NEW TASKS AND REALIGNMENTS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR THE JEWISH STATE IN PALESTINE

By ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

The United Nations' decision to establish two independent, democratic states in Palestine—a Jewish and an Arab state—is an event of great historic significance. This decision has laid the basis for a democratic solution in the interests of both peoples and of world peace and democracy. It is primarily due to the efforts of the Soviet Union, of the new democracy of Poland, and to the agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States.

For the Jewish people this decision is a historic step toward the realization of a dream of centuries. It signifies that the progressive forces of the world, headed by the Soviet Union, are actively promoting the fulfillment of the aspirations of large sections of the Jewish people for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. But we must also recognize that, while United States support was one of the decisive factors in the decision, American policy may yet prove a serious obstacle to its implementation. American policy may yet become an obstacle to the establishment of an independent Jewish state free of all foreign imperialist domination. American policy may seriously interfere with the ability of the Jewish state to become truly democratic and to follow a consistent policy of peace and collaboration with the Arab state.

For, in addition to internal political considerations, American support of the United Nations partition plan is motivated by the inter-imperialist rivalry of the United States and Great Britain for control and influence in the Middle East and the Mediterranean. In that region, as elsewhere, Wall Street is seeking to create economic, political, and military bases for use to prevent the full independence and development of the projected Jewish and Arab states and against the whole anti-imperialist camp headed by the Soviet Union.

American imperialism will try to make the Jewish state its puppet and to exploit and oppress the Jewish people. American and British imperialism together will try to intensify and prolong friction between Arabs and Jews and obstruct the economic unity and the political cooperation of the two states.

To guard against this danger to the Palestine Yishuv and to the Jewish people as a whole, we must be on the alert against the dangerous theory of reactionary circles in the Zionist movement that the Yishuv and the Jewish people everywhere should orient their policy toward the "West" (read, imperialists). Need we be reminded that the "West" failed to protect our people from Hitler—in fact, cold-bloodedly abandoned us to Hitler during the rise and fall of Nazi-fascism—and that it was the "East," the Soviet Union, which protected and saved millions of our people from extermination? Great Britain, the strongest power in Western Europe, is the imperialist exploiter and oppressor of the Yishuv, and represents one of the greatest and most dangerous obstacles to the realization of the U.N. plan for a Jewish state. The other major Western power, the United States, which is now the center of world reaction, is reaching for imperialist control of the Middle East and of the projected Jewish state as political and military bases for a new world war. As for France, it is being converted by its ruling class into a vassal of Wall Street.

The hard fact is that orientation toward the "West" and against the "East" means alignment with the oppressors and persecutors of the Jewish people. It means orientation toward reliance upon the enemies of an independent Jewish state in Palestine, upon the Truman-Marshall plans, and support for Wall Street's preparation of a new world war. For the sake of its own future and that of the Jewish people in general, the Palestine Yishuv—the coming Jewish state—must take its place in the anti-imperialist and democratic camp, the only dependable ally of our people everywhere. The Yishuv must realize that a durable, democratic peace is the first condition for the realization and survival of the Jewish state.

The democratic forces of American Jewry must therefore oppose American or Anglo-American attempts to dominate the Jewish state in Palestine. There is great danger that Anglo-American imperialism will seek to distort and violate the U.N. decision, will strive to exclude the democratic states headed by the Soviet Union from influencing the implementation of the decision, and, finally, will attempt to prevent the two new states from emerging truly free and independent. We must fully support the struggle for the establishment of an independent, democratic Jewish state, for the development of economic unity and political cooperation between the Jewish and Arab states, and of the cooperation of the Jewish state with the anti-imperialist, democratic camp in the U.N. and throughout the world.

Encouraged by the maneuvers of
the Arab reactionaries and especially the pro-fascist Mufri group are inciting Arab-Jewish conflict and preparing for prolonged hostilities against the Jewish people in Palestine. Their aim is to obstruct, and force a reconsideration of, the U.N. decision. Reactionary Zionist circles in Palestine, continuing their nationalist-chauvinist policies toward the Arab people, are making the work of the Arab reactionaries and of imperialism all the easier. Obstacles are thus being multiplied to make the carrying out of the U.N. decision more difficult.

We must therefore fight for the quickest implementation of the decision. We must demand:

1) That the Security Council of the United Nations take full charge of the Palestine situation and assume direct responsibility for implementing the decision of the General Assembly.

2) That the Security Council call upon the British administration in Palestine to cease interfering with and hampering the defense actions of the Jewish community.

3) That the Security Council call upon all member nations to take every necessary measure to prevent shipment of arms and munitions from their respective countries to those Arab groups and countries that are attacking the Jewish community and fighting against the U.N. decision.

4) That the Security Council take all necessary measures to arm the Jewish community which shall carry on its defense actions under the supervision of the Security Council.

In the wake of the U.N. decision, old divisions and alignments—for or against a Jewish state—are gradually losing their significance. A new alignment of social and political forces must take place in Jewish life everywhere on the issues arising from the goal of creating the Jewish state. This new alignment will help to consolidate all democratic and anti-imperialist forces in the fight for the carrying out of the U.N. decision. It will also influence the policies of democratic and Left forces in the Zionist movement, in Palestine as well as in this country, and will move them toward the anti-imperialist and democratic camp. We must work with all our might to accelerate and promote its realignment.

To summarize our main analysis and conclusions:

The historic U.N. decision on Palestine became possible in the present period because of the following factors: first, the existence, the vitality, and the just national demands of the Jewish community in Palestine, which is growing into nationhood and becoming an important political factor in the Near East; secondly, the favorable international situation.

But we distinguish between the two qualitatively different components of the favorable international situation. The first of these is the vastly increased moral and political authority of the Soviet Union in world affairs due to its decisive role in defeating the fascist enemy in the war. This component embraces the rise of the new democracies of Europe and the growth in strength of the anti-imperialist camp generally. In the United Nations this camp, headed by the Soviet Union, has played a decisive part in the decision for a Jewish state.

The other component is the great weakening of British imperialism, the increased strength of American imperialism, and the rivalry between them, as well as their desire to combine against the real independence of the Arabs and Jews and against the anti-imperialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. These factors, together with internal political considerations, led to the acceptance by the United States of the Soviet compromise offer for the setting up of the two new states in Palestine.

We must keep these facts clearly before the eyes of our people. Only then will they fully realize who are the real friends of the projected Jewish state and of the Jewish people in general. Only then will they fully understand the new dangers now threatening the realization of the Jewish state—the dangers coming from American and British imperialism.

CERTAIN IDEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS REGARDING ZIONISM

Recent events with regard to Palestine have once again brought to the fore certain ideological questions on Zionism. It has been asserted that Communist support for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine became possible only through a departure from Marxism on the Jewish question and the consequent adoption of some Zionist ideas.

Some Zionist leaders welcome this "departure" from Marxism because they hold that Marxism is thereby weakened and Zionism strengthened. At the same time, certain Marxists disapprove this "departure" because they, too, believe that it weakens Marxism and strengthens Zionism. This misconception was advanced, especially by certain Zionist writers, following the famous Gromyko speech in the United Nations in May, 1947, which proposed the establishment of one, dual Jewish-Arab state in Palestine or, if this should prove impossible, the consideration of establishing two separate independent and democratic states. In this declaration of Soviet policy, Gromyko, according to certain Zionists and a few Marxists, was supposed to have abandoned the Marxist position on the national and Jewish questions.

In November, 1946, the Communist Party issued a resolution on work among the American Jewish masses which clearly demonstrated that the Communist fight for a Jewish national home and for Jewish statehood in Palestine flows inevitably from the application of Marxist national policy to the concrete conditions of Palestine in the present period. Our position, of course, dif-
tered from the Zionist conception. We could not accept the Biltmore Program, which denied the legitimate national rights of the Arabs and subordinated the Arabs to the Jews. While top Zionist officials down to the last moment opposed turning the Palestine question over to the United Nations, we had throughout insisted that a democratic solution demanded recourse to that organization. Furthermore, we could not agree with the Zionists that the achievement of a Jewish state in Palestine would solve the Jewish question as a whole and for all countries. Our conception of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine is based on the Marxist principle of the right to self-determination and equality of all nations. As Marxists, as irreconcilable enemies of imperialism and national oppression, we fought for the fulfillment of Jewish national aspirations and statehood in collaboration with the Arab people of Palestine and with full respect for their equal national rights. This represents a Marxist approach to such questions, as developed by Lenin and Stalin. Such an approach is incompatible with the bourgeois-nationalist ideology of Zionism. For Marxists, as Lenin and Stalin hold, “the final complete and permanent solution of the Jewish question will be attained only under Socialism on the basis of the principles formulated by Lenin and Stalin and as developed in the Soviet Union’s solution of the national question.” (Resolution on work among the American Jewish masses, Political Affairs, November, 1946, p. 1037.)

The policy of developing Jewish statehood in Birobidjan bears directly and intimately on whether or not Marxism is compatible with Jewish statehood. In an article in the July, 1947, issue of Political Affairs, I stated, in dealing with this question, that:

... when the Soviet government promulgated in 1934 the famous decree for establishing Birobidjan as a Jewish Autonomous Region, Kalinin explained that the purpose was to create a Jewish state unit, Jewish statehood, for the economic and cultural development of a Jewish nationality. Not only did this constitute no departure from Marxism, but, on the contrary, it was the development of Marxism applied to the solution of the Jewish question in the concrete circumstances of the Soviet Union. It follows inevitably from Stalin’s historic contribution to the solution of the national question and from the entire Marxist-Leninist policy of the Soviet government on this question.

And further:

This proves conclusively that there is no contradiction in principle between Marxism and the idea of a Jewish state. It also proves that Marxism brought forth and supported the idea of a Jewish state when the objective conditions became ripe for it, when progressive forces had made their appearance in the historic stage, forces interested in, and capable of, realizing the aspirations of large sections of the Jewish people for a Jewish state. This is what happened in the Soviet Union with regard to Birobidjan. This is what prompted Marxists in the recent period to raise the question of Jewish statehood and of a Jewish state in Palestine.

From this it is clear that we make no claim that Marxists always posed the question of Jewish statehood in the same way or that they have always favored a policy of struggle for a Jewish state.

Some people still labor under the misapprehension that Lenin and Stalin opposed a Jewish state in principle and that they shared the opportunistic and bourgeois-nationalist views of the Social-Democratic Jewish “Bund” in old Russia on this question. Nothing can be further from the truth. To quote again from the same article:

It was Stalin, in his polemics with the “Bund” in 1913 and in other writings, who insisted and demonstrated scientifically that a people cannot live a normal and full national life—cannot be a single nation if it does not have a common territory, does not have one national economy, language, and culture. Stalin was speaking about the Jewish people. This meant two things. First, the Jewish people cannot act as a single nation, much as they may desire it. Second, in the absence of a Jewish community anywhere on earth growing into nationhood, the Zionist policies for a Jewish state at that time (1913) were not only utopian but profoundly reactionary since no progressive forces of any sort were then present in the objective situation interested in and capable of realizing the dream of a Jewish state. It is still true today that the Zionist conception that the Jews of all lands constitute one single nation is of a bourgeois-nationalist character.

Marxist opposition to Zionism was different in principle from that of the “Bund,” for the latter proceeded on the false assumption that it is possible to create a Jewish nation without a common territory and national economy. Soviet Marxists, on the contrary, realized that it was impossible to create a Jewish nation that lacked these basic features. Thus, when it became possible to set aside a common territory to be settled by Soviet Jews and on which to develop a Jewish national economy and culture (national in form, Socialist in content), the Soviet Marxists projected the development of Soviet Jewish nationhood and statehood in Birobidjan. The question of Jewish statehood in Palestine must be approached from the same basic Marxist point of view.

Basic changes have occurred in the internal and external position of Palestine and its peoples, as well as in the general life of the Jewish people in the capitalist world during the crucial period of the rise and fall of Hitlerism. Failure of the Western world to protect the Jews from Nazi extermination, and the tragic loss of a third of our people at the hands of the fascists during the war, have made the old dream of a Jewish state in Palestine the aspiration of wide masses of our people. Most decisive, however, are the two factors mentioned above, i.e., the growth during the same period of a vital Jewish
community, developing into national development in Palestine and the favorable international situation following the war. A democratic realization of Jewish aspirations has therefore become possible.

Consequently, and in full accord with their basic position on the national question, the Marxists raised the question of Jewish statehood in Palestine. They raised it in the most democratic, most desirable, and in the long run, most durable form—in the form of one, dual, Jewish-Arab, independent, and democratic state. They also indicated that, if deterioration of Jewish-Arab relations made the proposal for a common state impractical at this time, it might then be necessary to consider the establishment of two separate and independent states.

As we know, conditions made it necessary to decide in favor of two separate states. The U.N. plan called for two independent and democratic states, with economic unity between them. This proposal was, of course, entirely different from the many partition schemes contemplated by British and American imperialism.

It is important to realize that the major responsibility for the further deterioration of Arab-Jewish relations, from the time of the historic Gromyko declaration in May to the U.N. decision in December, 1947, rests with British and American imperialism, which was effectively aided by Arab and Jewish reactionaries inside and outside of Palestine.

It should also be noted that the democratic and anti-imperialist forces, both among the Jews and the Arabs, bear their own responsibility for the inadequate struggle for Arab-Jewish unity and for a democratic Arab-Jewish state of two equal peoples.

There are some who maintain that, by agreeing to the partition of Palestine, Marxists have once again departed from Marxism, have abandoned their proposal for a Jewish-Arab state, and have accepted something advocated by Zionism. But here, too, fancy has won over fact. The truth is that Marxists have not abandoned their conviction that the type of state they proposed would represent the most consistently democratic solution and the most enduring. Partition itself will be successful precisely to the degree which the economic unity and political cooperation of the two states develops. In other words, the closer the two separate states approach the status of one state consisting of two equal nations, the closer we shall be to a complete and permanent solution of the Palestine question, to the firm and irrevocable establishment of independent Jewish statehood.

Our Party's resolution on Jewish work stated:

A major task in the struggle for the independence of Palestine is the joint Arab-Jewish fight, supported by all progressive and anti-imperialist forces, against the British and Anglo-American imperialist schemes for the partition of Palestine for some fraudulent 'independence' maneuver similar to the one in Trans-Jordan, based upon the collaboration with imperialism of the Jewish and Arab reactionary forces. (Political Affairs, November, 1946, p. 1039).

It is now clearer than ever that Marxist opposition to the imperialist schemes for partition of Palestine and support for a U.N. solution was correct.

The fight was carried on by the anti-imperialist forces despite opposition from reactionary Zionist circles. The fight was effective because it helped to prevent the carrying out of Anglo-American imperialist schemes and forced the issue into the United Nations. The democratic forces headed by the U.S.S.R. were thus afforded an opportunity to project and work for a democratic solution.

The U.N. decision, which removed British and/or Anglo-American imperialism from exclusive jurisdiction over Palestine, created conditions for the democratic states to influence the democratic implementation of the partition decision. We should note at this point that official Zionist policy was opposed to bringing the issue of Palestine before the United Nations.

It is therefore clear that in their fight for Jewish statehood, for an Arab-Jewish state, or for two separate independent and democratic states as decided by the United Nations, Communists did not have to depart from Marxism on the national and Jewish questions. On the contrary, the position of the Marxists was developed in accord with changing conditions and constitutes the application of Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism to the solution of the Jewish (and Arab) question in Palestine. It is therefore clear that the Marxist position in support of a Jewish state in Palestine did not derive from the acceptance of Zionist political ideology. Marxists will continue to distinguish in the future, as they have done in the past, between the living reality of Jewish national-unity in Palestine—and, hence, of the fulfillment of their right to self-determination—and Zionism as an imperialist ideology incompatible with Marxism.

ZIONISM AND THE NEW ALIGNMENT IN STRUGGLE FOR THE JEWISH STATE

Some Zionists claim that the United Nations decision was a triumph for Zionism, even as a private victory for the Zionist parties. And, I am sorry to say, some confused progressive non-Zionists are impressed by this chatter.

Fortunately, the masses of the Jewish people, including the bulk of the Zionists and many of their leaders, do not share this belief. The masses of our people consider the United Nations decision a triumph of justice and truth. The masses of our people acclaim the United Nations decision as opening the way to the realization of Jewish national aspirations. They do not consider it a triumph of one particular Jewish po
political movement or party, even though many Jews grant Zionism considerable recognition for the U.N. decision.

The time has long passed when many, including some American Jewish Marxists, identified the Jewish Yishuv and the idea of Jewish statehood in Palestine with Zionist ideology and its political program. Some people concluded that one could not favor Jewish statehood in Palestine without supporting Zionism; or, conversely, if one were opposed to Zionism, that one would be obliged to oppose Jewish statehood in Palestine. This erroneous identification of Jewish statehood with Zionism was responsible for many past errors of American Jewish Communists on the Palestine question, and has been exposed and criticized in the Party resolution of 1946.

The central objective of political Zionism has been the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. However, this objective was not confined to the Zionist parties. It was the aspiration of large masses of our people. By incorporating this aspiration into a political platform, the Zionist movement undoubtedly played an important part in the emergence of a Jewish national community in Palestine. No one would question that the Zionist movement has become, over the years, an important factor in Jewish life. But it is demonstrable that official Zionist policies have always been oriented on imperialism and reaction.

The bourgeois-nationalist, chauvinist ideology and official policies of Zionism in relation to the Arab masses played an important role in intensifying national tension, provoked by British imperialism and aided by the Arab reactionary nationalists. Zionist policy has always insisted on the "negation of the Diaspora," i.e., that Jewish life in all countries outside of Palestine is doomed. This theory, an integral part of basic Zionist philosophy to this day, exhibits a complete contempt for the achievements and vitality of many Jewish communities throughout the world. That it has proved utopian and reactionary is evidenced by the Jewish communities in the Soviet Union and Birobidjan in particular, in the United States, Poland, etc. This theory has also had the effect of estranging from the Yishuv large sections of our people in many lands.

Among Jewish workers and the Jewish masses generally, Zionist ideology has always tended to cultivate trends toward separation from the labor and progressive forces of their respective countries and from other peoples. Such trends play into the hands of reaction and anti-Semitism and militate against the struggles of our people for equal rights and for survival everywhere, including Palestine.

Zionism as a political movement worked for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine. It thus contributed to the emergence of the Jewish Yishuv, whose existence in turn helped make necessary and possible the U.N. decision. But Zionism also bears a heavy responsibility for many of the difficulties which now confront the realization of this decision. Zionism is partially responsible for the deterioration of Jewish-Arab relations, because of its failure to break with imperialism and join hands with the anti-imperialist, democratic forces of the world, which are the most dependable allies of our people for the realization of the Jewish state.

Now that concrete prospects have opened up for that realization, Jewish opinion all over the world is in ferment, and a new realignment is taking place. Within the Zionist movement, democratic elements begin to realize that the establishment and safe-guarding of the Jewish state demand a firm alliance with the anti-imperialist forces of the world.

This process will continue. It is a healthy manifestation and one that we must encourage. There is need for a powerful united movement of Zionists and non-Zionists to bring the independent Jewish state into being. The development of the anti-imperialist unity of our people everywhere is imperative for their survival and flourishing. Welded to the over-all democratic, anti-imperialist struggle of the entire American people, this line of struggle can assure the eradication of fascism, and the securing of a durable peace, of equality, economic security, and democracy.

---

**A MERE TRAINING TO ACT AS A MACHINE**

"All objections urged against the Communist mode of producing and appropriating material products have, in the same way, been urged against the Communist modes of producing and appropriating intellectual products. Just as, to the bourgeois, the disappearance of class property is the disappearance of production itself, so the disappearance of class culture is to him identical with the disappearance of all culture.

"That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine."

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party.*