence that will bring on the redemption,” and the process by which that will take place: “In the future the edifice of redemption will begin inwardly; from the center point of Zion it will spread out to the streets of Jerusalem, to the boundaries of the land of Israel.”⁶⁶ Redemption will begin in Israel, but it will not stop there. It will expand until the entire world has been redeemed.

Rabbi Lawrence Englander explains this concept further in his article on Kook’s theology of repentance. He writes that just as the individual soul cries out for redemption, the entire world does as well. While the individual soul is yearning for redemption, there is a “world soul” that does the same. Englander explains that according to Kook, the individual is a microcosm of the world, or the world is a macrocosm of the individual. We can understand individual penitence as

⁶² *ibid.* 49

⁶³ *ibid.* 95

⁶⁴ *ibid.* 55

⁶⁵ *ibid.* 56

⁶⁶ *ibid.* 260

a parallel to *Tiqqun Olam*: “the repair and unification of the universe.”⁶⁷ As Englander writes, “when one raises his personal *teshuva* to the highest level, it becomes dedicated to the ideal of honoring God; this is the ‘larger light’ of *teshuva*, which will shine most clearly at the dawn of the messianic age.”⁶⁸ Here, *teshuva* refers to penitence, which can be both individual and collective. Putting all of this together, “through the mediation of righteous individuals and the collective soul of the Jewish people, the person’s *teshuva* helps to achieve a rectification within his community and, ultimately, a cosmic return to God. *Teshuva* in both an individual and communal sense, creates the possibility for redemption.”⁶⁹ According to Englander’s explanation of Kook’s ideas, individual penitence eventually leads to world redemption.

This is not just a role the Jewish people *can* play. Kook indicates that it is required of the Jewish people, and necessary to their existence. In a letter written to Rabbi Judah Leib Seltzer in 1913, Kook explains this ideal, in which illumination of the Jewish people extends to the rest of the world. He expresses hope that through this illumination, the world “would experience a revival and liberation through us, through our profound thoughts, through our clear pronouncements that could become the life-giving principles for many nations, to bring them out of the darkness and toward the light.”⁷⁰ But this is not just desired, he tells Rabbi Seltzer. Instead, it is “what is expected of us [the Jewish people], for this we were created.”⁷¹ The duty of the Jewish people to be the “light unto the nations,” to which Kook repeatedly refers, is rooted in duty to guide the world to redemption. This is a responsibility Kook believes rests on the shoulders of the people of Israel.

⁶⁷ Englander, Lawrence A. "On Repentance." *Essays on the Thought and Philosophy of Rabbi Kook*. New York: Herzl, 1991. 121-33. Print. 124

⁶⁸ *ibid.* 124-5

⁶⁹ *ibid.* 126

⁷⁰ Kook, Abraham Isaac 356

⁷¹ *ibid.*

To summarize, Kook's description of penitence works toward the same goal as Kabbalah's vision of redemption, producing the same outcomes, leading to the conclusion that Kook's description of the process of penitence can be understood as parallel to his vision of the process of redemption. Kook writes most succinctly, "Certainly the light of the Messiah, the deliverance of Israel, the rebirth of the people in the restorations of its land, language and literature—all stem from the source of penitence, and all lead out of the depths to the heights of penitence."⁷² Because penitence is so closely tied to redemption, for Kook, the conditions for redemption are very peaceful and individual. There does not need to be disaster or destruction, as is called for in apocalyptic redemption, and the only human action that is necessary is the devout study of the "philosophical," "ethical," and "inner" levels of the Torah, all of which is tied to penitence. This peaceful version of messianism, in which penitence plays a central role, will be important when we come to understand the vision of redemption preached by Kook's son, Rabbi Tzvi Yehuda Kook.

Tzvi Yehuda Kook and Redemption

While the writings of the elder Kook have been translated and well-circulated, enabling an analysis to be done based on his original writing, this is not the case for the younger Kook. His main activity was classroom teaching, leaving only sermons and speeches, few of which have been translated to English, rather than written work, leaving little to work off of when it comes to extracting his ideology. While several of the scholars discussed in the Introduction to this paper have mentioned or briefly discussed Tzvi Yehuda's teachings, all do so in discussion of Gush Emunim. Ian Lustick devotes a few pages of his book on Gush Emunim to the ideology of Tzvi Yehuda, but only as it applied to the founding of Gush Emunim. The same is true for

⁷² *ibid.* 53

Michael Feige. Similarly, Myron Aronoff assesses only his character and leadership, without discussing ideology. Richard Hoch is the only scholar to write in English on Tzvi Yehuda's life and ideology exclusively, so it is on factual information and translations provided in his work that this argument will be based, simply because his work provides the most information about Tzvi Yehuda. Hoch also provides a translation of Tzvi Yehuda's most famous speech. Given on the occasion of Israel's Nineteenth Independence Day in 1967, the so-called "Nineteenth Psalm Speech" presents clearly Tzvi Yehuda's ideology of redemption. Because every scholar I have read on Tzvi Yehuda discusses this speech, many quoting from it frequently, it is clear this it has been widely acknowledged as the most influential given by Tzvi Yehuda, and is therefore also important in understanding his ideology.

Hoch describes Tzvi Yehuda's vision of redemption as "realistic messianism."⁷³ This model aligns most readily with the active restorative redemption model discussed above. In Tzvi Yehuda's view, redemption will come about gradually, with no grand cataclysmic event, like that predicted in apocalyptic messianism. There will be no supernatural outbreaks like the war of Gog and Magog, changes in the cosmos, or unparalleled natural disasters.⁷⁴ This gradualism is critical to his understanding of redemption, and it comes from a passage in the Jerusalem Talmud: "Israel's redemption [occurs] little by little."⁷⁵ Lustick writes that Tzvi Yehuda was often quoted as saying that redemption comes about "*kima kima*," which translates to "little by little."⁷⁶

Tzvi Yehuda used the events of the century prior to his life as evidence that redemption was already occurring, and caused him to "understand the current State of Israel as being [an]

⁷³ Hoch, Richard Lawrence. *The Politics of Redemption: Rabbi Tzvi Yehudah Ha-Kohen Kook and the Origins of Gush Emunim*. 1994. Print.164

⁷⁴ *ibid.* 5

⁷⁵ *ibid.* 183

⁷⁶ Lustick 117

intermediate stage of redemption: the process is not over but it is underway.”⁷⁷ As this quote indicates, Tzvi Yehuda believed he was living in the midst of redemption. “This is visible, there’s nothing hidden here,” he says in his “Nineteenth Psalm Speech.”⁷⁸ He praises Rabbi Nathan Friedlander, who wrote on the concept of gradual redemption, believing his ideas to be most accurate. Signs of it are all around, Tzvi Yehuda believed and asserted. Whenever he heard good news he knew it was a sign of redemption happening: “every few days the newspapers announce that the banana crop is very nice. The fruit crop is very good. The Land of Israel is giving its fruit generously—so the End is nearing according to the words of Rashi.”⁷⁹ However, Tzvi Yehuda spends more time claiming that the evidence of redemption is clear than he does explicating what that evidence is. By way of explanation, Hoch suggests that Tzvi Yehuda finds evidence in physical elements of the land around him: “To [Tzvi Yehuda], the proof of redemption, or at least its beginnings and development, is found in concrete physical objects, such as trees, and buildings, not to mention settlers.”⁸⁰ Redemption is clearly apparently to anyone who examines his surroundings, Tzvi Yehuda believed, which explains why he was so aggressive about settlement, as will be expanded upon below.

Tzvi Yehuda also believed that redemption would contain the traditional elements discussed in the first section of this paper: gathering of exiles, establishment of the Davidic Kingdom, restoration of the temple, and coming of the Messiah. He devoted different levels of attention to each element, but all were essential. He believed the establishment of the Davidic

⁷⁷ Hoch 183

⁷⁸ Kook, Tzvi Y. "The 19th Psalm for the State of Israel." Speech. Independence Day. Jerusalem. 14 May 1967. *The Politics of Redemption: Rabbi Tzvi Yehudah Ha-Kohen Kook and the Origins of Gush Emunim*. 296-334. Print. 319

⁷⁹ Kook, Tzvi Y. 321; Rashi is the shortened name of Rabbi Shlomo Itzhaki, a French Rabbi from the late eleventh century, known for his famous biblical commentary, still quoted and used today. (Wylen 250)

⁸⁰ Hoch 175

Kingdom was already taking place during his life, as the state of Israel acted as a temporary version of the rebuilt Kingdom.⁸¹ However this could not be the final version of the Kingdom, because it was still incomplete. Tzvi Yehuda speaks to this idea in his “Nineteenth Psalm” speech. As he looks back on Independence Day, he feels confused. His initial reaction to the United Nations Partition Plan of 1947 was quite negative. He could not muster up the energy to be joyous at the creation of a state, which had been so long hoped for, because this state was not as it should be. In other words, it was not the full state that prophecy had promised. “They divided My land” was his response.⁸² While people danced and celebrated in the streets of Jerusalem, Tzvi Yehuda stayed inside and wept.⁸³ “I sat alone and the red-faced because it weighted on me. In the first hours, I could not, reconcile myself with what was prophesied...’[And] they divided My land!’ I could not go out wholeheartedly with my entire soul.”⁸⁴ It was not until a few days later when he decided, “this was from the Lord” and found the will to celebrate with his neighbors.⁸⁵

Even though he eventually did celebrate the establishment of Israel, Tzvi Yehuda continued to believe that it was not the true end result of redemption. In order for the true Davidic Kingdom to be actualized, Jewish sovereignty needed to be attained. Recall that this was a critical piece of the active restorative redemption model, and one that Tzvi Yehuda too focused on. In “Nineteenth Psalm,” Tzvi Yehuda speaks of the international community as *goyim*, rejecting any intercession they have in the workings of the Holy Land or, later, the State of Israel. On the day the speech was given, Independence Day 1967, there was a military parade

⁸¹ *ibid.* 185

⁸² Kook, Tzvi Y. 299

⁸³ *ibid.* 300

⁸⁴ *ibid.* 299

⁸⁵ *ibid.* 300

through Jerusalem that was opposed by the international community because they were wary of acknowledging Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.⁸⁶ Remember, this speech was given before Israel regained control of the entirety of Jerusalem, so it was still a divided city. To protest the existence of this parade, no foreign attaches or other representatives took part. In response to this, Tzvi Yehuda says:

How happy are we! Now we have this sacred day—without the “in-laws” they goyim. Thank God. These ‘inlaws’ are not appearing at our wedding, at our celebration. All these years we have requested to break the yoke of the goyim that is around our necks and He will lead us with proud bearing into our land.⁸⁷

Terming the international community *goyim* (non-Jews, foreigners) and describing their attendance as a “yoke” evokes an attitude of otherness and resentment on the part of Tzvi Yehuda. Similarly, Tzvi Yehuda says of the so-called *goyim*, “they think they are the ‘owners’ of the world, they organize the world, the UN and so on. They run the world—these fools. We know the Master of the Universe uses them in organizing matters.”⁸⁸ Outside nations have no business interfering with the affairs of Israel, because it is God who truly governs everything. Though they could try to influence what occurs in Israel, and prevent the Jewish sovereignty necessary for redemption, “they will not succeed in disturbing, in spoiling this...they will not succeed in hindering all this,” Tzvi Yehuda says.⁸⁹ When Prime Minister Golda Meir included Arab Israelis in her post-Yom Kippur War government coalition, Tzvi Yehuda responded explosively, arguing that “she made a fatal mistake by even considering the possibility of forming a minority government with a Mustafa and an Ahmad taking part in ruling this Godly

⁸⁶ *ibid.* 301

⁸⁷ *ibid.* 301

⁸⁸ *ibid.* 302-3

⁸⁹ *ibid.* 305-6

country.”⁹⁰ Similarly, he consistently referred to Henry Kissinger as “husband of a Gentile”, implying he was “incapable of safeguarding Jewish interests” and therefore would be no help to Israel in the pursuit of peace.⁹¹ This clear suspicion of non-Jews was clearly evidenced in Tzvi Yehuda’s politics. This distrust will become important in discussion of Tzvi Yehuda’s impact on the settlement movement.

Robert Eisen writes that Tzvi Yehuda translated the struggle between Israel the nation and its enemies into a cosmic struggle between Israel the people and the rest of the world.⁹² In Tzvi Yehuda’s view, as Israel fought to advance the messianic process, everything around it worked to stop it. “He identified metaphysical evil not just with Israel’s Arab enemies, but with the gentile nations in general, because in his view all nations to some degree harbored hatred of Israel and wanted to hold back the messianic process.”⁹³ This explains why Tzvi Yehuda was so assertive and often aggressive when it came to the status of the Jewish people and the international standing of the State of Israel.

In order to obtain this sovereignty over the entire land of Israel, that was so essential to complete fulfillment of the Davidic Kingdom restoration (and therefore redemption), the Jewish people needed to be assertive, Tzvi Yehuda taught. Though the Six Day War made great gains for the question for sovereignty by attaining territory that belonged to Tzvi Yehuda’s conception of the entire Land of Israel, it was not enough to just militarily occupy the land.⁹⁴ It needed to be

⁹⁰ Hoch 143

⁹¹ *ibid.* 148

⁹² Eisen 150

⁹³ *ibid.*

⁹⁴ During the Six Day War of June 1967, Israeli acquired control of East Jerusalem, the Gaza Strip, Sinai Peninsula, West Bank, and Golan Heights, more than doubling its size. Israeli military presence has remained in the Golan Heights and West Bank for the past 45 years, in the Gaza Strip until 2005, and in Sinai until 1982. East Jerusalem is the only piece that has been

settled. This meant that first, the Jewish people had to choose to return to the land; the exiles had to gather. Hoch writes that in Tzvi Yehuda's view, this stage would only be complete with "the restoration of full Jewish sovereignty over the complete Land of Israel and the voluntary return to tradition by the Israeli public."⁹⁵ Tzvi Yehuda clearly ties this return to and settlement of the land to redemption. In "Nineteenth Psalm," Tzvi Yehuda cites Rabbi Guttmacher, who said, "When there will be 130 [Jewish] families in Israel at the start of our assembling here, redemption will begin even if the Jews are not worthy of it."⁹⁶ Thus, the mass immigration to Palestine that began at the end of the 19th century and continued through the early years of the state of Israel's existence was surely evidence for Tzvi Yehuda that this process had begun. Though the Jewish people might not be seeking redemption, it was happening anyway.

Further, the Jewish people have been given a commandment to "build the land of Israel, settle the Land of Israel," he says also in the "Nineteenth Psalm."⁹⁷ This commandment to settle the Land of Israel is a mitzvah, and one that is of analogous importance to wearing *tefillin*. This building "is to be done from the general principle, the building [is to be done] by the nation. The building of our government, our sovereignty, by our hands."⁹⁸ Again, no one from the outside is to interfere, but rather the Jewish people are to settle and build the land themselves. This section of the speech culminates in the statement: "Our mitzvah is to be a *fighting* people. The commandment to rule is a commandment to be a fighting people....we are commanded to be a fighting people for a commanded war."⁹⁹ Because this quote comes in a passage discussing the

officially annexed by the state of Israel (Rubinstein, Alvin Z., and Alan Dowty. *The Arab-Israeli Conflict: Perspectives*. New York: Praeger, 1984. Print. 53).

⁹⁵ Hoch 198

⁹⁶ Kook, Tzvi Y. 324

⁹⁷ *ibid.* 323

⁹⁸ *ibid.*

⁹⁹ *ibid.*

mitzvah of Land settlement, it can be inferred that this “war” is the quest for ownership over the Land of Israel. Tzvi Yehuda says here that he is not afraid to be assertive, or even aggressive, and the Jewish people should not be afraid to stand up for themselves in pursuit of this goal. They have been called to do what it takes to build their nation and rule it themselves, even if that means “fighting.”

Eisen presents a similar picture of Tzvi Yehuda’s ideology, in which Jewish interests are superior to all others, even if it means resorting to aggression. Eisen suggests that even though Tzvi Yehuda recognized the moral qualms of this stalwart perspective on the necessity of sovereignty despite opposition, he was not hindered by them.

If Israel’s wars resulted in the killing of innocent Arabs, this should not be an obstacle to the messianic process, which trumped any moral qualms about such actions. Moreover, Jewish morality was superior to gentile morality, and therefore actions that might appear to be immoral from a non-Jewish perspective were not immoral from a Jewish one.¹⁰⁰

If redemption necessitated land acquisition by force, that was morally acceptable in Tzvi Yehuda’s view, because the Jewish people’s moral standard was different from that of the rest of the world.¹⁰¹ Tzvi Yehuda stopped at nothing when redemption was on the line, and he believed it to be on the line consistently.

Lustick takes note of Tzvi Yehuda’s desire for land acquisition, even if it meant violence, in the context of the land policy of Gush Emunim. Lustick quotes an article for the Gush Emunim journal *Artzi*, entitled “Between the People and Its Land,” in which Tzvi Yehuda wrote,

We are commanded both to possess and to settle. The meaning of possession is conquest, and in performing this mitzvah, we can perform the other—the commandment to settle...Torah, war, and settlement—they are three things in one and we rejoice in the authority we have been given for each of them.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ Eisen 150

¹⁰¹ *ibid.*

¹⁰² Lustick 106

Lustick points out that this attitude was influential in the development of Gush Emunim's mode of operation, but that will be discussed in greater detail later. What is important here is that Tzvi Yehuda was not afraid to endorse the use of force if the pay off was acquisition of holy land.

Tzvi Yehuda believed anyone who opposed this drive for absolute Jewish sovereignty over the entire land of Israel was spiritually lacking. Hoch writes of the violent reprimands Tzvi Yehuda gave in response to anti-Zionist organizations and more specifically, the *haredim*, ultra-orthodox Jews, who opposed Zionism on the grounds that it attempts to hasten redemption, which they believe to be forbidden.¹⁰³ He calls them heretics who lack faith because they turn their religious piety into an obstacle against the state.¹⁰⁴ As debates over what to do with the land acquired in the Six Day War began to develop, he pitted this accusation of faithless heresy against those who favored territorial compromise and negotiations or challenged legitimacy of settlements as well.

The restoration of the Davidic Kingdom and establishment of Jewish sovereignty were the elements of redemption focused on most by Tzvi Yehuda, because he believed them to be occurring during his lifetime. He devotes far less attention to the coming of the Messiah and rebuilding of the Temple because they were, to him, distant events. However what he does have to say about the reconstruction of the Temple is important to note because it introduces an element of his theology that connects with his father's ideology: piety. Hoch explains that Tzvi Yehuda believed the Temple would be rebuilt, and that rebuilding would be the culmination of the redemption, but that this would not happen until the distant future.¹⁰⁵ This is because the Jewish people are not yet ready for such a restoration. As Hoch writes, because the Temple will

¹⁰³ Hoch 177

¹⁰⁴ Kook, Tzvi Y. 314

¹⁰⁵ Hoch 199

be the site of worship and sacrifices, “not only must the Jews fully rule the Promised Land but they must be spiritually ready to restore sacrifice.”¹⁰⁶ It is through Torah study that this spiritual readiness comes about, says Tzvi Yehuda, so Torah study is incredibly important. In “Nineteenth Psalm” he articulates, “Less study of *Orot*...less study of [the writings of] Rabbi Judah Loew, less study of the *Kuzari*, the Holy of Holies and the like, [results] then in thing being forgotten--foundations of faith, of the world: every thing that is holy and real.”¹⁰⁷ Neglecting to study the Torah and the writings of influential Jewish thinkers is dangerous because it can lead to losing touch with the “holy and real.” He similarly laments that “there are those who to our sorrow are not prepared to praise the name of Heaven—and may mercy be upon them.”¹⁰⁸ As a *rosh yeshiva* and son of a prominent rabbi, Tzvi Yehuda certainly understood the importance of Torah study and pious worship, but that he makes Torah study and worship a precondition for rebuilding of the temple on the other, is unique.

Abraham Kook also emphasized the importance of Torah study as a means of increasing penitence and therefore coming closer to redemption. However, Tzvi Yehuda parts from his father on the critical role of repentance. While the elder Kook understood redemption to be intimately connected with penitence, Tzvi Yehuda felt it played a much less crucial role: “The decision is that redemption does not need complete repentance.”¹⁰⁹ It is apparent from “Nineteenth Psalm” that Tzvi Yehuda believed other pieces of redemption to be more critical at the time he was living, than the penitence required for temple construction. Because restoration of the Davidic Kingdom and establishment of Jewish Sovereignty were active movements occurring during his lifetime, he saw the necessity of settlement and other actions that furthered

¹⁰⁶ *ibid.* 200

¹⁰⁷ Kook, Tzvi Y. 213

¹⁰⁸ *ibid.* 235

¹⁰⁹ *ibid.* 320

these aims to be critical, whereas the penitence necessary for the rebuilding of the temple, which was to occur later, was not so pressing. Because Abraham Kook saw redemption as a less formulaic and more gradual spiritual process, he did not place importance on decisive actions in the way Tzvi Yehuda did. A more detailed analysis of the difference between the two Kooks will be provided below.

So while Tzvi Yehuda said that “redemption does not need complete repentance,” what it *does* need in the eyes of Tzvi Yehuda can be found in a biblical verse that he quotes three times throughout his speech. Ezekiel 26:8 says “But you, O mountains of Israel, you shall shoot forth your branches, and yield your fruit to my people Israel for they are at hand to come.”¹¹⁰ Expanding upon this verse, Tzvi Yehuda points out two commands the verse makes, which tie back into the key redemption elements discussed throughout this paper: “settling the Land of Israel” and “ingathering of the exiles.” Tzvi Yehuda asserts that it is through these two commands that redemption takes place. The shooting forth of branches refers to cultivation of agriculture and development of the land, which relates to settlement. The benefactors of the fruit those branches produce are the exiles that will come to the land (“they are at hand to come”). Thus Ezekiel 26:8 is interpreted as promoting the idea of settling and building up the population of Israel. Tzvi Yehuda claims these are “clear words.”¹¹¹ They are in the open, not hidden, visible to anyone who is looking. Thus while Abraham Kook ascribed to the kabbalistic notion that truth is found deep within scripture, making it necessary to dig past multiple layers to find authentic meaning, Tzvi Yehuda claimed this message was clearly stated at the surface of the text. These clear words command settlement and return from exile, which are designed to jumpstart the redemption process outlined here, with all component elements: restoration of the

¹¹⁰ *ibid.* 320

¹¹¹ Kook, Tzvi Y. 320

Davidic Kingdom, ingathering of exiles, complete Jewish sovereignty, and rebuilding of the Temple.

It is important to note the presence of many kabbalistic concepts in “Nineteenth Psalm,” in addition to the biblical and Talmudic quotes and allusions, anecdotes about other rabbis, and political assertions. For example, in a section of the speech where Tzvi Yehuda quotes his father, he mentions the Chariot of Israel, which is the throne of God understood by Kabbalists to contain numerous mysteries.¹¹² In the same passage he talks of varying worlds and the levels of the worlds, which is another idea borrowed from Kabbalah. These are mere allusions to complex concepts that would have been understood by Tzvi Yehuda’s yeshiva-educated audience. However because these concepts do not have high political significance, and the purpose of this paper is to understand the political actions of Gush Emunim rather than the nuances of their religious ideas, the complicated kabbalistic ideas presented in the speech will not be expanded upon.

Comparing Abraham and Tzvi Yehuda Kook

Tzvi Yehuda viewed himself as solely responsible for promoting his father’s teaching and ensuring it would be remembered by successive generations.¹¹³ However it is clear that the messages of Abraham and Tzvi Yehuda, particularly with regard to redemption, have significant differences. While certain aspects of Tzvi Yehuda’s redemptive theology come from the work of his father, the centrality of penitence to the redemptive process that is at the heart of Kook’s idea of redemption is completely overlooked in Tzvi Yehuda’s analysis. A deeper understanding of the differences between the two rabbis can help clarify the teachings of each individually.

¹¹² Kook, Tzvi Y. 327; Sherwin 30

¹¹³ Hoch 116

As was discussed above, the elder Kook tied redemption directly to penitence, believing it was through individual and collective penitence that the world would be redeemed. He did not set a formula or timeline for this process, but referred to it abstractly as an ideal to be sought after rather than a reality that was already occurring. In sum, Kook believed attentive study of the “inner meaning” of the Torah paired with sincere penitence would bring about the spiritual renewal necessary to reestablish the connection between man and God, and thereby initiate the redemption of the entire world.

Summarizing Tzvi Yehuda’s vision of redemption, it is much more active and assertive. It follows a formula, using historical events to prove its accuracy and political circumstances to further its progress. Though redemption has already begun, it is a gradual process that relies on the Jewish people’s actions to fuel its development. This action involves active settlement of and sovereignty over the entire land of Israel, and direct rejection of any effort to hinder that settlement. Though Tzvi Yehuda never explicitly endorsed violence, he did not reject it when need to settle and achieve sovereignty necessitated it. Although piety played a role in Tzvi Yehuda’s vision of redemption, in the context of preparing the way for the rebuilding of the temple, it does not receive the attention Abraham gives it, and it is not connected to penitence at all.

There are clearly sizable differences between the two theories, and these differences are evident in the actions of the two rabbi. One manifestation of this comparison is the attitude the two figures had towards non-Jews and secular Jews. Abraham Kook was known for being particularly liberal when it came to interactions with non-Jews.¹¹⁴ Much of his writings reflect

¹¹⁴ Bosker, Ben Z. Introduction. *Abraham Isaac Kook: The Lights of Penitence, the Moral Principles, Lights of Holiness, Essays, Letters, and Poems*. New York: Paulist, 1978. 1-21. Print.

this liberal and open-minded attitude, emphasizing the Jewish people's need to love the entire world, not just the Jewish world. In *The Moral Principles*, Kook writes extensively on love, arguing that "the heart must be filled with love for all."¹¹⁵ This "all" includes Jews, gentiles, animals, and any other being on earth. The love that is in the soul "embraces all creatures, it excludes nothing, and no people or tongue."¹¹⁶ It is a natural part of the human being, because Kook believes that it is "impossible not to be filled with love for every creature, for the flow of the light of God shines in everything, and everything discloses the pleasantness of the Lord."¹¹⁷ This love is not just passive and theoretical. It is active. It is important for this love to take the form of "practical action, by pursuing the welfare of those [they] are bidden to love, and to seek their advancement."¹¹⁸ This means the Jewish people were, to Kook, responsible for the welfare of all people, not just their own.

On this theme, David Shatz and Lawrence Kaplan write in their introduction to a collection of articles on Kook and Jewish Mysticism, that the overarching principle of Kook's philosophy is "that all reality has its source in the divine", so "all opposition, discord, and conflict are illusory; in the profoundest vision of things, all reality is one and unified."¹¹⁹ For this reason, the world should live in harmony. There should never be a need for conflict or the violence associated with conflict, according to the view of Abraham Kook.

Tzvi Yehuda, on the other hand, developed an identity opposite to his father's tolerant, cooperative, and open-minded reputation. In the early 1960s, he embarked on a struggle against Christianity in Israel, at times becoming violent. He broke into the home of a *yeshivah* graduate

¹¹⁵ Kook, Abraham Isaac 135

¹¹⁶ *ibid.* 137

¹¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹¹⁸ *ibid.*

¹¹⁹ Kaplan, Lawrence, and David Shatz. *Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook and Jewish Spirituality*. New York: New York UP, 1995. Print.10

who had converted to Christianity to steal his *semikhah* certificate, the certificate proving ones rabbinic ordination. He then burned the certificate, displaying his disapproval of a newly converted Christian retaining the honor of rabbinic ordination.¹²⁰ In a similar event, Tzvi Yehuda attempted to have a performance of Johan Sebastian Bach's *St. Matthew's Passion* at Jerusalem's *Binyanei ha-Uma* (Jerusalem Convention Center) cancelled on the grounds that a Christian piece of music had no business being performed in the capital of the Jewish state. When he failed to have the program cancelled, Tzvi Yehuda organized a group of students to disrupt the performance. One student climbed on stage during the piece and vocally denounced all Jews in attendance. Though he was arrested, this student was from that point on held in high esteem by Tzvi Yehuda.¹²¹

Tzvi Yehuda justified his distaste for Christians using Maimonides, an influential Jewish philosopher and Torah scholar of the twelfth century. Said Tzvi Yehuda, "In Maimonides, there are clear words: Christianity is *avodah zarah*. [It is] a simple and explicit *halakhah*."¹²² *Avodah zarah* refers to "strange worship" and is often used to mean idolatry. In other words, Christianity was synonymous with idolatry, and therefore dangerous to the Jewish people especially when it infiltrated Israel, the Jewish state.¹²³ As has already been discussed, Tzvi Yehuda had a similar distrust for international organizations or foreign governments, believing them to undermine Jewish sovereignty and thereby pose a threat to the state and people of Israel.

How was it possible for a Tzvi Yehuda, who identified himself as the promoter of his father's teaching, to develop such a radically different message than that of his father?

¹²⁰ Hoch 134

¹²¹ *ibid.*

¹²² *ibid.* 213

¹²³ While Tzvi Yehuda could have taken this particular line of Maimonides' work out of context to support his antagonism toward non-Jews, he nonetheless attempted to justify this distrust for non-Jewish individuals and institutions with a prominent figure in Jewish thought.

Few scholars directly compare the ideology of the two Kooks, and those that do only superficially address the comparison. Eisen, for example, writes “the younger Kook radicalized his father’s teachings,” but does not expand upon why or how this radicalization took place.¹²⁴ Lustick, similarly, devotes one sentence to the differing significance of Israel’s redemption on the rest of the world preached by the two Kooks, but again, does not expand beyond a simple statement of the comparison.¹²⁵ Gadi Taub provides the best analysis of the similarities and differences between Abraham and Tzvi Yehuda. He writes that Tzvi Yehuda reinterpreted Abraham’s original ideas after his death, seeking to bring redemption and political action into a much closer partnership: “Redemption was lowered from the sphere of the state to the level of a political party. It was stripped of theological ambiguity and turned into a political platform.”¹²⁶ Taub’s assessment is accurate. While the elder Kook wrote of redemption as a religious goal, Tzvi Yehuda made the message political. He took advantage of the historical circumstances, particularly the wars of 1967 and 1973, utilizing them to spread his religious ideas.

Taub draws this idea from Aviezer Ravitzky, who explains further that Tzvi Yehuda attempted to further his father’s legacy by “clarify[ing] the strong connection between theology, historical experience, and political activity.”¹²⁷ According to Ravitzky’s analysis, the Holocaust had worked to discredit the elder Kook’s idealistic hope for a peaceful redemption, and it was therefore unlikely that his message could still attract followers.¹²⁸ Ravitzky quotes one of Tzvi

¹²⁴ *ibid* 149

¹²⁵ Lustick 36

¹²⁶ Taub, Gadi. *The Settlers: And the Struggle over the Meaning of Zionism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2010. Print. 41

¹²⁷ Ravitzky, Aviezer. *Messianism, Zionism, and Jewish Religious Radicalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996. Print.124

¹²⁸ *ibid* 126

Yehuda's leading students who explained this transition from Abraham to Tzvi Yehuda's ideology well:

In their openness and inclusiveness, the teachings of our master the Rabbi [Abraham Kook], of blessed memory, bring together all that is good and beautiful in the treasure house of Jewish through throughout the generations, as well as the choicest of universal ideas. But when it comes to focusing these teachings on real life...one must frame, sharpen, expand them to a certain degree...Thus, on the political level, if his father, our master, of blessed memory, was above parties and factions, loving all of them, Rabbi Zvi Yehuda, of blessed memory, had to take a clearer public stand.¹²⁹

Tzvi translated his father's teaching into the "language of action," turning the elder Kook's "optimistic expectation" into "absolute certainty about the future."¹³⁰ There was no mistaking the significance of the Holocaust in Tzvi's eyes, according to Ravitzky. It was a "divine act of purification" designed to rid the Jewish people of the "impurity of exile" and thereby start the process of redemption.¹³¹ It was therefore necessary for Tzvi Yehuda to reinterpret his father's passive but expectant theology of redemption into one that took this divine action into account, teaching the Jewish people how to respond accordingly.

To expand upon Taub and Ravitzky's ideas, events beyond just the Holocaust could have also affected Tzvi Yehuda's ideology. Born in 1891, Tzvi Yehuda lived through the founding of Israel and two major wars in which Israel was involved. All of these had profound impacts on the Jewish people, including Tzvi Yehuda. Because of this great impact, Tzvi Yehuda had to make sense of the events—by tailoring his vision of redemption to the historical circumstances, he could explain the events as signs of ongoing redemption, and then utilize them to comfort his followers, just as he had done with the Holocaust. As was discussed above, the belief that redemption was coming within a few generations was common throughout Jewish history.

¹²⁹ *ibid.* 123

¹³⁰ *ibid.* 124

¹³¹ *ibid.* 127

Living through so many tumultuous events, especially those of such negativity like the Holocaust and Yom Kippur War, likely made this desire for redemption even weightier in the mind of Tzvi Yehuda and his students. Similar to Scholem's argument that biblical prophecy emphasized redemption's imminent arrival in an attempt to reassure the Jewish people living in desperation and exile that a better life was coming soon,¹³² Tzvi Yehuda rationalized the chaotic experience of the Israeli public by inserting it into a redemptive framework. Tzvi Yehuda and his followers began to view events like the Six Day and Yom Kippur Wars as signs that redemption was coming, and therefore action needed to be taken. As Hoch explains, God had begun the process through divine action and it was up to the Jewish people to further it.¹³³ The Holocaust, Israeli Independence, Six Day War, and Yom Kippur War were signs from God that it was time to act. Tzvi's redemptive ideology reflected that.

Abraham died in 1935, over a decade before the state of Israel was established, so he never had the opportunity to comment upon the issues Tzvi Yehuda was most vocal on: reactions to the UN Partition Plan of 1947, what to do with acquisitions of the Six Day War of 1967, and what to make of the disappointment of the Yom Kippur War of 1973. It is possible that, had he lived a few decades longer, he too would have grown weary of foreign intervention and developed the same distrust for non-Jewish authority that Tzvi Yehuda had. However Abraham lived through pogroms in Eastern Europe, Arab riots in Palestine, and other anti-Semitic activity, but never indicated these to be signs of redemption. He did not personally experience these in the way Tzvi experienced the founding of Israel and the two wars, so this could partially explain the different reactions. But there must have been, in addition, other factors besides the tumultuous events of Tzvi Yehuda's life that explain the reinterpretation of ideology we have been

¹³² Scholem 5

¹³³ Hoch 222

discussing. Robertt Eisen suggests that while Tzvi Yehuda had the same respect for secular Zionism that his father was famous for, Tzvi Yehuda grew weary of the secular Zionist government's inability to understand the critical religious importance of their work.¹³⁴ Tzvi Yehuda was influenced by the rise of religious fundamentalism that grew out of a response to secularism, which likely contributed to his development of an ideology less sympathetic to non-Jewish interests as well as his acceptance of violence as a means to defend Jewish interests.¹³⁵ These outside influences could have helped shape Tzvi Yehuda's reinterpretation of his father's message by giving it a more fundamentalist nature.

A further explanation of the significant dissimilarity between the ideology of the two Kooks could be a tied to the younger Kook's personality. It has already been discussed that Tzvi Yehuda held his father in incredibly high esteem. He was obsessed with his father's reputation, both during his life and after his death, revering his father as an almost holy figure. Hoch explains that Tzvi Yehuda turned his father's room into a holy site, idolized his possessions, referred to him as "my lord, my father, my teacher and master," and annually observed the anniversary of his death much more extensively than what is called for in traditional Judaism.¹³⁶ However Tzvi Yehuda did not receive the respect he undoubtedly felt he deserved as Abraham's heir. He was not appointed head of his father's yeshiva until well after Abraham's death, was not ever elected Chief Rabbi, and not invited to participate in the publication of a five-volume memorial work in Kook's name.¹³⁷ Hoch writes, "Although Rabbi Tzvi Yehuda was [Rabbi

¹³⁴ Eisen 185

¹³⁵ *ibid.* 186

¹³⁶ Hoch 119

¹³⁷ Hoch 125

Kook's] only son, there is no indication that any of his father's contemporaries thought of him as his father's spiritual heir."¹³⁸

This kind of neglect likely had a negative psychological impact on Tzvi Yehuda. As someone who respected his father so much, he could have felt a need to live up to his father's name, and when he did not receive comparable recognition from other rabbis and intellectuals shortly after his father's death, he looked to a new place to get it. Whereas Abraham was a great national leader who was able to attain widespread support through influential writing, Tzvi Yehuda thrived in the classroom. As has already been discussed, his students revered him and admired his strong, reliable character.¹³⁹ His speeches provided inspiration, and his voice was often referred to as *bat Kol*, or heavenly voice, signifying the divine content of his words.¹⁴⁰ As his popularity with students grew, a following arose that adopted Tzvi as a "spiritual leader."¹⁴¹ Gideon Aran, a sociologist-anthropologist at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem who contributed to the book series *The Fundamentalist Project* with a chapter on Gush Emunim, writes, "By adopting Rabbi Kook the Younger as their spiritual leader, [his students] propelled him from the status of a forgotten, ridiculed figure at the margins of the Torah and Zionist worlds into an outstanding Israeli personality with magnetic influence on a broad circle."¹⁴² As Tzvi Yehuda's following grew, he gained a reputation for this charisma, which had the power of infusing a room with holiness and inspiring his students to action.¹⁴³ This talent for motivational speaking likely fueled his confidence, leading to speeches and sermons with increasingly active

¹³⁸ *ibid.*

¹³⁹ *ibid.* 249

¹⁴⁰ *ibid.* 246

¹⁴¹ Aran, Gideon. "Jewish Zionist Fundamentalism: The Block of the Faithful in Israel."

Fundamentalisms Observed. Ed. Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991. Print. 270

¹⁴² *ibid.* 270-1

¹⁴³ Hoch 244-8

messages. Because so many of his speeches focused on redemption, this had the effect of slowly transforming the message of passivity to which Abraham ascribed, into the active version Tzvi Yehuda preached.

Ian Lustick suggests that historically, anyone in a leadership position in the Jewish community had to convince his followers that his rule would not hinder, but ideally hasten the coming of redemption. He had to “evoke images of an imminent redemption and credibly exploit divine imperatives” in order to gain the respect of the population.¹⁴⁴ The Hasmonean victory against the Syrian-Greek empire in 165 BCE, the justification of the Jewish Zealot rebellion against Rome in the first century, and the development of Rabbi Yohanan Ben-Zakkai’s anti-active redemption ideology after the destruction of the second temple are all examples of this.¹⁴⁵ Tzvi Yehuda’s proclamation of his active restorative redemption model follows this same pattern: he adamantly asserted that those who followed his teachings were taking steps toward redemption.

What has not been well-explained by Taub, Ravitzky, or any of the other scholars that have been drawn on thus far is in an explanation of the significance of this shift of philosophy between Abraham’s passive Kabbalistic redemption and Tzvi’s active restorative model. Both state convincingly that Tzvi Yehuda translated his father’s writings to what he believed was the appropriate message for the political climate, but neither discusses the direct consequences of that translation. This significance is incredibly important to the modern Israeli political discourse: the emergence of political organizations that modeled themselves after Tzvi Yehuda’s message. The most vocal and prominent of these groups is Gush Emunim.

¹⁴⁴ Lustick 20

¹⁴⁵ *ibid.* 21-22

Founding of Gush Emunim

By chronicling the founding and development of Gush Emunim, we can see how historical events and influential figures shaped the group's theology, and where the Kooks' ideologies fit into the framework. In *For the Land and the Lord*, written about Gush Emunim and Jewish Fundamentalism, Ian Lustick cites three interrelated factors that contributed to the founding and development of Gush Emunim: ideas articulated by Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook, the leadership and "ideological elaboration of those ideas by Kook's son, Rabbi Tzvi Yehuda Ha-Cohen Kook, and the political ascendance of the Likud Party.¹⁴⁶ While the ideology provided by the Kooks set the foundation for the group's beginning, its political partnership with Likud helped the group to grow and gain influence in its early years. We shall see, however, that the message is modeled off Tzvi Yehuda's teaching much more than his father's, and because of this, we can view the ideology of Gush Emunim as one of the consequences of the politicization of Abraham Kook's message.

This connection between Tzvi Yehuda and Gush Emunim is not new. Many of the movement's founders were Tzvi Yehuda's students at Merkaz ha-Rav, a yeshiva in Jerusalem founded by the elder Kook. While Kook was *rosh yeshiva*, Tzvi Yehuda acted as the "spiritual leader," and taught classes in faith, Bible, and "God-fearing."¹⁴⁷ Tzvi Yehuda was not given the role of *rosh yeshiva* until several years after Kook's death, but once he assumed the position he became one of the most respected teachers in the nation, according to Richard Hoch's study on Tzvi Yehuda's ideology and its connection to Gush Emunim.¹⁴⁸ Tzvi Yehuda's students held him in incredibly high esteem. Some called him capable of prophecy, and he had the uncanny ability

¹⁴⁶ Lustick 29

¹⁴⁷ Hoch 124

¹⁴⁸ *ibid.* 263

to persuade his students to do exactly what he wanted them to, whether it was to take up rabbinic post or engage in a protest.¹⁴⁹ Hoch attributes Tzvi Yehuda's almost cult-like following to both the content of his teachings and his charisma. He was not an eloquent speaker; he was prone to mumble and stutter, but this was endearing to his students, and helped him acquire a group of devoted adherents.¹⁵⁰

This influence began with a group of students at Merkaz ha-Rav in the 1950s called Gachelet. These students felt torn between the growing force of Zionism in the new state of Israel and their identity as traditional Jews. When they came to Merkaz ha-Rav, Tzvi Yehuda exposed them to the teachings of his father. They found comfort in the unity Kook described between Judaism and Zionism, which influenced these students to strive to "become both more Zionist and more religious."¹⁵¹ Gachelet was important to Tzvi Yehuda because they were the first group of students to really identify with him and take him on as their official rabbi. Gideon Aran writes that Gachelet "appropriated the doctrine of Rabbi Kook the Elder, transforming it from the esoteric and quietistic dogma of a small and marginal circle into a gospel which spread throughout Israel to serve as a platform for the ensuing activism."¹⁵² However the members of the group were interested in Tzvi Yehuda's teachings in addition to his father's, which helped Tzvi step out from his father's shadow. Eventually many of these students in Gachelet became leaders in Gush Emunim.¹⁵³

¹⁴⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁵⁰ *ibid.*

¹⁵¹ Hoch 130

¹⁵² Aran 270

¹⁵³ Hoch 132

The Six Day War of June 1967 was a crucial point for Tzvi Yehuda, because he saw the war as religious event, and a sign that the process of redemption was occurring.¹⁵⁴ After suffering a surprise attack from five Arab neighbors, Israel successfully defeated their aggressors and obtained significant land gains, more than doubling their territory, all in just six days.¹⁵⁵ The Six Day War revitalized the Israeli population's Zionist fervor and had an especially profound impact on the students of Tzvi Yehuda because they saw Israel's miraculous victory "integrating them within the existing messianic-mystical approach taught at Mercaz HaRav yeshiva."¹⁵⁶ According to Aran, these adherents to Tzvi Yehuda's message understood the war to fulfill the messianic plan the rabbi had laid out in his teaching, beginning with the crucial element of acquisition of the entire land of Israel. Thus, the gains in the war meant "a messianic principle thousands of years old was inadvertently realized in one fell swoop."¹⁵⁷

The war took on extra significance for the students of Tzvi Yehuda because of the speech he had given just weeks before the outbreak of war, commemorating Israel's Nineteenth Independence Day. Aran attributes the "spiritual base" of Gush Emunim's religious Zionist ideology to the "messianic mystical system" introduced in this speech.¹⁵⁸ In the speech, Tzvi Yehuda expressed the "incontestable" claim that redemption is already underway.¹⁵⁹ He also uttered remorse at the situation of a divided Israel; an Israel without key biblical cities: "And where is our Hebron—have we forgotten it?! And where is our Shechem—have we forgotten it? And where is our Jericho—have we forgotten it?"¹⁶⁰ Land acquisition in the Six Day War

¹⁵⁴ *ibid.* 139

¹⁵⁵ Rubenstein 49-53

¹⁵⁶ Aran 271

¹⁵⁷ *ibid.* 272

¹⁵⁸ *ibid.* 268

¹⁵⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁶⁰ Kook, Tzvi Y. 299

included all three of these cities named in the speech, leading Tzvi Yehuda's students to view the speech as prophecy fulfilled by the war, which garnered even more support for Tzvi Yehuda's ideas.

Although the government did not sponsor any organized settlement activity in the new territories immediately after the war, because they knew there was the possibility of exchanging this land for peace, Tzvi Yehuda believed this to be a mistake.¹⁶¹ He felt passionately that the success in this war was a gift from God, designed to move the Jewish people closer to the sovereignty called for in redemption. He wrote in a proclamation entitled *Lo Taguru* (Do Not Be Afraid), issued on September 19, 1967 that it is "a sin and a crime to transfer of our land to *goyim*."¹⁶² Nothing could justify this land transfer, and any attempt to do this would be "null and void." As a result of this teaching, two private movements, led by students of Tzvi Yehuda, established settlements in Hebron: Etzion and Park Hotel.¹⁶³ Though he was not physically involved in the settlements, Tzvi Yehuda played a significant role in this activity, by inspiring the ideology that fueled the movement. Thus, the settlement movement had begun, with the Six Day War as a major catalyst.

Many political and ideological groups came out of the renewed Zionist excitement that the Six Day War provided. Movement for the Whole Land of Israel was one such ideological movement. It was militant and romantic but completely devoid of religion.¹⁶⁴ Once Gush Emunim was established after the Yom Kippur war, it quickly surpassed this movement in popularity, perhaps because of its religious aspects, and as Movement for the Whole Land of Israel lost momentum, Gush Emunim absorbed lots of the non-religious members of this

¹⁶¹ Hoch 141

¹⁶² *ibid.* 140

¹⁶³ *ibid.* 141

¹⁶⁴ Lustick 43

movement.¹⁶⁵ The significance of the Land of Israel Movement to the founding of Gush Emunim comes in Tzvi Yehuda's reaction to the movement. Aran writes that Tzvi Yehuda refused to sign the movement's charter just after the end of the 1967 war on the grounds that "the 'true whole Land of Israel' was still not in Israel's hands."¹⁶⁶ His response was to publish a proclamation identifying the biblical borders of the Land of Israel and, in Aran's words, "declaring that a person should even risk his life for its conquest and settlement."¹⁶⁷ This statement was published and circulated after the 1973 war, and quickly became the basis of the Gush Emunim manifesto.¹⁶⁸

The Yom Kippur War of 1973 struck a harsh blow to the Zionist fervor that the Six Day War had cultivated. It was, says Hoch, a "painful surprise to the Israelis who had imagined themselves invincible following the Six-Day War."¹⁶⁹ Though Israel did not lose any land in the war, the death count was great, leading to widespread discontent and frustration amongst the Israeli population. No one could fathom how Israel could have performed so poorly in this war when just six years earlier they had defied all odds and destroyed the very same enemy armies. Many lost faith in the government and therefore turned to other sources of authority and leadership. As a result of this mentality, grass roots organizations began to form, led by military heroes who were disillusioned by the war, trying to rebuild the state "in a manner that could justify the losses in the 1973 war."¹⁷⁰

The Yom Kippur War was also the first time a significant number of Orthodox Jews fought with regular combat units. Lustick writes,

¹⁶⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁶⁶ Aran 275

¹⁶⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁶⁸ *ibid.*

¹⁶⁹ Hoch 142

¹⁷⁰ Lustick 44

This participation gave religious Israeli Jews self-confidence and legitimacy within the wider secular society. Amid the psychological confusion of the period following the Yom Kippur War, a generation of young religious idealists, whose pride had always suffered by the honor granted to kibbutzniks and other secular Jews for serving in the army, felt empowered to offer their own analysis of Israel's predicament, and their own solution. But their analysis was not technocratic, it was theological.¹⁷¹

This rising influence of religious youth was an important condition for the founding of Gush Emunim.

Aran writes that Tzvi Yehuda's students did not abandon the messianic model to which they had been adhering in light of the disappointment of the Yom Kippur War. In fact, they used the war as further evidence that the path they were on was the right one. They saw this war as evidence of the "Pangs of the Messiah": the hardship that comes before redemption. Aran explains that these "activist-believers" called on the legend of dual messiahs to explain the war loss. In this legend, the first Messiah, the son of Joseph, comes amidst trial and tribulation, preparing the way for the second messiah, The son of David, to arise and usher in redemption.¹⁷² They took this opportunity to prove their "Torah Zionism" or "Zionism of Redemption" was superior to mainstream, secular, political Zionism.¹⁷³

Gush Emunim arose in this atmosphere: the nation had an abundance of recently acquired land paired with a politically frustrated population. When the Likud party, the center-right, traditionally hawkish party in Israeli politics, gained power in 1977 with Menachem Begin as Prime Minister, Gush Emunim found a political partner with similar goals. Likud was willing to

¹⁷¹ *ibid.*

¹⁷² Aran 277

¹⁷³ *ibid.*

settle the territories acquired in 1967, so they could provide Gush Emunim with more governmental support than they had enjoyed in the past.¹⁷⁴

Ideology of Gush Emunim

Gush Emunim's goal at its founding was to "recapture the spark of Zionism" by settling the territories. They sought to renew the Zionist fervor that came out of the Six Day War but had waned in light of the Yom Kippur War. The leaders and founders were students of Tzvi Yehuda, and Hoch writes "their actions show a clear attempt to realize his hope that the Jews' exercise of sovereignty over the Land of Israel would further their redemption."¹⁷⁵

The group is difficult to study, however, because it has published very little about itself and its ideology, and an even smaller portion has been translated into English. Since its founding, the Gush Emunim has published only one positional paper, in 1973, and even that was only circulated for a short time before it was shelved and put out of sight.¹⁷⁶ Much assessment of the group's ideology then, comes from extrapolations, based on the fact that most of its leaders came out of Merkaz Ha-Rav.¹⁷⁷ Similarly, they do not have formal membership criteria or regular meetings, so even the makeup of its members and supporters is difficult to determine.¹⁷⁸

Gush Emunim's officially stated purpose as written in its manifesto is as follows:

To create a great revival movement in the Jewish people in order to realize the full scope of the Zionist vision, based on the understanding that the source of the vision lies in the Jewish heritage and the roots of Judaism, and that its goal is the complete redemption of the Jewish people and the entire world.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴ Lustick 47

¹⁷⁵ Hoch 144

¹⁷⁶ Aran 290

¹⁷⁷ Sprinzak, Ehud. "The Iceberg Model of Political Extremism." *The Impact of Gush Emunim: Politics and Settlement in the West Bank*. By David Newman. New York: St. Martin's, 1985. 27-45. Print. 28

¹⁷⁸ Weisbug and Waring 183

¹⁷⁹ Taub 54-5

There are three key elements in this mission statement, which can be used to analyze Gush Emunim's ideology: realization of a "Zionist vision," connection to "Jewish heritage and the roots of Judaism," and the goal of "complete redemption" of both "the Jewish people" and the "entire world." Using these three elements of the Gush Emunim mission we can begin to extrapolate the group's belief system and the origins of each tenet of belief: Abraham or Tzvi Yehuda Kook.

This first element, "desire to realize the *full* scope of the Zionist vision," expresses Gush Emunim's belief that secular Zionism can only go so far on its own, without a religious element. Aran writes that for Gush Emunim, Judaism is a critical component of Zionism. There is no Zionism that is not Jewish and no Judaism that is not Zionist. The two must go hand-in-hand, or their goals will not be fulfilled.¹⁸⁰ This is because the secular Zionist goal, to create a state as a homeland for the Jewish people, does not go far enough. Lustick writes of the secular Zionist belief that the Jewish people are a normal people who have been demonized and marginalized wherever they are a minority. The creation of a Jewish state would "normalize" the Jewish population, because it would eliminate their status as a diaspora population and instead make them "*goy kekol hagoyim*, a nation like all other nations."¹⁸¹ The existence of their own nation would then allow them to live peacefully as minorities in other countries, just as a French minority is able to live peacefully in Spain, for example.¹⁸² Gush Emunim believes this to be flawed logic, which sells the Jewish people short. The Jewish nation is *not* just like all others, according to Gush Emunim. It is uniquely chosen, Lustick writes, as evidenced by the covenant

¹⁸⁰ Aran 296

¹⁸¹ Lustick 74

¹⁸² *ibid.* 74-5

God made with Moses on Sinai.¹⁸³ Because of its abnormality, the Jewish nation should not model itself after other nations, or attempt to normalize itself based on the constraints of western diplomacy. Rather, the uniqueness of the Jewish nation frees it from the same “laws and principles of national self-determination applicable to other nations.”¹⁸⁴ This is important because it provides Gush Emunim with the rationale for rejecting western diplomacy and legality for its own tactics, which include paramilitary activity and illegal settlement.¹⁸⁵

This aspect of Gush Emunim’s ideology comes more from Tzvi Yehuda, than his father. Both supported Zionism, but the elder Kook worked closely with secular Zionists, believing their movement to be productive actions to redeem the Jewish people, even if they themselves did not recognize it.¹⁸⁶ Tzvi Yehuda, on the other hand, grew frustrated with the secular Zionist willingness to succumb to diplomatic concessions. Although he taught his students to honor the secular government of Israel and work with them as much as possible, Hoch provides several examples of times when Tzvi Yehuda vocally opposed or physically disrupted government action that sought to surrender land for peace, which were discussed above.¹⁸⁷ His support of the illegal Shiloh settlement in 1978, similar support of an illegal settlement on Mt. Hawara near Nablus several months later, and his involvement in legal confrontation over the Elon Moreh settlement in 1979 are a number of such instances, which show Tzvi Yehuda and Gush Emunim’s disregard for what they perceived to be the unproductive activity of the secular government.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸³ *ibid.* 75

¹⁸⁴ *ibid.* 76

¹⁸⁵ Aran 267

¹⁸⁶ Lustick 31

¹⁸⁷ Hoch 150

¹⁸⁸ *ibid.* 150-156

Where Abraham does fit into this analysis is in the special nature of the Jewish people. Abraham believed the Jewish people to be different from other nations, and they should be proud of that distinction. In his essay “Road to Renewal,” Kook writes that the Jewish people are “different from other nations, differentiated and set apart by a distinctive historic existence that is unlike that of all other nations.”¹⁸⁹ The distinction comes from the “great tribulations” they have suffered, which Kook believed led to great “consolation” and “influence.”¹⁹⁰ Thus the rejection of the secular Zionist normalization argument traces to Abraham, but he tended to be much more willing to work with secular people and groups despite the Jewish “chosenness” than either Tzvi or Gush Emunim.

The second element of the mission statement worthy of consideration is adherence to Jewish history. Michael Feige describes the monumental importance of memory for Gush Emunim. Memory of the past is a key part of Jewish identity, nationalist movements in general, and revival movements as a whole, so the fact that Gush Emunim is a Jewish nationalist revival movement means memory is of the utmost importance to their ideology.¹⁹¹ Applying the importance of memory to Gush Emunim, it is especially important to the acquisition of land. Gush Emunim must be able to prove that land was originally theirs, that the territories of the Six Day War were liberated rather than occupied, and that the Land of Israel actually does historically extend as far as they claim it does. Thus the collective memory of the Jewish people is crucial to Gush Emunim’s success as a movement.

Gush Emunim are at the same time invested in the past and engrossed in the future. They glorify Jewish history, as conceptualized by secular Zionism, but use it as a tool to rally the

¹⁸⁹ Kook 289

¹⁹⁰ *ibid.* 290

¹⁹¹ Feige, Michael. *Settling in the Hearts: Jewish Fundamentalism in the Occupied Territories*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2009. Print. 40

Jewish around the idea of redemption, which is a future event.¹⁹² A major goal is to revitalize historic Zionism which they believe died out in the 1950s and 60s. In this way, Ehud Sprinzak writes, members of Gush Emunim see themselves as heirs to “old Yishuv” Zionism.¹⁹³

This theme of Jewish history was also influenced by Tzvi Yehuda, who feared that Israeli society has forgotten the places sacred to Jewish heritage. The most famous quote of his Nineteenth Psalm Speech, quoted above, expresses this concern, that Hebron, Schechem, Jericho, the Jordan Valley were being forgotten by the Jewish people.¹⁹⁴ These places had sentimental and historical significance to the Jewish past, and Tzvi Yehuda expressed outrage at the idea that they were not a part of Israel. These cities and their place in Jewish history could not be forgotten.

Finally, the mission statement expresses a goal of complete redemption of both the Jewish people and the whole world. Lustick writes that Gush Emunim sees its actions “as a means of advancing, or of preventing retreat, in what is seen as a cosmically-ordained process of redemption.”¹⁹⁵ According Gush Emunim, current events provides evidence that the redemption process is unfolding. Historical events and contemporary political trends are ways of God communicating with his people. The Holocaust, for example, was God’s way of punishing the Jewish people for their resistance to Zionism—by enabling their persecution, he forced them to leave the Diaspora and return to Israel. In this way, nothing happens by accident, but all is connected to God’s grand plan for the world and the Jewish people.¹⁹⁶ More importantly, everything is connected to redemption.

¹⁹² *ibid.* 46

¹⁹³ Sprinzak 31

¹⁹⁴ Kook, Tzvi Y. 299

¹⁹⁵ Lustick 4

¹⁹⁶ *ibid.* 86

As we have seen, there are different understandings of the concept of redemption, so it is important to understand Gush Emunim's interpretation of redemption as different from others. Gush Emunim, as a group, believes in the active, restorative model discussed above, in which humans have a role to play in the gradual process. Gush Emunim is eager to fulfill that prescribed role, and usher in this redemption they believe has already begun. As Aran describes it, "Gush Emunim views the world in the light of redemption. All pragmatic or moral considerations must be judged according to one messianic criterion: will the matter at hand delay or hasten the process of complete redemption?"¹⁹⁷ Because redemption is so closely linked with Jewish sovereignty, control over Judea and Samaria is the key to salvation, and settlement in the territories is of the utmost importance.¹⁹⁸ It is only with complete sovereignty over all of the historical land of Israel that the "complete" redemption of which the mission statement speaks will be actualized.

The heavy importance of land settlement is articulated in the Gush Emunim manifesto, quoted by Taub:

The illumination of the Jewish heritage firmly embedded in the foundation of the return to Zion imparts another, inestimably more profound dimension to the entire Zionist idea, embodying the meaning of our obligation toward the Land of Israel, through immigration and settlement, nurturing the message of Redemption that will shine steadily until the time is right.¹⁹⁹

Taub argues that the emphasis on "Land" rather than "State" of Israel is the crucial difference between religious settlers and secular Zionists. Redemption of the land rather than establishment

¹⁹⁷ Aran 292

¹⁹⁸ *ibid.*

¹⁹⁹ Taub 55

of the state was, and still remains, the central part of redemption for Gush Emunim.²⁰⁰ Again, “complete” redemption necessitates this redemption of the *whole* land.

Lustick speaks similarly about the cardinal importance of the Land of Israel for Gush Emunim. The Jewish return to the Land is an expression of their love for the Zion and not, as secular Zionists would argue, merely an attempt to escape persecution.²⁰¹ Gush Emunim believes this love to be well-founded and historically-grounded because it dates back to the covenant with God, “which includes the promised land as an integral part.”²⁰² Thus, giving up land is equivalent to “tearing of the flesh.”²⁰³

The source of Gush Emunim’s extreme devotion to the Land of Israel cannot be attributed solely to one Kook or the other, because both dedicated significant portions of their writing to the topic. Kook, the elder, attributes great spiritual importance to the land. The Jewish people desire to return to the Holy land, “to its essence, to its spirit and way of life.”²⁰⁴ He expressed in a letter to a friend Rabbi Pinhas Ha-Kohen in 1909 that the land is “the center of our life, whose majestic splendor we feel as we return to it, confident in our hopes for redemption and eternal deliverance increasingly stirring in us.”²⁰⁵ In a letter to the same rabbi one year earlier he writes of the importance of returning to the Holy Land and working intimately with it, supporting the agricultural settlements of labor Zionists.²⁰⁶ In a commentary on Kook’s approval of Zionism, Jewish historian Paul Fenton writes that Kook was “deeply convinced that the return to Zion marked the beginning of divine redemption” and he believed “that the Jew could only

²⁰⁰ *ibid.*

²⁰¹ Lustick 83

²⁰² *ibid.* 84

²⁰³ *ibid.* 85

²⁰⁴ Kook 126

²⁰⁵ *ibid.* 351

²⁰⁶ *ibid.* 337

attain full spiritual maturity in the Land of Israel.”²⁰⁷ However Kook does not ever claim exclusivity in settling the land—the emphasis on sovereignty that is crucial to Tzvi Yehuda’s ideology is not present in Kook’s writing on the land. He also does not give settlement the urgent, critical importance that his son does. Kook describes settlement as an ideal whereas his son describes it as a pressing necessity. For Tzvi Yehuda, settlement is a *mitzvah*, or commandment. In the “Nineteenth Psalm” speech he articulates this belief repeatedly, evoking the teachings of the Hatam Sofer, one of the most respected Orthodox Rabbis of the early 19th century: “And when the ‘Hatam Sofer’ in his holy words [says] that this working land, working [each] millimeter, [each] clod of earth...which establishes that this mitzvah is the equivalent of wearing *tefillin*, this is no mere figure of speech.”²⁰⁸ Elevating the settlement to the status of a commandment on the same level as wearing *tefillin*, leather boxes containing words of Torah which are commanded to be worn on the head and left arm during morning weekday prayers,²⁰⁹ gives it much more importance than Kook ever did.

This mitzvah extends further than just settlement though. It requires employing the land and building it into a nation:

And two of the great sages of the last generation, [the authors of] *The Stones of the Nazir* and *The Salvation of His Kingdom* establish this—that the mitzvah is to build the Land of Israel, settle the Land of Israel; building the Land of Israel which is to be done from the general principles, the building [is to be done] by the nation. The building of our government, our sovereignty, by our hands.²¹⁰

It is clear that for Tzvi, the Jewish people have a duty to occupy the Land of Israel but also cultivate it, build on it, and control it politically. This is precisely what Gush Emunim seeks to do.

²⁰⁷ Fenton 13-14

²⁰⁸ Kook, Tzvi Y. 314

²⁰⁹ Wylen 102

²¹⁰ Kook, Tzvi Y. 232

The difference between the two Kooks on their attitude towards the land comes from where each places it in his redemptive theology. Tzvi Yehuda makes control of the Land the central tenet of his redemptive philosophy, a critical step that must be fulfilled for redemption to occur. Abraham, on the other hand, views return to Israel as necessary and beneficial, especially for the individual Jew, but it is just one aspect of a larger redemptive process. The difference between the two is well-stated by Taub:

For the elder Rabbi Kook the settling of the land was not a commandment in the narrow sense, to be observed separately, but rather a part of the larger process in which the spiritual awakening of the Jewish people could not be reduced to any single imperative. The elevation of the commandment to settle the land to *the* supreme mitzvah, and a basis for a whole way of life, was, then, a theological innovation, part of a revolutionary redemptive theology conceived by the younger Rabbi Kook.²¹¹

While Abraham's love for the land likely influenced Tzvi Yehuda's view on the subject, it was Tzvi Yehuda's attitude of centrality of the land to redemption that Gush Emunim adopted.

Conclusion

Looking at the Gush Emunim's ideology as a whole, it is clear that while some traces of Abraham can be found, what really fuels the group's actions are the teachings and charismatic energy of Tzvi Yehuda. Where Gush Emunim does draw from Abraham—namely, belief in sanctity of land, approval of the mixing of Zionism with religion, and belief in the Jewish people as distinct from the rest of the world—Tzvi Yehuda also agrees. He certainly derived these ideas from his father, and continued to proclaim them in his own teachings. However the penitence, love, and spirituality that are so central to Abraham's teaching are not reflected at all in Gush Emunim's ideology. Abraham was the founder of Religious Zionism and Gush Emunim is a religious Zionist group, but their connection stems little further than that. Instead the

²¹¹ Taub 45

development of Gush Emunim's ideology came from Tzvi Yehuda's reinterpretation of Kook's teachings, based on political considerations and societal influence.

The most important subject of this reinterpretation was the ideology of redemption. Gush Emunim's actions indicate belief in the active, restorative model, to which Tzvi Yehuda ascribed, but with more emphasis on radical action than even Tzvi Yehuda preached. While Tzvi Yehuda was not physically involved in more than one settlement attempt, Gush Emunim took Tzvi Yehuda's political message seriously, constructing settlements all across the territories acquired in 1967 and involving themselves actively in Israeli politics. The evolution of this redemptive ideology from Abraham to Tzvi to Gush Emunim can be summarized as follows: Abraham's passive, patient redemption theology follows the kabbalistic model while Tzvi follows the active restorative model, and Gush Emunim embraces a more extreme version of the restorative model.

The legacy of Tzvi Yehuda continues to be debated, as evidenced by a recent feature in the Israeli news source *Ha'aretz*. In an article entitled "Rabbi Kook's Followers Are Still Debating His Legacy" from March 11th of this year, Chaim Levenson and Yair Ettinger analyze the discussion surrounding Tzvi Yehuda in the religious Zionist community today. Was Tzvi Yehuda overly disobedient or violent? Would he be proud of the state of the settlement movement today? What can we learn from his involvement in settlement activity that took place during his lifetime? The article indicates that the quest to understand Tzvi Yehuda's ideology remains active thirty years after his death, showing the continuing relevance of this historical figure. Levenson and Ettinger conclude with the interesting point that, "Though the elder Rabbi Kook was more scrupulously ultra-Orthodox than his son, religious Zionist youth nowadays who seek inspiration, and a vision that unites various streams in the national-religious camp, turn to

Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook rather than his son.”²¹² If this is an accurate statement, it provides further evidence for a connection between Abraham, Tzvi Yehuda, and religious Zionists, like Gush Emunim. That students are shifting their attention from Tzvi Yehuda towards Abraham shows where the progression of ideology that this paper has explored stands today. Students are expressing increased interest in the “universal and mystical” ideas of Abraham’s teachings, away from the active interventionist message of his son.²¹³ With each new generation of religious Zionists, these ideological issues continue to evolve. Decades after the deaths of both Kooks, their ideas remain the subject of discussion, now in the context of Israeli political issues. These modern followers of the Kooks are the leaders of today’s settlement movement, so they play a significant role in Israeli politics, but their motivation is primarily religious in nature. They work to ultimately bring about redemption. Therefore, it is essential to fully understand the religious significance in addition to the political motivation of the settlement movement, in its full capacity.

Bibliography

²¹² Levenson, Chaim, and Yair Ettinger. "Rabbi Kook's Followers Are Still Debating His Legacy." *Ha'aretz* [Tel Aviv] 11 Mar. 2012. Web. 15 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/features/rabbi-kook-s-followers-are-still-debating-his-legacy-1.417753>>.

²¹³ *ibid.*

- Aran, Gideon. "Jewish Zionist Fundamentalism: The Block of the Faithful in Israel." *Fundamentalisms Observed*. Ed. Martin E. Marty and R. Scott Appleby. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1991. Print.
- Bosker, Ben Z. Introduction. *Abraham Isaac Kook: The Lights of Penitence, the Moral Principles, Lights of Holiness, Essays, Letters, and Poems*. New York: Paulist, 1978. 1-21. Print.
- Eisen, Robert. *The Peace and Violence of Judaism" From the Bible to Modern Zionism*. New York" Oxford UP, 2011 Print.
- Englander, Lawrence A. "On Repentance." *Essays on the Thought and Philosophy of Rabbi Kook*. New York: Herzl, 1991. 121-33. Print.
- Feige, Michael. *Settling in the Hearts: Jewish Fundamentalism in the Occupied Territories*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2009. Print.
- Fenton, Paul B. "Rav Kook and the Return to Zion." *Thinkers and Teachers of Modern Judaism*. New York: Paragon House, 1994. 7-16. Print.
- Friedman, Lara. "As the Illegal Outpost of Migron Goes, So Goes All of Israel." *The Huffington Post*. 14 Feb. 2012. Web. 18 Mar. 2012.
<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/lara-friedman/israeli-settlements-migron_b_1273726.html>.
- Heller, Aron. "Israel Settlements: Netanyahu Defends Construction In East Jerusalem." *The Huffington Post*. 11 Feb. 2011. Web. 25 Mar. 2012.
<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/11/02/israel-settlements_n_1071013.html>.
- Hoch, Richard Lawrence. *The Politics of Redemption: Rabbi Tzvi Yehudah Ha-Kohen Kook and the Origins of Gush Emunim*. 1994. Print.

"Israel PM Benjamin Netanyahu Defiant on 1967 Borders." *BBC News*. 24 May 2011. Web. 25 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-13515226>>.

Kaplan, Lawrence, and David Shatz. *Rabbi Abraham Isaac Kook and Jewish Spirituality*. New York: New York UP, 1995. Print.

Kook, Abraham Isaac. *Abraham Isaac Kook: The Lights of Penitence, the Moral Principles, Lights of Holiness, Essays, Letters, and Poems*. Trans. Ben Zion Bokser. New York: Paulist, 1978.

Kook, Tzvi Y. "The 19th Psalm for the State of Israel." Speech. Independence Day. Jerusalem. 14 May 1967. *The Politics of Redemption: Rabbi Tzvi Yehudah Ha-Kohen Kook and the Origins of Gush Emunim*. 296-334. Print.

Kershner, Isabel. "Israeli Officials Denounce U.N. Rights Council Bid to Study Effects of Settlements." *New York Times*. 23 Mar. 2012. Web. 25 Mar. 2012. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/24/world/middleeast/israeli-officials-denounce-move-by-united-nations-human-rights-council-to-investigate-settlements-affect-on-palestinian-rights.html>.

Klein, Joe. "What About the Settlements?" *TIME*. 3 Apr. 2012. Web. 3 Apr. 2012. <http://swampland.time.com/2012/04/03/what-about-the-settlements/>.

Levenson, Chaim, and Yair Ettinger. "Rabbi Kook's Followers Are Still Debating His Legacy." *Ha'aretz* [Tel Aviv] 11 Mar. 2012. Web. 15 Mar. 2012. <<http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/features/rabbi-kook-s-followers-are-still-debating-his-legacy-1.417753>>.

Lustick, Ian. *For the Land and the Lord: Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*. New York, NY: Council on Foreign Relations, 1988. Print.

- Ravitzky, Aviezer. *Messianism, Zionism, and Jewish Religious Radicalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996. Print.
- Rubinstein, Alvin Z., and Alan Dowty. *The Arab-Israeli Conflict: Perspectives*. New York: Praeger, 1984. Print
- Segal, Eliezer. *Introducing Judaism*. London [u.a.: Routledge, 2009. Print.
- Scholem, Gershom G. *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*. New York: Schocken, 1971. Print.
- Scobbie, Iain December. "International Law Is Clear: Israeli Settlements Are Illegal." *Los Angeles Times*. 16 Dec. 2009. Web. 18 Mar. 2012.
<<http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinionla/la-oew-scobbie172009dec17,0,2895217.story>>.
- Sherwin, Byron L. *Kabbalah: An Introduction to Jewish Mysticism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006. Print.
- Sprinzak, Ehud. "The Iceberg Model of Political Extremism." *The Impact of Gush Emunim: Politics and Settlement in the West Bank*. By David Newman. New York: St. Martin's, 1985. 27-45.
- Taub, Gadi. *The Settlers: And the Struggle over the Meaning of Zionism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2010. Print.
- Translation of the *Amidah*, Chabad "Translation of the Weekday Amidah." *Chabad*. Web. 06 Apr. 2012. <http://www.chabad.org/library/article_cdo/aid/867674/jewish/Translation.htm>.
- Weisburd, David, and Elin Waring. "Settlement Motivations in the Gush Emunim Movement: Comparing Bonds of Altruism and Self Interest." *The Impact of Gush*

Emunim: Politics and Settlement in the West Bank. By David Newman. New York: St. Martin's, 1985. 183-99. Print.

Wyllen, Stephen M. *Settings of Silver: An Introduction to Judaism*. New York: Paulist, 2000. Print.