

DR. NACHMAN
SYRKIN

DS
149
S958
1935
MAIN

ESSAYS

on

Socialist Zionism

ESSAYS
on
Socialist Zionism



University of
Texas Libraries

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	5
I. <i>The Jewish Problem and the Jewish Socialist State</i>	
CHAPTER 1. Emancipation and Anti-Semitism..	9
CHAPTER 2. Internationalism vs. Nationalism...	16
CHAPTER 3. Zionism	22
CHAPTER 4. The Jewish Socialist State.....	28
II. <i>National Independence and International Unity</i>	
CHAPTER 1. The Problem of Nationalism.....	31
CHAPTER 2. Nation and Culture.....	38
CHAPTER 3. A Nation Defined	42
CHAPTER 4. The National Struggles of Modern Times	47
CHAPTER 5. Nationalism and Socialism.....	53
CHAPTER 6. The International League of Free Nations	60

INTRODUCTION

AS these lines are being penned, Italian bombers are soaring over the wilds of Ethiopia, hurling death upon the inhabitants of the Black Kingdom. The conflagration threatens to spread and we may soon find ourselves embroiled in another holocaust—the second World War. The clash of national interests again makes us halt to ponder the question of nationalism and international amity. The Wilsonian League of Nations is facing the greatest crisis since its inception at the end of the war “to make the world safe for democracy.”

The development of International Socialism has not kept pace with the intensification of national feeling. The emergence of Fascist dictatorships has spelled the destruction of powerful Socialist movements. Italy, Germany, Austria, Poland, Hungary and Japan have become, or are in the process of becoming totalitarian states. In the face of such conditions, the road to Socialism has become indeed difficult.

The headstrong adventures of Fascist dictators, in keeping with the capitalist spirit of enterprise, serve to retard the advent of international cooperation. The dog-eat-dog politics of Fascism can only culminate in a universal catastrophe or social revolution.

The translation of the following essays will reach the public in what may be momentous October days. The readers will discover for themselves the appropriateness of the passages contained herein. We hope that the world will yet listen to the voices that desire peace, and that it will hearken to the plea of Syrkin that all nations be guaranteed territorial independence and the right to self-development.

* * *

It is 1935, and the Jewish people is writing into the records

of its age-old history new leaves of persecution. Between the swastika of the Nazis and the talons of the Polish eagle, nearly one-fourth of the Jews are conducting a valiant but hopeless struggle for existence. A similar fate is shared by millions of Jews in other European and Asiatic countries. Even in America, the smug security enjoyed by the Jews is being shaken.

The call to national renaissance is now responded to by millions of Jews, particularly Jewish youth, everywhere. From distant South Africa and the burning sands of Yemen, from the hell of Hitlerdom and the purgatory of Poland, from the frozen wastes of Siberia and from gilded America, thousands of Jews turn their footsteps toward the national home.

Even in circles that do not contemplate actual settlement in Palestine, there has developed a deeper understanding of the essence of the modern Jewish problem, for Zionism is no longer an academic question. Over a third of a million Jews—and their numbers are increasing daily at a rapid pace—are laying the foundation for the new national home. In the process of reconstruction, the contribution of the labor movement looms as a living monument to the perseverance and foresight of the pioneers marching on towards the Socialist Jewish State in Palestine.

* * *

Nearly four decades ago, when Nachman Syrkin first propounded the idea of Socialist Zionism, it was no easy matter to convince the nationally minded Jews that Socialists were genuinely interested in national rebirth, for, during that period, the vast majority of Jewish Socialists denied the need for a Jewish homeland, which they believed would lure the Jewish masses away from the social revolution. Zionists were suspicious of the Jewish Socialists who attended the Zionist Congress, just as the Socialist groups looked askance at the Zionists when they spoke to the Jewish masses in behalf of the national renaissance. In 1897, two divergent philosophies crystallized into definite, organized movements. Soon after the Zionists held their first congress in Basle, Switzerland, the Jewish Socialist Bund convened in Warsaw. Both pretended to hold the key to the solution of the Jewish problem. While the followers of Herzl based their calculations on the *national* history of the Jews, the Bundists saw fit to link the destiny of their people with that of the *working masses*. They could not be reconciled, until Nachman Syrkin established a synthesis of the two viewpoints. To Syrkin, Socialism and Zionism were two aspects of the same thing—Jewish nationalism.

The essays presented in this booklet were written two decades apart, the first, *The Jewish Problem and the Jewish Socialist State*, appeared in 1898, and the second, *National Independence and International Unity*, was written in 1917. They contain the reflections of an idealist on national and social problems.

In the period when the first essay was written, assimilation was making great inroads into the ranks of the Jewish people, particularly into the intelligentsia, upper bourgeoisie, and the radicals. With almost prophetic insight, Syrkin foretold the disillusionment that these assimilationists would meet. His estimate of the vitality of Jewish nationalism was proven correct by history. We have lived to witness the demolition of the premises of assimilation at the expense of the doomed German Jewry which was the most assimilated section of our people. It took about a century for Reformed Judaism to acknowledge nationalism as a part of its heritage. Recalcitrant Jewish labor circles, too, are becoming aware of the significance of Zionist achievements—particularly of Socialist Zionist achievements in Palestine.

Unlike the thoroughly materialistic Ber Borochov, Syrkin was essentially an idealist. His writings are frequently punctuated by references to abstract concepts such as spirit, soul, will, historical mission, and a host of others. Spurning the dialectics of Borochov, he refused to anchor himself in a material world, and perhaps in his unleashed enthusiasm for the roseate aspects of Jewish history lay the secret of his ability to prognosticate with such accuracy. Syrkin challenged the thesis that man is an economic animal. He attributed to the human will the power to influence the course of history. On such a premise, Syrkin constructed his life philosophy—that the destiny of the Jew led towards the realization of Socialist Zionism. In addition to the economic material facts, he discerned a dynamic *will* to live and create. His idealism, which was naturally accompanied by an abundance of optimism, led him to err in some of his practical conclusions. For instance, he believed that the Allies would emerge from the World War with a genuine program for the amelioration of the condition of oppressed peoples. The “purified humanity” that did emerge soon began to tarnish in the poisonous atmosphere of the post-war world. The old accounts had not yet been settled decisively. While he may have been justified in fearing Teutonic victory, he displayed extreme naivete in his faith in the idealism of the Allies. Similarly, his desire to see a Jewish

Socialist State made him err in predicting that capitalism would not be able to get a foothold in the process of rebuilding the homeland. For his wish was the father to the thought.
* * *

The first essay was dashed off by Syrkin in the form of a series of journalistic articles, and was not in the form usually used in the presentation of scientific theses. This is in sharp contrast with the style of Borochoy, the Marxist exponent of Socialist Zionism, to whom methodology and formal argumentation were of prime importance.

The translators took the liberty of omitting several portions of the original work as they dealt with items of interest only at the time the essays were written. Most of the fourth chapter of the first essay has not been included, as it is an outline of the practical program for rebuilding Palestine which now—thirty eight years later—has value only for the curious.

G. C. G.

October 9, 1935

I.

The Jewish Problem and the Jewish Socialist State

CHAPTER I.

EMANCIPATION AND ANTI-SEMITISM

CONTEMPORARY events, which bear only an incidental relation to Jewish history, have in our era propelled Jewish life towards new channels.

When the bourgeoisie gained supremacy over the nobility and aristocracy, it identified its own interests with those of the entire race, and proclaimed them as the inalienable rights of humanity. The bourgeoisie strove to achieve freedom and political power, that is, gain overt recognition of the rights and privileges of their class. The basic principle of this bourgeois class interest was freedom—freedom in religion, politics, thought, and property.

The proclamation of human rights emancipated the Jews from their medieval servitude and granted them civil and political equality with scarcely any exertion on the part of the Jews themselves. Without a power in back of them, and without their organizing to achieve their emancipation, the Jews were accidentally liberated by the triumph of the principle of equality. The Ghetto walls were broken, releasing the Jew into the world as a factor in civil life. The thousand-year-old condition of Jewish inequality was thus ameliorated; the wound inflicted on the Jewish nation with the fall of Jerusalem began to heal with the fall of the Bastille.

The germ of progress contained within the bourgeois society was accompanied by a weakness greater than any possessed by

other forms of social organization. "Freedom" was inscribed on the bourgeois ensign, but in no other form of social organization was there so much dependence of man on man. "Equality" was destroyed by the differences in wealth and property, while "fraternity," in bourgeois society, became an ironic symbol. In its struggles, the bourgeoisie unfurled the banner of "humanity," but never was individualism so much an end in itself as it is today. The contradictions of the bourgeois society find their expression in the individualistic character of that society—contradictions which lead to its breakdown. The very freedom and equality which the bourgeois society proclaimed, but which it now denies, marshal the forces that spell its doom.

The bourgeois society, whose sole aim is the accumulation of material wealth through the medium of competition, brought about a new appraisal of Jewish values. The traditions and aspirations of the Ghetto clashed with the new order of society and had to be thrust aside. While Ghetto Jewry was a homogeneous, though isolated, nation, Emancipated Jewry soon disposed of its nationalism in order to create for itself the theoretical basis for emancipation. This same Jewry, which not long ago prayed thrice daily for its return to Jerusalem, became intoxicated with patriotic sentiments for the land in which it lived.

This encysted and conservative people, which in the course of its exile was nourished by its nationalism, had suddenly become the exponent of national self-renunciation. If formerly the Jewish nation considered itself the crown of humanity, it now began to despise itself more than it was despised by its greatest enemies. The Ghetto Jew proudly displayed his Jewishness through his language, clothes, and customs; the Emancipated Jew endeavored to destroy the very essence of Judaism. The hope for the Messiah, for the renaissance of the Jewish people and for the return to Palestine, were the driving forces of the Jew in Galuth; in Emancipated Jewry there arose an antagonism towards this hope, an antagonism expressed by the eradication of the messianic concept from the synagogue. The solution to the Jewish problem was sought in assimilation. This assimilation was not dictated by higher moral ideas, but by the improved living conditions of bourgeois society.

Assimilation, which arose on the one hand through internal conflict with traditional Judaism and on the other hand through the adaptation to a new form of society, epitomized national self-abnegation. But as long as the assimilatory process was

in the making, it had to find a connecting link between the old traditions and the new Judaism, between the lamentations of the exiles by the waters of Babylon and the "prayers" of Jewish stock brokers who contentedly strolled by the waters of the Spree. This task was willingly assumed by theologians. The synagogue, like the church, has a healthy stomach—it digests all that its preservation demands.

In such manner, the synagogue began to draw toward the Frankfurt stock brokers. "The Jews are not a nation, but a religious sect created by God for the purpose of spreading the gospel of monotheism among the nations of the world"—thus philosophized modern Jewish theology. The Jewish inhabitation of Palestine and the national life of Jewry were, according to the historian Jost, merely an error of history which was corrected after the destruction of the Temple when Jewry began to appear before the world as the apostle of Jehovah. According to Geiger, the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of Jewry was the wise and careful plan of divine providence, for the Jewish historical mission was to bring before the world the truth revealed at Sinai. In the case of the pagans, the Jews accomplished this through Christianity. But Christianity was not *pure* monotheism. Only when Christianity will be purified by the uncompromising monotheism of the Jew will his historical mission be fulfilled.

The Messianic hope which permeated all Jewish writings was falsely interpreted by the new Jewish theology. The modern synagogue, influenced by the new society, invented a philosophy contrary to Jewish reality, full of logical contradictions. This was done because an ideological basis for assimilation was needed. How blasphemous was the rationalization of the rabbis, that the mission of the Jew was to spread the monotheist idea, when in reality, the rabbinical mission was self aggrandizement.

It appeared as though bourgeois freedom and Jewish assimilation had finally solved the old Jewish problem. But in reality, the splendor of the solution lasted only as long as the reign of liberalism. To the extent that the bourgeoisie had betrayed the principles of liberalism and had turned into an oppressing class, to that extent the theory on which assimilation was based, disappeared. The struggle for economic power, both of individual and class, became the chief characteristic of the modern bourgeois society, once it discarded its higher principles as unnecessary burdens. The emancipation of the Jew and his admission to all branches of social

activity was not palatable to the egotism of the bourgeois society. Jewish emancipation, therefore, began to evaporate as did the liberalism of that day. Jewish emancipation was from the beginning a general principle rather than a reality.

The characteristics of the new society were such, that Jewish emancipation was an anomaly. Freedom of competition in this bourgeois society resulted in a war of each against all—an everlasting individual and class struggle. The principle of "might is right" became the foundation of society. In the economic and political struggles of bourgeois society even the principle of liberty was relinquished.

Was it not natural, then, that the Jews, who even after their attempts at assimilation still remained a separate group, were mistreated because they were weak?

In addition, there were other conscious and unconscious motives which forced society to declare war against the Jews. The Jews were originally endowed with talents which were perfected during the course of millennia of struggle for survival. As a result, the Jews were better equipped in their struggle for existence. The economic solidarity of the Jews, remnant of Ghetto days, further increased their strength. The emancipated Jews began to scale the social ladder. The economic and social rise was in itself sufficient cause to arouse the predatory society to a united struggle against the Jews. Simultaneously, the Jewish meekness, and self-denial, their fear to appear as Jews, their passion to assimilate, their false patriotism—in short, their entire make-up—served as additional incentives to prejudice society against them. No matter how weak the Jews were without this make-up, with it they were weaker.

Jew-hatred appeared in all fields of society, wherever Jews were found and could be recognized as such. As in the Middle Ages, hatred, scorn, and derision again reigned supreme. Socially, the Jews were already outcast, and politically, the demand for the revocation of their liberties was gaining a strong foothold. In Germany, Austria, and Roumania the condition of the Jews, in spite of formal emancipation, went from bad to worse. In Russia, where the Jews resided under medieval special laws, their position was intolerable. Regardless of restrictions, there were enough avenues of competition between Jews and non-Jews to provoke conflict.

What is the basis for Jew-hatred? In the Middle Ages it was difference in religion; in modern days, it is racial difference. In other words, racial prejudices still exist after religious differences are no more a vital factor. Jew-hatred

sails under the flag of anti-Semitism, although it is the same ship and the same crew.

"The Jews are an incurably bad people, a people always seeking its own benefits and wanting to enslave the entire world, a people which, in spite of all its efforts to assimilate, still remains strange and hostile to the non-Jews. The Jews are the torch-bearers of capitalism, exploitation, usury, and suppression. At the same time, they are the historical virus, the despoiler, the trouble-maker personified. In short, the Jewish people is the curse of humanity." Such is the cry of modern bourgeois society.

But the unbiased observer must question this cry and ask of the bourgeois society: Is then not the bourgeois Jew an image of yourself, only clothed differently? Do you not find yourself reflected in him, and he in you? Does not the Jew exploit because he can, and do you not rob because you can? Are then not usury, exploitation, and swindle as characteristic of you as they are of him? Are you not both ready, twenty-four hours a day, to betray your state for your class interests, and your class for your private interests? In spite of all your declarations of love and sympathy for your own compatriots, are you not stranger and more hostile to your own oppressed brethren than to the Jewish bourgeoisie? Do you not resemble each other more than you differ from each other?

At these words, the bourgeois society plays its patriotic tune and cries hypocritically, "Jew-slave! What is right for me is not right for you, for we differ in spirit. That which I create is genuinely Deutschisch—you falsify and distort! There is an inherent madness in you which makes you feel as free as a bird. *Hep! Hep!*"

But when this filthy egotism is clothed in the mantle of racial superiority—a doctrine essentially false (besides, the Semites and Aryans belong to the same Caucasian race)—logic disappears and debate is useless.

Anti-Semitism, which is an integral part of the class society, differs in degree with the various classes. In a dormant form, anti-Semitism is hidden in all classes of society because it is a product of the class structure. However, it reaches its highest peak in declining classes, that is, the *middle class*, which is persistently being destroyed by the bourgeoisie, the almost ruined *landowner* who is being destroyed by the capitalist, and the decaying *peasant* class which is being strangled by the landowner. In modern society, these classes are backward and morally decayed. They are on the verge of bankruptcy and

battle perplexedly for the maintenance of their positions. They belong to the propertied class, but their property consists of debts. They are owners, but they do not possess that which even the common workers have—labor power. They are on the fence between the wealthy class and the proletariat, in constant fear of falling into the latter. The more wretched their positions become, the fiercer their internal conflicts, the more they are driven to become vampires who suck the blood of the working class. As time passes, the middle class sinks deeper and deeper into this infernal abyss. Unlike the proletariat, it is without culture or the desire for it, without character or ideal, without self-consciousness or desire for freedom. In spite of their steady economic decline, the middle classes still hold on to the tail of the ruling class; their eyes are focused above, though their bodies are sinking into the deep; they help maintain an order whose victims they are.

These classes pretend to be revolutionary, but their struggle is egotistic and far removed from any principles. Should their own interests be satisfied, and their state bonds converted into sound cash, this world would in their eyes be the best of all worlds. Then they would become the most loyal defenders of this society and its devoted guards. To slave and enslave—this is the motto of these classes.

If anti-Semitism has become the guiding political and social motive of these sunken classes, it is comprehensible in the light of their position. While class interests in general dictated struggle against Jews, the middle class intensified its anti-Semitism because it suffered from Jewish as well as general competition. The Jewish capitalist, not unlike the Christian capitalist, delivered heavy blows to the middle class; the Jewish middle-man was at dagger points with his Christian neighbor over a customer; the Jewish broker attempted to beat his Christian competitor. It is clear why anti-Semitism became the mainstay of the socio-political program of these classes.

Just as the lower middle classes were the rawest elements of society, so, too, was their anti-Semitism of the rawest type. Their opposition to the Jew was not fundamentally a result of Jewish characteristics, though admittedly assimilation and self-negation produced an unfortunate caricature of the Jew which might have nauseated the non-Jew. Nor was their opposition based on national and religious misunderstandings. These unrefined classes were not capable of such spiritual experiences. Only egotism, the lust for Jewish money, the desire

to undermine the Jewish competitor and expel him from the land—only these and no other reasons made Jew-haters. Hatred, jealousy and falsehood characterized them in their fight against the Jew.

Anti-Semitism of the middle class is a revolutionary movement of a low type, the revolt of a class against the existing order, not for the sake of higher human principles, but for egotistic interests, and though they clothe themselves in an ideological mantle, their true intentions are discernable. This type of anti-Semitism is best reflected in its leadership. The decayed elements of the bourgeois and proletarian society, who have lost every sense of truth and self-respect, and confused creatures who can be moved only by the lowest of passions, raise the banner of anti-Semitism and become its torch-bearers. No other parties, therefore, have as many publicly compromising leaders as the anti-Semitic ones. If their criminal records are such convincing evidence of their moral degeneration, it is even more evident in their insults, lies, and blackmail. At least one part of Ludwig Berne's famous saying that anti-Semites will in the future be candidates either for the workhouse or for the insane asylum, has been realized.

In spite of the moral degeneration of anti-Semitic leaders, and in spite of the disgust which the intelligent person has for anti-Semitism, the movement is constantly growing. The more the social classes are disrupted, the more unstable life becomes, the greater the attack on the middle class, and the more imminent the triumph of the proletariat—the higher will rise the wave of anti-Semitism. The classes which struggle against each other will unite in their common attack on the Jew. The potent elements of society, i. e., capitalism, monarchy, the Church and the State, seek to hide the social struggle and in its place bring to the fore the religious and racial struggle.

Anti-Semitism has, therefore, the tendency to sweep all society, and undermine the existence of the Jewish people. It is a result of the unequal distribution of power in society. As long as society is based on might, and as long as the Jew is weak, so long will anti-Semitism exist.

CHAPTER II.

INTERNATIONALISM vs. NATIONALISM

Anti-Semitism originates in physical superiority and is fed by the ever-increasing class struggle. The Jew derives from anti-Semitism a spiritual force, an impetus for his rejuvenation and renaissance. Whereas the Jew previously found solace in passively ignoring and detesting the enemy, his attitude has changed to a conscious and active protest. This process of moral purification is yet in its beginning, because the Jewish people is too subjugated by the spirit of assimilation. The Jewish people, however, possesses forces which will guide it in the right direction.

A class-less society and autonomous national power are the only means of solving the Jewish problem completely. The social revolution and cessation of the class struggle will assist in removing the abnormal condition of Jewry. Therefore, the Jew must join the ranks of the proletariat as that element which strives for the termination of the class struggle. Until now, the Jew was the torchbearer of liberalism, but since the bourgeoisie, which was responsible for Jewish emancipation in the old society, has betrayed its principles, the Jew must become the vanguard of Socialism.

Even prior to the birth of anti-Semitism, Jews began to join the ranks of the growing Socialist movement. The Jewish Socialists of Western Europe unfortunately inherited the traditions of the assimilationists and displayed the same lack of self-respect found in the Jewish bourgeoisie, with the only difference that with the former the moral degeneration was revealed more sharply. To the Jewish Socialists, Socialism meant first of all the discard of Jewishness, just as the liberalism of the Jewish bourgeoisie led to assimilation. And yet, this tendency to deny their Jewishness was unnecessary, being prompted by neither Socialism nor liberalism. It was a product of the general degeneration and demoralization of the Jews.

Impelled by their Judaism towards the path of revolution, the Socialists erred in that they did not guard the purity of their revolt. Instead of emphasizing, in their revolutionary opposition to the class society, their kinship with the most suppressed people of the world, and designating their protest in the first place as specifically Jewish and later raising it to

a higher, universal out-cry, they acted contrary-wise. What is more, they robbed the protest of its Jewish character. They suppressed all reference to their Jewish origin, and thus became merely another type of Jewish assimilationists.

The assimilated bourgeoisie turned away from Judaism. They denied Jewish nationalism because the Jewish people was weak and its conditions unbearable. Jewish Socialists turned away from Judaism, because, for them, Socialism was not the result of a moral protest against the world of oppressors, but a haven for the Jew whom liberalism had betrayed. Jewish assimilation clothed itself in the mantle of vicarious nationalism, of patriotic fervor for those lands in which Jews resided; Jewish Socialism used internationalism as a cape to cover its nakedness. This negative and honorless attitude towards its Jewish origin was just as little justified by the truth of internationalism as by the illusion of foreign nationalism.

The term "internationalism," because of the poverty of our vocabulary, is a source of unconscious mistakes and conscious falsifications. Two quite diametrically opposed phenomena of life with completely contrary ethical and historic-philosophical values are conceived in the above term, so we must employ criticism and analysis in order to arrive at a clear understanding.

Internationalism, not only in the narrow sense, but also in the cosmopolitan sense, is undoubtedly the ideal to which humanity strives. The confederation of all nations, the creation of one humanity with a common language, territory, and fate—of which the greatest spirits of all times have dreamed—is undoubtedly one of the greatest concepts of the human mind. Nationalism is always an accidental product, not a rational phenomenon of history. Nationalism is only an historical category and is not absolute. National differences rose in certain historical phases and will disappear in higher historical moments. The characteristic symbol of nationality is neither language, religion nor state, but the consciousness of historic unity.

Socialism will do away with wars, tariffs, and the conflicting economic interests among civilized peoples, and will eliminate the possibility of oppression of one nation by the other; on the other hand, commercial and cultural intercourse will increase to create a common base of interests and purposes. This alone will pave the way for internationalism. International developments and solidarity of the civilized peo-

ples will weld them into one humanity. Socialism, with its basic principles of peace, cooperation, and cultural development, bears in itself the seed of realization of the pure internationalism, that is, cosmopolitanism.

Socialism, which proclaimed the holiness of freedom and the right to self-determination, is both in its nature and in its practice the absolute opposite of pseudo-internationalism. Socialism is the opponent of all those conspiring to suppress a people. The Socialist movement staunchly supports all attempts of suppressed peoples to free themselves. Each national emancipation movement finds its moral support in Socialist ethics and in Socialist concepts of freedom. It was the Internationale which first greeted the Polish revolt against the Czar. Likewise, the Socialist masses of France and Italy reacted favorably toward the Cretes in their revolt against Turkey. At the national and international Socialist congresses the right of every nation to self-determination was proclaimed, since emancipation is an organic part of the ethics of Socialism.

The Socialists of most nations have already coordinated their nationalism and Socialism. No one can point to Socialist leaders who denied their own nationality and preached assimilation with a stronger people. It is the bourgeoisie of oppressed nations who deny nationalism and preach assimilation. They betray their own nation at the first opportunity when it behooves them to do so for more profits. Thus, the Polish bourgeoisie betrayed Poland and was the first to join hands with the enemy. Likewise, the Jewish bourgeoisie adopted assimilation and disposed of the Jewish nationality together with its hopes and aspirations in order that it might lighten itself of the ballast of Jewishness and occupy itself more freely with the stock exchange.

The bearers of national emancipation among all suppressed nations are the intelligentsia, the Socialists, and the proletariat. Only in the case of the Jews among whom everything is topsy-turvy, have the Socialists inherited the assimilation of the bourgeoisie as their spiritual treasure. In this, we recognize the decline in their Socialism.

The Jews once did not possess a higher national aspiration, and this was their life tragedy; nevertheless, they were still a separate nation. It was considered by the enemy as such. Though the Jews were robbed of all external national characteristics, being dispersed, speaking all languages and jargons, possessing no national property or creative national

forces, they were a distinct nation whose very existence carried the reason for its being. The existence of the Jews, who for centuries long carried on a bitter struggle against the external world, possesses a higher significance, since with their existence the Jews represent freedom of conscience. If the suppression of the Jew represented unrighteousness resulting from domination by the strong, then the existence of the Jew was a protest against that injustice. The Jew symbolizes human rights which would be extinguished if he were to vanish. The decline of the Jew must be paralleled by the decline of humanity.

The national suicide of the Jews would be a terrible tragedy for the Jews themselves, and that epoch would be the most tragic in human history. Let us imagine the last Jew surviving when Jewry dies in the midst of the blossoming peoples of the world. The blood which the Jews shed in their struggle for existence, the millions of victims lying strewn over all lands bearing eternal witness to their revolutionary struggle against their oppressors—would appear to him a tragic farce, a lost game. It is the sacred duty of the Jew to live, for he represents freedom and justice. Schopenhauer once stated that life is an offense because we pay for it with the penalty of death; for the Jew, life is a duty, because to him death is an offense.

In such a time as ours when the large Jewish masses do not and cannot assimilate, when the Jew is surrounded by enemies, when need and misery are the fate of the Jewish people, when the right of the Jew is publicly disregarded, when his honor is tread under foot and his misfortunes laughed at, to justify assimilation would be ironical. To elevate ourselves and give to life a purpose must be the motto of the better type of Jew. Out of the need of the Jew to fight for his existence, there necessarily grows the higher ethical duty of endowing his life with a national content as well as of removing all those barriers which limit the creative genius of the Jewish people.

If Jewish Socialism, which claims that it is not only a result of class interests but also of ideological motives, wants to elevate itself to a sincere and normal protest, then it must accept the Jewish protest as its guiding motive, and proclaim it publicly. The Socialism of the Jew must truly become a Jewish Socialism.

From the sound of these words, one may perhaps picture a type of reactionary Socialism because the word "Jewish" brings to mind the terms Christian, German, National, etc. However, this is not implied, because logically Jewish Socialism should be placed on the same level with proletarian So-

cialism, both having their common source in the suppression of human beings and unequal distribution of power.

Where the Jewish proletariat became class-conscious, it also created the true Jewish Socialism, free of every slave-like trace of assimilation. The Socialism of the Jewish proletariat bears in itself also a special Jewish protest which expresses itself together with its class-consciousness. The peculiar literature, thought, and sentiment of the Jewish masses which give them an outspoken national character differentiating them from other nations, are reflected in Jewish Socialism. Free from assimilation and without a tendency toward self-denial, the Jewish proletariat bears in itself consciously and unconsciously, the specific Jewish protest.

Insofar as the Jewish proletariat had in its early stage nourished itself on the propaganda of the assimilated intelligentsia, thoughts of assimilation entered its ranks, but the healthy consciousness of the proletariat, its self-confidence and self-respect fought and checked this infection. Furthermore, the Jewish class-conscious proletariat greatly influenced the Jewish intelligentsia and aroused the latter to self-consciousness.

Jewish Socialism will, sooner or later, remove all assimilatory tendencies from its ranks, and will loyally and publicly declare itself a huge protest movement of Jews. As a protest movement against Jewish suffering, Socialism may become the common possession of all Jews, because Jewish sufferings affect the Jewish proletariat as well as the intelligentsia, the Jewish middle class as well as the upper bourgeoisie.

Anti-Semitism helps the Jews maintain their national solidarity. As a result of the recognition of their common problem, the Jews may elevate themselves to a nation of honor and respect, and strive for higher goals. However, one must not make the mistake of thinking that this problem of the Jews is a desirable means for bringing about their moral elevation, or that anti-Semitism is a welcomed guest in Jewish ranks. Not the woe of the Jewish masses but a clear understanding of the causes will help solve their problem. Jewish suffering is a result of the unequal distribution of power and therefore will exist as long as there are in the world stronger and weaker forces. This is a truism of social life not influenced by the desires of man.

To illustrate this we bring as an example the Social-Democratic party. This party draws its moral strength from the economic decline of the masses. That, however, does not mean that it desires the economic ruin of the middle class, as reac-

tionary parties maintain. Social-Democracy registers economic fact, diagnoses its cause, and transforms it into ammunition for the class struggle.

The Socialist movement embodies those political tendencies towards which the Jews are driven. The Jews must accept the Socialist movement as their own. The Socialist proletarian is the only friend of the Jews and his victory will also end the Jewish suffering.

But as soon as the Jews attained national consciousness, and the Jewish Socialists, at the side of economic class struggle, took up the Jewish national protest, there appeared another form of protest which grew out of the peculiar condition of the Jewish people.

CHAPTER III.

ZIONISM

Socialism will solve the Jewish problems only in the remote future. Though Jewish suffering is the result of general social conditions, it has a specific characteristic with which Socialism cannot deal. Socialism, whether in its daily struggle or its ultimate realization, aids all the oppressed. Through the Socialist struggle, all oppressed have an opportunity to increase their political power, improve their economic lot, and elevate their spiritual condition.

It is altogether different with the Jews. The economic structure of the Jewish people, its political deprivation and its social conditions, place it in a peculiar situation which cannot be improved at present through the Socialist struggle.

The social structure of the Jewish people includes the upper bourgeoisie; the middle class, consisting of merchants and intelligentsia; and the lower class, composed of skilled and unskilled workers. The social struggle conducted against the Jews is aimed, first of all, at the economic position of the Jewish middle class. The Jewish intelligentsia, as part of the middle class, also suffers from anti-Semitic storms and together with the entire class has to exert all its energies to survive under strained conditions.

The class struggle can help the Jewish middle class but little, if at all. Economic instability is the prime characteristic of the Jewish middle class which is becoming weaker and weaker with the advance of anti-Semitism. Not only is the class struggle ineffective in this case, but since anti-Semitism draws nourishment from the class struggle, the keener the class struggle becomes, the greater becomes the need of the Jewish middle class.

The middle class cannot die. The elimination of small, independent owners does not advance with that tempo originally predicted by Socialist theory. The objective process of evolution is slow and the bearers of economic development somehow adapt themselves to change and postpone the fate which awaits them.

Nor can the insecurity of the Jewish intelligentsia be removed through the class struggle. The social boycott which is rapidly developing against the Jewish people in general, and against its intelligentsia in particular, cannot be broken

by any form of protest. At best the intelligentsia can bear economic and social hardship with an air of resignation. Even those governments which granted civil and political rights to the Jews rose against this class. With the intelligentsia of every nation steadily becoming more dependent upon its government, the Jewish intelligentsia lost its footing. Nor can the Socialist movement, because of its proletarian character and for tactical reasons, aid the middle class, particularly the Jewish middle class, which belongs to a despised people.

The class struggle cannot aid the Jewish proletariat to the extent that it does the general proletariat. The "lumpen" (slum or taterdemalion) proletariat, which embraces the greater part of the Jewish workers, and which consists of small merchants, peddlers, etc., is incapable of class struggle or Socialist activities. It can at best strive toward Socialism and sympathize with the class struggle, but can be of little real value.

In eastern Europe, where the Jewish proletariat lives in great need, it will not quickly be discharged from its social position. The unemployed Jewish proletariat must naturally, both as an oppressed class and as Jews, accept Socialism, though Socialism does not as yet affect the peculiar Jewish conditions.

Socialism is against any denial of Jewish rights, yet it often happens that for tactical reasons Socialist parties adopt passive attitudes. No matter how diametrically opposed the Social-Democratic Party of Germany is to anti-Semitism in principle, there were numerous political occasions when this Party rejoiced in anti-Semitism, or, at least, failed to attack it. Recent political history best reveals the character of the Socialist parties. Mention may be made of the attitude of the French Socialists towards the Dreyfus "Affaire." Just as the opportunism of the Social-Democratic Party sometimes led against the basic principles of Socialism, so, too, because of opportunism, the Party abandoned its absolute stand on justice for the Jews.

If the Socialist parties of democratic lands do not yet bring the Jews the awaited benefits, Socialism is of even lesser comfort in those lands where the Jews have not yet been emancipated. In Russia, where Jews are not emancipated, their condition will not be radically altered through an overthrow of the political status. No matter what new class gains control of the government, it will not be deeply interested in the emancipation of the Jews. That emancipation shall come to the

Jews as "manna," or as a result of idealism and humanitarian principles, is inconceivable. Only in the future Socialist state will Russian Jewry attain emancipation. Till then they will have to remain undesirables.

It is clear that no solution to the problem of oppressed peoples can ease the Jewish situation. His only alternative, as it was centuries ago, is immigration to other countries. In western countries, the Jews seek a temporary solution in social isolation; in eastern Europe, in immigration to free lands.

Dark clouds hover over the Jewish quarters. The eternal Jew once more takes his wanderer's staff. Once more walls are erected—"Into the Ghetto!" Need and misery, pain and shame again become his fate. These sufferings are greater than those of former days because they are accompanied by the knowledge that there is no further escape.

How shall the Jew react?

In the Middle Ages the Jews accepted their fate resignedly and only some individuals amongst them protested against the world. But modern Jewry adopted the rational means of migration. To pave a path for economically driven immigrants, for refined Jews stung by insults, and romantic and orthodox Jews who bewail the deterioration of the people and the destruction of the Temple, to form a rational outlet and raise their individual protest to a general moral protest, to a rebuilding of Jewish life—that is the aim of Zionism, a movement born of Jewish sufferings. Just as Cabet attempted to establish a social republic in Icaria, just as Herzka attempted to undertake the anarchist experiment of a stateless society in Freeland; so does Zionism attempt to create a common territory for the Jewish homeless in Palestine.

A political Utopia is that project which goes contrary to the direction of human efforts and experience, or for which there are not present in society any satisfactory motives for its development. Every attempt to turn history forward or backward, contrary to the main tendency of the time, must be considered a political Utopia. Thus, for example, it was an Utopian experiment when workers and their sympathizers fought the machine during the first days of the industrial revolution. On the other hand, it was an Utopia when the Socialist, Fourier, sat for many years in his home waiting for a millionaire to come and bring him the necessary capital to develop a Socialist state. Even if such a millionaire had come to his aid, the project would not have endured for long. The general social interests of those days were not in harmony

with the Socialist project which Fourier developed from his ethical and rational convictions. Nevertheless, fantastic experiments are not Utopian if they synchronize with the needs of humanity.

Zionism is not Utopian, since it derives from the life of the Jews. It is as little Utopian as Socialism, Socialism being the consequence of the social problems produced by the modern class structure. Zionism is borne out by existing realities; Utopias were the products of individual and rare spirits. Icaria is associated with Cabet, Freeland with Herzka, but the Jewish state is the product of the Jewish nation. The Jewish state answers Jewish needs and Jewish aspirations, and is closely bound up with the old land—Zion.

There is another important difference between the Jewish state and the Socialist Utopias. With the Utopians, the driving force was the ideal; with us, the need.

Zionism is a real phenomenon of Jewish life. It has its roots in the economic and social positions of the Jews, in their moral protest, in the idealistic striving to give a better content to their miserable life. It is borne by the active forces of Jewish life. Only cowards and spiritual degenerates may term Zionism an Utopia.

All non-Zionist attempts to solve the Jewish problem bear an Utopian stamp. For example, when the assimilationists parade about with the hope that Jews will assimilate—it is Utopian. Likewise, when some benevolent Jews believe that the Jews can return to agriculture in the land where they reside, and bourgeois Jewry and intelligentsia will lower their living standard—it is also Utopian. Furthermore, it is Utopian when bourgeois Jewry, feeling its position weakened by Zionism, believes that Zionism will disappear and the Jews will sink to their former resigned state. All these solutions to the Jewish problem are Utopian, since they are not in harmony with the striving and feeling of contemporary Jewry.

It is not the Utopian element that bars masses of Jews from Zionism, but their subjugation and passiveness which are the result of our thousand-year old bondage. Opponents imbibe their opposition to Zionism from various schools of thought, yet it all springs from one source—inner void and spiritual degeneration.

No other class is as morally bankrupt as the bourgeoisie. It lives in an atmosphere of falsehood and fraud. The bourgeois Jews come out openly as the defenders of society and supporters of the State, and yet, deep in their hearts, they

greet the revolutionary parties whom they can trust. They are overflowing with patriotism and chauvinism, yet consider the land and the people among whom they live only as objects of exploitation. Outwardly, they parade their love of country and people, inwardly they are cynical. Zionism removes the mask and presents them as they are—people without honor and respect, whose sole purpose is the accumulation of money. Zionism arouses the Jews to protest, and enables them to understand their own worthless and miserable existence.

The modern synagogue is partner to the Jewish bourgeoisie. Zionism comes into strong collision with it. At no time in history was the church so pliable to the demands of the ruling class as is the Jewish synagogue of the present time. The synagogue prostituted itself to the Jewish bourgeoisie. Zionism, which strikes the master, also strikes the servant. Zionism dispels the fable of the Reformed rabbis concerning the Jewish "mission." Therefore, Zionism encounters nowhere so much opposition as in the Reformed synagogue where the Jewish bourgeoisie prays to the almighty dollar.

Opposition to Zionism has also arisen from quarters least expected. It is painful that the Jewish Socialist intelligentsia should be hostile to Zionism. How is it possible to derive from the principles of Socialism, whose mainstay is equality and self-determination for all nations, opposition to a movement which has no purpose save the creation of a home for the unfortunate persecuted Jewish masses? Through their opposition, the assimilation-Socialists best revealed their lack of understanding of the essence of Socialism.

Jewish Socialists dig up baseless reasons to support their anti-Zionist attitude. When the excuses of internationalism, and the denial of the existence of a Jewish nationality were discarded, they found another argument—that Zionism conflicts with the class struggle. The Jewish people, they maintain, is divided into classes which struggle against each other, while Zionism ignores these economic differences, postulating a so-called unity of the Jewish nation. There can be no more foolish argument than to maintain that the Jewish class struggle conflicts with Zionism. Those who maintain this, do not grasp the meaning of the class struggle, and create contradictions which do not exist. Why should the Jewish proletariat, which is the first to be helped by Zionism, reject it merely because the other classes of Jewry have also adopted Zionism?

The class struggle does not give vent to all expressions of

social life. When a people is endangered, all parties unite to fight the outside enemy, though in normal times the classes fight each other. Similarly, parties unite in elections and form coalitions against internal enemies. Modern parliamentarism is based on this procedure. In every union of men for idealistic purposes, the struggle which divides man against man disappears and higher forms of solidarity emerge to the foreground. Class struggle is the main driving force of history, but it is not properly conceived to solve all our social problems. Creative activities are realized not through the class struggle but in spite of it. Zionism is a creative work of the Jews, and is not in contradiction to the class struggle. Moreover, it rises above it. Zionism can be accepted by all Jewry in spite of class differences.

The Jewish proletariat, the poor Jewish masses, the intelligentsia, and the middle class, can justifiably oppose a Jewish state being built on the principles of capitalism. True, the Jewish state, regardless of form, can erase a great number of the Jewish problems, but the modern conscience is so greatly impregnated with social and economic ideals that the Jewish masses will not accept a capitalistic Jewish state.

The *form* of the Jewish state is the only debatable issue involved in Zionism. Zionism must take the opinion of the Jewish masses into consideration, for without them Zionism will be a still-born child. The wheels of the Jewish state can not be turned if the powerful arms of the Jewish workers are missing. Zionism must take into consideration the Socialist aspirations of the Jewish proletariat, without losing sight of the aspirations of the middle class and intelligentsia. Zionism must of necessity fuse with Socialism, for Socialism is in complete harmony with the wishes and hopes of the Jewish masses.

Any other form of a Jewish state is scientifically and socially unsound.

CHAPTER IV.

THE JEWISH SOCIALIST STATE

It is impossible to conceive of Jews volunteering to build an autonomous state on the basis of social inequality, since that would signify "a social contract of servitude." In order that a social contract be fully realized, it must be based on freedom. Social inequality is primarily a product of the historic process. Conscious social activity desires to alter, in a rational and moral manner, the status quo. To build a new structure on the basis of competition and social inequality is socially and psychologically unsound.

People are now well aware of the nature of the modern bourgeois state, and they will not volunteer to build a structure that is unsocial, irrational and wasteful.

In order that a Jewish state become a fact, it is necessary that from the very beginning we avoid all the infirmities of modern life. If the Jewish state is to call forth a deep interest, it must adopt as its ideal justice, righteousness, social planning, and social solidarity. When the social principles of the Jewish state are realized, modern technology will flourish in it. The Jewish state must be a Socialist state if it is to be realized. Zionism must fuse with Socialism in order to become the ideal of the entire Jewish people, of the proletariat, of the middle class, of the intelligentsia, as well as of the idealist.

Fusing with Socialism, Zionism can be raised to a great national passion. All Jews will wish it to succeed, none will be indifferent. The hope for a Messiah, always the basic sentiment of the Galuth Jew, will be converted into political fact. The Jewish people will gain new content.

1898

II.

National Independence and International Unity

CHAPTER I.

THE PROBLEM OF NATIONALISM

THE complicated problem of nationalism is a modern one for which history has not yet found a solution. The sunshine which the World War promises must cast light upon this perplexing phenomenon and eliminate its being a source of human conflict.

The practical problem of nationalism has just become a vital historical issue, though theoretically the problem arose during the Nineteenth Century. Parallel with the cultural development of that century grew the problem of nationalism until in our day it has reached the stage of intense earnestness.

In ancient times, as well as in the Middle Ages, the problem of nationalism did not puzzle mankind. Man, until our modern era, did not investigate the spirit of culture, the essence of national life, or the plan of history. A philosophy of history—and the theory of nationalism is closely allied with it—has been developed only recently by the human mind.

In ancient times, the Jews were conscious of their own nationhood. The Jewish national consciousness was so marked and unique that the ancient prophet termed only the Jews a nation, while to the other peoples he denied the name. Jews were called *am* (nation), while non-Jews were termed *lo am* (no nation).

The Greeks, too, were conscious of their national power,

and termed all other nations "barbarians" or "tongueless," for the latter did not converse in Greek. The Romans were also conscious of their political power and of their superiority over other nations. "I am a Roman citizen" was the expression of a strong national consciousness.

In the Middle Ages, full national life was absent and, consequently, national consciousness was also missing. Religion, which was the highest, and practically the only cultural expression of life, was, in western Europe, Catholic-cosmopolitan. The cultural tongue of those days was the cosmopolitan Latin employed by the governments and learned men.

The modern idea of a nation did not exist; the king was the nation, rather, the nation was composed of two parts, the king and the people. When Louis XVI was captured during the great French Revolution attempting to escape, many citizens inquired: "What will become of the nation without the king?"

The development of modern culture and democracy preceded the process of national revival. The development of national language, literature, art, philosophy, and science, supplied every nation with a distinct color and instilled in each nation a special content, a separate cultural tendency, and a particular historical view. In the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, the leading nations of Europe, including Germany, France, England, and Russia, were isolated from each other politically, each nourishing its own national culture. In each of these nations a national creativeness was manifest.

However, a long period has passed since the states developed their politico-economic individuality and national culture, and the national problem rose to the surface. The founders of the national culture in England, France, and Germany at the close of the Eighteenth Century and beginning of the Nineteenth, had not thought of the purpose and destiny of their nation in the light of the problem of nationalism at large. Neither Racine nor Moliere, the prophets of the coming French poetry and drama, neither Rousseau nor Voltaire, the theorists of revolutionary France were conscious of the particular value of the French idea, nor did they attempt to analyze and determine the paths and perspectives of the French nation in the historic process. Nor did the thinkers and poets—Kant, Lessing, Schiller, and Goethe—in whom the German national genius manifested itself in its entire magnitude, conceive of Germanism as a distinct national product, and the German state as a powerful national-political organism. English philosophy and literature in the Eighteenth

Century were critical and descriptive, but knew of no profound type of English nationalism.

Nationalism first appeared in the Nineteenth Century when the European nations reached a high standard of national self-consciousness through their life and literature. Nationalism in its first philosophical stage was limited to one's own nation and cultural milieu.

The first thinker to recognize various national missions in nations, missions charged by the historical process, was the German philosopher Hegel, who may be considered the first theorist of nationalism. Hegel, in his historic philosophy, developed the theory that human history follows a plan, and that the various historical epochs each represents a distinct act in this universal, divine drama. He classified history into four epochs: the Oriental, the Greek, the Roman, and the German. The German, according to him, constituted the ultimate objective of world history; all other modern nations, such as the French or Slavic, had no value or mission.

Hegel's historical philosophy, according to which the universal plan culminates in the German world, called forth a spiritual unrest on the part of the rising Russian intelligentsia. According to Hegel, the Russian-Slavic people was excluded from the world of progress. The Russian intelligentsia refused to submit the great Slavic people to the rule of Hegel's philosophical nationalism. Consequently, a new spiritual movement developed in Russia, Philoslavism, which adopted the Hegelian views, sublimating not Germany, but Russia. History reached its highest peak not with the Germans, but with the Russians—the Slavic people. Western Europe was doomed to decay and die, and only Russia would continue to weave the fabric of history. The parliaments, constitutions, and democracies of western Europe were mistakes, the highest expression of truth being found in Russia's political system, where the nation, the land, the church, and the government were united in one. These were the chauvinistic teachings of the Philoslavs, which greatly influenced the later development of Russia.

Thus, Hegel's historic philosophy and Russian Philoslavism were the first serious attempts to determine the value and purpose of nations in the historical process, the first attempts to define nationalism.

During the Nineteenth Century, the wars and revolutions, and particularly the development of literature and art among the nations, further intensified and clarified the

idea of nationalism. In the middle of the Nineteenth Century, a new science, the psychology of nations, appeared, which aimed to recognize and determine the individual spirit of all nations, past as well as present. It attempted to investigate the culture, history, and God, to study the hopes and fears of each people—in short, to determine the characteristics and spirit of each and every nation. Cultural history, ethnography, sociology, and particularly historic philosophy contributed their share to the subject of nationalism.

Nationalism, which is important to the cultural life of humanity, called forth, in its purely theoretical aspects, the chauvinistic passion of its founders. Hegel and his followers saw in the German nation the "chosen people," while all other nations had no historical mission. The Hegelian over-evaluation of the German nation penetrated the minds of all German nationalists and chauvinists, and greatly influenced the political development of the country. We saw how this Hegelian philosophy brought forth the Philoslavic movement, which made the same error in appraising the Russian people.

Nationalism, however, is not merely a cultural or historic-philosophical problem. It does not interest itself only with the purpose and value of nations, but also with the role of each nation in the modern political and economic struggle. Since in history the determining factor is not right but might, the problem of nationalism becomes a problem of extension of might: conquest. On the other hand, nationalism arises among oppressed nations who struggle for their emancipation, self-determination, and revival. To them it appears as a moral force.

The term "nationalism" has become a word causing misunderstandings, being dualistic in meaning. Reactionaries and oppressors of mankind—the dynasties, governments, capitalists, aristocracy, and church—whose eyes are focused on military expeditions, conquests, and suppression even of parts of their own nation, preached the ideal of nationalism. Nationalism, in the language of the ruling classes signified reaction and chauvinistic patriotism. The oppressed nations and classes, and revolutionary leaders also employed "nationalism" to embrace the noble ideals of human life.

It is said that the Nineteenth Century was the century of nationalism. However, it is more exact to say that the half-century since the Franco-Prussian War (1870), is the period in which nationalism molded historical developments. For the past several decades, imperialism, colonial policies, and mili-

tarism have been the life-giving diet of ruling nations. All powers within whom capitalism developed, such as Germany, England, France, Russia, and later Italy, Austria, and Japan, created for themselves the cult of imperialism, a nationalism resulting from the innate logic of capitalism.

The nationalism of the ruling classes and governments during recent years has made the proletariat face the problem of nationalism and related issues. For years, the proletariat of the European countries sought a proper attitude to the problem of nationalism, national armaments, national expansion, and imperialism. It recognized that while the chauvinistic nationalism of the ruling class was dangerous, the uncritical negative attitude of the proletariat to the problem of nationalism was incorrect and even reactionary. For the past twenty years, the Socialist parties of Germany, France, England, Austria, and Italy have devoted themselves to a solution of this problem.

The cultural aspect of nationalism, as well as the political, was of prime importance to the suppressed class. This was due in no small measure to the democratization of education. In all previous epochs of history, education was the privilege of the ruling classes. Only the rich and powerful, the rulers and learned men maintained the spiritual national life, and enjoyed its fruits—art, literature, philosophy, and science. The politically and economically enslaved part of the nation, the toiling and stricken masses, was deprived of the higher national culture. Each nation was a national kernel with a non-national periphery of toiling masses. Even in the Eighteenth Century, when modern culture was unfolding, the masses of France, Germany, and England were isolated from their national culture. Voltaire and Rousseau, Kant and Goethe, Hume and Adam Smith lived among the aristocracy and not among the masses.

However, since the Nineteenth Century the cultures of the nations have begun to affect all strata of society. Of course, even now culture in its higher and more refined form is the privilege of the bourgeoisie and the ruling class. Only the rich find nourishment in music, art, literature, and philosophy. But the basic foundations of culture are gradually becoming the possession of the entire people with the expansion of democracy. The more the lower classes are thrust into the national cultural life, the more they develop from unconscious step-children into conscious blood-relatives of the nation. The creative genius of the nation is aroused in them,

and they become acquainted with the history, spirit and creativeness of the entire nation. The expansion of democracy broadens the base of the nation in the cultural as well as the political sense. All classes of the nation become permeated with the feeling of a common land, common culture, and common future.

Thus, the problem of cultural nationalism was finally felt by the lower classes of the civilized nations. Does national culture possess an absolute value in itself; or is it merely an accidental phenomenon in the history of mankind? National language, art, literature, the feeling of national solidarity, the consciousness of a common historical fate, and the common will for the future—all these fundamentals of nationalism, do they aid the progress of the nation? Do they elevate the group and the individual? Is nationalism a source of creative life? Is it in harmony with the unfathomed wisdom of world history? Or, is it a limitation, a shortening of life, an error of history, an obstacle on the road to a universal culture? Thus, the cultural aspect of nationalism, no less than the political, became the center of the spiritual problems of the modern proletariat.

If among ruling nations the suppressed classes, with the growth of democracy, joined the political and cultural life of the nation, it is even more evident that they did so among the suppressed nations. Among the latter, however, the heavier burdens of national suppression fell on the shoulders of the lower class. The ruling powers sought everywhere to destroy the economic development of suppressed nations, as in the case of England with Ireland, India, and the American colonies. Likewise, Austria attempted to restrain the economic development of Galicia, Roumania, and Bohemia. Russia always attempted to hinder the economic progress of Poland. Ruling nations robbed oppressed nations of their civil rights, or discriminated against them—take the case of the Jewish people in Russia and Roumania. The ruling nation denied freedom of language and culture to the oppressed nation and enforced its own language and tradition. Thus, it robbed the oppressed people of its national possessions and injured its vitality. As the down-trodden classes of oppressed nations developed culturally and politically, democracy and Socialism entered the nation, and the masses participated increasingly in national life, placing themselves under the banner of national emancipation, which joined the struggle for democracy and Socialism. The national problem of suppressed na-

tions became the central problem of their socio-political and cultural life.

The nationalism of oppressed classes, especially of the oppressed nations, had a content different from the nationalism of the ruling classes, especially of the ruling nations. Nationalism has a dual meaning and diametrically opposite tendencies. Nationalism, to the ruling elements, means suppression and negation of foreign nations, inflation of their own value, stagnation and petrification of national culture, and sanctification of traditions. This reactionary, particularist nationalism considers its own nation as absolute and sees in all other nations a means for self-aggrandizement. The nationalism of oppressed elements is a recognition of the principle of equality for all nations and national cultures. This is the progressive, international, human nationalism which recognizes not the nation, but humanity as absolute, and sees in its own nation not only an end in itself, but also an instrument for the good of humanity.

CHAPTER II.

NATION AND CULTURE

In our modern era peoples *consciously* struggle for political, spiritual and cultural individuality, although their struggles are as old as the race.

The social and spiritual life of peoples is expressed in national forms. Each people has followed its own course and has developed its own peculiar individual character.

The origin of the ancient races and nations is a mystery. Did all races originate from one, or did nature produce various races from the very beginning? In other words, which of the two views—monogenism or polygenism—is correct? Science cannot as yet answer. Despite the theory of Darwin the origin of man still is unknown. Science is not yet certain as to the number and kinds of races into which humanity is divided. All anthropologists agree that the three races — the white Aryan, the yellow Mongolian, and the black Negro — are all ancient. Others add the Malayan and Semitic to the same category. Still others believe that there were seven to nine races. Those who maintain that there were only three explain that all other variations in humanity are a result of the mixture of the original races. Thus, for example, the Hindus are a composite of Aryan with a substantial mixture of Negro blood. The Semites, some maintain, are Aryans with a slight mixture of Negro blood. When it comes to the different mixtures of the races and their variations, science abandons the field of research and bases its theory largely on assumption.

The original process of the differentiation of humanity is hazy. However, the internal logic, the purposefulness, the historical gain of these differentiations are clear. Through the differentiations of man, races and nations, the development of culture was made possible. In the course of history, various nations with their peculiarities of language and culture developed out of the original races. Nations and cultures are the various frames in which human history weaves its eternal cloth in various fabrics and in numerous colors, a cloth of many folds and seams.

The forces of life in ancient days concentrated many races within the fruitful valleys around the Nile, Tigris, Euphrates, and Ganges, where central powers organized to guard the fruitful soil from floods, and preserve collectively their own

existence through common labor. Thus appeared the first historical powers—Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, India, China—the first civilization, in the vicinity of the great seas and fruitful valleys of the globe.

Through state organization there developed in the course of the historical process, new peoples and nations, and new languages and cultures. In the state, various people would often fuse into one nation, and various cultures into one culture. Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, India, Persia, Rome, and Greece—down to the modern states—were mixed with other peoples and languages. In every nation and culture, it is possible to recognize the traces of certain formations, the various historical layers. However, within each mixed state, the pulse of the culturally higher people beat strongest, and the popular heart throbbed with its spiritual force.

In the storm of history, through wars, migrations, and assimilations, many peoples vanished from the face of the earth, and other peoples and cultures appeared in their place. From ancient days to our present times, the nation, language, culture, and often race changed in Egypt, Babylonia, western Asia, southern Europe, America, and elsewhere. The modern Italian people is nationally, culturally, and linguistically different from the ancient Romans of Italy. The English nation is an admixture of Anglo-Celts, Anglo-Saxons and others, and the English language contains their national linguistic elements. How markedly different was the language and culture of ancient Greece from the modern. In our present day, the Roumanian nation and language developed as a result of an ethnological and linguistic mixture. The United States is a new nation, a melting pot of all nations of the world. New nations are appearing in South America—the Argentine and Brazil—whose amalgamation have not yet ceased because of the continuous influx of Europeans, especially Italians. The majority of nations and cultures are in continual flux—they appear and disappear on the horizon of history. As soon as a nation reaches a degree of stability and unity, it develops new, original characteristics and creative powers, which stamp it with culture and originality. If we are to speak in terms of pictures, it may be said that culture manifests itself in multitudinous forms. Using biological language for the sake of analogy, it may be said that within each nation “genes” are inherited from generation to generation, remaining unchanged throughout history. This particular “gene” is the carrier of the so-called national spirit. Originality, regardless of source,

determines the uniqueness of a people. The closer the originality of a people approaches universality, the more cherished it is.

Each nation, so to speak, has a mission, which is not the result of a fantastic plan of history, but is the sum total of racial characteristics, national possessions, cultural forces, moral tendencies, conception forms and hopes which were ingrained since ancient days and are still potent. In the course of history, these attributes have been continuously refined, improved, and consciously recognized as creative forces. A hasty glance at the history of ancient nations, as well as present ones, reveals the cultural differences and creative originalities of nations in language, literature, art, religion, social life and historical will. One can even define various cultural types represented by the different peoples.

The ancient Greek nation, the aristocrat of the Aryan race, was creative in beauty, art, painting, and sculpture. It developed the first principles of science, philosophy, and government. Great though its genius in observing nature and man, it was limited in its ability to conceive religion, morality, historic-philosophy, justice, and collectivism. Where the talents of the Greek ended, the genius of the aristocratic representative of the Semitic race—the Jew—began. The Greek idolized nature; the Jew, history; the Greek sought beauty, the Jew, holiness; the Greek was limited to the individual, the Jew felt for the group; the Greek recognized the plurality, the Jews, the oneness and unity in the aim of history. The Greek conceived space, the Jew recognized time. The two ancient nations created two original cultures, two distinct tendencies of spirit.

When we analyze the cultured nations of the present era—the German, French, English, and Russian—we recognize marked differences in their culture. The strong, calm, disciplined and conscious German nation possesses even today, characteristics similar to those mentioned by the Roman historian, Tacitus. The alert, restless Frenchmen are in many respects similar to the ancient Gauls described by Caesar.

How great are the spiritual as well as the physical differences between these nations! Philosophy, metaphysics, dramatics, music, science and research—these are the great contributions of the German nation. The profound German spirit penetrates the inner world. Luther, Kant, Goethe, Hegel, and Beethoven are the representatives of the German national genius.

The true genius of the French nation found expression in grace, in rhythm and rhetoric, in pathos, in beauty, and in the aesthetic cult of man—in spheres where the German genius is limited. Rousseau, Saint Simon, Victor Hugo, Emil Zola personify France.

The poverty in music and philosophy of the English nation was compensated for by its manly honor and respect, its humaneness. Lyric sentimentality was expressed in English poetry. Partly as a result of these characteristics, and not only because of social, historical causes, the deep feeling of the Anglo-Saxon for independence and freedom originated.

The mystic social sentimentality and religion, as well as the great humanitarian pathos of the Russian is a rare characteristic possessed by other nations in smaller measure.

The main problem of historic-philosophy, national psychology, and sociology in the future will be to determine and analyze the characteristics and tendencies of the various nations in the course of history. However, it is now clear that history has found its highest expression in the abundance of nations, and celebrates its triumph in the varieties and colors of the national cultures. It is becoming more and more evident that the cultural individuality of each nation becomes deeper and more refined, purposeful and universal. When a national culture reaches its highest stage, it elevates itself to universal heights, and dreams of universal fraternity and the unity of the entire nationally differentiated humanity. Thus, the Jewish nation, at the peak of its culture, that is, at the time of prophecy, conceived of a united mankind. The Greek philosophy of the post-Socratic period, the fruitful epoch of Greek culture, hallowed the idea of world-citizenship, or cosmopolitanism.

Nationalism and internationalism, people and humanity, individualism and universalism are in the final analysis, complementary terms.

CHAPTER III.

A NATION DEFINED

From our consideration of the relationship between nation and culture and of the roles of the nations in the historic process, we can arrive at a definition of what constitutes a nation. This is not merely of theoretical value, but of political importance to the orientation of the modern national struggles. Theory had occupied itself with defining a nation. In the course of research and observation, its definition changed, placing emphasis, not on the external, political attributes, but rather on the spiritual, cultural experiences and forces of a nation.

It is clearly understood now that a nation does not fall with the destruction of its political state. However, international justice even now, recognizes only those nations with political power. International justice recognizes the existence of the Montenegrans who number 300,000 souls, for there is a Montenegrin state, while on the other hand, it fails to recognize the Polish, Bohemian, or Jewish nation.

The Socialist Internationale was more tolerant than the international powers. The Internationale did not demand that a nation be an independent state, but recognized as nations peoples on their own historical territory striving for national revival. Thus, the Polish people was recognized as a nation, though all scattered and exiled peoples, no matter how nationally conscious they were, were excluded from the right to nationality.

That a separate language is not an absolutely essential attribute of a nation has also been recognized. Several nations may use the same identical language, and one nation may employ several different tongues. The Spanish and various South American peoples, who are vastly different in composition and history and are politically independent of each other, converse in the same Spanish tongue. The French and the inhabitants of Eastern Canada speak French; the English and the Americans speak English. On the other hand, the United Swiss nation uses three languages: German, French, and Italian. The Belgians employ two languages: Flemish and Wallachian. The Jewish people, in addition to its own languages and jargons, uses the languages of the nations among whom it resides. Each nation, when it elevates itself

to true national consciousness, seeks to adopt a national language, although a common language does not make one nation of the various peoples; nor does the employment of many languages by one nation destroy its oneness.

Even to a lesser degree can a common origin serve as an absolute basis for national unity. Pure, unmixed nations, if they exist, are very rare. In each nation are streams of blood from various sources. The Germans contain considerable Slavic blood, combined with that of other nations. The Anglo-Saxons contain Celtic blood, German, and others. Likewise, the Russians contain considerable proportions of the Tartars and Finnish peoples. The present Greek, Italian, Roumanian and American nations are mixed peoples, just as are the new nations of South America. It may be said, that of all nations, the Jewish is the purest, having less mixture in it than any other nation. The cause lies in that converts, or those who have intermarried, have, in their second generation abandoned the Jewish nation. Thus, the Jewish blood has steadily flown into other nations, but the Jews themselves, have maintained their racial and national purity more than the others. For national unity and continuity in the historical development, it is, naturally, essential that the basis of a race, its main bloodstream, should not be lost in the process of admixture. Predominant strains of other races and blood can, naturally, change the national character considerably and bring forth other characteristics and forces from within the nation. But no matter how much a people mixes with the blood of others, it still maintains its original, national characteristics, and follows its own original path, provided it has already become crystallized into a nation, and particularly when in addition to its internal conscious forces it also possesses the external attributes and forces of a nation.

The true foundation of a nation is spiritual, and cultural. A social group which has perfected in the course of generations a certain equality and unity in its spiritual life, in its thought and feeling, and possesses an historical fate of which it is conscious, and has a desire for further historical continuity—such a group is a nation. In other words, the chief characteristic, the determining attribute of a nation, is its historical culture. Common reminiscences, common consciousness of its present, and common aspirations for the future—these build a nation. A nation is a cultural, psychological phenomenon.

The discussion of what constitutes a nation lasted for a long while, until this definition was finally accepted. According to

this definition, peoples robbed of their rights by ruling powers still have a right to nationality and national recognition. Not only the peoples who have lost their political independence are, according to this definition, recognized as a nation, but also those peoples who are scattered among the other nations. The Jews, who are scattered among all nations and speak various languages, are a nation as long as they possess their cultural individuality, the consciousness of their common fate, and the common national will regarding their future. The peoples of limited culture, as the Lithuanians, Latvians, Ruthenians, Cretes, Armenians, Albanians, Tartars, Gruzians, etc., who possess the above-mentioned three characteristics, even though in a smaller degree, are nationalities, and must be recognized by the world as such.

This definition of a nation is theoretically true and historically just; it is theoretically true *because* it is historically just. And yet, even those who have recognized the principle of nationalism have sinned heavily against the true conception of nationalism.

Lassalle, for example, in his work *The Italian War* (1859), viewed the Italian nation in the proper light, for it had a history of cultural and national achievements. However, he did not possess enough foresight and courage to recognize the right of other small peoples who clamored for independence. Likewise, the rights of small nations were not recognized at the International Socialist Congresses. Even Otto Bauer, the great theorist of nationalism, who defined a nation as a group of people having a common fate, did not recognize the Jews as a nation with a political future, for he maintained that the assimilation tendencies among the Jewish people were stronger, and more real than its Zionist desires. But according to our definition of a nation, it is sufficient that a group of people having a common desire for the future, no matter how great or small, be recognized by political and social science as such.

The cultural forces and potentialities which are the true internal bases of a nation are also the substance of the nation. The national substance is the soul of a nation and cannot be transmitted to any other nation. A nation can adopt another's religion, language, or civilization, but not its internal national culture. The Negroes in America speak the English language, even though they cannot pronounce the Nordic "r", but they have not adopted the Anglo-Saxon or American culture to any great extent. The Japanese have adopted the entire European

civilization, science, technique, organization, and even philosophic and sociological views, but they have not adopted the internal culture of any of the European states. For thousands of years, Jews lived in Europe, conversed in all languages, participated in all cultural movements, and yet, they remained a nation with a particular and original culture. Its cultural ego is its nationality, its soul of which it cannot be deprived. Nor can one nation transmit its nationality to another, for it is an intimate property that cannot be changed as easily as a religion, language, or citizenship. A person cannot adopt another nationality if he wishes to remain true to himself. A person cannot separate himself from his nation not only because he has obligations to its history and the historic individuality which his nation represents, but also because he sins and lies against his own personal individuality through his separation from his nation. A person can as little part with his own nation as he can join a strange nation. Both acts are a moral falsehood, and a crime against a holy truth, the truth of his own being. The ruling classes of the oppressed nations are always ready to adopt assimilation, though it is morally unjustified, for assimilation is only the striving of the higher classes for material and cultural gains. Among all oppressed nations, such as the Jews, Poles, and Czechs, the ruling classes have always been inclined toward assimilation, whereas the masses remained true to themselves.

A nation that has not lost its spiritual ego and cultural forces strives to become an autonomous nation and regain its national language, land, and political independence. Only under complete autonomy and independence can the cultural and spiritual essence of a nation begin blossoming, and achieve to a greater degree, its creative individuality. A nation that is robbed of its language, land, and independence is hampered in its further development, and, therefore, must struggle for its national rights. Human history is full of the struggles of nations which were robbed of a certain element of their national life, and which, therefore, struggled for their national fullness and historical completeness.

These considerations show us at which point of national life a nation reaches its highest development. Nationality is the common memory, the common consciousness, and the common will of the people. When the memory, the consciousness, and the will of a nation join to guarantee or achieve the external attributes of national life (its land and political independence), the nation has achieved its highest degree of

national life. Action binds the nation, strengthens its national content, and supplies it with the heroic glamour which continues to live in future generations. When a nation conducts a war or revolution, when it creates a new, inspiring religion out of its depths, when its cultural spirit generates philosophy, music and literature—its national life achieves its highest expression. With these national deeds, a nation is able to exist for thousands of years, as it draws from them national heroism, even before the culture dawns upon the national consciousness. When a people is in doubt and is doubted as to its nationalism, its deeds are the determining factor. When, in spite of the cultural monuments of the historic Jewish people, doubts arose during the Nineteenth Century as to its national aspirations, Zionism was the determining factor. The Armenians regained nationhood through their national, revolutionary, and Socialist parties. The national deeds elevate oppressed peoples to the dignity of a nation. A revolution, even if unsuccessful, according to Marx, forgives all the sins of an enslaved people and removes from it its historical shame.

According to our definition, we are able to understand the difference between a true nation and a local province which, mistakenly, claims the rights of a separate nation. The Bavarians in Germany, though they speak a distinct Bavarian dialect which is markedly different from the spoken or written German, and though they find themselves in a separate province, are not a separate nation. The pretenses made by some provincial patriots for the recognition of Bavaria as a separate nation, are not more than an error. They are only a provincial variation of the Germans and share together with the German nation a common memory, consciousness, and desire. The same may be applied to the White Russians and, perhaps, to the Ukrainians. The provincial variations of the great nations are entitled to their local peculiarities. Their local features should be guarded and respected by the general constitution of the land, though it must be remembered that they are organic parts of the indivisible nation.

In addition to the general considerations and experiences of a nation, the history of modern national struggles points out which human groups constitute nations and shows how deeply the national characteristics are enrooted.

CHAPTER IV.

THE NATIONAL STRUGGLES OF MODERN TIMES

From the womb of history emerged nations, born of common human needs, and in these nations the human cultural spirit found diverse expression. History records nations who appeared, developed, achieved their highest goal, struggled for further historical life, and disappeared. But only in modern times, in the era of democracy and freedom, of higher political and economic organization, did the nations begin to recognize themselves culturally, to analyze their individuality, to insist on their national existence, and to consciously determine their own destiny.

As long as brutal force and despotism ruled Europe, and the peoples were sunk in ignorance, there was no room for national ideas or national movements. In Europe, nations have existed since the Middle Ages, but their rights were recognized by none, and the nations themselves did not pretend to justify their existence. The boundaries of the nations were determined not by their own interests and wishes but by those of the ruling dynasties. Where freedom and rights were denied the individual, they were also denied the nation. Several centuries ago, it was possible for a monarch to give an entire land and its people as a dowry. The state and its inhabitants were the property of the king, who could do as he willed. Thus, in the Sixteenth Century, for example, one man, Charles V, ruled Germany, Spain, Netherlands, Naples, and a great part of the New World.

At the close of the Eighteenth Century the formation of the modern state and the rise of democracy against the reactionary forces of the Middle Ages were begun. The state assumed the character of a centralized economic unit with separate economic interests and aims. This form of state organization brought about a greater unity within the ranks of the nation. Democracy, which was born in the course of the struggle against the reactionary powers of the Middle Ages, symbolized the hopes and progressive tendencies of all awakened nations, and served everywhere as a nationalizing force.

Two great events which occurred almost simultaneously at the close of the Eighteenth Century influenced the birth of the national idea and served as a powerful stimulus to the national movement. These were the French revolution of 1789, and the

partition of Poland among Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1793. In the French Revolution, the united French people consciously recognized its nationhood as opposed to the ruling monarchy. The Revolution proclaimed that the French Republic was "united and indivisible." Then, the self-consciousness of the French nation was born. The newly developed idea of independence had abolished all the privileges of the ruling classes and its institutions which were not in harmony with the "Common Will," an expression coined by Rousseau. The nation was the "Common Will." The French Revolution proclaimed the right of the nation to govern itself, abolish the kingdom, deliver the king to the scaffold, and prepare the road for the future equality.

The French Revolution, through the declaration of the principles of freedom and self-emancipation, indirectly influenced all the oppressed nations to begin the struggle for their independence. If the French people could remove their yoke of slavery, then why could not the Poles and Hungarians? After the French Revolution, revolutionary restlessness filled the hopes of all peoples, from Russia to Mexico, and everywhere men began to experience the beautiful dream of freedom and emancipation. Peoples subjected to the rule of other peoples, as Belgium, Italy, Bohemia, Hungary, or Germany (which was divided into more than 300 small kingdoms, each having its own king and court), could not, naturally, realize a French Revolution in their own lives. As long as their own land was not yet free and independent, there was no possibility for democratic and social reforms. But all nations of the world—even the distant Mexicans—were deeply moved by the French Revolution.

If the French Revolution awakened a yearning for liberty from external and internal oppressors, the division of Poland created a new national problem in Europe. Oppressed and suffering Poland began to struggle for its national existence and independence, and it soon became the revolutionary people of Europe. Through the partition of Poland and its struggle for independence, the question of national rights was revived in Europe. With the fall of Poland, the relationship between state and nation was recognized, and everywhere the injustice to this landless people was seen. The Polish people became a soul without a body which wandered among all nations of Europe and implanted the seed of revolution against national oppression, against tyrannous government and the ruling class.

The French Revolution was followed by Napoleon and his wars. The revolutionary, awakened French people and the powerful, conscious French bourgeoisie wanted to remake the world with the new freedom. Napoleon, with his revolutionary French army and with the support of the bourgeoisie, introduced French political forms everywhere. The conquests of Napoleon awakened the desire for national freedom and autonomy, and soon the wars of national independence began. Dormant national feelings were awakened, and the national wills became dynamic forces. The Napoleonic wars prepared the grounds and laid the foundation for the unifications of Germany and Italy. Napoleon preceded the appearance of the German philosopher, Fichte. In Russia, the Napoleonic wars awakened the national and cultural forces which were responsible for the first revolutionary uprising in 1825, the Decembrists' Revolt.

Napoleon's power was destroyed by the awakened forces of the European peoples. At a time of national danger, all peoples became conscious of their strength and of their duties to themselves, and made an end to the usurper of the French throne. The nations, having thrown off the yoke of Napoleon met at the Vienna Congress of 1814 to revise the map of Europe in accordance with the principle of nationality. Before the defeat of Napoleon, the governments had promised to extend the boundaries of the countries to include all the territory on which their people resided, and had guaranteed the independence of each and every nation. The Vienna Congress, however, was composed of representatives, not of nations, but of their sovereigns. The only delegate who represented liberal views was, strange to say, the mystical Russian Czar, Alexander I. But the weak and uncertain voice which he raised in defense of an independent Poland was drowned out by the other delegates. Instead of opening a new epoch of liberty, the Vienna Congress destroyed what the French Revolution had accomplished. The interests of the ruling classes were victorious, and, instead of an era of national liberty, reactionary rule began, and the foundation of the Holy Alliance was laid.

In 1818, 1819, 1820, and 1822, intra-European Congresses took place, their only aim being to strengthen established governmental authorities and burn the remnants of the French Revolution. The Holy Alliance of the rulers in Russia, Austria, and Prussia, which was later joined by almost all other countries of Europe except England, was an alliance to guard the

interests of the old order. It was a counter-revolutionary connivance to turn back the wheels set in motion by the French Revolution.

But the awakened revolutionary spirit of humanity could not be subdued. The revolutionary flame could not be extinguished, and political and national revolutions spread from one end of the world to the other. The Greek war for independence from Turkey in the '20s had sympathy and support, even from Russia, which was always hostile towards Turkey. In its essence, the national-emancipation war was also a revolutionary war. It awakened the anger of humanity against the oppressors of weaker nations, and taught the world the new truth of national independence. Small wonder, then, that the great genius of that period, the English poet, Byron, was so inspired by the Greek revolution in which the principle of liberty triumphed.

In America, the year 1826 marked the end of Spanish rule. South America had been under the rule of Spain, as North America was formerly under the rule of England. Under the leadership of the famous South American patriot, Bolivar, the countries fought against Spain, and declared themselves free and independent republics. In South America, Bolivar played the same historic role as Washington in North America. In vain did the Holy Alliance threaten to come to the aid of Spain to suppress the uprising. The South American states, however, freed themselves of the Spanish yoke, and almost the entire continent became independent republics.

The Doctrine proclaimed by President Monroe in his message to Congress in 1825, was a great step forward in the direction of freedom and national autonomy on the American continent. Through the Monroe Doctrine, the United States declared that all republics and nations of America were free and that no European power dared interfere with them, for any attempt on the part of a European power to subdue any of the American nations would call forth an armed resistance on the part of the United States. Thus, not only was the principle of Americanism and the leadership of the United States on the American continent proclaimed, but also the principle of self-determination at large.

The July revolution of 1830 in France was the first revolutionary thunder amidst the reactionary Europe. The oppressed nations and the leaders and dreamers of independence eagerly accepted the challenge of the revolutionary calls of Paris. The July revolution created a new and free order in France, but

it also had a great influence on the revolutionary national awakening of the various European peoples. Belgium revolted against Holland with whom it was allied by force, and after a revolutionary struggle, proclaimed itself an independent state at its national congress on November 10, 1830. It also declared itself a constitutional monarchy, being supported by 170 votes as against 13. After much searching, a king was found for the throne in the person of Prince Leopold, who had previously refused to accept the Greek throne. Since then, Belgium remained a neutral state, guaranteed by all nations, including Germany, until the latter voided the "scrap of paper" when its army entered the supposedly inviolate boundaries in August, 1914.

The French Revolution served as stimulus to an uprising in Poland. Alexander I had given Poland something like a constitution, but Nicholas I abolished it almost entirely, leaving only its shadow. As soon as the news of the French Revolution spread, a great revolutionary movement appeared in Poland. In December, 1830, a revolutionary uprising took place which stirred the entire population. The Poles had hoped that England and France would come to their aid, and sent ambassadors to London and Paris. But England and France remained indifferent observers to this fruitless struggle for Polish independence. This unfortunate strife lasted more than a year and demonstrated Polish devotion but very little more. The Polish aristocracy which led the revolt, was not of a high caliber. Instead of promising freedom to the masses, thus cementing the nation for the revolutionary struggle, the national assembly at Warsaw occupied itself with such questions as the future boundaries of Poland. The revolutionary army was led by inefficient generals on whom suspicion of betrayal fell. The Czar's army soon entered Warsaw and the revolt was suppressed. Thus the last remnants of Polish independence disappeared. But this national uprising had an enormous influence on the further development of democracy and revolution in Europe. The escaped Polish revolutionists spread throughout Europe, and were the yeast of political and national revolts of other awakened nations.

In 1848 another revolution broke out in France and soon spread to central Europe, Germany and Austria. The political revolt called forth numerous struggles for national independence among the suppressed peoples. Under the leadership of Kossuth, the Hungarian people revolted against Austria and declared itself a free state, but thanks to the aid extended to

Austria by Alexander I, the Hungarian revolution was suppressed. But the final measure of national independence which Hungary achieved in spite of everything, originated in that national uprising.

Among the Slavic peoples of Austria, too, in the revolutionary year, a national emancipation movement began. In Prague a revolt broke out which attempted to gain independence for Bohemia. But the Slavic peoples in Austria, in their national struggle, had not elevated themselves to the height and understanding necessary for the achievement of national emancipation. They launched a counter-revolution which helped to maintain the old regime. The revolt in Prague was subdued with blood, and nothing more than a national memory remained of that struggle.

Oppressed and divided Italy also began the struggle for national emancipation and unity. Northern Italy revolted against foreign Austrian rule, finding support throughout Italy against the tyrants from both within and without. The great national revolutionary leaders, Mazzini and Garibaldi, conducted the battle which was, unfortunately, lost after two years; and on the ruins of the land the Austrian flag once more waved. The exiled pope, with the aid of European reactionaries, returned once more to Rome, and sat on the holy throne. Italian emancipation ended with defeat and embarrassment. But ever since that revolt a great hatred against all foreign oppressors and an everlasting national hope remained within the Italian people, never to be forgotten. Hopes were revived again even more passionately, ten years later.

In 1859, the Italians in their second war with Austria, now supported by France, achieved their real national independence. The emancipated Italian nation now entered the road to democratic social progress. Cultured humanity was enriched with another great nation which began to create human culture in its own independent manner.

CHAPTER V.

NATIONALISM AND SOCIALISM

The democratic bourgeoisie led the national struggle everywhere in accordance with its own material and spiritual class interests. The revolutionary Socialist proletariat, not much later, joined the struggle for national emancipation, for the reconstruction of humanity on the principles of free nationalities, and for amity among nations.

The attitude of Socialism towards nationalism was not as clear and as definite as was the attitude of democracy. While democracy raised the banner of national emancipation everywhere, the awakening proletariat, while conducting the class struggle within its own nation and accepting the principle of internationalism, maintained an indifferent, critical, or even unfriendly attitude towards the national emancipation movements. Gradually the international proletariat recognized the value of the national emancipation struggles, especially after a revolutionary proletariat rose among the oppressed nations and demanded admittance to the Internationale. Only after the World War did the international proletariat fully recognize the historical truth, that each nation had a right and a duty to determine its own path in history.

The Socialist proletariat appeared in the more or less advanced capitalistic countries of western Europe—in England, France, and later in Germany. Those capitalistically developed countries, however, were nationally independent. The proletariat of England, France, and Germany felt only the social pressure, the yoke of capitalism. The awakened revolutionary spirit of the proletariat, was, therefore, directed, not toward the problem of nationalism, but rather towards the class-struggle within the nation proper. The ideal of the awakened proletariat was not national emancipation, but international unity and the weakening of chauvinism and national isolation.

The first Socialists, and not the pre-Socialist philosophers such as Kant, Fichte, and Hegel, conceived the idea of a united humanity; to them it appeared, in their philosophical naivete, that the multitude of languages and nations were obstacles to a rational life. True, those first Socialists had no clear conception as to which language should replace the numerous unnecessary and harmful tongues, and which nation

should replace the many nations. The first Socialists, as Witting, Moses Hess (in the beginning of his activities), and, to a certain extent, Marx and Lassalle, toyed with the hazy idea of a cosmopolitan, uniform, and one-tongued humanity on an economic base of Socialism, in which all ethnographical and cultural differences would disappear. The "Communist Manifesto" of 1847 was imbued with this hazy cosmopolitanism.

Marx and Lassalle had moral justification for their hostility to nationalism. In the middle of the Nineteenth Century, the democratic revolutionary movement appeared in Europe, and was joined by the national revolutionary movement. The revolutions of 1848 were different in every country. In France it was partly democratic and partly proletarian; in Austria it was democratic and national. In the course of the revolution, national movements appeared among the Slavic peoples: the Ruthenians, Slovaks, Croats and Bosnians. But these small Slavic nations soon joined the reactionary movement which suppressed the revolution. Thanks to the counter-revolutionary forces of the Slavic peoples, the democratic uprising in Austria failed.

Marx, who was then a young man, was of the opinion that the backward Slavic people had no historical value or justification for national independence. The Russian revolutionary, Bakunin, agitated among and organized the Slavic peoples of Austria for a national revolt. In his opinion Austria was committing a great historical outrage in oppressing the Slavic peoples. He called upon the oppressed to destroy the Austrian rule. Marx, on the other hand, thought that the Slavs ought to assimilate with the culturally developed German people. In his earlier revolutionary period, he viewed all historical events from the standpoint of the ruling civilization and democracy. Thus, for example, he greeted the annexation of Mexican territory by the United States in the 1840's. The United States, according to Marx, was the bearer of civilization and culture, and, therefore, had a moral right, and perhaps, even a duty, to conquer and civilize the barbarian Mexican people whose national consciousness and independence had no value. He excepted the Poles, who had always revolted against their oppressors, and served as the dividing line between barbarian Russia and democratic Europe, and recognized their right to national independence.

Lassalle, too, in his early revolutionary activities, did not view the idea of national independence as absolute. He main-

tained that the Slavic peoples of the Balkans and Austria had no reason for their existence and that their only future was to assimilate with the great German nation. Like Marx, he recognized only the high civilized nations whom history had especially favored. Both of them failed to realize the underground, historical forces which elevate even a fallen people to the height and dignity of a nation.

The negative attitude maintained by the founders of Socialism to the national emancipation movements was not the result of an historic-philosophical conception, or the result of a scientific investigation. Rather, it was the result of lack of attention paid to national problems, a casual opinion that found support in casual observations. But new historical events soon placed the national problem in a new light, and called forth a different attitude from Marx and Lassalle. These new events began with the Italian War of 1859.

The Italian War against Austria was of international significance. It affected not only the interests of all west European nations, but also the entire European democracy and Socialism. A new problem arose: what should the attitude of democracy be towards this war for national emancipation? Lassalle issued his famous work, *The Italian War*. In it he declared for the first time in Socialist literature, that each nation that had not lost its historical consciousness or faith had a right to strive for national independence and for national development in accordance with the historical spirit of that nation. Lassalle declared that national emancipation was a prerequisite for democracy and Socialism. This same Lassalle, who in his youth dreamed of the acquisition of Palestine for the Jews but later estranged himself from the Jewish people and demanded that all smaller nations assimilate, finally recognized the great role of nations in the historical process.

The Italian War brought about a great change in Moses Hess. Hess, one of the founders of the Socialist philosophy, recast his views regarding the relation between nationalism and Socialism. Like Lassalle, he was close to the Jewish people in his early youth. The blood accusation of Damascus in the 1840's influenced both Lassalle and Hess. As years rolled by, Hess, like other Socialists of his time, preached the theory of a cosmopolitan humanity. The Italian War, however, produced a great change in him. In 1861 he published his famous book *Rome and Jerusalem, the Last National Problem*. It is a book on the Jewish national problem from the view-

point of radical philosophy and revolution. *Rome and Jerusalem* was not only a treatise on Socialist Zionism, but also on nationalism in general.

Another historical event occurred then which influenced Socialism to include in its program the emancipation of oppressed nations. This was the revolt of Poland against Russia in 1863. It was accepted by democrats and Socialists that Poland must become independent, so that it might serve as a buffer between despotic Russia and civilized Europe. Marx advocated the emancipation of Poland, for Poland through its revolutions had gained a right to its independence. The Polish Revolution caused much excitement among the revolutionary elements of Europe. The Internationale, organized by Marx, was greatly stimulated by the Polish Revolution, and the Internationale sent its greeting to the revolutionaries, and for many years it occupied itself with their problem.

Another event of historical importance served to fan anew flames of reactionary nationalism; at the same time, however, Marx and the Internationale were led to recognize the value of free nationalism. The Franco-Prussian War broke out in 1870, and after the impressive defeat of France, Germany remained supreme on the continent. The German victory gave birth to a chauvinistic spirit, the spirit of Bismarck, which placed might above right, and "Deutschland uber alles." Chauvinistic nationalism triumphed in Germany, and from there it soon spread across the European continent.

At the time of the Franco-Prussian War in 1871, Marx delivered an address before the Internationale, in which he proclaimed that justice and righteousness must exist among nations as well as among individuals. This the social revolution had to realize. For the first time, Marx recognized the rights of nations to historical development and self-determination; and veering from his former classification of "progressive" and "backward" peoples, he had declared all nations equal just as individual men are, irrespective of their rank and origin, in the legal-moral sense. The theory of nationalism was elevated by the founder of modern Socialism to an absolute principle.

As long as Socialism spread among only the west European nations, it remained indifferent to the national aspirations and hopes of oppressed peoples. The proletariat felt only its own economic need, and viewed with ignorance and, therefore, hostility, the national struggles of oppressed peoples.

Only when Socialism took the workers of the oppressed nations under its protection did its attitude towards nationalism change. Socialist movements among the oppressed people of eastern Europe formed in the 1890's. Socialist parties were founded among the Finns, Poles, Czechs, Latvians, Lithuanians, Slovaks, Ruthenians, Ukrainians, Jews, Armenians and Gruzians. These Socialists naturally shared a different attitude toward the national problem. The proletariat of an oppressed people cannot be indifferent to the need and historical fate of its own nation. It is true that at first, many Socialists of the oppressed nations were under the influence of cosmopolitanism and in order to make the internal class struggle more acute, excluded national struggle from its Socialist program. Socialists of other oppressed peoples, for example, the Jews, adopted a form of bourgeois nationalism by preaching assimilation with the ruling nation as the only Socialist solution to the national problem. But such cases were few. As soon as the Socialist movement became deeply enrooted among the masses, it united the social with the national struggle. The Socialist parties of oppressed peoples have everywhere included national emancipation as an integral part of their program. On the red banner of Socialism, "Social Equality" and "National Equality" were inscribed side by side.

As soon as Socialism found support among the oppressed nations, a new theory regarding nationalism was developed. As early as the 1880's, the great revolutionist and Socialist, Lavoisier, recognized the theoretical error of cosmopolitanism. In his *Nationalism and Socialism*, published in 1876, he declared that internationalism did not mean cosmopolitanism. To him, a cosmopolitan was an egotist who trust aside all responsibilities to his fellow men, while an internationalist had to demonstrate his sincerity by service. In the striving of a group to maintain its nationality, no conflict with Socialism existed. This view was a great step forward in clarifying the relationship between Socialism and nationalism.

The demoralization of the Austrian Empire influenced the Austrian Social-Democratic Party to include in its program the national reorganization and autonomy of the national minorities in the country. In 1899, the party convention proclaimed the principle of national autonomy, whereby each nationality within Austria was entitled to its own language, school, culture, and administration—in short, complete territorial autonomy. The Austrian Socialists were the first theorists of *progressive* nationalism, a nationalism which was

not only in harmony with internationalism, but also the prelude to it. Shpringer-Rener, a Socialist, developed a plan whereby national autonomy could be practiced in the nationally-mixed territories. Otto Bauer, in his book *The National Problem in the Social Democracy*, published in 1907, created the theory of modern nationalism. This theory was climaxed by the thought, that only under Socialism could a nation achieve its highest cultural individuality and perfection, and that only the Socialist organization of society would lead to the triumph of the principle of nationalism.

The Second Socialist Internationale recognized the national struggles of oppressed peoples and the national programs of the Socialist parties of such peoples. The structure and organizational forms of the Internationale proclaimed the equality of all nations, of the strong and of the weak, of the states and of the stateless, though this principle is still not inviolable, and in practice has not been followed to its final implications. The Internationale, however, became the revolutionary forum at which each oppressed nation was defended, and every form of national suppression was condemned.

It is true that Socialism has not, as yet, made peace everywhere with the principle of progressive nationalism. The Socialists of the ruling powers, did not, until the World War, recognize in their entirety the national demands of the weaker peoples. The national problem was recognized in Socialist literature as a necessary evil, and not as a problem of greatest historical and cultural importance. The Russian Social Democrats viewed the revolts of the oppressed minorities in the Russian Empire unfavorably. English Socialists have not as yet recognized the Irish nation. German Socialists were at heart indifferent to the great political and cultural struggle of oppressed nations. They fought the national organizational forms of the Czech Socialists. Many Socialists of oppressed peoples did not properly understand the historical earnestness and the cultural importance of national renaissance. This hostility and indifference was not a result of cosmopolitan views, but rather a result of the reactionary nationalism and imperialism with which some of the Socialists of the ruling powers were poisoned. Nationalism for its own people and cosmopolitanism for the weaker foreign peoples—this was the degrading philosophy of this type of Socialists. They refused to dispose of their national superiority and fought the national and social tendencies of the oppressed peoples. Many Socialists of oppressed peoples, such as the Jews, often imitated their

comrades of the powerful nations. As the saying goes, "The weak dance to the tune of the strong."

It is partly due to this indifferent attitude of the Socialists of the ruling nations toward the aspirations of the oppressed peoples, that the World War was made possible. Socialism as a proletarian "lebens anschauung" had not as yet fully assimilated the idea of national equality. The Socialists were partly victims of chauvinism and imperialism. This accounts for the war policy of the Austrian Social Democrats towards Serbia, and the attitude of the German Social Democrats to the World War.

Out of the War will appear a purified humanity and a new Socialism. The new Socialism will recognize the equality of all peoples and will lead them to a united international humanity.

CHAPTER VI.

THE INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE OF FREE NATIONS

The term "internationalism," like "nationalism," is liable to many conflicting interpretations. Its use calls to mind the negative elements of nationalism. It does not express a positive content; it is used, rather, to convey opposition to chauvinism, war, reaction, and often, though not openly, implies indifference or hostility to the problems and aspirations of nations. The positive content of the term has never been clarified.

The reason for the vagueness and misuse of the term "internationalism" is that there is no content in it other than that of "nationalism." Even the Greek term "cosmopolitanism," "world-citizenship," had no positive content save critique of the limitations of nationalism.

The ideal of universalism, cosmopolitanism, fraternity of nations, which was manifested in the higher religions and philosophies, had only a moral content and was awakening man to the fact that history can spell *human harmony*.

It is impossible, however, to introduce into the term "internationalism" a new ethnographical or psychological content to oppose that of "nationalism." How may internationalism oppose nationalism? By the fusion of all races, of all nations, of all cultures? Should it mean the union of the black, yellow, and white races—of the Negroes, Chinese, and Europeans? Such race-fusion would be unnatural and absurd, as well as destructive. If internationalism means the fusion of all nations, it certainly cannot mean the fusion of all nations of all races but only of the white race, especially of Europe. But even then, what is the meaning of the fusion of the Germans, French, English, Americans, Russians, Italians, and Jews into one nation? What new people would arise from this conglomeration? Should all assimilate with one stronger nation? Should all turn English, German, or Russian; or, should a new heterogeneous people be created, different from all the previous nations of the world? Which language would become the world language—one of the existing languages, or a new artificial tongue? And what will be the cultural characteristics of this new white nation? Whence will they originate, and in what form will they find expression? What will be the spirit, the temperament, the philos-

ophy, art, organization, will, and tradition of this new "universal" nation? Will this culture be created of nothing, or will it be an unfortunate conglomeration of all cultures? Or will it be, perhaps, a cultureless nation possessing only great material wealth?

No one has ever attempted to introduce into the term "internationalism" the idea of the abolition of nations and their fusion into one nation, because the concept of a new super-nation is contradictory and its value, negative and anti-cultural. Humanity would be impoverished spiritually and its creative forces would wither if the national characteristics, the various national wills and tendencies, disappeared.

It is true that a new, mixed nation has been formed in the United States, uniting and fusing many stocks into one. The immigrants who, during the Nineteenth Century, left England, Germany, and later, eastern Europe, have more or less abandoned their own nationality. In the beginning of the Nineteenth Century, America was organized by the English, and, the language, culture, and traditions of these new Americans, were naturally English. The later immigrants, partly because of need and partly because of desire, assimilated with the existing Anglo-Saxon communities, linguistically and culturally. The groups that entered America gave up their languages, cultures, and even their historical memories, primarily because they were non-organized minorities of diverse origin, and were on a very low cultural plane. Political liberty and economic opportunities wiped out the national identity of the immigrants who in their own homes were not in the center of national life. This international American melting pot was, therefore, no organic culture, but a mechanical civilization. But even in this land, national tendencies, the result of the cultural growth of the incoming masses, are noticeable.

In the modern times of international Socialism the new meaning of internationalism has gradually crystallized. The World War revolutionized attitudes toward the right of nations to exist, and through the horrors of war the human mind saw international harmony and eternal peace. The inviolability of each nation, irrespective of its size, power, or historical value, has become axiomatic during the course of the War. *The sacredness of nations, their absolute right to life, growth and equality—this is internationalism.*

Through the storm of the World War, the philosophic dreams and the moral desires of the Eighteenth Century have become living truths and realities. That which was proclaimed

by radical philosophy at the close of the Eighteenth Century is now being realized by the democratic world in the social and national life at the beginning of the Twentieth Century. The *selbst zweck* as well as the social nature of individuals was recognized by the philosophy of the Eighteenth Century. The German philosopher, Kant, expressed the philosophy of harmony between man, nation, and humanity.

Kant's moral principle was that man was not a tool for use by other men, but that each individual was an aim in himself. If this Kantian principle were applied to human society, society would be transformed from an individualistic to a Socialist form. Political servitude, economic exploitation, and social inequality are possible only when one man considers his fellow man a tool to be plied. Only in the Socialist society of equality will Kant's moral principle be realized. This principle must be applied to nations, that is, to the international league of nations.

The international league of nations, however, is possible only if humanity will become imbued with the principle that all nations must become free, and that states be organized accordingly. This means a thorough revision of the world map. The World War (if this war should really be the last world war, and thus compensate for the great crime which humanity perpetrated against life), may lead humanity to the realization of this principle and to the revision of territorial boundaries.

Present governments, with few exceptions, will have to be reorganized and their boundaries changed, in order to permit the formation of the free international league of nations. This principle of nationalism will have to be honored not only in Europe, but on all other continents where the influence of modern culture and revolutionary Socialism extends. Those nations which in the course of brutal history have been scattered among others nations, have no less right to territorial autonomy than the territorial nations. Nationalism means territorial autonomy—cultural autonomy is but a compromise with cold historical reality.

The principle of free nationalities also offers the absolute solution to the Jewish problem. So-called national autonomy is no solution to the problem of the Jewish people. National autonomy for the Jews means the right to its national language, school, community, and administration of its communal institutions. It is problematical, however, as to the extent that national autonomy would meet the real needs of

Jewish life. Should the Jewish people forever deny itself territorial independence, and should it everywhere unite its historic fate with that of the nations in which it resides?

The life of the Jews in the Galuth for nearly two thousand years has proved that the Jewish people cannot assimilate, cannot adapt itself entirely to the surrounding nations. The dispersion of the Jewish people among the ruling nations, always brings forth tragic contradictions into the life of the Jews and everlasting friction with the neighboring peoples. Jewish dispersion is a paradox for the Jews and a problem for the world. Nationalism to the Jewish people can mean only territorial autonomy. The principle of internationalism demands that the Jewish people be granted by the league of nations the rights and possibilities to build a free, Socialist republic in Palestine. This territorial autonomy for the Jewish people is in harmony with the highest ideals, hopes, and aspirations of the Jews, and is the only rational solution to the Jewish problem, which is also the world's problem.

Only the reorganization of humanity along the lines of Kant's moral principle will make internationalism possible and supply it with content. This internationalism is the league of all nations and the elevation of humanity over the individual states. Only through the application of the principle of nationalism to the international organization of autonomous states is lasting, eternal peace possible. Humanity, which until now was a moral, historic ideal, will become a political, social reality. Only within a united humanity is war illogical, as well as legally impossible. Wars will lose their present moral-legal grounds and their causes will be removed.

The international league of nations as a legal, political organ, will control and administrate all those points on the globe which are of international importance. Thus, for example, Constantinople, the Dardanelles, the Suez Canal, Gibraltar, Aden, and the Panama Canal cannot remain under the control of one nation, but must be under the wing of the international league of the nations. The true Internationale will also create a new international code of laws to regulate the relationships between the nations.

Internationalism is the road to Socialism. As long as people do not recognize the rights of each and every nation, they cannot realize in each separate society the social equality of all men or the abolition of capitalism. How can the proletariat of one nation fight against capitalism, when it is ready to unite with its ruling class to suppress another, weaker nation

—when it does not recognize the rights and independence of other nations? *The working class cannot be revolutionary in class relationships and reactionary in its dealings with other nations.* The weakness of Socialism until now was that the proletariat of the ruling powers had neither interest in nor understanding of the oppressed peoples. The proletariat of the ruling powers, seeking to deny and criticize the national demands of the oppressed peoples, used and misused the phraseology of “internationalism,” which to it was a proletarian form of chauvinism and imperialism. The World War was ushered in when the unsound forms of internationalism and Socialism went bankrupt.

The principle of free nationalism must be proclaimed as holy and inviolate, for only free nationalism makes internationalism possible, and internationalism is the prelude to Socialism .

1917

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN - UNIV LIBS



3034913858

0 5917 3034913858

Price:
Thirty Cents

Printed in U.S.A.



Published by
Young Poale Zion Alliance
of America
1225 Broadway
New York, N. Y.