

Party, too, demanded his immediate return. His wife, Luba, and their five-year-old daughter (now in Palestine) at first pleaded with Borochov not to return to Russia. His wife was again an expectant mother, but even this did not influence Borochov's course. "I am a soldier—I must answer the call!" was his reply.

On his way to Russia, Borochov stopped in Stockholm and helped to prepare the memorandum containing the Poale Zion demands before the Holland-Scandinavian Socialist Conference, to which he was also a delegate. From there he proceeded to Russia to attend the Third All-Russian Poale Zion Convention.

S. Har, who met Borochov in Petrograd and accompanied him to Kiev, relates that among other things Borochov announced his plans to issue a revised edition of "Our Platform" to take account of present Jewish and Palestinian realities. (His speeches at the Conference and the impressions will be found on pp. 124-132.)

The Party selected him as one of its delegates to the Conference of Nationalities, and there he delivered two addresses: "The Federation of Nationalities in the New Russia" and "The Language Problem". His proficiency in the problem of nationalism resulted in his selection as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention of the Russian Republic. In the course of the Party's preparation for these responsible tasks, Borochov travelled day and night as its emissary. On one of those trips he caught a cold which later developed into an inflammation of the lungs; and after a brief illness he died in Kiev on December 17, 1917 (second of Tebet)—at the age of 36.

INTRODUCTION

THE THEORIES OF BER BOROCHOV AND THEIR PLACE IN THE HISTORY OF THE JEWISH LABOR MOVEMENT

by ABRAHAM G. DUKER

TODAY SOCIALISTS and communists have come to the realization that Jewish group survival may be feasible, desirable, or justifiable even from their respective points of view. The example of the Soviet Union setting up a separate territory for Jewish settlement in Biro-Bidjan, whether it be merely a means of defending the Soviet Far-East from a Japanese invasion or an *Ahad Ha'amist* attempt to establish a cultural center for Yiddish speaking Jewry, is an open recognition of the right of the Jews to survival as a national group. The recent admission of the "cosmopolite" anti-nationalist Leon Trotsky that the Jewish problem must be solved through territorial concentration follows the same principle, although he would postpone this task until the world revolution had taken place. The socialist schools of the Second International recognized this right during and immediately after the World War. Their leadership is very sympathetic and active on behalf of the idea of Labor Palestine. The smaller revolutionary socialist groups as well as some of the communist Trotskyite groups of all varieties have recognized this principle. Even the most extreme among them are not averse to the admission on an equal basis of the representatives of the Zionist revolutionary parties, like the *Hashomer Hatzair* and the *Left Poale Zion*, to their conferences and deliberations. One cannot say that all socialists and communists are favorably inclined to the idea of Jewish survival, which to a socialist must imply territorial concentra-

tion of the Jews in a given locality. There are still many who cling to the idea of the assimilation of the Jewish masses, even under the present order. Assimilation and the resulting indifference to the plight of the Jewish masses are especially very popular among the adherents of various left-wing ideologies who happen to be of Jewish descent. Most of it can be explained on the basis of the inferiority complexes of minorities and *Juedisches Selbsthass* (self-hate). There is no doubt, however, that the hostility of the socialists and communists to Jewish group survival has lessened considerably. The upbuilding of a strong Jewish labor movement in Palestine, the national policy of the Soviet Union, and especially the example of Nazi Germany and Poland, have been the prime factors in exposing the impracticability of assimilation under capitalism and, to a lesser degree, its undesirability under socialism. Differences of opinion exist concerning the place, the time, and the method for territorial settlement. Some would have it only in Palestine; others would have it in any other place but Palestine. Some advocate its immediate realization; others would postpone it until after the social revolution or limit it to Biro-Bidjan. Many insist on the Yiddish language as the only distinguishing trait of the Jewish proletarian nation of the future. Others advocate Hebrew and a set of certain religio-national cultural traditions. It can be said with certainty, however, that no socialist or communist will today deny the right of the Jewish proletariat to national self-determination at some time and under certain circumstances. Even the Jewish official communists will grant it, if "they, the Jewish masses, express their desire for it".

This increasingly realistic approach to the Jewish problem is in direct opposition to the opinions of the founders and leading lights of the pre-war socialism of all schools. Karl Marx never repudiated his youthful views on the Jewish religion which he expressed so vehemently in his dispute with the Hegelian Bruno Bauer. To him "the basis for the Jewish religion was practical need"; "the worldly ground of the Jews" was "practical need, avarice". "What is their worldly God? Money." "Money is the jealous God of Israel above whom there cannot be any other God." Judaism and the Jewish caste which confesses it would disappear

with the disappearance of the capitalistic order. The definition by Marx of the Jews as a caste was based on complete ignorance of both the history and economic circumstances of the Jewish people in his own times, even in the then relatively industrialized Germany. His opinions of Judaism are too strikingly parallel to those expressed by Feuerbach to admit their originality. Besides, these opinions were the common stock of the "enlightened" world of his day. To Marx goes the credit of approaching the Jewish problem from an economic point of view rather than from the theological-moralistic one which was so prevalent in his day. One cannot say that Marx was an anti-Semite. Yet there is no doubt that in spite of the fact that "it has often been said that Marx both embodied and intensified the dialectical powers of the Jewish spirit", the founder of socialism was emotionally blocked on the Jewish problem. His later utterances about it are too few and far-between to indicate definitely his process of reasoning, but most of them are unkind and hostile. His silence in the face of the beginnings of the socialist movement among the Jews in the 1870's, the series of Russian pogroms in 1881, and the subsequent mass migrations cannot be explained in any other way.

This attitude of Marx gave the socialist thinkers the easiest way out—to ignore or to minimize the Jewish problem. It gave Jewish-born socialists a good excuse for assimilating and for neglecting the interests of their brethren in the Ghetto. Moses Hess, the "communist Rabbi", was an object of contempt in socialist circles when he published his *Rome and Jerusalem* in 1862. This is not the place to trace in detail the influence of Marx on the attitudes of the leading pre-war socialists to the Jewish problem. A few illustrations will suffice. Franz Mehring referred to Marx's study about the Jews with: "These few pages are of greater value than the huge pile of literature on the Jewish problem which appeared since that time." Kautsky maintained even later that the Jews were a caste and not a nation in the Middle Ages and that they still constituted one in Eastern Europe. Lenin, who relied largely upon Kautsky and Bauer as experts on the Jewish problem, still maintained in 1913 that the "Jews in the civilized world are not a nation; they have become most assimilated . . . The Jews in

Galicia and Russia are not a nation; they unfortunately . . . are still a *caste*." He said continually that the solution of the Jewish problem in Russia should take the same course which it followed in Western Europe, namely, "a doubtless progress of their assimilation with the surrounding population". "The Jewish question," he stated in 1903, "stands now as follows: assimilation or isolation? And the idea of a Jewish 'nationality' has a definitely reactionary character, not only among its consequential followers (the Zionists), but also among those who attempt to combine it with the ideas of Social-Democracy (the *Bundists*) . . . The idea of a Jewish nationality is a denial of the interests of the Jewish proletariat, introducing within it directly or indirectly a feeling which is hostile to assimilation, a Ghetto feeling." He quoted with enthusiastic approval Kautsky's idea that the complete assimilation of minorities "is the only possible solution to the Jewish problem, and we have to support everything which will aid to remove Jewish isolation". For this reason Lenin was opposed even to Yiddish schools for Jewish children in Russia. Stalin too followed the policies of Marx and Lenin in his pre-war treatment of the Jewish problem. Brachman, an outstanding Soviet scholar in the field, agreed as late as 1936 with Marx that "the special caste situation of the Jews" was "*taken from life*". The presentation of the Jews as the "nationality of the merchant and money man was not an invention of the Jew haters."

It is not within the space of this essay to trace the evolution of the change of opinion of socialist leadership today. In Russia, it took place because of the realization after the Bolshevik revolution that the Jews could be converted to communism only through the medium of the Yiddish language, and that unless some recognition of national rights be given to the Jews in the Soviet Union, Zionism would constitute a permanent menace to the spread of the communistic ideology among them. The declassment and poverty of the majority of the Jewish masses in Russia, which took on a very sharp form during the period of Military Communism and a somewhat milder form during the NEP (New Economic Policy) period, also were important factors, since the proposed land settlement of Russian Jewry could not take place on an individual basis.

The introduction of the "national policy" by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union gave the stamp of approval to the idea of solving the problem of Jewish unemployment through concentrated territorial settlement, and gave rise to a series of plans in this direction. The most important among these are the now forgotten "Jewish Republic" in Crimea which was widely publicized as the solution of the Jewish problem in its own times and the more recent establishment of the autonomous region in Biro-Bidjan.

Among the socialists in Western Europe, it can be said, the recognition of the special interest of the Jews as a national group and of their right to survive was brought about almost entirely through the efforts of the Socialist Zionist movements, especially the Poale Zion Party, during and after the World War.

The earliest attempts to conduct socialist propoganda among Jews were mainly of the assimilationist cosmopolitan variety. The earliest Jewish socialist circle, which was organized in the Government Rabbinical Seminary at Vilna about 1875, had as its only purpose "to mingle with the people". Its founders, except Lieberman, were not interested in propoganda among the Jews. In 1880, a group of Jewish socialists in Switzerland, who intended to conduct socialist propoganda in the Yiddish, stressed the fact that they were not interested in any Jewish questions, their only purpose being "to preach the ideas of social revolution among the Jewish masses. In order to do this successfully, the masses must be approached in the language which they understand". The first Yiddish socialist newspaper, *Die Arbeiter Zeitung* (1881), had no specific Jewish aims. The early Hebrew and Yiddish publications of Morris Vintchevsky, who continued Lieberman's work in London in the 1880's, were typically cosmopolitan. He even raised a doubt as to the possibility of the continued existence of the Jewish people. The *Narodnik* movement counted many Jews among its members and teachers.

The pogroms of 1881 came as a rude shock to all the Jewish intelligentsia of Russia. The revolutionaries particularly were faced by the recognition of the pogroms on the part of their

Russian contemporaries as a progressive revolutionary tendency. In 1881, the executive committee of the *Narodnaya Volya* issued a proclamation calling upon the Ukrainian peasants to continue their pogrom activities because the Jews were guilty of all their sufferings. In 1882 this proclamation was further popularized. The official organ of the movement stated that "we have no right to be negative or even indifferent to a pure folk movement", and that it was impossible to avoid the fact that the revolution would begin with the beating up of the Jews. The attitude of the leaders of this movement changed later, but the bitter taste remained in the mouths of many of the Jewish revolutionaries.

These reactions of the Jewish revolutionaries were varied. Some abandoned their socialism and became Jewish nationalists. Others justified the interpretations of the role of pogroms. Some remained indifferent and even for years after continued to maintain that "there were no Jewish people, no Jewish language, and no Jewish workers". Some awakened to the realization that socialists ought to pay some attention to the Jewish problem. P. B. Axelrod, for instance, in his brochure, *About the Tasks of the Jewish Socialist Intelligentsia*, criticized them for their neglect of the Jewish masses. He pointed out the mistake of ignoring the fact that "the Jews as a nation occupy in Russia an exceptional position" and that the population of the country was far from having the cosmopolitan views of international solidarity among the poorer classes. He speculated about directing the pogroms "if not against all the centers of exploitation", at least exclusively against the wealthy Jewish classes. He seriously thought of Palestine as a place of immigration for Russian Jewry. The opinion of a noted geographer that Palestine was not fit for mass settlement dissuaded him from further action in this direction. Most characteristic was the attitude of complete bewilderment such as was expressed by Leo Deutch, a leading revolutionary, in a letter to P. Lavrov. "It is impossible for a revolutionary to solve the Jewish problem in a practical way. What can be done by revolutionaries in places where the Jews are attacked? To defend them would mean to arouse the hostility of the peasants against the revolutionaries. It is bad enough that they killed the Czar; yet in addition they are

defending the *Zhids*. The revolutionaries are faced with two contradictions. It is simply a situation without an escape, both for the Jews and for the revolutionaries . . . Do not think that I was not embittered and faced by a dilemma. Nevertheless I shall always remain a member of the Russian Revolutionary Party and will not leave it even for one day, because this contradiction, the same as many others, was not created by the Party."

At the time when cosmopolitan socialism made its beginnings among the Jews in Russia, there arose a national tendency as well. Aaron Lieberman, who organized the first "Society of Hebrew Socialists" (London, 1876), never speculated about definitions of Jewry. He took its national existence for granted, at least on a cultural basis. He always referred to the Jews as a nation. He was too much a product of his own generation of cosmopolitan socialists to become an adherent of the nebulous Zionism of his period. He was, however, a lover of the Hebrew language, and his last public appearance in New York was at a meeting of a Hebrew speaking society. He insisted on the observance of the Ninth of Ab as a national holiday and looked upon his earlier propaganda work in Russia "not only as a means of gaining recruits for the Russian revolutionary army, but also as a means of heightening the national consciousness of the Jews". But his influence among the contemporary Jewish socialists was nil.

The next effort at the introduction of specific Jewish issues into the revolutionary movement came strangely enough from the Ukrainian, M. Dragomanov, who in his theory of the free union of peoples (promulgated in the early 1880's) promised autonomy to the Jewish cities. His follower, the Jewish revolutionary, Rodin, issued a proclamation calling on Jews to join the revolutionary movement and to demand cultural autonomy with Yiddish as their language.

The most significant effort of this early period to bring the Jewish needs to the attention of active socialists was made by Chaim Zhitlovsky, who was one of the founders and leading spirits of the Socialist Revolutionary Party. Beginning with the publication of an essay in 1887, which dealt with the Essenes from

an economic point of view, this thinker developed his interpretation of Jewish life and socialism which so greatly influenced the Jewish labor movement at a much later stage. Zhitlovsky maintained that "scientific" Marxism was not a scientific system, but merely a metaphysical theory. He denied the need and utility of the theory of economic materialism for the socialist movement. His approach to socialism was of the agrarian ethical variety. From this point of view he denied the "iron laws" of Marxism about the disappearance of the Jewish people. He maintained that the Jewish people had always fought for its national existence and that religion was merely a means for this struggle. He saw the need for a Jewish progressive renaissance, the aim of which he visualized in the establishment of a secular, Yiddish speaking, mainly agricultural, group life. The main obstacle in the way was assimilation, which to him was at the same time the main cause of anti-Semitism. Under capitalistic Russia, the Jewish bourgeoisie was bound to increase in number and to become Russianized. The Jews thus would be identified by the masses with reaction. Assimilationist socialism took away the best elements of the Jewish nation and forced them to work for their ideals among the non-Jews, whereas they could have done this same work among their own people. The return of the Jewish intelligentsia to Jewish nationalism would, in his opinion, revive agriculture and the Yiddish language among the Jews, and would eliminate the artificial religious factor in their survival. The best way of fitting this scheme into the frame of the Galut was the orientation of the *Narodnik* movement, which was based on agricultural Russia, and later of the Socialist Revolutionary movement which had the most liberal nationality policy. Zhitlovsky's earlier efforts at organization and propaganda failed to bring any direct results within the Jewish labor movement. He is known better for his later contributions.

The early workers' mutual aid societies and study circles among the Jews in Russia and Poland, which later developed into trade unions and gave rise to the *Bund*, also began without any specific Jewish aim. When at their beginnings in the 1880's they were very small, they served as educational and Russianizing agencies.

Later, the increase in the number of members and the maturity of the leadership caused them to utilize the Yiddish language in their propaganda, which remained of the purely *Narodnik* or Social-Democratic variety. At the earliest celebration of May First by the Jewish workers in Russia, held in Vilna in 1892, one of the speakers discussed the question as to whether the Jewish workers ought to join the socialist movement or follow those who advise the Jews to go to Palestine and to settle there the Jewish and social problems. He condemned the idea of the existence of a "separate Jewish nationality" and called upon the Jewish workers to join the "great world-embracing fighting party of workers" which would achieve "true freedom, brotherhood, and happiness for all mankind without the exclusion of the Jews." This attack on the *Chovevei Zion* movement shows that the workers refused to swallow easily the cosmopolitan theories of their *intelligentsia* leadership. In 1895, A. Martov, later an outstanding Social-Democrat and Menshevik, called in his May First speech for the creation of "a special Jewish workers organization which would be the leader and educator of the Jewish proletariat in its struggle for economic, civil, and political liberation." It would, of course, join the other parties in the struggle. His main reason was his fear that the Russian or Polish working classes might in their difficult struggle yield on certain issues "which concern us Jews in particular, such as, for instance, freedom of religion and equality for the Jews." He also thought that "as long as the present order exists every nation ought to strive, if not for political independence, at least for fully equal rights." "National indifference of one nation to another which is robbed of general civil rights is the greatest obstacle to the development of the oppressed nation." It was the duty of the Socialist Party to awaken it in order that it might liberate itself from civil inequality. Since his ideas were frowned upon by the leadership and members of the Jewish groups, he recanted very soon after.

What individual theorists and propagandists failed to achieve was accomplished by a mass movement. The *Bund* (General Jewish Workers' Alliance) was organized in September, 1897 (the same year in which Theodore Herzl convoked the First Zionist

Congress in Basle, Switzerland) as a culmination of tendencies and discussions about the necessity of the establishment of a Jewish workers' movement within the various propaganda circles and elementary trade unions which conducted their activities among the Jewish artisans and proletarians in Russia. The *Bund* began as an economic organization, and its progress in the direction of a consistent ideology was slow and hesitant. It refused to face the Jewish problem as one international in its scope. It maintained that the Jews having lost the characteristics of a nation could never regain them. At best Jewry can be called a composite of different groups without any strong link of unity. The *Bund* considered itself merely a local Russian party for Jewish worker. Its early leaders were completely neutral to assimilation, linguistic or otherwise. In their minds, assimilation was neither desirable nor undesirable. History alone would determine its future. The difference between the *Bund* and the Russian Social-Democratic movement of that period was the fact that the *Bund* conducted its propaganda in Yiddish among Jewish workers. It maintained its cosmopolitan outlook for some time; but very soon, mainly under the pressure of Zionism and of the initial momentum inherent in its Jewish membership, it began to concern itself more and more with Jewish issues. These tendencies culminated with cultural work in Yiddish and a modest demand for national cultural autonomy for the Jews in Russia, after the Austrian theoreticians had made such demands *kosher* from a socialist point of view. The militancy of the *Bund* and its political action in the early stages of its development fill a glorious chapter in the history of the Jewish labor movement. But it certainly failed to furnish a solution for those desiring a socialist road to Jewish survival.

The attempts to arrive at a synthesis of Zionism and socialism began contemporaneously with political Zionism. Some intellectuals discussed this problem at the First Zionist Congress at Basle in 1897. Individual socialists of prominence (as for instance, Bernard Lazare, Farbstein) were active Zionists since the beginning of the movement. The first man to make a serious attempt at this

task was Nachman Syrkin. His propaganda began with the publication of a series of essays (1898), and culminated in 1904 with his organization of the first Socialist Zionist group, *Heirut*, in Berlin. Syrkin's ideology was non-Marxian. He believed that the abnormal economic situation of the Jewish masses in the Galut, which is expressed in their frequent migrations, leads them directly to Zionism. The solution of their problem can take place only in a free Jewish land of labor and socialism. Attempts at productivization in the Galut can be successful only temporarily, because as soon as conditions improve a return to middle class occupations takes place. Because of the interests of the upper and middle classes in maintaining their economic positions in the Galut, assimilation is their expression. But the Zionism of the proletariat, in which he also included the petty employers as well as all the working people, has little in common with the various bourgeois varieties, such as the modest colonization plans of the *Chibat Zion*, the *Maskilim's* longings for a cultural center, or the West European Jews' philanthropic approach of saving their poorer brethren. Yet, he believed in working in common with the bourgeois Zionists. The task of the proletarian Zionists was to organize the Jewish masses, to fight against the Jewish moneyed and assimilated bourgeoisie in order to force it to aid the upbuilding of the national home. The achievement of Zionism was one area in the activities of the movement, and must proceed independently of the work in the second area, namely, that of political socialism in the Galut. Syrkin's "double area" theory of socialist activities did not become very popular because of the lack of coordination between the work for socialism in the Galut and the Zionist work for Palestine. Yet, his ideology has been a factor in the later development of the non-Marxian groups in the Labor Zionist movement.

At the time when Syrkin was conducting his propaganda in Berlin, there arose (since 1900) different Socialist Zionist groups in Russia under the name "Poale Zion" ("Workers of Zion"). They were scattered in different cities without any organizational unity. At first, their only distinction from the General Zionists was their working class membership. They denied the connection between

the Jewish proletariat and the socialist and revolutionary movement. Their denial was based on the interpretation that the revolution could not solve the problem of Jewish poverty which sprang from the Galut. Later they maintained that a struggle for socialism in the Galut was impossible because there was no Jewish ruling class and no healthy Jewish proletariat. They did, however, concern themselves with economic issues and conducted trade union work. The ideological leaders of this trend were the Minsk groups.

A different development took place in Southern Russia. There, under the leadership of Borochoy, the groups which were also organized under the name of "Poale Zion" based their ideology on a unity between Social-Democracy and Zionism. In those days which Syrkin so aptly termed "the period of theoretical chaos", the different ideologies of the several Socialist Zionist, or rather, Socialist Territorialist groups were slowly and laboriously evolved through a great deal of discussion, pamphleteering, and the appearance of the early press of the movement.

A breaking point in the evolution of the ideologies was caused by the offer on the part of England, presented at the Sixth Zionist Congress at Basle in 1903, to create in Uganda a Jewish national home. This offer was rejected because of the strenuous objections of the Russian Zionists. The Zionist movement split into two warring groups, the pro-Palestinians and the anti-Palestinians. This dispute finally led to the establishment of the "Jewish Territorialist Organization" (ITO) under the leadership of Israel Zangwill.

The same issue came to a head among the various labor groups in Zionism. The enticing offer of Uganda appealed to those who looked for an immediate realistic solution in terms of mass emigration. The possibilities of Palestine as a land capable of absorbing the Jewish masses within a reasonable time seemed to be remote and visionary. Thus the movement was immediately divided into two trends, namely of Palestinism and territorialism. The Minsk groups were territorialist. The Southern Russian group retained their Palestinian sympathies. Out of this chaos of discussions and orientations there arose several distinct movements,

all of them orientated on some combination of socialism and Zionism and on the impossibility of solving the Jewish problem without a territory. They were divided on the questions of Palestine, Galut activities, and the theory of non-proletarianization.

The theories of non-proletarianization or limited proletarianization were accepted by all the early Socialist-Zionist and Socialist-Territorialist groups. The proponents of the first theory believed together with all the Russian Social-Democrats of this period that the development of capitalism was constantly increasing the ranks of the proletariat at the expense of the petty bourgeoisie. This in turn would bring about the realization of socialism in the classical revolutionary manner. It was impossible, however, for the Jewish declassed bourgeoisie to become proletarians, because of the competition of their non-Jewish fellow workers and national oppression. Declassment or emigration must be the lot of the Jewish masses. Emigration could be but a temporary relief, for the same process of declassment was bound to be repeated eventually in the new lands. The only way out was the territorial solution. The theory of abnormal proletarianization is different only in degree from the non-proletarianization. It grants that the Jewish petty bourgeoisie is becoming proletarianized, but not to the same degree as the non-Jewish bourgeoisie, because the major basic industries are closed to Jewish workers with the usual resulting evils. Territorialism was to prevent this and allow the Jewish proletariat to develop in a normal manner.

The S. S. (Russian initials for Zionist Socialist) Party, organized after the rejection of the Uganda offer, soon became the strongest group within proletarian territorialism. They, too, arrived at their ideology from a Marxian approach. They maintained that the realization of socialism can be accomplished only through the existence of a highly advanced stage of production and a culturally developed rising proletariat, fully confident of its role in the conduct of the class struggle. The historical mission of overthrowing the capitalistic system would be achieved only by the

industrial proletariat. They believed in the theory of non-proletarianization in its pristine purity. The Jewish masses, they taught, cannot be proletarianized or industrialized. Their class struggle is a helpless, negative one. It results are nil. The revolutionary tendencies of the Jewish proletariat are not due to its place in the scheme of production but to ideological motives and particular tendencies to abstraction. The results of the steadily and irrevocably increasing impoverishment of the Jewish masses are seen in emigration, which is a historical necessity and as inevitable a tendency and a positive factor as the role of the basic industries among the non-Jews. Emigration leads to the concentration of the masses in certain territories where the tendency to enter basic industries cannot be satisfied because of the ever repeated conditions of national oppression. Therefore, the emigration movement has to be converted into one of colonization. The basic tendencies in emigration must eventually lead both to class consciousness and to the attempt to settle the Jewish masses in a free territory, where the class struggle will be given a normal expression. Thus territorialism is complementary to the class struggle. The actual realization of territorialism is a long process which will enable the Jewish proletariat to improve its class position through organization and will power. Territorialism cannot be achieved by the proletariat alone. It will be aided in its tasks by the masses and some layers of the middle classes in different countries. The task of the proletariat is to strengthen the territorialist ideology, to struggle for democracy within the Jewish community, to introduce proletarian elements into the process of colonization and socialist ideology into all cultural and educational institutions. The S. S. adopted the name Zionist Socialists and not Social-Democratic Territorialists and continued to participate in the Zionist Congress for a short period because of two very practical reasons. By retaining the name "Zionists" and being counted as such they hoped to gain more adherents. By calling themselves Socialists and not Social-Democrats they hoped to gain the adherence to their movement of an outstanding group of intellectuals which was then in the process of formulating the ideology of a new movement, the *Vozrozhdenye*.

The ideology of the *Vozrozhdenye* (Renaissance) group resembled greatly that of Chaim Zhitlovsky. Its leaders criticized both the indifferent attitude of the Jewish socialists to the fate of the Jewish nation and the one-sidedness of the Zionists who in their hope for the future ignored the needs of the present and the possibilities of the Galut. The *Vozrozhdenye* group believed in the need of the Jewish people for its own national home as a main condition "for the full development of the national potentialities and the completely normal existence of a nation". It had no objection to Palestine as a national home. It would, however—confident in the inevitability of the realization of this idea—"affix our national thought, our national aims, our national forces on one central idea, the idea of the national renaissance", thus leaving the realization of their territorial aspirations in the realm of theorizing. It also denied the theory of non-proletarianization.

Its concern with the Galut later led this group far astray from its original position. Its offspring, the *Seimist* Party (Jewish Socialist Workers Party, *Serp*), abandoned the Marxian interpretation for one similar to that of the Socialist Revolutionaries. The ultimate reason for all historical development was according to its theoreticians the perpetual striving for limitless self-development. They placed the main emphasis on the national aspect of life through which all other aspects find their expression and are reflected. National consciousness thus is the reason for the historical progress and development of both the individual and the national group. The national consciousness of a ruling nation shows very often tendencies of chauvinism and exploitation of other peoples. That of a subject nation is a progressive one. To them, the proletariat was classified according to its nationality. The achievement of socialism in their opinion implied component and separately conducted struggles for economic liberty and for political and cultural salvation.

The *Seimists* also evolved a concept of exclusive Galut work. Territorialism according to them would be a logical result of Galut activities, just as socialism was to develop out of capitalism. It could grow out only of healthy Galut conditions. The salvation for the subdued nationalities would be the change of all multi-

ple nationality states into federations of free nations to be ruled by a parliament composed of the representatives of the different component nationalities. Each nationality would have its own parliament (*Sejm* is the Polish term for Parliament) with the rights of legislation and taxation. The task of the Jewish proletariat would be to force within the Jewish parliament the representatives of the bourgeoisie to follow a policy suitable to the interests of the masses. It would be aided in this struggle by the intelligentsia and by the progressive elements of the bourgeoisie. Thus it would achieve the twofold aim of normalizing Jewish life in the Galut and of obtaining eventually a territorial center. Very soon the *Seimists* followed the logical conclusion of their policy that "the better conditions are in the Galut, the easier it will be to build the national home". They devoted their activities completely to the class struggle, Yiddish, cultural work, and to the strengthening of the *Kehillah*, which they would rebuild into a secular institution, a preliminary step in the attainment of the parliament.

Competition between these different schools of territorialist thought was quite sharp. In the beginning the S. S. was the most energetic in its activities and successful in gaining the most adherents. Very soon it became the strongest competitor to the *Bund*. It was strengthened in 1907 by the adherents of the Minsk Poale Zion, which for a while was organized under the name, Jewish Territorialists Workers Party. The S. S., called Socialist Territorialists in the United States, outnumbered the other two territorialist groups in this country, the Anarchist Territorialists and the *Seimist* Social Revolutionary Territorialists. They were also quite strong in Austria and in other centers of Jewish life in Europe. The *Seimists*, on the other hand, remained a small but vocal and influential party of intellectuals. Very soon they all lost their positions to the Poale Zion, after the unity of this party was achieved as a result of the indomitable efforts of Ber Borochov and his youthful associates.

Borochov set out to solve all the doubts raised by the general socialist movement and by all these different groupings within the Jewish labor movement. In logic Borochov was a thorough-going materialist and Marxist; emotionally he was a Zionist. His theory is a result of both these aspects. He had first to contend with the assimilationist Marxists, hence his general theory of nationalism. He had to justify his belief in Jewish survival, hence his theory of the role of landless nations and territorial concentration. He had to prove that Palestine could be the only territory because he was a lover of this land, hence his theory of the *stychic* process. At the same time he had to reconcile work in the Galut with the task of building the territorial center, hence his theory of the role of the Jewish proletariat and the changes which would take place while the process of immigration to Palestine would go on. His theory had to be materialistic to the core; otherwise he could not gain the following of the Jewish youthful intelligentsia, which at that time, together with the Russian intellectuals, was turning away from the socialist *Narodnik* teachings to dialectical materialism as a result of the propaganda of Plekhanov and his associates.

Borochov saw clearly the errors of his contemporaries in following blindly the utopian notions of cosmopolitanism. Marx failed to formulate clearly a "Marxian" approach to social problems which spring from national differences. Thus socialism in its early stages was cosmopolitan in its outlook, and continually negated or minimized the importance of nationalism in the class struggle. This point of view was largely due to the fact that most of the socialist theoreticians were or considered themselves to be members of majority national groups within a state. Minorities are naturally more concerned with the problem of national survival than majorities because they suffer from national oppression in addition to the usual economic oppression.

Borochov's doctrine of nationalism can be called the earliest successful effort in the direction of evolving a theory of nationalism on the basis of dialectical materialism. The basis for the mate-

rialistic analysis of Borochoy is a new term which he introduced, namely, "conditions of production" which is an extension of Marx's and Engels' concept of "relations of production". "Conditions of production" include the sum total of conditions under which production takes place: the geographical, anthropological, and the historical, which function both within the respective group and in connection with its relation to other groups.

This concept furnishes the basis for Borochoy's approach to the problem of nationalism. According to Marx, social conflicts result from the development of the forces of production and their clash with the existing relations of production. Borochoy interprets, in an analogous manner, national conflicts as a result of the clash between the developing forces of production of a nation and the conditions of production under which it lives. To Borochoy, a people is "a society which grew out of the very same conditions of production". A nation to him is a people in a higher stage of development which, in addition to springing from the same conditions of production, is also "united by the consciousness of its individual members and a kinship arising out of a common historical past". Nationalism to him is "the feeling of kinship created as a result of a common historic past, the roots of which arise from the common conditions of production". It is a product of bourgeois society. The period of feudalism knew only peoples, but not nationalities, which began to develop with the rise of capitalism. The bourgeoisie with the aid of other classes was able to liberate the entire population from its former masters. The abolition of feudalism was thus a progressive revolutionary step.

The nationalism of the ruling classes is diversified. For the class of the great landowners, the territory is valuable as their chief source of income, which they derive from rent. Their nationalism is a land nationalism. They are not concerned with who controls the market for the products as long as they continue to derive their income from it. In backward states their class is mostly identified with the regime. In more developed states where the bourgeoisie has defeated them, they try to make peace with their former foes through the protective coloring of nationalism and reaction.

The great bourgeoisie knows no traditions. It is not concerned with language and customs which are merely within the needs of the domestic market. The territory presents to this class an operating basis for the purpose of seizing the world market.

For the middle class and petty bourgeoisie the territory possesses significance as a market for consumers' goods. Selling and purchasing of these goods require the use of the same language, hence the concern of this class for the extent of the area of its language and culture. It is the weakest class and is subject to many internal conflicts. In search of support for its continuously tottering position, this group comes to the aid of the reactionary domestic and foreign policies of the landlords and great bourgeoisie.

For the proletariat, the territory has a twofold significance. It is important both as a work-place and as a strategic place for the conduct of the class struggle. The proletariat, too, is not a unified, solid bloc. It is split because of the varying conditions of production. Competition exists between the skilled and unskilled workers. The territory becomes a base for the struggle only after its occupation by the worker as a work-place has become secure. This is the reason for the lack of class consciousness and the presence of nationalistic sentiments among the "proletarianizing" masses in search of work as well as among the natives who are in the defense of their jobs against the influx of foreign workers. The development of the territory as a base for struggle lessens both the individualistic and the nationalistic trends within the proletariat and increases class solidarity.

Among nations which live a normal economic life, nationalism is reactionary and dangerous because it obscures the class relationship. The situation is different among nations which live under abnormal economic conditions because of either national subjugation or the lack of own territories. This uncertain strategic base of the proletariat of such a nation causes its class consciousness to be closely identified with its national consciousness. Its class struggle assumes both objectively and subjectively national characteristics and trends. Its national consciousness is derived only from the desire of the proletariat to overcome the abnormalities of its strategic base. The nationalism of the organized revolutionary

proletariat of a subject or landless nation has as its purpose the struggle for a normal work-place and a strategic base. It cannot achieve its aims without striving for the normalization of the conditions of production for the *entire* nation. Its nationalism is thus the only real nationalism since it does not strive to obscure the class relationship nor does it call for class collaboration.

The application of Borochoy's theory of landless nations to the Jews follows the same line of reasoning. The Jewish nation has no territory of its own. It falls thus within the category of a landless nation which has entered a foreign system of economy. It has to adjust itself economically to the demands of the majority nations among which it lives. The first factor in this process of adjustment is the inevitable assimilation. Assimilation is counter-balanced by and is in constant clash with the second factor, a negative one—namely, that of isolation. As long as the landless nation is merely exploited by its host nations, its economic position is fairly definite and strong. But as soon as exploitation is replaced by the inevitable appearance of competition, the minority is bound to lose steadily its economic positions to the majority. National competition forces it to engage in the branches of economy which are the least important and the weakest.

To the Jewish capitalists, Jewish national life does not permit any imperialistic aspirations. This class has managed to adjust itself remarkably well to its environment. If not for the pressure of the hordes of "poor East European Jewry" which constantly bring pogroms and migrations to the attention of their wealthy relatives, this class would not have felt any sense of isolation. Only the fear of the spread of anti-Semitism ties it to the other classes of the Jewish people. Its only expression of this bond takes a philanthropic form.

The middle bourgeoisie has a much closer connection with the masses. First, there are its national interests in the internal market. It has to compete with the non-Jewish bourgeoisie. This introduces assimilation and at the same time sharpens its national consciousness. Since its problem is that of finding a territory upon

which to base the struggle for its market, it shows tendencies of dreaming of Jewish independence and a Jewish state. Its members feel most keenly the legal restrictions and the misery of the masses; hence they are more nationally minded. Nevertheless their main tie to the Galut is their immediate economic interests. Their national energy can be partly utilized but cannot form the basis of any serious endeavor for the radical reconstruction of Jewish life.

The Jewish proletariat, too, suffers from the abnormality of the economic development of the Jewish people and its resulting occupational distribution. It is concentrated in intellectual professions and in secondary industries, remote from nature and natural resources. Thus, the Jewish fields of work are of little value both in the economic structure of the country and as a basis for the class struggle of the Jewish workers. The processes of capitalism tend to throw a steadily increasing number of the declassed Jewish petty bourgeoisie into the ranks of the unemployed reserves at a greater proportion than that of the non-Jewish petty bourgeoisie. This influx makes it harder for the Jewish worker to find employment and to conduct a normal class struggle. The Jewish worker is confined largely to small shops and plants and thus is unable to organize properly to fight against his exploiters. He cannot participate properly in the process of bringing about the social revolution. Since the basic industries are closed to him, "he is incapable of paralyzing the economic organism in a single strike . . . His exploiter is the small capitalist whose role in production is negligible. When the Jewish worker does go on strike against the industry which exploits him, he does not appreciably disturb the equilibrium of the country. He is not even strong enough to obtain his just demands without the support of the other more fortunate workers of the surrounding nationalities. He cannot obtain even the most minor concession when his national needs do not coincide with those of workers of another nationality." This peculiar, weak position strengthens in turn his sense of proletarian solidarity. Since these difficulties of the Jewish proletariat are based on national factors, he must be, unlike the proletariat of other nations, interested in nationalism.

These shortcomings of the Jewish people and of the Jewish proletariat will be eliminated by the settlement of the Jews in their own land. There the worker will develop under normal conditions and find his strategic base from which to conduct the class struggle and achieve the social revolution.

As opposed to the free choice of territory by the other Socialist Territorialist theoreticians, Borochoy propounded his own interpretation of Palestine as the land of future Jewish mass immigration and settlement. Just as the realization of socialism will take place through a *stychic* process of the concentration of capital without dependence on any conscious factors whatsoever, so too will the future concentration of the Jewish emigrants into a definite territory begin *stychically* and independently of anyone's will. This does not mean an immediate return of the Jews to Palestine. The Jewish masses, driven out because of their abnormal situation from the lands in which they reside, must emigrate to any country which will accept them. But even in the more thinly settled lands, they are forced to engage in their former occupations because of the national oppression. The basic industries continue to be closed to them. At the same time the need for new lands of immigration increases because of progressively sharper competition resulting from the steady expulsion of the Jews from their occupations. The absorptive capacity of the new lands of immigration will decrease gradually, so that eventually all of them will bar their gates to the Jewish wanderer. Ultimately, there will remain but one avenue for the masses in their search for a haven. They will have to direct their wanderings to a land where they will be able to enter all branches of production without any great difficulties. This land will have to be able to give the petty Jewish capitalist an opportunity to invest his capital in industry and agriculture; it will have to be able to give the Jewish worker the opportunity to engage in basic industries or to transfer from industry to agriculture without undue difficulty. This land must be semi-agricultural, thinly populated, fitted for the immigration of the petty bourgeois Jew and his small investment, where neither the Jewish capitalist nor the worker will meet with national

competition in their efforts to enter the basic industries. This land is, of course, Palestine. Economic necessity will drive the Jews there.

Borochoy, like most of his contemporaries in Europe, was not well acquainted with the Arab problem. He considered Palestine as an "international hotel" the same as "Switzerland, Yemen, and Tibet." Countries of this type have their peculiar economic structure, which is characterized by small native or petty bourgeoisie production and by the fact that a large proportion of the population derives its livelihood from the pilgrim and tourist trade. A land of this type has also a peculiar cultural structure. The population is highly cultured but has no culture of its own. The natives depend on the "foreign guests" economically, and they adjust themselves to the incomers culturally. Therefore, they are acquainted with a number of languages, and they lack the feeling of national isolation and are more free from chauvinism. On the basis of this interpretation the Arabs in Palestine are not of an economically or culturally independent type. They are not a nation and will not become one for a long time. They are open to cultural assimilation because they cannot offer economic competition on a national basis. They will thus adopt the economic and cultural characteristics of the incoming Jews. "The development of the forces of production will be taken over by the Jewish immigrants and the present population will eventually become economically and culturally assimilated with the Jews."

The part which the Jewish proletariat is to play in the achievement of the normalization of Jewish life through the immigration of the masses into Palestine is a very important one. It is parallel to the function of the proletariat in hastening the decline of capitalism through the class struggle and the sharpening of class relations. The Jewish proletariat is bound to participate in this process of the settlement of Palestine. The means for its participation is the class struggle, the only weapon of the proletariat. Mass migrations require order and management. The Jewish masses which are so anxious to migrate can certainly not be entrusted with this task. The sorely beset petty bourgeoisie is too individualistic and too

disorganized to do it. The upper and middle bourgeoisie cannot do it because they are not sufficiently interested in a basic and thorough solution of the Jewish problem. Furthermore their interests are of a reactionary class position. The revolutionary proletariat is thus bound to undertake the task of introducing order into the process of Jewish migration into Palestine as well as in the process of converting this semi-agricultural country into a place fit for increasing immigration of the masses. This process is a double one. The Jewish proletariat, through its participation in the general class struggle in the Galut, will force the individual governments of the countries in which the Jewish masses reside to adopt a more democratic policy and will strengthen the tendencies in support of the Jewish plans for Palestine (as for instance, by insisting on unlimited immigration). The interest is bound to grow in time. The gradual impoverishment of the Jewish petty bourgeoisie, the poverty and the increasing radicalization of the masses will see to that. Immigration to Palestine will begin with the petty bourgeoisie. Later, international capital too will begin to invade the country, a desirable thing from Borochof's point of view. While the bourgeoisie will assume the task of upbuilding, the proletariat will undertake the task of its liberation from capitalism. During the first few years of colonization, there will be temporarily some collaboration between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in order to achieve the most elementary aims of the establishment of normal economic relations within a capitalistic society. The partnership will be of the type of the joint action between the enlightened bourgeoisie and the revolutionary proletariat in their effort to overthrow the Czarist despotism in Russia. The class struggle can be mitigated or postponed but cannot be finally averted.

The grave problem of the final achievement of territorial autonomy or perhaps independence of Palestine from the Turkish regime will be solved as a result of this organic process. The Turkish government will most decidedly interfere on behalf of the bourgeoisie in its struggle against the demands of the proletariat. This in turn will bring about the intervention of the powers of Europe which will demand the liberation of Palestine from the despotism of Turkey. As the territorial autonomy will be established, the

proletariat will have achieved its only aim, since it has no other national aims. The class struggle will continue until the liberation of the proletariat will be completely achieved.

What of the Jews outside Palestine? Borochof never admitted the possibility of the settlement in Palestine of the majority of the Jewish people. According to him, the majority of Jews will continue to reside throughout the world. The establishment of the territorial autonomy of the Jewish center of Palestine will place the Jews in the Galut in a position of a national minority of the same nature as all other national minorities. This of course will gradually remedy the evils of their exceptional economic distribution due to their present condition as a national minority *without* a center. Eventually all national minorities in general, and the Jewish one in particular, will disappear completely. National autonomy will make this process easier, since it will lessen the clashes between the majority and minority. With the elimination of national oppression under socialism, minorities and nations which are backward economically or culturally are bound to assimilate completely and painlessly among their more developed neighbors. In the same way Borochof foretold the solution of the Arab problem in Palestine—through assimilation with the higher culture of the Jews. His ideas concerning the eventual assimilation were never adopted by the movement. Borochof himself revised them later.

It is easy to criticize the early system of Borochof in the light of more recent changes in Marxian thought and in Jewish life. His mechanistic approach to social problems as characterized by his emphasis on purely *stychic* trends certainly cannot be accepted. The tendency now among the orthodox Borochovists and the less articulate neo-Borochovists is to attempt to prove that Borochof included the element of *will* in his *stychic* process. His own statement as to his materialistic approach would seem to belie it. At best this attempt is similar to present efforts to read new contents into the teachings of Marx on the basis of stray quotations instead of admitting that perhaps even a genius cannot foresee all.

A corollary to this *stychic* process is the disregard for all efforts and factors which are not purely materialistic. Early Borochovism does not concern itself with any moral or spiritual values; it has no concern whatsoever with the individual. It disregards the efforts of collectives and cooperatives which are based on social-spiritual drives rather than on purely economic factors. It tends to look on the proletariat as the exclusive possessor of the mission of bringing about socialism. For this reason its present adherents fail to appreciate, for instance, the return to the Hebrew language in Palestine. They try to interpret it as a deliberate conspiracy against the Yiddish speaking masses, rather than to see it as a spiritual revolt against Galut life and as a return to historical, traditional values.

This particular attention paid to the proletariat is especially unrealistic when applied to Jewish life. Furthermore, Borochovism implies a sacred worship of Borochov's early writings with its concomitant dogmatism, narrow-minded sectarianism, continual hair-splitting, and "holier than thou" attitude of a small group of chosen people who claim to maintain the gospel in its pristine purity. To American Jewry it offers nothing. A theory evolved under conditions of a multi-nationality state, a theory which does not take cognizance of religious and traditional elements in Jewish life and would substitute for it a mere Yiddish speaking community, does not hold water even from its own materialistic approach. The upbuilding of Palestine, too, failed to follow the exact lines of the *stychic* process as indicated by Borochov in his early teachings. The collective will of the Jewish people in its historical settings and the individual determination of a small group of pioneers also played a great part in the task. The twofold task of the "creating" bourgeoisie and "liberating" proletariat failed to function at least in the first stages of the construction of the Jewish homeland in Palestine.

In spite of these shortcomings, Borochov managed to construct a system of ideas which appealed strongly to his own contemporaries and many of which remain unchallenged today. The same standards of criticism that can be applied to Marxism apply to the basis of his economic interpretation. Its acceptance depends on the

acceptance of dialectical materialism. Its further development also depends on the liberation of socialist thought from dogmatism and the disease of blind hero and quotation worship. Borochov's greatest contribution to socialist thought, namely his theory of the organic unity between socialism and proletarian nationalism, remains unacknowledged, although it is being carried out to some extent in practice by the same cosmopolitan socialists and communists who fought him so bitterly on this score. In his insistence on united action among the different schools in socialism, Borochov, too, was ahead of his times. His predictions of the role of the declassed bourgeoisie as an aid to declining capitalism, is almost a prophecy of fascism. His synthesis of Zionism and socialism suffers, as he admitted later, from dogmatism. Socialist Zionism of today is too much of a movement of idealists to permit itself to be cramped by rigid materialistic formulas. His analysis of the problem of emigration of the Jewish masses cannot be called completely original. It is a logical development of contemporaneous theories. Yet, he predicted, in 1905, the stoppage of world immigration. The concentration of Jewish immigration towards Palestine has come true in our own day.

Many other accomplishments of Borochov remain unknown in the hustle and bustle of partisan life and arguments. In his studies in the field of the Jewish labor movement, he easily shared the honors with another brilliant young theoretician, Jacob Lestshinsky, then a leader in the S. S. movement. His economic interpretation of Jewish history has contributed a great deal to the direction of scholarly research in this field. It is a fact worth mentioning that most of the younger scholars in the field of Jewish history in Poland and Palestine who adhere to this economic approach are Borochovists. His contributions to clarity in the field of the economic development of the Jews are permanent. His analysis of the class relationship and assimilation within the Jewish community, too, is a synthesis rather than an original contribution. Yet, it still stands the test of time. The outstanding merit of Borochov as a thinker was his ability to analyze things as a man of action, too. His own dogmatic convictions never prevented him from seeing reality. For the sake of practical achieve-

ment he, unlike many of the socialist thinkers of his day, was willing to put aside many theoretical reservations. Otherwise, how could one explain his joining together with the Austrian non-Marxist Poale Zion and his efforts to present a united front of Jewish labor before the Socialist International. He never pretended infallibility, though his teachings were the gospel of a movement in his early youth. His gentle cynicism in the latter period of his life, which was aimed at his assertive dogmatic and ideologically self-righteous youth, is a proof of toleration and self-criticism, hardly ever found and thus even more to be desired among theoreticians and founders of social movements.

The early Poale Zion groups, it has been noted, had no common ideology. Their varied beliefs were conflicting, the only point of unity being Palestine. Borochoy was successful in neutralizing the *Voxrozhdenye* and Territorialist influences within these groups. Finally his efforts culminated in the Organization Convention of the Jewish Social-Democratic Workers Party Poale Zion in Russia, which took place in Poltava in February, 1906. The police arrested many of its participants, including Borochoy. Yet the convention managed to draft a platform, which was later extended and adopted in final form at the second convention which met in Crakow in August, 1907. The platform followed closely the theories of Borochoy. It included both *maximum* demands for complete socialization of the means of production and *minimum* aims for the establishment of territorial autonomy for the Jewish nation in Palestine along democratic principles and through the class struggle. The gulf between the Poale Zion and the bourgeois Zionists was stressed. It allowed for cooperation with them only in practical Palestine activities. Participation in Zionist congresses was advocated, but solely for the purposes of criticism, the support of democracy, and educating the proletariat.

At the same time a different development in Labor Zionism took place in Austria, centering in Galicia. The early Labor Zionist movement found its expression in the organization of trade unions,

mutual aid societies, and Zionist groups of workers, clerks and salesmen. These groups emphasized the need for democracy within the Jewish community. They did not hesitate to place the *Lumpenproletariat*—the petty merchants and hucksters—on the same level as the factory workers, and they continually asserted their primary allegiance to Zionism. In 1904 a convention of these groups at Crakow resulted in the organization of the Jewish Socialist Party Poale Zion of Austria. From the point of view of theory, this party differed widely from the Russian one. Its ideologists maintained that the Zionist movement was an expression of the entire Jewish people and transcended class interests. Therefore the Party considered itself an integral part of the Zionist organization and fully adhered to the Basle program. It maintained that the position of the Jewish worker and commercial employee was different from that of the non-Jew, since the Jew had to face both exploitation and discrimination. It warned the Jewish workers against following the teachings of the Social-Democrats in Austria who denied this fact. It negated the importance of the socialist solution unless it were combined with a Jewish autonomous territory. It denied the truth of the materialistic view of history, and as a result it also negated the *stychic* process. Instead it stressed the need for the conscious direction of the migration of the Jewish masses to Palestine. It considered their sentimental ties with this country an important factor in the speedy establishment of the Jewish national home.

The Poale Zion groups in other countries followed in their ideology either the Russian or the Austrian schools. The American movement, which was officially organized as a party at the 1905 convention in Baltimore, followed the Austrian school. Very soon, however, there arose within it a strong Borochovist opposition, which later came to dominate the movement. The parties in Argentina, Roumania, and Bulgaria also adhered to the Austrian school. The movement in Great Britain followed Borochoy with some divergences. The Palestinian Party, which was organized as a result of the *Second Aliya* in 1905, began on a strict Borochovist basis. The peculiar conditions of Palestine pioneer life,

however, modified its orthodoxy to a great degree within a few years.

Reality encroached upon theories. The two divergent schools of Poale Zionism met at Zionist congresses. Both were active in Galut work; both were seeking new channels for practical activity in Palestine. A world convention of representatives from the different countries met in the Hague in 1907 in connection with the Eighth Zionist Congress. Thus, the Jewish Socialist Workers World Confederation Poale Zion was established. Its program, adopted in 1909, attempted to gloss over ideological differences. It called for the abolition of capitalism and complete socialization of the means of production through the economic and political class struggle of the proletariat, as well as for the territorial solution of the Jewish problem through Jewish mass settlement in Palestine and its neighboring countries. But the differences within the two wings could not be eradicated by formulas of compromise. They continued, latent, until moments of crisis when they flared up openly. They revolved mainly about the problem of participation in the Zionist congresses. The Poale Zion became in 1907 an autonomous federation within Zionism. Yet, this was considered as class collaboration on the part of the Russian membership who under the influence of Borochof decided to leave the Congress in 1909. This decision was disputed by most of the other parties. The question was not settled definitely until it became a major factor in the split of 1920. The Russians, too, objected to working for the Jewish National Fund, which they considered an institution created by the bourgeoisie for its own needs. The party substituted for it the Palestine Workers Fund (1909), which failed to gain any appreciable monetary results. Scepticism was also expressed by the Borochovists to Professor Oppenheimer's plans for cooperative settlements in Palestine, which later turned out to be a success.

In spite of these differences the World Party functioned as a united body in other respects. It is impossible to give here a detailed presentation of its activities and achievements. In Russia it

was the pioneer in the armed self-defense movement against the pogroms. It conducted trade union activities vigorously. It participated actively in the political life of the country, in the revolution of 1905, in the elections to the Duma and local bodies. It conducted an open fight among the workers against anti-Semitism, which was particularly prevalent in the Polish provinces of the country. It was an active factor in the cultural revival of the Yiddish language. It led a successful fight together with other parties against the self-proclaimed monopoly of the *Bund*. Together with the entire socialist movement it suffered a decline during the reaction which followed the 1905 revolution. In America, it devoted itself largely to Zionist and cultural affairs. It was the first to found Yiddish secular schools where Hebrew, too, was taught, and later was instrumental in the creation of the first American Jewish Congress. In Galicia, it was a potent factor in breaking down the joint monopoly in political and community life of the *Chassidim* and the Polonized wealthy oligarchy, and fought for the recognition of the Jews as a national group even at the cost of antagonizing the local socialist movement. In Palestine, its members were instrumental in the organization of the trade unions and cooperatives. Its efforts to unite all the Jewish labor parties in order to effect a joint representation of the Jewish proletariat as a national unit within the Second International met with failure because of the opposition of the *Bund*. It was equally unsuccessful in gaining admittance to this body as a world movement because of the opposition of the cosmopolitan socialist leadership. Unlike the other parties, it refused to enter it under the guise of branches of the socialist parties in the different countries.

The World War brought new problems to the movement. It was then impossible to conduct the usual socialist activities in most European countries. Unemployment and mass exile caused all the Jewish labor parties to turn their attention to relief activities and the establishment of consumers' cooperatives. The Poale Zion maintained its central offices in a neutral country and continued to exercise its efforts to obtain the sympathy of the socialist world for the Jewish people through a series of memoranda and publications. In addition to the usual socialist demands, the Party put forth a

program for Jewish rights which included equality, national autonomy in some countries, freedom of emigration, and mass settlement in Palestine under international auspices. In 1916, it was admitted to the Second International as a representative of the Turkish Socialists because of its Palestinian connections. Its demands were included in the 1917 peace manifesto of the International.

At the same time, the World War tended to accentuate the differences within the movement both through the cessation of normal relations between the different countries and through the changes in the economical and political life. The movement in the democratic Allied countries, especially in the United States, abandoned its uncompromising Borochovist ideology and devoted its attention and activities to the fields of relief, community organization and Palestine work of the types frowned upon by the more orthodox Russian brethren. This "ideological retreat" was aided by the presence of Borochov, who came to the United States in 1914 as a refugee from Austria and naturally assumed a position of respect and leadership in the movement.

The later writings of Borochov reveal almost a complete *volte-face* from his early theories. Unfortunately he died before he had the opportunity to revise his system or to construct it anew. During his stay in America Borochov was occupied more with practical problems. We suspect that he too succumbed to the more pragmatic atmosphere of American thought. But there are indications aplenty that Borochov strayed far away from Borochovism. His Russian comrades, whom he met again in 1917 after a separation of almost ten years and who followed his orthodox path, could not recognize him. The man who had analyzed microscopically every iota in the programs of all the Jewish labor parties looked in 1915 upon the differences between the anarchists and socialists as *Zukunftsmusik*. He called himself "a Marxist without 'matter' and a critical empiricist opposed both to materialism and idealism". On the question of the post-revolutionary type of collectivism, he declared himself to be an anarchistic socialist. He declared his

willingness to let all "these philosophic questions dream peacefully till after the social revolution". He was for the unity of all those who believe in the necessity of vigorous activity towards the abolition of capitalism, "be they socialists, anarchists, syndicalists, I. W. W.'s, materialists, Kantians, empirical realists, or revolutionaries from the school of Marx, Kropotkin, or the prophet Isaiah". He called for the same type of freedom and unity in Zionism, as long as its purpose was the creation of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. This home was to be built by the partnership of the working class and the entire Jewish people. He abandoned his strict interpretation of the *stychic* processes and emphasized the role of will in social movements. "Years ago," he admitted, "we said: Zionism is a *stychic* process. Our only task is to remove all the obstacles which interfere with this process. And we left the creative work to the bourgeois Zionists . . . We erred formerly when we contended that natural emigration waves are already under way. General Zionists were closer to the truth when they said that for the present only the organic process has begun." He approved of the efforts made along the lines of cooperative colonization and called it "the way to a socialist society in Palestine. While this colonization is not in itself socialism, it does teach the Jewish proletariat the elementary lessons of self-help." Borochov also widened his concept of the tasks of the Jewish proletariat. Palestine was to be more than a strategic base for its struggle. The task of the proletariat was to build Palestine as a home for the "entire Jewish people". The proletariat desired to build a new life and Palestine was to be the base for its creativity. Thus he saw clearly the ideological motivation in Socialist Zionism. He saw in the struggle against assimilation something much more than a struggle for a strategic base. Then it was to him the fight of all the Jewish masses against the attempt of national suicide on a part of the Jewish intelligentsia and upper bourgeoisie. The masses, he declared, "will not yield to the notion that the Jew disappear among foreign nations and alien cultures."

Borochov also changed his terminology. The terms, "the entire Jewish people", "the Jewish masses", were used by him in his later stage in addition to the term "proletariat" which he previously em-

played almost exclusively when discussing any constructive tasks. He advocated making the terminology of the movement more elastic. He looked upon the stern and mechanistic expressions of his younger days as a product of a period during which "no one believed in romance, ornaments, or adornment." He called for an abandonment of the "naively realistic" view on life. Most characteristic is his return to the ancient name, *Eretz Yisrael* (Land of Israel), for *Palestina*. To Zionists the land of Israel had to be *Eretz Yisrael*. For young Borochov and his followers, a sentimental name of this type would not befit the territorial center which was to be a result of the *stychic* process. They always referred to it as "Palestina" and abandoned the historical name which was accepted among the Yiddish speaking masses. The later Borochov openly returned to the "emotional terminology"; and to the dismay of his Borochovist comrades, he exclaimed, "Now we can and must proclaim: *Eretz Yisrael*—a Jewish home!"

It was natural that the new Borochov could not be accepted by the old Borochovists, especially those of Eastern Europe. The Poale Zion movement was never completely Borochovist; it was composed of the two conflicting trends in Labor Zionism, the Marxian and the non-Marxian. As long as both the upbuilding of Palestine and the social revolution were subjects mainly for discussion and petty activities, they could work together. After the Balfour Declaration and the March Revolution in Russia, this unity had to be abandoned. Cooperation with the bourgeois Zionists in their congresses and funds, the establishment of the *Hechalutz* movement and the Jewish legion, the direction of colonization into cooperative channels, the task of obtaining the recognition of minority rights through the Jewish congresses in several countries—all these problems had to be decided upon not as theoretical matters but as the actual needs of the day. On the other side, the Poale Zion had to make up their mind about the future of democracy in Russia and the future of world socialism.

The November Revolution decided all these problems for the movement by causing its split. It is doubtful whether even the

commanding personality of Borochov could have stopped it had he continued to live. Most of the Russian Poale Zion who were brought up on Borochovism, which is as revolutionary as the extremist form of Leninism, joined the Bolsheviks. Some began to cooperate with them in city councils and other political activities immediately after the March Revolution. The November Revolution found their leftist elements ready for full cooperation with the Bolsheviks. Many joined the Red Army as special Borochov brigades and units. The organization of the Third International brought them nearer to the communists. In justice to them it must be stated here that they certainly did not anticipate the turn of events which was to take place both in the Soviet Union and in world socialism. Those were the days when the world revolution was almost a certainty to them. The communist Poale Zion hoped for a defeat of world imperialism and for the immigration of the Jewish masses into Palestine with the aid of the World Soviet Republic. Some even planned the organization of a Jewish Red Army which was to drive the British imperialist troops out of Palestine. The majority of the movement went with the communistic wing (which later became known as and still is called the Left Poale Zion) which became weakened because of the steady loss of its membership to the Russian and other communist parties. They looked upon themselves as the future Jewish section of the Comintern. Their negotiations with this body came to naught because of the objections of the *ex-Bundists* and other "Jewish" Jewish communists who still had old accounts to settle with the Poale Zion. Because of their unblemished revolutionary record, a small number of the intransigents who refused to join the general rush into the Communist Party was tolerated in the Soviet Union till 1928. Till that year the Left Poale Zion was an officially recognized communistic party with its own press and youth movement. Almost all of its members joined the Communist Party. Some have figured prominently in the recent Trotskyite trials and expulsions. The Left Poale Zion have been more successful for some years in Poland and Palestine than in Russia. They have undergone several splits. They are the only orthodox Borochovists left, and their number and influence are constantly decreasing. Borochov-

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
LIBRARY

121095

ism also left some marks on the ideology of *Hashomer Hatzair*, but not enough to call this extremist Marxian wing in Zionism a Borochovist one.

Not all the Labor Zionists in Russia joined the Poale Zion. At about 1906 there arose new youth groups in Eastern Europe under the names *Zeire Zion* and *Hatechiyah*. Their main aim, settlement in Palestine, brought them into close ideological contact with the growing labor movement of this country. It was natural for their settlers to join the non-Marxian *Hapoel Hatzair* rather than the Poale Zion, whom they knew so well from Russia. Meetings of these groups at the various Zionist congresses culminated in the unification of the *Hapoel Hatzair* and *Zeire Zion* groups at the Eleventh Zionist Congress in Vienna (1913) on a platform which called for complete democratization of the Zionist Organization and for support of the Palestine labor movement. Slowly the *Zeire Zion* drifted to the left. Under the influence of the Russian Revolution they adopted a socialist ideology which in its Zionist side was similar to that of the Austrian Poale Zion and which in its views on socialist and national problems resembled that of the Russian Social Revolutionaries. They denied the importance of the class struggle between the Jewish workers and their petty employers; they would substitute for it the productivization of both of these poverty stricken elements to normalize Jewish economic life. The class struggle to them implied all efforts at the improvement of the situation of the workers, including the establishment of cooperatives. They differed radically from the Yiddishist Poale Zion in their demands for the sole use of the Hebrew language in Palestine and for the equality of both Yiddish and Hebrew in the Galut. They paid most attention to Palestine work. This accounts for their organic connection with the *Hechalutz* pioneer movement, the organization and early guidance of which can be attributed to them.

At the Fifth World Convention (Vienna, 1920), the Poale Zion decided to join the Comintern. The adherents of the Right

Wing, who were willing to join this body under the condition that it should include all the revolutionary socialist parties with the right of independent action, organized a new world union. It joined the Vienna International and later was absorbed together with it in the new reorganized Second International. Despite the internal differences concerning the language problem and the participation in Zionist congresses it managed to maintain its unity. The most characteristic aspect of the Right Poale Zion was its desire for unification of the Labor Zionist movement. In 1925 it united with the World Union of the Left Wing *Zeire Zion* (in 1919 this organization was split as a result of its adoption of a definite socialist program) under the name World Jewish Socialist Workers' Party Poale Zion (united with the Zionist Socialist Alliance). The new organization adopted practically a Poale Zion platform, with the only exceptions of the recognition of choice between Yiddish and Hebrew, of the special position of Yiddish in Galut and of the right for minorities to foster Hebrew cultural activities. By this time, no more doubts existed concerning participation in Zionist congresses.

The Right Wing of the *Zeire Zion* joined the Palestinian non-Marxian *Hapoel Hatzair* in the *Zionist Labor Party Hitachdut*. In 1929 the Palestine Poale Zion known as *Achdut Haavoda* united with the *Hapoel Hatzair* to form the *Mapai* (*Miflegot Poale Eretz Yisrael*—Palestine Labor Party), which was recognized by the Second International as the Jewish Section in Palestine. This action led to the further unity of the movement. The *Hitachdut Party* united with Poale Zion Party in 1931. The two organizations were merged in the U. S. A. in 1931 to form the present United Jewish Socialist Labor Party Poale Zion-Zeire Zion of America. In 1936 a section of the Left Poale Zion in Palestine joined the *Mapai*. Thus the overwhelming majority of the Socialist Zionist movement is now united in one party, except for the communist Left Poale Zion, the youth movement *Hashomer Hatzair* (an extremely left wing revolutionary socialist group and its adult movement the Socialist League in Palestine), as well as some smaller youth organizations. Yet, even these extremist move-

ments are at present cooperating in the *Histadrut*, the General Federation of Jewish Labor in Palestine, and the World League for Labor Palestine. The Labor Zionists have since the World War become the most powerful factor and strongest wing within the Zionist movement.

The united party of today resembles in its composition the pre-War World Party. Though it is well knit and united in action and policies, yet its different component wings are still clearly differentiated. The *Mapai* is the ideological leader of the movement both by the virtue of its numerical strength and the tremendous influence of Palestine today. The adherents of the former Poale Zion of the Marxist variety form its revolutionary Left wing. They still follow to some extent the early teachings of Borochof, though they would modify and reinterpret them. The left wing also includes former Left Poale Zionists, who differ with the communists only on the Jewish problem, and others who joined it because of its concrete Palestinian activities. A very influential group is the former Right Poale Zion of Russia, Poland, and Palestine, who follow the Reformist school of Marxism. They could be classified as adherents of the later Borochof. The former *Hitachdut* or *Zeire Zion* adherents, as well as the Austrian Poale Zion, have retained their non-materialistic approach to social problems. The influence of the former *Hapoel Hatzair*—who seek in their activities a solution to their personal problems as men, look upon the party as a comradesly collective, and adhere to the “religion of labor” ideas of A. D. Gordon—is still felt strongly. Naturally, the only reason for the effective unity and joint action among so many different groups is their common desire to reconstruct Jewish life on the basis of socialism and Zionism, and their practical work in Palestine.

The various parties in the Galut are led mainly by the former Poale Zion. They reflect the peculiar conditions of the different countries, both in their ideologies and methods. In Poland and France, for instance, they are largely revolutionary. In the United States and England, they are mainly Reformist. The Polish party

has retained more of Borochofism than any other branch of the movement. They, too, are united in their common aims, in spite of so many differences. The most characteristic aspect of the present movement, in contrast to the pre-War period, is the scant attention which is given by it to abstract theorizing in most countries, especially in Palestine. The cause for this change is the preoccupation with the concrete tasks of the construction of the Jewish National Home. This lack of concern with theories makes it impossible to give at the present time an answer to the baffling question: “What remains of Borochof?”