

nates firstly, deforming the conditions of production, hence the resulting incompatibility with the state of the production forces.

All these factors operate, in Borochoy's conception, independently from the relations of production; the latter has relevance only to the class conflict, which is in turn obscured by the absence of territory.

Although Borochoy's characterization of the Jewish socio-economic structure and the peculiar effects of capitalist development on the Jewish masses are accurate indeed, his analysis of these characteristics is the inverse of historical materialism. The "conditions of production" concept that Borochoy claims to invent is a distorted version of the Marxist concept of "conditions of material life of society", i.e., the social being from which men's consciousness arises. Although initially influenced by natural environment, these conditions are explicitly viewed in historical and dialectical materialism to be determined by the method of procuring the material means of subsistence that is the mode of production of material values indispensable for the existence and reproduction of society. The mode of production corresponds to a state of social productive forces at the disposal of society and the relations of production in a given historical conjuncture. This is to say, social productive forces are not a function of these conditions but their very determinants.⁴⁷ He employs not the materialist conception of history but, rather, the theory of factors "which dismembers the activity of social man and pictures its various aspects and manifestations as distinct forces that supposedly determine the historical movement of society."⁴⁸ Borochoy commits a profound mistake in claiming that his conception of the Jewish question derives from historical materialism while reducing the materialist con-