

rulers, foreign policy has taken precedence above all other aspects of government.

Important as the Aswan project is, it is hard to see a solution of the Egyptian problem by purely technical means. The hallmark of the present military regime is that, while sincerely seeking the industrialization and modernization of Egypt, it hopes to achieve that goal without breaking up the old social structure. Apart from the monarchy and the pashas, the power-structure remains intact. The dictatorship has little more authority over the direction of the economy than Nehru's democracy, and for the same reason: The economy is, by and large, still in the hands of the same possessing classes. When the experience of China is set against that of all those colonial countries which have tried to make progress without a basic social revolution, it is easy to see that technical expedients are not enough; barriers which look insuperable to a regime that has its hands tied by old social relations may be leaped or circumvented by a regime that is free to make a fresh economic start.

GENERAL Neguib, when he was in office, told an Egyptian diplomat: "My dear ambassador, just explain to your friends that if we had not seized power, others would have otherthrown the monarchy and by other means." The Lacoutures write:

In the collusion which was constantly offered by the British and Americans and which Nasser accepted, there was certainly an element of ideological understanding, a common determination to block the passage to a violent

social revolution by offsetting it with technical reform (the idea being less to bar the road to an imaginary Soviet invasion, than to nip in the bud some Mao of the Nile Valley).

These are insights into the motives of the military revolutionists, but as the Lacoutures point out, they by no means define the entire process. In its foreign relations, a regime which started out to make the most of its ties with imperialism soon found that it was offered little independence in return for its collaboration, and broke violently to carry out some of the most striking anti-imperialist coups of recent years. The limited technical reforms of its internal policy have grown in implication, not because the changes have been so great, but because the awakening of the people has been furthered, and because they sit in judgment on the regime's actions, and make demands and exert pressures.

Nasser's regime is certainly a dictatorship masquerading as a revolution, but it is also a dictatorship fulfilling some of the obligations of a revolution, and initiating the trends and processes which will make for more revolution in Egypt. So long as the military can effectively substitute itself for the social struggle, keep the pot boiling, and give at least the impression of forward motion, it can hold sway. If it falters, the dispossessed nobles and landowners are on hand to take over again, with imperialist help, unless the Egyptian working class and peasantry have in the meantime so matured as to be able to make the Nile Valley the scene of Africa's first experiment in socialism.

OPINIONS

The Jewish Tradition

by A California Reader

ISAAC Deutscher's article "Message of the Non-Jewish Jew" in the September *American Socialist*, brings to mind the statement of the ancient Jewish sage Hillel: "If you are not for yourself, who will be for you? If you are for yourself alone, what are you?" The six "great revolutionaries of modern thought"—Spinoza, Heine, Marx, Rosa Luxemburg, Trotsky, and Freud—who went "beyond the boundaries of Jewry" recognized the profundity of the idea that a Jew must not be for himself alone. Marxists must agree that only "universal human emancipation"—world socialism—answers the "Jewish question," just as it is the only answer to the problems of any oppressed people.

However, it would seem that Deutscher neglects another aspect of the same question. It is not enough for a socialist to be against narrow nationalism which separates the Jew from the non-Jew. The struggle for the defense of the full economic, political and social equality of the Jewish people, and against all forms of anti-Semitism, is an integral part of the struggle in defense of democracy and

civilization. In other words a Jew must be "for himself," although "not for himself alone."

It is true, as Deutscher says, that "the world has compelled" some Jews "to embrace the nation-state as the way out." For the remnants of European Jewry who found themselves after the second World War in a worse plight than that of any other war-torn people of Europe, deprived of all earthly possessions, homeless, without means of livelihood, in most instances bereft of relatives, friends and even families, herded into Displaced Persons Camps, often little better than the concentration camps they survived, some "way out" was needed. Most Jews of Europe saw no future in their old homelands, which were haunted with memories of the misery of their past. Marxists are not called upon to oppose this right of self-determination (and of survival), even when it takes the form of emigration to Israel.

WE may argue that the national consciousness awakened in Jews by the Nazi persecutions is a long step back from the advanced internationalist consciousness and assimilationist aims that predominated among Jews in pre-Hitler Europe and that it therefore constitutes a political retrogression for the Jews. Nevertheless, the validity of the

struggles against national oppression cannot be denied. It is incumbent on present-day Marxists to approach the question in its new historical context. Deutscher says correctly that "decaying capitalism has overstayed its day and has morally dragged down mankind: and we, the Jews, have paid for it and may yet have to pay for it." It is this very situation which makes the past traditional Marxist position of assimilationism invalid.

There is no necessary conflict between a Jew adopting an internationalist ideology while at the same time recognizing the bond between American Jews and Israeli Jews. For a bond also exists between the Jewish worker in New York, the Jewish cave-dweller in Tripoli, the Jewish Falasha hunter in Abyssinia, and the Jewish farmer in Israel. This is so despite the fact that Jews do not constitute a race—since historically there has been a co-mingling of a variety of known as well as unknown ethnic strains in the Jewish people. And despite the fact that they are not a religious confraternity because there are as many unbelievers as believers among the Jewish people. And despite the fact that they are not a nation because for almost two thousand years they have been scattered over the earth, living as distinctive groups among the nations, yet differing widely from one another and lacking the homogeneity of a nation. For there are a thousand subtle threads, visible as well as invisible, that connect even the most assimilated Jew with other Jews. There are ethical values and social attitudes, folkways and folkwisdom, a Jewish folksong sung by a grandmother, a humorous anecdote told by a father. And if it isn't these positive signs of identification—there are the negative ones—the identification with the six million victims of Hitler's gas ovens. Moreover, American capitalism has never permitted the full and equal integration of the Jewish people in American life.

THERE are two types of response to the historical situation in which the Jew finds himself: the bourgeois-nationalist and the internationalist. The Jewish nationalist

sees and shows the Jew invariably in physical and cultural isolation from the non-Jew. Such nationalism affirms the idea that Jews always have been and always will be apart from and at odds with the remainder of mankind. It denies that the cause of anti-Semitism resides in the class division of society in which a ruling class disorients the majority it oppresses by diverting popular wrath from itself onto the Jews. It regards anti-Semitism as some "eternal" products of the non-Jewish character. Bourgeois nationalists seek to prevent the development of the ties that bind Jew and non-Jew. It is against this form of Jewish nationalism that Deutscher's article strikes a well-deserved blow.

But there is another form of bourgeois ideology—that of the opportunist whose principal obsession has been to relieve himself of the encumbering baggage of his Jewishness. In a world where it is highly inconvenient to be born a Jew, where he cannot endure the finger of social scorn pointed at him, he tries hard to transform himself into his snobbish conception of an Anglo-Saxon Gentile. This philistine historically has also spread anti-Semitic slanders against his own people because he finds it a lot more pleasant to hunt with the hounds than to run with the hares. Any Jew who attempts to "transcend his Jewishness" by ignoring or denouncing it is of no aid in the struggle for "universal human emancipation."

Ilya Ehrenburg once said that "we are Jews not because of the blood that is in us, but because of that which has flowed out of us." I share Isaac Deutscher's hope that "together with other nations, the Jews will ultimately become aware. . . of the message of universal human emancipation." To help make this hope become a reality is the aim of a Jewish socialist who must transcend his Jewishness and embrace a world socialist solution. At the same time, by understanding his roots and appreciating his culture, he can use those positive traditions in his history to win other Jews to join together with their non-Jewish comrades in the movement for the emancipation of all men.

A Review-Article

Anatomy of an Old-Line Union

by Bert Cochran

EMPIRE IN WOOD by Robert A. Christie. Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1957, \$5.50.

DR. Robert A. Christie wrote this book for his doctorate and at the time of its publication, it was noticed mainly in the academic reviews. It

has recently figured in news stories because of its accidental connection with a court biography of William L. Hutcheson for which the Carpenters Union paid its author, one Maxwell C. Raddock, the tidy little sum of \$310,000. The Raddock book turned out to be largely a plagiarism of Dr.

Christie's and other works; and testimony before the McClellan Committee left a suspicion that the huge sum of money paid for it also covered costs of trying to blackmail AFL-CIO President George Meany into calling off his cleanup campaign. Dr. Christie got into the newspapers momentarily with his testimony before the Senate committee that the only expense which Mr. Raddock probably had in writing his book "was a pair of scissors and a box of glue."

At any rate, Dr. Christie's book is a scholarly proposition, quite penetrating and superior when tracing the economic and sociological influences on the evolution of the union, but lacking in feel when discussing the union's internal politics. The narrative starts off on the wrong foot with Dr. Christie