

TOPOS AND UTOPIA

In Landauer's and Buber's Communal Socialism

by

Avraham Yassour

(Department of Political Philosophy •

The Institute for Research of the

Kibbutz and the Cooperative Idea

(University of Haifa)*

Prepared for an international seminar
on Utopia-Dream of Anarchy (Paris, June 1981)

* The Institute for Advanced Studies

Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, 1981

"There is now a need to bring to fore a different sort of martyr, not heroic sacrifice, but rather tranquilly silent martyrs who aren't seen in order to serve as a model of the righteous life."

(The Call to Socialism, these lines are inscribed on Landauer's tombstone in Munich)

Landauer saw himself as "the bearer of an anarchistic weltanschurg" and the outstanding point was that the anarchism was realized by the force of the good will of men and by way of small cooperative settlements which would change the existing conditions.¹ His social plan was the establishment of a society in which group living was based on "confederation arising from freedom and communal spirit." Such a society would represent a sort of alliance of communities-settlements with communal economy and self-management and would establish fair trade among them for the purpose of supplying commodities. The single socialism is that which is realized; actualization of socialism through freedom (there is no separating purposes and means; independent self-realization is the main thing) has its source in humanitarianism, in spirit and in culture, and not in class-struggle or any sort of coercion. The new collective society has as its base the individual and it gradually takes the place of the State, with all its controlling and suppressing apparatus.

The revolution is Utopia (having religious implications, closest to the Jewish faith) which comes after the "Topia". It is a sort of new birth of a new man, a renewed style of living out of repentance. One must begin with Genesis and the pioneers in spirit-those who will begin with the independent realization of collective life within community groups (Gemeinden) which will join the federated alliance and which will maintain the new socialist way of life within the old world. The revolution comes about not through parties or labor unions, not through politics or coercive power, but rather through the force of the personal example. The revolution awakens all that is superior in man and grants good to all; it is not an isolated rebellion, not a deed of successful establishment, but rather a continuing renewal, a changing of the daily way of life from the point of view of an infinitely perpetual process.²

At the time of the publication of his essay The Revolution (Fall, 1906), Landauer continued to write on socialism and in January 1907 he published Thirty Socialistic Guidelines,³ in which he developed his anarchistic ideas with regard to the annulment of the State in the period of the growth of communal groups and communities alongside the State and as its successors.⁴ The Volk and the Laud are key terms in his opinions and he gives them mystic implications; the organization called upon to effect the socialism is not a party, but rather an "alliance" (Bund), an alliance which surpasses the party as the Gemeinschaft (community alliance) surpasses all known organizations, including the State.⁵ Making his "Socialistic Alliance" central epitomizes Landauer's social grasp, which he defined in brief outline form in Twelve Principles, (and which he explained more broadly in a lecturing tour, and the pamphlet, What Does the Socialist Alliance Want?, and in his book, The Call to Socialism).

Following is a new translation of the Twelve Articles which is helpful in understanding the exchange of letters from 1919:

THE TWELVE ARTICLES OF THE SOCIALIST BUND⁶

(June 14, 1908)

1. The basic form of socialist culture is the Bund of independent economic groups, exchanging goods with one another in justice.
2. This Socialist Bund treads the path that history assigns, in place of the state and the capitalist economy.
3. The Socialist Bund accepts the word "republic" in its original sense as the goal of its endeavors: the affairs of the commonweal.
4. The Socialist Bund declares anarchy in its original sense as the goal of its endeavors: order through voluntary union.

5. The Socialist Bund embraces all workingmen who want the social order of the Socialist Bund. Its task is neither proletarian politics nor class struggle, both of which are necessary accessories of capitalism and the authoritarian state, but the struggle and organization for socialism.

6. The real activities of the Socialist Bund can begin once the organization has been joined by large sections of the masses. Until then its task is propaganda and organizing.

7. The members of the Socialist Bund want to place their work in the service of their consumption.

8. They shall unite their consumption in order to exchange the products of their labor with the aid of their bank of exchange.⁷

9. They shall send out pioneers who, in domestic settlements of the Socialist Bund, shall produce everything they need, including the products of the earth.

10. Culture does not rest upon some form of technology or upon the satisfaction of needs but upon the spirit of justice.

11. The settlements should be models of justice and of joyous labor; not a means to reach these goals. The goal is only to be reached if the ground and earth come into the hands of socialists by means other than purchase.

12. The Socialist Bund strives for justice and, with that, for the power to abolish private property in land and soil through great fundamental measures; it seeks to give all Volk comrades the possibility of living in culture and joy through a union of industry and agriculture in independent economic exchange communities on the basis of justice.

(E. Lunn's translation)

EXCHANGE OF LETTERS: GOLDMAN-LANDAUER, MARCH 1919

-A-

Nachum Goldman
Berlin
14 March 1919⁸

Mr. Gustav Landauer
Munich
Wolf Hotel⁹

The Very Honorable Mr. Landauer:

You have no doubt received my two telegrams with regard to the convention of the representatives for Eretz-Israel¹⁰ and you realize that the convention will take place only at the end of April. We sincerely hope that you will have the chance to be in Berlin during that period and that you will be able to participate in the convention.

From Dr. Buber¹¹ you already know that he plans to arrange a small preliminary convention in Munich in mid-April to study the question of building the (national) settlement in Eretz-Israel.¹² You offered to cooperate with us in Munich and expressed willingness to assist us in drafting the proposals and the outline which we will want to present to the convention. I wish to propose to you today the most important points on which we need your advice; these are the result of counseling among friends here:

1. As a fundamental question in building the settlement, we see the problem of concentrated vs. decentralized society.¹³ We here are all united in the desire that the settlement be based on a decentralized community system¹⁴ while the emphasis is on the community as a unit (of itself) in which the people have a direct relationship with one another. The difficulty in this question is only in determining which areas of the social life demand a centralized structure, for instance, technical administration and economic life.

We request that you inform us of your opinion and, if possible, draft it in outline form.

2. With regard to the Nationalization of Land,¹⁵ we are all united (in opinion) and with us as well, I believe, are most of the Zionists. With the nationalization of land, we are also demanding the nationalization of the resources of the land (water, coal, etc.).

3. Very difficult and unclear to us are the questions of industry. Only a few among us are Marxists in the sense that they demand socialization of the means of production.¹⁶ Before our eyes is the image of a factory organized on the basis of association¹⁷ in which the workers participate as the owners and have equal rights concerning all problems of distribution of profits, administration, etc. The controversy is as follows:

- A) Will the entire united community be credited with profits, or only the collective association of the given factory, something which we suspect as dangerous, since a new, petit-bourgeois, capitalistic working class will spring up; furthermore, (circumstances will be created in which)

the situation of the workers in a profitable factory will be better than that of those in less profitable factories?

- B) Is it not possible to combine the two principles: on the one hand, a single factory unionized on a cooperative basis and on the other hand, collectivized industry; this special society will make possible supervision and far-reaching rights of intervention on the part of the public, which seem necessary, and not on the part of workers in the successful factories, who don't know to defend themselves against penetration of new elements?

4. Also very difficult and unclear are the questions of trade arrangements. Are they to be nationalized or are they to be turned over to the settlements themselves, and who will deal with the international exchange of goods, etc.?

These are the same points which we debated until now in our own circles and on which we are now asking your advice. On all these questions we will want, perhaps, to present outlines or proposals to the convention of delegates and we ask you to formulate your position in such an outline form. We can discuss any of the questions at length at our meeting in Munich, but it is most desirable if you could inform us beforehand in writing, so that we may come somewhat prepared.

On other important questions (the Arab question, the agricultural settlements, terms of land acquisition, etc.), it is preferable that we discuss them here before approaching you with a request for advice on these matters also.

I hope that among all the preoccupations in which you find yourself in these days and weeks in Munich, that you will find, nonetheless, time to reply to our questions. I thank you in the name of all of us.

My very best wishes and regards,

Yours,

(Nachum Goldman)

-B-

Krombach (Schwaben) ¹⁸
19 March 1919.

Dear Mr. Goldman:

Buber has not written me. ¹⁹ In any event, I shall be glad to participate in the small convention in Munich. If possible, I would like only at that time, to decide the matter of my participation in the larger delegates convention in Berlin. The uncertainties on which I am dependent are too numerous. ²⁰ With regard to the questions, we can try to answer them together at the convention and in any event, I have no desire to give answers, rather, to point out additional questions to the problems which you brought up.

1. Decentralization, and with it, freedom and volunteering are to be introduced to a wide degree in any place where there is no need to insist upon profitability and competitive power, that is, wherever it's possible, for the matter, to permit non-thrifty management of the economy. And here as well belongs the question of whether the economy, and that which is called the "State economy" will be based on the productivity of work only or whether profitability is needed as well? A further question is whether by disregarding the existing centralized establishments (the System), can the growth of centralization which the communities demand (to introduce) be made possible? Are we to judge the possibility according to the instance? And closely related to the question of centralization are the questions of taxation, State economy, police, judicial administration, officialdom, representation system (democratic government). And with all this, it seemed to me, nonetheless, possible not to force beforehand all which will be necessary on the part of the State, rather to leave this to the development of the communities and their desires; nevertheless, only then, when not the benefits of the organism, but rather the good spiritual peace of the individual parts, this is the ultimate principle.²¹

2. Nationalization of the land must be a fundamental principle. It must become an existing actuality in each instance when spoken of rare land resources which are claimed for the allied community (ore, coal, clay deposits, large waterways which serve as a passage for the goods of the community, etc.). But we can usually realize this fundamental principle in various ways: leasing of land parcels by means of the community, community ownership and collective working of the land, etc. Here too, the direction of Question 1

is influential. To think that each community will have its own means of marketing, which it will dominate in an independent manner, excluding the abundant land resources which are owned by the united community. But in fact here is the golden opportunity for taxation on the part of the whole: in communal acquisition of chemical fertilizer, agricultural machinery, marketing unions, etc. Also, suppose, in spite of the danger of waste, it is better to give free will (to volunteering) to develop than to decide beforehand on a forced pattern.

3. To be truthful, one needn't be a Marxist in order to refute the economy which is based on profits. Your posing the question has no meaning in my eyes.²² Here belongs more appropriately the question of equal value in trade, of the financial economy without interest, and of mutual credit.²³ Afterwards, when we shall solve these questions as far as it is possible to solve them, comes the turn of the following question:

4. National trade and trade with the rest of the world, which is still capitalistic. Both of these questions are secondary. If we can only solve the problem in Question 3, then to each good there is a market value of its own and the style of trading - in markets, with offers and demands by means of newspaper advertisements - doesn't represent any difficulty. The question of trade with foreign nations in the following circumstances: a) if there is a surplus of products, b) if these are so superior in quality and so inexpensive that there will be buyers for them in the world market. The reply to both these questions is positive when it is necessary to import specific products. Whereas this is undoubtedly the (present) situation and it is not important to what degree it is vital, above all else, to nationalize

the foreign trade and it is only fitting to expropriate it from the individual economies and from the community economy. The supply of goods from abroad and their distribution must be the matter of the general public; the public will see to it that there will be appropriate products for export, otherwise the situation will lead to indebtedness and dependence on foreign nations.

I suggest that you and your colleagues think over my hurried comments and afterwards we'll attempt, in a joint effort, to reach the phrasing of an outline. Looking forward to seeing you and with warm regards,

Yours,

Gustav Landauer

II

When an inspired man, -
seeking a role in chaotic times, -
cannot help, he becomes a rebel.

(G. Landauer, Die Revolution)

For Buber Zionism was the resumption of the relationship and the rebirth of community.²⁴ And from then on there is a continuity and connection to the opening lecture of his courses at the Hebrew University on Mount Scopus forty years later: "The only political chance for a small nation thrust between large states is the meta-political status Isaiah implies ... Deep down in the nation it lives in the form of human yearning to sustain the truth ... In order to sustain and realize truth he needs a topos, a certain place, this place for this people, for according to his mission there is need for this people in order to begin the realization, that is, to be a real nation, a social people, which by its very reality seems to call the peoples to come together in a people of nations, in a humanitarian people, in real humanity."²⁵

These are his words, and they are not chosen randomly; there is continuity in his thinking throughout the years, focusing on man as a social being, that is, in society and state. I will allow myself to note at the outset that the end of Buber's pre-dialogue period initiates a phase of

profound concern with the problems of society, a phrase marked by the undertaking and completion of a series of books Die Gesellschaft (Society) and by the growing influence of his friend Gustav Landauer. In his The Revolution, which appeared in the second year of the series, Landauer stated, in the spirit of communal anarchism, that "a large proportion of our institutions .. are today dead, cold, turned into paper, and lacking any relevance to man ... the spirit creates laws. But if the laws survive and the spirit disappears, the laws cannot create spirit and cannot substitute for it."²⁶ I find clear echoes of this opposition in what Buber said in a public speech citing Kant: It is in the nature of authority to necessarily distort the free judgement of reason; and he finds here the renunciation and disappointment of the philosopher: "He can no longer believe in the capacity of the spirit to achieve hegemony without losing its purity."²⁷

Buber lauds the Essences, among the "righteous" (Hassidim) who did not wish to be party to government (the successful government of the Hasmoneans) but chose to be part of a perfect full of life community. On the other hand there was Rome, the ruling state, the "state in stark nakedness". Jesus of Nazareth is represented as continuing on the path of the Essence in the attempt to build a true community, in contrast to the "bare state" which is only a "coercive association repelling any natural fellowship." Jesus founded "a new sect destined to grow in the belly of the monster and burst it."²⁸ The prophets' lofty resistance lay in their fight against "a state that no longer has God in it, and no spirit within it." This is what he says in an article dedicated to his friend Landauer, in which Jesus is

described as an anarchist in the image of that close friend of his, who really believed that the renewed growth of fellowship will blow up the monstrosity of the state (the artificial hollow Leviathan) from inside.

In a number of essays Buber includes an historical survey of the intensifying opposition between society and state. Thus in a lecture of 1901²⁹ containing the first of his "sociological doubts" while earlier influences (Nietzsche) are still discernible, he notes that the old Gemeinschaft was marked by purposefulness and instrumentality, while the new one coming into being will be the representation of life itself, exuding creativity and vital reciprocal relevance (Wackselwirkung) between complete and real human beings themselves. That is the true society of real human beings; it is an aim in itself, life itself is its aim. Buber rejected the Gesellschaft-Gemeinschaft dichotomy of Ferdinand Tonnies which has since made history in the discipline of sociology; nor did he incline toward the socialistic theories then current on fellowship and political revolution as a socially innovational structure. He explicitly declares: "So will unsere gemeinschaft nicht Revolution, sie ist Revolution ... Unsere Revolution bedeutet, 1955 wir in Kleinem Kreise, in reiner gemeinschaft, ein neues leben schaffen" ... (Our community does not desire revolution, it is revolution ... our revolution means that we will create a new life in a small circle, in a pure community).³⁰

What unites those who belong to this new community-sect is the common Erlebnis: the members of the same generation felt a kinship of souls and joined together in a radical criticism of the environment they lived in, their union was not a purposeful association for changing social reality.

I would tentatively define the young Buber's approach at the start of our century as socio psychological. In that essay he quotes Landauer, who was shortly to declare in an essay commissioned by Buber: "Sociology is not a science; and even if it were the revolution for special reasons could not be a subject for scientific treatment ... our subject: ... to examine the phenomenon of revolution from the point of view of social psychology. Social psychology itself is a revolution ... the beheading of Charles and the storming of the Bastille were applied social psychology ... Rousseau, Voltaire, Stirner were revolutionaries, being the savants of social psychology."³¹ Everything was still ahead of them, ahead of the young people of the "new community" circle. Buber's advance to over-sociologization and then to ontologization of evidence of man's socialness would lead to the conversion of cultural radicalism to folkist conservatism (in justification of German policy in World War I). Later, with his real contact with social reality in Eretz-Israel, would come the formulation of his socialist-religious attitude with the topi-anarchic tinge.

It will not be digressing too seriously from our discussion if we touch lightly on the further development of Buber's social thinking. As noted, beginning in 1906 Buber initiated and edited a series of monographies entitled Society which published books by Sombart, Simmel, Bernstein, Dawid, Mautner, Oppenheimer, Tonnies and naturally Landauer (40 books in all between 1906 and 1912). It is hard to find a properly defined central idea passing through this varied series like a silken thread; but there was undoubtedly a unifying and connecting frame of mood and mind. The title of the series

certainly implies this, and the disciples of Simmel, Dilthey and insurgent intellectuals found it a proper vehicle for their professional approach which was detached and critical of the "civilization" at the turn of the century.³²

The direction Buber meant to give his series, as stated in the preface to the entire series is interesting.³³ It does involve a socio-psychological approach is not clearly defined and did not commit the authors, each of them a leading person in his own circle. In the preface, Buber for the first time, the scholars believe, dealt with this famous concept of Zwischenmenschliche (between man and man; inter-human) as a key problem. Years later he wrote: "When almost fifty years ago I began to purchase my own foothold in social science, I then used the concept 'interhuman' which was not yet known ... we have before us a special category ... a special dimension of our experience ... it is our right to speak of social visions at any time or place that the common existence of multitudes of people, their connection with each other, leads to joint experiments and joint reactions ... that does not mean that there is any personal relation whatsoever between one person and another in that group ... I differentiate between the social and inter-human."³⁴

According to the 1906 preface, the "interhuman" is primarily a category from social psychology; in the "between" (intermediate state), there is a reciprocal and mutual connection which is serious unionization that can be called societality. The "interhuman" assumes the existence of differences between individuals with purposes of their own as a basis for the creation of

formed patterns; and these are the objectivization of the expressions of the human collective: values, spiritual and economic intermediators, the social aspects of culture, etc. On the other hand, activity, revolutions, are the dynamic aspect of the "interhuman". Sociology is the science of the forms of the "interhuman". Activity in the "interhuman" is a matter for economic, social and cultural history. If there is a desire not to remain detached from real life (erlebte leben) all these must not be separated from psychology. Society cannot be conceived without examination of "the life experience of the souls" (das Erlebuis von Seelen). Everything that happens between individuals is only what obtains between complexes of psychic elements -- and only thus can it be understood. Social forms have a unique significance in human psychics. "The problem of the 'interhuman' is basically a problem of social psychology: Its object is social life which should be viewed as a psychic process." This was a sort of legitimization for a new area of research at the beginning of our century...

There is no "social soul" above the soul of the individual; all the processes take place in the individual soul, but they are discernible when the individual is in a socialized situation (Vergegellschaftung) and in that situation connections mutual relations and socialization are the "interhuman". As Buber does not make a decision and refrains from identifying sociology with social psychology, he proposes that the entire series should serve as "preparatory work for descriptive social psychology", as then required.

Divine presence as a sine qua non belittles the status of man; and in fact the Buberian anthropology, man was only a minor partner in creation. Here too there was to come a correction: It is up to man to reform his world that was created, and the Messiah will not bring our world redemption in the form of the kingdom of heaven cancelling out this vale of tears. "Life-long partnership and a full heart between human beings, that is real community here, that is the kingdom of God directly, His kingdom in this world. The kingdom of God is the community that will emerge in the future ... in the path of the prophets of Israel, not to whizer away the society but to sustain it. And like the Essenese, he does not flee or retire from this secular society, but seeks to really establish it as a true religious community ... For the Divine Presence rests only where the desire to make a covenant with the Lord is strong, and man's aspirations to keep it is mighty, where man is bold enough to live his life face to face with the Absolute ... The true community is the Sinai of the future."³⁵

All this is in his The Holy Way, dedicated to his friend, F. Landauer. In his "Hebrew Humanism"³⁶ there is

no longer any hint of the "community of blood"; he speaks of the "realization of the spirit," of the partnership in which God is revealed "in the company of man", of "our revolution, the communal settlement revolution", and of "the community -- a communal society -- in which the direct relations between men emerge and develop, relations which carry with them the divine component which imparted to the group a permanent image."³⁷ Landauer's influence is clearly discernible; Buber even tried to involve him in the discussion of the problem of communal settlement in Erez-Israel -- as I wrote not long ago in the first publications of Landauer's letter to Nahum Goldman on the eve of his murder.³⁸

The ontic-religious dimension Buber gave to the "true" social relations was to prevent him from reaching the political-anarchist conclusions his admired friend had; at the same time he adopted quite a lot of his social-anarchistic outlook. This aspect of Buber's social philosophy was to deepen and be reinforced during his life in Erez-Israel and Israel, and lead to a deepening of the beliefs of those Socialists known as Utopians and in the achievements of the communal movements. His thinking at this stage, we will analyze as socialist-religious-communitarian, with a tinge of anarchy.³⁹

The model of the covenant found in biblical literature persisted in Buber's thinking: The acceptance of the Bible was the beginning of our existence as a people; the people as a political society originated in the faith in the god Jehovah. The religious-political unity Moses forged is a social ideal Buber places in contradiction to the split characteristic of anything historical.⁴⁰ That split derives from the imperfection of the created world; the active person, as he is free and decisive, will redeem himself from this split through his participation in the realization of the kingdom of God. The renewal of the Covenant is thus the original human ideal in the fact of the vulgarity and materialism dominating the state and the political-nation. Buber always feared the encroachment upon God by the national state ... and he appeals to anti-statist elements that are mainly socio-anarchic.

Buber's book, Paths in Utopia⁴¹, is a clear expression of the innovations in his social thinking. During World War II and the holocaust of the Jews in Europe, he thought-through and prepared this book, which was complemented by two articles: "on the Essence of Culture," and "Between Society and State,"⁴² discussed below.

"Between Society and State" provides an historical panorama of the developing concept of the "true categorical separation between the social element and the political element."⁴³ In Buber's opinion, for Aristotle the concept of state congruents the concept of society -- and he is not content; our author is not satisfied with the further step taken by the Stoics. It goes without saying that the Hobbes model was also rejected because in it people rally round the state because of mutual fear of annihilation, and also in Rousseau's philosophy, the social and political element "are blended in a most questionable manner".⁴⁴ With Locke, Smith, Ferguson and Hegel another line emerges which takes root in the writings of Lorenz von Stein and Karl Marx. It was Buber's fear that the appurtenances of state destroyed creative social spontaneity. And further: "Only after the birth of the finished bourgeois society from the womb of the revolution" could Saint Simon ("a dilettante of genius" according to Buber) propose the separation of social leadership which is administration from political leadership which is government. Buber is enchanted by Proudhon's statement that "The limitation of the function of the state is a question of life and death for liberty, collective and individual."⁴⁵ Nor was he unaware that

Saint Simon very closely approached "the idea of innovating the structure". What he lacked was the concept of real, organic social units from which this new structure could emerge; ... and it is precisely that social unit that was the main thing for Fourier ... and in his school (we find the concept that) union is free ... in which individualism is joined spontaneously with collectivism."⁴⁶ Harmonious spontaneity between the individual and the community is the essence, and an organic society is one whose structure permits it; the more varied and rich the structure, the more perfect the society and the more resistant to the other element, the political domineering one. In the historical conditions of growing centralization and industrialization involving vulgarism and the other curses of capitalism, there is nostalgia for a solution of that kind! The ideal from now on was the restructuring of human society and its upbuilding, a community of communities. That is the reason for Buber's supportive interest in the fate of organicity in the life of the kibbutz and kvutza in Erez-Israel in which the people of Israel was renewing its life.

The "political element" whose materialism and growing strength are in the province of political institutions (just as the expression of "the social element" is in the diversified social forms), is the universalism of the state in the face of the groups and associations the authorities view only as an annoyance. Groups, circles, congregations, societies, unions, associations of all kinds, and not individual atoms, but the basic components of society; society develops what they have in common but is incapable of forcing it upon them, and lacks the strength to cope with the conflicts between them. Society does not have the power to defend itself against external foes. The fact of "general instability" endows the state and its establishments with "decisive, unifying" strength. "The state rests on the instinct for survival of society itself; the crisis in external strength enables it once in a while to overcome the internal crises."⁴⁷ Under those circumstances, Buber finds the constant maintenance of the "political element" necessary, and in this he deliberately departs from any consistent anarchistic ideology including that of his friend Landauer. He also disagrees with Marx, about whom he writes: "With him begins the movement of socialism in which the social

element no longer exists except as a final goal and is missing from the practical program."⁴⁸ His discussion thus focuses on the relations between the social and the political, and on a search for a norm that restricts the tendency of the "political element" to crumble and splinter the various social forms.

Buber considers Lorenz von Stein the founder of the "science of social reality;"⁴⁹ his book, however, opens with a quotation from Bertrand Russell's Power.⁵⁰ That is not accidental, of course; Russell is known as a brave fighter for freedom which seems to him to be the foremost "political good" and he consequently finds it an urgent necessity to limit the power of the state and its governing establishment. At the same time he is critical of anarchism which seeks an absolute revolutionary annihilation of the state (that of Bakunin and others) and his chief proposals are in the spirit of guild-socialism. Buber does not accept Russell's social creed; he considers it a mixture of areas and a far-reaching generalization: "Social beings all contain a grain of power, authority, command, which they need to survive; but that element is not the chief one in any being that is not political."⁵¹ At the same time they are closer than they seem at first glance.

The "political element" is thus compulsion, the application of power which is always a clear infraction against the social approach based on "spontaneity, shaping from within, which is also the foundation of variety."⁵² Buber's inclination for the Utopian socialist creeds is clearly indicated in the following statement of his: "Human relations, that is, real life, are in fact distorted and perverted ... in the time of the capitalist regime. The change in the political and economic order is not for the purpose of realizing socialism but in fact for the imperative removal of inhibitions, however, the change of order should by no means be considered as the first thing in time with the innovation of structure following ... 'Utopian' socialism considers cooperative for the innovation of structure ... the main task belongs to the comprehensive, complete union, which includes production and consumption ... The most important thing is to establish the power that ... will converge into a many-faceted unity. (!) 'Utopian' socialism can in a special sense be called 'topian' socialism: it is not outside of place but aspires to realization at all times in a particular place and under particular circumstances."⁵³

Buber finds utopian elements in every socialist doctrine: "The Utopian picture is a picture of what 'ought to be' ... The Utopian wish is .. a desire for the right thing ... which by its quality cannot be realized in an individual but only in a human group ... The vision of the right thing in its idea is amended in its picture of a place that is entirely good, a sort of Utopia."⁵⁴ The Utopian in socialism is revealed as topian - it is

not aimed at the perfecting of the created world (eschatologically speaking) but at the development of possibilities inherent in the life of human beings together; and their improvement depends on the will of the human being aware of this ability of his.

In Paths in Utopia Buber tells us that it is important now when an "anti-dialogic trait has gained control", to observe attempts to implement the idea; they are bold and problem-ridden. And he is seeking the inner connection between communal laborer's settlements and Utopian-topian socialism. From the examination he gives this inner connection, he is convinced that the kvutza-kibbutz are the one experiment that did not fail, and for that reason it has a special national significance and an universal significance as well.

Notes

1. See the letter of G.L. to Paul Eltzbacher, Gustav Landauer: Sein Lebensgang in Briefen, ed. by M. Buber, 2 vol., 1929 1, 52. His identifying with and his disagreeing with anarchism as an ordered opinion are found in his following articles: "Der Anarchismus in Deutschland," Zukunft, January 5, 1895; "Anarchistische Gedanken uber Anarchismus," Ibid, October 26, 1907. In his thought the influence of Proudhon, Kropotkin and Tolstoy are notable. For the similarities and the differences between his thought and these thinkers, see M. Buber, Paths in Utopia, 1947, pp. 30-59 (Hebrew) and W. Kalz, Gustav Landauer Kultur Sozialist und Anarchist, Mersenheimam Ilan, 1967, 113-19.
2. Essays of G.L. -- Call to Socialism, The Revolution, Twelve Principles were translated into Hebrew by Israel Cohen, Tel Aviv, 1955 (Am Oved). See there the translator's introduction. Landauer's influence on Hapoel Hatzair, (The Young Worker), Zeirei-Zion (Young Men of Zion), and Zionist youth movements are studied in collections which appeared in his honor in 1929 and 1939.
3. In January 1907, Zukunft, "Volk und Land: Dreissig Sozialistische Thesen." (See also in Beginen, 3-20).
4. His opinion of the communal settlement (Siedlung) and the allied community (Gemeinschaft) are taken from mystic sources with which he developed ramantic-socialistic ties. On this matter, see his article in the collection Beginen and also the introduction of H.J. Heydorn to the new edition of Call to Socialism, Frankfurt, 1967.
5. Shmuel Hugo Bergman tells "How great was the excitement" of A.D. Gordon when "he found his ideas" in the writings of Landauer which he brought with him upon his return from the convection of the Hapoel-Hatzair (Prague, 1920, where Martin Buber had eulogized Landauer). See Bergman's article "Landauer and Gordon" in the collection Gustav Landauer, edited by Y. Zandbank (Tel Aviv, 1939), p. 58.

A.D. (Aharon David) Gordon was born in Trojnov, Ukraine in 1856 and died in 1922, in Degania, the first Kvutza in Palestine. He was involved in the development of the kibbutz movement.

6. Gustav Landauer, "The Twelve Articles of the Socialist Bund," "Appendix," in Eugene Lunn's The Prophet of Community: The Romantic Socialism of Gustav Landauer (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1937), pp. 349-50.

Translation of Twelve Principles of the Socialist Alliance was done according to the style found in W. Kalz, p. 142-3, in the periodical Der Sozialist, 2jg, 14. In the same book, p. 143, is found a broader version of the Principles from the year 1912.

7. In Landauer's anarcho-socialist opinions, various influences are notable, especially the influence of P.J. Proudhon. "People's Bank," spoken of in par. 8, is one of the foundations of the just society according to Proudhon's outlook. Products must be traded for products of the same value; since it is impossible to arrange direct trade, a popular credit system is needed which will insure general trade without the banks and the various financial personages being able to grab excessive profits in a parasite-like manner. See Proudhon's Solution du Probleme Sociale, 1848-9, and also his plan for a "Popular Bank."

Silvio Gesell, an economist among Landauer's close friends and a member of the Soviet government of E. Troller, developed ideas according to Proudhon's theory in the fields of banking and economy.

8. On the top of the letter appears, in handwriting - Nachum Goldman, apparently according to the printed address, Berlin w15, Sachsenstr. 8, and the symbol of the letter in its original - Go/B. The two letters published here are found in the Buber-Archives (The National and University Library in Jerusalem) and their numbers are: 167/168, 432. Ms Var.

9. Landauer's address in Munich was at that time: Hotel Wolf, Anulfstr. From the time that Kurt Eisner invited him to Munich, he divided his time between political activities in that city and Krombach, where his family lived (and afterwards, also Eisner's daughters).

10. Reference is to a special gathering Palestina-Delegiertentag, which was planned for the end of April in Munich, on the initiative of Buber, Goldman, and others. In Volume II of Landauer's letters, this gathering is mentioned as a "Jewish Socialist Convention" (Konferenz Judischer Sozialisten) and it is mentioned, with Goldman's appeal, only once in G.L.'s letter to Buber on March 20 (Briefe, 1, 402).

I found much more in the second volume of M. Buber's letters: Briefwechsel aus Sieben Jahrzehnten, Vol. II, 1918-1938, Heidelberg, 1973. In letters 18-20, from early 1919, the convention, its importance and its potential participants are mentioned. Buber left Munich on the very day of the murder of Kurt Eisner (February 21); previously, he met with G.L. and among other things, the convention was spoken of: Landauer promised to participate and to help in its preparation. In a letter from Arnold Zweig to Buber on March 6, he writes that it would be justified if it would be possible to "transfer" G.L. from German to Jewish politics, and this was apparently the thinking of Buber, who knew that in Pesach 1919 several Zionist conventions were planned in Europe and representatives from Eretz Israel were likely to participate.

11. N. Goldman mentions the Buber-Landauer conversation in Munich; among the letters published in Volume II of Buber's letters, is found a letter from Goldman to Buber, No. 21 from March 14, 1919, in which the program of the convention is described. Goldman suggests that Landauer open with problems of communal settlement. The suggested date is Pesach, so that representatives from Israel travelling to the convention in Berlin could also participate. The place - Munich, for the convenience of Buber and Landauer. He promises to telegraph Landauer.

In a second letter on the matter, No. 22, from March 20 (in the collection of letters of G.L., No. 573), G.L. writes to Buber that he has already replied to Goldman, will be pleased to meet them in Munich and hopes it will be a fruitful session. He even agreed to Goldman's suggestion that the invitation to this special convention be signed by both of them.

12. Settlement and building of Eretz-Israel didn't seem, in the eyes of the Socialist-Zionists, an ordinary process of settlement of barren land. In a speech from 1918, Buber describes this settlement as "revolutionary settlement," since they aren't to repair an existing structure, but rather to base a new existence on the act of settlement and in this we are called upon to bring about the renewal of an image" Paths in Utopia, p. 145). According to the program of the convention, G.L. was invited to lecture on the social aspect of the settlement in consideration of his original grasp concerning communal settlement as the first means to the socialist change of society. His influence on Zionist youth groups and on Hapoel Hatzair was obvious. Bergman tells us in the already cited article of A.D. Gordon's excitement over the discovery of the ideas of Landauer (see Note 5, above). G.L.'s belief in settlement, cooperation, and closeness to the earth are elements that can be found in A.D. Gordon's own writings.
13. Centralization was seen in G.L.'s eyes as a feature of the coercive capitalistic systems. Only in decentralized arrangements is face to face democracy possible. M. Buber mentions specifically G.L. when he describes socialism as real cooperation between people, direct living relationships between "I" and "Thou" -- in his article "Why Must the Building of Eretz Israel be Socialistic?" (See Paths in Utopia, p. 149.)
14. In the historical debate between Hapoel-Hatzair and the Akhdut-Ha'avoda (Labour Union) this was the first to represent the measure of decentralization which is derived from the emphasis on the autonomy of the socio-economic unit (the group). Goldman uses the term "dezentralisierten Gemeinschafts ordnung."

15. Nationalization of land, return to the village, special attention to nature-land, these typify the Socialist-Zionist and the "Agrarian Socialism" in general and the anarchist socialism of G.L. in particular; but also the opinions of Proudhon, Kripotkin, and others. See lines 66-73 in the Landauer reply to Goldman, above.
16. Goldman wrote on "Vergesellschaftung der Produktionsmittel" and this standard claim of Marxist German socialism (and sometimes Marxist theory) is challenged in the arguments of G.L.'s letter).
17. Written "Genossenschaftlich organisierte Fabrik". (An early hint of the problem of kibbutz industry of our times.)
18. Most of G.L.'s letters since mid-1912, were titles from Krombach (Swaben). This is the birthplace of Hedvig Lachman, his wife, and the Landauer family lived here until his murder.
19. In his letter to Buber on March 20, there is mention of a letter of March 18, which has not been found. Probably in this letter Buber mentioned the convention, but the letter was not yet in Landauer's hands. In any event, it was agreed between them, face to face, beforehand. (see notes 10, 11, above).
20. On the events and on Landauer's mood in the last month of his life there is reliable evidence. And the facts are supported by his letters from the same days. (See above). His words proved to be prophetic.
21. Landauer belonged to the school of anarchism that sees the foundations of anarchism in the individual, his/her individual rights, his/her devotion to anarchism. He found an original theoretical solution to the integration of the individual within the whole, the part in the organism (these problems were not foreign to the pioneers of communal life in Eretz-Israel). This emphasis is important in order to classify Landauer as not-belonging to the "folk" ideology (Volk) of which totalitarian collectivism is the identifying sign.

22. It is obvious that not only Marxist socialists reject an economy based on the race for profits. The enchanted future society of Landauer is based on autonomous cooperative-communities producing through love of work to supply goods, etc., as described in Twelve Principles.

In addition G.L. saw the worth and the urgency in the immediate independent realization of these new forms of life. In 1903 he participated in meetings of the union of "Deutsche Gartenstadt Gesellschaft" which was organized on an "anti-urban" spirit of romantic drifting from the city to the country. Among the members of the organization was Franz Oppenheimer, the author of The State, who probably expected to find there, like Landauer, the beginnings of cooperative settlement. On this subject, see the memoirs of Max Nettelau.

23. Equal worth in exchange, exchange bank, credit without interest, are ideas of Proudhon that found expression in every description of the just future society in the work of Gustav Landauer. (See also his Twelve Principles.)
24. "Mein Weg zum Chasidismus", (1918), Hinweise, Zurich 1953, S. 187.
25. "The Demand of the Spirit and Historical Reality", (1938), Am VeOlam, pp. 59-60.
26. G. Landauer, The Revolution, (Hebrew), Tel Aviv, 1951, p. 177; and in his Call to Socialism: "Where there is no spirit and no inner necessity, there is external authority, constitutional and state arrangements. When there is spirit, there is society. Where there is a lack of spirit, there is a state. The state is a substitute for the spirit ... A nation as a natural necessity of a born community is a beautiful indestructable primordial spirit. But a national joined to a state and violence is contrived cruelty and deliberate stupidity," ibid., p. 48. For Landauer's meaning of "spirit", very much like Buber's, see Mauerer's Call to Revolution, Detroit, 1971, and already noted Kohn, Buber, p. 195 on Landauer's influence on Buber's social thinking.

27. Am VeOlam, p. 54.
28. "The Holy Way", Teuda VeYeud, Jerusalem 1959, pp. 96-100 ("In memory of my friend Gustav Landauer") (English in On Judaism, ed. by N. N. Glatzer, 1967).
29. Alte und Neue Gemeinschaft - at the Buber archives MS47/C, published in 1976 in Vol. I of Association for Jewish Studies Review, Cambridge, (Mass.). This was Buber's lecture at the Architects' House in Berlin, 1901, before the fellowship of the Hart brothers; I find some significance in Landauer's early retirement from this "new community" as the members, it transpired, did not display the modicum of social sensitivity that could satisfy him.
30. As above, in the 1976 publication, pp. 54-55. F. Tonnies' Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft appeared in 1887 and impressed his contemporaries; Buber was not pleased with the diagnosis that Gesellschaft totally dislodges Gemeinschaft, and held that elements of Gemeinschaft relations persist beyond the institutional formalization characteristic of the Gesellschaft stage; nor did he approve the necessary remedies if it were possible to return to an organic rural community. He expressed his explicit criticism in a public debate in 1919, and see Worte an die Zeit, Munchen 1919, Bd. 2, S.11.
31. G. Landauer, The Revolution, pp. 151-153 (Hebrew).
32. This was the aristocracy of the spirit (Geistesaristokratie) that challenged Prussia's aristocracy and royal court, which they found "provincial".
33. The introduction appears in the first volume of the series: W. Sombart, Das Proletariat, 1906. Simmel's book was on religion; however against the background of the problems Buber raises in his introduction, there is on the one hand "How is society possible?" as it appears in the first chapter of Simmel's Die Soziologie, and on the other hand "social psychology" of the Dilthey type.

34. Buber's introduction takes up pages IV to XIV in the first volume of the series. The term das Zwischenmenschliche appears on p. IX. Buber later translated it as "interhuman" in his essay "The Elements of the Interhuman" (1953) included in the collection Sod Siah, Jerusalem, 1959, pp. 211-233. The quotation is on pp. 213, 216. In the opinion of M. Friedman, a noted Buber-scholar, he was original and the first to use the term. At times Buber uses the term des Zwischen (intermediation?) in the same sense. This is the area of tension -- of attraction and repulsion -- between two when both are complete subjects: "The sphere of the interhuman is the sphere of the individual facing his fellow, and its manifestation before us I call the dialogue ... (What happens then) is only a hidden accompaniment to the talk itself, an accompaniment to a highly social happening of many meanings, and its significance lies not in either of the participants, or in the two together but in this coordination of the act in their bodies, their 'intermediation'."
35. "The Holy Way", Teuda VeYeud. pp. 99, 103.
36. Ibid., p. 110.
37. Ibid., pp. 111, 113, 115.
38. See "Gustav Landauer -- On Communal Settlement and Its Industrialization", Hakibbutz, 2(1975), pp. 165-175.
39. Buber considered himself a religious socialist, see: Paths in Utopia, Tel Aviv 1947, pp. 13-14, and also "Drei Satze eines religiosen Sozialismus", Hinweise, S.259.
40. "What in Moses was personally united was rent in two and the split goes through the very order of the nation set up by him ... among the strongest elements of his work was that 'religion' and 'politics' are not to be separated ... the unity of human leadership of the 'mob' known as God ... in social reality as the objective unity of the community order ... Moses wanted undivided human life as the proper answer to divine revelation; but the division, is the historical path of man," Moses, p. 180.

41. Paths in Utopia was published in 1974 by Am Oved Publishing House of the Worker's Trade Union; chapters of it appeared in Hebrew periodicals during World War II. Buber also lectured on subjects dealt with in the book.
42. "On the Essence of Culture" first appeared in Mahbarot LeSifrut, 4(1943) and was included in Pnei Adam, Jerusalem 1962, pp. 377-393. "Between Society and State" first appeared in Molad 27(1950); it was the 25th anniversary of the founding of the Hebrew University. The essay was issued in English in: World Review, N.S.27, 1951 IV.
43. Pnei Adam, p. 400 ("Society and State").
44. Ibid., pp. 400, 403-405.
45. Paths in Utopia, p. 33 (Hebrew).
46. Ibid., pp. 25-26. The problem of individualism and collectivism preoccupied Buber more than once. Here is a typical passage: "If individualism conceives of only part of man, collectivism conceives of man only in part: neither penetrates or reaches the totality of man, man as a whole ... the first step (of the vital recognition) must be the destruction of the deceptive option that has infiltrated and permeated all thinking in our day: 'individualism or collectivism'", Pnei Adam, pp. 109-110.
47. Pnei Adam, p. 410.
48. Ibid., p. 409.
49. Ibid.
50. The usual Hebrew translation of Power is otzma. In his book Russell writes: "In the course of this book I shall be concerned to prove that the fundamental concept of social science is Power, in the same sense in which energy is the fundamental concept in physics (p.12)

... It is obvious, for example, that, owing to increase of organization, the State has more power now than in former times (p. 13) ... The most important organization of which a man is an involuntary member is the State" (p. 211).

51. Pnei Adam, p. 397.

52. Paths in Utopia, p. 77.

53. Ibid., pp. 77-78.

54. Ibid., p. 15.