

Biblical studies. As a group the Yemenites are deeply religious and intermarry little with the other Jewish communities in Israel.

Coming as they do from one of the most backward absolute monarchies in the world, the Yemenites, like most Oriental Jews, have not as yet been involved in any large numbers in the labor and progressive movements of Israel. There are Yemenites in all three workers' political parties, but it is a tragic fact that the only organization that has made real headway among them and among other Oriental Jews is the Irgun-Freedom Movement. The Irgunites have exploited the Oriental Jews' hatred of the Arab countries from which they fled as well as their justified resentment at the discriminatory treatment accorded them in the Yishuv. These "Arabized" Jews of the Middle East and North Africa constitute the largest reservoir of potential future immigration into Israel. This and their high birth rate will increase their proportionate weight in the population, so that in a generation or two Oriental Jews and their descendants may become a majority.

## XII. Unfinished Business

The nub of the issue in regard to Israel is this: will formal independence mask a new colonial enslavement, or will the bones of freedom be given flesh and blood? In other words, will Israel be an imperialist or an anti-imperialist base? All other problems must be judged in relation to this central problem.

One of the misconceptions that Israel's government is helping to demolish—a misconception, especially prevalent in labor Zionist circles, including Mapam—is that strong trade unions, widespread co-operatives, and a modern industrial society guarantee that Israel will be a progressive factor in the Middle East and in world affairs. We have seen that these achievements did not in the past prevent Jewish Palestine from serving as an instrument of imperialism, nor will they in the future. What is decisive is foreign policy. A foreign policy that strengthens imperialism weakens Israel and its progressive potentialities. Conversely, a foreign policy that weakens imperialism strengthens Israel and enhances its progressive role.

The war of liberation weakened the position of British imperialism in the Middle East and temporarily upset the predatory calculations of the United States. But this war marked the beginning, not the end, of the fight for independence. It could not finally decide this question because politically it was led by class forces which even before the conclusion of hostilities sought to come to terms with imperialism—a betrayal that in 1948-49 the forces of the Left were strong enough to retard, but not prevent. With the establishment of the first elected government, a new phase in the liberation struggle opened. For Americans, whose understanding of Palestine has in the past been befogged by illusions and sentiment-

talities, it is essential to recognize that this government, in which the Social-Democratic Mapai provided the mass base for the bourgeoisie, *marked the re-entrance of Israel into the world colonial system of imperialism.* The "mandate" is held this time by the United States—a "mandate" backed by billions of dollars—though British influence in Israel and in the rest of Palestine remains strong. This relationship of Israel to the imperialist bloc is not altered by occasional differences that may arise between its government and the government of the United States or Britain—any more than such differences have altered similar relationships in the case of Greece, Kuomintang China, and the "independent" Philippines.

If the war against the Arab states was for the people of Israel and the peoples of the world a war for independence from alien oppression, for the capitalists of Israel and for those in control of its government it had a different meaning. The aim of a Jewish state as a buttress of imperialism—that aim which from Herzl to Weizmann, Jabotinsky and Ben Gurion had been the lodestar of Zionist policy—had not been abandoned even if the methods of achieving it had changed. This aim expressed not so much the crassness of individuals as the outlook of a class, the Jewish bourgeoisie, which had developed too late in history to play an independent role and was bound umbilically to foreign imperialism. For these forces the objective of the war was to defeat the British policy of reckoning exclusively with the Arab ruling classes and to win for capitalist Israel a place in the Anglo-American design for the Middle East. If in the past the Zionist leaders had proposed that Jewish Palestine become a dominion within the British empire, they now sought in practice to make it an unofficial dominion within the American empire.

Israel's semi-colonial status rests not only on the Anglo-American dominance already achieved in its economic life, but also on its excessive dependence on contributions, investments, and loans from abroad—chiefly from the United States. No country which exists on foreign doles can be truly independent. Yet with the establishment of the Jewish state, the Yishuv's dependence on foreign aid, instead of declining, increased substantially. And the policy of Israel's government has been to increase it further by offering foreign investors inducements such as they enjoy in few colonial lands.

The economic justification for this policy is that in view of Israel's own limited resources, it represents the principal way to develop industry, agriculture, commerce, and transportation, and make possible the absorption of a large immigration. The public has been led to believe that even if some of the political consequences are a little unpalatable, there is no alternative. No one can deny that Israel for some time to come will be unable to dispense with the voluntary contributions of world Jewry, and will also need additional foreign capital. Nevertheless, the argument for leaning on American financial power, to the extent that it is sincere and not a specious apology for subservience to imperialism, is based on illusion. Far from furthering healthful economic development, the conditions under which this aid is being given and utilized *are tending to colonialize Israel and to reproduce there the evils of the Jewish social structure in other capitalist countries.*

In 1949, when the influx of foreign capital in the form of gifts, loans, and investments reached the highest point in the history of Jewish Palestine, only a negligible proportion was flowing into industrialization. *The relative level of industrial development, in view of the large increase in population, actually declined.\** As a result, those immigrants who were finding employment were streaming preponderantly into trade, handicrafts, and such elementary industries as baking. Few were finding jobs in industry, and only about 8 per cent were going into agriculture,<sup>1</sup> though agriculture ranks second to industry for Israel's future.

Of the voluntary contributions, the bulk had to be used to maintain immigrants and provide them with homes. Essential as this is, it does not contribute directly to the country's economic development except temporarily in the building industry. In the case of the \$100 million American loan, the conditions attached to it provided only 20 per cent for industrialization. And perhaps the greatest mirage of all has been foreign private investments.

Moreover, by hitching their wagon to American dollars, the leaders of Israel's government were also hitching it to the American depression that was creeping like a leprosy over the most powerful capitalist country in the world. If their desperate appeals and im-

\*See pages 149-51.

provisions could be called an economic program, it was a program for disaster. And its political consequences were no less harsh.

### THE OTHER CHOICE

What is the alternative? The alternative is not simple; it cannot be achieved without struggle and sacrifice. But the choice is between the kind of sacrifice that will progressively free Israel and the kind imposed by the Anglo-American absentee masters and their local overseers, which will progressively enslave it. The idea that Israel is so small and weak that it has no alternative, but must take sides with its enemies while pretending to be neutral between them and its friends, is vicious nonsense. No less vicious and nonsensical is the idea that precisely such a policy will in time enable Israel to stand on its own feet.

The real alternative is not untried and unproved. It is in fact the only policy that proved a resounding success as against the dismal failure of years of collaboration with imperialism. This alternative was inherent in the liberation war. It was the policy of resisting imperialism and looking for support to the anti-imperialist forces of the world which led to the creation of the state and the defeat of the Anglo-American aggressors and their Arab mercenaries. But the Yishuv's leadership, pursuing other aims, blocked the full unfolding of that policy and the gathering of its fruits. Subsequently they returned completely to the pro-imperialist course.

Naturally, the methods of peace are not the methods of war, but the essence of the alternative policy remains the same. It may be summed up as consisting of two complementary elements: full mobilization of all internal resources behind an integrated program designed to achieve rapid industrialization and absorption of immigrants, and at the same time reduce dependence on financial aid from abroad; and alliance with the anti-imperialist factors in the Middle East and in the world.

The full mobilization of Israel's internal resources cannot be achieved on the theory that if only the capitalists, local and foreign, had sufficiently succulent "inducements" dangled before them, they would be filled with a consuming passion to promote the national welfare. Nor can it be achieved by reducing purchasing power that

is already far too low, or by a tax program that soaks the poor and wrist-slaps the rich.

A first step in a program for economic independence should be nationalization of all foreign-owned concessions, such as the Palestine Electric Corporation, Palestine Potash, the Haifa refineries, as well as the foreign banks, and their operation by the government in the interests of the people. This would not only weaken the position of foreign imperialism, but would place in the hands of the government important levers for advancing the country's economic development. In addition, it would make possible lowering the cost of electricity, oil, and the Dead Sea minerals for industry, agriculture, and home use, and the expansion of credit at lower interest rates.

A second step is the nationalization of imports. This will halt the practice of importing manufactured goods that could be produced in Israel.

A third step—once the immediate needs of the immigrants are met and more favorable conditions for their economic absorption created—is the utilization of financial aid from the Jews of other countries, as well as increased revenue from the wealthier elements in the Yishuv, to establish state-owned industrial enterprises and to expand Histadrut enterprises and co-operative agriculture. From the same sources can also come most of the funds for a great water-and-power development project such as the Jordan Valley Authority plan proposed by Dr. Walter C. Lowdermilk.<sup>2</sup> Foreign loans and credits, if necessary, should be on a strictly business basis, without economic or political strings that become shackles for Israel.

The success of this internal program, which will, of course, require many additional measures, is closely related to Israel's external program—to changing its lopsided foreign trade and lopsided foreign policy. The concentration of Israel's foreign trade in the Anglo-American sphere is unhealthy economically and politically. It also means a highly unfavorable trade balance for Israel. Closer economic and political relations with countries that will treat Israel as an equal, will be willing to buy from her as well as sell to her, and will not attempt to dictate to her are imperative to further her economic development and independence. This means, in the first place, close economic and political co-operation with those that

stood by Israel's side in her hour of greatest need, that seek no bases, no domination, no advantage at Israel's expense: the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. The one-sided character of Israel's trade is evident from the fact that in the first eight months of 1949 23.6 per cent of her imports came from the United Kingdom and its possessions, 26.9 per cent from the United States, and only 11.5 per cent from the U.S.S.R. and the people's democracies. From the Soviet Union itself Israel bought a mere 2 per cent of the total.<sup>3</sup>

Even those limited commercial relations which the Israeli government has developed with the Soviet Union and its allies have revealed the vast difference between trading with imperialist and with anti-imperialist countries. On this question an editorial in the June 26, 1949, issue of *Al Hamishmar*, Mapam daily, stated:

"The large transport of Russian grain was only one example of Soviet friendship. In this connection it must be stressed that the Russian grain was far cheaper than that we have been buying from the Anglo-Saxon countries; that it was paid for in pounds and not in dollars; and that it is but an example of the immense possibilities of firm economic relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. Such relations will undoubtedly free us from our economic dependence on capitalist countries, dependence which only entails political extortion."

Israel's first trade agreement was with Hungary and its terms were so favorable that they evoked praise even from the reactionary Revisionist *Hamashkif*, which described them as "based on the principle of equality and full reciprocity," in contrast to "the one-sided trade policy imposed by the former mandatory regime."<sup>4</sup> A similar pact was signed in May, 1949, with Poland. The agreements with Hungary and Poland were but small tokens of the truly "immense possibilities" of trade with Eastern Europe.

As part of a program for economic independence Israel should also seek to develop two-way trade with the Chinese People's Republic and with the colonial and semi-colonial countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. These countries are, with the exception of China, dominated in varying degree by foreign imperialism, but in all there are strivings toward full independence that also manifest themselves in the sphere of trade. Of special significance for Israel is its immediate neighborhood, the Middle East. The Middle East

could become a major trading area, in which Israel would be able to sell as well as buy. This question of course depends not alone on Israel, but on the readiness of the Arab states to live in peace with their younger and more highly industrialized neighbor.

This kind of economic program, internal and external, and Israel's liberation from all encroachments on its independence cannot be achieved so long as its government pursues a foreign policy of *de jure* neutrality and *de facto* support of the architects of the Marshall Plan and the Bernadotte Plan. To defend its future Israel must develop in peace far more consistently the political pattern that won it victory in war: resistance to imperialism and its satellites, and alignment with the anti-imperialist forces of the world headed by the Soviet Union and the people's democracies. To urge this is not to urge Israel's involvement in a potential war conflict; it is already involved in that conflict—on the war-provoking side. It is to urge its involvement in the world fight for peace. This does not mean that the form of Israel's alignment with the peace bloc should be identical with that of the people's democracies. But let not questions of form obscure content. What we are discussing is the replacement of a pro-imperialist with an anti-imperialist policy, a change from a course that undermines Israel's economic progress and independence to one that will strengthen them.

Nor does this imply severing relations with the West. On the contrary, it means closer ties with the Jewish *masses* of the West, as well as with the non-Jewish working people and progressive forces of the capitalist and colonial countries. These proved to be the most active supporters of the Yishuv's independence fight. And Israel can by the policies it pursues strengthen the progressive elements everywhere and be in turn strengthened by them.

What are the perspectives for achieving this kind of program? Its opponents are obvious but its supporters already include a substantial and influential section of the Israeli public: the workers, farmers, and small business and professional people around the Communist Party and Mapam. No doubt, as the struggle develops, these will not stand alone. Such a program could also be counted on to enlist the co-operation of those who in the international arena actively aided Israel's battle for independence. Let us try to evaluate the dynamics of the unfolding conflict over Israel's future.

## CHANGING RELATIONS

Though Israel is moving in the Anglo-American orbit, it would be a mistake to oversimplify relationships and to equate its status with its situation under the Mandate. The Palestinian Jewish nation today is far different from the colonization project of the years after the Balfour Declaration. Its class and national structure are much more highly developed, as are its class and national consciousness. It has gone through an independence struggle which has cost blood. The context of world relationships, of which Israel is a part, is also vastly different from that of the earlier period. World imperialism has been greatly weakened, socialism and the anti-imperialist forces correspondingly strengthened. Israel's new-won independence and the ousting of imperialism from direct dominion over Palestine are themselves expressions of this change.

The United States rules in Israel not directly, but indirectly. This is for Washington both an advantage and a disadvantage. An advantage because the true anatomy of power is concealed from the people and their anger is largely directed at the old master, Britain, rather than at the new. It is an advantage too in giving the State Department greater maneuverability in its relations with the reactionary Arab regimes. But it is a disadvantage in that the United States must rule through a state apparatus not its own, with an army and police that it does not directly control, through a government which is susceptible to popular pressure and must permit, for the present at least, relatively wide democratic liberties.

Within the limitations imposed by foreign imperialism, the government of Israel rules directly instead of simply influencing and organizing the Yishuv to accept alien rule, as did the Jewish Agency and the Vaad Leumi under the Mandate. This too is both an advantage and a disadvantage. An advantage because the state apparatus, taken over so largely from the British, gives the government more effective instruments for the control of the people than the leading bodies formerly had. It is an advantage too because Zionist nationalism and Social-Democratic reformism and the borrowed glory of the liberation war serve to conceal the government's class and pro-imperialist role and to give it greater authority and prestige than its precursors had. But direct governmental power is

also a growing disadvantage for Mapai and its partners. Formerly they stood apart from the government and at times even appeared to be in opposition to it. The evils that befell the Yishuv were blamed almost entirely on the British, and the fire was directed against them. But now that Mapai has identified itself completely with the capitalist state and is attempting to convert the Histadrut into a virtual state agency, it has become more vulnerable. The class struggle brings the workers more and more into conflict with the government and its apologists, and increasingly class and national issues become intertwined. The nationalist-reformist fog is not so thick that it can forever prevent the working people from seeing who it is that is appeasing the capitalists at their expense and leading the nation into the Anglo-American morass.

This new situation has also been reflected in the changed relations between Mapai and Mapam. The latter, under the impact of the developing class struggle, found it no longer possible to play the role of "loyal opposition" to Mapai, with which in the past it had been bound by nationalist affinities that overrode all differences. Mapai for its part, since it now bore the responsibility of state power in behalf of the capitalists and of those in Washington and New York who hold the purse-strings, could not tolerate a partner that was at the same time an opponent, feeding popular discontent with government policy. There came a parting of the ways and a turning of Mapam toward joint action with the Communists, even though neither the break with Mapai nor the approach to the Communists was clean-cut and Mapam's leaders sought to evade their full implications. Yet despite all shortcomings, this was no passing phenomenon, but the beginnings of a fundamental realignment which expressed the growing class polarization of the Yishuv.

The Achilles' heel of the government in power is the relative weakness of the bourgeoisie. This is characteristic of most colonial and semi-colonial countries. The relative weakness of the Israeli capitalists has been accentuated by a number of other factors. This is a singularly lusterless business class, which stands outside the nation's deepest traditions: the pioneering that built the country has been virtually a monopoly of the workers and farmers, and it was predominantly their blood, sweat, and devotion that launched the national revolution and created the state. The small vote of the

openly capitalist parties, such as the General Zionists and the Progressive Party, is a measure of the lack of prestige and popular support of the bourgeoisie. To achieve a semblance of a mass base a section of the capitalists was compelled to masquerade behind the false patriotism of the Irgun.

This relative weakness is further indicated by the extent to which the business men have had to permit the Yishuv's life to be dominated by Mapai. Of course, they also found in the Mapai leadership their would-be savior. But the Histadrut base which Mapai provided to support the policies of the bourgeoisie is obviously unstable; for it consists of workers whose interests clash with those of the capitalists and who will not forever walk the treadmill of their policies, however liberally daubed with "socialist" paint.

The political realignment signaled by the growing co-operation between Mapam and the Communists is destined to bring into being a force capable of achieving an alternative program through the creation of an alternative government. Hitherto the Left bloc has not been strong enough to set such a government as an immediate goal. But it is certainly not music of the distant future. The immediate task of Israel's Left-progressives is one of organizing and educating the people—above all, the workers—to wrest whatever concessions are possible from the capitalists and their government, and to forge in struggle the prerequisites for a truly national people's government, with Mapam and the Communists as its core.

#### SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY AND SOCIALISM

This will not be a socialist government, but it can become its precursor. Much that is mere ignorance and much that is calculated fraud has been written and said on the subject of socialism as it relates to Israel. Socialism, like liberty, is a noble idea, in whose name many ignoble crimes are committed. Prior to the first Israeli election Ben Gurion promised "socialism in our time"—just as Ramsay MacDonald and Clement Attlee did in England. But Ben Gurion reserved the choicest quackery for the members of Mapai and the Histadrut since much of the leadership's hold on them depends on sowing confusion about socialism. In a speech before a Mapai conference on the eve of the 1949 Histadrut elections, the Prime Minister declared that one of the ways in which

the dynamic qualities of the Jewish state were being expressed was in "the gradual, but thorough, transformation of the structure of society and of the body politic with a view to removing class differences and turning the people into a nation of workers."<sup>5</sup> In the name of this "gradual, but thorough" social transformation Ben Gurion shortly thereafter entered into an alliance with clerical reaction. In the name of "removing class differences" Ben Gurion's government and his adjutants in the Histadrut later that year forced upon the workers two sweeping wage cuts. For the sake of "turning the people into a nation of workers" the Mapai chiefs were placing the people at the mercy of the American trusts.

And the years of Social-Democratic groveling before imperialism and of partnership with the Jewish bankers, industrialists, and clerical Tories were described by Ben Gurion as a policy of "class independence," which "was established by us forty-five years ago." All this added up, according to the Prime Minister, to a unique Israeli brand of socialism, neither "reformist" nor "revolutionary," resembling neither German Social-Democracy nor British Laborism, nor Russian Communism because—"we belong to a people whose fate resembles that of no other people..."<sup>6</sup>

This unique Israeli "socialism" has, however, a depressingly familiar look. It is not for nothing that the Bevins and Ben Gurions were for so many years cheek by jowl, sharing the verminous bed of the Second International and praying to the same anti-Soviet god. Nor is it an accident that the close comrades-in-arms of the Mapai leaders are today such "socialists" as David Dubinsky, boss of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union and troubadour of the Marshall Plan and the North Atlantic Pact.

The forging of their state was a stage in the emancipation of Israel's people. As in all formerly subject countries, the historic function of an independent capitalist state is to create the political conditions for the subordination of the national struggle to the class struggle, for the advance from national to social liberation. Increasingly the Israeli people are face to face with the fact that in capitalist Israel they are just as afflicted by poverty, insecurity, wage-cuts, unemployment, and threats to democratic liberties as are the peoples of other capitalist countries. And their government is

just as incapable of eliminating these evils, of lifting from Israel the incubus of foreign imperialism and its war provocations as similar governments in India, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

National liberation itself remains incomplete and insecure so long as reactionary capitalist forces—with or without a “socialist” label—hold power. That is why the unfinished business of Israel’s independence struggle requires a determined fight against social reaction and its defenders, open and concealed. It is in this way that the conditions for transition to a higher stage will ripen. This socialist transformation can be achieved only as part of the national and social emancipation of the entire Middle East.

### THE ARAB WORLD

This Middle East, of which Israel is part, is an area predominately Arab. Israel is bound to that area not only geographically, but economically and politically as well. Within its own borders there is an Arab minority. Of crucial importance therefore are the Jewish state’s relations with the Arab world. Israel’s liberation war succeeded in virtually wrecking a British political base in the Middle East, the Arab League. But the Foreign Office did not put all its eggs in one basket. From the outset there was between the Egyptian-dominated League and Britain’s puppet, Abdullah, a clash of ambitions. After the end of the Palestine hostilities, London sought by other means to expand Abdullah’s territory and political power. The resistance of Israel’s government—if it could be called that—was of a kind hardly likely to impress either Jordan’s ruler or his masters. The ultimate aim was some version of the Greater Syria plan, joining Jordan, Syria, Iraq, and Arab Palestine.

At the same time Anglo-American imperialism could count three important victories snatched out of the jaws of defeat in Israel’s liberation war: the widening of the gulf between the Jewish and Arab masses; the conversion of the refugee problem into a bludgeon against Israel; and the blocking of an independent democratic Arab state in the rest of Palestine. In each case the policy of the Israeli government played into the enemy’s hands.

All this has confronted Israel with a serious danger to its economic future and military security. Only a drastic change in course can force an exit from the cul-de-sac into which imperialist pressure,

reactionary Arab machinations, and chauvinist Israeli policy have led the Jewish state. An indispensable first step in such a change is the ending of all discriminatory treatment of the Arab minority in Israel and the adoption of measures to integrate the Arab citizens on a basis of full equality into the country’s economic, social, and political life, while allowing them cultural autonomy.

Of towering significance for Israel’s future as well as that of the Arabs is the disposition of the Arab part of Palestine. The Israeli government’s attempt to make a deal with Abdullah, that is, with Britain, made it necessary for the Soviet Union to support the democratic internationalization of Jerusalem through which the imperialist advance can be partly blocked and the interests of the Jewish and Arab peoples partly safeguarded. And whatever the immediate fate of the Arab sector of Palestine, the people have a vital stake in refusing to abandon the goal of a democratic sister state. They should insist that their government take up this fight and aid the genuine representatives of the Arab people.

Finally, while Israel must seek to establish normal relations with all the Arab states, irrespective of their regimes, its national interests lie in not ignoring realities: it is only in co-operation with the progressive forces in the Arab countries—those that risked life and liberty to oppose the criminal anti-Jewish war—that the feudal roadblocks to progress can be blasted away and the Middle East transformed from an imperialist base into a base of freedom and peace.

### ISRAEL AND WORLD JEWRY

What is Israel’s relation to the Jewish people in other countries? This is a complicated question. Zionism holds that the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine is *the* solution of the Jewish problem. But what is the Jewish problem? Essentially it is a problem of the discriminatory treatment to which Jews are subjected in virtually all capitalist countries, discrimination which at times assumes violent forms. Zionism sees the cause of anti-Semitism not in social factors, not in capitalist and pre-capitalist reaction, which also victimizes other national minorities, but in the Jewish people’s lack of a “national home.” The more extreme exponents of this view have

even maintained that the mere establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine would automatically banish anti-Semitism everywhere.

In Israel itself the belief that a Jewish state would solve the Jewish problem finds expression in the Zionist dogma of "liquidation of the Diaspora" and "ingathering of the exiles." While in the American Zionist movement this doctrine is preached little and practiced less, in Israel every Zionist party, from right to left, subscribes to it, and perhaps its most ardent advocate is Mapam. According to this concept, the Jews in *every* country and under *every* social system are "homeless" and "in exile." They are doomed for all time to a rootless existence, to anti-Semitic discrimination and persecution unless they seek refuge and fulfillment in Israel.

Of course, Israel cannot physically accommodate all the Jews in the world. Nor do the majority of the world's Jews, whose national homes are in other lands, wish to uproot themselves and move to Israel. But even if all the Jews went to Israel, this would not solve the Jewish problem. For the forces of fascism and anti-Semitism, which today threaten the Jewish people, threaten Israel too. Zionist isolationism sometimes reaches astonishing proportions. It is fatuous to state, as did Mapam's official organ in arguing for increased immigration into Israel, that "the earth is burning under their [the Jews'] feet in the Diaspora. If war should break out—and this is not unlikely under present circumstances—who knows what dangers will threaten the Diaspora."<sup>7</sup> How brief memory is. In the last war socialist Russia saved more Jews than Zionist Palestine,\* and socialist Russia—Stalingrad—also saved Palestine.

It was this false theory of Israel as the solution of the Jewish problem everywhere that in 1949 brought the Israeli government and the Zionist movement into conflict with several of the people's democracies. It should be noted that when the East European countries decided, in spite of their own acute manpower needs, to permit the emigration of those of their citizens who wished to go to Israel, they were making an exception in favor of the Jews: the

\*A report in *International Conciliation*, No. 389, April, 1943, issued by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, states: "Of some 1,750,000 Jews who succeeded in escaping the Axis since the outbreak of hostilities, about 1,600,000 were evacuated by the Soviet government from Eastern Poland and subsequently occupied Soviet territory. . . . About 150,000 others managed to reach Palestine, the United States and other countries beyond the seas."

emigration of non-Jews was forbidden. But it was one thing for Jews, who no longer felt themselves able to live with the horrible memories that the Nazis had left them in Poland or Rumania, to seek new homes in Israel. It was quite another thing for Zionist emissaries to go from door to door with all sorts of glowing promises and organize a mass exodus, often in violation of immigration laws.

This was all the more intolerable in view of the policy on the Jewish question pursued by the people's democracies. Though the effects of years of anti-Semitic indoctrination of the non-Jewish population could not be wiped out over night, the East European governments had made anti-Semitic activity a crime, were actively combating it, and were providing their Jewish citizens with homes, productive work, religious institutions, and unprecedented opportunities for developing their own cultural life. But with five million Jews in the United States, with millions more in Latin America, England, France, and other capitalist countries—none of which was free of anti-Semitism—Israel's government and the Zionist organizations insisted on concentrating on the half million in the people's democracies—the very countries where the Jewish problem was in process of being solved through the *destruction of the social roots of anti-Semitism*.

When two of the East European countries, Rumania and Hungary, imposed restrictions, a flood of scurrilous attacks was unloosed in Israel, the United States and elsewhere against all the people's democracies and the Soviet Union, which were even accused of anti-Semitism. The hoax was concocted that the doors of Eastern Europe had been shut tight against Jews clamoring to leave. Only after the campaign had passed its crest did the Associated Press report in a Tel Aviv dispatch: "Immigration from Rumania to Israel is continuing. Only yesterday 307 immigrants and five tourists arrived in Haifa from Rumania aboard the steamship Transylvania."<sup>8</sup> And official statistics revealed that during the first five months of 1949, at the height of the hullabaloo about the "imprisonment" of East European Jewry, the largest number of immigrants into Israel came from Poland, Bulgaria, and Rumania in that order, with Czechoslovakia in fifth place, directly behind Turkey.<sup>9</sup> This did not deter the Prime Minister of Israel from making a venomous personal attack on Ana Pauker, Foreign Min-



ister of Rumania, who happens to be Jewish. Ben Gurion declared that "to her any Jew is a fascist," and charged this distinguished representative of a government which ended all pogroms, opened Jewish schools, published Yiddish textbooks, rebuilt synagogues with "endeavoring to destroy the Jewish community in her own country."<sup>10</sup> Such animus cannot be considered merely personal; it is a distillation of policy.

There are Zionists who want to make of the Jewish communities throughout the world mere appendages of Israel rather than participants in the life of their own countries. Thus, a leading American Zionist educator, Carl Alpert, wrote after the U.N. partition decision: "Whatever convictions I may previously have had about the continued existence of world Jewish communities are beginning to disappear. I believe that the creation of the Jewish state now at last spells the ultimate doom of Jewish communities elsewhere. Indeed, the galut, the Diaspora, as we have known it heretofore, no longer exists. The existence of a Jewish state means that there is no galut any longer—no galut as a Jewish group status. Now there are only Jews outside of Judea, and it will become increasingly difficult for us to continue to exist as Jews in the true sense."<sup>11</sup>

This defeatist view serves neither the Jewish communities nor Israel. It only brings grist to the mill of those who would brand the Jewish people as aliens and would gladly help fulfill Alpert's predictions about their doom. And Israel's own interests certainly do not lie in the weakening of other Jewish communities.

The relation of the Jewish people to Israel is quite different from that postulated by Zionism. It is not the relation of "exiles" to their homeland. The very concept "exile" or Diaspora is a kind of inverted anti-Semitism. It is an acceptance of the anti-Semitic premise that the Jews are an alien element, that they do not belong in the countries in which they live, work, marry, and bring up children. But American Jews, for example, do not regard themselves as being "in exile." They have just as much right to consider the United States their country as the non-Jewish Americans. And they have just as much right to retain, if they wish, certain specifically Jewish interests, values, and relationships as do other groups, without in the least diminishing their American character.

Nor is the relationship one between branches and the trunk of the tree. It is rather the relation of one part of the Jewish people to another. The help which American Jews give to Israel is an expression of that relationship—and such assistance has not been confined to Israel. It is natural that the majority of American Jews should have rejoiced when the Jews of Palestine, so many of whom had suffered the bestialities of Nazism, threw off British oppression and gave the world glowing examples of courage and skill in their liberation war. It is natural that a majority of American Jews should continue to have a special interest in Israel's future.

But this is a relation between Jews belonging to one nation with Jews belonging to another. And let us not forget that the Jews of all capitalist countries have their class divisions as do the non-Jews. Not every Jew looks upon Israel with the same eyes. The American Zionist leaders are themselves refuting the Zionist dogma by their policies, which demonstrate that their primary ties are not with Israel and its interests, but with the American capitalist class and its interests.

It is probable that over the course of years the bond between Israel and the Jews of other countries will grow weaker because the circumstances of national life for the people of Israel will differ more and more from those of the Jews living elsewhere. It is also probable that the ties between the Jews of Israel and the Arabs throughout the Middle East will grow stronger because Israel's problems and destiny will be increasingly intertwined with theirs.

As for the Jewish problem, its solution is no mystery. For some 2,500,000 Jews in the classic land of pogroms, Russia, it no longer exists—and not even the hoax about Soviet anti-Semitism can recreate it. Vestiges of anti-Semitism were revived by the Nazis in some parts of Russia, but these do not constitute a revival of the Jewish problem, and such remnants are being rooted out. The country in which, under the tsars, national hatred was rife, has given the world an unparalleled example of more than 150 nationalities living in brotherhood. From a conservative source, *The American Jewish Year Book* for 1946-47, compiled and edited by the American Jewish Committee, has come eloquent testimony to the

brilliant success of the Soviet solution of the Jewish problem.\* An article in that issue of the yearbook by Henry Frankel, a member of the American Jewish Committee's Foreign Affairs Department, states: "Before the war broke out there was reason to believe that anti-Semitism had already been eliminated from Soviet life."<sup>12</sup> Mr. Frankel further reports:

"Jews hold fourth place among the more than 150 nationalities of the Soviet Union in the number of Red Army heroes and war workers whose services won special recognition from the Soviet government."

Twenty per cent of the Stalin Prize awards in the arts and sciences were in 1943 and 1944 granted to Jews.

"Jewish literary activity too is reviving in the Soviet Union. . . . It is planned to republish classic Yiddish literary works, an anthology of the Bible, an anthology of Talmudic literature, an anthology of Midrash, and an anthology of Hebrew-Sephardic poetry. . . . According to a survey by the all-Union Book Chamber, 3,263,000 copies of Sholom Aleichem's works were published in the U.S.S.R. between 1935 and 1945. About half of these were in Yiddish, while the others were in Russian, Ukrainian, Byelorussian, Azerbaijanian, Armenian, Jewish-Tadjik, Polish, Bulgarian, Moldavian, and German."<sup>18</sup>

And for those Soviet Jews who wish to constitute themselves as a separate nation, with a territory of their own and eventually their own state, the Soviet government has set aside the Jewish Autonomous Region in Birobidjan. Zionists often point to Birobidjan as a "failure" because its Jewish population has grown slowly. But, according to *The American Jewish Year Book* article, "The absence of political or economic discrimination elsewhere in the Soviet Union has given the majority of Soviet Jews little inducement to pull up stakes and go to the Jewish Autonomous Region."<sup>14</sup> The "failure" of Birobidjan—which, incidentally, has developed considerably since the war—is the best tribute to the success of the Soviet solution of the Jewish problem!

\*Despite the testimony of its own yearbook, the American Jewish Committee was in 1949 responsible for planting in the American press fabrications and slanders concerning "Soviet anti-Semitism." This hoax was exposed by the New York *Daily Compass* in a series of articles by Tom O'Connor.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the outcry at the refusal of Rumania and Hungary to permit themselves to be made *Judenrein* expressed something else than the interests of the Jews of those countries. The bourgeois nationalists wanted to "rescue" these Jews from the real solution of the Jewish problem which socialism alone makes possible.

#### ISRAEL AND ZIONISM

This book has attempted to show that Israel and Zionism are not the same even though they have been closely linked. It was not the forces on which Zionism leaned that created Israel. Those forces—at various periods German, Turkish, tsarist Russian, British, and American imperialism—were directly and indirectly responsible for the murder of six million Jews. And the last two did everything in their power to prevent the birth of the Jewish state and to destroy it after birth. It was the forces that Zionism opposed—the anti-imperialist working class and its allies in the Yishuv and throughout the world—that generated the fight for independence, created the state, and pressed forward to victory in the liberation war.

What is the future relation between Zionism and Israel? This is a question that has been widely discussed in American and world Zionist circles. But the discussion, while reaffirming old bonds, has failed to touch on that which is new: that *the establishment of the Jewish state has laid bare the essential conflict between Zionism and Israel*. It is a growing conflict between an independent nation and state, with interests of their own, and a movement which reflects the interests of the capitalists, Jewish and non-Jewish, of other nations and states—especially of America.

This conflict seethes within the Zionist movement itself, but it is expressed even more sharply outside the narrow confines of Zionist politics. While influential American and English Zionist leaders discreetly favored accepting the Bernadotte plan, public opinion in Israel strongly opposed it. Or consider the anti-Soviet attitude of the Zionist leaders as contrasted with the warm feeling of the Israeli people toward the U.S.S.R.

Perhaps the point can be best illustrated by recounting a little episode concerning Dr. Chaim Weizmann which the writer witnessed. Early in October, 1948, Dr. Weizmann returned to Israel.

During his prolonged absence the Mandate had been dissolved, the Jewish state proclaimed, and Israel had been forced to fight a bitter and bloody war for survival—a war which was still not ended. Hatred of Britain was intense and almost everyone considered her the main enemy. Nevertheless, at a press conference Dr. Weizmann expressed a desire for a resumption of the old relations between the Yishuv and Britain. He confessed that though he had been elected president of the provisional State Council in May, he had retained his British citizenship until shortly before stepping into the plane that took him to Israel. In renouncing that citizenship, he told the press, he had sent a letter to the Home Secretary expressing his deep gratitude that he had had the honor of being a British subject for forty years. Dr. Weizmann's remarks were completely out of tune with the mood of the people of Israel—and he was just as completely unaware of being out of tune.

After the conference a correspondent of a leading American newspaper, himself a Zionist, said to me—and his words carried deeper meaning than he knew: "Dr Weizmann is a distinguished leader of world Zionism. He is not an Israeli."

#### WHAT LIES AHEAD

Those who serenade Washington rather than London are no less out of tune with the interests of Israel's people. Dr. Moshe Sneh, former head of the Hagana and now one of the leaders of Mapam, once said to the writer: "British and American imperialism are like the two edges of a scissors. Sometimes they work together, sometimes apart. But their point is directed at us." The American edge of the scissors has since grown sharper and longer. Today Washington has replaced London as the number one enemy of the people of Israel. The America of the oil trusts, the steel kings, the Wall Street bankers, the goldbraided generals, the atomic diplomatists, having failed to strangle Israel at birth, now seeks to make of her the Middle East Philippines—substituting new shackles for old.

What are Washington's aims? They are to convert Israel more completely into an instrument of United States policy for a fourfold purpose: (1) to organize the Middle East as a joint Anglo-American war base against Russia; (2) to intensify the exploitation of the Middle East by the American oil trusts and other big business

interests; (3) to strengthen American as against British influence in that area; (4) to counter possible anti-imperialist developments in the Arab world. For all four purposes it is necessary to increase Israel's economic dependence on the United States and estrange her completely from the Soviet Union, the people's democracies, and the Arab progressive forces.

Not all the details of this strategy have yet been worked out, but its large design is already operative. Earlier feelers about the inclusion of Israel in a Mediterranean pact had struck a responsive chord in Prime Minister Ben Gurion, though protests from the Left forced the government to disclaim any intention of joining such a pact.<sup>15</sup> There have also been discussions about bringing Israel into the Marshall Plan. Though Foreign Minister Sharett has declared, "The Marshall Plan in its present form is not acceptable to us,"<sup>16</sup> form rather than content is evidently the governing consideration. The real attitude of those who determine Israeli policy was indicated by a writer in the *New York Times Magazine*: "Though left-wing extremists oppose this, Mapai leaders and labor spokesmen such as Pinhas Lubianiker, secretary general of Histadrut and member of parliament, have called Marshall Plan help the 'only solution.' Unofficially the Prime Minister is also thought to hold this view."<sup>17</sup>

However, in regard to the Marshall Plan, as on the strategic question, American policy is moving cautiously, both because of public sentiment in Israel and because the relations between Israel and the Arab states are still unsettled. And after all, the conditions of the \$100 million loan and the general pattern of American-Israeli relations are serving the purpose of domination quite well. President Truman has also indicated that Israel and the Middle East would become guinea pigs in his "bold new program" of increased government backing for big business operations "in underdeveloped areas of the earth."<sup>18</sup> He made a virtual commitment to this effect in a message sent to the 1949 convention of Hadassah.<sup>19</sup>

The influence of the American Zionist leaders, of the non-Zionists in control of the United Jewish Appeal, and of the Jewish Right-wing trade union chiefs has been thrown behind efforts to entangle Israel more deeply in the American imperialist web. Daniel Frisch, president of the Zionist Organization of America,

after a four-week trip to Israel, dispensed with subtleties and emphasized, according to the *New York Times*, "the need for the Israeli government to adopt a 'pro-Western orientation.' Such a policy, he maintained, would encourage a more rapid influx of private capital and also lead to Marshall Plan aid for Israel."<sup>20</sup>

Behind the copious sympathy for Israel on the part of American Jewish capitalist groups and their labor lieutenants lies an aim that was revealed with brutal, if unaccustomed, frankness by Herman L. Weisman, a Zionist Organization vice-president, who was a director of the defunct Israel Corporation. Weisman told the 1949 Zionist convention that Zionism must be a factor in the building of the Jewish state so that it would "fulfill its historic mission of being a standard-bearer of Western civilization in the Middle East."<sup>21</sup> To which the non-Zionist standard-bearers of the civilization of Anglo-American imperialism are in effect saying a fervent Amen.

Is it for this that the people of Israel have made such bitter sacrifices? The American people in their own interest cannot afford to have this repulsive role inflicted on their Israeli brothers and sisters. For American workers and other progressives this issue is an inseparable part of the struggle against the entire reactionary foreign policy of our government, which betrays America as well as the nations it seeks to victimize. It is part of the fight to save the Bill of Rights from destruction at the hands of those who imprison American Communists for "dangerous thoughts" in order the better to imprison and shackle the nations of the world who dare to dream of freedom. We are not helpless if we act to use the strength that is ours. Americans who cherish liberty and peace can by their vigorous efforts influence our government's policy toward Israel and toward other countries, as they have in the past. We should demand the cancellation of all the oppressive conditions attached to the American loan, the ending of all intervention in Israel's internal affairs and of all war activities in the Middle East. We should insist on co-operation with the Soviet Union to bring genuine peace to Israel and its neighbors and to help them solve their problems. But while much can be done immediately, let us have no illusions that a fundamental change in Washington's policy can be effected without a massive anti-imperialist, anti-war political

movement—a party capable of electing a people's government.

Those of us who are Jews have a double duty: to our country, America, and to the Jewish people of whom we are part. The prophets of the dollar Baal who claim leadership of American Jewry are trying to seduce this community of 5,000,000 into bowing down to those who lust after world empire and war. These false leaders are seeking to isolate the Jewish masses from their progressive allies and to make them dependent on favors from Republican and Democratic reactionaries. But what honest Jew, who is sincerely concerned about his people's welfare, can fail to be disturbed about certain of the consequences of the bi-partisan cold war? The resurrection of Nazism in Western Germany, the revival of Ku Kluxism and other anti-Semitic movements in the United States, and the carrot-and-club policy toward Israel following the efforts to strangle it in the womb—are they not all part of the same pattern? There is urgent need for all of us, rank and file Zionists and non-Zionists, to affirm our real interests, our aspirations and our fighting faith. There is need to join efforts in building a broad movement of American Jews that can become a major factor in combating the dangers that threaten Israel, the Jewish people everywhere, and the American people.

The great Jewish sage Hillel, who lived shortly before the Christian era, once said words that sank into the hearts of the ordinary folk: "If I will not be for myself—who will be? And if I am only for myself—what am I? And if not now—when?"<sup>22</sup>

This applies to nations no less than to individuals. In the world crisis of which Israel is a part, if we are to wrest the future out of the dead hand of the past, we must take sides—with ourselves and with mankind. If not now—when?