RICERCHE SLAVISTICHE

NUOVA SERIE

VOL. 7 (LXVII) 2024

SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ EDITRICE
2024

RICERCHE SLAVISTICHE
NUOVA SERIE VOL. 7 (2024)

RIVISTA FONDATA DA GIOVANNI MAVER
Vol. LXVII dalla fondazione

Corrispondenza
ricercheslavistiche.seai@uniroma1.it
Prof.ssa Monika Woźniak: monika.wozniak@uniroma1.it
Dipartimento di Studi Europei, Americani e Interculturali
Circonvallazione Tiburtina, 4 – 00185 Roma

https://seai.web.uniroma1.it/node/4751
https://rosa.uniroma1.it/rosa01/ricerche_slavistiche
Rivista di proprietà della «Sapienza» Università di Roma
Registrazione del Tribunale Civile di Roma: n° 149/18

ISSN: 0391-4127
ISBN: 978-88-9377-369-0

Sapienza Università Editrice
Piazzale Aldo Moro 5 – 00185 Roma

www.editricesapienza.it
editrice.sapienza@uniroma1.it

Iscrizione Registro Operatori Comunicazione n. 11420
Registry of Communication Workers registration n. 11420

Finito di stampare nel mese di dicembre 2024 presso Sapienza Università Editrice
Printed in December 2024 by Sapienza Università Editrice

Ricerche slavistiche. Nuova serie 7 (67) 2024: 65-93

Piotr Laskowski

JEWISH ANARCHISTS IN EASTERN EUROPE'S MELTING POT. THE CASE OF MAX NACHT (NOMAD)

In recent studies on anarchism much attention has been paid to the question of multilingualism, as it "was an essential element of the anarchist culture that arose in the last twenty-five years of the nineteenth century" (Campanella 2022: 34). One may even speak of "transnational turn" in current anarchist studies and the rise of "transnational histories of anarchism, which appreciate the polyglot milieus in which anarchists are usually found, as well as the fecund international networks that spark innovations in anarchist ideas" (Adams 2013: 50; cf. also Berry, Bantman 2010, Bantman, Altena 2015, Zimmer 2015). The use of multiple languages was, for anarchists, not only the question of practical needs of communication, but also, and possibly above all, the political declaration of their internationalist stance. In her illuminating chapter on "Multitongued Languaging" (*altsetsungte shprakheray*, the term coined by Yankev Glatshteyn) Anna Elena Torres examines "how Yiddish anarchists approached language ideology, utopianism, multilingual praxis, philology, and immigrant socialization" for, as she observes, they "approached language not (only) as cultural expression or habitus but as a tool for remaking the world" (Torres 2024: 226). The phenomenon became even more significant in the borderlands, Eastern European in particular, where linguistic differences implied national divisions. Shmuel Agursky – himself an anarchist at the time he had lived in Chicago, before he decided to return to revolutionary Russia where he joined Bolsheviks and became, in 1918, one of initial members of a Commissariat for Jewish National Affairs still maintaining close relation with Peter Kropotkin; in 1919-1920 Agursky visited the US again to help form the Communist Party there (see recollection in Robins Lang 1948: 176-178; cf. Zimmer 2010: 306 [unpublished PhD thesis, fragment omitted in the published version of the book:

Zimmer 2015]) – in the introduction to the collection of testimonies concerning the Revolution of 1905 in Belarus, written in Yiddish, stressed the existence of linguistically 'mixed population' [*bemishter bafelkerung*] that became at the time politically divided along national lines ("Because of mixed population in the western region, we had in Belarus the whole range of national political parties", Agursky 1925: IX). In that situation, the choice of language was for anarchists an element of political strategy and ideological statement.

In this paper, I would like to tackle this issue taking as the case study the revolutionary activity of Max Nacht, known under his *nom-de-plume* Max Nomad which he assumed after his emigration to America in 1913. He was a prominent figure of Eastern and Central European radical milieus in the first decade of XX century, specifically during the Revolution of 1905, and an exemplary case of multilingual anarchist. His autobiographical book, *Dreamers, Dynamiters, and Demagogues* (Nomad 1964) is a treasury of information about Jewish, Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, and German radicals at the time.

Nacht was born in 1881 in Buczacz, Galician town at the north-eastern peripheries of the Austro-Hungarian empire. His father, Fabius Nacht was a typical representative of *maskilim*, a minoritarian group within the Jewish population of the region at the time. Born in 1848, Fabius was raised speaking German. He studied medicine in Vienna, and in 1878 returned to his native Buczacz, "where he soon established himself as a respected physician and member of the community thanks to his professional stature and what people perceived as his 'higher', German culture" (Bartov 2022: 189-190). He was a co-founder and director of the Jewish hospital there, and he also became one of the first socialists in town. His older son, Siegfried Shlomo (on his double name cf. Portmann 2008: 11; later, in America, he took the name Stephen Naft) was born in Vienna in 1878 and spent first eight years of his life at his grandmother's in Leopoldstadt district, younger Arthur and Max were born after Fabius had moved back to Buczacz.

Max was bilingual, but it is not clear what language he primarily used at home. One could expect it was German (Portmann 2008: 12), but there exists an interesting testimony of Siegfried who rejoined his family in Buczacz at the age of 8 and could not communicate with his brothers "because they spoke only Polish and Ruthenian, and I only German" (quoted after Bartov 2022: 192). Anyway, Max had excellent

command of both German and Polish. His Ukrainian (Ruthenian, as Siegfried called it) was, as Max himself recalled, "not quite up to snuff" (Nomad 1964: 135). As for Yiddish, although Max might have acquired some basics from his grandmother (Portmann 2008: 13), he strived to perfect it on various occasions – in Vienna during his studies (with a help of Russian-Jewish anarchist workers; Nomad 1964: 103), and in London in the Jewish anarchist community of East End (about this community, see Rocker 2005) – yet as late as 1962 he still needed translator for the texts he published in Yiddish (cf. Nomad 1962). Certainly, he could not regard himself as part of Yiddish-speaking Jewish community that constituted most of the population of his native town.

The Nacht brothers were therefore quite different from typical Jewish youth of their generation who revolted against their religious, conservative, Yiddish-speaking parents. The Nachts were rather a typical example of "fathers and sons" known from Russian literature (notably Bartov chose this Turgenev-inspired title for the chapter devoted to them). Sons of educated freethinker and rationalist, "agreeable and undogmatic social democrat" (Bartov 2022: 191), they became revolutionary radicals who would go far beyond their father's mild socialism. When Fabius Nacht died in 1936, the Polish socialist papers honored him with favorable obituaries (Bartov 2022: 191). Also "Chwila", a Jewish daily published in Polish, of liberal-Zionist leaning combined with an unwavering loyalty towards Polish *raison d'etat* ("'Chwila' was organically Polish"; Vincenz 1977: 46), paid honor to Fabius Nacht, as "good physician and honorable citizen" ("Chwila", 22 Nov. 1937: 8). This kind of respectability was, as we will see, something Fabius' son Max could not care less about.

Max Nacht spent his childhood in Buczacz and, as I will try to show, it was a fundamental experience that motivated his later political choices, even if he left his native town quite early to complete a secondary school (*Gymnasium*) in Vienna. According to his "Autobiographical Sketch" in English, he considered himself a Marxist "since the age of 14", but in 1901 he became an anarchist, "chiefly as a reaction against the growing Bernsteinian deviation of the Social Democratic parties from revolutionary Marxism" (IISH, Max Nacht papers [henceforth MNp] 34). He began to study law at the University of Vienna – quite unusual choice for an anarchist, which he explained by limited career opportunities for Jews on one hand, and famous examples of anarchist

law graduates, like Saverio Merlino and Pietro Gori, on the other (Nomad 1964: 11). In 1902-1903, he published a series of articles in German in the anarchist periodical "Neues Leben" based in Berlin. Notably, he wrote on the revolutionary movement in Russia (the articles appeared also as a booklet *Die revolutionäre Bewegung in Russland*; Nacht 1902) and the Ukrainian peasant protests in his native Galicia. At the law faculty in Vienna, he befriended Ukrainian radical, Mychajlo Lozyns'kyj (Михайло Лозинський), with whom he decided, in 1904, to publish in Polish the anarchist paper "Wolny Świat" [The Free World]. Immediately after the publication of the first and only issue they were both accused of "high treason". Lozyns'kyj was arrested, and Nacht managed to escape to Switzerland, to Zurich, where he took over and edited, again in German, the anarchist paper "Der Weckruf". After few months, in 1905, threatened by the police, he left Zurich, and moved to Geneva, where he immersed in the milieu of Russian refugees ("It is there that I learned Russian and French", IISH, MNp 34). There he met Polish revolutionary Jan Wacław Machajski who influenced his views in a most decisive way. In 1905 Machajski published in Geneva his most important work, *Umstvennyj rabočij* [The Intellectual Worker], which he had written in Russian during his exile in Siberia. Machajski denounced socialism as the ideology of a new class, the owners of intellectual capital, who would pretend to be partisans of the working people's cause only to replace the rule of financial capital with their own. Machajski with particular care analyzed the policies of German Social Democracy (SPD), which became, after 1890, the strongest and most successful socialist party in Europe. Nacht recalled that he had translated Machajski's book into German but did not manage to get it published (IISH, MNp 34). In 1906-1907 Nacht lived in Paris and London. In London he communicated only in Yiddish and French, as he was a part of the immigrant anarchist community there, and he did not know English at the time (Nomad 1964: 137). In 1908-1909, he went back to Polish lands to take part in the revolutionary movement and organize the group of Machajski's followers. In 1908 he prepared in Polish the account of Machajski's views, which was never published (the manuscript is preserved in IISH, MNp 20). Arrested for a short period in 1909 (his father supplied him in prison "with the best modern literature in German, Polish, and French"; Nomad 1964, 134), after release,

Max "returned to Western Europe (Paris, Rome, Constantinople) working in turn as typesetter, proofreader, and teacher of languages (1910-1913)" (IISH, MNp 34). In 1913, as he felt "definitely Europamüde", he emigrated to the United States. Initially he supported the Bolshevik revolution, but by 1923 he would get "thoroughly fed up and disgusted with the intolerance, the undisguised lust for power, and the obvious emergence of a neo-bourgeois bureaucratic-managerial class in Soviet Russia" (IISH, MNp 34). Since the 1930s, under the name of Max Nomad, he started to write books on the revolutionary movements in Europe (Nomad 1932, Nomad 1939).

Ironically – and Nacht had a great sense of the irony of history ("History plays ironical pranks", Nomad 1933: 228) – for a long time he was being recognized not by his fellow radicals, but by the American neoconservatives (particularly those who had a Trotskyist episode in their youth). Nacht introduced Machajski's ideas in America where they were reduced to the critique of the Soviet system as the class rule of party bureaucrats (which corresponded with post-Trotskyist ideas of James Burnham and with Milovan Djilas' *The New Class*). In 1979, the collection of essays *The New Class?* appeared which presented the texts of icons of neoconservative movement, like Daniel Bell (who commented favorably on Machajski in his seminal *The End of Ideology*; Bell 1960: 335-337) or Norman Podhoretz, as well as prominent sociologist Peter L. Berger, whose theory of "knowledge class" may have been influenced by Machajski's and Nacht's legacy, even if he did not mention them explicitly (cf. Berger 1986: 66-68). The editor B. Bruce-Briggs wrote in the introductory essay:

> Jan Wacław Machajski made the educated classes the keystone of a thoroughgoing critique of socialism […]. Socialism was the ideological instrument of the class interest of the "white-hands" (i.e., white-collar workers)/ the intellectual workers/the intelligentsia who wished to replace the capitalists as the exploiters of the workers […]. Machajski's ideas are only known today because of the work of his disciple "Max Nomad" (né Nacht) […]. Although he had become disillusioned with his master, Nomad introduced Machajski's ideas to American intellectual circles in the 1930s. (Bruce-Briggs 1979: 12-14)

This appropriation of Nacht by the neoconservatives was possible only at the expense of complete negligence of the stakes of his critique of state socialism and the Soviet Union (as Bartov [2022: 227] observed, Nacht might have been a vehement critic of the left, "though never joining the ranks of the right"). For Nacht never renounced his radical views, even if he became disenchanted by revolutionary projects. His disillusionment with Machajski, mentioned by Bruce-Briggs, was in fact caused by the remark by Machajski's widow in 1934 that the radical ideas of her late husband were only a tactics to win a workers' support and get to power ("Apparently assuming that, having grown older, I had rid myself of the anarchist 'prejudice' against power, she thus summed up the gist of 'our' theory: […] 'we' were offering the masses more than any other group did. So it was only natural that in the process of the struggle *we* would get into power"; Nomad 1964, 203). The shock caused by this remark – one will never know whether Machajski indeed regarded his ideas as mere tactics – made Nacht pessimistic about the prospects of revolution that would bring real equality and serve the interests of the oppressed. Inspired by Robert Michels (Michels 1910), Nacht recognized the "iron law of oligarchy" as a decisive argument that any organization, no matter how democratic in its aspirations, will necessarily produce the ruling elite. However, far from neoconservative cynicism, Nacht throughout his whole life remained a partisan of the oppressed, and developed what he called his "own version of the 'permanent revolution' (or rather permanent revolt/protest)", that is "the necessity of a *permanent protest* against every social system, present or future, that is, a permanent struggle for more and more now of the good things of life for the underprivileged…" ("Max Nomad's views summed up", IISG, MNp 34, cf. Nomad 1964: 206).

It is only in the last few years when researchers have accentuated Nacht's revolutionary profile. Werner Portmann (2008) published an illuminating double biography of Max and Siegfried, pointing out the importance of Jewish identity for their radical views. Omer Bartov (2022) followed Portmann and focused on their native Buczacz (the town where Bartov's family lived too) and social tensions there. This study will follow their footprints.

I would like to reconsider Max Nacht's linguistic switch from German to Polish in his political writings between 1902 and 1909. Although, as we will see, his choice to write in Polish certainly had a practical aspect to it,

it also had the implications that would interest me here. I will try to show that the political ideas which Nacht decided to express in Polish were incompatible with a dominant Polish culture insofar as it was the culture of patriotic intelligentsia – the descendants of Polish nobility who lost their social standing after the failed national uprisings. Constance Bantman and Pietro Di Paola have differentiated lately between "banal nationalism" and "everyday nationhood" to show that national attachments did not disappear completely in the anarchist movement, internationalist *par excellence* (Bantman – di Paola 2023). While it is true, this phenomenon, in case of Jewish revolutionaries in Eastern Europe, provoked different reactions than among French and Italian anarchists Bantman and Di Paola analyzed. Max Nacht's radicalism, which he considered an expression of "personal sense of inadequacy and insecurity of the impractical son of a radical Jewish physician" (Nomad 1964: 11-12), makes it possible to interpret his use of Polish in terms of "minor language" in a sense given to the term by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari – that is as a choice "to be a foreigner, but in one's own tongue […]. To be bilingual, multilingual, but in one and the same language" (Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 98). It was not only Nacht's multilingualism but above all his "sense of inadequacy" that made his use of Polish so specific insofar as he introduced the minoritarian perspective unthinkable, even unimaginable, within the frames of dominant Polish culture. As Deleuze and Guattari observed in reference to Franz Kafka:

> "Major" and "minor" do not qualify as two different languages but rather two uses or functions of language. Bilingualism, of course, provides a good example, but once again we use it simply for the sake of convenience. Doubtless, in the Austrian empire Czech was a minor language in relation to German; but the German of Prague already functioned as a potentially minor language in relation to the German of Vienna or Berlin. (Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 104)

Polish, in that sense, was also a "minor" language within the Austrian empire, but at the same time it was a "major" language in Galicia, where Poles politically dominated Ukrainian and Jewish population. To speak "minor Polish" meant, in Nacht's case, to open it to the perspective which Polish culture totally ignored – the perspective of Buczacz, a town which predominantly spoke Yiddish and Ukrainian ("What defines a minority […] is not the number"; Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 469).

In 1906, while on political exile in Switzerland, Max Nacht and his brother Siegfried published a revolutionary songbook with songs in French, German, Yiddish, Spanish, Italian, English, Czech, Polish, Russian, and Ukrainian. This little booklet was preceded by the introduction written by the brothers in German. It seems to sum up perfectly Max's views on the political dimension of language. It opened with an exclamation: "A revolutionary songbook in all languages!" [Ein revolutionäres Liederbuch in allen Sprachen!]. The brothers begin with a typical anarchist experience:

> But some people will ask the question: "Why a songbook in all languages if everyone only cares about the songs in their own language?" Well, anyone who raises this objection is either one of those unfortunate people who have never voluntarily traveled beyond the borders of their own country, or one of those fortunate people who have never been forced by necessity or by the police to travel involuntarily from country to country [diesen Glücklichen, die niemals durch die Not oder durch die Polizei von Land zu Land gehetzt unfreiwillig reisen mussten]. For, as soon as one arrives in a new country, among comrades of other languages, one wants to share their enthusiasm even before one can speak to them, one wants to sing their songs with them, one often learns the language from the revolutionary song, and afterwards carries this song back home as a warm memory of the joyful hours spent in the company of comrades from other countries. (*Le Chansonnier* 1906: 5-6)

Then the Nachts pay attention to the specific situation of their own homeland, and many other borderlands:

> Many already know several languages due to the political and ethnographic situation of their country [die politische und ethnographische Lage ihres Landes]. So, for most of them, a songbook in one language would not suffice, because life has often turned them into polyglots, into true internationalists [weil sie doch oft das Leben zu Polyglotten, zu wirklichen Internationalen gemacht hat]. (*Le Chansonnier* 1906: 6)

The introduction concludes:

> This songbook was also created by wandering rebels on the road and in exile [...]. And now, little songbook, go out into the world, accompany

> the homeless, wandering, expelled, exiled comrades in battle and on their wanderings, and at the sound of your songs, the homeland of the homeless, the fatherland of the anti-patriots – the whole earth, the whole of humanity will become your homeland [beim Klange deiner Lieder wird zur Heimat der Heimatlosen, zum Vaterland der Antipatrioten – die ganze Erde, die ganze Menschheit werden]. (*Le Chansonnier* 1906: 6)

This clear anti-patriotic stance, inherent in anarchist thought, was motivated, in Max Nacht's case, by the reminiscences of Galician "mixed population". In the most illuminative sketch of Polish modern history, which he produced in English in 1933, Nacht portrayed his native Eastern Galicia:

> The ruling class of the Austrian Poles, chiefly the landed nobility and smaller gentry whose offspring would fill the ranks of the clergy and bureaucracy, were permitted to lord it over the Ukrainians of Eastern Galicia […]. Polish national sentiment in Galicia was not particularly aggressive. Whatever ugly mood it showed was not against the central government of Vienna, but against the occasionally obstreperous Ukrainian intellectuals and their peasant following. The latter kept wondering about, and sometimes even protesting, against that strange phenomenon of a territory, 80 percent of whose inhabitants were Ukrainian peasants, being represented in Parliament mostly by Polish noblemen of their flunkeys. True, the latter claimed that what civilization there was in that God-forsaken corner of Austria was Polish – but this was rather an obscene joke. For the enormous majority of the "Poles" inhabiting the urban settlements, with the one exception of the Galician capital Lemberg, were small Jewish tradesmen, whose attachment to Polish culture was – proverbial. They spoke Yiddish, and their only contact with the superior culture of the masters was in the form of paying graft to the Polish bureaucrats. (Nomad 1933: 230)

It is essential to notice sarcastic remark about the Polish "civilization" in Galicia. Nacht's choice to radically "minorise" Polish language may have been motivated precisely by this phenomenon.

Galicia was a land torn by national divisions fueled by Austrian government ("it was a policy of playing off one nationality against another, of stimulating their mutual jealousies and quenching their desire for independence by granting some of them the right to oppress their weaker neighbors"; Nomad 1933: 230). In the opening part of

his 1964 reminiscences, Nacht summed up the situation in Buczacz: "The majority of its population consisted of Yiddish-speaking Jews. The remaining denizens […] were equally divided between Poles and Ukrainians who hated and despised each other even more than they did the Jews" (Nomad 1964: 7).

Nacht belonged to the first Jewish generation that had to face modernity at Eastern European peripheries, with fierce nationalisms and antisemitic violence inherent to it. The year he was born, Russia saw a wave of pogroms after the assassination of the Tsar Alexander II. In 1898 anti-Jewish violence swept across western and central parts of Galicia, that is terrains with the Polish majority (Unowsky 2018). In 1903, the atrocious pogrom in Kishinev took place that propelled next wave of antisemitic violence in Galicia, again its western part (Soboń 2011: 270-275). Like many of his Jewish contemporaries, Nacht was attracted by socialist movement and its internationalist attitude. What makes him stand out is the fact that he was one of the first to realize that even socialists could not resist nationalist temptation. Machajski's idea of intellectuals who conceive the socialist ideal to take power within the frame of nation-state provided Nacht with explanation of this particular socialist complicity with nationalisms.

During his studies in Vienna, at the time he was writing in German, Nacht published in 1902 in "Neues Leben" the article under the notable title *Brief aus Halb-Asien* [A Letter from Half-Asia]. Bartov (2022: 193) considers the title a sign of "internalized […] particular German view of the East" and suggests that young Max Nacht would see his task as a "revolutionary civilizing mission". However, it is quite possible that the title was ironic. Nacht's sarcastic remark made 30 years later about Polish cultural superiority may reflect his views at the time he wrote his article. Nacht described there the struggle of Ukrainian peasants against Polish landlords, the struggle he supported wholeheartedly. With a sense of humor, but also with some pride, he recalled the peasant's approval of his support: "they showered me with well-wishes, as well as asking me to become a minister. An anarchist minister!" (quoted after Bartov 2022: 193). This anecdote does not have to be a sign of a superior political consciousness. In his early texts written in German Nacht on every occasion repeated that it was the East where the real (that is anarchist) revolution was still possible, while in Germany, with its powerful Social Democratic party, socialism had already been

domesticated by the bourgeoisie. In the preface to his 1902 collection of essays written in German on the revolutionary movement in Russia, he expressed the hope that "this booklet, by demonstrating the heroic struggle, would contribute […] to raising the courage of many comrades who have understandably become pessimists because of the lamentable degeneration of the labor movement in Germany" [die infolge der beklagenswerten Versumpfung der Arbeiterbewegung in Deutschland begreiflicherweise Pessimisten geworden sind] (Nacht 1902: II). And even in the songbook published with his brother he could not refrain himself from observing: "Only the Germans are poor in revolutionary songs [Die Deutschen allein sind arm an revolutionären Liedern]. The few songs from the past period of struggle have been forgotten and the present has not produced any new ones" (*Le Chansonnier* 1906: 5).

Clearly for Nacht it takes the minority to make a revolution, hence his criticism of the situation in Germany with its powerful Social Democratic party. The ultimate effect of the "majoritarian" character of German Social Democracy was the reaction of the party to the arrest in 1903 of Siegfried Nacht, accused of planning an attack on the king of Great Britain. As Portmann (2008: 56) noted, after the arrest one of the main German socialist papers, "Vorwärts", immediately published the article with antisemitic hints (it reminded the public that Siegfried's "real" name was "Salamon"). Max reacted with the article *Anarchistenjagd* in "Neues Leben", where he observed that "the best and shortest way to strike down the opponent is to shout the beautiful word: 'Jew!'" (quoted after Portmann 2008: 56).

The "majoritarian" perspective of socialists went along with the firm belief in progress, in unquestionable logic of historical development. Walter Benjamin observed in his famous *Theses on the Philosophy of History* that the "conformism which has been part and parcel of Social Democracy", the sense of "moving with the current", and the "conception of progress which did not adhere to reality" were linked very tightly and they all contributed to the failure of the German Social Democracy (Benjamin 1969: 258, 260). It is astonishing that in "Wolny Świat", the anarchist journal Nacht published in Polish in 1904, the introductory exposition of "Nasze zasady" [Our principles] has a passage that strikingly resembles Benjamin's *Theses*: "The whole cultural development so far has turned out to be a bloody irony for the people" [Cały dotychczasowy rozwój kulturalny okazał się dla ludu krwawą ironią]

("Wolny Świat", April 1904: 1). Benjamin expresses it thus: "There is no document of civilization which is not at the same time a document of barbarism" (Benjamin 1969: 256). Nacht had conceived his critique of "cultural development" before he met Machajski, who also would ridicule "socialist providence" [социалистическое провидение] that makes masses "patiently wait for socialist paradise to come and bless bourgeois progress in communist prayers" [терпеливо выжидать наступления социалистического рая и в коммунистических молитвах благословлять буржуазный прогресс] (Volskij 1968: 45). In 1905, at the time he met Nacht in Geneva, Machajski prepared the Russian translation of Marx's "Holy Family". Against German Marxists, in his preface Machajski pointed out that in this text Marx had achieved "the deepest expression of proletarian class perspective" ([Machajski] 1906: 45) which was immediately neglected in other Marx's and all the Marxists writings: "all progress of the Spirit had so far been progress against the mass of mankind, driving it into an ever more dehumanised situation" (Marx – Engels 1975: 84).

One can see clearly now that for Nacht "Halb-Asien" was not a terrain of civilizing mission, but a place where true revolution was still possible precisely because the devastating consequences of the "progress" could be perceived there. These consequences affected mostly the minorities while socialist intelligentsia presented themselves as partisans of the progress. In 1909, one of the articles by Machajski (originally published in Russian in one and only issue of a journal he founded, "Rabochyi zagovor") appeared as a booklet in Polish with an addendum on Polish socialism. The added fragment stresses that the Polish socialist intelligentsia was capable of "brazen distortion of the workers' movement" because "it was not in vain that they were, as they called themselves, 'the easternmost outpost of the international revolutionary proletariat'" [Boć nie na próżno była ona wtedy, jak sama o sobie mówiła, "najdalej na wschód wysuniętą placówką międzynarodowego rewolucyjnego proletariatu"] (Rappaport 1981: 271). Thus, instead of imitating the "majoritarian" policies of Western European socialists, Nacht advocated a "minorisation" of Polish socialism – and it is only in "Halb-Asien", where such a "minorisation" can be conceived.

Although Nacht attempted once more, in 1905, to proliferate his revolutionary ideas in German, as the editor of "Der Weckruf" in Zurich, he soon felt disappointed. The only anarchist opposition to Social

Democracy in German revolutionary milieus had an extremely individualist profile, which Nacht despised. Some, not unimportant, part in his disapproval was played by his prejudices which today we can certainly recognize as homophobic. His attitude towards fellow anarchists like Erich Mühsam and Senna Hoy, who were eager to collaborate with "Der Weckruf", is undoubtedly marked by some sort of homophobia (cf. Nomad 1964: 16-19, 123-129). Without dwelling deeper into this important question (which probably facilitated Nacht's rapprochement with American neoconservatives) we may propose that in 1904, and definitely after 1905, Nacht rejected using German because for him it was not the language he would deem "minorisable" as he could not recognize anarcho-individualist, "queer" perspective as minoritarian.

The situation with "Wolny Świat" was very different. Nacht maintained it was the "first […] Anarchist periodical ever to appear in Polish". Although it was a debatable claim, it is important that he saw himself as a pioneer of anarchist publications in Polish. In the spirit of his *Brief aus Halb-Asien*, Nacht published the paper together with Ukrainian anarchist Mychajlo Lozyns'kyj. The decision to do it in Polish was, as Bartov (2022: 209) observed, "a curious linguistic choice for this Ukrainian-Jewish pair". Nacht explained it later as purely pragmatic: "Polish at that time was the lingua franca of all Galicians, Poles, Ukrainians, and Jews" (Nomad 1964: 12). However, in the note on the last page of the first and only issue, the editors ask for further financial support and acknowledge their will to publish materials in Ukrainian and Yiddish too. The journal indeed was explicitly addressed to all the three ethnic groups:

> Far from any nationalist feuds, granting not only every nationality but every group in general the right to self-organization, we will, as far as we are able, develop our activities among the Polish, Ukrainian and Jewish populations in Galicia, as well as everywhere else where the Polish, Ukrainian or Jewish worker groans beneath the present order. ("Wolny Świat", April 1904: 7)

In the article "Anarchist movement among peoples of Austria" [Ruch anarchistyczny wśród ludów Austrii] editors analyze the perspectives of anarchist movement in their particular social environment. They comment briefly on anarchist following in Austria proper

and Bohemia to focus on Galicia and point out that there was almost no trace of anarchist ideas among Poles, whereas in Jewish community anarchism gained some influence due to its popularity in Yiddish workers' circles in England and America, and "among the Ruthenians [i.e. Ukrainians in Galicia] the ideas close to anarchism were propagated by Dragomanov and his disciples (above all Pavlik)" ("Wolny Świat", April 1904: 7).

The driving force for Jewish and Ukrainian anarchists, as few as they were, was certainly the opposition to the Polish nationalism inherent also in the Polish-led socialist movement in Galicia. Much later, in the article written after the death of Rudolf Rocker, a pivotal figure of London Yiddish anarchist community, published in New York Yiddish anarchist paper "Fraye arbeter shtime" (notably, Nacht did not write it in Yiddish, it was translated by Mark Mratchny, a renown Jewish-Belorussian anarchist, active in the Russian revolution of 1917, arrested and later expelled from Russia by the Bolsheviks), Nacht recalled how he was a young anarchist, "adherent of Peter Kropotkin's doctrine and admirer of his personality":

> By chance I have discovered that of the same opinion were also Jewish workers in the capital of my eastern Galicia. I stopped in Lviv to meet my ideological companions. They were five or six men, all former social-democrats who rejected the Polish nationalism of their leaders… [ale gevezene sotsial-demokratn, vemen es hot opgeshtoysn der poylisher natsionalizm fun zeyere firers]. (Nomad 1962: 3)

In 1933, Nacht described Polish patriotic socialists in Galicia using Machajski's theory:

> The Socialist leadership consisted mostly of déclassé intellectuals and semi-intellectuals, Poles and Jews. To the various malcontent elements of the lower middle-class and to the working class of the country they offered a grotesque combination of Marxian class struggle terminology with the democratic and nationalist verbiage of the romantic knight-errants of Polish freedom of the middle of the nineteenth century. The "class war" talk was to get the vote of the workers, scarce as they were, while "Polish independence" was to win over the growing ranks of the educated or semi-educated lower middle-class elements. To them a liberated Poland

> meant prospects of steady jobs in the administration, the army, and all the other branches of public life. (Nomad 1933: 231)

The tragedy of Jewish leaders of Polish patriotic current of socialism can best be seen in the case of Herman Diamand. Born in Lviv in 1860, his social background was quite similar to Nachts'. He too spoke German and Polish, and had some command of Yiddish. Diamand studied law in Vienna and earned a doctorate there. He was one of the founders of the Polish socialist party in Galicia and a steadfast Polish patriot devoted to the cause of independence throughout all his life. He advocated the use of Polish language among the Jewish community, and even if he edited his party's paper in Yiddish, he considered it only a temporary activity and hoped for the replacement of Yiddish with Polish. He strongly opposed not only the creation of a separate Jewish socialist organization, but even the autonomy of Yiddish schools (Piasecki 1978: 38-42; more generally Najdus 1982). His support of the Polish language was motivated by the conviction that it would abolish national divisions between Poles and Jews. Hence his firm opposition against what he considered "Jewish separatism". However, his use of Polish was purely "majoritarian", and thus very different from Nacht's. Diamand adhered to and reaffirmed the dominant Polish culture. Notably the Jewish section of Polish socialists in Galicia passed the resolution, which they considered a gesture of recognition, that "Comrade Diamand is not a representative of Jewish national and cultural needs" (Piasecki 1978: 44). Moreover, Diamand was honored – a very ambivalent honor it was – with a poem written by a Polish socialist worker: "Hey Diamand, free Jew, You are loved by the working people / For you are the one of the Jews able to look others boldly in the eye" [Hej Diamandzie, Żydzie wolny, Ciebie kocha lud roboczy / Bo Ty jeden z Żydów zdolny śmiało patrzyć innym w oczy] (Piasecki 1978: 36). And yet, at the eve of pogroms in Galicia in 1898, Diamand wrote to his wife: "I have faced a moment when 'patriotic' socialists are succumbing to Slavophilia ['patriotyczni' socjaliści ulegają słowianofilstwu], so that it is difficult to do anything with reasoned arguments" (Diamand 1932: 35).

The "Slavophilia" – Diamand's polite euphemism for antisemitic hints among Galician Polish socialists who wanted to prove to conservatives and nationalists that they are not a Jewish party – did

not imply unconditional acknowledgement of the aspirations of the Ukrainians. Nacht noted:

> There were Socialist students and workers among the Ukrainians of Galicia to whom the protestations of international brotherhood sounded suspicious when coming from the mouths of those Polish socialists. Some of them even had the courage occasionally to accuse the latter of being nationalists pure and simple, and of dreaming of an imperialist Poland… (Nomad 1933: 231)

And indeed, even if Polish socialists supported the Ukrainian cause – as Ignacy Daszyński, the most prominent of Polish socialists in Galicia and Diamand's closest associate did in 1908, after the assassination of the Polish governor of Galicia by an Ukrainian student (interestingly, Nacht met the assassin: "In the prison yard we had a good long chat in German, for my Ukrainian was not quite up to snuff, and he would rather die than use the Polish language"; Nomad 1964: 135) – the Ukrainians were an instrument of Polish interests. Daszyński expressed it quite overtly: "We Poles have the most important interest in gaining an ally against Russia, so that we have a brother and friend in Eastern Galicia, not an enemy" ([Daszyński] 1908: 42).

In the case of Ukrainian activists, one may speak of the anarchist threads inherent in their vision of egalitarian self-governing rural communities. This idea is found in numerous forms of Slavic Romantic populism. Max Nettlau, the father of anarchist historiography, remarked in the chapter XXVIII on Ukraine of his *Bibliographie de l'anarchie* for 1897:

> We know that the socialists in these regions of Russia and Austria-Hungary are federalists par excellence and that [...] M. Dragomanov, M. Pavlik, J. Franko [...] came very close, in theory, to the anarchists, retaining only this profound difference: the anarchists had in mind the liberation of humanity as a whole, whereas they, the Ukrainian socialists, thought above all of Ukraine [les anarchistes ont en vue la libération de l'humanité tout entière, tandis qu'eux, socialistes oukraïniens, pensaient surtout et avant tout à l'Oukraïne]. (Nettlau 1897: 197)

In this situation the choice of Polish language for the publication of "Wolny Świat", even if it was forced by Nacht's limited command of Ukrainian, opened a specific perspective since on the one hand, it introduced anarchist ideas in the Polish culture where they were virtually nonexistent (in that way it "minorised" Polish discourse), and on the other – it bound together two minorities more prone to anarchist views on the ground of the third language that was detaching them from their national identities (and at the same time became "minorised" by their perspectives). As Deleuze and Guattari observed, the stake is not to be a minority, with fixed, stable identity within the system, but to discover the creative potential of minoritarian condition:

> Majority assumes a state of power and domination […], the standard measure […]. That is why we must distinguish between: the majoritarian as a constant and homogenous system; minorities as subsystems; and the minoritarian as a potential, creative and created, becoming. (Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 105-106)

"Becoming-minoritarian" affects both the minority (so that it would not produce fixed identity), and the majority, because "minority is the becoming of everybody, one's potential becoming to the extent that one deviates from the model" (Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 105). Thus, minority is truly universal in that it, and only it, can exceed all the divisions, including national ones: "Minority as a universal figure, or becoming-everybody/everything [devenir tout le monde]" (Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 470).

The stake is therefore not to remain a defined minority, but to transform the whole reality organized by "majoritarian" concepts of nation (or gender, or race):

> It is important not to confuse "minoritarian", as a becoming or process, with a "minority", as an aggregate or a state. Jews, Gypsies, etc., may constitute minorities under certain conditions, but that in itself does not make them becoming […]. Even Jews must become-Jewish […]. But if this is the case, then becoming-Jewish necessarily affects the non-Jew as much as the Jew [...]: it is the non-Jew who becomes Jewish, who is swept up in, carried off by, this becoming after being rent from his standard of measure. (Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 291)

Since "minoritarian" becoming needs to affect both minority and majority as far as they are essentialized, furnished with identity, and involved in majority-minority relation of power, for non-Jews becoming-Jewish would mean a move beyond the "standard measure" of, say, Polishness defined by the constructed "Other", by not-being-a-Jew; for Jews becoming-Jewish would imply the use of specific minoritarian experience of Jewishness to question very mechanism of producing minority and majority. One may suppose that it was precisely this kind of experience and this concept of Jewishness that led Jewish youths to anarchism (among the anarchist militants who have their biographic entries in the first, and only, three volumes of *Słownik biograficzny działaczy polskiego ruchu robotniczego* [Biographical dictionary of militants of Polish workers' movement, 1978-1992], more than 80% were Jewish; Grinberg 2008: 168).

The process of "minorisation", philosophically analyzed by Deleuze and Guattari, was to some extent perceived, even if not conceptualized, by the Polish elites governing Galicia. The right-wing Catholic paper "Nowy dzwonek" saw "Wolny Świat" as a Jewish-Ukrainian instrument of corrupting (that is: "becoming") of the local population, called by Polish elites "Ruthenians" and kept in the position of subservience:

> The police in Lviv have confiscated lately the entire print run of the first issue of the magazine "Wolny Świat". The magazine wanted to spread anarchy in our country, because right in the introductory article it announced that it would destroy private property, the state, and the Church [...]. Galician anarchists, like the Socialists, are headed by Jews, assisted by Ruthenian Ukrainians [Na czele zaś anarchistów galicyjskich, jak i na czele socyalistów, stoją żydzi, a pomagają im ukraińcy ruscy]. The assistant of Jewish anarchist […] is certain Michał Łoziński, a Ruthenian-Ukrainian [Rusin-ukrainiec] married to a Jewish woman. It is not surprising that "Ruthenian Ukrainians" unite with Jews and anarchists, since the aspirations of the Ukrainians are almost exactly the same as those of the anarchists […].
>
> This should be a sufficient warning to those Ruthenian peasants who associate with the Ukrainians and belong to their camp. Every Ruthenian peasant who holds with the "Ukrainians" is working together with them to overthrow the Holy Faith and is an enemy of the Lord Jesus Christ. ("Nowy Dzwonek" 8, 1904: 18-19)

The author – probably Marceli Dziurzyński, a priest who edited the journal as well as a number of other ultraconservative papers "for the people" intended to preserve the status quo and loyalty of the peasants (Lato 1963: 66) – differentiates here between the Ruthenians, peasants who are supposed to subordinate to Polish domination, and the Ukrainians (notably, in the whole text he does not use a capital letter and often puts the word in inverted commas), that is those who resist the subordination and cooperate with Jewish activists. Of course, typically for the antisemitism of Polish elites, the moving force are Jews, but it is the close link between becoming-Ukrainian and anarchism that is interesting here.

However, this process was endangered by the temptation to construct a modern nation. And, as Deleuze and Guattari observed, "the birth of nations implies many artifices: Not only are they constituted in an active struggle against the imperial […] systems […], but they crush their own 'minorities', in other words, minoritarian phenomena that could be termed 'nationalitarian'" (Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 456). In this process, the stake of minoritarian becoming would be lost. (It is quite instructive to note here how Nacht denounced as "utterly ridiculous" the "sudden conversion to Yiddish separatism" and "Jewish nationalism" of his first revolutionary "hero", Anselm Mosler, who also tried to stir up the spirit of rebellion among the Ukrainians: Mosler would address Jewish public in German, despite his newly-sworn Yiddishism, and to Ukrainians he would speak "a mixture of Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian" – which clearly contrasted with Nacht's choices; Nomad 1964: 8-9, cf. Bartov 2022: 193-195). On that issue Nacht and Lozyns'kyj parted ways. As Nacht observed, very much in line with Nettlau's remarks,

> Lozynsky's anarchism was rather the rabid expression of a nationalist intellectual's protest against the Austro-Polish landed nobility who – with Vienna's approval – were oppressing four million Ukrainian peasants in that godforsaken corner of Habsburg monarchy. Lozynsky's "negation" of the State, *in abstracto*, for his great-great-grandchildren, as it were, did not prevent him from dreaming of a democratic Ukrainian Republic in a less distant future. (Nomad 1964: 11-12)

When they met again in 1909, five years after their common anarchist enterprise which ended up with Lozyns'kyj's arrest and Nacht's escape to Switzerland, Nacht was already a disciple of Machajski, while Lozyns'kyj had become "a voice of the left wing of the Ukrainian nationalists":

> Our encounter was far from friendly: to me he was a […] mercenary of the budding Ukrainian bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. To him, I was a romantic gigolo of a fantastic World Revolution that would never occur. We were, of course, both cruel and unfair to each other". (Nomad 1964: 13)

In fact, Lozyns'kyj did not reject all the minoritarian potential of "becoming-Ukrainian" at the time. In 1909 he published a book Люди. Біографічно–літературні нариси: Драгоманов, Франко, Павлик, Сембратович, Бернзон, Реклі, Крапоткін, Толстой, Тургенєв, Гарібальді, where – as the title shows – he juxtaposed Ukrainian radicals of anarchist leaning (Dragomanov, Pavlik, even Franko) with pivotal figures of anarchist movement (Reclus, Kropotkin, also Tolstoy), and Romantic patriots like Garibaldi. A year later he published his translation of Kropotkin's "Appeal to the Young" (До молодїжи). And in 1915, Lozyns'kyj devoted the whole book to the "Ukrainian national question in the works of Mikhailo Dragomanov" (Українське національне питанє в творах Михайла Драгоманова). Dragomanov, as we have seen, was the most important thinker trying to combine anarchist ideal with Ukrainian national identity. In anarchist circles he was known for his edition of letters of Mikhail Bakunin (Dragomanov 1896). In the conclusion of his book Lozynsk'yj quoted extensive fragments from Dragomanov's "Letters to Dnieper Ukraine" (Листи на Наддніпрянську Україну) that seem to reflect his own view of the relation between national identity and internationalist perspective:

> We have said that we recognise nationalities as an obvious fact [очевидний факт], as the result of certain natural and historical circumstances of national life (sometimes unexplored scientifically and always changing); we recognise that this fact must always be kept in mind in public work, and especially we recognise the importance of the most prominent national feature, the national language, as a means of moral communication between people [важність найвиднїщої національної ознаки, народної мови, як

> способу морального звязку між людьми]. We recognise not only the right of living groups of people, including national groups, to autonomy, but also the immeasurable benefits that people derive from such autonomy. But we cannot look for guiding thoughts for our cultural, political and social work in the national feelings and interests, for otherwise we would get lost in all sorts of subjectivities, in the forest of historical traditions, etc. We are looking for such guiding and controlling thoughts in the scientific conclusions and in the international, universal interests [Ми шукаємо таких провідних і контрольних думок в наукових виводах і інтересах інтернаціональних, вселюдських]. (Lozyns'kyj 1915: 108)

Dragomanov – and Lozynski – sums it as follows: "Whenever there was a need, I said the same thing: cosmopolitanism in ideas and goals, nationality in the soil and forms of cultural work" [космополїтизм в ідеях і ціlях, національність в грунтї і формах культурної працї] (Lozyns'kyj 1915: 109).

For Nacht this was not enough. He would consider it a copy of what he saw in Polish socialism: universalist verbiage and narrow aspirations of ambitious and at the same time frustrated national elite to take governmental positions in their own nation-state. In 1933, Nacht presented the ironic view of recent Polish history – and the evolution of Polish radicals from partisans of emancipation to nationalist oppressors. "Poland, all through the nineteenth century […], [s]horn of her independence, divided among Russia, Prussia and Austria, she had become the symbol of Europe's struggling democracy". Nacht recalls Polish participation in various revolutionary movements including the Paris Commune of 1871 as well as the support of Polish independence on the part of Marx, Bakunin or Herzen. But once Poland gained independence, it brutally subordinated Ukrainians, organized antisemitic pogroms, in short, as Nacht bitterly observes, "achieved the ambition of every oppressed nation yearning for 'freedom'" (Nomad 1933: 228-229, 235).

When he met with Lozyns'kyj for the second time, Max Nacht was engaged in revolutionary activity as an organizer of Machajski's followers in Polish lands. The year 1908 saw the collapse of the Revolution that had begun in 1905 in Russia. From Machajski's perspective, it was the time when one could clearly see the incapability of socialist parties as regards the true revolutionary transformation. Machajski

believed there would be many disenchanted socialists ready to radicalize. The Revolution, paradoxically, strengthened Polish nationalists, and radicalized their antisemitism. "Events of 1905 (…) showed what an effective political fuel instrumentalized xenophobia could be" (Krzywiec 2015: 189–190). The socialist parties, the PPS in particular, with its focus on Polish independence, proved unable to counter the rise of nationalism. In 1933 Nacht analyzed:

> Russian Poland had highly developed industries with a growing working class. The economic development killed the nationalist aspirations of the Polish propertied classes […]. Thus, the only social group that refused to make peace with the Tsarist regime was the large group of impecunious, malcontent intellectuals and semi-intellectuals. Their advancement as the leaders and organizers of industrial and public life was blocked by the presence of the foreign invaders, who reserved all the privileged jobs for themselves. It was these malcontent intellectuals who undertook a heroic struggle for Poland's independence […]. They combined their nationalist vocabulary with Socialist slogans and persuaded large sections of the workers that Polish independence was the indispensable condition of their emancipation from capitalism. Joseph Pilsudski became the founder and leader of a powerful revolutionary organization called PPS (Polish Socialist Party), whose heroic struggles against the Tsarist regime earned it the admiration of the whole Socialist world. That party attracted the best minds among the Polish intellectuals, for whom the cause of Polish emancipation, that is to say, their own rule over Poland, was identical with the cause of the Polish workers. They were, of course, not always conscious of the fact that they were using the workers as mere tools for their own interests, and that the "Socialism" they were preaching was only a cloak for nationalism. (Nomad 1933: 232)

Obviously, the PPS was primary target of their attacks, but Machajski and Nacht were also distrustful of internationalist Polish Marxists led by Rosa Luxemburg who dissented from the PPS to form separate party, Social Democracy of the Kingdom of Poland and Lithuania (SDKPiL). The SDKPiL stood on the internationalist position and Luxemburg firmly rejected the ideas of "social patriots" of the PPS: "Instead of political programs, nationalist programs would be drawn up. Instead of a coherent political struggle of the proletariat in every country, its disintegration through a series of fruitless national struggles would be

virtually assured" (Luxemburg 1976: 58). However, she tried to differentiate between the national sentiments of the masses and the political aspirations of the elites: "In the framework, in the spirit of the Polish proletarian class struggle, the cause of nationalism itself takes on quite a different appearance than it has in the aspirations of the *szlachta* [gentry] and the petite bourgeoisie" (Luxemburg 1976: 96). As a result, she eventually argued for Polish, and exclusively Polish, autonomy – which Lenin summed up sarcastically:

> One cannot help smiling, therefore, when reading how our magnificent Rosa Luxemburg tries to prove, with a very serious air and "purely Marxist" phrases, that the demand for autonomy is applicable *only* to Poland and *only* by way of exception! Of course, there is not a grain of "parochial" patriotism in this; we have here only "practical" considerations… (Lenin 1977: 47)

But in 1918, it will be Luxemburg who will criticize Lenin for his support of "the so-called right of self-determination of peoples":

> While Lenin and his comrades clearly expected that, as champions of national freedom even to the extent of "separation," they would turn Finland, the Ukraine, Poland, Lithuania, the Baltic countries, the Caucasus, etc., into so many faithful allies of the Russian Revolution, we have instead witnessed the opposite spectacle [...] To be sure, in all these cases, it was really not the "people" who engaged in these reactionary policies, but only the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois classes, who – in sharpest opposition to their own proletarian masses – perverted the "national right of self-determination" into an instrument of their counterrevolutionary class politics. (Luxemburg 1961: 49-50)

How to prevent this process, foreseen by Machajski and Nacht? Luxemburg differs from Nacht insofar as she was always thinking in terms of majority. In 1906, she wrote: "The communists […] represent, as against various group interests, national or local, as a whole of the proletariat, and in the various stages of development of the class struggle, the interests of the whole movement" (Luxemburg 2008: 170). These interests include democratic freedoms: in 1918 Luxemburg criticized Lenin for showing "a quite cool contempt for the Constituent Assembly, universal suffrage, freedom of press and assemblage, in short, for the whole apparatus of

the basic democratic liberties of the people which, taken all together, constituted the 'right of self-determination' inside Russia" (Luxemburg 1961: 48); in January 1905, at the very beginning of the first revolution, her party, the SDKPiL, published the appeal with demands of "political freedom", "parliament", and the "constitutional assembly" (*SDKPiL w Rewolucji* 1955: 72-73). But behind these postulates there was a vision of a majoritarian party that would be able to govern. It is precisely her majoritarian position that makes Luxemburg's project self-contradictory (cf. Guérin 1971). To govern, to represent the majority, every social-democratic party sooner or later will have to concede to national sentiments. Luxemburg realized that painfully in 1914, when German socialist deputies at Reichstag (with notable exception of Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg's friend) voted in parliament in support of the war-effort of the German government. And she paid the highest price when in 1919 the new majoritarian German Social Democratic government used *Freikorps* right-wing militants to have her and Liebknecht murdered. In the 1920s Polish communists condemned the "Luxemburgist error" – the term they used for her rejection of the Polish independent nation-state.

Thus, from Machajski and Nacht's perspective, the position of Luxemburg in 1905 was not so different from that of the PPS. Both parties were working together to "put the brakes on the economic struggle so that the workers' popular revolt is always directed not against the Polish bourgeoisie but in its defense against tsarist absolutism, against 'foreign partitionist rule', as the PPS adds" (Rappaport 1981: 272).

Nacht prepared in 1908 a concise presentation of Machajski's ideas in Polish. It is the text that questions every ideal dear to Polish majoritarian socialism, or rather to Polish intelligentsia of post-noble origins that was leading the socialist movement:

> Political freedom, a constitution, a democratic republic, independence, autonomy, the universal right to vote for parliaments and assemblies – these were the slogans in the name of which the Socialists [...] exhorted the workers to battle.... (IISH, MNp 20)

Nacht's opposition to "political freedom", a central concept of Polish culture rooted in the tradition of post-feudal nobility, was based on the assumption that real freedom can be achieved only by "minoritarian" becoming. Now we can see that the term "Halb-Asien" served

as a counterpoint to the nation-state with its parliaments and political parties – it was a perspective of a different kind of revolution.

Nacht's choice of Polish had important consequences. Taking part of the two minorities – Ukrainian and Jewish – he conceived, on one hand, the political vision that was meant to "minorise" the majoritarian Polish discourse, and that, on the other hand, prevented transforming Ukrainian and Jewish case into "minorities as subsystems", with fixed identities and "majoritarian" aspirations. Nacht's writings aimed to "infect" or "bastardize" the Polish culture, dominated by the perspective of intelligentsia, with a minoritarian perspective: that of Jewish-Ukrainian, "half-Asiatic" anarchism. To take the words of Deleuze and Guattari, Nacht's shocking rejection of the core values of Polish culture aimed to

> conquer the major language in order to delineate in it as yet unknown minor languages. Use the minor language to send the major language racing. Minor authors are foreigners in their own tongue. If they are bastards, if they experience themselves as bastards, it is due not to a mixing or intermingling of languages but rather to a subtraction and variation of their own language. (Deleuze – Guattari 1987: 105)

And it is a tragic irony of history that requires further reconsideration that this revolutionary "minorisation" that failed as regards Polish dominant discourse, became (ab)used and "majorized", though not without Nacht's consent, by the cynical neoconservative intellectuals in America.

Bibliography

Archives

IISH = International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam, Max Nacht papers.

Publications

Adams 2013 = Matthew S. Adams, *The Possibilities of Anarchist History: Rethinking the Canon and Writing History*, "Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies", 1 (2013), pp. 33-63.

Agursky 1925 = Shmuel Agursky, *1905 in Vaysrusland. Zamlbukh*. [Publisher not mentioned,] Minsk 1925.

Bantman – Altena 2015 = Constance Bantman, Bert Altena (eds.), *Reassessing the transnational turn scales of analysis in anarchist and syndicalist studies*. Routledge, New York-London 2015.

Bantman – di Paola 2022 = Constance Bantman, Pietro Di Paola, *Banal and everyday (inter)nationalism: French and Italian anarchist exiles in London, 1870s–1914*, "Nations and Nationalism", 29 (2023) 1, pp. 176-190.

Bartov 2022 = Omer Bartov, *Tales from the Borderland: Making and Unmaking the Galician Past*. Yale Univeristy Press, New Haven-London 2022.

Bell 1960 = Daniel Bell, *The End of Ideology*. The Free Press, Glencoe 1960.

Benjamin 1969 = Walter Benjamin, *Theses on the Philosophy of History*, in Id., *Illuminations*. Transl. Harry Zohn. Schocken Books, New York 1969, pp. 253-264.

Berger 1986 = Peter L. Berger, *The Capitalist Revolution. Fifty Propositions About Prosperity, Equality, and Liberty*. Basic Books, New York 1986.

Berry – Bantman 2010 = David Berry, Constance Bantman (eds.), *New Perspectives on Anarchism, Labour and Syndicalism: The Individual, the National and the Transnational*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, Newcastle 2010.

Bruce-Briggs 1979 = B. Bruce-Briggs, *An Introduction to the Idea of the New Class*, in B. Bruce-Briggs (ed.), *The New Class?* Transaction Books, New Brunswick 1979, pp. 1-18.

Campanella 2022 = Lucia Campanella, *Multilingualism in Anarchist Periodicals: Language Politics within Anarchist Multilingual Communities in* El perseguido *(Buenos Aires, 1890-97)*, "Journal of European Periodical Studies", 7 (2022) 1, pp. 34-37.

[Daszyński] 1908 = [Ignacy Daszyński,] *Mowa posła Daszyńskiego o sprawie polsko-ruskiej wygłoszona w Izbie posłów dnia 21-go maja 1908 roku*. Wydawnictwa "Naprzodu" i "Prawa Ludu", Kraków 1908.

Deleuze – Guattari 1987 = Gilles Deleuze, Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*. Transl. Brian Massumi. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis 1987.

Diamand 1932 = Herman Diamand, *Pamiętnik Hermana Diamanda zebrany z wyjątków listów do żony*. Towarzystwo Uniwersytetu Robotniczego, Kraków 1932.

Dragomanov 1896 = Michel Dragomanov (ed.), *Correspondance de Michel Bakounine. Lettres à Herzen et à Ogareff (1860-1874)*. Perrin, Paris 1896.

Grinberg 2008 = Daniel Grinberg, *Formes de la militance juive radicale en Pologne*, in Amedeo Bertolo (ed.), *Juifs et anarchists. Histoire d'une rencontre*. Transl. Patrizia Farazzi, Marianne Enckell, Jean-Manuel Traimond. Éditions de l'Éclat, Paris - Tel Aviv 2008, pp. 159-171.

Guérin 1971 = Daniel Guérin, *Rosa Luxemburg et la spontanéité révolutionnaire*. Flammarion, Paris 1971.

Krzywiec 2015 = Grzegorz Krzywiec, *Roman Dmowski and Polish Nationalism until 1939*, in Bartłomiej Błesznowski, Marcin Król, Adam Puchejda (eds.), *Genealogy of Contemporaneity. A History od Ideas in Poland, 1815-1939*. Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego – Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen, Warsaw-Wien, pp. 185-205.

Lato 1963 = Stanisław Lato, *Galicyjska prasa „dla ludu" (1848-1913)*, "Rocznik Historii Czasopiśmiennictwa Polskiego", 2 (1963), pp. 57-74.

Le Chansonnier 1906 = *Le chansonnier international du révolté – Internationales Rebellen-Liederbuch*, Arnold Roller [Siegfried Nacht], Max Nacht (eds.). Broschüren-Gruppe des Comm. A.-B.-V., London 1906.

Lenin 1977 = Vladimir I. Lenin, *Critical Remarks on the National Question*, in Id., *Collected Works*, vol. 20. Progress Publishers, Moscow 1977.

Lozyns'kyj 1915 = Mychajlo Lozyns'kyj [Михайло Лозинський], Українське національне питанє в творах Михайла Драгоманова. [Publisher not mentioned,] Відень [Wien] 1915.

Luxemburg 1961 = Rosa Luxemburg, *The Russian Revolution and Leninism or Marxism*. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor 1961.

Luxemburg 1976 = Rosa Luxemburg, *The National Question – Selected Writings*. Horace B. Davis (ed.). Monthly Review Press, New York-London 1976.

Luxemburg 2008 = *The Essential Rosa Luxemburg. Reform or Revolution and The Mass Strike*. Helen Scott (ed.). Haymarket Books, Chicago 2008.

[Machajski] 1906 = [Jan Wacław Machajski], *Примечания переводника*, in Karl Marx, Friedrich Engeles, *Святое семейство* [transl. Jan Wacław Machajski], vol. 2. Novyi Golos, S. Petersburg 1906, pp. 39-63.

Marx – Engels 1975 = Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works*, vol. 4. Lawrence & Wishart, London 1975.

Michels 1910 = Robert Michels, *Zur Soziologie des Parteiwesens in der modernen Demokratie. Untersuchungen über die oligarchischen Tendenzen des Gruppenlebens*. Klinkhardt, Leipzig 1910.

Nacht 1902 = Max Nacht, *Die revolutionäre Bewegung in Russland. Historische Skizze*. Verlag von "Neues Leben", Berlin 1902.

Najdus 1982 = Walentyna Najdus, *Kwestia narodowa w ujęciu Polskiej Partii Socjalno-Demokratycznej Galicji i Śląska*, "Kwartalnik Historyczny", 89 (1982) 2-3, pp. 271-297.

Nettlau 1897 = Max Nettlau, *Bibliographie de l'anarchie. Année 1897 – № 8*. Stock, Paris 1897.

Nomad 1932 = Max Nomad, *Rebels and Renegades*. Macmillan, New York 1932.

Nomad 1933 = Max Nomad, *The Crucial Importance of Poland*, in *Recovery Through Revolution*. Samuel Schmalhausen (ed.). Covici-Friede, New York, pp. 228-243.

Nomad 1939 = Max Nomad, *Apostles of Revolution*. Martin Secker and Warburg, London 1939.

Nomad 1962 = Max Nomad, *Mit a halbn yorhundert shpeter*, [part 1], "Freye Arbeter Shtime", 15 July 1962, p. 3.

Nomad 1964 = Max Nomad, *Dreamers, Dynamiters, and Demagogues: Reminiscences*. Waldon Press, New York 1964.

Piasecki 1978 = Henryk Piasecki, *Herman Diamand w latach 1890-1918*, "Biuletyn Żydowskiego Instytutu Historycznego", 2 (106) (1978), pp. 33-49.

Portmann 2008 = Werner Portmann, *Die wilden Schafe. Max und Siegfried Nacht. Zwei radikale jüdische Existenzen*. Unrast Verlag, Münster 2008.

Rappaport 1981 = Herman Rappaport (ed.), *Anarchizm i anarchiści na ziemiach polskich do 1914 roku*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa 1981.

Robins Lang 1948 = Lucy Robins Lang, *Tomorrow Is Beautiful*. Macmillan, New York 1948.

Rocker 2005 = Rudolf Rocker, *The London Years*. Transl. Joseph Leftwich. AK Press, Oakland 2005.

SDKPiL w Rewolucji 1955 = *SDKPiL w Rewolucji 1905 roku. Zbiór publikacji*. Tadeusz Daniszewski et al. (eds.). Książka i Wiedza, Warszawa 1955.

Soboń 2011 = Marcin Soboń, *Polacy wobec Żydów w Galicji doby autonomicznej w latach 1868-1914*. Verso, Kraków 2011.

Torres 2024 = Anna Elena Torres, *Horizons Blossom, Borders Vanish: Anarchism and Yiddish Literature*. Yale University Press, New Haven-London 2024 [page number in e-book].

Unowsky 2018 = Daniel Unowsky, *The Plunder: The 1898 Anti-Jewish Riots in Habsburg Galicia*. Stanford University Press, Stanford 2018.

Vincenz 1977 = Stanisław Vincenz, *Tematy żydowskie*. Oficyna Poetów i Malarzy, Londyn 1977.

Volskij 1968 = А. Вольский [Jan Wacław Machajski], *Умственный рабочий*. Inter-Language Literary Associates, New York-Baltimore 1968.

Zimmer 2010 = Kenyon Zimmer, *"The Whole World Is Our Country": Immigration and Anarchism in the United States, 1885-1940*. PhD thesis. University of Pittsburg, 2010.

Zimmer 2015 = Kenyon Zimmer, *Immigrants Against the State: Yiddish and Italian anarchism in America*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana – Chicago – Springfield 2015.

Piotr Laskowski
(Institute of Applied Social Sciences, University of Warsaw)
p.laskowski6@uw.edu.pl
ORCID: 0000-0001-9106-5499

Jewish Anarchists in Eastern Europe's Melting Pot. The Case of Max Nacht (Nomad)

The article traces the linguistic choices Max Nacht (later Nomad, 1881-1973) made during the period of his intense involvement in the anarchist militancy in the Habsburg Empire and Switzerland between 1902 and 1908. Nacht was a prominent figure of Eastern and Central European radical milieus in the first decade of XX century, specifically during the Revolution of 1905, and an exemplary case of multilingual anarchist. His autobiographical book, *Dreamers, Dynamiters, and Demagogues* (1964) is a treasury of information about Jewish, Ukrainian, Russian, Polish, and German radicals at the time. Born and raised in Buczacz, a Galician town at the north-eastern peripheries of the Austro-Hungarian empire, Nacht was a careful and critical observer of the nationalisms tearing Galicia apart – in particular the politically dominant Polish nationalism. The article focuses on Nacht's collaboration with the Ukrainian anarchist Mychajlo Lozyns'kyj, with whom he published, in 1904, the only issue of an anarchist newspaper in Polish, "Wolny Świat", until their paths diverged due to Lozyns'kyj's involvement in the left-wing Ukrainian national movement, and subsequent Nacht's adherence to the ideas of the Polish revolutionary Jan Wacław Machajski. Nacht and Lozyns'kyj's political strategies and their linguistic choices are embedded in the theoretical framework developed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, particularly the distinction between majority, minority and minoritarian becoming.

Keywords: Max Nacht (Nomad), Jewish anarchism, Ukrainian anarchism, Nationalism.

INDICE

SLAVI, TEDESCHI, EBREI:
MIGRAZIONI, CONFINI, ESPERIENZE

A cura di Roberta Ascarelli, Ramona Pellegrino e Laura Quercioli

Roberta Ascarelli, Ramona Pellegrino, Laura Quercioli
Slavi, tedeschi, ebrei: migrazioni, confini, esperienze. Prefazione delle curatrici 7-15

Roberta Ascarelli
Pregiudizi, avventure e silenzi. Intellettuali polacchi e Haskalah berlinese 17-40

Giovanni Gorla
Echi herderiani alle radici del pensiero etnografico di Shloyme An-ski 41-64

Piotr Laskowski
Jewish Anarchists in Eastern Europe's Melting Pot. The Case of Max Nacht (Nomad) 65-93

Alois Woldan
Nathan Samuely – A Jewish Writer from Galicia 95-116

Stanisław Obirek
Rudolf Maria Holzapfel and Stanislaw Vincenz, i.e. Crossing Not Only Religious Borders 117-139

Michaela Bürger-Koftis, Ramona Pellegrino
Riflessioni linguistiche sul tedesco e sul russo in Julya Rabinowich: un confronto tra narrazione autobiografica orale e il romanzo Spaltkopf 141-164

Valentina Parisi
Fuori dai teatri della memoria: l'ebraismo plurale di Sasha Marianna Salzmann 165-192

Liliana Giacoponi
"Il paesaggio dal quale io giungo […] era una contrada di uomini e libri". La ricezione dell'opera di Paul Celan in Ucraina 193-218

Laura Quercioli
Vom Zuviel war die Rede, vom Zuwenig. Paul Celan nell'opera di Mirosław Bałka 219-241

STUDI E RICERCHE

Tarik Ćušić
Italijanske posuđenice u savremenom bosanskom jeziku ... 243-270

Emanuel Klotz
Die slawischen Namen der Gemeinde Nikolsdorf (Osttirol) – Slavia Tirolensis VII 271-295

Arnold McMillin
Hanna Komar at the Start of a Very Promising Career as Poet and Translator 297-328

Giacoma Strano
Na Puti di Čechov: una storia nella storia 329-350

Элина Свенцицкая
Верлибр как герменевтика: Экспериментальные переводы М. Л. Гаспарова 351-377

IN MEMORIAM

Irena Fedorowicz, Kinga Geben
Wspomnienie o profesorze Algisie Kalėdzie (1952-2017), założycielu polonistyki na Uniwersytecie Wileńskim 379-385

RECENSIONI

Velimir Chlebnikov, *Poesie*. Saggio, antologia e commento di Angelo Maria Ripellino. Intr. di Alessandro Niero. Nuova ed. a cura di Alessandro Niero e Riccardo Mini. Einaudi, Torino 2024 (Gabriele Mazzitelli) 387-390

Autor und Subjekt im Gedicht: Positionen, Perspektiven und Praktiken Heute. Hrsg. Peter Geist, Friederike Reents, Henrieke Stahl. Metzler, Heidelberg 2021 (Alessandro Achilli) 390-392

Olena Ponomareva, *Dizionario Hoepli Ucraino: Ucraino-Italiano*. Hoepli, Milano 2020 (Salvatore Del Gaudio) 392-395

Zuzana Nemčíková, Ivan Šuša, *Antológia súčasnej slovenskej literatúry / Antologia della letteratura slovacca contemporanea*. Istituto Slovacco a Roma, Roma 2023 (Josef Sikola) 395-398

Note biografiche sugli autori 399-403