

ception of history to mere "economic materialism" or, more appropriately, "territorial materialism", according to which an economic or, say, territorial factor "operates of its own accord, without the intervention of man", negating the role of the social relations forgetting that economic relations are themselves "a function of the social productive forces." Borochov denies the Jews their very history; the history of class struggle, the Jewish modes of social relations they have entered in the process of procuring their means of subsistence for centuries, and the developmental effects of this process. He therefore implicitly suggests that the social being of Jews has historically remained constant, determined merely by a single factor--ex-territorialization, indicating not the slightest comprehension of dialectical materialism. This richness of Jewish history, scientifically documented in Leon's Marxist interpretation of the Jewish question, points to the limitations of Borochov's utterly undialectical materialist conception of history. By way of contrast with him, Leon interprets the Jewish question and the rise of Zionism by going much deeper into Jewish history to explain why the Jewish masses are overwhelmingly petty bourgeois, that is, how the inverted pyramid-like structure emerged, a point that Borochov starts with but never explains.

To give an example of how Jewish history can be accurately analyzed, let us examine Leon's study as summed up by Nathan Weinstock:

"Proceeding from Marx's comments on the fact that the secret of Jewish survival resides in Jewish history, Leon developed his concept of the people-class as the key to Jewish history. It is the role fulfilled by the Jews during their history which provides the explanation of their survival as a distinct community. Analyzing the successive economic functions assumed by the Jews in the pre-capitalist era, under manufac-