

MAPAM is the party of the synthesis of Chalutz Pioneering Zionism and Revolutionary Socialism. None among us questioned this basic premise even during the most difficult days of shock and disappointment following the Prague Trial and the "Doctors Plot" in Moscow. MAPAM's loyalty to its principles was not shaken even by the revelations made at the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist party or by the ferment which followed them. Nevertheless, we must admit to ourselves that this loyalty to principles did not immunize all of MAPAM against ideological confusion and some distortion of concepts. Therefore, we have reason to redetermine what this loyalty to principles demands of us.

Forty years have passed since the October Revolution. Despite all the defeats encountered since, we are entitled to conclude that the October Revolution has stood the test, not only in the Soviet Union but has spread across a fourth of the earth's surface encompassing a third of humanity.

Forty years after the October Revolution, with its achievements and failures and after the victory of the socialist system in a large portion of the globe, we have reached a new stage in the struggle for Revolutionary Socialism. This new stage has two manifestations: a) Alongside the form of dictatorship of the proletariat practised in the Soviet Union, there have appeared and crystallised more democratic and equitable forms of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat in China, Yugoslavia and Poland; b) Opportunities have arisen for achieving socialism by different means,

beginning with liberalisation of the proletarian dictatorship and ending with the possibility of gaining power in the wake of a parliamentary victory.

Nevertheless, the truth is that this victory of Revolutionary Socialism was accomplished in the past and is achieved today at the cost of severe failures, with great dangers still apparent on the horizon. Therefore, agreement in principle with the October way does not relieve us of the necessity to examine premises in view of these severe failures and apparent dangers. The forty years of the Soviet system's existence must therefore be balanced against the dangers which now threaten its future.

ABOUT THE ACHIEVEMENTS

There is one fact which no diatribe can erase — foundations were laid in the Soviet Union for the maintenance of a socialist economy and regime. The system which rose from the ruins of the Czarist regime more than once faced the threat of extinction. Countless hardships and sacrifices of wealth and human beings occurred in the days of the Civil War, the imperialist intervention and during World War II. The Soviet Union was cut off by siege from most of the world for decades. We can now say that all these trials were passed successfully. The Soviet economy grew immensely; it left all the capitalist states, except for the United States, far behind it and now competes with the latter for first place among the nations of the world.

Following the Twentieth Congress and the publication of Khrushchev's secret speech on the horrors of the Stalinist rule, we had begun to hear, from time to time, appalling stories from eye-witnesses. There must be a great deal of truth in their words. However, if all they said was true, then the end of the Soviet regime would have come long

ago. If it were all true, then the entire giant mechanism of Soviet economy must be rotten to the core and devoid of all value. We know, of course, to what extent the plague of bureaucracy infected the Soviet administration in all its ramifications. — But, according to these stories, the Soviet Union was not just suffering from manifestations of bureaucratic corruption; we are told that there everyone is stealing, shirking work, and voraciously ravaging the state economy.

Ten years ago, when we received the wave of aliya (immigration to Israel) from Teheran and Tashkent, we heard testimony from people who could not be suspected of hating the Soviet Union. We asked them, nevertheless, how they could explain the Stalingrad victory and the rapid rehabilitation of post-war Soviet economy against a background of rottenness. There was no answer.

One person, however, offered the following argument: "It is true that the Soviet Union succeeded in establishing a nationalised economy with thousands of industrial enterprises and that it managed to set up the kolkhoz (collective) system in the villages. But a nationalised economy is not necessarily identical with a socialist regime."

How true is this argument? It is a fact that in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries, control of the means of production by the capitalist minority and capitalistic relations of production were eliminated and foundations were laid for socialistic relations. It is a fact that these production relationships held fast and were even strengthened during the past generation.

Shall we conclude from this that socialism has already gained its victory in the Soviet Union? No. Shortly after Stalin's death, Molotov voiced the opinion that only the *foundations* for a socialist regime had been laid in the Soviet Union and that the full victory of socialism must still be

fought for and won. The Central Committee of the Communist Party saw fit to admonish him for his "sin" and to correct publicly his "error". He was forced to apologise and declare that the socialist stage had seemingly been passed long ago and that the way was now open for the achievement of communism.

The question remains: Who was right — the Molotov of moderation who revealed the truth as he saw it, or the Molotov of overstatement ordered from above? Undoubtedly, Molotov the moderate was correct. Socialism has not yet been achieved throughout the vast Soviet economy and society. The regime is still fighting to free itself from the manifestations of bureaucratic degeneration, corruption and injustices which have plagued it.

But there is still another version. This version asserts that the failings, deformities and signs of rotteness which were uncovered in the Soviet Union prove that the disease had reached down to the roots. This approach even casts doubt upon the existence of socialist foundations in the Soviet Union. It claims that what was established is, at most, state capitalism. *The truth is that if the foundations for socialist relations of production had not been laid in the Soviet Union, it would have been impossible to maintain a nationalised economy of such colossal proportions, even for a few years.* Without socialist relations of production, such a nationalised economy could not have risen within the space of forty years replete with revolution, imperialist intervention, economic and political siege, anti-Fascist war and Cold War.

Those who question the existence of socialist foundations in the Soviet Union forget that the nationalised state economy was created by tens of millions of people. If this economy overcame every stumbling block and reached such strength,

if it exhibited such competitive ability against the capitalist economy, it was due to the fact that within the process of Soviet economic development there arose socialist relations of production. Although the socialist character of production relationship was damaged in no small measure by the disorders which infected the Soviet regime, only such a socialist character could have made it possible to activate the masses of people in such a gigantic constructive project, in such a short time and under such difficult conditions — a human effort almost incomparable in the history of humanity.

It is true that these socialist relations of production are far from perfect. They still bear severe deformities. But we must remember that without self-sacrifice no imposed force and no administrative apparatus, be it the most advanced, could have succeeded in moving and developing productive forces of such dimensions.

Dudintzev's novel, "Not by Bread Alone", berates bureaucracy which bars the way to creative initiative, wastes public property, gets involved in entanglements and degenerates in the process of grasping for personal advantage. The bureaucrats are opposed by fresh forces who fight and sacrifice themselves for the advancement of the socialist economy, wipe out corruption and press forward and upward. What does this struggle within the Soviet society between corrupt and regenerative elements foretell?

Dictatorship of the proletariat is not an end in itself. The means which it takes — as harsh as they may be — are intended to shorten the path which human society is forced to pass from a regime of wars between nations and of exploitation by one class of another, to a regime of peace and socialist democracy. *The harsh means of the regime of proletarian dictatorship were intended only to guarantee the molding of a cooperative economy in city and in village, to*

facilitate the rapid education of the masses, to bring about the liberation of the woman from discrimination and dependence, to secure independence and equality of nations; in short — to establish a social carrier for socialist democracy.

By educating millions of skilled workers, engineers, agronomists and artists — all this within the framework of proletarian dictatorship — the Soviet Union was guaranteed its base for socialist democracy. If, in a few years, every Soviet youth will have access to secondary education — as do all kibbutz children in Israel — this will serve as a more adequate guarantee of de-Stalinisation than the somewhat hypocritical dissociation with Beria's crimes and the personality cult in some of the more outspoken addresses at the Twentieth Congress.

In my book, "On the Threshold of an Era," published in 1941, i.e., on the eve of the Soviet Union's entrance into the Second World War, I devoted a special chapter to the mutual consummation of proletarian dictatorship and socialist democracy. The Soviet Union was still under siege, surrounded by enemies; it was still impossible to predict when and through what stages proletarian dictatorship would give up its place to socialist democracy. I refrained, at the time, from prophesying when proletarian dictatorship would eliminate itself and when it would complete its task of giving birth to socialist democracy.

Fifteen years have passed since then. At least half that time was caught up in a whirlpool of civil war, World War and Cold War. Today we are convinced that the years of isolation and siege have passed, perhaps forever. Today the Soviet Union is encircled by allies. Together, these countries number 900 million people, more than a third of the world's population. Alongside these countries there has been created a neutralist bloc which is ready to cooperate in the struggle

for peace and the independence of peoples. We have reached a point where the socialist bloc, together with the neutralist bloc, are a decisive majority of the world's population. The majority of humanity today opposes war; it calls for peaceful co-existence of the opposing regimes.

These factors, as well as the nature of the proletarian dictatorship, universal education, encouragement of the equality of peoples, liberation of women, etc., all of which, at first glance, seem to be part of the regime's superstructure, often may play a decisive role in the development tempo of production.

But above and beyond all estimates of achievements and failures, as well as observation of lights and shadows, we are faced with the conclusive fact that the Soviet regime has held out for forty years; moreover, it has deepened its roots and is expanding its sphere of influence. The very fact that there is a generation in the Soviet Union which was born after the October Revolution and has already reached middle age is partial proof of its stability. This stability, which was at first sustained primarily by the severities of dictatorship, today finds its main support in the great achievements in the economy, society and culture, achievements which were accumulated during these forty years.

At present, the number of those who have completed studies in various fields of the economy, of science, and of the humanities is considerable but remains only a minority of the populace nevertheless. This achievement alone was sufficient to cause a tremendous transformation in the Soviet people, its character, its creative potential and its cultural capacities. The degree of democracy in the regime is dependent largely, though not entirely, upon this transformation. The very development of productive forces and the entrenchment of socialist relations of production within the framework of the

Soviet regime help in crystallising the social base which is due to rise eventually and break the bonds of compulsion and bureaucratic dereliction.

This process also aids in the transition from centralised lines to a system of de-centralisation and increasing self-government, both in the economic-administrative and national-cultural fields. Development of popular, many-sided creative ability promises higher productivity and greater success in all fields of production. It also guarantees greater equality and the gradual elimination of compulsion and intimidation. This process may also weaken unharnessed competition in work output and related signs of careerism and corruption.

MANIFESTATIONS OF DEGENERATION AND PERVERSION

The Twentieth Congress revealed manifestations of perversion of the proletarian dictatorship. It promised to put these to an end and to advance the Soviet regime toward social democratisation, toward decentralisation and economic and cultural self-management. The horrible revelations of the Soviet regime during the long period under Stalin's leadership seemed to open a deep chasm at our feet. The impression left by Khrushchev's behind-the-scenes speech was so devastating that the signs of a change for the better which were noticed at the Twentieth Congress were quickly forgotten.

A great many had the feeling that this reign of terror is stamped in the very essence of proletarian dictatorship. The October Revolution's great message of humanity's liberation from imperialist exploitation, from rule of nations by nations, from the dangers of war, was as though forgotten by many of those who had been staunchly loyal to socialism during the past generation.

Isn't this somewhat astonishing? Could there have been any doubt that the October flag symbolised the freedom of man from the shame of starvation, national enslavement and colonialist exploitation? It should justifiably have carried this message today, in an age of expansion for the socialist and neutralist world, more than ever before. However, the failures uncovered at the Congress still blur the vision and power of judgment of many people. The message of the October Revolution which fired their imagination for more than a generation does not inspire nor even warm them any more. There is a danger of the flag being lowered, of nihilism. Therefore, we are obliged to return to the Twentieth Congress and evaluate the events which preceded it.

The speakers at the Congress stated that, considering the dangers and trials which faced the Soviet Union after the October Revolution, the severe measures of the proletar-dictatorship were justified and valid — up until the Seventeenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party in 1934. From that Congress on, they saw no justification in the continued reign of terror and abominations which held sway over the entire state and especially within the ranks of the party itself. They approved the war against the Trotskyite-Bucharinist deviation and the campaign of eliminating the kulaks in the villages — everything, up to that date, 1934.

We have no intention of passing judgment as to the correctness of one date or another. Much as before 1934, in the civil war years and in the days of the war against kulak sabotage in the village, the Soviet regime was driven to certain harsh methods of proletarian dictatorship, so was it obligated after 1934 to use drastic methods against the danger of provocation and Fifth Column. From the moment of Hitler's rise to power, all the European countries and especially the Soviet Union were threatened by these dangers,

which reached their peak with the invasion of Soviet territory by the Nazi armies.

But neither before nor after 1934 did we ever justify violation of democratic principles within the Bolshevik Party, the mass extermination of its leadership and thousands of rank-and-file members, the show-trials or the system of extracting forced confessions. We still decry the uprooting of whole peoples and the exile of millions, innocent together with guilty, to the concentration camps located somewhere in the vicinity of the North Pole. We have not forgotten that among those imprisoned in these camps to this day are thousands of Jews paying for their loyalty to Zion and longing for their homeland.

Bureaucratic degeneration, ever-increasing concentration of authority in the hands of the few led by Stalin, violation of all rules of civil law, secret police control in all fields of life and in all social, economic and governmental levels — all these were not objectively necessary in any period of the October Revolution, neither before nor after 1934. These phenomena indicated the degeneration of the proletarian dictatorship and democratic centralism. Lenin fought these manifestations and censured them from the first. As the years passed, these phenomena spread throughout the Soviet Union.

At the Twentieth Congress, there was a general competition in criticising these revelations. As we recall, they were blamed on Beria and on the "personality cult," i.e., Stalin's one-man rule. The famous speech was attributed to First Secretary Khrushchev; it was he who unfolded the long list of horrors related to the days of Stalin's work and rule. Afterwards he tried to shake himself free of all responsibility for this speech, and claimed that it was no more than a fabrication of the American State Department. At various opportunities he went as far as declaring himself

Stalin's pupil and returned to Stalin the title of "Great Teacher of Marxism-Leninism." It is probable that he was forced to correct the former impression under pressure of the group of Stalin's associates which remained in the Party Presidium. The dismissal of this group will undoubtedly unloosen again the tongues of Khrushchev and his comrades.

One strange thing is still bewildering: These shocking discoveries appeared in the world's newspapers for a full year. Even in the socialist countries, Stalin was revealed as "a sadist and a madman" whose hands were covered with blood. Everyone believed that this speech was genuine; even the People's Democracies believed it authentic. Then suddenly everyone began to wipe out all traces of it.

At the last convention of MAKI (The Israel Communist Party) there was not even a mention of the denunciation of Beria or the renunciation of the personality cult. We are accustomed to watching this group accept as absolute proof that which seems most suitable to the First Secretary of the C. P. S. U. at any particular moment. The man who was idolised before his death as "The Sun of the Peoples, Father of Victory and Genius of all Generations," suddenly turned into a satanic monster.

Even if we leave determination of the authenticity of Khrushchev's secret speech to the experts, we find in the public speeches of the other Soviet leaders a desire to clear themselves of any participation in responsibility for the reign of terror during Stalin's last years. Sole responsibility is placed upon the dead Stalin and his executed aide. *Whether Khrushchev's speech is authentic or forged, whether there is any truth in all that was staged around the "personality cult" or whether the responsibility for the failures of the entire period up to the Twentieth Congress falls upon the entire leadership, including Khrushchev — the truth is that*

the failures of that period reach such proportions that they could have jeopardised the achievements of socialism and its eventual victory. The truth is that we were all shaken profoundly by these revelations of degeneration and failures.

I shall not attempt tracing the roots of these revelations nor would I try to enumerate the mistakes according to the order of their importance. I would like to point out, however, one particular mistake of a theoretical nature which, at the Twentieth Congress received no small blame for the missteps of the revolution and the revelations of bureaucratic perversion of the proletarian dictatorship. As Marxists we are not surprised at the extent of the power and drive of revolutionary theory. We know how fatal a theoretical mistake can be when, as a result, we lose clear sight of the truth which determines the fate of the enterprise and the path to its achievement.

The conclusions of the Seventeenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party stated that the Party had succeeded in overcoming the factional war within itself. Deviationists gave in and the general line of the Party was victorious. Collectivisation was concluded with victory and with the elimination of the kulaks. Also victorious was the cruel campaign against acts of sabotage by the class enemy in the Soviet village. Socialism continued to be realised in one country. Nevertheless, the time had come to loosen the reins, to ease up on the severities of the dictatorship and to strengthen democratic principles in the Soviet state and within the Communist Party.

This would have seemed to be the logical, realistic conclusion — but the opposite came about. The leadership of the Communist Party, with Stalin at its head, reached a contrary conclusion. Instead of close observance of the system of democratic centralism, with an accent on greater

democracy and weakened centralism, instead of striving to achieve a classless society following the decisive victory over the class enemy in the village, Stalin and his associates decided to sharpen the war against the remnants of the class enemy. In order to facilitate their rule, they advanced the paradoxical explanation that after the downfall of the remnants of the class enemy, the latter necessarily represents an even greater danger to the Soviet regime. And so, the Soviet leaders began to hunt class enemies in every out-of-the-way corner.

In the process of hunting imagined enemies, the vast country was suddenly filled with endless suspicion. The hunt for saboteurs brought on the search and discovery of "enemies" within the walls of the Communist Party itself. With the victory of the general line and the defeat of the class enemy, the demand of the hour became unification of the entire party against the growing Nazi-Fascist threat. But the chase after the class enemy, supposedly hiding within the camp, turned such renowned commanders as General Tukhachevsky into Nazi spies and central members of the Politburo into provocateurs and enemies of the people. The terror against the enemies of the working class was diverted against the loyal supporters of the Revolution. A large number of leaders of the October Revolution and many of its fighters fell prey to this reign of terror. The dictatorship of the proletariat came to be a tyrannical regime. The entire country was overcast by the shadow of terror and bureaucratic domination of aspects of the economy, the society and the party.

And thus came about the show-trials against party leaders and thousands of functionaries. Thus it occurred that, on the eve of World War II, this internal campaign came to an end after the extermination of a large section of the leadership of the party and the Red Army. The Soviet

Union's backbone of leadership of constructive and defensive forces was seriously weakened.

The misdirection of the path of the Revolution began to assert itself in all spheres of life. The same ethical duplicity which we criticized back in 1941, in "On the Threshold of an Era," now found itself a permanent berth. It even began to leave its mark on the programmatic declarations of the party leadership. The accepted lie, which was taken for granted in all phases of the administration, passed on from the bureaucracy and penetrated the writing of history, science and literature; it reached the farthestmost cells of Soviet society. All were agreed that declaration and reality are two different things. While in reality terror grew and the circle of those carrying responsibility shrank, conventions and congresses feted the victorious *slogan of democratisation*.

In real life the terror of the Secret Police, which eliminated its victims without law or trial, took control while in the luxurious halls of the metropolis, meetings of the Supreme Soviet and conventions of functionaries and outstanding party members met to ratify the Stalin Constitution and the Kolkhoz Charter. These two acts were intended to guarantee the democratic rights of the Soviet citizen and the principle of self-management in the cooperative villages. But reality bared the hypocrisy of these festive declarations.

At the Twentieth Congress it became generally apparent that the Emperor was naked. The Constitution and the Kolkhoz Charter turned into scraps of paper from the start. *But if Soviet society did not reach ultimate degeneration and if, despite the regime of suppression, the unfailing source of devotion, self-sacrifice and patriotism was not exhausted, it was because the socialist economy created such forces that even a regime of suppression, even an atmosphere of ethical duplicity and bureaucratic corruption, could not harm its core.*

Another example of the glaring contradiction between theory and practice is the matter of *wage-differentiation*. A differentiated wage scale within reasonable limits is an accompanying appendage of a socialist order. But an inexcusable gap was created between the wage level of the laboring masses and the living and wage conditions of the technical-administrative and party apparatus, including the professional intelligentsia. This gap enlarged the social differentiation between a minority enjoying special privileges because of expertness or station, another minority employed mainly in "superstructure" occupations, and the great populace of workers at the lathe or on the tractor, those who with their own hands activate the forces of production and comprise the broad base of the society as a whole.

On the one hand rose a minority enjoying luxuries; on the other were the millions in city and village, the vast majority of Soviet society who work under conditions of privation and crowdedness. Amidst these conditions of growing differentiation, of privation and a system of work control as compared with expansiveness and a life of luxury — public meetings heard proclamations on the transition from the stage of socialism, the construction of which had been supposedly completed, to the imminent stage of communism.

How far we are in actuality from the accomplishment of socialism and the transition stage to communism: Only now are the concentration camps being emptied of the millions who were sentenced for disciplinary offenses, imperfect work and political sins, both real and imagined. The stage of socialism achieved must be very far off if we still hear how norms are achieved by threats of punishment and the pressures of unrestrained competition.

Some comrades are not upset by these faults. They claim that all defects can be attributed to the superstructure

of the regime. In their opinion, the nature of Soviet production is absolutely socialistic — despite the deformities which marred the regime. But what is the truth? If the proletarian dictatorship, directed by the Communist Party, replaced the system of democratic centralism with a system of anti-democratic centralism; if, over a period of years, this anti-democratic centralism became a tyranny ignoring human rights and silencing all freedom of thought, creation and expression; if so, we are no longer interested in speculative hair-splitting over which category such a party belongs to. Even if it is clear that a party is part of the superstructure of society, does it thereby cease being a driving force of decisive influence upon the activation of productive forces and in molding the character of relations of production? If in People's Poland the continuation of the Stalinist line brought about the Poznan outbreak and if a general strike was a hair's breadth away; if Gomulka was forced, in order to unite the people behind him, to give up collectivisation of the villages; if Khrushchev said that the tyrannical regime seriously lowered labour efficiency and agricultural production, then we need not go into extended research in order to understand what dangers faced the continued development of socialist productive forces and production relationships in city and village.

There is no need to remind us how to recognize the difference between a socialist regime and communist society. We have not forgotten that, under a socialist regime, man does not receive according to his needs; his wages are relative to the quantity and quality of the work he produces. *But if after forty years of socialist regime, millions of workers and farmers do not enjoy a decent living in return for their labor while a minority of professionals and high job-holders have a standard of living comparable to the*

well-to-do bourgeoisie in the capitalist countries, then we must protest against this insufferable gap between wage levels — a gap which harbors the danger that the present social differentiation may one day develop into a class differentiation.

To attribute this gap to a faulty superstructure now, after forty years of building socialism, is out of the question. This gap cannot but damage production relationships and hamper the development of productive forces. Under such conditions, not only can we not talk of the achievement of socialism; there is even the danger that the very foundations of socialism may be undermined. Under conditions of such obvious inequality, there can be no guarantee of harmonious integration between productive forces and production relationships, the outstanding characteristic of a socialist economy. The natural result of the present condition is the appearance of contradictions between the latter two, with all the inherent danger to the socialist nature of the economy involved in this.

At the Twentieth Congress, there was a serious attempt to bare defects, manifestations of perversion and dangers facing the Soviet State, economy and society. Although judgment of the past was not accompanied by positive self-criticism, the dissociation from all that was included in the concept of Stalinism showed a general desire to correct wrongs. It looked like the beginning of a change for the better. Indeed, in not a few fields the tyrannical regime was weakened; the all-powerful authority of the Secret Police seemed to have been ended; a certain amount of collective responsibility was initiated among the upper echelons of the regime; an end was put to wholesale extermination, without a trial, of thousands of suspects accused of unfaithfulness or deviation; there were first signs of liberalisation in science, literature and art. Lately, there has also been an

attempt to do away with economic over-centralisation and to adopt a system of decentralisation and self-management of regions, under the supervision and direction of the central government in Moscow.

Nevertheless, we have not noticed drastic changes in a number of sectors which determine the nature of the Soviet regime. Now, as before, there is no debate worthy of the name within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Even discussions held behind the closed doors of the Central Committee end, as in the harshest days of Stalin, with the dismissal of leading members from the Party Presidium, the Central Committee and high governmental posts. We are once more approaching one-man rule. Once more we hear wholesale accusations against the more liberal Malenkov together with Molotov and Kaganovitch of the old guard, and Shepilov of Khrushchev's men. They are accused of engaging in factional activities and undermining the party's foundations.

Apart from physical extermination, all this reminds one of the tactics accepted in Stalin's day for disposing of rivals from both right and left. The vaunted collective responsibility which was brought forward as proof that the personality cult had been overcome, again is being forgotten as though nothing had happened in the meanwhile, as if only yesterday they had not been uncovering the horrors of the "personality cult". If there are discussions, they take place behind the closed doors of the Presidium and of the Central Committee. No echoes of these discussions reach the people, much as no echoes reached them from Politburo discussions in Stalin's time. Once more unanimous votes are guaranteed at all stages. Once more there is fear of a wave of dismissals and punishments. The trend toward assimilatory integration of small

peoples is active today as in the days of Stalin, especially in the case of the Jewish minority.

The spring buds in books like Dudintzev's "Not by Bread Alone" have not yet brought the spring. "The Thaw" (of Ehrenburg's book) in intellectual, literary and artistic life has not yet arrived. Monotony and conformity, Zhdanov style, are still on top. Centralism has not yet become democratic and, even now, democratisation in many fields is on the surface only. The accepted lie has not stopped asserting itself in social relations. Ruling circles have not yet given up their double ethics. The contradiction between theory and practice has not yet disappeared. Even the fear which followed Soviet citizens day by day has not altogether passed. Whatever the case with others, the masses of Jews still dread the wrath of the "evil eye."

IN SUMMARY :

The development of tremendous forces of production in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the guarantee of harmonious integration between these productive forces and the socialist relations of production demand continuously growing democratisation in social relations and growing economic and cultural self-government of the peoples dwelling within its framework. Productive forces in the Soviet Union have reached such a degree of might that unshakable socialist relations of production will not be able to exist for long without increasing democratisation of social relations and without increasing decentralisation in the management of the nationalised economy and in the relations of the peoples within its borders. We have witnessed a contradiction between two tendencies; while the Soviet economy is trying to break the bonds of centralism, undemocratic central-

ism and signs of bureaucratic perversion are still evident in labour relations, in wage levels, in the party, in education, in culture, in literature — and above all, in the national policy and in the relations of peoples.

LIGHTS AND SHADOWS IN THE PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACIES

A spark fell in Poznan which lit a flame. The uprising by masses of workers there stimulated terrific ferment throughout Poland. These waves of awakening carried Gomulka back to the seat of power. It was discovered that this ferment was far from being social ferment alone. It was a people's awakening aimed against the continued regime of suppression and Stalin-type domination. The sharp edge of this awakening was directed against the faction which continued, even after the Twentieth Congress, to follow blindly after the dictates from Moscow.

When Gomulka was returned to power, Khrushchev and Bulganin rushed to Warsaw and tried to turn back the tide, but they failed. The threats of Soviet Army divisions moving towards Warsaw were of no avail. Tension reached its peak, but political sense won the day. The Soviet leadership resigned itself to Poland's independence. Gomulka, in return, declared his loyalty to the Warsaw Pact of mutual defense which had been signed by all the socialist countries except Yugoslavia.

After Poland came Hungary. Hungary had no leader of Gomulka's stature. There the fermentation, awakening and uprising were met by the Stalinist pupils of Rakoszi. The fatal intervention of the Soviet Army, which was prevented in Poland, was called for in Budapest by Rakoszi's pupils. We witnessed a nation's tragedy whose aftermath will not

soon be forgotten even though the wounds may heal. The fatal intervention of the Soviet Union in Hungary was exploited by fascist and reactionary elements. In the end, it was declared necessary to suppress a counter-revolution in order to return Hungary to the front of Socialist countries. This necessity was admitted by both Tito and Gomulka. After the imminent danger had passed, they raised their voices the more vehemently for the equality and independence of socialist nations, small as well as large. They repeated their protestations against the dictation of the Soviet Union.

Especially characteristic was the appearance of People's China in the face of this crisis-of-faith which had occurred between the Soviet Union and a number of the People's Democracies. It is notable that this Communist country, first in population and second in terms of power, was the one to raise its voice forcefully in defending the independence of socialist nations. It rejected national overbearing and the domineering aims of the Soviet Communist Party and the Soviet government. Since then, China has appeared as a mediating, balancing and regulating factor. She strengthens ties of solidarity where they have slackened and demands the return of independence where it is in danger.

We are not short, in our country, of people who negate the Soviet regime, and hate Communism. But even that part of the camp of Worker's Zionism which believes in Revolutionary Socialism and counts itself among the friends of the Soviet Union — even here, the prestige of the Soviet Union is at low ebb while that of People's Poland and China has reached a new high. As opposed to the manifestations of neo-Stalinism in the Soviet Union, as opposed to the policy of assimilation by force practiced by the Soviet Union in relation to the Jewish minority, some comrades point to Poland's courageous war for its independence and freedom

and the democratisation of its regime. They point out its struggle against the plague of anti-semitism and for the Jewish minority's right to self-determination. Gomulka has justly become an admired figure in Israel, in almost all circles. The freedom of expression which was returned to Polish journalism has also won acclaim.

Nevertheless, this is not the entire picture. Although we cannot doubt the regenerating and progressive nature of the Polish October, the fact is that the Communist Party in People's Poland won itself popular support through painful concessions. In order to win Cardinal Wyszynski's acquiescence to the present regime, Gomulka was forced to introduce Catholic education in all schools, to expose the youth to anti Marxist and, as a matter of fact, even anti-Communist spiritual influences. Collectivisation was halted and some of the kolkhozes, which comprised in all no more than 6% of Polish agriculture, were also disbanded in favor of individual farming. Anti-semitism has been showing itself among broad sections of Polish society.

We believe in the success of the line which People's Poland has followed. But we cannot ignore the fact that Gomulka's regime, despite the support of a decisive segment of the people, stands for the moment on unsteady ground under which primeval forces boil, endangering its stability. We believe, nevertheless, that in the long run, the Polish October will pass all its trials and improve its position.

A fresh breeze is blowing across Gomulka's Poland and it spells democratic renewal within the Communist camp. But meanwhile we must admit that from the economic and social aspects, i.e., the development of productive forces and the stability of relations of production, the Soviet Union is by far the more stable. We must not ignore this truth. *With all our criticism, the Soviet Union, now too,*

comprises the determining link in the chain. Every other socialist country, and even People's China, will have to depend upon the economic and military strength of the Soviet Union for a long time to come.

Yet the forward position of the first socialist land does not bestow upon it special privileges; on the contrary, it imposes greater obligations. It imposes the full obligations of aid of the type which would strengthen mutual guarantee between socialist countries. In fulfilling its obligations towards the socialist countries, the Soviet Union would also benefit, because the strengthening of mutual guarantees also assures greater security within its own country and at its borders.

Stalin concluded one of the speeches before his death with a message of freedom, equality and independence for peoples, large and small. Tito had reason, nevertheless, to blame Stalin for interfering with the independence of the Yugoslav people. The Twentieth Congress regarded him as responsible for the split between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union in 1948. Khrushchev and his comrades went to Belgrade "to beg forgiveness" from the Yugoslav people. They promised lasting friendship and equitable relations from then on between the former contenders. Then came the tension in Poland and the crisis in Hungary. The ideological controversy between Belgrade and Moscow was renewed. But now, after the removal of Molotov and his associates, Radio Belgrade again sings his praises.

Let us say plainly: we do not unreservedly identify ourselves with the special approach of Yugoslavia's leaders. *But there was one decisive matter, which was the crux of the controversy between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union, whose true value and importance we did not appreciate at the time. That was the struggle of the Yugoslav people for its independence and against the dictates of Moscow. This is*

a struggle which should be acclaimed not only by Yugoslavia but by every people struggling for national and social liberation, on its way to independence according to the particular conditions of its country.

Whoever reads the story of the threats which Stalin threw at Tito's Yugoslavia in 1948, cannot but recall Bulganin's "gracious" letter to the State of Israel, the same letter which questioned our State's right to existence and a future. The concentration of Soviet armed forces on Yugoslavia's borders in 1948 reminds us of the threat of Soviet volunteers who would be mobilized against us in the interests of Syria and Egypt.

Mighty China as well as smaller Poland and Hungary all show extreme sensitivity regarding this particular point. It was this very controversy which caused the split between the Cominform and the term "Titoism."

To our sorrow, those who spoke at the Twentieth Congress and after it, continued to maintain the contradiction between theory and practice, between declarations and their execution. Despite declarations on the equality and independence of peoples, the Soviet Union, even after Stalin's death, tried to increase the dependence of the People's Democracies on the dictates of Moscow, although with no great success.

We might ask this question: How far can the reins of mutual guarantees be slackened and to what extent can the severities of proletarian dictatorship be done away with in the People's Democracies? Proletarian dictatorship has existed in these states for no more than eleven years. Their forces of production have not yet reached their full development. Their stability has not yet been guaranteed by socialist relations of production. That is the situation in nearly all the People's Democracies. Socialist relations of production

in the village are still in their infancy. Not only have these countries not completed the building of socialism — they have not even secured sturdy foundations for its construction. Marxism-Leninism does serve as the official doctrine of these states. It is the foundation on which the political line is laid and which guides the education of the people and the youth. Nevertheless the masses, young and old, still fill the churches to overflowing, piously following the priests' every word. It is obvious then that these states are still in need of supervision from within and a great deal of assistance from without in order to guarantee the stability of the socialist order within their realm.

What then is the problem? Is the struggle against the enemies of the workers and for the stability of the socialist regime being carried by an independent social base; is the stability of the regime guaranteed by forces from within? In this respect it cannot be denied that in comparison with other parties, the Communist Party in Yugoslavia knew how to protect the foundations of the socialist regime with its own forces. It maintained the socialist regime although it was isolated and harried.

The other People's Democracies faced a much harder trial. The socialist regime within them, rather being initiated through the victory of revolutionary forces from within, was initiated first of all through the victory of the Red Army. In those countries the revolutionary base has remained weak to this day. Their communist parties are flooded with opportunistic elements.

The system of stewardship enforced by Moscow was not able to speed up the education of independent cadres, capable of maintaining a firm attachment to the masses of workers in those countries. The results were not long in coming: While independent parties such as in Yugoslavia,

and to a certain extent, in Poland, passed their decisive test with flying colors, the Communist Party in Hungary, whose cadres were not rooted among the masses, was revealed in the hour of trial as a broken reed.

Does this mean that Czechoslovakia or Hungary must experience the same years of suffering and the same failures as did the first socialist state? Any affirmative socialist would be ready to justify many of the Soviet Union's failures on the grounds that these failures were a sort of tuition-fee for the socialist regimes that arose in its wake. He would justify these failures on the premise that the severities of forty years of proletarian dictatorship shortened the thorny road for the states that came later. Today, it has become a necessity to shorten the road and accelerate the pace of democratisation in those countries.

Among the reasons for the weakened attachment of workers to the regime in the People's Democracies, low wages and an unsatisfactory standard of living are most prominent. I devoted special attention to the problem of the wage gap in the Soviet Union. The events of the recent past leave one with the feeling that in comparison with the workers of the Soviet Union, even greater suffering was the lot of the workers in other socialist countries. They suffered doubly despite the fact that their power of endurance was weaker. In the Soviet Union it was Malenkov, now dismissed from the leadership, who dared after Stalin's death to draw more courageous conclusions. He decided to increase the tempo of production in light industry and weaken it in heavy industry. He did this in order to lighten somewhat the burden on the workers, even at the price of slowing down production in heavy industry which is so essential to the military preparedness of the Soviet State and the entire socialist bloc.

There is no doubt that the workers' power of endurance in the People's Democracies reached a limit which threatened a catastrophic crisis. Loosening of the reins became an undeniable necessity, even though it meant a worrisome slowing-down in the tempo of production, development and armament. Reality proved that tightening the belt and adding additional burdens did not in the long run speed up the rate of production, development and armament, but lowered work-output and quality, aroused bitter feelings toward the regime and toward the party responsible for it. This bitterness and even hate were especially vehement toward the Soviet stewardship and toward those among the ruling elements of these countries who carried out the wishes of the Soviet leadership.

From all that has been noted above it becomes evident that :

- a) In order to maintain a decent standard of living of a nation, it is necessary to calculate the desired rate of development of the country's economy, not in terms of a few short years, but in terms of a more extended period;
- b) Such an extended period of construction and development, alongside of the satisfaction of the working populations' needs and the reduction of the gap in wage scales, can be realised in an atmosphere of peaceful co-existence between regimes and between the conflicting world blocs.

THE SITUATION OF THE JEWISH MINORITIES IN THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Before going on to the problem of co-existence between the regimes, I would like to touch on the influence of the Cold War upon the attitude of the revolutionary world toward the Jewish problem.

The extreme reached in contradiction between theory and practice under anti-democratic centralism is proved by the way in which the slogans "Brotherhood of Peoples" and "National Equality" were put into practice. The October Revolution decreed the right of self-determination for small as well as large peoples within the area of the U.S.S.R. During the Revolution's "honeymoon" years, we saw a blossoming of national life and cultures — including those of previously unheard-of peoples. The Jewish minority was also given an opportunity to rejuvenate its conditions of production by concentrating in special settlement areas in Crimea and the Ukraine, and by creating a would-be state in Biro-Bidjan. A large net-work of schools was developed. Yiddish literature flowered and scientists applied themselves to their task. Even in the Communist Party a separate autonomy of sorts was granted to the Jews in the form of the "Yevsektzia" (Jewish section of the C.P.).

Meanwhile we were nursing illusions. Everything seemed to be running smoothly. The appeals of the Anti-Fascist Committee from Moscow, which were intended to demonstrate universal Jewish solidarity, still echo in our ears, while under cover of illusory proclamations, the physical extermination of the Jewish minority's cultural and community leadership was being carried out in the Soviet Union. The forced assimilation of the Jewish masses was graced with the respectable name of "integration".

We live at a time of sharp crisis within the Jewish minorities in the socialist countries. We have not always realised the full sharpness of this crisis. We always believed in the Borochovist prognosis and we asserted that, historically, sooner or later, the necessity for territorial concentration in Israel of all the exiles, no matter the country or regime of their origin, would be proven. But in the period leading

up to the Prague Trial and the Doctors' "Plot," even the pessimists among us had no doubt that the Jews in socialist countries were guaranteed full equality. Of course, they predicted that the Jewish problem would grow more severe, but they placed the fulfillment of their prophecy in the more distant future.

Therefore, we confined ourselves to the demand for continued aliya (immigration) from the People's Democracies. The possibilities of aliya from these countries seemed more actual, since the Jews there had not yet adjusted themselves to the new regime. In addition, the local government heads regarded them as a difficult social problem. We never gave up the possibility that the gates of the Soviet Union would be opened to allow Jewish aliya to their historic homeland. But during all these years, we did not call indefatigably for realisation of this demand.

There was a time when we, together with all the other parties with whom we cooperate in the present government coalition, made a careful distinction between the emphatic demand for aliya from the People's Democracies and the cautious request presented to the Soviet government and its representatives.

Then came the Twentieth Congress, which laid the afflictions of the Soviet regime open to the public eye. Among the evils criticised were the offences of the Soviet regime against smaller peoples and the acts of iniquity and even exile against these peoples. The speakers at this Congress promised to heal these wounds and correct the wrongs. They hid just one problem: that of the Jewish minority.

The number of Jews in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries is estimated to be three-and-one-half million. Some add, others subtract from this number. Whatever the case, this is a not inconsequential minority in the

Soviet Union. The Soviet Union contains dozens of peoples and "sub-peoples," whose number is no greater than the Jewish minority, yet they even constitute some of the republics which together comprise the territorial entity of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The principle of self-determination is applied to these nations, both large and small. They have the opportunity to develop their national independence in the fields of culture, education and self-government. Of course, there were also other small peoples who were sentenced to exile and uprooting for real or imagined sins during the war with Hitler. But there was one people which, both in Stalin's day, as well as in Krushchev's has been condemned to imposed assimilation — the Jewish minority.

The official propaganda of the Soviet Union explains politely, followed by MAKI (Israeli Communist Party) in brash crescendo, that the Jews were given every opportunity to develop their language and culture — but that they themselves have rejected these as worthless. Up to a short time ago, they argued that the Jews were willingly integrating themselves within the peoples among whom they lived, and especially within the Russian people. But recent eye-witnesses have discredited this official version. We have heard the reports of socialist and even communist delegations, and especially from their Jewish members. All these had the impression that not only is there no voluntary assimilation or integration through brotherhood and equality, but on the contrary — the Jews are dejected and unsure of the morrow. Anti-semitism has become noticeable in large sections of the Soviet people.

They tell us that there are some Soviet leaders who favor a numerus clausus and the removal of Jews from key positions. According to reliable sources, this numerus clausus

applies to universities, governmental institutions and industrial establishments. We recently heard from serious people who had been there that, were the gates of the Soviet Union opened to aliya, a mighty stream would burst forth — and it would be the youth which was born after the Revolution that would be at its head. This youth, which was on the verge of assimilation, was suddenly hit by the shock of disillusion and was awakened to thinking anew.

There is a classic example in the Zionist movement of the return of assimilated Jews to their people — Theodore Herzl. It is well known how strongly aroused he was by the anti-semitism in the Dreyfus Trial and what part this experience played in bringing the father of political Zionism back to his people. This experience also occurred in other lands. Now this shock is operating among the most assimilated part of the Jews in the socialist countries. This ferment is especially active within the Jewish concentrations in Poland and in the Soviet Union.

It happened that the process of displacement by the local population which was described with such clarity by Borochove took place — of all countries — in the Soviet Union. This process impeded assimilation and again confronted the Jewish minorities with the problem of their existence and their future. It is possible that Krushchev's grandson, whose mother was Jewish, may not have to suffer from discrimination now that even Kaganovitch has been discredited and deposed. Perhaps he will continue to nurture the illusion of "integration". Perhaps Jews, as individuals, will assimilate even under the most severe conditions in the same way as Jews converted throughout the ages. *But the Jews as a whole or the Jewish youth in the Soviet Union and in the socialist countries, after decades of complacent assimilation and blind faith in the regime, were faced with evidences of racial*

discrimination; after the feeling of a homeland was again stolen from them, they suddenly awoke to a new consciousness of their ancient homeland.

Indeed, the wheels of history grind slowly but surely; they grind with cruel consistency. *In direct opposition to all our assumptions, Borochovism was verified in the socialist countries and sooner than we thought — even sooner than in the developed capitalist countries. The process of de-proletarianisation took place among the Jewish masses in the socialist countries, the classic countries of productivisation and proletarianisation.*

The October Revolution found the Jewish masses in the towns of Ukraine, Byelorussia and Polesia uprooted and dispossessed without any economic foothold. Great and sincere efforts were made during the first years of the Revolution in order to rehabilitate the social and economic structure of the Jews.

Thousands were concentrated in special agricultural regions in the Crimea and in the Ukraine. Tens of thousands were transferred to Biro-Bidjan. Hundreds of thousands were incorporated in industry and manufacturing. The intelligentsia was quickly absorbed into the party and government apparatus which was thirsty for cadres and experts of all sorts.

As time went by, the expanded apparatus of the five-year plans began to absorb many of the Jews who had meanwhile entered agriculture and industry. It seemed a paradox that the process of renewed de-proletarianisation was encouraged, during the years of intensive development, by that same administration which, in Kalinin's day, made such great efforts in the opposite direction. These Jews were joined by others who had been dispossessed and driven from their villages during the Nazi occupation by Hitler's

armies, which were helped to no small extent by lackeys from among the local population. The Jewish concentration in the villages was destroyed, never to return. In the years of the feverish rehabilitation of the Soviet economy following the war, an increasing stream of Jews arrived from distant areas and from villages in order to resettle, primarily in the big cities.

In the meantime, the Soviet economy grew and became strong. In the wake of this development, new cadres were prepared among the peoples of the national republics. A section of them streamed to the large cities, and was absorbed in places of employment where the Jews had played an important role so long as a shortage of professional and intellectual forces had been felt.

The years of the Cold War which followed World War II found the large majority of Jews in the large cities, once more removed from basic occupations. They returned to the occupations of the Jewish intelligentsia and the rootless Jewish middle-class in the capitalist countries. Borochov's Zionist prognosis began to be substantially verified. The Jews were again detached from industry, trades and especially from agriculture. But they were not detached, after years of Nazi persecution, from the basic processes of Jewish extra-territorialism. They became more sensitive to the unique Jewish fate; the Jews of the socialist countries grew more strongly attached to the Jews beyond their borders. And, above all, there rose a longing for the Land of Israel.

This feeling was further stimulated by the Jews from the countries on the borders which were annexed by the Soviet Union during and after World War II. These Jews had not gone through forty years of adjustment to the regime. They had not yet been absorbed into the Soviet economy and society. Still carrying with them the burden

of shocking memories of the Nazi occupation, they are now being reminded of the taste of discrimination.

At the height of the Cold War, the Jewish minority became suspect of cosmopolitanism. We recall the implications of this definition from the late Stalin period. A cosmopolitan was candidate for the Cain's-mark of traitor, spy, saboteur or deviationist. How well we remember the Yevsektzia leaders, for example, their bold hatred for Zionism and their fanatic orthodoxy. Yet we were informed after the Twentieth Congress that the leadership of the Yevsektzia was eliminated. The fate of the spiritual leadership of Jewish writers, actors and scientists befell no other people. There was no other reason for this other than that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had decided to solve conclusively the problem of the Jewish minority in the shortest possible time, even at the price of the forced dissolution of the Jewish entity.

The Jewish community is stricken with fear. Even today, after the Twentieth Congress, the Jews in the Soviet Union are afraid to appear publicly as Jews. It is possible that the new course after Stalin's death promises a change for the better to other peoples, but the attitude toward the Jews is essentially the same as it was in the darkest days of Stalin's reign. The declarations of the Soviet leaders and of MAKI spokesmen that the Jews are willingly turning their backs on Jewish life and that they are throwing themselves "hungrily" into the arms of assimilation are based on lies. This is attested to by every straightforward socialist or communist, by every man of conscience returning from a visit to the Soviet Union. With one voice, they tell of the glaring contradiction between the proclamations and what they saw. The time has come, therefore, for MAPAM to

take its place in unequivocal language behind the demand: "Let My People Go!"

A decisive change for the better also took place in the shift of policy by People's Poland. The Government of Poland is headed by a former inmate of Auschwitz. In that camp five million Jews were turned to ashes — alongside of freedom-fighters of the Polish people who were also tortured and annihilated. At the head of the Polish Communist Party today stands a man experienced in torment and hardened by struggle against dictation from abroad and against the Stalinist leadership. The system of dictation and tyranny which was practiced by the Soviet Union of Stalin's time toward Poland and the other socialist countries has continued without essential changes since his death. In Poland, as in the Soviet Union, the local lackeys of the Soviet rulers did not hesitate to use anti-semitism to oil the wheels of their machinations.

Upon his rise to power, Gomulka found that anti-semitism can be used as a poisonous instrument not only in the hands of communism's enemies, who undermine the regime from below, but also by those who interfere with the independence of Poland from above. Gomulka chose the right diagnosis. He was not fooled, like some of the Moscow leaders, into seeking the danger among the Jews. He saw the danger precisely in the hatred of the Jews. He saw a common denominator between the hatred of Jews and the hatred for the socialist regime and international solidarity. Having determined this diagnosis, he sought the solution. First, he admitted the government's inability to solve the problem of the Jews in a short time by their absorption into the Polish economy and society as citizens with equal rights.

He drew the correct conclusion: He re-established the

freedom of self-determination for the Jews and the right to choose their own homeland and emigrate to Israel, if they so desired.

In addition, he declared energetic war against anti-semitism and continued to defend the equal rights of those Jews who chose to remain in Poland, despite all. In short, *Gomulka decided against the illusion of Jewish assimilation, which had been championed by Marx and many of his pupils. Without admitting it, he adopted the Marxist-Borochovist approach, the only approach which reflects the extraterritorial nature of the Jewish minorities in all the countries of their dispersion, including the socialist countries.*

The experience in the Soviet Union taught us how the wheel always returns to its starting point. The leaders of the Soviet Union found themselves in a quandary and would not admit it. Gomulka, on the other hand, upon facing a dead-end, admitted it and thus succeeded in breaking out of the vicious circle. He succeeded in pushing forward because he acted as a Polish patriot, as a Marxist and as a man of conscience. He solved the problem without becoming involved in a contradiction between declaration and execution, between theory and practice.

I believe that the attitude of the Communist leaders in the Soviet Union toward the Jewish question testifies that they still carry a good many leftovers of the Stalin period, and have not found the strength to discard them. But we have no right to give up hope. We believe that, in the long run, socialism will overcome racial prejudice, for if socialism on its path to realisation does not overcome anti-semitism, it will itself be eaten to the core by anti-semitism. Anti-semitism is an inheritance of the tyrannical period; it is one of the manifestations of anti-democratic

centralism. It is the most blatant manifestation of Great Russian chauvinism.

The persons who plot the extermination of a people such as ours, with its glorious historical past and its powerful will to live, would not refrain from the domination and directed integration of other peoples as well. Anti-semitism and racial discrimination have ever and always been a chapter in the dark annals of domination over other peoples. If the leadership of the Soviet Union will indeed learn to honour the rights of peoples to independence and freedom, there then is hope that they will ultimately follow in Gomulka's footsteps, break out of the vicious circle and attain a logical and just solution to the problem of the Jewish minority in the U.S.S.R. They will be forced to reach this conclusion, for there is no solution of this problem other than granting the right of self-determination.

Instead of relying on such an illogical, hopeless and un-Marxist contrivance as forced assimilation alongside of social degradation, they will be compelled, sooner or later, to make use of the only way out which is both practical and conscientious — the granting of the right of self-determination to the Jews of the Soviet Union, and the free choice between aliya to their historic homeland in the Land of Israel and remaining in the Soviet Union as citizens, with equal rights in every respect. Because of my belief in the victory of socialism, I also believe that socialism will overcome the practice of discriminating against the Jewish minority. I believe that the need for territorial concentration in the historic homeland will eventually dispel the illusion of assimilation and the schemes of extermination.

ON THE WORKERS MOVEMENT AND THE PROBLEMS OF THE CO-EXISTENCE OF OPPOSING REGIMES

The arms competition between the world powers has reached a dead end, but the arms race continues nevertheless. It continues at a growing pace despite the general admission that a new world war would bring victory to neither side, because it threatens mutual destruction and the devastation of the entire world. The struggle between regimes has not reached a deadlock in the field of armament alone. Both from a political and a social viewpoint, the need for a modus vivendi and a transition to lines of peaceful economic competition for world hegemony is becoming apparent.

Recognition of the impracticability of a new world war and the necessity for peaceful co-existence were expressed at the Geneva Conference. But only a few months later, the Cold War was again renewed. The arms race grew incessantly. New trouble spots for world peace appeared in Hungary and in the Suez Canal region. Just as Western imperialism probed the East's weak spots in Hungary, Poland and East Germany, so does the Soviet bloc seek the weak spots of imperialism in the Near East. They seek a breakthrough in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. Peace between the regimes is a dangerous and tension-filled armed peace, yet a third World War is such a terrifying way out that the Cold War may be expected to continue for a long time to come.

The MAPAM Platform, which was accepted in Haifa (in 1951), called for the full independence of the State of Israel and the neutralisation of the Middle East. However, we found it necessary to emphasize categorically that we are not neutral as regards the struggle of forces in the world.

At that time, we regarded the Soviet Union as the leading power of the World Peace Camp. We regarded the ruling circles of the West as the factor endangering peace and threatening to set off a new global conflagration.

Today, too, we are not neutral regarding the struggle for the victory of peace and socialism in the world. But after the Twentieth Congress and in the light of the present policy of the Soviet Union and its allies, we must not close our eyes to a number of facts which have meanwhile become apparent. Although we participate together with representatives of the socialist camp within the common framework of the World Peace Movement, the facts prove that not all sections of the Communist world have been consistently free of guilt. For example, we must re-examine the motivations which brought about the expulsion of the Yugoslav Communists from the Peace Movement. Even the Soviet leaders have admitted that Tito's Yugoslavia was forced to resign from the Peace Movement. While it was disappointing that Yugoslavia did not find a place for itself in the mutually-guaranteed front of the socialist countries, we cannot forget that she was forced to resign from this front. These are facts which were affirmed by the Soviet leaders, and which lead us to the necessity of re-examining a number of premises which had been accepted by us at the time of our Party's previous convention. We are required all the more to re-examine these premises in view of the Soviet Union's participation in the arms competition, in pact involvements and in the stirring-up of tension between the peoples of the Near East.

I have already stated that in suggesting a renewed examination of a number of premises I do not intend fundamental revision of the ideological platform. We must not overlook the factual truth that the October Way, i.e., the

way of proletarian dictatorship, was and continues to serve in its various forms as the main path for achieving socialism. But not all the premises of Lenin's teachings have stood the test or retained their validity to this day. After forty years of the socialist regime, they require re-examination unfettered by habit or dogma.

What premises did not stand the test of time?

A. EXPECTATION OF RAPID EXPANSION OF A REVOLUTIONARY SITUATION IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND THE VICTORY OF COMMUNISM WITHIN THEM

The attempts at revolution in Germany, Italy and Hungary were, as we know, unsuccessful; they ended with serious setbacks or even with the victory of the counter-revolution. Even after these defeats, the Comintern did not despair. In order to shorten the road and accelerate the revolutionary situation, the Comintern continued putschist and separatist tactics. The great crisis which struck the capitalist world in 1929 caused a long period of mass unemployment, economic depression and deep social ferment. Instead of cooperating with the Social Democrats, especially in Germany, in order to smash social demagoguery and stem the quick rise of Fascism-Nazism, the communists branded reformism as social-fascism, split the working-class and actually thought that deepening the crisis might lead to a revolutionary conjuncture. Their oft-repeated premise, that the worse things become the better they will become, was shattered on the rock of reality. The Comintern's separatism cleared the road in no small measure for the rise of Hitler to power. We can not, of course, ignore reformism's part in violating class solidarity and opening the way for the

fascist enemy; suffice to recall the unfortunate role played by Leon Blum in the days of the Spanish Civil War and the Munich Pact.

Following Hitler's rise to power, the Comintern parties tried to mend some of the damage. A Popular Front was established in France and a number of other countries, but it failed to gather the strength needed to prevent the breakup of the progressive forces in the Spanish Civil War and Franco's coming to power. It did not succeed in preventing the Munich Pact.

Even in the years preceding World War II, our movement strongly criticised the Comintern's separatist strategems. We held these tactics responsible for the intensification of the Soviet Union's isolation and encirclement, as well as the inability of the workers' movement, including both its major divisions, to prevent the victory of reaction and fascism in Europe.

B. THE MISTAKEN PROGNOSIS ON CAPITALISM'S RAPID DECLINE

The separatist and sometimes putschist tactics of the Comintern in the period between the two world wars found its substantiation in the theories of declining imperialism and chronic crisis within the capitalist economy. We can see today that this anticipation of economic and social decline and bankruptcy of the capitalist system did not materialise so rapidly.

Upon the outbreak of the great economic crisis of 1929, two attempts were made to prevent the collapse of the capitalist world: one, through a fascist system of economic compulsion; the second, through a liberal system of social security and of governmental economic planning. Despite

the distance and the difference between the Nazi-Fascist approach of Hitler and Mussolini and the liberal approach of Roosevelt, we can not ignore certain parallel attributes between them:

- 1) Both held down the anarchic play of the capitalist economy by systems of governmental planning;
- 2) Both eliminated chronic unemployment and raised the economy in the major capitalist countries on the road to full employment;
- 3) Both attempts strived to divert the danger of crisis by armaments projects and governmental development enterprises.

The difference between the fascist experiment and Roosevelt's liberal approach was expressed in their social aims. Fascism solved the employment problem by forced conscription of labor which squeezed out profits for the owners of the large combines and laid the groundwork for World War II. Roosevelt's experiment, seeking to save the American capitalist economy from collapse, sought its answer in enlarging production output, raising the standard of living of the general population and augmenting the buying power of the masses.

Fascism was crushed in the Second World War. Truman's America continued Roosevelt's system of planned capitalism. Without ignoring its imperialist and anti-Soviet tendencies, it is a fact that the Marshall Plan tried by this very same system, and not without success, to rehabilitate Europe, fortify and arm it against the socialist bloc. This system was intended to guarantee full employment in West Europe and to prevent it from slipping into a chronic crisis.

This system, which saved America from chronic crisis in Roosevelt's day, was based on Keynes' economic theory. In Keynes' home country, a modified version of his theory

was applied by the Labour Government and by the Tory Government which followed it. In America, the Republicans are now forced to perpetuate, alongside gigantic arms projects, the major social security institutions and governmental development enterprises of their predecessors.

This factual description is not meant to refute the premise that in the overall accounting, the capitalist economy and system are based on contradictions between forces of production and relations of production. After all, the capitalist economy even today is marked by economic and political antagonism which conceals within itself the danger of economic crisis, gives rise to hatred among peoples, and leads to the onset of war. But despite these dangers, which have always jeopardised it, the capitalist economy succeeded, since the end of World War II, in holding off a serious economic crisis. Some point out that full employment in the United States was achieved by employing many millions of workers in the arms industry; otherwise, even the mighty American economy could not have escaped severe crisis. One way or the other, the fact remains that during the post-war years, the capitalist economy maintained a relative stability.

As has been stated, the capitalist order's relative stability does not immunize it forever against the dangers inherent in it. This relative stability does not immunize against economic and social contradictions within the capitalist countries and does not ward off political and even military antagonisms and conflicts between them, let alone between opposing regimes. Meantime, this relative stability is maintained through economic planning and regulation, and full employment, as well as arms projects and governmental services for the benefit of the public. Capitalism, then, is not in a state of rapid decline, as was predicted by the economic prognostications of the communist camp.

In the capitalist democracies there are sometimes bourgeois governments and sometimes coalition governments between the Social Democrats and the bourgeois parties. The common attribute of these governments is that they seek to strengthen the existing order through maintaining a planned economy which strives for full employment and economic stability.

Even in countries such as France and Italy, the homes of the strongest communist parties outside the socialist bloc, the revolutionary forces are almost at a standstill due to this relative stability. No one dreams of an imminent revolutionary situation in these countries. The communist parties are vegetating on one spot and, in some cases, are even retreating a few steps. These parties are in a quandary regarding analysis of the situation and concerning aims and goals. In France, Thorez continues to prophecy absolute impoverishment of the workers while Foster, the American communist leader, is forced to adopt formulations of an "economic high tide" and settles for "relative impoverishment." From time to time, we also hear various new statements regarding aims and goals. Communists in England and America swear to the victory of socialism by democratic and even parliamentary means. In Italy, vagueness is the rule, accompanied by the firm belief in a special Italian road to socialism. Whatever the case, the revolutionary sector in these countries is far from preparing itself for an approaching revolutionary situation.

The Twentieth Congress proclaimed that there are different roads to socialism. It even declared that the socialist order may quite possibly be introduced in a parliamentary manner, under the auspices of a revolutionary party, of course, and with its help. Disclosing the faults of the proletarian dictatorship and allowing for other paths, even

parliamentary ones, to a socialist regime was bound to arouse revisionist tendencies within the revolutionary parties, communist as well as non-communist. Several communist parties hastened to proclaim their own national way to socialism. Various delegations of communist parties began pilgrimages to Belgrade.

But what happened in Poland and Hungary startled the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. A group of leaders, including Molotov and Malenkov, began to increase their pressure and use their influence against far-reaching revisionism. The speakers who, at the Twentieth Congress, bitterly castigated Stalin, began to regret what they had said. The deceased who only yesterday was condemned to eternal damnation became the subject of new eulogies. Even the First Secretary, who at the Twentieth Congress made a laughing stock of a number of premises in Stalin's last economic essay, found it necessary to again acclaim Stalin as a great Communist and Marxist. A kind of neo-Stalinism began emanating from Moscow. In those countries in which the communists had mustered the courage to search for special roads to socialism, the brakes were applied in order to straighten out the line.

We have since been informed of the removal of the Molotov-Kaganovich group, of the increase of revisionism and that Moscow has given a new hold to Tito-style communism. Perhaps Italy and other countries will again begin to wink at Belgrade. They will again proclaim, in their strongest voice, their own road to socialism. The communist parties charge forward only to retreat to trenches prepared beforehand. Isolated in their countries, without partners and without a chance of reaching power in the near future, they twist and turn and change doctrines according to the winds which are blowing at the moment in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

A typical sign of the lack of revolutionary perspective for the near future and the disappointment of broad sections of the working class with the domestic and foreign policy of the communist camp is the programmatic revision taking place within the party closest to our own — the Italian Socialist Party, led by Pietro Nenni.

Nenni's party cooperated with the Communists in the trade union field and, to a large extent, in the political realm as well. Nenni's party drew closer to its partner through its support of a consistent trade-union class policy and by its leading place in the Italian Peace Movement. Togliatti's Communist Party responded to its partner by following a line of flexibility and care in formulations and in political statements.

A year has passed since the Twentieth Congress, during which the knot has become untied. The Italian Communist Party retreated from its liberal tendency and began straightening the line.

This was not the case with Nenni's Socialist Party, in which there appeared a profound programmatic and strategic revision. It seems that re-examination of certain premises, which did not stand up to the test, does not suffice for the Italian Socialist Party; it has decided upon parliamentarism as the road to bringing socialism to power — under all conditions.

At the Convention of the Italian Socialist Party, which took place a few months ago, profound differences of opinion appeared between different factions. There arose an aggressive opposition against the union with the rightist Social-Democratic Party founded by Saragat, and against the intention of loosening the political partnership with the Communist Party to a minimum. Nevertheless, it is enlightening to note that all factions joined hands in supporting the

programmatic revision which was resolved at this convention.

The Italian Socialist Party is not satisfied today with denouncing revelations of degeneration in the regime of proletarian dictatorship. This party declared at its convention that it negates any road to the realisation of socialism except parliamentary democracy. First of all, it rejects proletarian dictatorship as a way to workers' rule in Italy. It pledged to remain faithful to parliamentary democracy not only as a minority, but even after it has reached the helm of power and the class enemy has been reduced to a minority.

Even today, this party is not reformist. It is not satisfied with the introduction of reforms and corrections in the prevailing capitalist order, but strives for workers' rule and the realisation of socialism through parliamentary victory. We need not forget that our greatest wish, too, is to achieve socialism in our country by a democratic decision in the Knesset. In any case, this party is still close to us in spirit because of its loyalty to the worker's struggle and its sincere efforts for world peace and socialism. We continue to regard this party as an ally for an additional reason — its great understanding of the problems of the national liberation of small nations, including our own.

We understand the factors which led to the ideological retreat, but we do not agree with them entirely. The revision occurred because of disappointment caused by the failures and deformities of the regime of proletarian dictatorship, because there was no revolutionary opportunity in sight in Europe and America, and because of the unprincipled maneuvers of the communist representatives within the Peace Movement. The relative stability of the capitalist system and the absence of a revolutionary opportunity on the horizon were also taken into account. In tracing the evolution of events in this party, we may assume that with time, it

too will reach the conclusion that the factors which we listed should lead us to a re-examination of premises which did not stand the test of reality, but do not justify an extensive general programmatic revision.

THE PATH OF LIBERATION OF COLONIAL AND DEPENDENT PEOPLES FROM THE YOKE OF IMPERIALISM

The colonial question was the subject of one of the first theoretical discussions in our movement. This was not "study for study's sake." Clarification of this problem was forced upon us by the reality of our country during British rule. We lived then under the mandate of the first-ranking colonial power. The conclusions which we reached on this subject were close to those of the Independent Labour Party in England. Although we did not ignore the decisive and era-opening influence of the October Revolution on the liberation struggle of the colonial and dependent nations from the yoke of imperialism, we strongly dissented from the approach of the Comintern to the colonial question and from that of its MAKI counterpart in our country.

The Independent Socialist Left in England did not propose separation from the Empire by activating terrorist gangs as did the Comintern in the days of the Mufti in Palestine, or as they operate even today in other colonial countries. The Independent Labour Party then put forward the struggle for the independence of the colonies hand in hand with class struggle and the guarantee of social progress. It recommended that the colonies gaining their independence should be allowed the right of free choice regarding affiliation to the British Commonwealth or secession from it. We have not overlooked Labour's policy in Bevin's day: a perpetuation of imperialist policy. We have not forgotten Pass-

fields "good deeds". But despite the dualism and contradictions in practice, we may conclude that, in the end, the Labour Party had to acquiesce to the liberation of India, Burma and Ceylon from the yoke of British imperialism and to approve, during its period in office, the granting of complete independence to these countries.

Even the imperialist government of the Conservatives now at the helm in England was forced, while conducting suppressive activities in colonies such as Malaya, Kenya and Cyprus, to retreat to the lines which had been prepared by the Labour Government. The conversion of Negro Ghana into an independent state and a member of the British Commonwealth is one more sign of this development.

The struggle of these nations for independence was not directed by the communist camp. In the final stage of their struggle, these nations achieved full independence, while maintaining various degrees of cooperation with the capital power. The Indian struggle for independence, along Gandhi's "passive resistance" system, encountered countless bloody clashes and took a heavy toll of victims. Looking back, we must admit that this method of struggle, which was approved particularly by the left-wing of the socialist parties in Europe and in the colonies, found its justification and reached its goal.

Study of the struggle for independence taking place in Morocco and Tunis, leads to the conclusion that in these countries the war for independence sometimes takes the form of partisan and terrorist conflict; but this also has not been directed by the communist camp. The independence fighters in these countries have also striven for an independence which retains cooperative ties with their former overlord.

This sketchy presentation is sufficient to prove that the war of liberation from colonial and semi-colonial enslavement

has taken various forms throughout the years and has followed different trends. Today we cannot point out one single method or trend, which is applicable to all nations and all countries. We know today that different peoples struggled for independence and achieved it in different ways. In countries where a fierce social struggle took place, such as China, Korea and Vietnam, independence and full national and social liberation were reached through *civil war* and with the direct aid of the Soviet Union. It should be recalled that the Communist Party's struggle for the national and social liberation of China was preceded by maneuvers and deals with Chiang-Kai-Shek, deals which remind us of the shady alliance between the Comintern representatives in our country and the Mufti of Jerusalem.

There were countries where the war of liberation had a progressive social character, united the entire nation and only achieved national liberation, such as in India and Burma. In these countries, independence was achieved through popular revolt.

I have already mentioned *the partisan war in Morocco and Tunis, which was independent of the communist camp or its Cairo ally*. It achieved national independence while keeping a certain measure of mutual economic and cultural contact with France.

The most doubtful manifestation of a war for independence can be found within the Arab community in our country and in the surrounding countries, such as Egypt and Syria. This much is clear: We endorse the war of the Arab peoples for their independence and their liberation from dependence on imperialism. We assume that among the forces nourishing the liberating war of these peoples are also positive forces, though these are hidden for the present. But among these peoples and even within their

Communist parties, blind hate for our movement of national liberation and for our State is being encouraged. Real progress cannot be mixed with blind chauvinism and plots of extermination against our State and people, or with opposition to direct peace negotiations between our country and theirs. We have no right, therefore, to disregard the other side of the coin. We have no right to ignore the reactionary nature of the leadership of a number of these countries. *These are leaderships which combine supposed anti-imperialist struggle with the suppression of workers*. They are led to this day by men such as the Mufti of Jerusalem, who at one time was ready to exploit the support of the Comintern and its MAKI counterpart in the country in order to cooperate with Hitler during the Second World War. No less striking pages of collusion with Hitler and Mussolini were inscribed by the present ruling circles in Egypt and Syria. Hundreds of Nazi experts and advisers swarm around Nasser while communists are locked up in prison, and while Nasser himself is extolled in the capitals of the socialist countries.

The conclusion this description begs is as follows :

Reality was more varied and turbulent than we had imagined during the British Mandate and in the period between the two World Wars. The problem of the liberation wars in colonial and semi-colonial countries was apparently more complex and complicated than we thought at the time of the first discussion on this subject in our movement.

One more unique factor should be noted which added immeasurable impetus to the liberating march of colonial peoples — and that is World War II. The results of this war opened unforeseen opportunities before the colonial and dependent peoples.

It is clear today that the method of struggle which suited India and Burma did not fit semi-colonial nations,

such as China and Korea. *We now see that different paths led to the same goal, but some were not as fundamental or successful as others. The popular resistance in India, the Civil War in China, the partisan struggle in Morocco and the parliamentary struggle in a number of British colonies — all these proved effective for the most part, although not all of them moved toward full national and social liberation as fundamentally as others.*

And so, much as the Twentieth Congress recognised different paths leading to socialism, there need be no less justification for different paths leading to the liberation of colonial and semi-colonial nations from enslavement and dependence upon the imperialist powers.

Moreover, moral advantage and political effectiveness in this sphere are not always on the side of Soviet Russian policy or that of its allies. One side of the coin, the direct revolutionary struggle, as exemplified in China and in Vietnam, can be considered the credit side. The other side of the coin is the tactical maneuvers involved in pacts and counter-pacts, in arms competition and the rivalry of the blocs for positions of strength. This side is open to suspicion.

When the Baghdad Pact was created, not only MAPAM, but even official spokesmen of our State dissented. This pact, equipped with arms aplenty, is of anti-Soviet nature, but it is no less directed against Israel. In reaction to the Baghdad Pact, the Soviet Union helped form a counter-pact between Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia, with the Egyptian dictator at its head. This pact was also equipped with the best of arms, in this case from the Soviet bloc. More than being directed against the Western powers, this pact, too, threatens Israel. These are the allies who are received so royally at festivals and Peace Councils. The Soviet Union supplies these countries with full political and military aid,

does not go into meticulous examinations and does not require the slightest proof of social progress.

In giving arms to the dictators of these countries, the Soviet Union did not demand any obligation whatsoever that these arms would not be turned against us. This pact even offers cover for crimes against regional peace, such as the refusal to lend a hand toward peace negotiations with the State of Israel.

As is known, MAPAM opposed the Sinai Operation. Nevertheless, we assert that the one-sided censure of the State of Israel is illegitimate, as was the Soviet Union's shielding of Egypt's unceasing aggressive provocations preceding the Sinai Operation. To our sorrow, the forum of the World Peace Movement, which evaded support of direct Jewish-Arab peace negotiations, is exploited by the communist camp to serve the political interests of the Soviet Union. This policy, with its tactical and egotistic reasoning, sacrifices the fundamental struggle for Jewish-Arab peace on the altar of considerations which differ little from those accepted in the imperialist world.

Let this be said clearly: *Dictators who suppress progressive elements in their own homes will not lead their countries toward full national independence and will not persevere in their alliance with the Soviet Union. The Mufti turned his back on the Comintern and joined with Hitler; Jordan, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia behaved similarly recently; and it is not unlikely that the same will be done one of these days by a main supporter of Soviet policy in this region — Abdul Nasser.*

The independence of all nations of this entire region will not be assured without the cultivation of democracy and social progress; neither will this be secured without the establishment of Jewish-Arab peace. The Jewish-Arab anta-

gonism enfeebles the countries of the region, slows down their social advancement, increases their dependence on global factors and jeopardizes their full independence.

There was a time when we negated any war of liberation by colonial peoples which was not intertwined with a struggle for social progress and the advancement of the working class. Today, all-encompassing social progress is not required as a ticket of entrance to the family of nations deserving of national independence. But even today, there can be no doubt that any war of independence which combines its liberation from imperialism with social subjugation within its own confines, is insecure and spurious. To our great sorrow, it is the Communist Parties which take the questionable privilege of serving as defense counsel for these savage growths.

Zionism, our people's movement, has been invalidated by the communist camp ever since the days of Lenin and Stalin. But in Lenin's day, workers' leaders from Palestine were still invited to visit Moscow and there was a certain amount of tolerance exhibited toward the "Hechalutz" (Pioneer) movement. Even in the early stages of the Stalin period, a man like Kalinin was allowed to encourage the productivisation of Jews, to concentrate them in agricultural regions, and to grant them broad cultural self-determination. Finally, we even reached the Gromyko declaration, Soviet help in establishing our State, and a large stream of immigration from the socialist countries. During the first years of the State of Israel, Soviet diplomacy kept to undisguised neutrality as regards our country. The Soviet Union then also recognized the progressive nature of our agricultural settlement enterprise.

Only a few years have passed since then, but today it all seems an ancient legend. We must not ignore the mis-

deeds of our own State. But the pro-Arab, one-sided and hostile policy of the Soviet Union contributes greatly towards defeating the efforts of those forces within our country which call for a turn to neutrality on the part of our government.

It is our duty to reveal the true value of a number of counterfeit manifestations which have recently penetrated the world of concepts dealing with the war of independence of peoples struggling to free themselves from the yoke of imperialism. Social subjugation and reactionary tyranny cannot long run parallel to liberation from imperialism or to real national independence or progress. The threat of hostility and extermination proclaimed in Arab countries against our State by reactionary dictators who enjoy the aid of the Communist Parties in their countries must, in the long run, serve only reaction and imperialism. The political helmsmen of the Soviet Union, who excuse themselves from proffering help toward Jewish-Arab peace negotiations, will defeat their own purposes by this path. Not only does this maneuver undermine the security of our State; it bears the seed of decisive failure for Soviet policy in the Middle East.

The position of the Jewish community among our neighbors in the days of the mandatory government and, no less, the situation of the State of Israel among the states in the region, have always demanded a scrupulous and independent examination of the paths leading to the independence of peoples and their national and social liberation. The problem of the liberation of colonial people offers a perfect example of to what extent we must insist upon ideological, organisational and political independence, not only in all that concerns Zionism and Kibbutz Galuyot (the Ingathering of the Exiles), but also in relation to international policy. In fact, examination of the problem of the liberation of colonial

peoples, upon which rests the guarantee of the independence of the nations in the region, including ourselves, proves the necessity for a re-examination of several basic premises which guide our political struggle and ideological exposition.

PROSPECTS

After forty years of the regime of proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and the extension of the socialist revolution to People's China and the People's Democracies, we come to two postulates:

A) The October Revolution and the expansion of the socialist order across a fourth of the earth's surface and among one-third of its population were not able to cripple the capitalist regime in America, Western Europe and other sections of the world not under a direct covenant with the socialist bloc. In contradiction to the prophecies on imperialism's imminent downfall, capitalist economy still maintains relative stability. Capitalist economy is involved, as before, in contradictions which it hasn't the strength to resolve. But the danger to the human race manifest in an atomic war of extermination forces the leaders of imperialism to adjust themselves to the conditions of an extended armed peace. The contradictions inherent in the very existence of this regime give rise to antagonism between nations and regimes, but fear of the results of any new war forces the Western Powers to settle for the continuation of the Cold War, of arming and continual tension. Despite the dangers contained in this situation, it may, though not necessarily, continue for a long time to come.

B) The maintenance of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union during forty long years brought with it manifestations of perversion and signs of degeneration. The

delay in the transition from a regime of proletarian dictatorship to one of socialist democracy, and the continuation of the Cold War and the arms competition between the rival global powers — caused a slowing down in the expansion and the advancement of the revolutionary camp in Asia and Africa, and a complete halt in its progress in the Western countries.

Nevertheless, it should be noted that during those forty years of trial, the socialist system proved its advantages over the capitalist one. Despite the hazards and failures which were its lot, the Soviet Union surpassed all the capitalist countries, except the United States, in economic development. It achieved arms equilibrium between the Socialist bloc and the Western bloc.

The atomic era brought with it the opportunity of activating technical forces which, on the one hand, can bestir gigantic productive forces for the benefit of the human race and, on the other, may set off destructive forces threatening the liquidation of the human race. During this era, *only socialist relations of production are capable of mastering these technical forces for the benefit of humanity.* The capitalist system of production moves the world toward a paradoxical situation of fabulous accumulation of wealth in a number of countries, with the United States in the lead and, at the same time, increasing destitution among the majority of the earth's inhabitants. Huge stock piles of food are being cached away in warehouses while most of the world's population is underfed. In short, *the contradictions in the capitalist system are continuing to assert themselves under conditions of relative economic stability in a number of capitalist countries — the leaders of the imperialist bloc. Not only have these inherent contradictions not disappeared; they have even outgrown their partial and local character and taken on*

global proportions. As long as these contradictions exist, peaceful co-existence between the two regimes will be accompanied by the continuation of arms competition, Cold War and the threat against world peace.

From the point of view of technical progress and the development of the forces of production, the world has long been ripe for transition from capitalist relations of production to socialist ones. Despite its success in so far overcoming partial crises and despite the relative stability which the capitalist system secured for itself since the end of World War II, the inherent contradictions in this system have not ceased and will not cease their premonition of economic, social and political crisis. Above all else, there won't come an end to that threat of economic, social and political crisis which we call a World Atomic War. In light of such a crisis, any previous one has been child's play.

The need for co-existence between the two systems compels the world revolutionary workers' movement to re-deploy its ranks. A world-scale revolutionary situation cannot be foreseen in the near future. Present conditions point to a long road ahead. Still, we can assume that after the revolutionary world has overcome the defects and signs of degeneration which affected a number of regimes under proletarian dictatorships, there will appear the possibility for a rapid transition from dictatorship to democracy. Then the road will be opened to rapid economic and social progress. The superiority of the socialist economy over the capitalist economy will be proved the world over. The superiority of the socialist economy and society will lead to the extension of socialism to additional sections of the world. The transition from dictatorship to democracy and the economic and social-cultural superiority of the socialist regime will pave the way for more democratic paths to socialism,

even that of parliamentary decision. The expansion of socialism will weaken the Cold War and further strengthen the possibility of peaceful co-existence. In this manner will the advancement of revolutionary socialism toward its final victory be guaranteed.

S U M M A T I O N

1. We have tried unequivocally to review the positive and negative sides of the development of the socialist countries with the Soviet Union at their head. Special attention was devoted to the lights and shadows in the development of the Soviet Union.

The basis of the building of socialism was laid in the first socialist country which now prepares to celebrate forty years of the October Revolution. After all the trials which confronted it, this state reached second place in the world in production; it rivals the United States militarily and expects to rival it economically. After overcoming its enemies in World War II, the Soviet Union succeeded in breaching the siege around it. Today it is surrounded by a belt of socialist countries and allies.

2. These foundations for the building of socialism were laid by the regime of proletarian dictatorship. Though a number of the premises of Marxist-Leninist theory did not stand the test of time, the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the fundamental premise of this theory, has served and still serves, in its various forms, as the major road to the realisation of socialism.

3. Following the victory of socialism among a third of humanity and after forty years of the regime of proletarian

dictatorship in the Soviet Union, conditions ripened for a new stage in the struggle of revolutionary socialism for its victory. The characteristics of this stage are two-fold :

(a) Alongside the system of proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union, there came about different and more liberal systems of proletarian dictatorship in China, Yugoslavia and Poland.

(b) Conditions were created for the realisation of socialism in different ways, beginning with the liberalisation of proletarian dictatorship up to the noticeable possibility of socialism coming to power through a parliamentary victory.

4. The proletarian dictatorship is, according to Marx and Engels, a necessary form of government in the transition phase from capitalism to socialism. Inasmuch as socialist foundations grow stronger, proletarian dictatorship must give place, step by step, to socialist democracy. The crisis of proletarian dictatorship began when the leadership of the Soviet Union under Stalin deferred advancement toward democratisation of the Soviet regime after having destroyed the class enemy and after the foundations for the building of socialism had been laid.

5. The delay in gradual transition from a regime of proletarian dictatorship to one of socialist democracy and the manifestations of bureaucratic degeneration in the proletarian dictatorship were revealed by our movement in 1941, in theses written by me, ratified by movement institutions, and published as a book under the title, "On the Threshold of an Era." We then sharply criticised the first evidences of tyranny which were later revealed so shockingly at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We denounced the show-trials, the mass extermination of Bolshevik leaders, the bureaucratic perversion in the

system of government, the growing contradiction between theory and practice, the dual ethics in social relations, and Machiavellism as a system of foreign policy. We cannot deny that the criticism expressed in the 1941 theses subsided with the passing years. That was a period of coalition against the Fascist Axis, of the rescue of Jews by the Red Army, of the call by the Anti-Fascist Committee in Moscow to the entire world : "We Shall Not Die, But Live !" Those were the years in which the Soviet Union showed understanding for our movement of national liberation, both on the eve of the State's establishment and during the first years of its existence

In this period, most outspoken was the head of the Jewish Agency, David Ben Gurion, who declared (in a memorandum handed to Maisky, then Soviet ambassador in London), that for the purpose of winning the Soviet statesmen's hearts in the interest of the establishment of a Jewish State, we leave it to the Soviet Union to solve the problem of the Jews within its own borders. The first years after the inception of the State of Israel were years of mass immigration from the socialist countries. In those years, the State of Israel adhered to a policy of non-identification with the competing world powers. It was during those very years that the political and cultural leadership of the Soviet Jewry was being liquidated, but the faintest echoes of this did not reach us. Criticism of the Soviet Union on the part of MAPAI and the right-wing parties increased with the intensification of the Cold War. Truthfully, we must admit that up to the Twentieth Congress, we concentrated our criticism primarily on the problem of Soviet Jewry. We demanded satisfaction for the affront to them and followed with concern the developing alliance between the Soviet statesmen and the reactionary ruling elements in the neighbouring countries.

6. The struggle concerning our party's attitude toward the revolutionary world took place within our own midst mainly in the years before the Twentieth Congress. It reached its height with the imprisonment of Mordechai Oren and in the days of the Prague Trial. This was a stubborn struggle for the independence of our party and against leftist conformity which held this independence in contempt and tried to reduce it to a minimum. The formulation which stated that MAPAM maintains its independence in all matters concerning Zionism and Kibbutz Galuyot (Ingathering of Exiles) was only a compromise formula. In order to hold the camp together, we then omitted the formulation which was later accepted in May, 1956, at the meeting of the Central Committee after the Twentieth Congress, which states "MAPAM will maintain its autonomy as a Marxist and revolutionary socialist party".

7. However, we should note the fact that up to the Twentieth Congress, all sections of MAPAM — including the members of Achdut Avoda before and after the split — gave the Soviet Union the most generous benefit of the doubt in matters concerning socialist construction and international policy. Of course, the members of Achdut Avoda demanded a change from our approval of "Marxism-Leninism" to approval of "The Teachings of Marx and Lenin," but they did not have reservations from the far-reaching definitions of MAPAM as an inseparable part of the revolutionary world led by the Soviet Union.

8. The Twentieth Congress uncovered the manifestations of perversions in the Soviet regime. These manifestations involved signs of degeneration which had infected the proletarian dictatorship. These disturbing signs did not disappear with Stalin's death. The most noticeable characteristic of this process can be seen in the degeneration of demo-

cratic centralism, which steadily relinquished its place to bureaucratic and anti-democratic centralism. Collective responsibility was replaced by the tyrannical domination of an individual or group of individuals. Democratic centralism and collective responsibility, which reached their full scope in Lenin's day and which were now to be re-established according to the declaration of the Twentieth Congress, are still awaiting their redeemer. The way in which Molotov, Kaganovich, and their comrades were removed from the Presidium of the Bolshevik Party supports the assumption that the system of domination by individuals is still in force.

9. The change-over from democratic centralism and rule by an individual or by individuals left its mark on all phases of life and activity in the Soviet State as well as in the Communist Party, which bears the responsibility for everything done within it. It brought about bureaucratic perversion of the state apparatus, it replaced the war against the class enemy with terror directed against citizens, workers and Bolsheviks. Behind the slogans of equality and brotherhood-of-nations lay hidden a tendency towards gradual Russification of every ideological, scientific and cultural activity. The aim of exterminating the Jewish minority through forced integration is one of the evidences of degeneration of the proletarian dictatorship.

10. This anti-democratic centralism took the form of Great-Russian chauvinism in the field of relations between the peoples of the Soviet Union and other peoples. The chauvinism of the Soviet Union's leaders, against which Yugoslavia, Poland and Hungary arose in different ways, and against which People's China held reservations, also left its mark in the sphere of relations between the blocs and in questions of international policy. This line helps intensify the Cold War in the world, increases the arms-competition,

strengthens the aggressive pacts in the Middle East and is posed directly against the essential and just interests of the State of Israel.

11. The Twentieth Congress promised the democratisation of the Soviet regime and the return of democratic centralism to its former authority. It promised to correct the wrongs inflicted upon Yugoslavia and to base the relations between the Soviet Union and its allies on foundations of independence, sovereignty and equality. The Congress proclaimed the goal of the lessening of tension in the world and of peaceful co-existence between the opposing world regimes. Finally, the Congress proclaimed the goal of cooperation between different sections of the international labor movement, of a liberal approach toward different forms of proletarian dictatorship and different roads to socialism.

12. Two years have passed since then. It cannot be denied that efforts were made in several directions to clean out the manifestations of perversion which infected the Soviet regime and the manifestations of degeneration which infected the proletarian dictatorship. The relations with China, Yugoslavia and Poland are gradually being based upon equality, independence and mutual guarantee. The power of law has generally been reinstated and the terror against citizens has appreciably decreased. The concentration camps are beginning to be emptied. A measure of freedom of research has been given to scientists. The first buds of freer expression have blossomed in the field of literature and art, though these are now censured by the supervisory authority from above. There is now taking place a daring attempt at decentralisation and the granting of a certain measure of self-management in the economic field.

13. Yet we cannot conclude that there has been a decisive change. It can be said that there exists a confusion

of lights and shadows. Following the first steps of courageous advance, there often occur disturbing regressions. This labyrinthian path is especially noticeable in the appearance of the leadership of the Communist Party and the government of the Soviet Union in the realm of international policy.

14. Especially negative is the attitude of the Soviet Union and the communist camp to our people's efforts toward national and social liberation through the "ingathering of its exiles" in our historic homeland. In this respect, the horizon remains totally dark; so far, no rays of light have pierced the overhanging clouds. Soviet policy made of Israel an object in the Cold War, a scapegoat for the arms race and the competition between the Baghdad Pact and the Egyptian-Syrian Pacts.

15. We demand of the State of Israel a political line of independence and neutrality regarding the two competing world powers and we dissent from one-sided dependence upon the Western Powers. To our sorrow, the declared anti-Israel, pro-Arab line of the Soviet Union offers us no help in this struggle.

16. We stated in the Haifa Platform that, although we demand a policy of independence and neutrality on the part of the State of Israel, we, as a party, regard ourselves as an inseparable part of the revolutionary world. We proclaimed our faith in the historic possibility of MAPAM'S integration into the revolutionary world along with the revolutionary world's recognition of Zionism and the "Ingathering of the Exiles". We also declared on that occasion that we identify ourselves with the Soviet Union's line of international policy and that we reserve full independence for ourselves only in what concerns Zionism and the "Ingathering of the Exiles".

17. The Third Convention of MAPAM will have to

re-examine these premises in the light of the experience of recent years. MAPAM is still not neutral in the struggle for peace and the victory of socialism in the world. We are ready today for close rapport with the world of socialism under construction. But the experience of recent years led to the following conclusions:

(a) that we are prepared for close rapport with the forces of revolutionary socialism in the world, while maintaining our full independence and freedom of judgment as Zionists, Marxists and revolutionary socialists ;

(b) that we have no right to occupy ourselves with speculations, if and when we shall integrate within the revolutionary world ;

(c) that there is no foundation to assume that we identify ourselves with the revolutionary world in all excepting Zionism and the "Ingathering of the Exiles".

18. As independent revolutionary socialists, we now dissent from strategy and tactics of the communist camp, not only in all that concerns the Jewish question and the "Ingathering of the Exiles". We differ with the character of the proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union and in a number of countries following in her footsteps. We differ with anti-democratic centralism, with the policy of domination over socialist nations and with the violation of equality between these nations, with the policy which aids in intensifying the Cold War and with the Machiavellian policy toward the State of Israel.

19. We decry various manifestations of the strategy and tactics of the communist camp, not only because they are injurious to Jews, but because they are harmful to socialism. The degeneration of the proletarian dictatorship, anti-democratic centralism and the domineering line of the

Soviet Power in its relations with the socialist nations and in international relations are not just defects in the superstructure of the socialist regime. They may even shatter the sturdy foundations already laid and may endanger its future and the final victory of socialism in the world.

20. The relative stability which was reached by the capitalist system, the possibility of peaceful co-existence between the two opposing regimes, the stormy process of liberation of colonial and semi-colonial peoples from the yoke of imperialism, and the role which is to be played by the various socialist trends in the struggle for the independence of nations, social progress and peace in the Middle East and the entire world — all oblige our party to broaden its contact with the various socialist trends in the interests of peace in the world and in our region and for the enhancement of understanding for the national and social liberation undertaking of our people gathering in its homeland.

21. The re-examination of socialist revolutionary premises which we propose to the Third Convention covers a field of considerable proportions. It includes the developmental stages of actual strategy, the perspective and rate of expansion of revolutionary socialism, the problem of rivalry between the regimes, the path of liberation of colonial peoples, and finally, the problem of the Jews in the Soviet Union and in the socialist countries. But the review of several premises which did not stand the test, which sharpened or took on another form, does not affect the fundamental premises of revolutionary socialism and does not necessitate an overall revision of the party platform.

22. We believe that it is within the power of the socialist countries to overcome the dangers and dispel the manifestations of perversion and degeneration which infected their social, economic and political regime. We desire

the victory of socialism. We believe that if the socialist countries overcome their faults and failings, they will have taken a revitalised step forward and will prove their advantage in the present contest between the regimes. We assume that by overcoming its faults and failures the socialist camp opens a way to increasing democratisation of the regime of proletarian dictatorship and to different paths toward the realisation of socialism. We assume that with the advancement and strengthening of the socialist camp, there will be a place among the different paths for the realisation of socialism, for its achievement through a parliamentary victory accompanied by unflinching resolution to maintain this victory, to defend it against reactionary interference after its inception, and to guarantee its permanent victory.

23. The widespread worker's economy, comprising a considerable proportion of the national economy; the kibbutz movement — whose constructive enterprises stride in the fore of all other workers' settlement projects, and which plays a pioneering role in the struggle for the full national and social emancipation of our people in its homeland; the nationalisation of the land; the class struggle and the constant striving for the brotherhood of nations; the hegemony of the workers movement in the upbuilding of the land — all these give us ground to believe that in the course of the advancement of international socialism, we, too, will succeed, by democratic means, in establishing a socialist order in our country, will know how to perpetuate its existence, and will defend it from its enemies until its final victory is fully assured.

24. The serious reservation from the tactics and strategy of the revolutionary camp and the approval of the proposition that there are different ways to the realisation of socialism

further emphasize the conclusions accepted by the MAPAM Central Committee in May, 1956, stating:

(a) Our path to the realisation of socialism is by way of the "Ingathering of Exiles". We have no right to judge international events and developments without considering their reflection on our struggle for national and social liberation in our homeland.

In view of the tragic experience of the Jews in the Soviet Union, additional force is given the premise that, even the socialist regime, which forbids under law any manifestation of racial prejudice, was incapable of preventing serious manifestations of anti-semitism and could not dispose of the Jewish anomaly. Once more, it was revealed that only one solution remains for the Jewish anomaly — the Zionist solution, the "Ingathering of the Exiles" of our people in their historic homeland. It is our duty to demand the right of national self-determination for the Jewish minority in the socialist countries and the right of every Jew who so desires to emigrate to the land of his fathers. Considering the bitter and tragic experience of the past, we must now demand more emphatically and from all regimes — the right of the Jewish people to free migration to the land of Israel.

(b) We must more firmly maintain our ideological independence and undogmatically adapt Marxism-Leninism to the conditions of our country. Our ideological independence will encompass not only what concerns the "Ingathering of the Exiles" and the solution of the Jewish problem, but also the internal and external tactics and strategy of the revolutionary workers' parties. We must maintain freedom of judgment not only in what concerns our country and our people but also regarding

various aspects of the internal regime in the socialist countries.

25. It follows that we must maintain independent judgement as Zionists, Marxists and revolutionary socialists. Following careful examination, we shall praise the praiseworthy, be wary of the doubtful, and differ from the unworthy, while maintaining a close attachment to the camp of peace and revolutionary socialism in the world and protecting our freedom of judgment and our ideological independence.

I hereby propose that the Third Convention apply itself to correcting the Haifa Platform in the spirit of the premises which found their expression in the above theses and in their summation.