

NECESSITY AND PLEASURE: THE SPECULATIVE HISTORIOSOPHIC THEORY OF ZEEV JABOTINSKY

Daniel Galily

Dean of Students Affairs, Los Angeles University, Department of Humanities & Social Science, Beijing Geely University, China.

ABSTRACT: *Jabotinsky is the ideological father and founder of the Zionist Revisionist Movement (from the word 'revision' – re-observation) in the Jewish world of the first half of the 20th century. The movement expressed a right liberal ideology, against the ideology of the socialist movement. In the framework of his desire to create an alternative ideology to Marxism, primarily for the national Jewish movement, Jabotinsky decided to write a historiosophical review as a substitute for the historical materialism of Marx that appeared in Marx's book Capital: Critique of Political Economy in his article from the year 1938 titled "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy". He saw his approach to the historical materialism of human society as progress driven by psychological motives (from an evolutionary source) created following the person's desires to live his life beyond the desire for survival, which he called 'pleasure', 'entertainment', and 'luxury', in which there is the motive of 'kingship'. In other words, the person desires to be a king himself over a certain amount of property and aspires always to broaden the areas of his kingship, or in other words, the area of his livelihood (the amount of his property and the areas of his responsibility, abilities, and influences).*

KEYWORDS: Israel Studies, Zionism, Israeli politics, Zionist Revisionist Movement, Zeev Jabotinsky, Philosophy of History, Economic History, Political History, Economic Philosophy, Political Philosophy.

INTRODUCTION

The historian, by his very professional definition, has the role of describing historical events in the framework of his aspiration to present the facts of the human past. The philosopher of history sees himself following his professional definition as a person whose role it is to help the reader understand history. Namely, his role is not only to describe the past but also to explain it and reveal its meaning.

The philosopher can direct his attention towards the historical past and can philosophize about it. But he can also look at the work of historians, at their ways of investigation and description of the historical past, and philosophize about it. The first is the speculative philosophy of history, and the second is the analytical (critical) philosophy of history.

In other words, there is a distinction between the speculative philosophy of history, which builds theories of the past, and the critical philosophy of history, which studies the work of historians and attempts to reveal the methodological principles at its basis, through the analysis of the historians' language. Since the topic of the present research study addresses a theory on speculative historiography, we will discuss this issue in greater detail.

The 'speculative' philosopher of history attempts to build a philosophy of history. He looks at the process of the events that occurred in the past and seeks to reveal the fundamental laws that apply to and direct the historical development.

Thus, he believes that the discovery of the historical laws enables him to also predict the future. Hence, the research field of 'history' constitutes the understanding not only of the past but also of the present and the future.

The objective of the research arguments is to determine the general pattern or general format of the historical development in human society. Thus the purpose is to show the character of this development in terms of providing a purpose and meaning for the entire historical process.

The speculative philosopher of history generally anchors his theory in general metaphysical considerations on the nature of the universe and on the person's place in it. Such theories of study are sometimes called 'meta-historical' ('meta' in Greek means 'on' or 'about' and/or 'beyond').

Examples can be found in the speculative historiosophic theory of Hegel, who believed that the historical process is fundamentally spiritual and leads according to a certain pattern towards full liberty; in the theory of Marx, who maintained that in history economic factors and laws are dominant and society develops towards a communist society; and in the theory of Toynbee, who asserted that a certain psychological mechanism is what determines the rise and fall of civilizations.

Karl Marx, in his book *Capital – Critique of Political Economy* from the year 1867 presented a historiosophical theory titled 'historical materialism'. After his death, the approach was broadened and developed by thousands of academic research studies as an explanatory system and became a milestone on the path to the modern Communist doctrine.

According to this idea, history develops according to the main mode of production in society. In the first stage, society was composed of hunters and gatherers. People did not influence nature. In the second stage, society became agrarian: they manipulated nature, while in the third stage, society became industrial and the manipulation of nature increased significantly. Industrial economy created a tremendous change in people's life routine (urbanization).

Marx saw that in every stage there was a class that exploited and a class that was exploited. Ancient society had the master and the slave, feudal society had the lord and the serf, and industrial society has the capital owner/bourgeoisie and the worker/proletariat.

The supra-structure is the second facet of historical materialism. It comes to maintain the basis – the production relations. The supra-structure is the structure of society and the cases that influence it. It is composed of laws, nationalism, ideology, media, religion, and every other factor that distracts the subject (the proletarian) from the real truth that he is exploited. The supra-structure today creates needs and provides them and thus distracts society from the exploitation of the production relations.

The theory of Marx greatly influenced the Jewish socialist movements that were established in the first half of the 20th century, such as the Bund, MAPAM, MAPAI, and so on. These groups saw Marxist ideology, which included historical materialism, to be the ideological basis of their outlook in legal, political, economic, and social aspects.

As a response to the socialist ideology that controlled the political and social discourse of the international Jewish organizations in the first half of the 20th century, a liberal Jewish philosopher called Zeev Jabotinsky aspired to formulate an alternative historical materialism that would suit the liberal-economic idea.

Vladimir (Zeev) Jabotinsky was the ideological philosopher of the secular right in the Land of Israel and in the Jewish communities around the world. His philosophy still has dominant importance over the philosophy of Jewish intellectuals today throughout the world¹. The present research study will examine his mode of reference to the topic in the economic field.

Jabotinsky is the ideological father and founder of the Zionist Revisionist Movement (from the word ‘revision’ – re-observation) in the Jewish world of the first half of the 20th century. The movement expressed a right liberal ideology, against the ideology of the socialist movement.

From the age of fifteen, he was known as a gifted journalist, poet, author, and translator. He was recognized as an intellectual of the first order. During his life he wrote thousands of articles, books, poems, speeches, and letters that influenced not only the Revisionist movement and its continuations but also gradually the entire Zionist movement.

According to his writings, Jabotinsky saw that the Jewish socialist movement, which at that time was at the head of the Jewish national movement, implements in the field the national Jewish ideology and builds Jewish communities, including institutions, economy, and a fighting force. However, he identified that the Jewish socialist movements acts according to the philosophy of the ideological philosopher Karl Marx in the construction of the Jewish state. Namely, they were reinforcing the working class until there would be a class war with the bourgeoisie, after which the expectation was that a dictatorship of the proletariat would be constructed and would create absolute equality between the classes in the population².

Jabotinsky maintained that it is impossible to integrate Jewish nationalism and socialist ideology that negates nationalism and demands national equality. Jabotinsky called the political-ideological ideas of the Jewish socialist groups ‘shatnez’, the Yiddish word that means a mixture of things that do not mix.

Jabotinsky argued that the anthropological perception and assumptions of socialization on human nature are erroneous. The approach of the Soviet Revolution, which calls for the elimination of private property and socialization of the means of production, will result in a dead end. The reason is the absence of an individual foundation in the supra-objectives of socialism. Therefore, the wheel will turn back and on the basis of a broad consensus the legislation and changes with a socialist character will be cancelled.

According to Jabotinsky, the attempt in Russia is therefore empirical proof that the aspiration innate in people for private ownership of assets, including the means for ensuring the livelihood, is unavoidable. This refers to the means of production. Individualism, which leads to the striving for personal benefit and personal property, is considered a power that motivates economic activity in human society.

¹ Bela Moshe, *The World of Jabotinsky: A Selection of His Statements and the Main Tenets of His Doctrine*, Tel Aviv: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel, 1972, p. 335.

² Jabotinsky, Zeev, May 1931. “Memo to the Worker Committee of the General Worker Union”, In: *Jabotinsky Zeev, Letters to Different People* (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

Jabotinsky held that socialism is found disqualified from every aspect. It contradicts human nature, and its dialectic alternative to capitalism is not a historical inevitability. Moreover, its damage is dual: it erodes the unity of the nation and concurrently misleads the nation and shifts it from the path it should go on and when this is realized, it shapes for itself life, which is boredom, passiveness, and stagnation. In other words, socialism is not possible, it is not necessary, and it is not desirable.

It is possible to see in his writings that Jabotinsky argued that **“the individual is the supreme creation of nature ... the State needs to serve the individual and not the opposite³⁴”**. According to the outlook of Judaism, as he interpreted it, only immortality separates between the individual and God. Hence, he concluded that a person **“is intended to be free”** and **“only in exceptional cases is it permissible to make him a part of the mechanism”³⁵**.

RESEARCH LITERATURE

In the research literature that investigates the history and philosophy of the liberal philosopher Zeev Jabotinsky, there are two researchers who discussed his historiosophical theory as a part of broader research studies of his philosophy in other areas – Raphael Beilsky and Reuven Shoshani. The research works of these two researchers raised the following research arguments.

The Nature of Man – The Proprietary-Individual Connection. There is no modern ideological structure that does not entail an assumption on the issue of human nature. One of the most common criticisms – and perhaps the most common criticism – holds onto his argument that the anthropological perception of socialism and its assumptions on human nature are erroneous. Until the occurrence of the Soviet Revolution, the supra-goals of socialism were the elimination of private property and the socialization of the means of production.

Two fundamental factors stood at the basis of the failure of the socialist revolution in Russia. The first factor attributes the absolute absence of success to every attempt of a socialist revolution that will be undertaken in conditions similar to the Russian conditions of our time. The second is the profound crisis of the national industrialized sector.

Jabotinsky attempts to erode the validity of Karl Marx’s historical materialism as equivalent to the erosion of the elements of the structure of the Marxist doctrine. This is the removal of the scientific basis of historical materialism.

He argues that in human nature the drives of ‘necessity’ are also characteristic of other organisms, plants and animals, while the drives of ‘pleasure’, the dominant drives, are unique to the person. Man differs from animal in the drives of ‘pleasure’. Human civilization, in its infinite cultural indications, is the product of the drives of ‘pleasure’. This drive is a main factor

³ Bela Moshe, *The World of Jabotinsky: Collection of His Statements and the Main Tenets of His Doctrine*, Tel Aviv: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel, 1972, p. 67.

⁴ Shoshani, Reuven, *Anatomy of a Critique of Socialism in Jabotinsky*, In: Avi Bareli and Pinchas Ginosaur (eds.). *Man in the Storm: Essays and Researches on Zeev Jabotinsky*, Beer Sheva: The Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2004, pp. 93-119.

⁵ Shoshani, Reuven, *Anatomy of a Critique of Socialism in Jabotinsky*, In: Avi Bareli and Pinchas Ginosaur (eds.). *Man in the Storm: Essays and Researches on Zeev Jabotinsky*, Beer Sheva: The Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2004, pp. 93-119.

in the shaping of human history and should be considered as the creator of culture and civilization, which is built on the person's aggressive nature.

Man by nature is forced to constantly broaden and increase his circle of experiences and areas of rule. It is obvious that this fundamental assumption necessarily provides the ultimate justification for the private appropriation of material possessions, The individual's personality, by nature and essence, suits both the horizons of power classes and the social order established on private property. In this context, Shoshani notes that Jabotinsky apparently in the anti-materialist aspect draws from Croce and without a doubt most of all from the philosophy of Nietzsche.

‘Necessity and Pleasure’: The Historical Materialism of Zeev Jabotinsky

To understand Jabotinsky's liberal-economic outlook on human nature, it is necessary to perform an in-depth analysis of the article titled “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy” published in the year 1938 in London in a journal titled *HaMetzuda* (The Citadel) on the structure and significance that constituted a theoretical basis of his political, economic, and social doctrine.

As known, Jabotinsky objected to the main principles in Marx's theory but saw Marx as worthy of admiration in terms of the philosophical method he invented in his literature, called ‘historical materialism’, for the research of society, economy, and history. In contrast, Jabotinsky held that Marx's materialism did not examine the psychological motives for human development, a field called in the academic literature ‘psycho-history’⁶.

“The ‘laws’ determined by Marx, most were refuted in the meantime, such as the theory that value is based on work, the concentration of capital, the proletarianization of the masses, the class structure of society, the ‘unfitness’ of capitalism to regulate the production and the division of the ‘assets’ and the innocent ‘materialism’ without balance.”

“However, Marxism as a method of inquiry – the dialectic approach to the clarification of history, the relation between the historical phenomena and the production means – all this still is helpful and considerably. I have no objection that the viewpoint expressed in this book be defined as psycho-Marxism or as psycho-historical materialism.”⁷

Jabotinsky, as the opposition of the Jewish Marxist movements, understood that if he wants to create an alternative cognitive basis for Marxism then he must develop his own alternative historical-materialistic doctrine that seeks to find the motivating powers of all human history to an extent similar to the doctrine developed by Karl Marx in his book *Critique of the Political Economy*, in which he argued that history is driven by economic forces according to different periods, from the period of the person as a hunter-gatherer, through the agrarian society, to industrial society.⁸

The field that Jabotinsky addressed is called today in the academic world ‘speculative historiosophy’ or ‘speculative philosophy of history’. This field endeavors to look at all human history and the events in it from ‘a bird's eye view’ and to find the laws that explain all of

⁶ Eliezer Weinrib, *Historical Thinking: Chapters in the Philosophy of History*, The Open University Press, Ramat Aviv, 1987, p. 104.

⁷ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938. “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In *The Articles of Jabotinsky* (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

⁸ Marx, Karl, 1867. *Capital: Critique of Political Economy*, Tel Aviv, Publisher Sifriat HaPoalim 1953.

human history and to find the powers that drive it. This field of science shapes the outlook behind the historical writing and the trends and directions of the historian. However, this field influences additional areas, such as economics, society, law, and so on⁹.

Jabotinsky, when he went to develop his historical-materialistic theory, saw that other speculative historiosophical theories note that there are people and/or phenomena considered 'exceptional' in history, or in other words, the theories are not valid for them. However, Jabotinsky maintained that these theories did not constitute sufficiently inclusive ideas that could create in them all of human history. Therefore, it is necessary to create a more comprehensive and therefore more correct meta-historical theory.

*"These passages are of a special kind: they are the places that the classic authors saw a need to 'have reservations' at certain points: they noted that there exist phenomena of secondary import that appear to contradict their doctrines and excused them using the convenient saying that 'the exceptions prove the rule'. In a few cases, perhaps these exceptions were forced to suit the general schema, and I argue that frequently the reservations included the fundamental and truly decisive facts, not the 'exceptions' but the opposite, the main data in the situation of things; and these data are what should be built upon a new economic and social doctrine, in light of the course of development in recent years."*¹⁰

Necessity and Pleasure

Like Marx, who identified certain factors in history, such as the power of production and means of production that motivate them, Jabotinsky identified factors in history that drive human history, and he called them 'necessity' and 'pleasure'. However, unlike Marx, Jabotinsky believed that the factors that drive human history are connected more to the activity of all living creatures.

*"The activity of every living thing, the purpose is at all times to provide satisfaction of some need; however, the concept of need includes two elements that are fundamentally different and independent of one another, necessity and pleasure."*¹¹

In contrast to the historiosophical philosophers who preceded him, Jabotinsky believed that the factors that drive history are innate, not found from the ancient era of humanity but inherent in the development of the human organism, which expresses the evolutionary aspect in Jabotinsky's materialism. Jabotinsky described the element of 'necessity' as the nature of defense against the danger of destruction. In other words, this is the essential need for basic existence. In contrast, he described the element of 'pleasure' (also called 'entertainment') as the acts of aggression that have the purpose of broadening the area of life beyond the level of necessity for the achievement of survival and the achievement of satisfaction that is not essential to survival.

"Without speaking with absolute accuracy, it is possible to say that actions of the type of 'necessity' have the character of defense: the organism seeks a defense against the danger of destruction, full or complete, this is a struggle for the fundamental biological minimum of

⁹ E Eliezer Weinrib, *Historical Thinking: Chapters in the Philosophy of History*, The Open University Press, Ramat Aviv, 1987

¹⁰ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938. Introduction to the Theory of the Economy, In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Press in Israel).

¹¹ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

survival in life. Actions of the type of 'entertainment' are acts of aggression; they are not a truly essential condition for survival in life (an infant can grow in diapers) – here the 'need' is of a different type: this is the drive to produce much of the forces and the possibilities found in the organism, to broaden the area of life, to achieve satisfaction that can be given up without the risk of destruction, except that they provide the organism with the addition of satisfaction beyond the essential minimum."¹²

To clarify the argument, Jabotinsky gave an example of an infant's crying. He maintains that the infant's behavior constitutes an expression of these two factors: when an infant cries, he seeks the basic needs for his existence and survival but sometimes he will laugh as a result of receiving satisfaction that is beyond his basic needs.

"An infant in his cradle, when he moves his limbs or makes different noises with his mouth, can be voicing two different drives. Sometimes he intends to ask for food or to complain about physical discomfort, sometimes he is 'just' moving his feet or gurgling and vocalizing. These two forms of activity are expressed as a response to a certain need, but in the first case this is necessity and in the second case this is pleasure. The typical difference is that the infant cries when he does an action of the first type (necessity) and laughs in the second case (pleasure)."¹³

Jabotinsky identified that the cause of the 'pleasure', which is considered a relatively later factor in evolutionary terms, is expressed in the person's activity from the beginning of human history. He identifies the expression of a factor in the most initial stages of humanity in Africa.

"However, the person's activity is the field, where he perceives the stimulus (necessity) as truly decisive. Even in the lowest stages of civilization – the bushmen, the dwarves in Central Africa, the Hottentots, the person puts forth most of his efforts in the pursuit of things, which do not belong to any necessity of defense for the purpose of survival in life he knows decoration, song, celebration."¹⁴

Jabotinsky identified part of the forms of the factor of pleasure as spiritual forms such as prayer and song, these are activities not intended for the person's basic livelihood but are additional actions for enjoyment. Moreover, Jabotinsky saw the source of the concept of the 'soul' as the product of the different actions of enjoyment called 'pleasure' and/or 'entertainment'.

"The higher forms of pleasure are of course purely 'spiritual' or nearly so; they are expressed in song, prayer, the solution of abstract problems, but knowledge allows that the shared line are both for the material forms of the activity (entertainment) and the 'spiritual' forms. This is the 'focus' of all the drives of the type of (entertainment), its place is not in the stomach or in the skin's nerves but in that object without clear borders called the psyche."¹⁵

Jabotinsky described the factor of 'pleasure' as satisfaction beyond the biological minimum of survival. In other words, the expression is not found in actions in which people think about the satisfaction of their needs for survival to live and to exist only until the next day but also in

¹² Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

¹³ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

¹⁴ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

¹⁵ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

additional actions that are created when there is no everyday concern for the livelihood and the person can provide additional needs for the purpose of enjoyment.

Moreover, Jabotinsky saw the factor of 'pleasure' not only as a tool for the satisfaction of slight and momentary needs but also as a factor that expresses the entire scientific and spiritual development of human history. Hence, he asserted that the desire for 'pleasure' constitutes the human drive for discoveries beyond daily survival.

*"To focus on the utmost importance of the principle (entertainment) in human life, first it is necessary to separate the lexicographic instruction of the word 'pleasure', which brings to mind light entertainment, something fluffy and not serious. In the meaning given to the word here, it (if it is possible to say) is its true scientific meaning, pleasure is every effort aimed at any goal beyond the biological minimum of survival in life; and it is clear that these goals frequently have excessive importance or seriousness."*¹⁶

As an example, Jabotinsky brings the phenomenon of the wandering of the Jews from Eastern Europe to the United States. He claims that Jews in Eastern Europe had enough elements that would help them in the minimal survival in their lives and in their children's lives (which represent the factor of 'necessity') but some of them sought to satisfy additional needs beyond the minimal survival and decided to emigrate to the United States (which represents the factor of 'pleasure').

*"A typical example can be found in the phenomenon that we are accustomed to seeing primarily as the results of a 'threatening necessity' of purely material pressure: I mean the phenomenon of wandering. About thirty years ago, when the entry of immigrants to America was freely permitted, it was possible to see in each one of the districts filled with population in East Europe the following contradiction: two equally poor neighbors, both devoid of any hope of improving their situation in the place, but in the end, only one of them went to America, while the other, his neighbor, remained in his place of residence."*¹⁷

Since science serves as an inclusive expression for artistic creation and scientific research, which are an expression of pleasure, Jabotinsky reached the conclusion that as civilization advances and human society is less and less dependent on the satisfaction of needs for survival alone, the factor of 'pleasure' surmounts the factor of 'necessity'.

*"From the first beginnings of material luxury until song, religion, and that called science the fact that a living creature that does not do acts of the type of 'necessity' may be destroyed while it is possible to live a life without any action of the type of 'entertainment' - this fact does not mean that the role of (necessity) in the group activity of humanity has greater importance than the role of the principle (necessity). Rather, as the stage of civilization is higher, the advantage of the status of (entertainment) as opposed to (necessity) is prominent."*¹⁸

Jabotinsky maintained in his conclusion that ancient man focused on the motive of 'necessity', which means the achievement of the basic means of subsistence for survival. Hence, modern

¹⁶ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

¹⁷ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

¹⁸ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

human civilization is created because of the desire for pleasure. In other words, it is the result primarily of the motive of entertainment.

“It is possible to say with nearly complete accuracy: generally the civilization is primarily the result of the stimulus (entertainment) and only very slightly the result of necessity. People are completely devoid of stimulus (entertainment) would eat raw meat, some would sleep on the floors of caves, they would not know dancing, and not a hammer or in other words: they would be inferior to animals and equal to plants.”¹⁹

Nevertheless, a main part of the principle of ‘pleasure’ is the spiritual activity undertaken for enjoyment. In material terms, Jabotinsky maintains that the main expression of the principle of ‘pleasure’, considered natural in every person, is the accumulation of wealth or alternatively ‘luxuries’.

“What is called spiritual activity is purely pleasure. The relation between religious worship and dance is known in all its needs; nearly certainly that of the aspirations of the type of pleasure, the most typical one, is the aspiration considered regularly the most material one: I mean the accumulation of wealth.”²⁰

Essential Needs and Luxuries

Jabotinsky, when he goes to explain the theory, writes that in every period there are motives called ‘essential needs’ and ‘luxuries’. From ancient times, before the appearance of the factor of ‘pleasure’, in times that Marx called ‘primitive communism’, man lived according to the motives of ‘necessity’. Man in ancient years was a hunter-gatherer and his sole task in life was to hunt food for himself and for his family, to fulfill the essential needs so as to survive day after day in a difficult and challenging environment.

As stated, according to Jabotinsky, in every period the factor of ‘necessity’ exists as essential needs that must be obtained so as to survive, while the motive of ‘pleasure’ exists as a luxury that is not considered an essential item for survival but rather an additional item that exists for enjoyment. Hence, he maintained that in every period there is an invention that is intended to develop the ‘pleasure’ that is not widely disseminated and is considered expensive and with time this expensive item is more widely disseminated and becomes an essential need.

“In the pre-historical, most distant days of yore there was a first period, when truly a person lived when he heeded only the drives of defense of the raw necessity as it is. Then there comes a moment and in distraction the person allowed the raw meat to be burned but he needed to eat it and when he put it into his mouth he found that the meat was good. It is possible that when he got lost on the way home to the stone floor in his cave, he needed to sleep on the grass and he found that it is soft. If in this case the person was gifted in imagination, at the beginnings of logic and initiative (in other words, what we would call today a genius) then a second time he repeated the experiment but intentionally, he cooked in fire the meat he had and he spread grass in the cave. His neighbors who had gathered around when they wondered at his strange behavior called this a ‘luxury’ in the beginning from hatred and disgust and then from jealousy and at last began to imitate him, and in a few generations cooked meat and a soft bed were the

¹⁹ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

²⁰ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

custom, and the lack of these luxuries was considered a 'sad life'. Certainly in the person's awareness the fact that this is a special sorrow was not abandoned and is not so terrible as the lack of food; nevertheless the person was already willing to dedicate further effort to acquire these luxuries, and to put his life at stake to defend them against anybody who would attack them. The 'luxuries' of yesterday had achieved a status of respect of one of the necessary needs of life, and the desire for them imposed its authority on the person equally for every initial and fundamental need."²¹

Jabotinsky concluded that human progress is expressed in the transformation of products and services, considered luxury, to essential needs. In other words, the transition from one period to another, which is considered more advanced, expressed the transformation of customs considered prestigious and rare to widespread, to a level that they are considered as a part of life of every person.

*"In our time, even the poorest of people would not consider eating raw meat or a raw potato. To protect against the cold he will not use a piece of skin or woven cloth, but would want something cut and sewn, and not in the form of a sack with holes but in the form of a coat and pants. He does not sleep on the floor, and not on a rug, but on a bed; his seat is not a box but a piece of furniture with a special form, called a chair. Every one of these inventions is now found among the essential and most simple needs of acceptable existence. However, there was a time when each one was born as a luxury item."*²²

He maintained that until the start of the 20th century the dominance of the motive of 'luxury' in people's everyday life reached a high level, until the situation that 90% of the products used by people are 'luxuries', in other words, they are products that a person can survive without, and 10% are essential products, products that ancient man would not survive without. Hence, Jabotinsky clarified that the concept of 'luxuries' is relative to each and every period and that what was considered a 'luxury' in a certain period becomes an essential product in another period.

*"In the sum of the goods that are 'essential' for the person in our time – including those goods that are purely material – is every element that is a real primordial need, this is already taken from its place by a broad group of 'luxuries'. We shall not exaggerate, in my opinion, if we say that already in our time the industry all around the world, 90% of it, is busy in the manufacture of elements that are 'luxuries' and only 10% in the supply of truly essential things – the things without which man cannot survive in life. In agriculture, without a doubt, we will not find such a surprising proportion between these two types; however, even here, the areas of land, capital, and work dedicated to the raising of sugar cane, golden apples, tobacco, or flowers are steadily overtaking the border of the part of these three factors dedicated to the raising of grains, despite the fact that once there were princes and kings who never dreamed of such things."*²³

"Many of the forms of the luxuries have already become bodily habits: frequently we are certain that without them we would be destroyed, like without food or without protection from the cold. However, this is but an illusion: the most pampered of the multimillionaires, if he

²¹ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

²² Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher; Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

²³ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

would be marooned on the desert island of Robinson Crusoe, would survive in life, if he is young and healthy. From this perspective, our bodily practices do not have profound roots in the body itself; the source of the power of the luxuries is in our imagination alone. The manufacturing activity of human society works in this way to steadily provide satisfaction of our purely psychic 'needs': if we want to adopt cynical language, we can call them 'caprices', which are indeed ancient and have deep roots."

*"For the purpose of the discussion in this book, namely, we note that the word 'luxury' can be used (this is clear) in a relative manner and in an absolute manner. 'Luxury' in the relative sense is a concept related to the different conditions of place, time, and status: for the black man from the country of Botswana, a pair of shoes is a luxury, and he is very proud of them, while for the business man in Chicago even a car is not a 'luxury' and his wife demands from him a second car, since she really must have one. As long as you hear the word 'luxury' in regular speech, the intention is the relative sense."*²⁴

Psycho-Historical Materialism

The attempt to adjust psychoanalytic theories or any other psychological theory to the explanation of human history is called in the literature 'psycho-history'. This field, which was first studied by the founder of psychoanalysis Sigmund Freud and his students, was very important in the historical research towards the middle of the 20th century. The American historian William Langer even maintained in the year 1957 to the Association of Historians in the United States that psycho-history is the next task of historians²⁵²⁶.

It is possible to see in this article that Jabotinsky in the 1930s was among the first to identify the importance of this field of research. He even used it in the attempt to create historical materialism, according to the structure of methodology of Marx, but based on psychological principles for the explanation of the behavior of people in human society throughout history.

Jabotinsky concluded that human history is not driven by the influence of only the spiritual motive of the person as Hegel maintained (a motive that appears in every period that Hegel called the 'spirit of the time' – *Zeitgeist*)²⁷ and is not driven by the influence of the manufacturing forces alone as argued by Marx. The progress is determined according to the reciprocal relations between these two motives. The large presence of psychological motives caused him to describe his doctrine as 'psycho-historical materialism'.

"History (as it is reasonable to think) is not the result of one single idea factor, as in Hegel's opinion, and not of one single material factor as in Marx's opinion. History is the result of reciprocal activity between two fundamental drives, which are independence, (necessity) and (entertainment), which both have roots in human nature equally."

"The two drives are interwoven and intermingling at all times in one another, at all times they act and respond to one another, thus there are phenomena of border, where the two stimuli are mixed in one another. Moreover, there is no doubt that the drives that heed the stimulus

²⁴ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

²⁵ Eliezer Weinrib, Historical Thinking: Chapters in the Philosophy of History, The Open University Press, Ramat Aviv, 1987, p. 104.

²⁶ William Langer, "The Next Assignment", American Historical Review, Vol. 63 (1957), pp.283-304.

²⁷ George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, 1807, "Phenomenology of the Spirit", Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2001.

(entertainment) are realized more easily in periods when the equilibrium of the masses are disrupted, because of economic difficulties that act on the part of the (necessity) factor."²⁸

Lack and Entertainment

After he clarified the material elements that drive human history ('necessity' and 'essential needs') and the spiritual elements ('pleasure' and 'luxuries'), Jabotinsky shows the expression of these concepts in the economic aspect. From the economic viewpoint, Jabotinsky translates the two factors, 'necessity' and 'pleasure', and the two motives, 'essential needs' and 'luxuries', into economic concepts: 'lack' and 'entertainment'. Returning to the example of the infant, Jabotinsky describes the infant's two actions so as to clarify to the reader the nature of the two motives in human behavior.

The first motive is expressed in the noise and effortful physical movements of the infant when he is hungry. It is certainly possible to say that this is an action that the infant felt is necessary to satisfy his basic needs that derived from lack. The second motive is expressed in the sounds and body movements that come after the infant has been satisfied. The motive behind these sounds and movements is the satisfaction of the desire for enjoyment beyond the needs essential to his existence.

"In the actions of the person's life it is possible to clearly see two basic motives. The infant in the cradle sometimes makes noises and moves because he is hungry: this is for him the manner of 'action' or 'effort' and the motive is hunger, or in other words, a lack of something. When he is satisfied, he will continue to make noises and move, however, not from lack but for entertainment. A characteristic difference between these two types of action is that in the first case the infant cries and in the second case he laughs. However, the fundamental difference is that in the first case it is necessary; if this factor is not satisfied, then the infant will die: the person fights here for the minimum necessary for his existence. In contrast, the second factor – entertainment – may also not be satisfied without any risk of life: before us is the case of effort, undertaken not for the 'necessary' thing, but rather for something, which we define as follows as 'luxury'."

*"It should be noted – and here we touch upon a point of great importance – that the infant in a normal environment will increase by tenfold or hundredfold the efforts of the second type more than the first type, if the person feeding him is accurate then he will not have the need for means of the type of lack (L) and if he feels himself healthy and happy, in other words, if the things that are lacking are minimized then he will use many means of the type of entertainment (E)."*²⁹

The same laws of human progress apply to all aspects of humanity, including activity of every economy by people. In other words, when we look for the historical materialism that should explain human behavior in the economic sector, it is necessary to look at it in terms of 'essential needs' and 'luxuries' and in terms of 'lack' and 'entertainment'.

²⁸ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

²⁹ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

“This division between lack and entertainment applies to all forms of human action, and especially to economic activity.”³⁰

Entertainment as a Factor in History

After Jabotinsky has clarified the elements, he explained the influence of the motive of ‘entertainment’ in human history. Jabotinsky asserted that the motive of ‘entertainment’ is translated in material terms (and not spiritual terms) as the aspiration for riches. He uses Marx once again, saying that Marx was right when he identified this aspiration in society and was right when he assumed that this motive exists among the rich classes.

“For the purpose of further clarification, we use here the ‘naïve’ definition of Marxism itself: in many mass appearances the fundamental motive is not the ‘material’ but the ‘spiritual’ one.”

“To prove this, it is not always necessary to go far from Marx’s method. According to this method, the almost main role in history belongs to the war of the class interests, in other words, first the enormous ambition of the upper classes for riches.”

“However, what is the aspiration for riches? The rich person accumulates silk, velvet, and pearls, carpets, marble, and pictures, race horses, and so on – all, as if from the start, entertainment according to artistic taste or emotion of flashiness or the ‘snobbism’ or great or small ambition, in short – factors that are definitely not ‘material’.”³¹

However, Jabotinsky emphasizes that Marx erred in that he assumed that this motive existed only among the rich classes or alternatively the classes that rule through the means of production. He maintains that the motive of ‘entertainment’ is natural in all people, the poor in society as well, and therefore the advance of human society is determined by the aspiration of all people for material and spiritual wealth.

“I think for certain that the future historian, who will be armed with all the knowledge that was not at the disposal of his predecessors, will describe the mightiest events in human development as embodiments of the natural factor of entertainment”.

“Only sometimes will this factor be linked with the issues of ‘lack’, especially the ‘economic’ lack – and frequently (I think very frequently) it will become clear that not the leaders alone but the masses sacrificed from the recognition and the great time that the issues of the ‘bread’ for the factor of ‘entertainment’, this pertains also to a number of typical revolutions, perhaps most of them, and perhaps – all of them.”

To clarify this argument, Jabotinsky returns to the example of the phenomenon of mass migration of poor citizens from all over the world to America at the beginning of the 20th century, which is considered an ‘economic’ migration for all purposes. This mass migration proves that poor citizens who engage in everyday survival in their countries of origin have the aspiration for the motive of ‘entertainment’ that is expressed in economic wealth.

“The factor of entertainment has a great role even in a mass event such as migration – although it is accepted to think of migration as a typical ‘economic’ event. I do not address migration in

³⁰ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

³¹ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

the name of religious freedom, like the Pilgrim Fathers of the 17th century. In the regular migration to 'America' in the 19th century it is possible to see at each and every step that of two people who are found under the same economic, family, and other conditions one will migrate and the other will stay. Why? At last it was possible to find a livelihood in the old place, in other words, the factor of lack was not enough, the migration was ended now and no disaster transpired, providing further evidence that the mass migrations before the war were not at all 'necessary'. The migrant is almost always a man with an entertainment factor that is increased to some extent, in the known sense this is the 'adventure seeker', or cupidus rerum novarum."³²

From this example, Jabotinsky concludes that the factor that influenced in human history the people who are considered 'exceptional' in every period was not from necessity but from the motive of 'entertainment' that is translated to the aspiration for government, Divine revelation, or scientific truth.

*"In any event, it is necessary to accept as fact the influence of extraordinary people on the course of history and to take this into account. Again an exceptional personality never did anything 'exceptional' 'out of necessity'. Somebody will aspire to what he aspires – government, Divine revelation, scientific truth, justice on earth, vengeance for an old insult, discovery of new lands or just applause and glory – genius or cheater, hero or passerby – the motive is always factors of the type of entertainment'. To what extent in human history is the influence of Moses, Buddha, Jesus, Socrates, Aristotle, Copernicus, Loyola, Columbus, Galileo, Lincoln, Garibaldi, Lassal, Cromwell, Luther, Dante, and Giordano Bruno and all the others, the list is endless, manifest, to the same extent the history is first of all the outcome of the same type of effort of the will, which we called 'entertainment'."*³³

The Motive to be a king

Since 'entertainment' or 'luxuries' derives from the person's aspiration to broaden his control over his environment, part of the motive of 'entertainment' is called by Jabotinsky the 'motive of kingship'. According to Jabotinsky, since a person has ensured the level of his survival over time, the motive that derives from the desire to be strengthened beyond survival appears.

"The motive of entertainment is simultaneously the 'motive of kingship', the child in his cradle, with whom we opened the research study, continues to be satisfied with his vocal and motor efforts. He continues to surmount the obstacles of inertia, gravity, and so on – or in other words – he continues to struggle."

*"Why does he struggle in the process of entertainment, after the necessity has already been rewarded? It is clear to extend the area of his life: to touch the wall of his cradle, to feel or break the toy, or simply to attempt another movement of the muscles, to voice another sound. If we look at this phenomenon, all this can be summarized in one statement: 'government'. This is government of his body, his voice, the space, and his toy."*³⁴

³² Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

³³ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

³⁴ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

Jabotinsky maintained that every person aspires to control. The aspiration for control and the extension of authorities is the foundation stone in history. Hence, Jabotinsky believed that the motive called ‘entertainment’ or ‘luxuries’ fundamentally lies in the person’s nature to increase his power. In other words, ‘the motive of kingship’ is in every person’s nature. Every person searches for how to aspire to kingship and government and to extend the field of his ‘kingdom’, namely, the areas of his control and authorities.

Beyond this, from the examination of the role of motive in history, Jabotinsky maintained that the aspiration to government and the extension of authorities, within the person’s abilities, is the foundation stone in human history. A person during his life, after he has seen to his most elementary needs, always searched for how to broaden his authorities for the purpose of his enjoyment.

“Every toy, whether in its scientific sense or in the sense of the regular experience, is the aspiration for government, for ‘kingship’. Analyze every satisfaction of a person: it always is expressed in ‘control’.”

“There are no exceptions to this generalization. We need to understand well what it means: if the activity of human life occurs in a tremendous proportion, which increases and apparently is decisive, by the motive of entertainment and this is normal, desired, and progressive – in such a degree the aspiration of every person serves for the government and extension of the field of his kingship as the foundation stone of life and history.”³⁵

Hence, Jabotinsky concludes that every person in society is a king in his own right and society is a public of kings. In his autobiography, *The Story of My Days*, which he wrote in the year 1938, Jabotinsky wrote: *“Had my Creators blessed me with wisdom and knowledge sufficient for the formulation of a philosophical method, I would establish and build all my method: In the beginning God created the individual, every individual is a king equal to his fellow ...”*³⁶ This sentence was perceived by researchers as the expression of Jabotinsky’s support of the liberal philosophy of John Locke, which sees the person as good from his youth.³⁷

However, it is possible to see from the article where Jabotinsky sees fit to accept the liberal outlook in his philosophical writing, from the reason that it suited the theory of ‘psycho-historical materialism’, which maintained that man is evil from youth (according to Hobbes’s arguments) and is motivated by personal interests. Every individual’s desire to be a king himself is the natural drive among every person and only this way will individuals feel comfortable in society.

In his description of this natural drive, called ‘motive of kingship’, Jabotinsky agrees with the Italian political philosopher from the 16th century, Niccolo Machiavelli, when he says that the principles of ethics and morality cannot be expressed in the person’s behavior in actuality, following the drive of every person to be a king to the greatest possible extent.³⁸

³⁵ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

³⁶ Jabotinsky, Zeev, November 1936, “Story of My Days – Autobiography”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

³⁷ Bilsky Ben-Hor Rafaela, Every Individual Is a King – The Social and Political Thought of Zeev Jabotinsky, Dvir Press, Tel Aviv, 1988.

³⁸ Niccolo Machiavelli, “The Prince”, 1537, Translated by: Miriam Shusterman-Pedvano, Publisher: Dvir and Shalem Press, 2005.

“Every person is a king. Society needs to be a public of kings. Thus all the conceptions that conclude the ethical rules from the submission of the person’s will to the will of above fall. There is no desire that surmounts the desire of every single ‘king’. There is no point of ethics, or the theory of morality, which is built on such an immoral assumption, as if a person who is tossed into the universe and its sufferings against his will is still ‘morally obligated’ to somebody or something.”³⁹

Since anarchy can be created in a society in which every person seeks to be a king, Jabotinsky raises the following question. Where is the principle of ‘duty’? He asserts that a person in human society, as a king, feels that he has the obligation to obey society only when he feels that the obligation concerns him directly, namely, when he feels that there is something to benefit from the society.

“The desire of every ‘king’, the ‘duty’ is created only the moment that the king recognized it and only regarding it. This is also with regard to religion: the existence of Divinity is not argued in an objective manner but the recognition of the ‘sanctity’ of God’s commandments is only the kingly act of will of every king - the king gives the Divinity to the legislator by placing his sword on his shoulders.”⁴⁰

Since every person has the motive of ‘entertainment’ and there is the aspiration to increase the activity of the motive and in modern times most activity of a person is motivated by the same motive, it is necessary to limit every person’s need to reach the motive of ‘entertainment’ without limitation.

“Hence – many conclusions are important, we address only two: the first is in relation to society, the second is in relation to the economy. In the field of the social arrangements: there is only one way to complete between the concepts: state, law, meaning, even between ethics and the law of entertainment - it can be assumed as a basis the law of entertainment and an attempt can be made to conclude the rules of limitation and necessity, without which there is no existence not to the country, not to the public, not to morality.”⁴¹

According to the theory, every person sees himself as a king in his own right, and therefore every citizen needs to be committed to the laws of his country out of necessity. According to Jabotinsky, only in this way will there be order in human society; otherwise there will be anarchy. On this point, the historical materialistic theory of Jabotinsky addresses the field of knowledge in political philosophy called the ‘social compact’.

The ‘social compact’ is a metaphorical compact that political philosophers used to describe the informal consent among people when they decided to move from the ‘natural state’ (the state in nature in which every person is for himself) to the ‘political state’, in which people assemble as a society and every person needs to give his freedom to the sovereign.

³⁹Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

⁴⁰Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

⁴¹Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

The idea of the ‘social compact’ was discussed in the 17th and 18th centuries by many philosophers. The prominent ones were the English philosophers Thomas Hobbes⁴² and John Locke⁴³ and the French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau⁴⁴. These philosophers discussed the following question. Why did people agree, in an informal agreement, to shift from the natural state in which they had full freedom to the political state, in which people choose consciously to restrict their natural freedom and to give it to a sovereign to rule over them?

In Jabotinsky’s thought, as expressed in the article, when he says that a political situation exists only to prevent anarchy and a political situation is necessary to prevent the unavoidable war between the individual ‘kings’ who attempt to broaden the field of their kingdom, it appears that he agrees with Hobbes’s thought that stated that people gave their liberty to the sovereign to prevent anarchy and impose order⁴⁵. However, when he says that the political situation needs to look at every citizen as a ‘king’ in his own right, it appears that his opinions are commensurate with those of John Locke, who emphasized the individual importance of the person in that he maintained that people have natural rights and they gave their freedom to the sovereign only to preserve these rights⁴⁶.

However, in contrast to these philosophers, Jabotinsky asserted that people agreed to surrender their liberty to the sovereign only so that they could increase the field of their kingship (as they did in the natural state) in an orderly manner, without needing to be pulled into anarchy and wars against all. It is definitely possible to assume that his opinion on the problem in the natural state was commensurate with the opinion of Hobbes, but his opinion on the solution to this problem, which is expressed in the political situation, was commensurate with the solution of Locke.

The difference between Jabotinsky and Locke is expressed in that he maintained that it is necessary that the State protect people’s liberty and rights not because people are born with these rights but because they aspire to them. At the beginning of the article, it is possible to see that this opinion was inspired by the theory of evolution of Charles Darwin, which was expressed in his book ‘Origin of the Species’, where he asserted that the organism is found in constant war with other species, and to survive, it aspires to take control over the maximum number of means of food and existence⁴⁷.

“From this outlook the law and the kingdom are established only on the social compact. This is a contract between a billion and a half a billion kings with equal rights. They don’t have another choice, since without such a compact, each one of them will break into the other’s field of government.”

⁴² Hobbes, Thomas, “Leviathan”, 1651, Translated by: Aharon Amir and Edited by Professor Menachem Lorbeboim, Shalem Press, 2009.

⁴³ Locke, John, “On the Political Government”, 1688, The Second Tract, Translated from English by: Yosef Or, Magnes Press, 1948.

⁴⁴ Rousseau, Jean Jacques, “On the Social Compact”, 1762, Magnes Press.

⁴⁵ Hobbes, Thomas, “Leviathan”, 1651, Translated by: Aharon Amir and Edited by Professor Menachem Lorbeboim, Shalem Press, 2009.

⁴⁶ Locke, John, “On the Political Government”, 1688, The Second Tract, Translated from English by: Yosef Or, Magnes Press, 1948.

⁴⁷ Darwin, Charles, “Origin of the Species”, Translated from English and added an Introduction: Shaul Adler, Press: Bialik Institute, Jerusalem.

“This perception – that the king signs only obligations, the result of his self-recognition – needs to serve as the foundation not only for a party discipline out of volunteering but also political discipline out of necessity.”⁴⁸

Jabotinsky is like the philosophers of the ‘social compact’ who thought how their philosophical thought leads to an effective method of government. However, regarding the method of government, in contrast to Hobbes who maintained that the most effective way of preventing an anachronistic natural state is a dictatorship that will preserve order, Jabotinsky asserted that a dictatorship is not in actuality applicable since the citizens-kings will not consent to a government that will deny them the expansion of the field of their kingship.

“This perception means in essence the negation of the totalitarian state. The morality of the state is an anti-natural phenomenon in the same sense (not necessarily disparagingly).”⁴⁹

In his article, Jabotinsky maintained that people chose to move to the political state so that they will be ‘kings’ in an orderly manner without the fear that the aspiration for kingship will create anarchy. Therefore, when he asked what is the political system most suited to the political state, Jabotinsky maintained that the political system must be with one main criterion – a state that intervenes in the least degree in the citizen’s life. This concept was called in his language – the ‘minimum state’. In this concept it is possible to see adjustment to the political ideology of John Locke and his followers, who supported a liberal state that does not intervene in the citizen’s life.⁵⁰

“It is essential not to exaggerate. The morality that is healthiest and most normal and pleasant for all the kings is the ‘minimum state’, in other words, a state that acts only if there is real urgency. The kings limit the field of the free self-expression only if this cannot be avoided, by force of law of the non-penetration in nature. In other words, two people cannot sit on one chair. Therefore, for example, there is no basis to the limitation of the self-expression in the field of the ideas: The law of non-penetration and non-measurement does not control it, my ‘yes’ does not prevent the ‘no’.”⁵¹

Like John Locke, who saw the political situation to be an instrument of protection of the person’s natural rights, Jabotinsky maintained that the State has the need to intervene in the citizen’s life, but not in a permanent way but only in special cases. These special cases are expressed in extreme cases in which the citizens need the state’s intervention to protect their ability to broaden the area of their ‘kingship’.

“Of course, when we define what is the ‘minimum’ of the political intervention great flexibility is required. In days of war or crisis (both economic and political) there may be the need to broaden this ‘minimum’ – like a patient gives himself to the physician’s government for the time of the illness and not longer than that and not ‘in general’.”

⁴⁸ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel)

⁴⁹ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel)

⁵⁰ Locke, John, “On the Political Government”, 1688, The Second Tract, Translated from English from Yosef Or, Magnes Press, 1948.

⁵¹ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel)

Therefore, in the discussion on the method of government effective for human society, Jabotinsky concludes that democracy is a manner of government closest to the ideal of suitable maximum civilian liberty, since democracy is a form of government in which the citizens – the kings – choose the government and thus choose their fate. Thus, it is possible to conclude that there is agreement between Jabotinsky and some of the thinkers of the social compact.

“In general, the instinctive ideal of the person is tranquil anarchy. As long as the ideal cannot be fulfilled it is necessary to recognize democracy ... as the closest form to the idea.”⁵²

However, from Jabotinsky’s perspective, democracy, although it was created by nature as a method against different forms of the government of the minority, is not only considered as the government of the majority. However, to see to the stability of the system through the agreement of the kings to its authority and since in his opinion ‘every individual is a king’ it is necessary to take into consideration the desires of the kings for the minority of opinions in the state, since individuals who are found in the minority are still considered kings of equal value to their follows. Therefore, he saw democracy to be the art of compromise between the ‘kings’ in society.

“However, it is necessary to have one very important condition. For reasons that are not understood, the democracy is identified with the government of the majority. This is understood from a historical outlook – the democracies were created under the flag of the war against different forms of the minority government, this was the reverse momentum of the pendulum.”

“However, in essence the blind identification of the democracy with the majority government is not correct. The value of democracy does not depend on the feeling that the enslavement of 49 kings of equal rights to one hundred or even ten or one to a hundred. The point of democracy should be sought in the theory of agreement and compromise.”

In the social aspect of the state, from the rationale that originates in this materialistic theory, Jabotinsky maintained that an effective and stable society needs to prevent one ‘king’ from enslaving other ‘kings’ and having over them absolute possession.

*“The explosion of our desire of the ‘self’ cannot be clarified as the explosion of liquids and gases, but it is necessary to recognize once and always a huge moral difference: society needs to prevent the person in his aspiration to enslave people, such intervention is not required to the extent that he aspires to ‘enslave’ things, if there is no conflict between two people or more in relation to one object. There is no amorality on the matter that a person extends his ‘ownership’, in the broadest sense of *utendi et abutendi*, on a dead object.”⁵³*

In the economic aspect of the theory, Jabotinsky maintained that the aspiration to ‘control’ considered as natural in every person, is expressed in the absolute ownership of the private property and making wealth means to increase the amount of private property. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that only private ownership of every person over the property that he succeeded in achieving suits the desire of every person to be a king in his own right to the greatest possible extent and constitutes the self-expression most natural to the person.

⁵² Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel)

⁵³ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky’s Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel)

The most open adjustment to the concept, which addresses the idea of the ‘minimum state’ and the absolute private ownership of property under the thought of Jabotinsky, can be seen in the theory of liberalism of John Locke, who sanctified the right of ‘property’ as a natural right and in the theory of economic liberalism that was first formulated by the English economist Adam Smith in the year 1776 in his book “An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations”, in which he also maintained that the person’s actions are intended for the promotion of his selfish desires and a healthy society can exist only when the State does not intervene in the market forces but leaves the management of the economy to its citizens.⁵⁴

“The recognition of the principle of kingship will lead with complete certainty to the recognition of the principle of private property in the field of the economy. The aspiration to ‘control’ will be achieved only by the very fact of ownership, solid, without argument and without limitation. There is no doubt that that a person instinctively pursues everything and throughout this entire life the right of utendi et abutendi certainly with regard to all found in his area of activity – not only regarding things but also regarding people.”

“The possession of things – is the most natural form for the self-expression of the normal person, and as long as there is no sharp contradiction with the wise demands of others or of society at large, there is no point to interfere with this.”

Hence, Jabotinsky explains why state ownership of industry and means of production cannot be the solution to the social problem. According to Jabotinsky, even if we recognize the fact that the State needs to produce products for its citizens, this does not mean that it is necessary to prevent individuals (kings) from acquiring personal property.

According to this theory, the natural state of people is to be in control. In the economic world, this control is expressed in the amount of property in their possession. Therefore, Jabotinsky describes an economic method that does not allow people to acquire personal property as an action of rape that contravenes human nature.

“As known, even people of Communism recognize the primary laws of the institution of ownership. However, it seems to me that they still negate the right of ownership of the devices of production, in any event to a serious extent. From the point of tangency of the principle of kingship this is the most brutal form of rape regarding the natural basic and primary impulse of a person and the rape upsets the most precious and productive and progressive discovery of the instinct of entertainment.”

“We will dedicate a place to the question of whether ‘socialism’ is truly required for the solution of the social problem. Namely, is the transformation of the state to the supreme owner of industry necessary? However, even if we recognize that the state needs to produce the consumption of its citizens, it must not be concluded that for the purpose of the realization of this prescription it is necessary to forbid individuals the acquisition and utilization of machines.”⁵⁵

Hence, Jabotinsky concluded that the communists and the socialists are expected to make mistakes in the test of action. Already in the 1930s, only twenty years from the date of the

⁵⁴Smith, Adam, *The Wealth of Nations*, 1776, Translated from English; Yariv Itam and Shimshon Inbal, The Open University Press, 1996.

⁵⁵Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: *Jabotinsky’s Articles* (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel)

Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, Jabotinsky identified that the Communist ideal, which is expressed in the absolute ownership of the State over the means of production, will not succeed and is doomed to fail.

Therefore, following the fact that private property is a fundamental principle in every society, he even believed that the most extreme Communists and Socialists will one day accept the principle of private ownership of property (as indeed happened, for example, in the amendment of section 4 of the constitution of the British Labour Party in the year 1994).⁵⁶

“On this point, logic does not decide in the minds of the sages of Socialism and Communism; rather the emotional fanaticism ... is increased. Regardless of the question, whether the socialist idea will last a long time, I am willing to predict with complete certainty that Communism itself will in the near future allow ownership of the machines of production.”

“The outlook at the basis of this review recognizes private property (to the full extent that is commensurate with the equality of the rights of the citizens-kings and their demands) at the basis, axis, and drive of the social economy.”⁵⁷

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the historical-materialist theory of Jabotinsky maintains that in every generation of human history people use products for elementary needs for the purpose of daily survival, their survival and their family's survival, but in addition there is the invention of products considered 'luxury' products, which most people in every generation cannot allow themselves. These inventions advance society to the next generation, when they are transformed from a precious product into a widely disseminated product, and in the end to goods that are essential to the person's existence in society.

In this context, it is possible to see a similarity between this theory and the evolutionary theory of Charles Darwin, which was expressed in his book *Origin of the Species* and maintains that every organism in nature attempts to achieve some 'evolutionary advantage' so as to overcome another organism⁵⁸.

“Almost all the luxuries of the past generation are considered 'necessities' in the next generation. This is not Notbedürfnis (unnecessary) but rather Wahlbedürfnis (selected necessity); a purely psychological need, calculated and learned and it is possible without satisfaction, without any damage to life.”

“Hence, this part of human action, aimed at creation of things that are 'completely luxuries' does not belong to type luxury but to type entertainment. For the most part, we do not perceive this difference; especially people who must do the production effort do not perceive it.”⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Labour-Party.org.uk, “New Labour because Britain deserves better”.

⁵⁷ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel)

⁵⁸ Darwin, Charles, “Origin of the Species”, Translated from English and Introduction by Shaul Adler, Publisher: Bialik Institute, Jerusalem.

⁵⁹ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, “Introduction to the Theory of the Economy”, In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

With the Industrial Revolution and the subsequent technological advance, a situation was created in which 90 percent of the activities undertaken by people in human society are luxuries (actions that are not essential for everyday existence). Jabotinsky called the human aspiration for a life of luxuries the aspiration for kingship, namely, every person aspires to be a 'king' (to have control and to have property beyond the products and areas of control needed only to remain alive).

*"In the sum of the goods that are 'essential' for the person in our time – including those goods that are purely material – is every element that is a real primordial need, this is already taken from its place by a broad group of 'luxuries'. We shall not exaggerate, in my opinion, if we say that already in our time the industry all around the world, 90% of it, is busy in the manufacture of elements that are 'luxuries' and only 10% in the supply of truly essential things – the things without which man cannot survive in life. In agriculture, without a doubt, we will not find such a surprising proportion between these two types; however, even here, the areas of land, capital, and work dedicated to the raising of sugar cane, golden apples, tobacco, or flowers are steadily overtaking the border of the part of these three factors dedicated to the raising of grains, despite the fact that once there we princes and kings who never dreamed of such things."*⁶⁰

Therefore, from a material perspective, the person's evolutionary nature is to aspire to a quantity of richness that is beyond the level that he needs so as to survive. Hence, the method of government and the approach to the state economy, which will be effective, efficient, and agreed upon by the citizens of the country, will be a method that allows every one of the citizens the possibility of accumulating economic riches and of having the utmost control and political power, to the greatest possible extent, in an orderly and legal manner.

This method, which will have characteristics commensurate with the characteristics presented in this theory, is political democracy combined with a capitalist economic approach. In this method, the part of the 'luxury' products is increased, in comparison with the 'necessity' products, and thus this method helps all citizens be 'kings' in their own right.

In the framework of his desire to create an alternative ideology to Marxism, primarily for the national Jewish movement, Jabotinsky decided to write a historiosophical review as a substitute for the historical materialism of Marx that appeared in Marx's book *Capital: Critique of Political Economy* in his article from the year 1938 titled "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy". He saw his approach to the historical materialism of human society as progress driven by psychological motives (from an evolutionary source) created following the person's desires to live his life beyond the desire for survival, which he called 'pleasure', 'entertainment', and 'luxury', in which there is the motive of 'kingship'. In other words, the person desires to be a king himself over a certain amount of property and aspires always to broaden the areas of his kingship, or in other words, the area of his livelihood (the amount of his property and the areas of his responsibility, abilities, and influences).

Hence, Jabotinsky concluded that man is evil from youth and aspires to his personal kingship that is as large as possible. Therefore, man will not agree to a method that will limit him, given his psychological motives of 'necessity' and 'pleasure' (which are natural). Although Jabotinsky believed in and was influenced by American and Italian liberalism, the combination between the description of the natural situation of Hobbes and the political solution of Locke

⁶⁰ Jabotinsky, Zeev, January 1938, "Introduction to the Theory of the Economy", In: Jabotinsky's Articles (Publisher: Jabotinsky Institute in Israel).

shows the uniqueness of Jabotinsky's political idea, which constitutes a unique idea in the theory of the person's transition from the natural state to the political state.

From the idea of 'every individual is a king' in himself as a real interest of every person, Jabotinsky understood that human society would need to accept capitalism as the default, since this is the only thing that the person would agree to live under (without limitations). In other words, the idea that every individual is a king did not derive from the humane liberalism of Jabotinsky but from the pessimistic perception of human nature driven by selfishness (from here it is also possible to assume that Jabotinsky was the first who saw the factor of evolution as a source for the explanation of phenomena in society). Therefore, in contrast to Beilsky, I do not believe that the ideas of welfare of Jabotinsky are from the perception of morality of moral liberalism, of necessity to violate the principles of economic freedom in the name of social morality. However, the principles of welfare are derived from the need to 'save' the status of the proletariat (manual workers) who are expected to enter a crisis of mass unemployment in the future following the gradual process in the global economy in which machine takes the place of working hands.

Therefore, after the entire article was analyzed, I conclude that Beilsky erred in saying that the economic theory of Jabotinsky was made from the idea of 'necessity and pleasure' and humane (moral) liberalism separately and that Shoshany erred in arguing that materialism is only a historical frame for the liberal theory of Jabotinsky. Rather, this is a theory that is fundamentally liberal and a completely independent materialist theory. Thus, this theory needs to constitute an instrument of analysis and a materialist basis for his entire economic thought, although it was published relatively later than the other articles he wrote (1938).