

ZE'EV JABOTINSKY

NATION AND SOCIETY

(Selected Articles)

Edited by Elazar (Gad) Pedhazur

PUBLISHED BY SHILTON BETAR – DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

ELUL. 5721

AUGST 1961

CONTENTS

1. Race (1913)	Page. 04
2. A Lecture on Jewish History (1932)	13
3. An Exchange of Compliments (1911)	20
4. From the Social Philosophy of the Bible (1932)	30
5. A Letter on Autonomy (1904)	37
6. The Anti-Semitism of “Men and Things” (1945)	50
7. The Revolt of the Old Men (1936)	57
8. The Jubilee Ideal (1927)	62
9. Class (1933)	69
10. Introduction to the Theory of Economy (1936)	73

NATION AND SOCIETY

Foreword

We plan to publish a series of booklets from the writings of *Rosh Betar*. Out of a large number of books, we shall select essays, articles and speeches and compile them according to main themes, such as: Nation and Society; Zionism; Art and Literature; the Jews and the Arabs, etc. Each booklet will deal with one theme.

The booklets are not meant to replace the complete works of *Rosh Betar*, but to give the *Betari* a selection of major topics. It is hoped, that reading the selection will stimulate *Betarim* to turn to the collected works and study them in their entirety.

We consider these selections to be important to any young man who wishes to broaden his horizons and form an opinion concerning the most important problems facing the Jewish nation. Needless to say, the *Betar Madrich* will find in these selections an unfailing source of inspiration, research and thought, which will prove beneficial when performing the task of educating the young generation.



This booklet deals with problems of Nation and Society. Already in ancient times attempts were made to explain phenomena like Tribe, Nation, Race, Society etc. It is only in recent times however, that these were dealt with systematically, scientifically. The study of these problems is of utmost importance towards a better understanding of the Jewish Nation, since its history has no comparison in the history of other Nations.

The long oppressive life in the *Galut* among the nations, of different cultures and opposing concepts of life, left its mark on the Jewish nation. As a result considerable differences

arose between one Jewish community and another, to an extent that the existence of the Jews as a national entity having its own character, was, and still is, being questioned. At various times there existed the tendency – even among Jews – to consider the Jews as nothing but a religious group.

However, anyone who studies the history of our nation seriously; anyone who tries to bring to light what is hidden underneath the layers piled high by *Galut* life, cannot but see definite signs that unite the Jewish communities beyond the boundaries of the countries they live in. Anyone who listens to what takes place beneath the surface, cannot help but be moved by the deep yearning in the hearts of Jewish people to reunite the nation and renew its days as of old.

Indeed, one cannot, at the same time, ignore the degree of the intensity in this aspiration of the various Jewish communities. This difference is a result of the conditions a community lives in, the type of culture it absorbs, the amount of freedom and equality it enjoys and the economic changes which take place at certain time.

Depending on these and other similar factors the feeling of affinity may be strengthened to the extent that it takes the foremost place in the Jewish community, or it may be weakened and covered by layers upon layers till it is invisible. In such cases it takes patience and hard work to uncover the kernel.

For the purpose of illustrations we shall take a phenomenon which is often referred to, i.e. the comparison between Eastern-European Jewry prior to World War II and Western Jewry today. It is easy enough to point out the differences between the two as well as what created them. There are people however, who blame the one and extol the other as a “warmer” Jewry, more “idealistic” and even a more “Jewish” one. It is advisable not to get involved in this action

of labeling and instead study the special factors that influence it and thereby find the reasons for the special characteristics it acquired. Such a study is a prerequisite when one attempts to contemplate and lay down plans to fulfill the vision of the Ingathering of the Exiles.

Anyone who lives in Israel, or even just visits, can easily notice opposing character traits in the representatives of Jewish communities who made Israel their home. The difficulties encountered when attempts are being made towards the integration of exiles, make us realize again the effect that *Galut* life had on our nation. A superficial observer will probably express doubt in the following manner: “Has the conglomeration of tribes which do not resemble each other at all, a right to be referred to as a nation?” Another may form his argument in the following manner: “Is it correct to include in the term ‘one nation’ a Jew who is living in the *Galut* and is supporting the State of Israel materially and morally, but considers the country he is residing in as his homeland; a orthodox Jew who considers living according to the Torah the *raison d’être* of Judaism; An anti-religious Jew; a Jew who is living in *Galut* and denying any affinity towards Judaism as well as Israel? One cannot answer these and similar questions accurately before one studies the problems of Nation and Society in general and then applies his knowledge to the special problems of our nation.



Prior to the establishment of the State of Israel, our movement concentrated all its efforts in conducting the revolt and liberating the homeland. It was, therefore, inevitable that many problems, social ones included, were not given the attention they deserved. He who is occupied in fighting for freedom is forced to neglect the study of social problems, despite the fact that he realizes their great importance.

However, at present, *Betar* should devote much time, thought and energy to study, conduct research and lay down plans in this important field. The idea of social justice should be elucidated and presented as an ideal as well as a practical plan as opposed to the Socialist-Communist falsehood.

Rosh Betar realized the importance of research in problems of Nation and Society. In scores of articles and essays he dealt with these problems from various aspects. It was difficult to make selections from this extensive material for the purpose of this booklet. However, as stated above, we hope that after studying this booklet, the reader will turn to those writings which were not included.



Each article is preceded by a short introduction. We hope that this will be helpful in grasping the meaning of the articles.

Shilton Betar

Hamachlake Lechinuch Ulehadrecha

Introduction to “Race”

Marx and his followers renounced the ideal of Nationalism. They maintained that national identity was an outcome of the Bourgeoisie regime and its economic system. In contrast to Nationalism the Communist Socialist pointed to the ideals and interests that the working class have in common, and called for its unity beyond national borders. A classless society, not split by national affinities, was the desired aim of Communist-Socialism.

This was propounded in the *Communist Manifesto* published in 1848 by Marx and Engels.

On the other hand, he warns against the spiritual – cultural poverty that is bound to come as a result of an attempt to abolish the national framework.

The communist theoreticians headed by Marx alleged that Jewry is devoid of any national characteristics, and hence it has no right to claim the status of a nation. This idea was upheld also by many Jews who considered Jewry as nothing but a religious sect. It was this way of thinking that gave birth to slogans like ‘Frenchmen of Mosaic persuasion’.

The article on Race deals with these arguments too, and reasons as follows:- “There are nations that have a territory but no language of their own, the Irish being an example of this. There are nations that have a language of their own but have no consecutive territory, for example the Armenians. Lastly there are the Jews. One is therefore bound to conclude; territory, language, religion, common history – all these are not the essence of a nation, but its’ adjectives only. Indeed, these adjectives are of very great importance, especially in the stabilizing of national existence. But the essence of a nation, the first and last fortress of the uniqueness of its image, is its’ distinctive psychic, characteristics, the compound of its’ racial recipe.”

RACE

(1913)

Does a thing called 'Race' exist? Considerable misunderstandings were amassed around this term. The naïve among men think, that to admit the existence of 'Race' means believing- thus and not otherwise that the white man are the descendents of Noah's three sons – Shem, Ham and Japheth. But even the less naïve, think that to admit the existence of 'Race' means believing in what is called 'Racial purity' of the existing ethnical groups. They take pains to probe that the French, the English, the Germans and even the Jews are not to be classified as pure races, since each of these groups is the result of a mixture of different racial elements.

By doing this, they only divert the attention from the problem itself. The main thing is not whether the Germans or the Poles are a 'pure Race'; it is also doubtful whether it is possible to ascertain the term 'pure Race' with sufficient clarity. Let us assume for a moment, that we have reached the primeval 'pure blooded' Aryan or Semite. But how do we know that even he does not descend from an even more primeval day, from a mixture of other races of which we have no information? On the contrary. A more feasible assumption is, that the term 'Race' denotes a state of mixture of certain elements in a certain proportion, but that the quality and number of these elements, and the proportion according to which they are mixed are not equal. This difference from the point of view of the racial spectrum or from the point of view of what one could term, the racial recipe is the differentiating factor between races. Such a difference from the point of view of the physical family exists, undoubtedly and is evident among the closest nations, such as the French and the Italians, the Germans and the Dutch. There are also certainly,

intermediate types, but then there exist also intermediate types amongst plants and animals. If science had already the necessary means, it could have been possible to separate in a special manner the elements in the blood of a 'Typical' Frenchman and a 'typical' Saxon (for example) and discover and determine the formula of the uniqueness. In the case under discussion it makes no difference whether 'pure' races do exist or not. The main thing is, that the ethnical groups differ from one another in their racial spectrum and in this respect the word 'race' acquires a clearly and defined scientific meaning.

Therefore- if we are not concerned with a pedantic definition of the terms, we have the right to state, in general, that almost every nation has its' unique 'racial recipe', which is common to each individual in it. From this point of view (but of course not from the politico-juridical one) the nation and the race are almost identical. What is to be concluded from this?

There is some sort of a link between the physical state and the spiritual activity, a kind of psycho-physical parallelism. The materialists of the past preferred to speak explicitly about the physical causation of the psychic phenomenon; but since science did not ascertain the nature of the link between 'race' and 'spirit' since man cannot put his finger and point to transition from the physiological function to the psychic. We should rather ignore the causation and speak merely of parallelism. There is no doubt as to the existence of the latter. The physical activity of the individual enjoys a considerable amount of autonomy in the sense, that under the influence of different conditions it could take widely different forms and magnitudes. But in all its' phases of development, there is in it the unreasonable stamp (even if invisible to us) of individual's physiological nature. The matter could be phrased as follows-: *ceteris paribus*, that is to say; given the same climatic, geographic, historic etc conditions, given on equal level to the personal development and a similar biography who differ physiologically will differ in their psychic

response to an entirely identical stimulus. The physical differences are always accompanied (how and why, is still one of Nature's secrets) by psychic differences.

Let us take two persons who belong to two different ethnic groups-two individuals whose racial recipe is different. It is beyond doubt that, under similar conditions their psychic response will be different. Obviously, there is nothing more difficult than to 'describe' the psychology of each nation, to express it by means of a concise definition. All previous attempts to do this have failed. But in general, not everything that exists, the existence of which we cannot doubt can be exactly defined. It is impossible to 'define' the racial psychology. But in spite of that each 'racial' group (in the above meaning) has a unique 'racial' psychology, which is revealed in one way or another – in spite of the considerable differences between individuals – in each individual of the same group (of course with the exception of intermediate types)

The Marxists attribute historical development primarily to economic factors, or to be more precise, to the form of the means of production at a given period. We shall not deal here with the question whether they are right or not. Let us assume that they are right. Let us assume that the primary cause in the historical development is the means of production. But then, production depends upon the natural climatic conditions, the scope and quality of the soil etc. The initiators of the theory too, admitted this. All these conditions influence man's mere production in one way or the other force him to choose the one of least resistance. But then, the main and most important of all the 'natural conditions' is the one inside man- his psyche.

From the general point of view is not Psyche a supreme instrument of production? Man knows his needs, seeks way to satisfy them, accumulates experience, improves technical means, discovers the cooperation, even if in the beginning all this comes 'of itself' almost in the form of

a reflex, almost instinctively. All this takes place in the psyche through a psychic function, and if the psyche is of a special character, the results too must be of a special nature. Just as among people using stone tools of production, there is bound to be created even *caeteris paribus*, a different economy and a different culture from those created among people using iron tools. The psyche is a supreme instrument of production, and therefore the differences in psyche leave their stamp in all the spheres of the life activity of man, and foremost in the sphere of economy.

Given a complete similarity of all other conditions – climate, soil, history – two ‘races’ would create two different types of economy. According to a Marxist, out of different types of economy there stem different types of culture. According to a non Marxist- in the eyes of those who acknowledge the significance of ideological factors as autonomous and of primary causative nature this is even more obvious. If the types of economy, its special characteristics, the social order etc, are stamped by the ‘racial’ psyche it is even more so in the sphere of religion, philosophy, literature, and to some extent even the constitution. In short, the spiritual culture as a whole, the direct link between which the national psyche is more obvious and prominent.

Obviously, this is no more than a rough outline. In fact large or small deviations from it are inevitable. Let us describe the ideal type of an ‘absolute nation’. It would have to be distinguished by a specific racial spectrum, sharply differentiated from the racial nature of its’ neighbors. It would have to inhabit from time immemorial a territory with clear cut frontiers, preferably an island, and that the territory should harbor all the members of the nation, so that there would be no scattered minorities abroad. It would still be better if there were no alien minorities on the nation’s territory. It should speak a language entirely unlike that of any neighbor across any frontier; better still, a language unlike any other in the world, a language created by the nation itself and reflecting all phases of its’ thought and emotion. It should

practice a national religion, not a borrowed one like Islam in Persia, but one of its own creation from the earliest times such as Buddhism in India or Judaism of the Jews. And finally, it should possess an historic unbroken tradition common to all its arts from remotest antiquity. This would be the ideal nation, the absolute one, with no splitting factors in its national consciousness. But of course in reality no such nation exists. There exist only nations which in degree approach more or less the ideal type.

Either there are foreign minorities strewn and scattered in the national territory, and some parts of the nation are cut off from the main part by dividing territory which is in the possession of another nation of another nation; or the language is borrowed – a Celtic or a Slavic nation speaking Rumanian, or the Hungarians, in whose blood it is doubtful whether 10 per cent of Asian elements are still left, speak a language of an Ural-Altai descent. The religion of all European nations-with the exception of one is borrowed. There is a whole set of nations to which the term non-historic is attached. There are nations that have a territory, but no particular language like the Irish; those who have a language but no consecutive territory like the Armenians. And lastly there are Jews. One is therefore bound to state. Territory, language religion, common history – all these are not the essence of a nation but its adjectives only. Indeed these adjective are of great importance, and there importance is even greater for the stability of national existence. But the essence of a nation, its' first and last fortress of uniqueness of its image, is its' distinctive physical characteristics, the compound of its racial recipe.

This is so in the sphere of science only. In the sphere of politics (as I mentioned earlier) the problem is phrased in a completely different manner. In the eyes of the statesman and legislator the decisive factor in the ascertaining national affinity, in cases which are under dispute, is only the psychic one, the fact of national consciousness. Indeed, even philosophers

and psychologists sometimes choose this point of view. Renan, Lazarot, Freibl, Monzini, Blonzini, Yelinek etc, are all in agreement. A nation is will. But to the scientist, who is not only interested in the facts and the needs of present political life or in the phenomena of the physical life, but also in the objective first causes. Then, after all the shells which originate through history, climate, nature, foreign influences, will be peeled off, the 'nation' will contract to its racial kernel.

We shall now deal with the main problem, with which we opened this article. Will there ever be one herd and one shepherd? It is a question of prognosis; and in sociology, the word prognosis actually means guesswork. If it is possible in such guesswork to reach some sort of certainty, it is not in regards to what will be, but mainly in regards to what has been will not be. For example. It is only possible to believe that a day will come when general peace will prevail on earth. As far as I am concerned, I unreservedly believe it, though I won't attempt to prove it. But it is obvious that this does not necessitate the amalgamation of nations and their mixing into a one-species mixture. Peace and tranquility could also be vestures. In fact, wars did not break out because of the national differences, but because of economic interests. The national psyche entices the healthy nations to create through every movement of the body and every stir of the heart, the national culture. But when one nation attacks its neighbor to lust and pillage, the origin of this urge is not to be found in its national qualities, but in its economic appetite.

Certainly, the national psyche leaves its stamp in this act too, one way or another, even in the form which is termed temperament. Probably even its wars are conducted according to its specific way. But what drives it to war is after all, the economic interest. It is therefore possible to believe, that if men would have been able to solve the social-economic problem of mankind, according to the socialist recipe or any other one, all cause for war would have vanished, and

wars would cease. This is a belief. But when to this is added the dream of the integration of nations into one mixture, here it is already possible to state with some certainty. It shall not be.

As proof of the inevitability of the general integration, the well known arguments are raised; the intensification of cultural interchange between nations, the wide study of foreign languages, the propagation of the ideas of equality and tolerance, the migration of masses etc. All this is not convincing and very superficial. For almost all the above mentioned phenomena are characteristic only to the social regime of our days, and will probably vanish or lose their importance, especially at that period of social harmony, which is a necessary prerequisite for peace among nations.

It is possible to grasp the integration in two forms; as an integration of the race into one racial mixture of the cultures only. The first possibility obviously assumes mass imprisonment, a surge of intermarriage between Portuguese and Samoieds, between Albanians and Chinese. It is doubtful whether it is taken seriously. Migration is the only important factor from this point of view. Migration from some countries to other reached in our days absolute enormous numbers. Even if we deduct the temporary migrants, i.e. those who travel for work in order to return home then these absolute numbers will be reduced to at least half. As to permanent migration, it may bring about three kinds of results. Either the stream of migrants to a country is very small in comparison to its population and they are assimilated into it, or; the stream is so powerful that finally the migrants would become such a force in their new homeland and would assimilate the natives. Or, lastly; the new homeland is inhabited by a mixture of migrants from different nations, and the new stream will vanish in the general melting pot, as we witness taking place in the United States. In all three cases the result will be one. The old nation will remain, or a new one will be created. Matters would have been different had the migration between countries been

reciprocal. But such a process does not exist and is inconceivable. It is obvious that the country out of which there is mass migration has no room for new settlers, and, on the other hand, the inhabitants of a country in which there is ample space for migrants will see no reason to leave it. Sometimes there are temporary exceptions to this rule. But one cannot nevertheless talk about permanent and reciprocal 'osmosis' due to migration. However, the main point is that migration is the malady of the social organism, the fruit of social degeneracy a pathological phenomenon.

Therefore, when a recovery of the social regime will come about when economic life will be organized in such a manner as to grant each citizen the right to work, no man will have to look for a means of living in very remote places. As the causes preventing the nations from living in peace will disappear, there will be no *raison d'être* for migration.

Let us then give up the idea of racial integration. But the integration of cultures is just as remote. Indeed, there prevail interchanges of cultural values, and the process will keep on rendering blessed fruit. But this has no bearing and relevance to the problem under discussion. The more a nation collects and absorbs cultural values of other nations, the more will its' independent national creation increase. The Russian nation gave birth to great poets. That is to say, created a national literature, after having been for two hundred years under European influence. The spreading of the knowledge of foreign languages is no proof either. In the first place, one can point to a contrary process. The increase in cultural level sometimes cancels the need for foreign languages. An inhabitant of Constantinople, an illiterate and boorish person speaks six or seven languages, whereas the most cultured Englishman often does not know even French. In olden days every cultured Russian spoke French. There was also no other way of acquiring knowledge. Nowadays, one meets everywhere in Russia, University graduates who do not know foreign languages and do not need them, since everything can be read in translations.

This same phenomenon can be seen even in the boundaries of one country. A Czechoslovakian can live today in Austria without knowing German, much easier than one could do so fifty years ago. In general, in every decade there is a decrease in the need of the average intelligent person of knowing foreign languages for the sake of acquiring knowledge. There is no doubt that the day will come when the technique of translation and publishing will decrease this need to a minimum. There will remain amateurs who will like especially to read the books of a certain author in the original, but what will be the number of such amateurs, and to what extent will they influence the rest of mankind from the point of view of the 'assimilation of everybody into the whole'. One should add that not the same language will appeal to all of them.

Kantsky once pointed out that the present form of exchange of merchandise inevitably brings about the spreading of foreign languages. This is true! But it does not concern us here. Indeed in the private economy every merchant has to maintain individual contacts in foreign countries. There is therefore a need for tens of thousands 'of correspondents' and travelling agents who have a thorough knowledge of languages, and they in turn are in need of teachers. In general whoever looks for a job goes to the trouble of learning at least one language. After all, an additional hope for acquiring a means of living. But all this is characteristic only for the economy of our days, which is based on individual competition. Visualize for a moment an economy organized according to the Socialist plan- and you will see that the function of exchange of merchandise will be concentrated for each district by several chambers with a small number of workers; that means that perhaps even 99 percent of the class for whom the knowledge of foreign languages is a means of living will lose their *raison d'être*. The organization of production, abolition of competition etc. – all these are prerequisite conditions for the general peace; but exactly when these conditions will be carried out there will be

considerable decrease in the average citizen's material need to be in direct contact with foreign countries. Furthermore, thanks to collectivism there will be an increase in the contacts with the nearest surroundings. In such conditions the national characteristics of each closed district can only increase in 'purity' and strength, but never to the contrary, especially if we take into consideration the democratization of culture, which will then be inevitable, since the wide masses who are always and everywhere the fortress of the national 'essence' will join the cultural life.

In this future vision in its entirety there is no prospect of integration of cultures and their mixture, but on the contrary; glorious flourishing, such that we have not witnessed yet, of each national essence in an atmosphere of peace and tranquility. Through reciprocal exchange of the fruits of the individual and original creation this state will be reached. Happy are those who will live to reach those blessed times. He who will not live to see those days will also not remain in the memory of the future generations, and only the scholars will say of him whilst shrugging their shoulders he has eaten the fruits of his own doing.

Introduction to Lecture on Jewish History

In the “lecture on Jewish History” *Rosh Betar* deals with “unnatural” phenomena in the life of the Jewish nation- phenomena which aroused heated discussion and numerous interpretations.

Discussing first the wish of each nation of function as a separate society and create for itself a way of life and culture in accord with its nature, *Rosh Betar* explains why Jews in the *Galut* chose to deal in commerce. He also discusses the Ghetto phenomenon and states that it is the Jews who chose to live in a Ghetto and it was at a later stage that they were forced by the Gentiles to stay in it.

The fact that our religion passed through various reforms while we were living in our country, whereas with the Dispersion we became extreme conservatives and fought against the slightest change, is analyzed in a very interesting manner in this lecture.

The explanation to all these phenomena is to be found- according to *Rosh Betar*- in the wish of the people to have “isolators” that will help to preserve its uniqueness.

Rosh Betar concludes his lecture with an explanation of the reasons for the emergence of the Zionist Movement at the end of the 19th century.

A LECTURE OF JEWISH HISTORY

Even without being a Marxist, one can concede to a Marxist principle, namely; the main factor in all the historical phenomena is the state of the means of production. But according to the ordinary Marxist the 'means of production' are material only, a stone-hammer in prehistoric times, an iron machine in present days. This is where the mistake lies. In fact, these are not the most important means of production. Before man made the first hammer, he had to weight his mind what he wanted to create and what he was lacking for that purpose. Afterwards he had to invent the hammer in his mind. The most important thing, therefore, is the 'thought'. From among all the means of production, the supreme, first and most important one is our spiritual mechanism.

But each race has a different spiritual mechanism. This has nothing to do with the question whether there exist 'pure' races. Certainly each race is mixed and this applies to us Jews too - but the mixture is different.

In chemistry, two particles of hydrogen and one of oxygen together produce water; but two particles of hydrogen and two particles of oxygen together produce an entirely different liquid which one should not drink, but which can be used to turn dark haired women into a blonde haired one. The elements of composition out of which the Jewish race was created and the proportion according to which these elements were mixed, are not equal to those of the Italians or the English, and this fact in itself is sufficient to cause a difference. The Irish are a mixture, so are the Scotch, but the difference in the psyche, namely in the spiritual mechanism is vast, despite the fact that here the 'element of composition' is almost identical. They are mixed in different proportions. The quality of the 'spiritual mechanism' depends upon the 'race', the

strength of the intellect, a stronger or weaker leaning to search for new ways, the preparedness to be resigned to the prevailing situation or the daring which urges to invent; the stubbornness or on the contrary the character that gets tired with the first failure. The supreme means of production is in itself a product of the 'race'.

This is why each race has an explicit uniqueness, aspires to become a 'nation'. This is to say, aspires to form a separate society in which everything should be 'in our own image' – should be in accord with its specific taste, habits, and its peculiar virtues and shortcomings. It should encompass every single this; the language, economy, political structure, and in short the 'culture'. For the essence of 'national culture' is not restricted to books and music, as many assume. National culture is the sum total of all the habits, institutions, and ways of living of the nation. The accuracy that is to be found in everything German, the passing from one extreme to the other, which is characteristic of the Russians- this too is part of the national culture. The most important part of English culture is by no means Shakespeare. It is that merit which enabled them to be the first creating the parliamentary and judicial system. Then other nations borrowed these form them. A thing that one nation borrows from another is not exactly the same one. In each race the borrowed thing takes on a different form. For example the same parliamentary system which has a unique characteristic in England has an entirely different characteristic in Spain or France. This does not mean that the thing is 'better' in one nation and 'worse' in another but it is nevertheless different.

Perhaps this applies to the economy even more that to political matters. The economy is 'national' in its full essence. People forget this, since they see that the processes of living are similar in every country. But the similar processes are always accompanied by tremendous differences in the forms, habits, and kind of temperament. France and England both reach a high

level of industrialization and both use the same machines; but suffice it for one to reside several years in those two countries, and he will find out that there is an abyss between all their methods in the economic spheres of activity.

Each race that has an explicit uniqueness aspires to become a nation; that is to say, to create for itself an economic, political and spiritual surrounding, in which everything will originate from its specific ‘thought’, and will therefore also suit its special ‘taste’.

A certain race will be able to establish for itself such a surrounding only in its own country, where it is the master. Each race will, therefore, aspire to become a state. Each and every one. One race will aspire vigorously for it has the ‘stubbornness’ needed for it, whereas another race will aspire in a weaker form, for it lacks the strength to resist. But instinctively it desires it, for only in its own state will it feel ‘comfortable’ whereas in every other place it will feel ‘uncomfortable’ – uncomfortable, perhaps not only for itself, but also for its neighbors who are the masters.

The Jews are the most outstanding example of the rule according to which each ‘race’ always wishes to live in the surrounding that it created for itself in accordance with its special psychic ‘means of production’. Our history, more than 3000 years ago starts with a search for a country of our own; and today we are searching again for a country, and again the very same country. But our eternal aspiration for ‘our own country’ is not only expressed through that Zionism ‘from the generation of the desert to the pioneers’. If we shall observe very carefully we shall see this very same aspiration in the main phenomena in our history of the dispersion; in our economic life as well as in our attitude towards the religious tradition, and even in our daily ways of living to this very day.

When a Jew hater reproaches us for being mainly merchants (of ten he will even say usurers) we usually reply: it is not our fault – you did not let us perform any other trade. Perhaps it is a good excuse to be given to the Jew hater, but from a historical point of view this is not true. The prominent historic fact- the fact that up to recent times most of us have dealt in commerce only and that for many days we really carried out the main task in the development of the circulation of currency and credit among all civilized nations. This task was by no means ‘forced’ on us. It originated of our will and choice. The first example of this is to be found already in the Bible. When Joseph’s brothers came to settle in Egypt, he advised for a twofold reason. Firstly you don’t frighten them by competition, and secondly here you have a secluded economic corner, in which you will be able to create your own customs, to lean more or less a life that suits you and to be confronted with the Egyptian on every step. This is the advice according to which the Jews acted during their wanderings in the Diaspora at later times. The ‘abomination of Egypt’ does not always mean that the Egyptian really despised the thing. On many occasions it means only that the Egyptian did not mature yet for the fulfillment of a certain economic task, did not yet develop in his soul the capabilities nations when there already arose in the world the need for a global financial economy, but among the nations there was not yet a sufficient number of people to carry out such a task. The Jews chose particularly this ‘abominance of Egypt’. Only at a very later stage and for entirely different reasons were the Jews prohibited from engaging in other trades. But in the beginning we did it out of free choice. Economic activity simply served us as a means of national isolation, as a substitute for a territory of our own.

The same thing happened also in the sphere of tradition. During all the recent centuries, we were considered a nation, the like of which could be found in regards to our conservative attitude toward religion. The Christians split into three large churches and twenty small ones. But

amongst us there are not even 'sects'. What is the reason for this? As long as we lived in our own country we were by no means 'conservative'. The religious history of those days is a history of permanent movement, of development, of rejuvenation. In the period of time from the initiation of the monotheistic idea, which is connected with Abraham, and the 'Judaism' in the form it took during the reign of the last Hashmonean kings, Jewish religious thought passed through various phases – Moses, the prophets, the Torah of the priests. In those days we had sects too – from the "sons of the House of Rahab" to the later Essenes. Even Christianity was in the beginning but a Jewish sect.

But after the national calamity this kettle stopped boiling. He who wishes to disassociate himself from Jewry, gets converted, but in Judaism as such there is one tradition only. The most penetrating of our wise teachers among the *Tannaim* and the *Ammoraim* strain their minds to find the meaning of each hidden sign in the tradition. They discuss, dispute, sometimes even quarrel – but it does not bring about a branching off, a split into sects. The deepest split that took place in the form of Hassidism is no less orthodox than the *Gaon* of Vilna in its' attitude toward tradition.

What caused this change? How did it happen that the same nation when it lived in its own land was, from the religious point of view, the most restless one in the world, a nation in which every page of its holy scripture used to enrage its creator with its anti-Orthodoxy. How and why did it happen that such a nation suddenly became an example and a model of extreme orthodoxy and lack of motion.

Because it was exiled from its' country, religion remained the best means for 'isolating' itself from a too close contact with the surrounding nations. From the moment the natural

‘isolator’, that is to say the national territory is lost, each and everything is made into a substitute for the territory. This applies especially to that mighty means of separation called religious tradition. But in order that this succeed, it is for tradition to be motionless. Man lives on earth, and the worst calamity for him is an earthquake. When tradition is his only ‘plot of land’ he should guard it against the slightest tremor. The only thing he can agree to, the object for which he will strain his brain to the utmost, is to bring forth as many as possible ‘isolating factors’ from the tradition. He takes upon himself hundreds of complicated *Kashrut* customs; it is difficult to fulfill them, especially for the poor people, but the people abide by them sanctimoniously, for they ‘isolate’ the Jew from his surroundings. They help him to form even an illusory shadow of a surrounding of his own. If he does not have a state, let him at least have a substitute for one.

Such a substitute for a state was also the ghetto, the isolated Jewish district. Here too, it is not true that in the beginning we were ‘pushed’ into the ghetto. In the beginning, we ourselves established the ghetto in each town. Only after many hundreds of years, and for completely different reasons, did the gentile governments put a lock on the gates of the ghetto. Even in our days, each minority group establishes a ghetto for itself when it wants even in an illusory way to be a ‘nation’, living on its own land, and not to be confronted by strangers at every step.. This applies not only to the Jews in New York, but also to the English in Shanghai.

Thus did the Jew survive in the Diaspora, by turning each phase of his life into a means of isolation; a isolation from the economical point of view, by always choosing an economic sphere where not many gentiles were active yet; a double isolation, by giving up the idea of revisionism in regards to tradition, and by stressing in particular the isolating factors in the tradition. It cost the Jews the full price of individual and social life, but they paid the price

willingly and contentedly, so that the race could live in a surrounding of its own, even though a very meager life, to breathe a social air of its own, even through one lung.

It is often asked: Why is Zionism so strong in our days, when the old Jewish integrity was hampered considerably? Why could it not flourish hundreds of years ago, when every Jew was still a Zionist with his whole heart? The reasons are various, but here is the main one. Days have come when the old 'substitutes' the artificial 'isolators' were smashed. There therefore arose an urge towards isolation, a natural and invincible urge and search for the real isolator of the national existence- a specific country.

In the beginning the economic isolator was smashed. Economic development at last forced the 'Egyptian' to penetrate en masse into the "Jewish" trades. In the language of science it means that in Eastern Europe there arose an independent Bourgeoisie – a non Jewish one. The Jew was no longer isolated from the economic point of view. Then came the crumbling of the ghetto, the closed urban district – to some extent due to the new ideas of freedom and equality, but mainly because of the new economy which does not tolerate any social isolated groups. Just as it destroys the walls of the Gentiles 'village' and drags its inhabitants to the city, exactly in the same way – and even with less resistance, it destroys the 'Ghetto' walls. And these two phenomena which forced the Jew to take part in the life and way of thinking of the foreign surrounding, weakened also the third isolator, the strongest of all. – the immobile tradition, and in particular its content from the point of view of religious customs, which in the past served as a dividing wall between our neighbors and partners, even the closest ones. The found himself suddenly in the foreign street with no protection against the slightest blow of foreign winds.

In the beginning – during the first fifty years, he even liked it or believed that he liked it. But eventually he is confronted today by the world and is looking for the isolator – a specific country. Even if only for the brevity of the phase. As long as he believed that he ‘linked’ to delve into the depths of the noise, wealth and the beauty of a foreign surrounding, there is reason to question whether it was indeed ‘assimilation’.

The national movement in each nation that was oppressed for a long time starts with an epoch ‘assimilation’. Seventy years ago all observers were convinced that the Czechs became more and more ‘Germanic’, and only about thirty years ago, tens of thousands of Indians used to ridicule the ‘national culture’ and sing English songs only. But the result was of different kind altogether; and today we witness from an objective historic point of view that this stage of assimilation serves only as a first step towards the national awakening. A nation was living for many days in a cellar. Suddenly life pulled them outside and forced them to fight for their existence with the new weapon of modern culture; but as yet they could not control these weapons. First of all they had to learn, and that, they were able only from foreigners. They actually studied enthusiastically and fervently. Outwardly (or even inwardly) it looked as if this was the beginning of ‘assimilation’ and that very soon, the whole nation would become extinct. But when the first generation learned to use the new methods of life, there then arose a second generation, and started to translate the foreign culture to its own language, (the language of the lips or of the heart). The result was – the Czechoslovakian Republic, and tomorrow perhaps – the Indian Republic.

Gentlemen: Just as the special character of our economy in the Diaspora, and our *Kashrut* customs and even the Ghetto there were various forms of eternal Zionism; exactly in the

sense, Jewish assimilation was but a stage in the national rejuvenation, a step on the road from Zion to Zion.

Introduction to Exchange of Compliments

The term “the Chosen People” in reference to the Jews, caused numerous controversies amongst nations, groups and individuals. The Jews have been accused as being chauvinists for claiming the title of the chosen people. Even many Jews, particularly with the Emancipation and the flourishing of the Enlightenment, indulged in self-criticism whenever this problem was raised. Due to the long and dark *Galut*, which deformed the character of the Jewish nation, there were many who went over to the other extreme and considered the Jews to be an “inferior and base race”, the lowest in the racial scale.

Rosh Betar did not support either of the above viewpoints. According to him there are no superior and inferior rates. He saw in each nation a uniqueness of its own, just as he saw the same in each individual. In all his actions, writings and speeches he demonstrated a deep respect for Man and nations.

However, in view of the discussions that took place regarding the “inferiority” of the Jewish nation, he considered it an obligation to answer the slanderers.

In the following article, he draws attention to the strong character of the Jewish nation, to its feeling of self-respect and to uniqueness of its stubborn and non-compromising stand against attempts to assimilate it or inject foreign elements into its concepts and beliefs. On the other hand, he shows how the Russian nation did not emerge successfully from trials which were insignificant in comparison to those the Jews nation faced.

From the pages of this article, the great truth emerges: “A Jew even in poverty is a prince. Though a slave or a tramp, you were created the son of a king.”

AN EXCHANGE OF COMPLIMENTS

It was a friendly chat, the French call *causerie*. I did not take part in it, but sat nearby and listened. Therefore I am not responsible, either for the arguments or for the conclusions. The topic was furnished by Mr. Stolipin's article "An Inferior Race", an article which created considerable controversy. The conversant were two: a Russian and a Jew. They sit peacefully at the table and with smiling faces and discuss the problem of whose race is inferior.

"According to my opinion", said the Jew- "There are no superior or inferior races. Each race has its' own qualities, its' own features, a certain composition of its' talents. I am sure that if it would be possible to find an absolute scale and to evaluate exactly the special talents and qualities of each race, we would discover that all races are almost equal in their value."

"How come?" "Are the Chukches, and the ancient Greeks equal in value?" "That's my opinion. Had the Chukches lived under the conditions of ancient Greece, they too would have probably contributed values of their own to the world; not the same values which the Greeks contributed, for each nation has its' own essence, but nevertheless values, which perhaps would not have been inferior to the Greek values. Of course, no one can prove it. I am only voicing my opinion, but this is my deep conviction. I don't believe that there are superior and inferior races. All are equally good; each in its' own way."

"Strange to hear things like this, especially from a Jew. You who since ancient times considered yourselves the 'Chosen People' ..."

"Yes, yes. I know this argument. I'll tell you even more. After the destruction of the Second Temple by Titus, the Wise Men of Israel mourned in particular, the fact that the Lord had delivered them into the hands of an 'inferior nation' Do you realize, that the bright Romans from

the Principatus epoch, who had already absorbed on top of their own culture, the refined values of the Greeks, were nevertheless considered by them an inferior race. From this however we learn only one thing. Those Wise Men were blind. The same applies to all the new theories about inferior races – they are all a result of blindness”

No, I disagree with you on this point. Mr. Stolipin certainly exaggerated. This is revealed through his personal sorrow, which is indeed struck by blindness. However, a man is not to be judged while in sorrow. But one should not exaggerate in the opposite direction. Equality of value of all races is a paradox. I could point to the Negroes who reside next to the White man in the United States, and are nevertheless equal to the White man. The Turks created a city called Istanbul in the very same place where the Aryans created Byzantium etc. But your general assumption that all races are equal in value is so paradoxical in my opinion that I shall not even try to refute it. Even among your people, or rather in particular among your people, you won't find half a dozen men who will agree to this opinion. Let us then skip the general problem. We were dealing with the Jewish race. I repeat. Stolipin exaggerated. I also do not agree with the Chamberlin, although he is very intelligent and a deep thinker. And so I do not agree completely with Veininger who is one of your people, despite the fact that he too raised many deep and surprising arguments in support of the idea that the Jewish race (if such a term could be used) is not of an appreciable value. Apart from that, I have also read something from your side – Herz, who denies the existence of race altogether, and the writer Tzolsham, who considers the Jewish race to be superior. But I mainly take an interest in life itself, and here is the impression I gathered of this problem, both from the books and from observation of life.

You are undoubtedly, a race which has noticeable spiritual physical defects. (You will understand that I am not speaking of exceptions. There are very respectable Jews. I myself know

ideal men from amongst your people. Indeed, even those exceptions could be explained as a result of an accidental blood mixture; but as you understand we are not dealing with them now)

“I understand, I understand, do not be embarrassed, we are accustomed.”

“And here is the general impression I have gathered. You are most definitely a race that has no full value. I consider a race having a full value, as the one that creates and is harmonious and many sided. You have none of this. You have no creations of your own and you never had one. It has been proven that your Monotheism and the Shabbat are borrowed from others. With regard to these ideas you have only fulfilled the task of the popularizers, and if you permit me to say so – even of commercial travelers. Indeed, for this task the Jewish nation is particularly fitted. On the other hand, the Jewish soul is impenetrable to many concepts. Your scale of senses is very limited and lacks colour. This is the reason why you never had plastic arts, even in the glorious days of your independence. In order to build the Temple, King Solomon had to invite an architect from abroad. It is said that in your Bible and even in the Song of Songs- there is not one word designating colour. Only of David was it said that he was red headed Shulamit says that she has a dark complexion. The colours of nature, the sky, the sea, all these are not mentioned as if they don't exist for the dry, monotonous and calculating Jewish spirit. She has no need of them. They do not interest her. Compare this to Homer, his – pink fingered Morning Star...”

“Excuse me. What has this got to do with race? From this same race, Israelites, Levitas were produced, and almost all the Russian sculpture came from that race – Antokolsky, Ginzburg, Aaronson.... Simply in olden days the plastic arts could not develop among the Jews since religion prohibited the description of ‘what is in the sky above and on the earth below’...”

“No sir. This is no argument. The religious beliefs do not explain the national character. The explanation to the beliefs themselves is to be found in the qualities of the national character. A nation with artistic leaning would have never accepted an anti-artistic religion. Please don't interrupt. Let me continue. Even your Biblical morals, which you are so proud of, are dry, calculating, not chivalrous, if not to say simply not aristocratic. Each paragraph has next to it a promise of a practical reward, the undertaking of the Lord to pay in cash; to give a land of flowing milk and honey, and to grant long life on earth. The Bible does not know other superior motives for morals – not the idea of perfection, not the sublimity of the Lord, not the life of the other world. Take note of this fact. A nation in whose holy books there is not even one word of what is to happen to man after death. Compare this to the Aryans. The ritual of the 'fathers' is the very beginning of their religion! Is that not proof enough of an utter lack of interest in anything that has no practical and immediate aim? Not only your will, but your thoughts also did not function out of the boundaries of practical social life. They were simply not interested. Is that not a sound enough basis to deny the many sidedness of the Jewish soul? Does it compare in value to the many sided, chivalrous, harmonious, dreamy soul of the Aryan? Please understand. I have no intention to insult...”

“I understand, I understand.”

“As a matter of fact I have finished. I wish only to add that in life too, it is impossible not to find grounds for this theory. I shall not speak at length on this subject, but you must agree that if all human beings in every place and every time hate and despise this very same race, then one cannot accept the naïve explanation that the whole of mankind is corrupt. The causes for hatred against the Jews change, so do the contents of the accusations. The hatred and despise probably remain forever. Did it ever occur to you that there is probably in you something unbearably,

something extremely difficult to get accustomed to, since in every place and at all times you are treated in the very same manner? The list of great men who could not bear the Jews is sufficient. Cicero, Juvenal and Tacitus, Gordano, Bruno Luther. Shakespeare, Wagner, Dearing, Hartman. In fact even Renan, Pushkin, Gogol, Shevchenko, Dostoevsky Turgenev. This is not a tenth of the full list. In conclusion, this is what I shall say to you. You Jews meet the Russians only rarely, even the Russians who are your friends. I am amongst my people and I know their attitude towards you when you are out of sight. You, my sirs, did not even dream how many are your enemies, even from amongst your friends. Perhaps it is not 'hatred' in its' true sense perhaps not even despise; it is a sort of feeling impossible to overcome, a feeling of an inferior creature, of an inferior race. This feeling is shared by everybody. Even if a man like Milyukov, or Plechanov will assure me that it is unknown to him, I won't believe him. And if you all share this feeling, then the feeling is true."

"Have you finished?"

"I have. I am waiting to hear what you have to say."

"I won't argue with you;"

"Why?"

"I won't argue. Perhaps I'll only touch upon two or three smaller issues that I remember. Take for instance the life in the other world. Indeed, nothing is said about it in the Bible. Nevertheless it is obvious, that the ancient Israelites had beliefs about life in the world to come. At *Ein-Dor* Saul came to the sorceress and she brought up the prophet Samuel. Samuel 'arises' and asks: "Why did you disturb me?" To anyone who is versed in the history of culture, it is clear that such a legend, such expressions and in general the idea itself of bringing up the dead,

can be created only when there is the belief that beyond the grave the dead go on living. There are other expressions in the Bible. For example “And Abraham was gathered unto his People”. In other words he died. Or the pains Abraham takes in choosing a burial plot for Sarah. Every sociologist will tell you that these are definite signs of a nation that believed in life after death. In the Bible, these beliefs are not expressed explicitly. But don’t forget that almost all the ancient literature of Israel was lost and the Bible is only a fraction of it. In the Book of Esther the name of the Lord is not mentioned even once. Had this book been the only one to be left, you would have assumed that the Jews were not familiar with concept of God. Or in regards to colours and art in general. First of all, apart from the red headed David and the dark Shulamit, you have in the Bible also ‘green grass, red lentils, blue thread’.. Secondly, in regards to the wealth of visual impressions the pictures of nature in the Song of Songs are more perfect than Homer and his pink fingered Morning Star. Thirdly, why do you stress the lack of plastic arts and forget about the great development of music among the ancient Hebrews? The Book of Psalms is full of music. On every page there is melody and song. There is still a controversy as to which art has more depth, more creativity- the plastic or the tonic. In regard to architects from a road – why even in Russia, foreign architects for many years built your finest temples, and in spite of that you don’t consider yourselves lacking an artistic soul...All these are small issues. Of the problem itself, I won't argue with you.”

“Then it means that you agree?”

“No. It means only this. One does not argue about differences of taste. From what you said, one can learn only one thing. We do not appeal to you. It is a matter of aesthetics. There is no room here for objective criterion. According to you, the expectation of a reward in the other world is morally superior to the expectation of a reward in this world. In my opinion it is visa

versa. According to you, the idea of approaching God is more sublime to the Torah. The Torah commands you from time to time to cancel debts and not to harvest the corner of the field, but instead leave it to the poor. In my opinion these simple deeds have much more truth in them, not earthly truth, but a divine one, a truth that brings one closer to the Almighty. According to you, whoever borrowed elements of culture from Babylon, is like a commercial traveler. In my opinion, every creative work in this world is based upon borrowed elements. The nation that knew, from the dawn of its' life to collect these drops of gold and out of them erect such an eternal Temple – this nation is the most par excellence of all the nations in the world.

In short, it is a matter of taste. I do not deny the existence of races; I do not question the fact that there is an Aryan element and a Jewish element, and that these two differ in content. But any attempt to evaluate these two elements, to ascertain which of them is superior and which is inferior – any attempt of that kind is futile. From an objective point of view, I think that they are both of equal value, and that they are both equally needed by mankind. Any evaluation stems from a preconceived antipathy. If you wish I'll perform an experiment.”

What sort of experiment?”

“I'll try to analyse some events from Russian history. I'll act in the same manner as you did. I'll take a criterion, that is to my linking and accordingly inspect the events described in the Ilovaisky's text book. Let us see what will be outcome. Are you willing?”

“Please. Compliments for compliments?”

“True. Let us start with the criterion. According to you, the criterion for a superior race is creativity and many sidedness. I could voice my doubts even in this respect, as to whether the Russian nation proved its' many sidedness and creativity in one sphere of life – whether it

contributed to the world even one new great thing in the field of science, philosophy, religion, law, technology, art... But let us leave that be. I choose a different criterion for a superior race – Self-recognition. A superior creature, be it a scholar among barbarians, or an aristocrat among simpletons, always has in his heart the feeling of self value, a recognition that cannot be uprooted, and is not even bound to his own will. Externally it is usually given expression in what we call pride. This is the characteristic which accounts for King Lear never stopping being a king – even when in tattered rags. Conscience tells him that he is a king, and he cannot uproot it from his heart. This feeling that a man feels himself an aristocrat is first and most important sign of his aristocracy. Certainly, sometimes a rich man may pretend to be an aristocrat. On the other hand, among the Bushmen there is a belief that all other human beings are inferior to them. It is however sufficient for a simpleton who has advanced himself in the social circle to meet a true aristocrat face to face. Immediately the crack in his consciousness will be revealed. He will feel embarrassed. Will he be able to control the tone of his speech, and will he feel his inferiority? The same applies to the Bushman, who when confronted by a white man, in spite of everything leaves impressed by the white mans’ superiority. In the heart of the white man it won’t be impaired, whereas in the Bushman’s heart it will be shaken and destroyed. The white man will then be bound to dominate him, not only by force, but also through spiritual superiority.

Because of that, one can consider as an indication of a superior race only such a consciousness of superiority, that had the strength to resist strong clashes, and emerged undamaged.”

“That is the case. I understand you well, since for three thousand years the Jews believe in their superiority. They are therefore...”

“No. We do not deal with the Jews, but with you – the Russians. I have only clarified the manner in which I am using the term ‘Self Recognition’, and why I consider the existence of such self recognition as the main indication of a superior race (that is of course, if we assume that there are superior and inferior races.) A superior race must first of all have self-recognition, which is inherent with pride that stands against everything. Of course this does not find expression through vanity, but through a forceful stand, through an attitude of respect to its’ own spiritual values. To such a race the very thought that it should accept foreign authority and absorb foreign elements in its’ soul is despicable.

Let us now take Ilovaisky and start to measure your Russian history with this criterion.”

“Let us see.”

“At the dawn of history we find a call to the Variagians to come and rule Russia. This is an astonishing fact. You will tell me that it is not a fact, but a legend. Of course in reality, it did not happen that way. The Varigian kings came and took rule by force, and the dim memory of this event, in the course of time, turned to be a legend. But every legend is a creation of the nation and gives expression to the nation’s soul. Therefore, although the Russian nation is not responsible for the ‘call to the Variagians’ it is however, responsible for the legend. The idea, which is the heart of this legend, was probably quite conceivable, quite natural for the self-recognition of the Russian nation. Had it been otherwise, the legend would not have preserved this idea. And what is the essence of this idea? It is simply this: The leaders of Russia have gathered and decided to appoint a man from a foreign land as their head and leader. Not just simpletons, not just illiterate peasants, but leaders of the nation gathered and did not have enough self-love in order to find another solution to the situation. In the eyes of the nation that created

this legend, in the eyes of the nation that explained to itself the fact of foreign rule, this was apparently natural. It seems that the nation did not recoil from the idea that its' ancestors could not rule themselves, and that the only way to maintain order was to invite a lord from abroad. In order to understand the point in this legend, please compare it to the Jewish legend of what came to pass at the dawn of Jewish history. At the dawn of Jewish history the Jews throw off the yoke of a foreign king and wander through the desert – in order to conquer for itself a homeland. Don't you think that in these two legends are to be found two national psychologies?"

“No, I don't think so. But I am not arguing with you, I am only listening to you”

“Let us keep on turning the pages in Ilovaisky. Pay attention to the page in the book that describes how the whole nation accepted the new faith in the times of Vladimir. They stood in the water up to their necks and accepted the new religion. At the same time by order of the prince: “Please god, please rise!” This meaning that Perun is in their eyes still a god that can rise above the water. I can understand a nation changing its faith when its' foundations are shaken. But when the previous faith is still intact, when from the depths of the nations' soul comes forth the call “Please god, please rise!” – if at the same time the whole nation is standing in the water and accepting the new faith, then you have definite proof that there was no self recognition. There was no respect for innermost values; there was no feeling that it is impossible to thrust upon me an object that has no roots in my conscience. If there are in the world, superior and inferior races, then this is not the manner in which a superior would act.”

“One remark: Ilovaisky, brings in a saying which explains why there was a need to enter the water. ‘Dobrina used to baptize with the sword and Putiota with fire!’”

“Undoubtedly. But for comparison, allow me to remind you that we, the Jews were also were baptized to apostasy with sword and fire. This is not a saying with us. Our entire history of two thousand years is full of these things, and in spite of that no Putiota and no Dobrina had the least influence over us. Apparently, we are a nation to whom it is impossible to influence with a stick in hand. But...I am deviating; let us return to Ilovaisky.

Here we have the Tartar yoke. It is one of the strangest political phenomena in the world. There is almost nothing that resembles it. When the Romans conquered a country, they left an army there and established Roman or Latin settlements. They ruled a country by their residence in that country, in one form or another. Here, there was something entirely different. After the terrible destruction the wave of the Tatars returned to their ‘Orda’. In fact, the Tartars left Russia and maintained their rule over it, not by actually encamping on its’ borders, but through their threatening image from the distance. Don’t you think that for this there is a need for a special type of obedience? Of course the destruction was terrible, and the memory of this could not be obliterated. Despite this, there are certain rebellious characters, stubborn ones who soon forget the cruelest murderous lesson and fight till their hands are cut off. There are also other kinds of characters, softer ones. Again, please compare the attitude of the Jews to the foreign rule in *Eretz Israel*. As long as a handful of Jews remained in the Holy Land, they did not surrender. Bar Giora and Bar Kochba did not fight against an ‘Orda’ of nomads, but against the mighty Rome. The Tartars gave Russia, full autonomy, but it was servile and paid ransom. The Romans carried the saying “Zion will ploughed as a field”. They had to raze to the ground the flourishing cities of Galilee, to destroy and disperse the Jews. Only then, did Judea surrender. The blood bath of Titus was also a terrible ‘lesson’, but after seventy years Bar Kochba managed to forget it. Apparently not all races are blessed with the talent of remembering a ‘lesson’ so well that once is

sufficient to 'teach a lesson' and surrender is secured for two hundred years. Some races are not to be coerced, and others are. Which of them is the "superior race?"

"As you have said; it is a matter of taste. But I am listening. Go on."

"No. Frankly speaking, I am sick of it. We do not take an interest in your history to the extent that you, the anti-Semites, take an interest in our history. Perhaps I'll mention another small fact from the very same page in Ilovaisky's book about the Tartar yoke. It is related there that your princes used to travel to bow to the 'Orda', and prostrate themselves to the Khan. I do not consider it a disgrace; This was a very prudent and patriotic behavior. But look at a parallel example from Senkiewicz's novel *Quo Vadis*. Various people came before Nero and prostrated themselves. Only two Rabbis did not prostrate themselves. Nero acquiesced, because he probably understood that there was really no way of forcing them. Jews will not prostrate themselves. In short, there are all sorts of races, and it is very difficult to discern which of them is 'superior'.

"Do you know what my answer is to all this? You are anti-Russian even more than I am anti-Semitic."

"I deny this most forcefully. In my eyes all nations are equal in value, and of similar merits. Of course I love my nation more than the other nations, but I don't consider it superior. However if we start evaluating, all will depend upon the criterion. Then, you should know, that I shall insist on my criterion. Superior is the stronger in spirit, the one that can be destroyed but cannot be 'taught' a lesson, the one that will never surrender its' inner- independence, even when under a foreign yoke. Our history begins with the words' A stubborn nation' – and now after so

many generations, we are still fighting. We did not surrender. We are a race that will never be curbed. I do not know a more sublime aristocracy than this.”

“Hm...” muttered the Russian. “Indeed you were right. It is all a matter of taste. I... like my own taste.....”

Introduction to “From The Social Philosophy Of The Bible”

In the following article, *Rosh Betar* elaborates upon a number of social ideals. From these pages emerges the great principle, that according to the Bible, Man must fight and contribute to the improvement of the World, and that not only is this principle not in contradiction to the belief in the Creator of the Universe, but that this is the ordinance of the Almighty and his blessing is bestowed upon anyone who fights for the war of progress.

Rosh Betar extols this idea as against the religious concepts of Rome and Greece, according to which Man in a process of regression from the ‘ideal’ state he was in during primeval days.

He afterwards elaborates upon the ideas of the Sabbath, *Peah* and Jubilee, out of which originates a social concept, which is utterly opposed, and by far superior to the socialist one.

FROM THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF THE BIBLE

There will be repetitions here, things that were already said. We tend to forget some of them; but in general it is desirable to study as often as possible the social philosophy of the Bible.

The most important part of it is contained in the name “Israel”, in Chapter. 32 of Genesis where it is told how Jacob ‘fought with the Almighty’. During a whole night an Angel struggled with Jacob and could not force him to surrender. Therefore the Angel gave him the blessing and named him Israel for he fought with the Lord. Thus the meaning of the name was not one of disgrace, but on the contrary, a title of distinction. This is also proved by the fact that tradition made it the name of the nation as a whole. What is the meaning of this? What philosophy or world outlook is expressed through this name and this tradition?

It is quite clear. The name teaches us that according to the outlook of the Bible, it is not a sin at all to contend against the Almighty. Indeed, God has created the world as it is, but man should not become resigned to the fact that the world will always be ‘as it is’. He must try constantly to improve it. He must try to correct the numerous defects that God left in the world order. He left it full of defects, so that man would struggle and strive for the ‘improvement of the world.’

The moderns could give a ‘scientific’ interpretation of the story of the struggle with the Angel till dawn. Jacob struggled with his conscience that night. The following morning he is to meet Esau his elder brother, whom he, Jacob had deceived. Dark thoughts roam through his mind. The Angel that resides in his heart asks: “Jacob, Jacob. You deceived your brother Esau and Laban the Aramite. Perhaps your life is nothing but a long deceit?” This then, is the Angel

that Jacob is struggling against. He says, or better- thinks; “Would it be better, more just, if Esau, this child, this heartless one, was to receive the great secrets that you, the Lord of the World gave Abraham our grandfather? Or. – Had Laban this shrewd merchant who never dreamt a nice dream – had Laban always remained my master, and I who converse with Angels would have remained poor all my life and been dependent upon my father-in-law? The secrets that you, Lord of the Universe, have revealed to my grandfather are deep and sacred. But the world is in need of a practical order, and I dared do something, particularly in this practical sphere. And now say: who is right – You or I.” To this the angel that resides answers: “Blessed be thou the fighter, you, the improver of the World!”

There comes to mind, in connection with this a commentary to Chapter 28 of Genesis. Jacob sees in his dream, a ladder reaching the sky with angels ascending and descending. Here the very some idea can be formed. From the earth, one can reach the sky, and vice versa. There is a permanent contact with God and Man. Sometimes Man’s intuition reaches up to the Divine One, and man has the right to change the world order.

It is known that this idea regarding the capability and obligation of Man to improve the world, is the main difference between the Jewish tradition and the ‘Aryan.’ The Romans and the Greek believed in the “Golden Era”, which occurred in the distant past. The Jewish faith is connected with the Messiah – the era of universal happiness. Peace and justice will only come to be in the future, as a result of countless generations, who will suffer, learn and struggle. Finally, the Messiah will be a man. In this idea is ingrained the root of the term ‘progress’ which was alien to the logic of the Romans and the Greeks. According to their concept it is the other way round. In the course of generations, mankind becomes more and more remote from the “Golden Era”, and passes through the Silver Era to the Copper Era – and at last to the Iron Era. We too,

see the beginning in Paradise. But it does not at all resemble the Golden Era of the Aryan legend. A Latin poet gave the Aryan concept an exact description. The people of the first generations, the sons of the Golden Era, kept uprightness and justice, not because of the pressure of law, not out of the fear of punishment, but out of their own free will. (Ovid, *The Metamorphoses*)

In Jewish tradition, as long as Adam and Eve were in Paradise, they did not know what was good and what was evil. At the moment they learned to know the difference; that is to say, when they evolved from nice animals into human beings, they were forced to leave Paradise. The first generation of the society of mankind therefore grew up in a wild world which was full of dangers and sorrow; a world which had to be “improved.”

This is the main part of the social philosophy of the Bible. God has created the world, but man must assist in improving it. To achieve this aim he must fight, even ‘declare war against heaven’, in order to uproot that which is not suitable to a just world order. His weapons in this war are the knowledge of good and evil, his spirit and his intellect.

If we keep looking into the matter, we shall find in the tradition, hints of this kind, which refer to the term ‘improvement’ of the world, not only in its’ moral meaning, but also in the practical sense. This is stated in a way which is almost technical. Jacob’s device in connection with Laban’s flocks is particularly characteristic. I do not know whether it is really possible to exert much influence on the colour of sheep with the same means Jacob used. This however, is not important. The idea is important, and the idea is “Jewish”. According to the law laid down by the Lord; in the beginning according to the normal ways of nature, white sheep will give birth to white lambs, and black sheep will given birth to black lambs. Jacob interferes in the laws of nature and changes it. This is the first indication in the history of the white race of the aspiration

to rule nature, to conquer it, to dictate to it what and how it should create. This is the beginning of everything which is termed in our language today as rationalization and organization of methods of production. This is even, though indirectly the beginning of all kinds of machinery. What is machinery if not the 'device' of our ancestor Jacob, which came to be expressed in iron?

In connection with this it is desirable to look into the quarrel between Cain and Abel. The modern scholars see in it an episode from the ancient struggle between the tiller of the soil and the shepherd. There has always been an animosity between the tiller of the soil and the shepherd. The sheep and the cattle need plenty of soil, the animals causing damage to the wheat. Cain was a tiller of soil, Abel was a shepherd. This is the cause of the animosity between them and of the murder of Abel. It is all known. But God's attitude towards Cain is interesting. In the beginning, God acknowledged Abel's sacrifice but ignored Cain's. It seems that here there is still an echo of the Creator's old attitude towards "knowledge." Man should not taste the fruit of the tree of knowledge. You wish to become wise, to plough my earth, to force nature into your service; that is why I loathe your sacrifices! Suddenly, after Cain has committed a terrible crime, the murder of his brother, one discovers that the Creator does not want to eradicate the criminal. Instead he negotiates with him, gives him protection against other murderers, so that they won't do him any harm.

Cain then goes out and probably continues his plowing, "builds a town", the first town in history. The thought arises that the explanation that tradition is fighting for the same things that we today call "technology", "culture" and even "intensive culture". It is fighting for the right of Man to rule Nature, to get rid of the low forms of economy in favour of the higher ones. Even if blood is shed in the process, the Creator is ready to forgive sin. It is important that we should remember in our days, this trend in Jewish tradition towards social and economic "intensity",

particularly in our days, since in recent times a bitterness towards intensity toward technical progress, against the subjection of Nature has been felt. Thousands of serious thinkers speak of the need to stop the “race of new inventions”, for otherwise the workers will soon have nothing to do and will be doomed to die of starvation.

Since the times a hundred ago, when the hand weavers in England assaulted the manufacturers who tried to introduce mechanical looms, the world has not witnessed such hostility towards the machine as it has today. We should not therefore, if we shall soon witness a movement whose slogan will be the closing of all big factories and a return to hand work. The frightened souls feel that the world is becoming too “Jewish”, and has gone astray in its’ quest to act as creator and inventor by competing with the Creator of the Universe.

In fact, the crisis of our days is not the crisis of “Capitalism”, but first and foremost the crisis of the Proletarian. The machines make the worker more and more superfluous. A mass class, well organized, having political force, and on top of it – a class which considers itself to be the most important part of society, is in danger of losing its’ social and economic right of existence. It seems that a considerable part of this class has already lost it’s right of existence. Of course from this thing, both the members of this class and society as a whole suffer. Here it seems, is the root to the world crisis.

This is true, but it does not follow that the best solution is to “stop the inventions.” It is not that part of the workers became superfluous. It is a part of the eight hours work of the individual worker is what became superfluous. It is a mistake to say that where previously a hundred workers were needed, seventy five are sufficient today. Instead – another calculation is correct. In a situation where each of the hundred workers had previously to work eight hours a

day, he will now have to work only six hours. Production will remain unchanged, and therefore wages should remain unchanged. If the question is put in this form, then the example that Jacob set, will remain proper and just. One should not say “enough”, one should not stop the activity of the human intellect, which is always seeking new means to subject Nature and alleviate Man from his toil. On the contrary, one should keep seeking, inventing, alleviating.

The true social redemption, will not come about as the result of class struggle. It will come as the result of intellect, genius, of technical inventions and of rationalization. This is the way which will enable one day to turn “labour” into pleasure paid slavery into “paid sport.”

THE SOCIAL SHIELD

The Bible contains not only the principle of protest against social injustice, but also a system a scheme for social reconstruction. Of course, things are not proposed there in a systematical order. They are not compiled as one scheme in which there is Paragraph. A – and Paragraph. B. The “Paragraphs” are scattered throughout the various texts; but if we compile them, we shall have a real scheme. The scheme is short and does not deal in details. In my opinion it is the best, most real and wise scheme for social reconstruction. It is far removed from the wild anarchic competition, and from that slavery which is involved in all socialistic systems.

It consists of three paragraphs: The principle of Sabbath, the principle of *Peah*, and the idea of the Jubilee.

The principle of Sabbath is the root from which stemmed the whole range of social constitution in our own days, protecting the rights and the situation of the employee. Apart from the Sabbath rest, the Bible mentions a number of protective laws in the regulation of work of the employees, even in regard to the time that the employer must pay the wage (every evening). All these details can be compiled symbolically in the term Sabbath. The essence of the term is in this, that society should not leave the employee at the mercy of the employer, allowing him to force upon the poor everything he can.

The Bible does not recognize a “free contract”. The Bible does not recognize the famous “iron law” of the 19th Century economists, a law that ascertains, that the sole criterion of the working hours hunger that the labourer could undergo without “disappearing.” That is to say, without dying.

In its' narrow meaning Sabbath is a measure from one point of view only; that is in regards to the amount of work. In its broad sense however, as said above, the Sabbath is the beginning and origin of all those reforms that a hundred years of social fighters succeeded in achieving in countless spheres of protection for the worker. This principle first appeared in the Bible, not only as one of the *Tariat Mitzvot*, but as one of the Ten Commandments. It appeared as one of the most important basic assumptions for social life among human beings. Sabbath means that the relation between employer and employee is not a personal matter; it is something that 'concerns God.' It is determined by the supreme institution of Man's conscience, not according to the appetite of one side or the other, but according to the moral and material "pathos" of society.

Peah, is the law concerning harvesting. One is prohibited from gathering the whole produce. Part of the produce is to be left in the field or in the vineyard for the poor or the stranger, for the orphan and the widow. This is not charity; it is a Commandment 'to do'; that is to say a tax, which is put on the class of property owners, for the benefit of the class that owns no property. (A law in which lies an outstanding idea, and here too, the Bible is the origin – the same as Sabbath, for *Peah* is unknown in the social concepts of both the Romans and the Greeks) The whole sphere of social scheme in our days, an immeasurable sphere, from income tax and inheritance tax, to aid for the unemployed, originates too, from *Peah*.

A Viennese Jew, Popper-Lynkeus wrote a book called, "The obligation for General Nourishment." This book is an attempt to bring the idea of *Peah* to its' ultimate conclusion. According to Popper-Lynkeus' scheme, the state is obliged to release the citizens as a whole, rich and poor alike, of three main worries: Food, clothing, and shelter. The scheme is worked out in technical detail, and it contains exact calculations as to the number of people, who will have to

work yearly for the “obligation for General Nourishment”, in order to produce the necessary amount of food, materials and houses. I am not versed in the subject and do not know if the calculation is correct; but I believe that the essence of the thing, no matter how utopian they may seem to be today, will one day become a reality. Society will supply each individual with the basic minimum materially, just as it does already today supply each of us with the minimum in the spiritual sphere – the general primary school. Hunger and cold and lack of shelter will completely disappear, just as in some civilized countries illiteracy has disappeared; although a hundred years ago this too, was considered Utopian.

I believe in all seriousness, that before a hundred years will pass, this will become an established fact. Perhaps even today, the large taxes that each state collects from its citizens would have been used to supply the population as a whole with Popper-Lynkeus’ basic minimum, had millions not been spent on cannons and battleships. Popper-Lynkeus states this as a condition for his scheme.

Before the Obligation for General Nourishment will be put into action, here is a need to abolish the general obligation of military service. This is distinctly a Biblical idea. I believe wholehearted that this too will become a reality before a hundred year pass, and perhaps the children of the people of our generation will live to see a world with no wars. Then it will be possible to devote for purely social aims the vast sums collected from social taxes, and these very same children may also live to see a world that really materializes the idea of Peah to the full extent of the possibilities it contains. A world will be created in which the word hunger sounds like a legend from ancient times, a world in which nine tenths of the bitterness that distinguishes poor from rich will disappear. No one will have to worry about widows and orphans, about failure, of descent from a high economic status to a low one. Man will not

descend to the depths while he tumbles down. He will not smash his skull nor even break a finger during the descent- for society has created a soft and warm 'layer' which enables one to eat to satiety. Man can rest, and from there, start a new way of life. The origin for all this will be in two Hebrew words only. But here too there remains the difference between rich and poor. Indeed it has never been as prominent, as bitter and tragic as today. Nevertheless, a difference will continue to exist. It will always keep "stimulating" Man, always stirring the tendency toward a universal race between one man and another. It will always urge to demand of society, that society keep striving for equality. Society must, so that the difference will not remain forever and turn into injustice. Two solutions were given to this problem. One is called Socialism, a system in which the difference between rich and poor is to disappear completely in the future. This is achieved by taking away from the citizen any possibility of gathering "wealth." Together with wealth however, it takes away from him any possibility for private initiative and the most valuable stimulus to create with his own capabilities. An utterly different solution to the problem is given in the Bible, the idea of the Jubilee. This is the mightiest, the most super human of all social concepts which has been known in the whole history of human thought.

Introduction to “Letter on Autonomy”

In the “Letter on Autonomy” *Rosh Betar* replies to a man who claimed to be a ‘Nationalist’, and envisaged the preservation of the Jews as a nation through achieving National Autonomy in the *Galut*.

Rosh Betar studies the origin of the national feeling, the motives for national preservation and the blessing that such preservation is to bring to the world at large. He asserts that if needed, it is possible to conceive such a situation of absolute equality. It will inevitably cause a total assimilation of the Jewish nation.

A LETTER ON AUTONOMY

.... You formulate your arguments in the “concluding paragraphs” of your letter in this manner: “I too, admit without doubt that the preservation of specific national characteristic traits is not only in no contrast to the ideal of progress, but that it is desirable and even essential for progress. We understand progress as an aspiration for variety for the abundance of the various species and not for monotony. Therefore, I think, that it is the duty of each nation to preserve its’ uniqueness (of course while acquiring all the values of civilized humanity) and not to spoil the uniqueness of other nations. But I cannot understand why you think that having its’ own territory is an essential condition for the preservation of the national uniqueness. Imagine a nation dispersed in a large country, for example the United States, but enjoying there the rights of a national autonomy. It considers North America as its homeland, loves it, and serves it faithfully; and it considers all of its citizens, who are the sons of another nation as brothers.

Along with this however, it has the right to live according to its specific character, to establish its national school from primary to the university, and to teach there in its’ own language, to send its own representatives to Congress in Washington and to the Municipal Councils; to formulate its own laws in those spheres which were ascertained by the Constitution of the state. For this purpose it will have in addition to representation to Congress and general Municipal Councils, it’s own national institutions for self government – central, as well as local institutions. Lastly, it will have its own special courts for settling disputes amongst its own people. If the need arises it will have a national army of its own that will be part the general army of the United States. What would hinder this nation from preserving its national character forever? We know from experience that the victors, who wish to assimilate a vanquished nation, start by controlling the schools, the courts, the institutions for self-government and the army.

This means that as long as these forms of institutions are in the hands of this nation that has no territory and is free to conduct itself according to its own wishes – it is no danger of assimilation. You will say that it is impossible to gain such a wide range of rights while living in a foreign country. My answer to this will be that the Zionists, who dream, have no right to predict that any scheme has no chance of fulfillment. I cannot vouch that fulfillment will be easy, but I think that in any case I think it is very much easier (at least for the Jews in the U. S.A. and Western Europe) than to transfer millions of Jews to Zion, and establish there a new Kingdom.

You then refer to the “letters” of our great historian (Dubnov) in which a solution to the Jewish problem, similar to the one you offered, was given, and you mention that Professor Masaryk’s party in Czechoslovakia, already has demanded national autonomy for the Jews of that country.

First of all, one remark. You are wrong in thinking that I shall say: “It is impossible that while living in a foreign country we should gain a wide range of rights to an extent which we never had.” I won’t say anything of the sort. Admittedly, I do not agree with you, that it will be easier to fulfill your ideal than the Zionist ideal. Furthermore, my opinion is contrary to yours. I think that the fulfillment of our ideal will be considerably more difficult, but I do not see it impossible in the course of time.

In Czechoslovakia for instance and other districts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, various nations will eventually be forced to agree to the form of statehood that you are suggesting. There are certain areas where a population belonging to various nations lives in a mixture, and there is no possibility of drawing any territorial line between one nation and another. At the same time, both Hans and Wentzel do not want to leave the place. The choice

they are faced with, is either to slaughter each other, or to establish an autonomy based on a purely national basis, instead of the territorial one, which they have as of now adhered to.

Let us hope that the Austrians will prefer the second plan to the first. Of course it will not be an easy task to organize life on these grounds, because of lack of habit; but I have no doubt that it will eventually succeed. We shall have then “and the land had rest” as it is written in the Bible. The neighbors will gradually forget their past quarrels and live in peace and tranquility. But you and I are not concerned with peace and tranquility only. We wish also that peaceful living will also ensure the absolute preservation of the national uniqueness of each of the rivals who have made peace. If it would have been made clear that in this plan of making peace, there is a danger to the national uniqueness of one side or the other, and that it is bound to be assimilated- we would both given up this plan for peace and look for another plan. There is also another question. Does the autonomy you suggest ensure the preservation of the Jewish national uniqueness for a long period of time? For the sake of discussion we could substitute this question, by another one, a deeper one. It seems that according to your opinion the essential condition for the preservation of national uniqueness is will, and that this is sufficient. You do not, of course, ignore the fact, that this will should find for itself real elements in the life of the nation, and should give expression to certain needs, otherwise this need will gradually decay, and the nation will be assimilated with no opposition. As long as the will for the preservation of national uniqueness exists deeply rooted in the soul of the nation and nourished by these real roots – it will not deviate of its free will towards assimilation. Even dispersion among foreign nations does not embody a danger of this kind. I agree with you that the nation is not bound to assimilate as long as it has the will, consciously or sub-consciously, to preserve its uniqueness. I even agree with you, that the will for self-preservation can exist and influence our actions only

when there prevail real conditions and real needs, which awaken this will. If these real factors will disappear, the will of the nation to preserve its' uniqueness will vanish and will be assimilated amongst the nations of the world. This means that the question: "does the autonomy ensure the preservation of Jewish uniqueness for a long period of time?" can be substituted by another question. "Does the autonomy ensure the preservation of those factors which can stimulate and awaken, constantly in the Jewish nation the instinctive will to preserve its original and faultless uniqueness?"

Let us consider this problem. A few years ago, I asked myself. Wherefrom, does the feeling of our national uniqueness originate? Why do we like our language (those of us who kept the language)? Why does the national melody, even when not accompanied by words stimulate us to powerful excitement? Where is the origin of the psychological link, of this attachment to the specific national character, which is so powerful, that people are prepared to undergo torture for it's sake? The answer that occurred to me first, was: The origin is in the education of each one of us. But then I realized that this answer is wrong. In the first place, I observed people whose whole education took place outside the boundaries of the national institutions and forms. They did not see in their childhood even one "Pesach Seder", never sat in a "*Succah*", did not play with a "Dreidel (spinning top) on Chanukah", and their memory was impressed by even one scene of national religious life. Instead they remembered many insulting, degrading and repulsive things. There were some amongst them whose parents too, were educated in the same manner. In spite of this, when the time came, something stirred in the hearts of these people. They reviewed their behavior, began to long for their nationality, and even approached it in order to know it better and to absorb it. Secondly, do we not often see how an entire generation revolts against the special way of life it was educated to follow? Is not this the essence of the war

between fathers and sons? One fine day the sons start to hate the principles which their family life was based upon, and to which all their childhood memories are connected by an unbreakable link. They begin to hate, revolt, demolish in the name of the new principle in which they believe. If education in itself cannot create in us that psychological link to a certain way of life, and maintain it for ever and ever; and if this link is often created also outside of education, and even in spite of systematic education, it is obvious that one should not consider calculation as the cause for the national feeling, but instead look for something which precedes education. What is this something? I studied this question deeply and answered myself: The blood. This point I uphold now to be true.

The feeling of national uniqueness is ingrained in the “blood” of Man, in the physical-racial species, and in it only. We do not believe that the spirit is independent of the body. We believe that Man’s psyche is dependent, first of all on his physical structure. No kind of education, not the family, and not even the surroundings will turn a man, who was endowed by nature with a calm temperament, into an excitable and hasty character. The psychic structure of the nation reflects its physical type in a fuller and more complete form, than the mood of the individual. The nation shapes its own psychic character, for this character suits its physical-racial type, and no other mood is conceivable. From the point of view of customs and manners, the way of living obviously undergoes changes in the course of time. But the national uniqueness is not to be looking for in manners of customs. When we speak of a “self psychic structure” we of course mean something deeper. This “something” is expressed at different times in various exterior phenomena, according to the epoch and the social surrounding. But this “something” always remains as it is, as long as the physical racial type is preserved. Thus, a brass clarinet can give high or low tones, correct or faulty ones, pure or discordant ones. It can

play a prayer or a waltz in a large hall or a narrow room. All this changes its sound, but your ear will always discern that it is a clarinet and not a flute or a harp. You will not mistake it for the sound of another musical instrument, as long as its body, its form is that of a clarinet. Bend it shatter it. Perhaps it will stop producing sounds- but even the last distorted and screaming sound that will burst forth, will never the less be the sound of a clarinet. This is because the clarinet cannot produce other sounds than that of a clarinet. If you wish to produce the sound of a flute, you have only one method of doing this. Melt its brass and cast it in the form of a flute. Only then, when you will have the body of a flute, will it start "speaking" with the sounds of a flute. This is why we do not believe in spiritual assimilation. It is impossible, from the physical point of view, that a Jew who was born to many generations of pure blooded Jews will adopt the mood of a German or a Frenchman, just as it is impossible for a Negro to stop being a Negro. In the case of the Jew, it is even more inconceivable since the kernel of the psychic structure is a much more distinguishable racial sign, much more inseparable, and less liable to be obliterated, than the colour of the skin, the curve of the mouth, and the shape of the skull. A Jew educated amongst Germans, will be able to adapt himself to German customs and German words will even be entirely absorbed with the German culture. The kernel of his psychic structure however will remain Jewish, for his blood, his body, his physical racial they are Jewish. This will be obvious to anyone observing his actions and reactions. If he should marry a pure blooded Jewish wife, who is educated in our psychic uniqueness. There will be no assimilation as long as intermarriage does not occur. When intermarriage will increase to become the majority of cases, there will be children of half Jewish blood. Then the first breach for the true and absolute for the true and absolute assimilation, which cannot be rectified any more will take place. The decisive increase in intermarriage is the only sure means, the only chance for the abolition of nationality

as such. All the nations that disappeared from the face of the earth (with the exception, of course, of those that were entirely slaughtered, or that died and disappeared from the earth due to abnormal conditions of existence) were swallowed in the abyss of intermarriage.

What you suggest, dear Sir, does not threaten us either with slaughter or mass death. But the implementation of your plan autonomy in the *Galut*, in a foreign country might bring our nation in an absolutely natural way and through a need, which is inevitable, to a gradual increase in intermarriage. The final result will be the other cases of preponderance over marriage and through this to the utter disappearance of the Jewish nation as such, from the face of the earth.

We do not know what form the sexual relations of mankind will take in the future, and under a certain regime. But one thing is certain. They will be based on the system of free choice. Men and women will come together through mutual attraction, without paying any heed to minor reasons. As to the mutual attraction, we can again dare and prophesy that it will be governed in the future, as it is at present, by the laws of assessment. Let us clarify our words. If a certain man moves in Circle A. three times as much as in Circle B., then in 75 out of a 100 cases, according to the Law of Assessment, he will not choose a wife from amongst the second circle, but from amongst the first. Present society is split up into classes and groups which display, towards each other an attitude of jealousy, disrespect, or even hatred. That is why, in most cases, marriages take place from among the same class, from amongst the same group. But then, you and I dream of an epoch, in which there will not exist anymore the reasons for jealousy from lower to upper, nor for disrespect from upper to lower. There will be no hatred between the nationalities of mankind, and these nationalities will doubtlessly live in good neighborly relations, complete understanding, and mutual respect. I say without a doubt, for, if you had no hope that your plan would eventually bring about "good neighbourly relations, complete understanding and mutual

respect” between the nationalities, you would not have put your plan forward. In which way can we give our nation a national existence, without the hatred of Gentiles? This is the question that we, you and I are trying to solve.

Imagine dear Sir, this picture of good neighbourly relations in the future. Our offspring live in peace among the foreign nations numbering twenty times less than the population of that nation. The latter does not, however, crush them; it recognizes their autonomy and considers them as the sons of its homeland, in the same manner it considers its own sons. If added to this, we shall abolish the economic competition and the illiteracy – the main factors of any animosity (which both of us, you and I believe should disappear) we shall see that there exist all the reasons for the development of strong friendly relations between offspring, and the nation amongst which they live; Relations with no feeling either of hatred or estrangement.

Today, there are towns in which Jews are negligible minority of the rest of the population; but this negligible minority of the rest of the population leads its own completely secluded life. The Jew moves in Jewish circles ten times as much as in non Jewish circles, because he is not liked in Gentile circles. In that future which is full of brightness, there will remain no trace of the dislike towards the Jew. The Jew and the non-Jew will consider each other as brothers. (If this is not attained, all the trouble you have taken to develop autonomy in vain) As a result of this, the picture in such a town will be entirely different even if we assume that the Jews are not a negligible minority, but a large group, about fifteen per cent of the population. A town in which the Jews are four per cent of the population will actually be considered very “Jewish.” How then will a Jewish community live amongst the eighty-five per cent of the non-Jewish citizens? Again in estrangement? Of course not. Hatred will not exist anymore, but there will be complete agreement and mutual respect. That means that the Jew will be complete

agreement and mutual respect. That means that the Jew will be friendly with the non-Jew with the same ease and freedom as with another Jew. Therefore he will naturally move more in the circle of the majority of the population. If I, who am dark haired, have nothing against fair haired, live in a town in which the dark haired are fifteen per cent and the fair haired number eighty-five per cent, I will meet the fair haired and come closer to them, at least three times as much as with those that are dark haired. If the Jew will move in the non-Jewish circle three times as much as in the Jewish one (take into consideration, the complete agreement and the mutual respect) then it is natural that in seventy five cases out of a hundred he will feel attraction not to a Jewish woman but to a non-Jewish woman. Obviously, you do not assume that the prohibition of intermarriage will still exist in the law-book of that epoch. On the contrary, you and I believe that love between man and woman will, in that epoch be released from all the restrictions and prejudice, and every mutual attraction, which is now so often quelled in its initial stages, will be brought in a much easier and faster way to the fulfillment of the aim – the continuation of the species. Seventy-five percent of mutual attractions between Jews and non-Jewesses (or between Jewesses and non-Jews) will be the cause, of course in a natural and free way of seventy five per cent of intermarriages. The offspring that will be born of these marriages will not be complete Jews anymore, but half Jews. To the “main” populous, this will be a negligible mixture, unnoticeable. To the Jews who are a minority, this will be the beginning of the complete assimilation.

In other towns where the Jews are more than fifteen per cent of the population, this process of assimilation will be slower, but not many will be the places where the Jews are less than fifteen per cent, and there, assimilation will proceed by gigantic strides...

I see from here, dear Sir, the smile that appears unwillingly on your face, when you read this detailed number of weddings that will take place in the future. It is accepted not to talk about the details of the regime that is going to be formed. Such talk is considered naïve and ridiculous. Mr. Bilkerman would not have refrained from stating that this is unscientific. I too, think that it is impossible to guess the small details of the future regime, and there is no need at all to do so. But then, not everything can be considered as small details. The plans we make for future life contain also important and basic elements; these elements we can definitely foresee. We (I refer to us and to you too), who attempt to shape the future, who speak in the same name of the future, who promise future to the masses – we have no right to avoid investigating this future. We must study deeply and think of all the possible outcomes that may result from the step that we are asking the nation to take. Even the greatest pedantry cannot be here superfluous or ridiculous; it will only prove our serious deep attitude to this serious problem.

If I have forced you to read the long and detailed statistics about the future marriages, it has been done in order to clarify in my mind as well as yours, the general assumptions, which I shall now sum up: Autonomy in the *Galut*, should bring about normal relations between Jews and non-Jews; to a complete equality, to full agreement and to mutual respect. If it does not bring about this normal state fully and absolutely; if there remains in the epoch of autonomy even a shadow of hatred or contempt towards the Jew as such – then autonomy in the *Galut* does not serve as a solution to the Jewish problem. But if it will indeed bring about a situation in which the Jew will, while preserving his nationality, will live amongst the foreign nation, as a respected citizen having full rights. Then – as an inevitable result of such friendly relations there will be an increase of intermarriage to a decisive amount, and the number of these marriages will increase tenfold for the same reason that the Jews are in every place a small minority. It will in effect

cause a complete assimilation of the race into the foreign majority. Since the national psychic character can survive only under conditions which the physical racial character is preserved, then with the physical assimilation of Jews among the non-Jewish majority, there will disappear too, the Jewish character as specific national-cultural unit. The specific national character is preserved as long as there is, in the nation the aspiration to preserve it. This aspiration exists as long as there exists its real root, that is to say, the specific 'blood' one and specific psychic character and no other suits it perfectly.

With a change in the physical character there is also a decay of the aspiration to preserve the national psychic character at any cost, for this character will no longer suit the "blood" that was changed. Without the root, the spiritual flower will wither too, the will to preserve the specific national character. The latter will become blurred and will gradually melt in the sea of foreign waters. This will be the end to the struggle of the Jewish nation for its national substantiality, a struggle which has no comparison, a titanic war of so many generations!

Indeed, one of the most literary spokesmen of autonomy told me once in a conversation. "Even if we face a danger of extermination, through an epidemic of intermarriages, then this danger will be real, only when the last spark of hatred between Jew and non-Jew will be extinguished." Do you really believe that will ever happen? What optimism! I believe that autonomy will save us from direct oppression, that it will educate us in spirit and matter, that it will relieve us of the contempt of nations. But I do not toy with false hopes, and foresee without a shadow of doubt that the consciousness of foreigners will remain as an eternal dividing wall between our descendants and the descendants of our neighbours. Each will adopt a better attitude towards those of his own nation, than towards the Jew, and intermarriage will then remain too, remain as an exceptional phenomena.

Is this, dear Sir, your opinion too? Not long ago, I too, believed so, and have written in a booklet, that even though the Homeland is nothing but a shadow, which no one is in need of. There was already, according to some people, a man who has sold his shadow to the devil, and people shunned his company out of abhorrence, for the healthy and complete nature abhors anything that is incomplete and faulty – a body without a shadow, a fox without a tail, a nation without a land. No. I am no longer certain of this. I shall not pledge that it is true. I shall not doubt completely the possibility that learning and a change in ways reservations a nation that has no land. I have said this already at the beginning of this letter. But you, dear Sir, or many of those who share your views – perhaps you too are not, in the depths of your hearts certain of complete and full peace with no conditions? Perhaps you are ready to be reconciled on the basis of social-political equality “plus” national substantiality, and will not deplore the fact that the main citizens of the country will nevertheless go on considering your descendants as second grade citizens, the way Nordau termed it; that is to say- let them think of us as they wish, as long as they do not oppress us and do not disturb us from remaining Jews? But if you are reconciled with such conditions- your descendants never will, and will not be grateful to you for them. With the improvement of the cultural conditions in which the generation grows and is being educated, it becomes more sensitive to any more insult, even the slightest one.

To the negro, in the era of slavery, the abuses were not terrible, since he was used to something which hurt more than abuses. That was the whip. But to us and to you, even a slight hint of an insult is often more than a slap in the face, because we were educated under more civilized conditions.

I shall remind you of the legend (it always comes to my mind when I speak of the Italian Jews) about the Princess who so delicate that one pebble underneath her cushion disturbed her

from sleeping the whole night. A generation that was educated in consciousness of national pride and never tasted oppression; will never be reconciled to a lack of respect from the people among which it resides will under no circumstances tolerate the eternity of “existence of a second grade”. The solution of the Jewish problem means complete and absolute equality to our nation as compared to the nations of the earth. If there remains even one scratch, even one pebble of contempt against us, then the more there will be an improvement in the culture of our descendants, the greater will be their suffering due to this inequality, and the “cursed problem” will rise again to life. And then, perhaps again, by way of abuse, the master will mark us with the sign of foreigners. Again, a deceived and suffering nation will start searching for a new homeland.

The Jewish problem can either be solved completely, to the end, with no remnants, or it cannot be solved at all. If autonomy does not serve as an absolute solution – give it up. If autonomy serves as an solution to the Jewish problem, if it truly ensures complete equality, spiritually, that will not be dimmed by any fault, it is bound eventually to cause also a complete assimilation among the same surrounding population.

Preservation of national substantiality is possible only if the purity of the race is preserved, and for that we need a territory of our own, in which our nation will be the decisive majority. And if you, dear Sir, will ask me in dread – then you want isolation at all costs? I shall answer you, that one should not be afraid of any words, the word “isolation” included. The poet, the scholar, the thinker- anyone who is in need of creative work so as to give expression to his personality, must isolate, to be alone during his work, to be locked between his four walls without seeing anybody, for it is impossible to write poetry, or to create philosophical systems to the sound of disturbing conversations.

No creation can be envisaged without isolation; and if the poet or the scholar writes in this isolation, things that are of use to the public, then the isolation is a civic obligation. The nation too must create. The national-spiritual creation is the end of the existence of any nation, and if not for the purpose of creation it has nothing to exist for. For this task, the creative nation needs isolation, just as the individual creative personality is in need of it. And if the nation has not died, it will create new values in its isolation, and when it will create them, it will not keep them for himself, but bring them to the international table which is shared for the general benefit- and it's isolation will be considered by mankind as righteousness.

Introduction to Anti-Semitism

In his book "The War and the Jew", published during World War II, *Rosh Betar* studied the problem of anti-Semitism. In a deep and thorough analysis, supported by illustrations and statistics, *Rosh Betar* asserted that there were two types of anti-Semitism: a) anti-Semitism of men b) anti-Semitism of things. Amongst others, he drew attention to the fact that even assimilation is not subjective, but also due to objective conditions. One illustration of such is the phenomenon of Jews holding key positions and therefore being accused by the Gentiles of "usurping" the positions from them.

In conclusion, *Rosh Betar* points out two possibilities to solve the problem of anti-Semitism: total assimilation or the limitation of the activity of Jews both as individuals and as a group. The latter, if accomplished will be an act against Man's honor and the principles of equality.

The only solution, therefore, is through a concentration of the majority of the Jews in their homeland, where they will live as a sovereign nation and will, as in the past, contribute their share to mankind.

THE ANTISEMITISM OF “MEN” AND “THINGS”

Some Jewish readers may find these chapters too lenient with regard to the several Polish governments which succeeded one another from 1920 to 1939, and which between them should be held responsible for the progressive economic degradation of Poland's Jewry, for the systematic stultification of its legal equality, guaranteed under, both the Versailles treaty and the Polish constitution, and for the many recurrent and unchecked outbursts of brutal violence. The charge will be justified; but it is here the considered intention of the author to pass over the guilt of human beings in order to examine what is much more important – the objective reality, whose trend, in the central zone of Europe, is inherently and organically hostile to a scattered minority. The policy of government can affect this trend only to a certain extent; or it will perhaps be more exact to say that any government has in its power to increase the hardship inflicted by this trend up to the limit of human endurance, or beyond it, but it can do very little to soften or diminish the inevitable pressure, and nothing at all to remove it.

It is unfortunately true that some of these Polish governments especially in the period preceding Pilsudski's coup *d'état*, did much to aggravate the pressure; and none of them, not even the best, can claim to have done its duty, or the smallest fraction of its duty in respect of alleviating the situation. Nothing would be easier than to denounce them with the bitterness they deserve, now that they are all defeated and swept away. A chapter of denunciation might give a good deal of belated satisfaction to long repressed and outraged indignation. But the author confesses that to him it would give no satisfaction whatever. He prefers to adhere to his chosen line of enquiry, which considers not the sins of men, but the tendencies of an elemental social process.

Those men, ministers, and officials, writers and priests were often unforgivably guilty; and a long trail of Jewish tears, often tinged with something more salty than tears, leads up to their doors. If there is justice beyond this life, they will pay for their sins; if history be written by honest pens, they will stand condemned. But the purpose of this book is to force Jew and Gentile alike to realize that the fundamental curse of Jewish existence in the central zone of distress is due to something infinitely deeper than policies or ideologies or propagandas, whether anti- or pro: and he would not have the attention of his readers diverted in the direction of easy and cheap emotion, from the necessary stern concentration on the essential and irremediable tragedy.

The ghetto of East-Central Europe was doomed from of old. No government, no regime, no angel or devil could have transformed it anything even remotely approaching a normal homeland. It is now utterly impossible to restore it as such unless the numerical and ethnical proportions undergo a drastic change.

Some people are so sensitive on the subject that they regard it as disloyalty to the cause of Jewish emancipation if facts are adduced to prove that legal equality alone is utterly insufficient to ensure the Jews of even a minimum normal existence, least of all in East-Central Europe. One is reminded that the same sort of political prudery existed in Tsarist Russian. Liberals were so “enamored” of constitution and “parliament” that they resented as political treason any hint that life in a country that was strictly constitutional and parliamentary was by no means immune from injustice, oppression, bribery, anti-Semitism and other troubles. But theirs at least was a justifiable ignorance; they had never lived under a constitutional regime. The excuse is not valid in the case of the Jews of East-Central Europe: they have all had the experience of what legal equality is really worth; the Jews of Germany, Austria, the western half of Poland, and the Balkans, for three generations; and those of eastern Poland and the Baltic

countries for twenty years. All these Jews, without single exception, are fully and absolutely convinced that legal quality alone is no cure for the disease which has poisoned their existence, and will poison it again. It is unforgivably shortsighted now to withhold this experience from the notice of allied statesmen, some of whom, if not all, may be genuinely forgetful of it, and sincerely deluded into imagining that to restore the “equal rights” clauses in peace treaties, constitutions and covenants, would be a sufficient and adequate solution of the problem. On the contrary: the most urgent need of the day is to drive it home to all concerned that in East-Central Europe the equality principle alone means no equality, but the same old chaos over again.

To make this clear to outside observers, some bitter truths will have to be stated and admitted, however painful they may be to persons of exaggerated sensibility. These awkward admissions centre on the one essential and dominating feature of East-European reality: there are certain inevitable aspects in the normal social evolution of Eastern Europe (the words “inevitable” and “normal” should be emphasized) which are inherently, objectively, and organically fatal to the Jews’ existence.

The fact will be abundantly illustrated in the course of the following chapters: and here, as introduction to the subject, let us consider what is held to be the classical example of this incompatibility between the normal evolution of East-Central economy and the Jews’ foothold within that economy. It is the co-operative movement among the Gentile population, especially in the rural districts. In Poland there were some 750,000 Jews living in the villages, where they constituted, on the average 3.2 per cent of the total rural population. These three quarters of a million souls, with a few exceptions, lived by shop keeping and peddling goods to the farmers. The co-operative movement began long before the Great War, but its maximum development was reached during the last decade. In 1938 there were in rural Poland 3,207 consumers’ co-

operatives (membership. 35,000), 1,475 for the marketing of dairy produce, (membership 626,000) and 453 for general marketing (76,000 members). This development was killing the Jewish traders en masse. The effect remarkably enough, was most deadly precisely in the Ukrainian districts, where direct anti-Semitic propaganda was much weaker than among the Poles, and where the government had much less reason for desiring to weaken Jewish influence than in the purely Polish provinces: a proof that the phenomenon has little to do with any conscious will to harm the Jews qua Jews, but is rather inherent in the very nature of the development. It would oust the rural shopkeeper just as surely if he were an Armenian or a Chinaman; but he happens to be a Jew, who has nowhere to go.

There may have been a few Christian shopkeepers in these Ukrainian districts, and they too had to surrender before the onslaught of the co-operatives. But the “broken” Christian trader, as often as not, is absorbed into the administrative machinery of the movement: being a valuable specialist among simple peasants, he will be employed. The Jew will not be so employed; it is obvious to all that there could be no question at all of absorbing the displaced Jewish trader into the executive staff of a farmers’ co-operative that no Jew would ever dream of asking for such an “absurdity.” Is this too, to be described as anti-Semitism? The managers of the co-operative movement, most of whom are men of enlightened views, would indignantly deny such a charge. It is “simply” – they would say- that one has to look after his own people first.

The same phenomenon, but in a much more serious form, can be observed in one of the Baltic states (or perhaps in all). Violent anti-Semitism is not tolerated. What actually goes on is a social process rather commendable in itself: the State, in one form or another, is gradually taking over the more or less direct administration of all the valuable industrial or commercial concerns. The owners are paid fair value; or shall we say more or less fair value. If the owners are Gentiles,

they generally remain in charge. If they are Jews, the case is different: they are gradually replaced by non-Jews. This as a rule, is done without any harsh abruptness, but nevertheless effectively. As one of the victims put it to the author: "In Poland, when the government takes over a Jewish owned factory, all the Jews on the staff have to go. Here there is no such indecent haste. Ninety per cent of my former staff were left in employment when it happened; that was three years ago. A year later, only seventy per cent were left; last year fifty per cent, and now, the end is in sight."

A remarkable dictum is often quoted in that country; it is said to have been uttered by quite exalted lips. "Never trouble to kill the flies: but leave no crumbs for them." This aphorism is interpreted as a formula of deliberate if "polite" anti-Semitism; but there is no proof that it was ever really spoken, and it matter little whether it was or not. The crux of the matter is whether in the atmosphere of East-Central Europe a government engaged upon such an unquestionably progressive adventure as the nationalization of pivotal industries would be allowed to act otherwise. The total population of the country is that of a London borough; but there is a university and a school for higher engineering, with several thousand pupils. Every year more and more of "one's own people," fully qualified, line up for jobs – mostly excellent types of young manhood, keen gifted, honest and efficient. How long would any government be tolerated if it kept them waiting while Jews continued to staff and manage that would now be state concerns- though created by Jewish enterprise with Jewish capital?

A gross injustice! Of course; but mere disapproval is useless. The root of the trouble is not hatred of the Jews- that could be combated, if not eradicated- but something more elemental and primordial: sympathy with "one's own people," an instinct which cannot be criticized, because, after all, it is as natural as preferring one's own children to one's neighbor's offspring.

The Anti-Semitism of Things, of course, is due in the last resort to a certain subjective attitude of human beings. The line drawn here between the two kinds of Judeophobia- that of Men and that of Things- is, however, not an artificial distinction. Human anti-Semitism is an active enmity, a constant urge to harm the hated race, to humiliate them, to see them squirming and writhing beneath one's feet. Obviously, such an aggressive and sadistic mentality cannot be kept forever on the boil in the average member of the community; it must have its ups and downs, its periods of eruption and of hibernation, and even at its strongest only a leading minority manifest in its greedily acute stage; the majority must follow suit and mildly enjoy of fun. Being thus of a somewhat elastic nature, the "Anti-Semitism of Men" can sometimes be fought with a measure of success; the Germans for instance, a nation endowed with a remarkable genius for collective obedience, might be expected to tone it down to order, if not exasperated by too great an influx of revenants.

There seems to be something pathological in such a volcanic heat of hatred. However strong the racial repulsion, however appalling the sins of Israel, the subject obviously does not justify even a fraction of such a turmoil. The suspicion inevitably arises that this attitude is subconsciously based not only on repulsion but also on attraction: as is the case with sadism. A remarkable political feature of such volcanic anti-Semitism is its inability to appreciate the Zionist or other similar aspirations. Logically, the Nazis ought to be inclined to encourage any movements tending towards the evacuation of the Jews from Germany: in practice, they have done more than any government to stir up anti-Jewish trouble in Palestine, though it could only hamper the exodus. Should Uganda and Angola or Mindanao be declared a national home for the Jews instead of Palestine, the Nazi attitude would evidently be the same. Sadism does not wish to lose its victim; the Biblical story of the Exodus was the first recorded instance of this curious

interplay of two opposite passions: one longing to exterminate the hated breed and one determined to prevent their departure.

Other curious hypotheses have been suggested by observers of this morbid phenomenon. The most popular one of these was revived some years ago by Henri Berustein, in a play entitled *Israel*: it told the story of a young French aristocrat, a virulent enemy of the Jews, who lived to learn that his real father was not *son cher papa*, but a fashionable Jewish banker. The obvious suggestion is that all volcanic anti-Semitism is an abnormal infatuation, which must have some physiological basis, probably racial. Baron Etovos (pronounced approximately "Etvesh"), a great Hungarian statesman, wrote almost a century ago. "An anti-Semite is a man who dislikes the Jews more than he should." Why more? Why so excited? The simplest explanation is that he "has Jews on the brain," and that this mania is due to the prescience of a drop of Jewish blood, which produces some mysterious and atavistic reaction in the hybrid psyche. According to this theory, any "volcanic" Jew-hater- that is a man who does not just dislike them "as much as he should" but who makes a fuss about it-very probably has Jewish ancestors; they may be very remote, or hidden by bar, sinister, so that no written record can reveal the fact; they may have left no trace on the shape of the nose, or even the form of the eyes, but that is not essential. The "Jew complex" itself is held to be a sufficient proof of racial atavism.

This may be true or it may be mere guesswork. A specialist in collective psychopathology might well investigate the theory. The Jews will remain unmoved. They are not likely to be flattered by the revelation of Dr. Goebbels Rabbinical descent, nor would the discovery in any way diminish or increase their troubles. The authors' purpose in this digression is to emphasize the morbid, hectic, fluctuating character of what he calls the "Anti-Semitism of

Men”- as distinct from the “Anti-Semitism of Things” which is steady, constant and immutable, and therefore much more formidable.

It derives from the more discrimination which every normal person makes between his or her “own kind” and all outsiders. It need not be hatred, it need have nothing to do with actual repulsion. It may be dormant under normal conditions, and may remain dormant for generations, to awaken only when there is keen competition for some essential boon, when the choice is between one’s own kin and the outsider, and the instinct for self defense emerges. Even when it need not (though it may) flare up in an angry blaze: it may remain correctly polite, while inward merciless-as in the Baltic example; or it may run amok, as it sometimes does in Poland. It is not the form that matters, but the spirit. That spirit is the inextinguishable awareness of every Gentile that his Jewish neighbor is not “his own kind” and of every Jew that his Aryan friends are not “his own kind.” There is no intrinsic harm in his awareness; it is no obstacle to decent neighborly intercourse, to mutual help, even to friendship, so long as the social “climate” is favorable. In the “climate” of East-Central Europe it becomes the Jew’s death sentence.

Introduction to “The Revolt of the Old Men”

In his article, “The Revolt of the Old Men”, *Rosh Betar* discusses the difference between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

He points out, that in the nineteenth century; the predominant trend was towards the establishment of a regime that would exercise minimum intervention in the life of the individual and society.

As opposed to this; in the twentieth century the tendency to form totalitarian regimes is continuously being intensified. He elaborates upon this disease that human beings in the present century even cherish such a regime, whose greatest hero is the politician. He then calls upon the “old men”, those who reached maturity in the nineteenth century, to revolt and take action towards basing life upon the ideals of the nineteenth century. In fact, the problem becomes most obvious, when an attempt is being made to answer the question whether the state exists for the individual or Vice Versa.

Nowadays, when the regime in the state is being strengthened, and the individual is more and more being denied his freedom, it seems that even in democratic states, many believe that the individual exists for the state. Such a mood and way of thought provide the best breeding ground for the establishment of totalitarian regimes.

In view of this dangerous development, *Rosh Betar's* article is even more important today than at the time it was written. In the following pages, we included the most relevant parts of the article.

The Revolt of the Old Men (1937)

....”Discipline was in its right place during the 19th Century, recognizing the certain necessities, at particular instances, such as an emergency, when the nation stands at the crossroads, and the need to overcome a certain obstacle is most urgent. In other words – a bitter medicine. At the opportune time, it can be a blessing; but not every time is opportune. Discipline can be a very strong national and public spirit, penetrating everything, an object being demanded everywhere today. Even in his wildest nightmare, Man of the 19th Century could never picture such a thing.

Generally speaking, they did not comply with the State as such, but laid down certain important reservations. The government must be like a banister of a staircase, where a man may rest; therefore, the banister is of utmost necessity. But there is no need for crutches at every step and stair. The policeman is good and useful, if he is stationed at the corner of a street, or when he attends to an urgent call, but definitely not in any other form. It is possible to define the State Ideal of the 19th Century as follows: A “minimum” state or a more extreme definition, “moderate anarchy”. I am not sure whether in the 19th Century the term “proletarian regime” was ever heard. Nevertheless, in my youth, I never heard of it. A person of the 19th Century could not even picture to himself the smell of the state in every phase of his life like the smell of burning meat permeating the kitchen. The idea of pure Police States is like a dense forest from which man cannot extricate himself.

(Today) the Police State charges against us in the face. What is worse (who except us still attempt such experiments) is the readiness of our “times”, the preparedness with a broad smile, to accept the Police State, only without complaint, but with songs and dances. Something priceless has been extinguished in the soul of Man. Here is an interesting example. In no field

(Except one) is there a candidate for the wreath of genius. From here you do not learn that genius does not exist. To recognize genius is the task of the coming generations. But, until now it was taken as an accepted fact that the existing generation's task was to choose a candidate from among them to be crowned with the wreath of a genius, and to surround him with respect and wonder. Today, no such thing exists, not in the theatre, not in literature, not in the plastic arts, and not in science. Indeed, some say that Einstein is a true genius. If it is true, then the most characteristic thing about it is that he is the only genius of this era, and even he is on an uninhabited island. Hardly any man will understand him, maybe a few. And on the continent the dwelling place of all there is no need for genius.

But there is one exception: the "political leaders. In this sphere it is well known that the genius reached gigantic proportions. One after another, countries are catching the same virus, and are discovering among them the god's chosen ones, with the king's seal stamped on their forehead.

One thing is clear. As the leadership plague spreads, it is most vital that the chosen ones be of average stature. Man's mind is tired,; it needs rest. Beforehand it was the privilege of each one of us to rack his mind over the "cursed problems"; and today no one tends to do it. The masses seek instinctively, their overlord who will do the thinking for them, and who will be paid for erecting golden monuments in his lifetime. "A tired mind" of a complete epoch. It is nevertheless a fact that this tiredness is the root of the phenomenon that surrounds us – the Old Men. Because of this, the love of freedom is cast aside. It is the cause of the indifference of Man towards his own thought, the love of order, the hysterical love- almost lust to live the life of a free soul. Let us return to my terminology. The 20th Century is prepared to eliminate the foundation and life of "fair game". For her the "game" is nothing but a toy, whose place is

outside the “necessary”. The “game” is a relaxation from “life” and the true, serious and habitual life is regarded as the supreme authority for the laying down of the strict order of “hard labor.”

Will the Old Men revolt? This I do not know. But if they do revolt one of these days, they will first have to understand an old truth. It is not enough to revolt “against”, one must revolt “for” Here then comes the query. If we are disgusted with Police States, Communism and Fascism and reject them, a day will come when we will have to give an answer to the final question. Where is the type of order that you recommend?

This question must be answered with forthrightness. After all, even the Police State was not just created, for the sake of a new plaything. It was created to uproot famine and poverty, once and for all. The Communists and the Fascists are sure that the sole means for this is the “barracks”. And so what?- Status Quo- Which means the existing social regime of exploitation?

Nearly all those Old Men, whom I have the honor to know personally, reply angrily to the last question. No! The existing regime will relieve themselves of all responsibility for it, and clothe it with a boycott with such frankness, that it is cruel for me to remind them of the Latin formula. There is no third way.

There is no showcase in the world where the twelve types of social regimes are presented, or even six, and you, choose that which you like. There are only two. Either – or; the barracks, which means a systematic way of life, the Socialist where the life of the individual is dictated by the regime; or the regime where the criterion in this respect is the “will” of the individual. That is to say, the existing regime of today. The word will – I placed in inverted commas, for I remember the overall agreement in this term. I know and remember that a free man is not free in his own choice. He is under the pressure of thousands of factors. At every time and in every

place, even under the most ideal regime; from the point of view of freedom, there will always be pressure in one form or another. Excepting this it is possible to add purposely in any liberal regime, amendments of semi-compulsion. (*économie dirigée.*)

But, should it remain intact after the amendments, this same principle which determines, that in the final account, it will not be the state that steers my “boat” (be it God, the devil, good advice, but not an order of the police) All the time it will be principally, the existing regime, and no self delusion will help. One must take a clear cut decision; or the barracks, or the status quo. By the way dear guest; today there is no point in calling the status quo- Capitalistic Regime. This is an era, which does not yet exist in the nature of this form of state, where the general policy of law and administration adjusts itself, knowingly or unknowingly to the interests of the masses, as against the interest of the poor in general and the workers in particular.

It is fifty year or more that all the states face the opposite direction, especially since the War (mainly the dictatorial and anti-class regimes). Under a Socialist Regime, where the wealth, if I am permitted to state is under siege. It is used as the source of entrenching the state’s stand against concerted attacks from all sides, sometimes successfully, sometime unsuccessfully, the same as all the other socialistic factors competing with it. Today there is no remnant of a “capitalistic regime”, perhaps a more suitable term “bourgeois” regime; bourgeois meaning middle class. Indeed- three sections of cultured mankind are neither capitalist nor proletarian. These are the middle class. Their interests are many and changeable; therefore they require an elastic regime, easy to handle, which permits amendments. It is the type of social regime unlike the one between the two great revolutions of the 18th Century, the “Industrial”, and the “French.” A regime based on Liberalism, which absorbed large doses of drugs, from the collective work

contract, unemployment insurance, inheritance tax. It swallowed these and still remained the same regime, though in an amended form.

The only question now is; whether this regime is able to absorb all the additional amendments till the liquidation of the phenomenon of poverty will be realized; and together with this safeguard its' foundation and continue to be a regime of "free" play.

Introduction to “Jubilee”

In his article the “Jubilee Ideal”, *Rosh Betar* outlined the principles of a social concept which originates from the Bible- a concept diametrically opposed to the Socialist ideology.

Rosh Betar draws attention to the basic evils in the Socialist ideal among which is the curbing of the activity of the individual and denying him freedom. Any regime based on the Socialist ideal is bound to become a dictatorship. This was proved in the countries where an attempt was made to implement Socialism.

In opposition to these ideas, *Rosh Betar* offers the social concept of the Bible and points out that this concept – and not the Socialist one is compatible to progress, for it does not call for one big revolution, which will be followed by a stubborn conservatism. The Biblical concept embodies the ever continuing search for changes and improvements, which will be in accord with the changes time will bring.

Needless to say, the following article cannot be regarded as a complete plan. The fact that he used the word “Ideal” in the title is in itself an indication that *Rosh Betar* wanted to draw the attention to an ideal that should serve as a basis for a social plan. The latter should be worked out and suited to the epoch and its specific conditions.

THE JUBILEE IDEAL (1930)

One thing is certain. The roots of Socialism stem from the Bible. Nevertheless it is not exactly so. No doubt the Bible is filled with social protests. It seems then, that in that social order, the wealthy were able to lead a life of ease at the expense of the poor. But Socialism is not just an outcry. Socialism is a concrete program, attempting to solve the social problem by law; and a program of this sort especially is not found in the Bible. As opposed to this, the Bible has a concrete program for a social revolution. (to be more precise, a condensed form of a program). But not only is this program far removed from Socialism, but its very foundations reject Socialism from start to finish. The remedy for the Biblical social misfortune is the “jubilee Year.” The relevant book is the third book of Moses- Leviticus, Chapter 25. The fundamental difference between it and Socialism lies in the fact that one system is for the correction of evil, the other anticipates the evil.

Socialism is an attempt to anticipate the social evils. The program of a social order of this kind will not tolerate the unequal division of property. The Socialist order through its solid character, would eliminate this social problem, by today’s standards. Mankind would be organized in such a manner, so that no individual can accumulate property. The same as one cannot accumulate air, so it will not allow Man to accumulate wealth. From here one learns that the state will pay equal salary to the professor and the woodchopper for their labour. The scale of salary (as in Soviet Russia) can be static in a socialist order. In addition to this, one can imagine that in branches outside the regular, the salary paid will be outside the fixed scale. For instance: A successful novel, will sell a million copies and its author will become “wealthy”, or a brilliant pianist will become “wealthy” and will arrange a concert tour throughout the world (it is not out of the realm of possibility that radio will displace both the book and the concert hall) All these

are trifles. The source of the social problem is not in that somebody tried his luck and found a large pearl in the sea. The trouble will start when he exchanges the pearl for a large tract of land, or a factory with ten machines. Thus he will be able to utilize his neighbour's labour cheaply, and sell his goods at a high cost. Socialism prevents this danger, by freezing once and for all the means of mass production from the sphere of the individual.

The program of the Bible has nothing in common with this plan, which prevents at the outset the possibility of social inequality, of exploitation, of economic competition. The Bible requests the safeguarding of economic freedom, but at the same time, it accepts all sorts of amendments and taxes. The most important one is in relation to the Sabbath. "The seventh day is Sabbath to the Lord. Thou shalt not work, nor thy son, thy daughter, nor thy bondservant, maidservant, neither the beast nor the stranger within thy gates." Then the law of *Peah*. "Thou shalt reap the harvest of thy land. Thou shalt not reap the *Peah*, and the remainder of thy crop thou shalt not gather.... Thou shalt leave them to the poor and the stranger." Another commandment is the *Maaser* (one tenth) is "Holy to the Lord." From these seeds, throughout the generations, the present day system was evolved; the system of social safeguards and mutual social aid; tax on the wealthy for the benefit of the poor. There is definitely no similarity between this and Socialism, although many of its laws were legislated and brought to fruition under the direct influence of the Socialist Parties. These are nothing but an extension, an amendment to the economic freedom. It does not suppress the principle of freedom; but among the amendments that Bible lays down for economic freedom are long range, the most revolutionary; but very little is known of it in the world. Let us remind ourselves of the definition given in the Bible of the Jubilee Year. "And thou shalt seven Sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years, and there shall be unto thee the days of seven Sabbaths of years, even forty and nine years. Then

shalt thou send abroad the loud trumpet on the tenth day of the seventh month; on the Day of Atonement shall ye send abroad the trumpet throughout all the land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof: it shall be a Jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family.” (Leviticus, Chap. 25).

If a man was forced to sell his possessions to redeem a debt and failed to do so; on the fiftieth year his possessions shall be returned to him. This is applicable only to the private possessions of an individual. It is also written: “If thy brother be waxed poor with thee, and sell himself unto thee thou shalt not make him serve as a bondservant. As a hired servant, and as a sojourner he shall be with thee: He shall serve with thee into the Year of Jubilee: Then shall he go out from thee, he and his children with him, and shall return unto his own family and unto the possession of his fathers shall he return. (Leviticus, Chap. 25:39-41).

This is approximately all that is said of the Jubilee Year in the Bible. Nevertheless, here we have before us a mental uplift of reform. In actuality, it is an attempt to lay down a principle whereby social reform is in constant demand. The prime difference between the Biblical revolution and the Socialist revolution lies in this that the Socialist revolution comes “once and once only;” whereas the revolution of the Jubilee keeps returning. According to the program whose source is the ideal of Socialism: one of these days there will be fixed justice and order over land ownership (or in general, social justice and order). After that, there will be no addition of amendments. According to the Biblical program, economic life will be safeguarded even after the Jubilee year by the possibility of additional changes. People will continue to ask for advice, to struggle with each other and to compete. Some will become wealthy, others will become poor. Life however will preserve its form. Some will be victorious others will be defeated, but there

will be initiative. This liberty will be adjusted by two amendments. The first one is in force all the time; namely that on one day of the week, work is prohibited; the *Peah* of his field and of his vineyard shall be left to the poor. One tenth of his crop tax as “Holy to the Lord.” If we shall translate this into the language of our days, it means the laying down of fixed hours of work, various forms of social insurance for the workers, and diverse social taxes. The second amendment, the antidote of the regime of economic liberty is the Jubilee; like a gigantic axe which cuts down everything that grows above average height; the absolving of debts. The man who became poor through debt is returned to his possessions, the servant is set free again, equality is returned, and the game starts once more until a new revolution comes.

It is worthwhile asking whether this is better than Socialism or not. Let us overlook this question for a minute. For the time being the main thing is to determine its direct contradiction of Socialism. The idea of ever recurring changes and revolutions is an attempt to rectify an evil. This idea is based on the belief that the freedom of economic competition is one of the strongest foundations in the life of Man. Men will struggle; they will lose or win. It is necessary to upholster only the fighting ring with soft grass, so that the fall of the loser won't hurt too much. This “upholstering” is the Sabbath, *Peah* and *Maaser*; all those various methods which prevent exploitation to the point of blood-sucking, and poverty to the point of absolute lack of means. From time to time, the whistle of the referee is heard. The victors and the vanquished return to their corners from where the match started, and line up shoulder to shoulder; more so since the struggle is bound to continue.

Which is preferable; anticipating the evil or correction of the evil an old question? This question is awakened in the heart of each mother, while her children are still young. What is preferable to heal them if they catch cold, or not permit them to go outside lest they catch cold?

When a maiden reaches a certain age, the question takes on a different form. What is preferable- to disallow them to stroll with boys without a chaperone, or to take the chance on the possibility that the question of love will lead to complications which will demand the use of corrective means? Or on the State level- which is preferable- censure or means to curtail free speech from reaching the level of blasphemy? Prohibition of public demonstrations, or units of police in the vicinity to guard against violence. In general, which is preferable; vaccination against all known diseases, or doctors and pharmacies! Some say that if it were possible to vaccinate Man against all the diseases in the world, he would eventually turn into a monster. I have no idea of the wisdom of medicine, and it is not within my province to express an opinion as such, but.....

If I were a king, I would revise my country according to the Jubilee Law, and not through Socialism. Naturally, first of all, I would have to find wise counselors, to draw up a detailed plan upon the hint given in the Bible, an inelastic, ancient, childish formula which is unsuitable to present day trends. The historians are doubtful whether the Children of Israel even observed the Jubilee Law in days of old. Maybe this law remained as a commandment for the days after the coming of the Messiah. But all the law-books in the world cannot diminish the values not yet accomplished. Also, our swords have not yet been turned into ploughshares. But the day will yet come when the prophecy of Isaiah shall be realized. The coming of the Messiah is not a death sentence. It is a symbol of the true ideal. I would command my counselors to develop the Biblical hint into the language of our times. I would command them to write as follows:- The idea of ever-changing social reform is the law. Adapt it to the economic living conditions of today; and please take note; the period of fifty years fixed in the Bible is not one of the most important details. You may determine other intermediate periods. Furthermore, you may forego altogether the chronological symbol and change it with a more purposeful symbol. For instance;

you can fix that the “jubilee” takes effect when the authorized institution specially appointed for that purpose shall announce it; e.g. Parliament, Senate, Executive Council of Economic associations, or perhaps by a Referendum- a majority vote, whichever you may judge as best. The “revolutions” will then begin by serious prolonged crises- that is what is required. The main thing will be that your program once and for all shall be the law of the phenomenon called today social revolution, which will eliminate the stigma of blood and violence; it will become an accepted thing. Elect a special National Assembly which will inspect and check the paragraphs of this law, a step which is quite irregular and not to be accepted, only by special decision; also please investigate how the influence of this principle affects the economic production, especially that which is the basis of all economy- namely, credit.

In the same chapter of Leviticus, you will find a law which states that the value of a field shall be determined by “the number of years of crops” after the Jubilee, namely, after the nearest “revolution.” It is not sufficient to eliminate the chronological symbol. But if you choose this line of thought, search your wisdom, to find the necessary corrections to safeguard the existence of the principle of credit. Therefore, weigh the matter carefully in your minds, and show us the way. However, allow every man in our country to live, create, deal, invent, and struggle to achieve his aim without preventative censure; but at the same time knowing that from time to time the Jubilee will come, and the “blast of the *Shofar* will be heard throughout the country” proclaiming liberty to the inhabitants.

But I am not a king. On the contrary, I belong to that social level whose name was despised. The Bourgeoisie government: the product of Rome, Greece, Israel and Egypt. I believe that a government of this kind is elastic to infinity, able to absorb unlimited social reforms, and at the same time guarding its fundamental essence.

My heart is sure that the social order called Bourgeois or Capitalist will modify gradually to a means of eliminating poverty; namely, the lowering of the wage beneath the level of subsistence, hygiene and of self respect. Were it not for the defense budgets, it could be realised even today. Furthermore, like all human beings, the Bourgeois regime spews out all sorts of poisons, which inevitably brings upon itself unavoidable upheaval from time to time. It is my belief, that it is within its power to suffer these upheavals, and even include them in its system, self checking, a sort of law, to ensure the unlimited possibilities of the streamlining of the ever-changing social reform; changes fixed in advance, thought out, planned and without the unnecessary bloodshed.

In short, not only do I believe in the stability of the Bourgeois system, but objectively speaking, the seeds of the social idea lean toward a certain direction; ideal is its plain meaning. A goal worth dreaming and fighting for, even though today it does not as yet exist. But this fact does not prove a thing. There were times when the proletariat did not feel any Socialist idealism in his soul. Roman society during the period of the Emperors, strived without doubt for new ideals. Were it not for Saul of Tarsus, Europe would have heard of Christianity only 500 years later.

The word Bourgeois, was regarded as despicable, the Bourgeoisie beg forgiveness for their actual existence, feed on the fat of the land. In spite of this, I tend to think, that even should a new Marx arrive on the scene, and write three volumes on its ideal, and it is well possible, not "*Das Kapital*" but Jubilee, it is quite possible that this man will be born in Moscow.

Sometimes I reflect in my heart. Socialism is full of enthusiasm. It is quite possible that this is its main source of strength. But the world outlook which the Jubilee propounds has greater

attraction to the dreaming soul. Socialism does not reject that in the world commune, if Man will eat his fill, there will exist a life of monotony. Only questions of spirit and science can fire the hearts (to me it seems that the future in those days will be devoted to crossword puzzles). But the true bitterness will be removed from mankind forever. Indeed, the Russian poet Nadson described this, or something similar. Of course one does not take aesthetics into consideration when eliminating poverty, but the adventure still remains in the game and the struggle, the romanticism of the starting leap and the pursuit, the chain of creative freedom. The main point is, that the very thing the Socialism has sworn to uproot, and without doing so it is not worthwhile living. The eternal possibility of reform, the volcanic foundation of society is a suitable field for action, but not for grazing.

Introduction to “Class”

In his article on “Class”, *Rosh Betar* elaborates on the identity between Communism lies in their temperament only. Both aspire to bring about a situation in which the working class will rule the state.

According to Jabotinsky, the difference between Socialism and Communism lies in their temperament only. The first hopes to reach this goal gradually, by peaceful means, whereas the second demand immediate drastic steps. However, if it will strive to reach its goal gradually, by peaceful means, and enforce the rule of the working class upon those who disagree with it.

After criticizing both ideas, *Rosh Betar* deals with the problem of class and Zionism. We quote this chapter only since it gained in actuality in view of present trends in Israel. It is in these pages that one finds answers to many social and economic problems of Israel, and a warning against an ideology, that is based on “class struggle.”

Rosh Betar writes also of the contrast between the slogan: “Workers of the World Unite.”, and our national interest.

CLASS

One must not accept the struggle between Zionism and the class ideal. No compromise will help. It will both wreck Zionism and kill the yearning among the Hebrew population throughout the period of up building, or the aim of Zionism will not be attained.

The technical task of Zionism is to settle, on a limited area in a limited time, enough Jews to be a commanding majority in the country without ejecting its non-Jewish citizens. This task is called intensive colonization. I don't know whether another example exists in history, where immigrants succeeded in settling in such large numbers on an area so small which is already densely populated; and succeeded in enlarging the former population by their natural increase. Zionist colonization brings about at the fastest possible time a Jewish majority. This is not normal settlement, it is entirely irregular.

Even regular settlement is an "irregular" phenomenon; a process requiring specific conditions. Contrary to the normal order of a specific country, colonization upsets the order in relation to all spheres of public life. First of all, the political life of the country. In the settlement area- for instance, there is no place for ideal parliamentarianism, for this means a majority government, and as yet the "majority" here, the majority of the citizens, i.e. all those that have permission to settle, have not yet arrived to the country. But, "upsetting the order" which is much deeper is related to the National Economy. In normal country the economy develops of itself in a most natural way; new institutions, new forms of economy are created from existing roots.

Colonization disturbs the character of national development. It implants a new “root”, multitudes of new settlers, of a higher culture, needing more essential products; and in order to sustain them the state must create new forms of economy without waiting for the period when the “natural necessity” will arise.

As a result, colonization will develop the economy “artificially”. Firstly it must enlarge and create markets (to sell the produce of the new settler) by extraordinary means. This fact causes the main difference between normal economy and the colonization economy. Firstly, no country, even the poorest, is “stronger” than the next. It has more permanent “roots” it doesn’t have the characteristics of an experiment” which symbolizes the economic institutions of the new settler.

It is perhaps permitted or even good that there be a “class struggle” in a normal society. But this question is beyond the range of this article. One thing is abundantly clear; if a strike in Germany or Italy or a lock-out by the employer will cause the destruction of a hundred factories in Italy or Germany or even a thousand, it does not matter- Germany will remain German and Italy will remain Italian. But if for any reason whatsoever Jewish factories in Tel Aviv are paralyzed then we shall lose colonizing factors. This will prolong or even destroy our hope of attaining a Hebrew majority.

The conclusion of all this: there is no place for class struggle in colonization. He who wants to participate in the up building must first of all agree to the “extraordinary” situation and accept it as such. The success of colonization, under the conditions of our time, the error of commerce, and not the patriarchal era is based on the possibility of selling one’s produce, i.e. markets. And if it is necessary to sell iron to conquer these markets, i.e. to produce iron, then one

must even forego the accepted tradition of eight hours' work and high wage , even though we are sure that this tradition is in the best interests of justice and righteousness. I do not say G-d forbid that this is the present situation. Till now our production in *Eretz Israel* was sufficient not to disturb the "tradition", and we all hope that it will be so in the future. But the principle is correct. The need of the up building of the State precedes the needs of the particular class or individual; and if tomorrow we shall face the choice, to forego the "tradition", or forego the development of colonization, we shall of course forego the former. The workers themselves will realize this need even if not faithfully, towards the national ideal, but through simply realizing that the destruction of our production is their ultimate destruction and deprive them of their country.

Let us examine the class philosophy in relation to private property. Were it possible to build the Hebrew majority on the basis of "funds" we would all be contented. But it is impossible. The success of the up building is dependent upon the inculcating of private investment. The nature of the private property is known to us all. This investment will go to places where there is a possibility of "profit" which is called "profitability"; and where there is no such possibility, it will not go. This type of nature is bad, but on this also we shall not debate today. It is nature and there is nothing else to be done about it. According to the Marxist philosophy, the "output". But it is abundantly clear, even to the most enthusiastic disciples of Marx that if they wreck the production in *Eretz Israel*, the influx of private capital will be curtailed and put an end to the colonization. And here we witness a strange phenomenon. The propagandists of the "left" when directing their attention to the private capital in the Diaspora, promise paradise in the field of production if they will agree only to invest, and with the same breath when speaking to the proletariat, they explain the need in fighting against private capital, which is based on evil intention. It is a double sided falsehood; a lie that has no foundation.

Either they are the investors or the proletariat, because there is absolutely no relation between the class philosophy and the Zionist project. He who denies the up building of a Hebrew majority in Eretz Israel, must support the profitability of private investment.

And let no those who shout for mercy come to us “pleading”, and saying. “Is it not you that want to worsen the position of the Hebrew worker, to degrade him to the level of a barbarian?” A lie! I always stated and wrote, that not with money one creates a Hebrew majority, but with people, multitudes of them; and the “multitude” is composed of the poor and not the wealthy. Investment is only a means to settle the multitude of workers. If labor will cease to enter the country, there will be no colonization and no Zionism. Also the worker won’t come if he is to go hungry or be inhumanly treated. I support the principle of National Arbitration, which will defend both the interests of the worker and the private interests, i.e. because of the ulterior aim of the State. Also one must remember this; that he who comes to Eretz Israel to build, comes not for the bettering of this personal position and not for the betterment of his class. Thank heavens that the position of the worker today in *Eretz Israel* is no worse than his brother in the Diaspora. It is not definite however, that it always will be so. It was not so in the time of the “*Bilum*” nor in the time of the “Pioneers” that built America. And even here, times will come which will demand heavy sacrifice, first and foremost from the average citizen. It is natural, and the very essence of the concept “pioneer” whose Hebrew translation is “*Halutz*”. Here there is no place for “mercy”. No one was forced to come to *Eretz Israel*, nor will anyone be forced. Don’t volunteer if you want specific conditions. But if you volunteered, then know that it will be demanded of you for the benefit of the project to forego many of the advantages, which if you were in the Diaspora, you would not be prepared to forego.

There is also another side to the class philosophy, which is nothing else but a straight out lie under the conditions of the Zionist project, and that is: “Workers of the World Unite!” As a confirmed Liberal Bourgeois, even more, as a Jew and descendent of the prophet Isaiah, I believe that the day will come when all humanity will unite in the form of the Creator. This dream is more exalted than the private “unity” of the manual labourers, who will force the rest of mankind under its heel. It is dishonorable. I despise this slogan of partial unity instead of overall unity. Indeed, there is in this slogan under the conditions of the National project in *Eretz Israel* one side only, which not only arouses disgust, but worry over the future of the project and the future of the population.

On this topic I have written recently in various papers in the Diaspora These articles were also translated in *Eretz Israel* (“Defenders and Defenders”) and I won’t repeat the details of this distasteful subject. But the question is in its right place. The division between the *Yishuv* and between the ever present external danger is partially if not wholly in the enslaved hand of the bearers of that slogan. At the same time there is a smear campaign in the East whose source is Moscow, and it teaches its disciples thus: that if once more the Jews “revolt”, do not forget to declare that you are revolting against the Hebrew Bourgeoisie. Only his house and his property do you wish to destroy. You shall address the Jewish worker thus: “Workers of the World Unite!” This is how they are taught, and their teachers are ten thousand, and money is not lacking in order to speed up the “lagging pupil.” And who can count the listening ears?

Gentlemen, place your cards on the table and answer openly and freely, without hindrance and despicable lies. In such a case what will you do? With whom shall you “unite”. Who will you defend? Will you really propose a second “revolt” under the banner- war against

the Bourgeoisie! If it is so, and for a minute we will take it for granted that your settlements will not be touched, but only those with the “vested interests”. What will you do?

Either one of the two. If useless babble is the ideological slogan, then put an end to the babble, for it hinders, it only “confuses the mind.” It is liable to place dangerous hopes in the hearts of our enemies, and liable to poison the souls of the naïve among you, and bring about defects in your ranks especially in the most decisive hour. But if it is not babble, but a confession of true belief, then place your cards on the table, so that we shall know the truth beforehand.

Introduction to the Theory of Economy (Foreword)

Thinkers in various epochs tried to solve the riddle of the development of mankind. They realized that a feasible explanation to this development would provide a workable method for the solution of the social problems for social legislation. However, the difficulty in finding a solution is clearly seen even by one who has a superficial knowledge of history.

One school of thought tried to answer everything in the light of religion. In all the various phenomena they saw the deeds of the Creator. It is obvious that in this manner it was possible to answer everything, even though the phenomenon in question was intelligible, since the deeds of the Creator are, sometimes beyond the grasp of mortal men. There were however, many thinkers who did not accept this theory are kept on searching for a feasible explanation to the history of mankind. Since they were not successful in doing so, many reached the conclusion that the reason why Man cannot find an explanation is because there is none. They concluded that history is a series of accidents, and therefore each epoch in history is a separate unit, which has no relation to the one preceding it and the one following it.

In the 19th century, there was a strong tendency to approach history as one unit, motivated by certain permanent factors. One of the most prominent and influential philosophers of this trend was Hegel (1770-1831). In his philosophy of history he pursued the dialectic method, with the aid of which he tried to interpret history. Hegel's method is very complicated, and it is beyond the scope of this introduction to deal with its main principles, even superficially. But in order to understand the following article, it will suffice to state briefly what his method was. An established situation in history he termed as Thesis. The forces and trends opposing this situation and demanding its change, he termed Anti-Thesis. The result of the clash between these forces

which bring about a new situation, having elements of both, he termed Synthesis. According to Hegel, one could see in each era, the embryo that will in due course become the new era.

According to Hegel, the spirit striving for freedom is the motivating factor in history.

Many thinkers borrowed Hegel's method of historical research and used it for their own purposes. In opposing or differing ideologies borrowed from him (in Nazism, Fascism, Socialism) one can find borrowed elements from Hegel. However, how should not be identified as the father of these movements. Many of his terms and principles were given a different meaning and interpretation by these movements.

Karl Marx (1818-1883) was one of the thinkers influenced by Hegel. However, instead of considering spirit as the basic motive in the evolution of history (the way Hegel saw it) Marx claimed that Matter was the motivating factor. He therefore termed his method, "Dialectical Materialism". According to Marx, the evolution of history is the result of a permanent class struggle. He saw the motives of this struggle in the means of production and the distribution of its fruits.

According to Marx, one has to attribute the development of Man and Society mainly to "material factors."

Rosh Betar wished to write and elaborate in detail about the social and economic problems, but did not manage to do so. The following pages should be considered as an outline and attempt to explain the evolution of history by a theory diametrically opposed to that of Marx.

To *Rosh Betar's* mind, there were main factors in the development of Man and Society, namely: Necessity and Play. In a second article he substituted these terms with "bread and Entertainment."

Problems like the principle of ownership, the role of the “hero” in history, luxury versus necessity, the “kingdom” of Man and the principle of Democracy, which is derived from it- all these are being discussed briefly, though clearly in this article. It is for the reader to pursue and elaborate on these topics with the aid of this outline.

Introduction to the Theory of Economy

The activity of every living creature is at every instance based upon the fulfillment of a certain need. Indeed, the term Necessity is composed of two divergent principles completely independent of one another: Necessity and Play.

An infant in his cradle when moving his limbs emits various sounds. We shall deal with two of them. Sometimes he wants food, or protests against the lack of space. Sometimes he will simply move his legs, or gurgle. These two forms of activity come as a reaction to a certain need. However, in the first instance it is Necessity, and in the second, Play. The characteristic difference lies in the fact that an infant cries in the first category (N) and laughs in the second (P).

Without going into specific detail, it is possible to state that activity of the N type has defensive characteristics. The organism demands a defense against the danger of partial or complete destruction. This is a struggle for the fundamental biological minimum. The activities of the P type are aggressive, but on the other hand, are not necessary conditions for remaining alive (a child could grow up in napkins). Here, the need is of a different kind. It is the urge to make use of the strength and possibilities contained in the organism, to broaden the sphere of life, to acquire a sort of satisfaction, which is possible of forego without endangering, and at the same time adding satisfaction to the organism above the minimum necessity.

The stimulus N, unavoidably exists in the activity of every living creature and plant. The stimulus P, one can imagine, is found only within the sphere of living creatures. It is possible to assume that even the lowest organisms like the invertebrates also have some Play. In any case, it is not always possible to discern the presence of the stimulus P in every living creature. Bees and

ants for instance draw the attention of the onlooker as creatures obeying only to the law of Necessity and are foreign to any “unnecessary” exertion of the P type.

No doubt, a monkey expends more energy for P than for N. The dog not only tends to play, but his respect for Man, his preparedness to sacrifice his life for his master (which cannot be regarded as a Necessity, as the dog could remain alive successfully without a master) are phenomena of the P type in its much deeper meaning which we will consequently discuss.

However, in the activity of Man, the stimulus P, is a decisive factor. Even in the lowest forms of civilization like the Pygmies of Central Africa, devote most of their energies in the pursuit of objects that have no relation to the Necessity of self-preservation. He knows how to decorate, to sing, and to feast. Anything in human civilization which is not a reaction to the fundamental principle of self-preservation, is not to be classes as anything else but Play; a sort of material allowance, from poetry to religion, the majority of which we term as science.

The fact that living creatures which are active of the N type can be destroyed, but on the other hand can remain alive without the activity of the P type. This fact does not mean that the task of N among mankind is superior to that of P. The contrary is true. As civilization progresses, so the position of P becomes more prominent than N. With regards to modern times; here is an analysis which will without doubt, bring forth the irrefutable proof that mankind expends more energy in the pursuit and creation of products and conditions which will satisfy the urge of the P instinct, than the creation of products and conditions for self-preservation. It is possible to state with near exactness, that in general, civilization is mainly the product of the stimulus P, and only in a small measure, the product of Necessity. Man minus the stimulus P completely, would today

still be eating raw meat, sleeping in caves, not knowing how to dance or what is a hammer. Man would then descend from the level of animals to that of plants.

This difference it seems is used freely when speaking of “material” needs and “spiritual” needs. Indeed, the stimulus N is rooted in the body alone and can be satisfied with the help of touchable things. However, the stimulus P is not entirely spiritual, like the actions of an infant in the cradle, which although is not a necessity for remaining alive, is nevertheless material. The higher forms of Play are naturally purely “spiritual”, or practically purely spiritual. They find expression in song, prayer, and the solving of abstract problems. That knowledge creates the common factor both in the material forms of the actions of P as well as the spiritual is in this, that the “nerve centre” of all the urges of the P type have no place in the stomach or in the nervous system, but in that undefinable object called the Psyche.

So as to deal comprehensively with this important principle P in the life of mankind, we must first and foremost divorce ourselves from the everyday meaning of Play, which can be regarded as light entertainment, something not at all serious. But the meaning suggested here (if one may say so) is purely scientific. Play-is that energy exerted towards a specific aim above the biological minimum for remaining alive. It is clear that the abovementioned aims are sometimes given excessive importance.

To make this point clear, let us bring a number of illustrations of Play in its broader sense. Here is a typical example which can be found in that same phenomenon which we are used to seeing as the result of “Necessity creates Fear, “through purely material pressure. I refer here, to the phenomenon of migration. About thirty years ago, when there existed free immigration to America, one could witness in the densely populated areas of Eastern Europe the

following contrast. Two neighbours, equally poor, both without any hope of improving their existing situation. However, one migrated to America, and the other remained. It is clear that in most cases, the essential difference lies in the fact that one of the two neighbours had in him a stronger urge to enrich and broaden his sphere of life, to taste the change, to taste adventure; in other words, that which urged him to migrate was the stimulus P.

Everything which we term adventure either in its lowest or exalted meaning, is related to the type P, even if the purpose of the adventure includes by chance the “material” interests of the individual or the group. The adventure of Vasco da Gama or Christopher Columbus was simply Play, something divorced from biological necessity. The characteristics of Play which denote these two adventures, do not in any way detract one iota from the fact that these discoveries were ultimately a commercial blessing. One can quote the example of knights roaming the countryside, which was not at all through “Necessity.” Spectacles as these are quite common. I simply want to point out that the correct term describing the essence of these phenomena is Play, that same Play of an infant kicking his feet or of cannibals performing a tribal ceremony.

That which is commonly known as spiritual activity is purely Play. The link between religious worship and the dance is known. But even the hidden phenomenon is the soul of the prophet, the phenomenon of the struggle for truth, and the discovery of Columbus, can be placed side by side with the endeavor of the infant to touch his toes. Poetry and Science also belong to this type. Political activity, and the martyrdom of the forerunners of the Revolution, even though justified by the “material” need that they were struggling for, is also of the abovementioned type.

It is certain that among the striving of the type Play, even the most typical, is the one which is thought as the most materialistic. The lust for acquiring wealth and gold has no doubt

the elements of the spiritual, more prominent than any other desire that man could imagine. The desire to live in a place, to acquire castles and large tracts of land, of which it is most doubtful whether he will visit them at least twice in his lifetime. The meaning of all this is the giving of satisfaction to the imagination of Man and not his material needs. The climax of spiritual Play is the miser-Scrooge, or the Russian, Plushkin. They live a life of material want. Their “mania” is very closely related to the amateur antique and relic collectors, and only the lust for acquisition is different in the two illustrations.

Permissible And Vital Necessities

In pre-historic days, Man lived according to the urge of self preservation and material needs. After that, came the moment that Man without giving special thought began to cut his meat and found that it was better, or possibly by mistake on the way back to his stone cave, he was forced to sleep on grass and found it soft. If by chance, this man was blessed with imagination, this is the beginning of variety and initiative (in other words what today we would term as genius). The second time on repeating the experience, he toasted the meat over the fire and laid out grass in his cave. His neighbours probably gathered around bewildered at his at his strange behavior and called this phenomenon “permissible”, at first though hateful it turned into jealousy. Later on others began imitating him. After a number of generations, we witness roasted tender meat as a regular accepted thing, and the lack of these “permissible” objects is regarded as a “life of misery.” The consciousness of Man has not dimmed the fact that a “misery” of this kind is not as bad as lack of food, despite the fact that Man did not weaken his efforts in the acquisition of these “permissible” objects even to the point of giving his life in defending them against robbery. The “permissibles” of yesterday received an honored place as one of the most vital needs of life. The desire for them placed its discipline on Man equally for every fundamental need.

It so happened that the daughter of pre-historic Man accidentally cut her cheek, and the scar remained. The girl received the nickname “Scarface”. Even today, a child is proud to show a scar to his friends. And so it was then. The scar denoted distinction to its bearer. Another girl cut her cheek purposely, and thus was born the stimulus of decoration; a purely psychic phenomenon related to the type P. It was such a powerful stimulus, that nearly most women were prepared to suffer pain. In other words; to sacrifice the fundamental principle of self preservation.

Today, even the pauper will not think of eating raw meat and potatoes. To protect himself against the cold, he won't simply use a skin or something woolen. He will want something sewn, and not like a sack with holes in it, but something in the form of a coat and trousers. He does not sleep on the floor, nor on a carpet, but on a bed. He does not sit on a box, but on specially designed furniture called a chair. All these inventions are regarded as vital needs even though there was at time when these objects were regarded as “permissible.”

To sum up the vital needs of Man today, especially the material ones, we will find, without exaggerating, that 90 percent of production is devoted to “permissible” needs and only 10 percent to vital needs, which without them, Man cannot remain alive.

Everything that is “permissible”, even the most materialistic, is purely psychic, and the majority of forms have become habitual. We imagine that without them, our ultimate destruction would come about, like the lack of nutrition or protection against cold. This is nothing else but an illusion. The most civilized person, if he were cast upon an island like Robinson Crusoe would remain alive provided that he were young and healthy. From this aspect, our bodily habits do not have deep roots. The source of strength of these “perishables” is in our imagination alone. The activity of production in Society is being centered more and more around the provision of

satisfaction to the purely psychic needs. We could be cynical and state that these needs are “capricious”. A German philosopher aided but the fluency of his language was able to state the term exactly- “*Wahlbedurfnis*”– a need by choice.

For the sake of discussion, we must take note that the word “permissible” can be used in its relative as well as absolute form. “Permissible” in its relative form is a concept connected with the conditions of the specific place, the era, and the class. For a negro of Bechuanaland, a pair of shoes is permissible, and he is very proud of them. To a businessman of Chicago, even an automobile is not regarded as permissible, and even his wife demands an additional automobile, as it is impossible to live without it. In everyday language: When we hear the word “permissible”, we regard it in the relative sense. However, “permissible”, in the absolute sense, the scientific term, includes everything that man may forego and the scientific term, includes everything that man may forego and still remain alive as did Robinson Crusoe. Not only the automobile and the shoes, but also the table, the spoon and in general 90 percent of the object to be found even in the poorest slum area.

Psycho Historical Materialism

History is not the result of one individual idea, according to the view of Hegel, and also not the result of any sole material factor according to Marx. History is the result of two reciprocal processes, set in motion by two fundamental stimulants, independent of each other, N and P, each having equal roots in the nature of Man. These two stimulants are at all times interwoven one in the other and at all times reacting upon each other. But there are limits where the two are mixed and welded together. Furthermore, there is no doubt that the urges of P are realized more easily in those periods when the equilibrium of the masses is disturbed through economic difficulties, which react upon the N factor and thus (even though I still doubt it) it is possible that some learned gentleman will succeed in proving that each of the Crusades came about as the result of a poor harvest bordering on catastrophe.

But the assessing of this fact is not so as to dim the character of P, which depicts the characteristics of the Crusades, or the revolt of the French peasants in the 14th century, the Pugachov revolt in Russia and the Bolshevik revolution, even though without a doubt they came about as the result of the N factor. They reflect also, the existence of psychic factors of enthusiasm for the kingdom of truth and justice on earth, which is a characteristic expression of the stimulus P.

However, the main thing is that each of the two fundamental factors of history acts independently of the second. Sometimes there is a direct contradiction between the direction of Play and the most important demands of Necessity. Here is an illustration of our times. The Irish National Movement explicitly evades the most important economic interests of a decisive majority of the Irish people, the peasant class. Even though this fact is abundantly clear to them,

and they are beginning to feel the sting of British counter measures, they continue to support Mr. de Valera on the political platform, without laying any practical importance on the freedom of Ireland. A more illustrating example, is the historical attempts of the religious sects, especially the Jews of the Diaspora. Here we see the interests of material self preservation sacrificed stubbornly by a long chain of generations, for abstract principles.

There is nothing more null and void, without foundation, than the naïve attempts in thinking that the “material factor” was responsible for phenomena like the spreading of Christianity or Islam, or the Renaissance or even the great social revolution, be it that of Cornwell’s Puritans, the French or the Bolshevik revolutions.

The Impulse of Royalty

Impulse P is at the same time the impulse of “Kingship” or Royalty. That same child in its cradle, from whence we began our investigation, after eating his fill, still continues to make vocal and motive efforts- continues in his attempts to surmount obstacles of weight and rigidity and so forth. In other words; the child continues to struggle. What is the object that it is struggling for in the process of P after N has already been satisfied? Clearly for the expansion of its sphere of living. To touch the other side of the cradle, to feel or break that toy, or simply to test one more of its muscular movements, to produce yet another sound. If we examine all this closely, it sums up to one single stimulus- Power. Power over its own body and voice, over space, over the toy. Try and prevent the infants ‘movements. As soon as he will realize that obstacles have been put in its way, he will start crying. You have limited his sovereignty, and the child perceives it as suffering.

Every form of Play, both in our scientific and normal sense, is an urge to power, sovereignty, and kingship. Analyse the satisfaction that a man can feel. It will always add up to “possession.” The rider is pleased with his horse; the pupil succeeded in solving his problem, the author writes with enthusiasm, the young lady enjoys success, and so on endlessly. All these feelings of happiness exist in the consciousness that “I have power” over the horse, the pen, the heart. Pushkin’s mean Knight, who in reality does not seek a concrete happiness or satisfaction, “suffice for me the consciousness thereof ,” expresses that consciousness by means of the word which is considered to be the utmost expression of sovereignty: “I am reigning, I am King.” We shall classify it as the Royalty Impulse.

There are no exceptions to this rule. We must fully understand its meaning. In the event that the life activity of Man is conducted in great proportion by the P factor, and this is normal desirable and progressive; in this case, the basis for the striving of Man to govern and enlarge his sphere of rule is the foundation of life and history. From this there are many valuable deduction. We will deal with two only. The first is Society and the second is Economy.

In the field of Social Order, there is only one way to accept the concepts of State, Law, Discipline, even between ethics itself and the law of P. We take the law of P, using it as a foundation, and attempt to conclude the laws of limitation and need, for without them there can be no existence for the State, for the community, nor for ethics. If every living creature strives for Royalty, if all its energies are centred around this, then one must first recognize it.. Yes. Every man is a King. Thus, all the concepts which conform to the law of the subjection of the will of the individual to that of someone above him fall apart. There is no will that can supersede that of an individual king. There can be no use for ethics based on the immoral assumption as though Man were thrown into hell against his will and yet be “obliged ethically to someone or something. Thus the very concept “obliged is in direct opposition to the will of the individual. Obligation can only be valid when the individual alone recognizes it. The same thing applies to religion. One does not objectively debate the existence of God. However, the recognition of the holiness of the commandments of the Lord, is only the act of the will of every individual king. The king so as to say lays the sword on the shoulder of the Creator and promotes him to the function of Lawgiver. The state, as well as all law is based on this philosophy. This is an agreement between one billion-five hundred million equal kings. They have no other choice, for without his agreement each one will interfere with the sphere of rule of the next.

One must not accept the cheap and banal contradiction that the one billion-five hundred million did not know of this agreement but were compelled etc. because it is pure fiction. Exactly “fiction” of this type differentiates Man from the Ape, and is the foundation of all ethical progress. The important point however, is that this so called “fiction” is correct and healthy from the ethical standpoint, namely, that it must recognize Man as king who is not subject to any will except his own. He is neither servant nor overlord to anyone except himself. “Discipline” can only be acceptable in the form of “self-discipline.”

The concept, that a king signs undertakings which he recognizes, must be the foundation not only of voluntary party discipline, but also the compulsory discipline of the state. It must be declared that National discipline is that discipline which is agreed to and given free-willingly.

In effect, this concept negates the Totalitarian State. The state is an unnatural phenomenon in the same meaning as (not necessary derogatory) shaving or cutting fingernails or the Malthusian Law. It is necessary. But one must not exaggerate, the most healthy, normal and pleasant state for all the kings in the “Minimum State”; namely, as state that acts only in hour of dire necessity. The kings limit their sphere of free self expression, only when there is like two men who were unable to sit on one chair. Therefore for instance, there is no earthly reason why ideological expression should be limited. The law of non penetration does not apply here. My ‘yes’ does not prevent you from declaring ‘no.’

It is understood when we define the meaning of minimum state interference, elasticity and flexibility is needed. In time of war or crisis (political as well as economic) there may arise a need to broaden this “minimum”, just as a sick patient delivers himself into the hands of a doctor for the duration of the illness only.

In general, the instinctive ideal of Man is peaceful anarchy or another pan-Baselian synonym. As long as the ideal cannot be attained, one must recognize Democracy as the closest to the ideal. However, one must first lay down an important condition. For some unknown reason, Democracy identifies itself with majority rule. It is understood from the historic-philosophical point of view that democratic government were created under the banner of the struggle against different types of minority government. This was the contra-impetus of the pendulum. However, it is not exactly true that Democracy blindly identifies itself with majority rule. The value of Democracy is not at all in this that the minority, i.e. 49 equal kings out of 100 or 10, or even 10 out of 100 should feel themselves enslaved. The sense of the mainspring of Democracy should rather be sought in the science of agreement and compromise.

The recognition of principle P. unavoidably leads to the recognition of the principle of ownership, the striving for domination, which can only be satisfied by the fact of ownership; firm, undisputed and unlimited ownership. There is no doubt that Man throughout all his life, and in everything, instinctively tries to secure the right of use and exploitation over everything within the sphere of his activity. Not only over objects, but also over Man. The meekest man in the world, were he not to meet with any resistance would unnoticeably to himself become the tyrant of his family, of his associates and friends. The expansion of our willful 'I' can absolutely not be overcome, somewhat similar to the expansion of a liquid or a gas. It can only be stopped by resistance, i.e. by the unyielding of objects and by counter expansion of people.

But here we have to recognize once and for all, one mighty ethical difference. Insofar as Man strives to enslave people, Society must resist him. Insofar as he strives to enslave objects, such resistance is not at all obligatory, as long as there is no conflict between two or more people over the ownership of the same object. There is nothing unethical in the "ownership" in the

broad sense, over a lifeless object. On the contrary, if we were to bring the denial of ownership to its logical conclusion, a situation would arise which would be unbearable even for the monk in the monastery or the convict in prison. Even they have illusion of “my clothes and shoes”, “my bed.” They still even have the right to protest should a neighbor wear “my trousers” or “lie on my mattress.” Without that illusion, even they would be unable to live. The ownership of things is the most natural self government of the normal man, as long as there is no unbridgeable contradiction with a logical claim of the neighbours or of Society. It would be absolutely senseless to hinder it. As is know, this elementary primary law of the institution of property is being reorganized (and lately even glorified) by the theoreticians of Communism. They have already recognized (within certain limits) even immovable property, private living quarters and a tract of land (as yet of toy like dimensions). They still however, apparently deny the right of ownership of the means of production. From the point of view of principle P, this is the most ruthless form of compulsion over the fundamental principle of the natural impulses of Man. Moreover, here the compulsion hits the most valuable, the most creative, the most progressive facets of the instinct of Play. It has already been mentioned that the whole sphere of scientific, artistic and religious creation, is exclusively the domain of impulse P. Naturally, P has also unproductive manifestations, from the smashing of toys to sport. But it manifests itself also in the invention of the loom or the locomotive, and in the reduction of the price of the automobile through the invention of the conveyer belt. These are precisely the most valuable manifestations of impulse P. All these things became possible only because Columbus Jenner, Stevenson and Ford happened to have in their hands the possibility of such means of production and on such a serious scale.

We shall devote a special chapter to whether it is really necessary for the solution of the social problem to have “socialism”, namely the transformation of the state into a super-manufacture. But even if we assume that the state should produce all that its citizens may need, it does not yet follow, that for the realization of this recipe, it is necessary to forbid private citizens from owning and using machines. Here, the theoreticians of Socialism and Communism are not actuated by logic, but by fetishes of “housecleaning.” Quite independently of how long the socialist ideal will remain alive, I undertake to forecast with assurance that Communism itself in the near future begin to recognize also the ownership of the means of production.

The concept which is the basis of this essay recognizes private ownership (on the largest scale compatible with the equality of all citizen-kings and their claims) as the base, the axis and lever of social economy.