

Dov Ber-Borochoy: A Marxist-Zionist Ideologist

Author(s): Amos Perlmutter

Source: *Middle Eastern Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Jan., 1969), pp. 32-43

Published by: Taylor & Francis, Ltd.

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4282273>

Accessed: 01-12-2018 14:32 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Taylor & Francis, Ltd. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Middle Eastern Studies*

Dov Ber-Borochoy: A Marxist-Zionist Ideologist

Amos Perlmutter

The Socialist–Zionist movement played a key role in Zionist colonization of Palestine. Its ideology became the most influential and persistent in the Jewish community in Palestine (the *Yishuv*) before the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948.

Socialist–Zionism has been associated with most of the pioneer and colonizing efforts, institutions and procedures since the second Zionist immigration wave (*ha' Aliya ha-Shnia*) to Palestine in 1904–05, and became the chief force in the nation-building of Israel. It dominated Zionist immigration, consolidated the nationalist movement, and diffused the principles of an egalitarian social system into the *Yishuv* in Palestine. All this was accomplished by accumulating the social, economic and military functions in two all-encompassing political, economic and social structures, the Histadrut—the General Confederation of Labour, and the *Hityashvut*—the system of settlement.¹ The ideology of Socialist–Zionism supported the organizational and institutional structures of the Socialist–Zionist colonists and thus spread among the Jewish community in Palestine. Despite resistance from non-socialist groups and individuals, this ideology persisted and was incorporated into social and economic institutions, behaviour and procedures.

Socialist–Zionist ideology was not a unitary, totalitarian, and single ideology. It was iconoclastic—as all ideologies are. It blended messianic with programmist tendencies and integrated a variety of trends, doctrines and formulations of socialism and Zionism. It contained elements of the Russian Social Democratic variety of Marxism, Bundism, the Austrian and German Social Democracy, Russian Anarchism, Bolshevism and even of utopian pre-Marxian socialism. Its Zionist elements can be traced from the utopian Zionism of Moses Hess and Theodor Herzl to the practical Zionism of Sokolow and Weizmann. Thus, the Socialist–Zionist movement had many forerunners, as well as philosophers and ideologists.

This essay examines some of the doctrines of one of the early Socialist–Zionist ideologists, Dov Ber-Borochoy, and particularly focuses on Borochoy's attempt to integrate Marxism and nationalism. This essay is no attempt to examine the philosophical and political writings and contributions of Borochoy. It focuses only on Borochoy's interesting attempt to find a Zionist–Marxist formula.²

1. *Socialist–Zionism*

The Socialist–Zionist movement was born during the twilight period of assimilation as pursued by Jewish socialists on the one hand and the

Jewish bourgeoisie on the other. It was a movement critical of both. It rejected the cosmopolitan nature of both as misguided and offered instead a new theory based on an analysis of *Jewish* social and economic problems of the day. The Socialist-Zionist radical generation that succeeded the Bundists (the Jewish Socialist Party) turned its attention to those conditions which the Bundists had ignored but which were typical of the Jewish workers in the diaspora.

Socialist-Zionists, therefore, were to become the first Jewish economists and sociologists. When socialist Jewish assimilationists proclaimed theories founded upon the social and economic conditions of the European and Russian proletariat, they made no attempt to separate those conditions that pertained specifically to the Jewish worker. To make this distinction was the major innovation of Socialist-Zionism. Of the three leading Socialist-Zionist thinkers, J. Lestschinsky, D. Ber-Borochov and N. Syrkin, Borochov was the most influential. He was born on July 4 in 1881 in the small town of Zolotonosha in the district of Poltava, Russia, and received his early education at home from his father, a Hebrew teacher. His interest in Zionism was aroused very early, and when he was eleven years old he tried to run away from home to go to Eretz Israel. His early formal education took place in a Russian gymnasium, where he first became acquainted with Russian literature. In Yekaterinoslav University, where he met Russian revolutionaries for the first time, he joined the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party. But the R.S.D.L.P. attitude towards Zionism disturbed him and he left the Party. Towards the end of the century he started his first socialist analysis of the Jewish diaspora. He joined the *Poale Zion* club in Yekaterinoslav and his interest in the Uganda controversy led him to writing the comprehensive essay 'On the Question of Zion and Territory'. Borochov then developed a new theory which was to become the foundation of *Poale Zion* and which was incorporated into its 1906 platform. In 1907 he was arrested for his political activities and later escaped from Russia into central Europe. At the outbreak of World War I he was in the United States, active in the *Poale Zion* Party in New York. He returned to Russia during the March Revolution in 1917. Borochov was also a delegate to the Nationalities Conference in Russia. He died of tuberculosis at the age of thirty-six, on December 17, 1917, while campaigning for *Poale Zion*.

In all his works Borochov concerned himself with the various aspects of Jewish economic life, which he analyzed and interpreted. He first formulated what Theodor Herzl simultaneously called *Judennot*—Jewish misery—a permanent phenomenon in Jewish life, such as anti-Semitism and political oppression. Borochov, having studied this phenomenon in the Eastern European diaspora, termed it the Permanent Jewish Anomaly. In his 'On the Question of Zion and Territory' Borochov summarized his far-reaching studies and concluded with the following theses:

1. The Jews in the diaspora are regarded as a permanent foreign element chiefly because they differ from the people around them in psychological and physical behaviour, and appearance.
2. The 'Jewish Problem' is caused by the following two factors: (a) the Jews have neither a country of their own, nor a productive market; (b) increasing economic competition, resulting from the growth of capitalism, keeps the Jews in the various European countries from participating in the new economy

C

and in the capitalist market. This non-participation produces the 'divisive factor' which, in turn, contributes to the spread of anti-Semitism.

3. The anomaly of the diaspora, a product of competitive capitalism, will cause the Jews to become conscious of the need to leave the diaspora. The condition of the Jews will deteriorate in proportion to the general progress of the non-Jewish population. The imminent spread of competitive capitalism throughout all of Europe will transform the anomaly of the diaspora into a *permanent* phenomenon, i.e. turn it into a 'normal *galuth*'⁴ with anti-Semitism as its overt socio-psychological expression. Anti-Semitism will become based upon this permanent phenomenon.

Borochof further deduced from the growth of anti-Semitism during the late 1890s throughout Eastern and Western Europe that the political emancipation of the Jews was in a state of collapse. Anti-Semitism, which had been instigated and propagated in the feudal system, was now being carried on by the middle and petite bourgeoisie. He did not think that hatred of Jews would remain confined within the boundaries of economic life. He predicted that anti-Semitism, in his time largely a reaction to the 'normal' economic *galuth*, would become a movement far removed from economics, and that the bourgeoisie and the aristocracy, in spite of their economic differences, would join forces in the anti-Semitic camp.

In 1897 the Bund had rejected the Zionists' demand for a Jewish territory, arguing that this was a utopian aspiration. In their writings, both Borochof and Lestschinsky for the first time presented a justification for the claims of Zionism and Zion by basing this claim on an economic analysis.⁵ Here the concept of non-proletarianization emerged—and this Borochof tied to the 'no-territory argument'.

The main argument of both writers is that the Jews in the diaspora cannot be economically self-sufficient, mainly *because of lack of territorial concentration*. Their researches led them to conclude that the anomaly of Jewish economic life in the diaspora is *irreparable*. The crisis between feudalism and capitalism pushed the Jews away from any economic stability and deprived them of new economic positions.

Lestschinsky summarized his statistical findings as follows: (a) The percentage of Jewish capital investment in any productive branch of the economy is lower than that of the Jewish factories within a certain industry; (b) The percentage of working forces in Jewish factories is lower, with few exceptions, than the percentage of Jewish capital in this industry; (c) The percentage of the Jewish labour force is always smaller than the percentage of the general labour force employed by Jewish capital. Instead of proletarianization, concludes Lestschinsky, we find pauperization in the Jewish pale; instead of industrialization we still have the sweat-shop system.

Analysing data on the merging Jewish proletariat of Russia, Borochof found that in the process of capitalistic development increasingly larger numbers of Jewish people are drawn into the proletarian class. The small enterprises collapse and the ever expanding large-scale enterprises absorb the growing proletariat. In this general economic upheaval the small-scale Jewish enterprises also collapse, but the new Jewish proletariat created by this collapse cannot join the ranks of factory workers. Thus, the Jewish proletarian is left with but two alternatives. He can join the *Lumpen-proletariat* (impoverished proletariat) or emigrate to another country. But

migration to another country does not solve his dilemma. In the new country, too, the Jewish worker could also be rejected, and consequently the only solution for Jewish workers is to acquire a territory of their own where they can establish themselves as a permanent, stable proletariat. Historical study shows 'exodus from the diaspora' to be the only guarantee for Jewish survival. This Borochov based on his finding that Jews throughout the centuries of dispersion enjoyed something resembling full autonomy only under two sets of circumstances. Under the first, the Jews developed close cultural and economic ties with the population among which they lived, and such a decentralized environment worked towards denationalization of the Jews. Under the second, the Jews remained separated from the people in their host country, and the divisive factor was in full force. The first paved the way to assimilation; the second to nationalism.

Borochov and other founders of Socialist-Zionism were convinced that the determining force behind the Jewish national movement was the *reality of misery* of the broad masses. And the origin and cause of this misery was ascribed to the inevitable divisive factor. This new approach, differing decisively from the mystical and theological Zionism of an earlier decade, started an 'earthly', materialistic Zionism which became a challenge to both Bundists and anti-Zionists. Having thus completed his analyses, Borochov went on to construct the building blocks for Socialist-Zionism. He worked out the formula for the synthesis of nationalism and the class struggle, having postulated that national unity and solidarity are as natural as the class struggle and class solidarity.⁶

To him the national problem was the result of the contradiction between the creative forces of the nation and the conditions of creation. Here he saw the tie between the proletariat and the national problem. Both the proletariat and the nation seek free conditions of creation:

A nation is a community developed in the same conditions of production whose members are united with one another by a feeling of kinship derived from a common historic past. This feeling of kinship, created as a result of a common historic past—as a result of common conditions of production—is called nationalism.⁷

This view of nationalism derives from Marxist dialectical materialism:

Life under the relations of production which are harmonious for the individuals of the group evokes class solidarity; life under the same conditions of production, when the conditions are harmonious for the members of a whole society evokes the national consciousness of that society, the feeling of national kinship.⁸

Borochov, then, distinguishes between two phases of production relationships: one is the phase of 'conditions of production', and the other that of 'relations of production'. These are the fundamentals of his class analysis. The material relations of classes to each other and to the modes of production Marx had termed 'relationships of production'; these relationships of production are found in a nation within the context of 'conditions of production', including historical, geographical, and climatic conditions. This is Borochov's extension of the Marxist class analysis to fit his materialistic national concept:

In the process of production various relationships of production arise but the production itself is dependent on certain conditions which are different in different places . . . forces of production are dependent on geographical environment and the latter, of course, is different in different places . . . the conditions of production vary considerably; they are geographical, anthropological, and historic.

Those who ignore conditions of production on a national scale ignore the struggle between classes for the control of the national means of production. 'The national problem', Borochof wrote, 'therefore arises when the development of the forces of a nationality conflict with the state of the *conditions of production*'.⁹

This is identical with the Marxist class-struggle analysis which regards social crisis as the result wherever the development of the forces of production disturbs the constitution of the relations of production. This formulation concerning the relationships of production is taken from Marx's *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, where he states that capitalistic relationships of production correspond to a definite stage of capitalistic development. The constitution of society is 'disturbed' when the relationships of production have been rendered obsolete by the further development of the productive forces. Such a situation, says Marx, will eventually bring an end to the system of capitalism. Borochof comments that 'according to the teachers of Historical Materialism . . . one and the same process of development of the productive forces can assume various forms according to the differences in the conditions of production'.¹⁰

The horizontal class and vertical national divisions of human society appear as a result of these social relationships into which men enter into the process of production. But whilst the horizontal class divisions arise out of the different positions which each class or group occupies in the economic system, vertical national divisions are created by conditions of production which are different in different places.¹¹

Thus, the analysis of the economic conditions of the diaspora and the concept of non-proletarianization led Borochof to accept as inevitable the necessity of a Jewish exodus from the diaspora. However, territoriality as the cure for Jewish economic maladies posed more questions than it settled. The principal question was the choice of the land that would provide a stable base for the Jewish proletariat: should it be a land that offered economic opportunities and a certain amount of political freedom, or a territory having historical significance? In the second phase of Socialist-Zionism, the questions move from the academic into the practical realm and must be answered in practical terms.

2. *Socialist-Zionism and Territorialism*

Borochof's analyses made many Jewish socialists and Zionist socialists aware of the fact that the socio-economic and nationalist issues were intertwined and inseparable. Under pressure the Bund amended its programme to include the principles of Jewish nationalism, but these differed from those of Zionist nationalism. Actually, the nationalist programme of the Bund, rather than presenting the Bund's interpretation of Jewish nationalism, was very similar to the interpretation of the anti-Zionists.

The Zionist theory of Jewish nationalism denied that Jews could live successfully in the diaspora. Zionism, as demonstrated above by Borochov's statements, had found life in the diaspora impossible.

Territorialism, on the other hand, was a theory which found life in the diaspora possible, and even necessary. There were three major protagonists of territorialism, Simon Dubnow, the Bund and the Seimists.

The chief theoretician of territorialism was the Jewish historian Simon Dubnow, author of the *History of the Jews*, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland* and other works on Judaism and Jewish nationalism. Dubnow based his theory of Jewish national autonomy on his theory of nationalism. According to him, each nation passes through three successive phases of development: the racial; the territorial-political; and third and highest, the historical-cultural. Historically, therefore, nationalism is divided into three types: social, political, and spiritual. In the history of mankind only the Jews have reached the highest, the spiritual stage of nationalism. Consequently the Jews are known as an historical-cultural type, or a spiritual nation. The essence of his territorial-national theory is found in his essay 'Concerning Ancient and Modern Judaism':

Both political and spiritual Zionism have their roots in the negation of the Galos (Exile), in the conviction that outside of Palestine—in the lands of the Diaspora—the Jewish people have no possibility of continuing its existence of a normal national entity. Both political and spiritual Zionists have their eyes equally fixed upon Zion as an anchor of safety for Judaism. Neither doctrine had formulated a clear idea of the future destinies of the Jewish Diaspora; that is, of the destinies of the entire Jewry of the world, minus the section settled in Palestine. . . .

The theory of autonomism takes as its point of departure the historic fact that at all times, with the exception of a few brief, partial deflections, the Jewish Diaspora, taken as a whole, represented a national organism, in which the absence of a political and territorial unity was made up by the stronger cohesion of its spiritual cultural ties, and the greater intensity of its social and autonomous life.¹²

Dubnow did not oppose Eretz Israel as a centre, but saw it as only one of many centres of Jewish life. He said:

The fate of universal Jewry ought not to be bound up with one single center. We should take into account the historic fact of a multiplicity of centers of which those that have the largest number and can boast the most genuine development of a national Jewish life are entitled to the hegemony of the Jewish people.¹³

This is a short exposé of the principles of territorial-autonomism. The bourgeois faction, largely based on Dubnow's principles, saw the traditional order of the pale, the *Kehilah*, as the centre of autonomy. Next let us examine the territorialists—the socialists—the Bundists—and the *Seimists*.

The Bundists expressed their interpretation of Jewish nationalism through a territorialist solution of their own. V. Medem, the Bund's theoretician, summarized his version of territorialism which he called 'cultural-autonomism' as follows:

The principle of autonomism [the Dubnow version] is not new. But in the Bund's programme we do not find autonomism *per se*; it is neither 'districtism' nor territorialism, but national-cultural autonomism. What is this cultural autonomism? It is territorial autonomism with a change in the territorial principle.¹⁴

Medem further stated that, according to the argument presented by the Geographical Territorialists,¹⁵ territorialism was the nationalism of the people. But instead of referring to a nation they speak of a territory. This, Medem felt, did not solve the problem of national oppression, for each strong nation within a territory can oppress the weaker ones. Because he believed that the further development of the capitalist society would increase disunity among the national groups dwelling within one geographical territory, he did not consider the geographical-territorial solution as adequate to the national problem. Although the Bund accepted autonomy of a territory as a necessary means to decentralize a large-size country, it did not accept this as an answer to the national question. To Bundists the answer to the national question was national-cultural autonomy. Under this scheme the total population of a territory was not to organize the affairs of the territory. Rather, the members of each ethnic group, even if living in individual colonies scattered throughout the territory, were to be organized under a system that was culturally rather than territorially autonomous. This theory, of course, was developed primarily in response to the problems created by the spatial distribution of Eastern European Jewry.¹⁶

The second prominent socialist-territorialist group was the Jewish Socialist Workers Party, more popularly known as the Seimists (*Seim*—Polish parliament). The first known gatherings of this group were in the form of an intellectual 'salon' called *Vozhroshednia* (Emancipation) sometime during 1904–05. A journal by the same name was published, devoted largely to socio-economic studies of the contemporary diaspora. The most popular and most frequent issue investigated by the contributors to *Vozhroshednia* was the issue of cultural autonomy. *Vozhroshednia* laid the ideological foundations for the Seimists. The Seimist Party diverged even more from proletarian Zionism than the first faction. Its programme at the time of its formation in April 1906 in Kiev was built predominantly around the principle of territorialism. It soon relinquished the territorial synthesis of Dubnow–Medem, its erstwhile *raison d'être*, in favour of the theory of Personal National Autonomy.

In the main the Seimist argument ran along the following lines. The establishment of extraterritorial national parliaments (hence the name, *Seim* = parliament) will bring about a legal and political solution to the problems of the various national minorities. Such parliaments should concern themselves with the cultural-spiritual problems of each of the national-minority members represented in them. But they should not limit their activities to that task alone. They should further actively participate in all political and economic issues that concern the minorities they represent. The third group was the S.S. Party or the Socialist–Zionist Labour Party (S.S. are the first letters of Zionist–Socialist as spelled in Russian). This group set itself as an intellectual rival coterie to the Seimists, which emerged from the *Vozhroshednia* (Emancipation) salon of 1904–05. The S.S. Party became the most radical of the Territorial–

Socialists groups. It was the protagonist *par excellence* of cultural autonomism. The S.S. Party was officially organized in 1905 in Odessa at the height of Uganda-Zionist* controversy. In fact, it became the most vociferous of the Ugandist groups.

The Seimists had much sympathy for the Social Revolutionary Party in Russia and in their programme expressed approval for the Social Revolutionaries' agrarian thesis of the revolution. They became even further removed from Zionist socialism as well as from Marxian socialism. They began by rejecting the non-proletarianization concept, later by opposing Zionist and territorialist activity of any kind and their rejection of Marxian economics was evidenced by the sympathy they expressed for the Social Revolutionary Party.

Borochov attacked the cultural autonomists along two lines. One attack was directed against the bourgeois territorialists of the Dubnow school, the other against the territorialists of the Marxist school—the Bundists and the Seimists.

The Dubnow adherents, having built their theory on developmental phases, thought that the political-historical phase (the second)—manifested by love of Zion—was over, and the third and highest stage of Jewish national history—the cultural-spiritual phase—had begun; and that the Jewish masses needed cultural autonomy rather than political-territorial independence. Borochov countered this approach by saying: 'The people of Israel need rescue rather than revival of culture.'¹⁷ He admitted that the realistic basis of Zionism (the Jewish anomaly) was identical with the argument for territorialism, but nevertheless rejected the territorialists' solution because it was based on historical sentimentalism rather than on the material class conditions of the Jewish people.

The materialist-territorialists (Bundists and Seimists) were charged by Borochov with having committed two grave errors. He accused the Bundists of dogmatism and lack of historical realism. He made this charge in spite of the fact that they shared his pessimism (based on the economic anomaly of the Jews) concerning the future of the Jewish diaspora, because he viewed cultural autonomism as a theoretical hybrid, as a politically expedient doctrine rather than a philosophical belief shared by the left- and right-wing territorialists. Both the Dubnowists and Bundists-Seimists also shared in the common wish to undermine Zionist nationalism. While Dubnow's nationalist solution was an outgrowth of his general *Weltanschauung*, the Bundists constructed their nationalist doctrine in an attempt to undermine Zionism completely.

Socialist-Zionism was a natural rival of the Bund because both recruited members from the Jews of the pale. A theoretical territorialist may recognize the possibility of Zion amongst other territorial centres of Jewish nationalism, but the materialist-territorialist is always opposed to Zion. Dubnow's territorialism at least attempted to ameliorate existing ills within the present. But how could the Bundists, recognizing the anomaly concept, hold the territorialist view which strongly implied turning the values of diaspora life into a positive nationalist doctrine? Borochov considered such a position, based on what in effect was a contradiction, as nothing more than a complicated lie.

Borochov further condemned the materialist-territorialists for having

* Adhering to the 1905 British proposal to establish a Jewish state in Uganda.

turned the problem of national Jewish independence into a bread-and-butter question instead of elevating it, as the Zionists did, to the political-positive realm. That is to say, materialist-territorialism was based solely on Jewish misery, while Zionism went beyond, to a positive approach. Thus the controversy between Socialist-Zionism and territorialism can be summarized as follows: They both share the concept of the anomaly of the diaspora, but they differ sharply in their respective solutions to the problem. The territorialists reject the Eretz Israel solution as 'idealistic, romanticist, and bourgeois', while the Zionists reject territorialism because it fails to analyse the problem through to its only 'logical' conclusion.

Borochov's Zionist Formula

The intellectuals of the late nineteenth century attempted to answer the problems of society, economics, and politics in a pseudo-scientific manner based upon laws. Borochov, the progeny of this intellectual climate, was no exception. Behind his Socialist-Zionist formulations can be found two fundamental laws: (1) The Weber-Fechner Law,¹⁸ and (2) the Styctic process.¹⁹ These laws sprang from elaborate studies undertaken by Russian economists and especially by the Mikhailovsky school of sociology. Borochov, who had made a 'scientific' study of the conditions of Jewish economic life in the diaspora, used these laws as his major methodological tool in his analysis; they helped him formulate the Socialist-Zionist dogmas that were to be shared and accepted by many future generations of Socialist-Zionists.

Borochov's over-all formula can be simply stated: Diaspora conditions will inevitably lead to spontaneous migration of both Jewish capitalists and Jewish workers to Eretz Israel, where after the establishment of a Jewish economy the forces of production will in turn give rise to a class struggle that will ultimately lead to the creation of a Jewish socialist state. Underlying this over-all formula are Borochov's concept of the Styctic process and the concept of the anomaly of the diaspora.

He expected the Styctic principle to guide immigration to Eretz Israel; that is to say, immigration would assume a spontaneous and non-directed form. He saw immigration as the inevitable result of the anomaly of the diaspora, and he expected immigration to occur when the maladjustment between Jewish economic life in the diaspora and the objective conditions of rising capitalism in Europe would reach a point at which the maladjustment could no longer be tolerated. Then both the Jewish proletariat and the Jewish bourgeoisie would migrate to Eretz Israel. He predicted that, through the effects of the Styctic process, capital investment would flow from the Jewish bourgeoisie, factories would be built, and a conscious proletarian group would emerge in Eretz Israel. The World Zionist Congress (composed largely of members of the bourgeoisie) would be primarily responsible for taking charge of the capitalist migration as well as the migration of the potential industrial workers. Once this migration would become regularized, he thought, the Styctic process would become instrumental in bringing about two different, though interlinked, effects: the Jewish proletariat in Eretz Israel would form the base for a politically and territorially independent nation; and the proletariat remaining in the diaspora would gain in strength from this newly created independent

nation. He saw as the function of the bourgeoisie the furnishing of the productive needs while the proletariat would be the instrument of production.

Borochov firmly believed that the immigrants in Eretz Israel would undergo the developmental stages defined by Marxist theory; that the capitalization of the economy could be undertaken only by the bourgeoisie and therefore would be directed by it, but that the subsequent democratization of society must be accomplished by the proletariat.²⁰ But Borochov's theories were not confined to the development of a new nation. He was equally concerned with the problems of the Jewish proletariat in the diaspora, aiming at the 'normalization of the *galuth*'. This too, he believed, would be accomplished as a result of the Stychic process, depending in turn on the dynamics of Jewish life. Here again Borochov juxtaposed a materialistic-economic interpretation of the Jewish diaspora against the arguments of the spiritual and political Zionists, refuting the romantic and historical-idealistic Zionist approaches as a solution to the Jewish question. Borochov's *Weltanschauung*, in this period, 1898–1903, appears to contain some ambiguity, however. While his historical materialism led him to complete acceptance of the return to Zion, he simultaneously burdened Zionism with the task of normalizing the *galuth*. He did not appear to recognize any discrepancy in these dual aims, and advocated Zionism with its triple objectives of redemption, revival, and return, as the only solution to the Jewish problem. He wrote:²¹

'The dream of Zion grew out of the material conditions, out of the growing divisionalism which matures and grows throughout the entire Jewish nation. The dream of Zion is the full answer to the divisional processes, to the process of integration, to anti-Semitism and Jewish nationalism. In Zion is found a means to the normalization of the Galuth.'

Borochov's formula at this stage of his intellectual life was divided into a maximum programme—the normalization of *galuth*—and the minimum programme—the return to Zion. The passage of time, with new issues, pogroms, and catastrophic social and economic events, would turn this formula upside down, and the point would be reached when Zion would constitute the maximum programme and the normalization of the diaspora would remain as the minimum task.

Although Borochov has become a sage of left Socialist-Zionism, his ideology has directly influenced the Kibbutz movement very little. The Marxist-Zionist formula was millenarian in the spirit of other late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century doctrines. In fact, contrary to Borochov's prognosis, the majority of Jews went to America, while at the turn of the century only a tiny group emigrated to Israel. The 'anomaly' of economic conditions in the Eastern European diaspora and the Bolshevik Revolution started a tide of immigration toward the United States, not Palestine. Very few immigrants were caught in the Borochovist straits. Nor did Jewish capitalists establish factories in Palestine so that Jewish workers could have a try in a class struggle from which the new Jewish proletarians would rise. In fact, Borochov would have least expected that those who enshrined him established rural collective settlements and not an industrial factory system in Palestine. They sought redemption through agricultural work and not industrial labour, at least in the early years of Socialist colonization in Palestine.

The class struggle in Palestine was well isolated, at least in the early days. The Socialist-Zionists established themselves in pioneer rural settlements away from the city and its industrial complex.

Three decades after the first Kibbutz was established, and only when this agricultural system was consolidated, did the Kibbutz movement develop industry. Borochov's concepts were turned upside down. While he had believed that out of the new class struggle the Jewish proletariat would establish itself and bring about the Zionist-Marxist state, the Socialist-Zionist movement turned to industrial work long after it was consolidated in Palestine. The Borochovist formula failed in the urban centres as well. Here the Jewish worker was organized along national rather than class lines. The Histadrut did not encourage the emergence of a class-conscious proletariat, it rather harnessed the industrial and urban worker for the nation. No independent industrial unionism emerged. Instead, the industrial worker organized by the Histadrut and the agricultural worker organized by the Hityashvut systems became the social-economic resources for the political and military power of the Jewish state; a progressive colonizing commonwealth, a workers' movement strongly imbued with egalitarian values, but far from the Marxist-Zionist commonwealth conceived by Borochov. Borochov can thus join a respectable community of socialist thinkers and dreamers whose sincerity and dedication to the cause of the oppressed is accompanied by their rather naïve and primitive doctrines and formulas.

1. The two major settlement systems were the rural colonies settlement system by bourgeois Zionists, the Moshavot; and the complex rural settlement established by the Socialist-Zionist movement whose most famous patterns are the Kibbutz (also the *Kvutzah*) and the Moshav Ovdim.

2. Borochov has written his essays in many languages, Yiddish, German, and Russian. However, there is no single collection of his writings in these languages. The Hebrew collection is, so far, the most comprehensive. Three volumes of Borochov's works have been published by Hakkibutz Hameuchad—Sifriat Poalim, edited by L. Levita and D. Ben-Nachum in 1955, 1957 and 1964.

3. Borochov, 'The Question of Zion and Territory' in *K'tavim* (Works) 1, 36–56.

4. *Galuth*—Diaspora, Exodus.

5. Borochov's full analysis is found in his essay 'The Economic Development of the Jewish Nation', in *Nationalism and the Class Struggle*, selected writings (New York: Poale Zion Zeire Zion of America, 1937). Lestschinsky's writings on this topic can be found in his *The Jewish People, Past and Present*, 'The Economic Development of the Jewish People' (New York: Jewish Encyclopaedic Handbooks, C.Y.C.O., 1946), I, 361–8.

6. Borochov, *K'tavim*, I, 154–80.

7. Borochov, *Nationalism . . .*, *op. cit.*, pp. 131–2.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 137.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 138.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 124.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 135.

12. S. M. Dubnow, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1920), III, 51–3.

13. *Ibid.*

14. V. Medem, 'National Movements, Socialist-National Parties in Russia' from *Twenty Years to Medem's Death* (in Yiddish) (New York: Poale Zion of America, 1943), pp. 189–90. A Hebrew translation is found in *Klal Israel*, *op. cit.*, pp. 538–41.

15. Geographical Territorialists has reference to Dubnow's school.

16. According to the statistics of 1897, the Jews—mainly an urban people—were scattered in the following cities: Of the total urban population, 59.4 per cent were Jews in the District of Pinsk; 58.7 per cent in the District of Grodno; 53.7 per cent in the District of Schedlitz; 52.7 per cent in the District of Vitebsk; 52.6 per cent in the District of Mohilev; 51.3 per cent in the District of Keltz; 51.0 per cent in the District of Voholin; 50.6 per cent in the District of Radom. In these seven out of twenty-five districts where Jews were permitted to reside, they constituted a majority. (Taken from J. Lestschinsky 'The Jewish National Movement in the Diaspora and Jewish Autonomism' in *Klal Israel*, *op. cit.*, p. 511.)

17. Borochov, *K'tavim*, I, 29.

18. Weber-Fechner Law—a physio-psychic law—concerns the relationship between external irritation and the amount of sensitivity which is caused by this irritation. This complementary relationship is expressed in a mathematical formulation; while sensitivity progresses arithmetically, irritation progresses geometrically. Borochov uses this law to explain the lack of co-ordination between subjective feeling and the objective situation of man. See footnote 3 in Borochov, *K'tavim*, I, 394.

19. Stychism. In Greek the word ΣΤΟΙΧΣΙΟΝ (Stichion) means elements. ΣΤΟΙΧΣΙΟΖΝ—elementary. In Russian the word СТИХИЙНОСТ (stignost) means spontaneity. Borochov borrowed this concept from Mikhailovsky. Stychism is used to explain an historical sociological phenomenon. Special reference here is to the phenomenon of spontaneity. 'Stychism, in Bolshevik terminology, meant the control of workers . . . evidence has been presented to show that the Bolshevik view of workers' control and of socialism differed from the conception held by the workers. Thus, there existed a basic and fundamental dispute between the workers and the Bolshevik Party regarding the goals and objectives of the revolution. Further evidence of this divergence in viewpoint is provided by the Bolshevik use of the words *Stikhinost* (spontaneity) and *Soznatel'n'ost* (consciousness). . . . The concepts which these words encompass are peculiar to and specific for the framework of Bolshevik ideology. In this respect it is significant to note that a pre-Bolshevik dictionary *Dal'* does not include *Stikhnost* either as a noun or an adjective. The meanings these words now possess arose historically in the Bolshevik Revolution and reflect the mutually antagonistic world conceptions of the Bolsheviks and the workers. A Soviet dictionary *Tolkovyi Slovar'* defines *Stikhini* the adjective from *Stikhinost* (spontaneity) as follows: '. . . unorganized, not regulated by anything, developing without any guidance'. Frederick A. Kaplanf 'Russian Labour and the Bolsheviks 1917-1920', unpublished Ph.D., dissertation, University of California Berkeley, 1956, pp. 139-40.

20. A detailed explanation is found in Borochov, 'Our Platform' and 'The Role of Working Class in the Territorial Realization', in *K'tavim*, I, 272-310, 311-37.

21. Borochov, *K'tavim*, I, 81.