

**PAUL
NOVICK**

ZIONISM TODAY

**The Zionist Movement
Labor Zionism
Palestine Realities**

Questions
— and —
Answers

TEN CENTS

Published by
THE JEWISH BURO OF THE
CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U. S. A.
New York, 1936



ZIONISM TODAY

An analysis of the proceedings of the nineteenth Zionist World Congress held in Lucerne, Switzerland, August 20-27, 1935, and a review of present conditions in Palestine.

By PAUL NOVICK

1.

THE head of the political department of the Zionist Executive Committee in Jerusalem and the actual leader of the Zionist World organization, David Ben-Gurion, stated in his report for the executive committee at the 19th Zionist Congress in Luzerne:

"The year 1933 will assume a distinctive place in our history, similar to 1897 and 1917. In this year took place fundamental changes in the position of the Jewish people. Their existence in the Diaspora was definitely endangered." (*Kongresszeitung*, official stenographic organ of the Zionist Congress, No. 3, p. 4.)

Zionism has entered its third epoch. 1897—1917—1933.

Zionism has staked its cards on the endangered existence of the Jews in the "Diaspora," that is the existence of Jews in all lands other than Palestine.

This view is not *entirely* new. Since 1897 Zionism has thrived on persecution in the "Diaspora." Its growth was retarded whenever the Jewish masses fought for improvement in their respective countries. In the "epoch" of 1897 (Herzl Zionism) when Zionism based its major activities on the six million Jews of old Russia, land of revolutionary ferment, the movement made comparatively

little headway. The expected "exodus" to Palestine did not materialize. Zionism was still less successful in the 1917 epoch (Balfour Declaration) when the magnitude of the October revolution gave impetus to a revolutionary upsurge not only throughout Europe but the entire world. The Jews of Russia, Poland and other countries thought little of migrating to Palestine. Even those groups enthusiastic for the Balfour Declaration (an enthusiasm often artificially stimulated) evinced no desire to go. The era between 1917 and 1929 inclusive (with the exception of one year, 1925), saw relatively small emigration to Palestine.

However, since the Great Crash and its prolonged world-wide capitalist depression, its economic extermination and pogroms; particularly since the advent of Hitlerism in Germany, the epoch of "upbuilding" and "prosperity," the third epoch of Zionism began.

One of the delegates of the semi-fascist Judenstaat Party, which is strongly opposed to the Histadruth (Palestine Zionist labor movements, as well as Poale-Zion from various countries), engineer Strueker characterized this epoch as follows: "It was said here," he stated from the platform of the Lucerne Congress, "that history will have something to say about the role of Zionism *under the rule of the present executive committee.*" (That is, different from what delegates of the Judenstaat Party were saying.) "But there it will read: '*Under the rule of Adolf Hitler*' . . ."

Hitler was quite often mentioned at the 19th Zionist Congress, although very seldom attacked. The Judenstaat delegates on two occasions shouted derisively in the direction of the Histadruth delegates: "Heil Hitler." The Histadruth delegates answered in kind, shouting towards the Judenstaat people: "Schuschnig agents" (meaning, agents of Italo-Austrian fascism). This is the manner in which both wings voiced their sentiments in the epoch of 1933.

The "left" delegate, Sereni, from the benches of the Histadruth, piously declared:

"We have nothing to be ashamed of the fact that we used the persecution of the Jews in Germany for the upbuilding of Palestine. That is how our sages and leaders of old have taught us . . . to make use of the catastrophes of the Jewish population in the Diaspora for upbuilding." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 9.)

We heard similar views from the "National Poet," H. N. Bialik, a long time before. "Hitlerism, in the last analysis, is a blessing for our people," he stated in an interview printed in the New York Jewish *Morning Journal* of December 3, 1933. The Histadruth delegate, Sereni, (from the "extreme left" Hashomer Hatzoyir) expressed it with more subtlety: "the sages of old told us to build on catastrophes . . ."

The catastrophes brought some results. Still, there wasn't—and there couldn't be—any real joy, the joy of victors and builders.

Before the congress convened one of the members of the Zionist World Executive, Isaac Greenbaum, in an article in the Warsaw Zionist daily *Haint*, entitled "*Tragic Conflicts*," had something ominous to say about the sick economy of the Zionist *Yishub* (settlement) of Palestine.

"The owners of orange groves," Greenbaum states, "find themselves in a quandry. In England prices of oranges have fallen because the market is choked with the fruit. The coming season will be still worse. There will be more fruit. And because of the terrific *Hamsonim* (heat waves from the desert) which occurred last spring, there will be too many oranges of the kind that cannot be sold in England. The downgrade of the price index of this year has already made itself felt in the orange trade. New groves are not developed. As a result, fewer workers are required, fewer pipes and other articles used. There is an upset in the economic life of the country

which may lead to a crisis—though the situation can be localized. However, either way the orange industry may develop the economic life of the land is fraught with hazards that can be avoided only by selling to Germany." (*Haint* No. 178.)

But here Greenbaum sees more *tragic conflicts*. Palestine is made dependable on Nazi trade.

"*Between the interests of Erez Israel and the Diaspora,*" Greenbaum continues, "*an abyss begins to yawn.* The development of Erez Israel imposes sacrifices on the Jews in the Diaspora, the retreat from certain sections of the communities in the Diaspora, *actually the relinquishment of their struggle for rights.* This must lead to capitulation. It may result in demoralization and bring judgment to an unprecedented degree." (My emphasis.)

Judgment upon whom? Undoubtedly, Greenbaum is fearful of what will happen to Zionism when the Jewish masses in the countries where they live realize that *the interests of Zionism run counter to theirs.* Mr. Greenbaum's article emphasized conflicting interests which become ever sharper in the "third epoch" of Zionism when a number of its leaders openly depend on Jewish persecutions for its growth.

Mr. Greenbaum (who, be it remembered, is a member of the World Zionist Executive Committee) has expressed the attitude of the Palestine Yishub which is fearful of the policies of the Zionist leadership, fearful of entanglements with Nazism, as it is fearful of the entanglements with British Imperialism. "An abyss begins to yawn."

2.

There was *Batlanuth* (quack synagogue "philosophy") in the opening speech of the president (now the honorary president) of the Zionist organization, Nahum Sokolov. *Batlanuth* with a purpose.

Here assembled the congress of an organization pretending to represent the Jewish nation, no less. But the keynote speech of its president fails even remotely to echo the cry of the Jewish masses against their medieval persecutors—Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Streicher! The Executive Committee could have (if it willed) inserted into Sokolov's speech a protest and condemnation against Nazism. It chose, however, to hide behind the *Batlanuth* of a Sokolov. His tedious excursion into history, his philosophizing about the situation of the Jews throughout "all times" merely served to take the place of a definite statement on the tragic position of the Jews in capitalist countries, particularly in Germany. His talk of "eternal sufferings" only served as a "philosophical" cloak in place of the stark realism necessary to face the problem of the German Jews.

Those who remembered Sokolov's speeches at previous congresses, his attacks on the Soviet Union, no doubt found it difficult to restrain a smile as they listened to his statements—the Zionist organization "does not intend to take any position in international political affairs, or to criticize the internal affairs of a given country." . . . "It is generally difficult to orientate oneself in this respect because European politics is changing its alignments with such dizzying tempo." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 2, p. 2.)

At the 18th Zionist Congress in Prague, Sokolov was storming against the "destruction of the Hebrew language" in the Soviet Union, and against the "attacks on the Jewish religion." *That time* Sokolov displayed an abundance of courage. "We cannot permit," he shouted, "the Russian Jewry, the courageous and deserving Russian Jewry, to be struck from the book of the living, nationally and culturally, without any moral consequences." (*Kongresszeitung* of Prague No. 4, p. 1.) Obviously, the Hebrew language and Jewish religion (that is, if matters were

exactly as portrayed by Sokolov) are more important to the Zionist leaders than the Jewish masses themselves who are now being exterminated in Germany and other capitalist countries.

Note the difference in approach. In Prague, the subject was an enemy government—the Soviet government. Hence unequivocal denunciation. In Lucerne, when Germany was under discussion, Sokolov evinced amazing mildness.

In his opening speech he said:

“We can do nothing against the pitiless higher force, but we preserve our consciousness of the injustice that is being committed against us.”

That was all the “criticism” uttered by a professed leader of the “Jewish People” against a medieval bloody inquisition, the sadistic Nazi regime which exterminates and heaps daily humiliations upon German Jews.

Sokolov made the innocuous statement in the name of the Executive Committee—a statement no doubt carefully weighed.

However, despite this inane comment, the tragic conflicts Mr. Greenbaum mentioned prior to convening, cropped out in all their strength after deliberations began. They were felt again, when the transfer agreement with Germany came up. During these deliberations and discussions the inevitable inner contradictions of Zionism came into play. The Lucerne Congress represented a picture of internal crisis and decay exactly as did the former congresses. The fact that the revisionists seceded before the congress took place and convened by themselves under the wings of Austrian fascism in Vienna, merely obscured some of the *external* evidence of that decay. We did not witness the disgraceful scandals and free-for-all fights that took place two years before, in Prague. The Lucerne Congress had nothing on the agenda similar to the murder of

• Dr. Ch. Arlosoroff which deadlocked the Prague Congress (a murder which was not even mentioned in Lucerne although the earlier congress appointed an investigating committee). However, though irritating questions were quashed, the inner conflicts of Zionism could not be concealed, as is patent by the charges the two wings hurled at each other.

One of the leaders of Zionism, the "socialist" Berl Loker, head of the organization department of the Zionist Executive, openly stated: "We are witnessing a crisis in the Zionist movement." He spoke lightly of "November Zionism, Declaration Zionism, Prosperity Zionism." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 7, p. 9.) The "general" Zionist, Dr. I. Schwartzbord, (the congress had several "general" factions) declared in his speech: "The Zionist movement is experiencing a severe crisis. The larger number of schkolim (membership certificates) is a suggestive force, the cosmetic factor in the movement." This cosmetic element, according to Dr. Schwartzbord, cannot hide the "highest degree of partisan friction and partisan hatred" within the Zionist movement so full of "unrest and anarchy." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 7.)

All the talk of prosperity and unity, or the declamation of the representative of a faction named "World Unity," Rabbi Goldblum, that there is "One Torah, One Land, One Zionist Organization," could not conceal the inner struggles of Zionism, nor the exaggerations in the figures of the sale of "Schkolim."

The delegates at the Lucerne congress were split into the following number of factions: Misrahi (60 delegates), Paole-Zion Histadruth (199), Judenstaat Party (8), General Zionists (31), World Union of General Zionists (47), United General Zionists (45). There were also 65 delegates scattered among a number of other factions, while each faction had divisions within its own ranks. A strong

left-wing in the Histadruth agitated against the Nazi transfer agreement and against the deal with the religious Zionists of the Misrahi. (Altogether there were 455 delegates.)

As to the "cosmetics"—the figures of the sale of schkolim—the situation was as follows:

The official sales figures listed according to countries, shows that in 1934, 239,197 schkolim were sold (36,388 in the United States). That was a "regular" year without congress elections. One may assume that these quotations are closer to the truth of the actual strength of World Zionism, although the shekel entails few if any responsibilities, the 239,000 buyers of schkolim representing heterogenous groups.

In 1935 the Zionists sold 975,929 schkolim. The figures tell the story of the heated election campaign conducted by the various factions and parties and the extent to which peddling with schkolim was conducted. But it seems these "cosmetics" of the artificially enhanced schkolim sale during the congress year of 1935 failed to sufficiently satisfy Zionist propagandists. So they added the sums for both years, producing an impressive total and boasting about a million and a quarter schkolim. Thus they seek to create the impression of a million and a quarter sales of schkolim annually to regular supporters.

This is in line with the intensified propaganda outlined by the Zionist leadership at a conference of the Keren Hayesod (Foundation Fund) prior to the opening of the Lucerne congress. There it decided to enlarge and strengthen the propaganda apparatus although a large proportion of the propaganda funds had already been expended on the machine. In this connection it is important to note that in the United States, 34,000 Pounds (about \$170,000) were collected for the Keren Hayesod during 1934. Of this amount, according to the *Kongresszeitung*

No. 2, p. 6, 16,000 Pounds were listed as expenses! Only 18,000 Pounds—out of 34,000—reached the main office in Jerusalem, where in turn a large percentage was again spent on the apparatus.

The schkolim and election “cosmetics” were indeed thickly laid. Lucerne and Vienna (Revisionist Congress) competed with each other for a bigger showing of “votes.” Whereas, at the Congress in Prague the *entire* Zionist movement, *including the Revisionists*, could show only 800,000 schkolim for the *two* years previous to the congress, the Revisionists themselves, at their congress in Vienna, produced a total of not less than three-quarters of a million votes cast for them in the short period before the congress convened . . . (The Lucerne congress claimed a total of 700,000 votes.)

This juggling of votes and of schkolim, is again characteristic of the 1933 epoch of the Zionist movement.

3.

Wilhelmstrasse and Downing Street were not the only avenues of importance which occupied the attention of the delegates in Lucerne. There was another great street—Nalewki (main Jewish business street of Warsaw).

One of the speakers, delegate I. Fishman of New York, reminded the congress that Dr. Chaim Weizman (now the president of the Zionist organization) was once attacked for stating that Nalewki and other such streets of the business section of Warsaw were being transferred to Palestine. “At that time,” the speaker went on to say, “Weizman was condemned as the enemy of everything these streets represent. Today his words of warning have the endorsement of us all. And I say that we do not want in Erez Israel not only the Nalewki but the Kurfuerstendamm and Broadway as well.” (*Kongresszeitung* No. 7, p. 2.)

This was strong language. One can readily appreciate the sentiments expressed by Mr. Fishman and other delegates concerning Nalewki or Broadway. However, a movement which builds on persecution and catastrophes, could reap nothing better than Nalewki.

Nay, according to a recent statement by Weizman, conditions in Palestine must be much worse than on Nalewki.

About a month prior to the congress Weizman deplored the changes in the economy of Palestine. Years ago, he stated, we commenced with the usual form of agriculture, the production of grain. Then, we decided to go in for vineyards. We secured the best machinery from France. We spent enormous amounts of money (collected in the "Diaspora"). Subsequently, we decided wine was "no good." We began the production of almonds. Almonds!—was the cry of the *Yishub*. But it soon appeared that almonds are "no good," either. We started to plant oranges. Oranges! Orange groves! Prosperity! There is nothing better than orange groves! Until we realized quite recently that oranges also are "no good." And so we went in for *migrashim*, lots, real estate! Orange trees which were secured and developed with such terrific expense are being uprooted, orange groves are parcelled out and sold at speculative prices on the real estate market.

That is what the Zionist economy has accomplished in its third epoch! No wonder Weizman is sounding the alarm. No wonder Zionist writers are openly speaking of "National and Economic Bankruptcy." (Rachel Feigenberg, in the *Chicago Courier* of September 19, 1935; J. L. Wollman in the *Toronto Jewish Journal* of August 25, 1935.)

Which leads us to the central question—*soil, land*.

Zionism is paying dearly for its consistent denial that such a question (pointed out by its opponents) exists.

Zionism never wanted to acknowledge the fact that *there is no free land in Palestine*. By misleading its following, by appealing to chauvinism and patriotism Zionism sought to disregard the obvious. Once in two years, however, in summing up its activities from the congress platform, it is forced to face this question.

Enthusiastic nationalists who are misled by the metaphysics and emotionalism of Zionist propaganda must have been shocked to hear what the head of the Keren Kayemeth (National Fund) M. Ussischkin, had to say. Ussischkin stated:

“The problem of Erez Israel is solely and exclusively a question of land. I emphasize: solely and exclusively. When we will have land we will have everything that comes with it. Of this there can be no doubt. When we are without land nothing can save our reconstruction.” (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 1.)

Ussischkin asserted that in the two years which elapsed between the 18th and the 19th congress, only 36,000 dunan (9,000 acres) of land were secured by the National Fund. The entire land possession of the National Fund, secured during many decades for many millions of dollars amounts to 350,000 metric dunan, about 170,000 acres. (According to Graphic Facts issued by the United Palestine Appeal, New York, the Jewish National Fund collected \$20,000,000 between the years of 1901-1935.)

“My attitude is not an optimistic one,” Ussischkin emphasized. “Today, it is more pessimistic than two years ago.”

Again he pointed to the Jewish population figures of Palestine which in two years has grown about 11-12% in proportion to the general population, while the land fund grew *one and a half percent* (from 5% of the general area to 6½%).

The resolution on land adopted by the congress states that "the landlessness of the Jewish people . . . is the basic source of Jewish tragedy. The return of the Jewish people to Erez Israel is essentially a return to land." *But there is no land.* All speakers emphasized the fact that it is becoming ever more difficult to secure it, and that speculative prices must be paid for every inch of ground.

A correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, M. A. Tanenblatt, (a Zionist) reports that as much as 20 Pounds per dunam of land—or 80 Pounds (\$400) per acre—was paid during the year preceding the congress. (Cleveland Zionist daily *Jewish World*, August 23, 1935.) The same correspondent of that paper stated (July 25) that it was becoming "*difficult or almost impossible*" to extend the rural sections of the *Yishub*. "*Every day the securing of land is getting more difficult and more rare.*" . . . "*It is not for nothing that M. Smilansky (one of the oldest colonists in Palestine, a rich farmer) keeps lamenting: There is no land. Without land, without the possibilities of buying land, a nation cannot grow.*"

The most outstanding Zionist authority on colonization, Dr. Arthur Rupin, in his extensive report before the congress emphasized that *at least a third* of the Jewish population in Palestine *should have* gone into agriculture. But in 1931, when the recent census was taken, only 15% were thus engaged. Now, Dr. Rupin admitted, *the percentage is still lower*, adding: "The buying of land in Palestine is becoming increasingly difficult and when the soil is sold on the market exorbitant prices are asked for it." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 4, p. 3.)

But Dr. Rupin was rather vague. At one of the last sessions of the congress the official rapporteur of the colonization committee, Mr. Schkolnick, stated that *only twelve* (12) percent of the Jewish population in Palestine is engaged in agriculture. Yet, all signs indicate that

even this estimate is too liberal. There is serious doubt whether 10% of the *Yishub* is working on the land. Zionist opponents place the number between 6% and 8%. Anyone who wishes to get a *real* picture of Zionism or Palestine must discount Zionist figures whether they concern schkolim, votes, or agriculture in Palestine.

Let us, however, take some more of Dr. Rupin's figures.

In my book, "*Palestine, the Arabs, the Zionist Movement*" (Yiddish), published in 1932, I reprinted a report submitted by the Zionist organization in 1930 showing that there was a population of 7,556 souls in *all* "national" colonies. (Kvutzot, Moshavat, etc.) Now, according to Dr. Rupin, the population in these colonies is 11,000 . . . Together with the colonies still maintained by the Keren Hayesod—18,000. This is the increase "national" colonization can boast of during a period when the Jewish population of Palestine nearly trebled!

Fifty-five years of Zionist activity. Many scores of millions spent. The result: 11,000 souls, 18,000 souls in all "national" colonies, "including the cantor, the shochet, and the mohel," as Jabotinsky put it at the 16th Zionist Congress in Zurich which I had occasion to attend.

Is it any wonder that even Zionists speak of catastrophe when they touch upon this subject? "Erez Israel Before an Economic Catastrophe," screams the headline of the aforementioned letter from the Palestinian correspondent of the Jewish Zionist press in the United States and Poland, J. L. Wollman.

"The number of Jewish workers in the colonies today is not larger than it was six years ago," stated the leader of the Histadruth, Mereminsky, at the congress of the Keren Hayesod. (*Kongresszeitung* No. 1, p. 6.) His colleague, Shprintzak, supported him: "Despite advances Zion's watchmen are disheartened because *for many years no national colonization has taken place.*" . . . "Tens of

thousands of halutzim are becoming wage-earners." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 5.) And their mutual colleague, Hartzfeld, went still further: "You know that lately the colonies were almost entirely emptied of agricultural workers." . . . "For years we have been asking that the worker in the colony be given a room, a house, a roof under which to place his bed, yet we were unable to obtain this minimum." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 10.) And another Histadruth delegate, Chasan, stated: "The Jewish city has grown but not so the Jewish village." . . . "We must concentrate our efforts today in safeguarding the National Home from the fate of another Diaspora." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 6, p. 1.)

At the Lucerne congress, there were widespread charges that colonization had been arrested and *people were fleeing from the colonies*. The unhealthy "boom" in the cities, the speculation, the chaos of the Nalewki had attracted many who were without a roof over their heads in the colonies. Because of the *lack of land* only an insignificant number of the tens of thousands of the new immigrants could replace those who migrated to the cities. Dr. L. Piner, of the "World Union" faction stated at the congress that a middle-class family requires between one thousand and twelve hundred pounds (\$5,000-\$6,000) to settle, *exclusive of the cost of the land*.

And land is precious. Land is difficult to obtain.

It is true that the British administration, because of its own machinations, is blocking the way towards the utilization of the desert and swamp lands. But it must be remembered that the imperialist administrators *are committed to this policy* because England will not give up its dualist game, its playing of Zionism against the Arabs, tactics Weizman decried so bitterly at the congress. Moreover, even if the British administration *could* favor Zionism in relation to the land question as it is doing in other

matters, the problem would remain unsolved since even desert and swamp lands are not abundant and reclamation takes years of effort and expenditure of huge sums of money. The Hula concession, much ballyhooed by Zionist propaganda, will not be ready for colonization (according to Ussischkin's statement at the congress) before *seven or eight years*. (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 2.)

Immigrants coming to Palestine with the desire to engage in productive work cannot always be condemned for reverting to the old Nalewki businesses. Out of the 25,000 German Jewish immigrants since the two and a half years of Hitler's rule, only 2,000 (according to the *official* report of Mr. L. Jaffe) settled on land. And even this claim must be taken with some reserve, together with the alleged numbers of German refugees alternately placed between 25,000 and 30,000. (See page 37.)

Zionism entered Jewish life with the avowed intention to straighten the "eternal Jewish hunchback" and eliminate the "Menachem Mendel" from the Jewish horizon. The middle-man, the agent and luftmench, they promised, would be productivized. Yet the following result belies all their good intentions.

Officially, 12 percent of the population engage in agriculture, 88% live in the cities, (Tel-Aviv absorbing almost half of the entire *Yishub*). Orange groves are uprooted to make room for real estate speculation. Jewish workers flee the colonies where they are unable to secure adequate shelter. In the cities, according to Dr. Rupin (see also *New Palestine*, September 13, 1935) 50,000 Jews including women and children depend upon industry and handicraft for a livelihood. In addition, 14,000 without families were engaged in the building trades. Add to this total of 64,000 the 42,000 living on agriculture (12% of 350,000) and the grand total of 106,000 is reached. The balance of 244,000 (over two-thirds of the *Yishub*)

consists of professionals, middle-men, officials, luftmenschen, Menachem Mendels, speculators.

4.

At the conference of the Keren Hayesod, delegate Dr. Zamonsky asked: For how many years will the Jews of Palestine be able to export 15,000,000 Pounds (\$75,000,000) annually?

The representative of the opposition (Judenstaat Party) touched upon a question which the leaders of Zionism were careful to omit—the export-import of Palestine.

Since the beginning of the capitalist crisis and the upsurge of Zionist immigration, the export-import of Palestine shaped itself in the following manner:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Export</i>	<i>Import</i>
1929	£1,734,000	£1,167,000
1930	2,078,000	6,985,000
1933	2,592,000	11,122,000
1934	3,218,000	15,133,000

Whereas, in 1929 the export exceeded the import, leaving an active balance of about 600,000 Pounds, the situation afterwards was sharply reversed. Zionist “upbuilding” kept boosting the import figures with dizzying tempo until in 1934 there was a deficit of nearly 12,000,000 Pounds, \$60,000,000!

At the congress, it was predicted that 1935 would witness imports into Palestine close to 100,000,000 dollars, leaving the export proportionately the same. Anybody even superficially acquainted with economics can readily appreciate what this means.

It emphasizes the precarious situation of Palestinian economy.

What did the mounting imports consist of? Were

they raw materials, machinery and tools? An answer to this question is essential because of the contention that a colony in the process of upbuilding "must" have an adverse export-import balance.

The official report of the Palestine Economic Corporation for the calendar year of 1934 (p. 10) states that out of 15,000,000 Pounds spent during that year on imported articles, only 1,076,894 Pounds went for "raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured." Against that, 9,168,281 Pounds were spent for "articles wholly or mainly manufactured." For the importation of food, nearly 3,000,000 Pounds were spent (2,902,093). For "miscellaneous and unclassified" articles over 2,000,000 Pounds. Therefore the deficit of \$60,000,000 during 1934 was due to the country's lack of resources. Palestine was forced to buy much of its *food* as well as other *necessities* from foreign lands. The money derived from private sources and from collections was returned to the "Diaspora" . . .

Delegates to the Zionist Congress lamented the fact that in Palestine *no permanent values are being created*. Expenditures were not earned in the country. The figures quoted substantiate this statement quite clearly.

How long can such "economy" last?

It came to pass that the organ of the most ultra-Zionistic faction of Zionism, the Tel-Aviv daily *Davar*, published by the Histadruth, was forced to state (August, 1935):

"What is the basis for the prosperity of Erez Israel? The secret of this "prosperity" is known to everyone—the influx of capital whose ample sums cover the adverse export-import balance. With these sums of money the Yishub does not build a sound economic foundation for future economic equilibrium. The main items of the imports are food-stuffs. The statistics for the import of machinery and tools look quite dreary. There hangs over the Yishub the constant danger of bankruptcy."

The economic atmosphere had become so strained, that some capitalists, even prior to the crisis, found it uncomfortable.

In general, the Palestinian exploiters have little to complain about. For them prosperity in Palestine *was* a reality. But this prosperity had little or no effect on the workers. We have seen how the leader of the Histadruth, Harzfeld, complained that the worker in the colony could not afford a roof over his head. We have it on the authority of Mr. A. Revusky who, in his book *Jews in Palestine*, states (p. 246) that in the "prosperity" year of 1932 only 18% of the Tel-Aviv workers earned \$2 a day and over, while 47% earned between \$1.50 and \$2, the balance earning between \$1 and \$1.50 (30%) or even less than \$1 daily (5%). The Palestine Economic Corporation reports that speculation which centered mainly in real estate, in "lots" and apartments, compelled the worker who wanted a decent home to pay as much as 50% of his earnings for rent—which supplies the reason why most Jewish workers in Palestine live in barracks or in old slummy houses. The real estate boom was a disaster to the toiling masses while the speculators reaped high profits.

But the era of such "prosperity" was bound to come to an end. Some of the speculators sensed this end in due time. The above mentioned correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Mr. Tannenblat, states in his article:

"British Jews already are leaving for England, taking with them both their investments and their profits. The British Jew does not want to bank indefinitely on speculation. He no longer sees the possibility for safe and sound investments."

Quite possibly the British Jews in question had already foreseen the Ethiopian War. We shall come to this later. But it must look pretty bad for the "economy" of the

Yishub when these Jews see no *possibility* for "safe and sound" investments.

The war in Ethiopia was not the main reason for the crash of the Palestine "prosperity." The sad plight of the orange industry (already mentioned), the unhealthy real estate boom in and near Tel-Aviv, as well as the dumping of German goods, were bound to lead to disaster. Shortly after the Congress in Lucerne wound up its affairs, the cry: "work! bread!" was heard in Tel-Aviv and other places. According to a statement in the *New York Day* of January 10, 1936, unemployment in Tel-Aviv at the end of 1935 had already risen to "approximately three thousand." Since the Jewish population throughout Palestine including women and children who make their living from industry, handicraft and construction number 64,000 (see page 17) one can readily see that a considerable proportion of the proletariat was represented among the unemployed in Tel-Aviv alone. These unemployed are *not receiving any relief* since by handing out money from the unemployment fund the Histadruth would thereby officially recognize that further immigration is now impossible . . .

The economic crisis resulted from an unhealthy boom produced by an unhealthy settlement in a poor and settled country.

5.

The unhealthy economy of the Zionist *Yishub* in Palestine supplies the main reason for the prominent position of the Histadruth in the Zionist movement.

In Germany and Great Britain the Severings and McDonalds were kept in office as long as it was necessary for the bourgeoisie to give the workers a semblance of power and to use the reformist leaders for the purpose of exacting more sacrifices from the workers. This holds

true for the role played by the Severings of the Histadruth. The Jewish workers of Palestine, as we have just seen, are miserably paid and made to sacrifice their lives while the "national bourgeoisie" reaps high profits. The Ben Gurions are doing their part by preventing (as much as possible) strike struggles in the name of "national" "upbuilding."

There is, however, a unique Palestinian factor which strengthens the position of the Histadruth leadership. The bourgeoisie of the Yishub, sunk in speculation, are almost divorced from the land. The Histadruth, with a healthier membership rooted in the soil is a natural focal point for the others. This group composed the strongest faction in the Lucerne Congress. However, it too, in its membership claims of approximately 80,000 shows its relationship to the speculation methods of the Yishub. One is made to infer from their figures that at least 200,000 Palestinian Jews live on productive toil—an erroneous assumption indeed, for in the alleged 80,000 are already counted wives and even a certain number of children.

In 1932 (while I was visiting Palestine) the membership of the Histadruth, according to the *Dawar* of May 19, 1932, amounted to 30,078. Out of these 7,183 were wives of members. A. Revusky states in his book (p. 244) that in July, 1934 the 55,463 Histadruth membership included 12,426 "housewives who are not employed in any outside work," as well as "about 3,000" members of the "Working Youth" which in both cases is "a departure from the usual practice" of trade unions. According to Revusky only 40,000 out of the 55,463 could be counted as bread-winners (around 70%). The proportion now is less than that.

Among these bread-winners the Histadruth counts individual *owners* (farmers and others) some of whom are small capitalists. This strata contributes to the ultra-right reformism of the Histadruth leadership and sharpens its

antagonism to the class struggle. Mr. A. Revusky testifies (p. 199) that these leaders "frequently reject Marxism as an ideology of uncompromising class struggle. They consider the Jewish workers in Palestine the vanguard of the whole nation and assert that they must cooperate with other classes and take upon themselves the responsibility for the destinies of the Jewish people as a whole." The non-productive and sometimes anti-working class elements counted among the Histadruth membership gives the policies of this organization a nationalist, instead of a class character and endows it with power in the general Zionist movement.

At the congress in Lucerne the leaders of the Histadruth were ardently praised for their Zionist patriotism. "Ben Gurion delivered a highly patriotic speech," delegate Dr. Swartzbord declared. Dr. Schmorak also stated that Ben Gurion's "general Zionist speech" had evoked his admiration. The representative of the 36 German delegates—the "famous 36"—who were provided by the Nazi government with foreign passports and with special privileges for foreign exchange (in order to facilitate their arrival in Lucerne), the representative of these delegates, Mr. Blumenfeld, stated: "While Ben Gurion was speaking one felt that this was the real representative of genuine General Zionism."

The praise for Ben Gurion was well-deserved. Ben Gurion as well as the other representatives of the Histadruth expressed the very essence of Zionism.

Because of his evasion of the German issue, Mr. Sokolov's courage was not up to raising the Soviet question. He left it to Ben Gurion, who stated:

"Russian Jewry has been torn off the body of the Jewish nation. The great epoch of the Balfour declaration and of the realization of Zionism has arrived, but for this large and valuable branch of the Jewish

nation it bears no fruit. This is a major and painful loss. Still we hope that Russian Jewry is not forever torn away and that it will return to the nation as a free, organic and creative part." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 3, p. 3.)

The "left" delegate, M. Yarblum, lamented the fact that the "Russian Jewry" was absent and complained that the Soviet government singled out the Jews for persecution—an act in violation of the Soviet constitution . . .

The representatives of an unhealthy Yishub, supported by British imperialism, aided by the Nazi transfer agreement, had the temerity to speak thus about the Jewish masses in the Soviet Union who are rebuilding their life on a healthy, Socialist basis.

The leaders of the Histadruth, like the Severings and McDonalds of old did most of the "unpleasant work." It was they who supported the transfer agreement with Nazi Germany. None other than Ben Gurion and Golde Meyerson, leaders of the Histadruth. True, they encountered opposition from their own colleagues and followers. The Histadruth delegate, Kaplansky, complained that out of the 1,700,000 Pounds worth of German goods imported into Palestine in 1934, "only" 600-700,000 Pounds were "transfer goods," whereas around 1,000,000 Pounds worth of goods were imported from Germany in the "regular" way, for foreign exchange. Kaplansky complained that the imports from Nazi Germany were a blow to Palestine and Zionism, morally and economically. He saw no moral reason for bringing into Palestine Jewish money whose owners remain in Germany. This clearly indicates that the Zionist cry to "Save the German Jews" also meant the saving of *capital* of the Jewish bourgeoisie who still reside in Germany. These Jews sell their German goods in Palestine and deposit their money in the banks of Tel-Aviv, London or other cities.

These Nazi imports, it was pointed out at the congress, are crushing the weak industry of Palestine. In connection with this it would be worth while to quote the Zionist correspondent J. L. Wollman, who in his article "Erez Israel Before an Economic Catastrophe," informed us that the silk factory "Meshi," established by American Jews with a capital of \$400,000 (employing 120 worker; for Palestine, a large number) was closed because it could not compete with Japanese prices. Other factories, mainly establishments manufacturing pipes for the orange groves, were affected by German dumping.

Inside the Histadruth faction, representatives of the rank and file agitated against the policies of the Ben Gurions. The leaders closer to the rank and file rebelled against the transfer agreement, while the revolt against the pact with the Misrahi was proportionately greater. At a meeting of the Histadruth faction 52 delegates voted against the pact while 12 abstained. At the congress, the delegate Yaari, in the name of the ultra "left" section of the Histadruth, Hashomer Hatzoyir, openly declared that his group had refrained from voting on the Misrahi pact. (The group did not vote *against* the pact, as it most probably did at the faction meeting.)

The Jewish workers of Palestine are by far, dissatisfied with the policies of the Ben Gurions. The influence of the anti-fascist Jewish workers of Palestine is strongly felt in the struggle conducted by the Ben Gurions against Jabotinsky and his fascist cohorts. The Ben Gurions are *compelled* to fight. In 1934, when Ben Gurion concluded his pact with Jabotinsky (for "national peace," *against strikes*, etc.) the radicalized elements of the Histadruth started a revolt against him, voting the pact down by 15,000 to 10,000—which number is indicative of the actual and active membership of the Histadruth. However, the struggle between Ben Gurion and Jabotinsky too often

reflects the contradictions inside the camp of the Jewish nationalists, and the contradictions inherent in the various imperialistic interests whom they serve. The Ben Gurions, it must always be remembered, are first of all nationalists, chauvinistic tools of imperialism.

More than one delegate at the Lucerne Congress spoke of "cooperating" with the British government, but it was Ben Gurion here, too, who displayed most courage. Any opinion not to cooperate with the British government "is an act of treachery against the aspirations and redemption of the Jewish people," he said. (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 9.)

We shall deal with the subject of imperialism in the following chapter. Let us have a glimpse of the pact with the Misrahi.

The Histadruth leader, Schprinzak, in his plea to the Misrahi faction that it participate in the presidium and in the work of the congress, stated:

"Didn't you build this house together with us?" . . . "I and my friends admit without any discussion, that the Sabbath must be the day of rest in Palestine and that the Sabbath must be holy—but the demands must not have the character of an ultimatum" . . . "Do what you have to do ! Educate the masses to follow the holy law! Deepen your educational work!" (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 5.)

This plea did not suffice to break the "strike" of the Misrahi delegates who refused to participate in the presidium and in the work of the congress until their ultimatum was granted. And granted it was!

According to the pact concluded between the Histadruth and the Misrahi (it is worth noting that the Misrahi concluded the pact *not* with the congress as a whole, but with the Histadruth as *the real power* of the movement) the observance of Sabbath was made obligatory. The resolution passed by the Congress (previously adopted

by the Histadruth faction with a vote of 119 against 52, with 12 delegates abstaining) states that "the Congress places upon the Zionist organization the duty of carrying out with all lawful means at its command the Sabbath rules, in line with the constitution of the Zionist organization and the decisions of its authoritative institutions."

Which means that all institutions under the jurisdiction of the Zionist organization, or subsidized by the Zionist organization, will be *forced* to observe the Sabbath and all its religious rules. The religious observance of the Sabbath was made a *law* by the Zionist Congress.

The Zionist organization has a controlling power in the colonies, in the "communistic" Kvutzot, in the Kibuzim, in the various kitchens, restaurants, children's schools, Tel-Aviv municipality, etc., etc. The observance of Sabbath was actually introduced by the pact into the public life of the *entire* Yishub.

Even prior to the pact, the Sabbath was more or less religiously observed. In Tel-Aviv and in the Jewish quarters of Jerusalem and Haifa theaters and cinema houses were always closed on the Sabbath. Communication was at a standstill. Even conferences of the Histadruth are not held on the Sabbath—the only day the employed worker *could* attend . . . The municipality of Tel-Aviv used to "borrow" Arab workers from Jaffa to do essential work on the Sabbath. Now, however, the religious observance of Sabbath in public life has become a matter of law, of force!

The Zionist "state" was fused with the church, the latter its master. Leaders of the Histadruth seem to, quite willingly, have accepted the rule of the church. At the conference of the United Palestine Appeal held in Washington, February 1-2, 1936, the president of the American Misrahi, Rabbi Gilman, said that since the pact was concluded the office of Mr. Ben Gurion in Jerusalem became

“a bureau for Shmirath Sabbath” (the observance of the Sabbath).

The great French Revolution separated the church (in most countries) from the state. In “modern” Palestine, in the Yishub under the leadership of “Socialists” who build “communes” the clock was turned back to the eighteenth century . . .

Zionist national socialism in more than one way smacks of by-gone days. Not for nothing are there such close relations between Zionism and the forces now ruling in Germany. The *New York Times*, in a cable from its Berlin correspondent, September 18th, 1935, stated:

“The Zionist paper, (The Berlin “*Juedische Rundschau*”) is given a considerable measure of liberty in expressing its opinions because in a limited form they tally with certain ideas of the Nazis.”

On September 8th, 1935, Hitler’s organ, *Voelkischer Beobachter*, summed up the activities of the Zionist Congress as follows:

“The main defender of the Transfer was the labor party, which comprised about half the Congress. The attacks of the leader of the Staats Party against the labor group had the reverse effect: The transfer agreement which was concluded with Germany in 1933 and has for the last two years greatly increased the German exports to Palestine, so that after the Mandatory power, (Great Britain) Germany now occupies the first place among the countries exporting goods into Palestine—this pact was not only ratified, but even put under the control of the Zionist executive.

“After this decision any decision for the boycott lost all sense.”

The leaders of the Third Reich extend their hands to the leaders of the “Third Epoch.” But the latter will nevertheless continue to speak in the name of the “Jewish

people," although it becomes clearer than ever that the Yishub represents sharp differences with the "Diaspora," that there is an abyss between the interests of Zionism in Palestine and the interests of the Jewish masses throughout the world.

Delegate Bogratschov (of the "World Union" of the general Zionists) declared at the congress that M. Ussischkin, head of the Jewish National Fund, cannot participate in the meetings of the young workers of Palestine "because the red flag reminds him of the hatred against the Jewish people in the Diaspora." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 6, p. 2.) Nevertheless, Ussischkin is very popular with the leaders of the Histadruth, and vice versa. At this congress where the Histadruth played the leading role Ussischkin was elected chairman of the Actions Committee. The man who manifests an undying hatred for the red flag—the flag which symbolizes *genuine* liberation for the Jewish masses and *real* Jewish reconstruction—has the confidence of all factions of Zionism, including the Histadruth!

Hatred toward the red flag is inevitable in a movement which forces religion upon the community, which is part of the anti-Soviet front, which derives support from the Nazis.

6.

The 1933 Zionist orientation by no means signifies that Zionism has severed itself from the navel of British imperialism.

At the present moment when the nations of Africa and Asia are aroused over Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia, Zionism leans more heavily on British imperialism to safeguard its present possessions in Palestine, as well as to extend its influence outside.

The most important leaders of Zionism made speeches at the congress in favor of "cooperating" with England.

The political leader of the Zionist Executive in London, Prof. S. Brodetzky, even spoke of the benefits of Zionism "when Palestine shall finally become a part of the British empire." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 6, p. 11.) He maintained, however, that at present it would have been dangerous to change the "status of Palestine in the framework of the Mandate." Prof. Brodetzky emphasized: "The basis of our activity is and will also be in the future—the attachment towards Great Britain."

Such were the speeches delivered by people who hitched their policies permanently to the chariot of British imperialism. We have already quoted the declaration of Ben-Gurion, that any opinion against cooperation with the British government is tantamount to a "betrayal of the aspirations and of the redemption of the Jewish people."

It is a "betrayal" to harm the status quo of the Mandate over Palestine, as well as a "betrayal" to upset the status quo of British imperialism generally. The Zionist leadership hopes both to maintain the *Yishub* in Palestine and to extend its influence outside the present boundaries of Palestine through its work within the system of British imperialism which oppresses hundreds of millions of people in the colonial countries.

This extension of influence not merely concerns Trans-Jordania. Ben-Gurion, in his speech before the Congress, made some sweeping statements. A million *families*, no less, will be settled by Zionism in the near future. But for this purpose Trans-Jordania will not suffice, and Ben-Gurion is already having an eye on other territories. He stated:

"The borders of Palestine do not extend from Dan to Beersheba, but from at least 250 kilometers farther south. The Red Sea has played a great part in Jewish history. During Solomon's time the first effort to create a Jewish fleet was made, but not with a Jewish personnel. We must not let ourselves be

dominated by present-day conditions, but must hold to the historic line. Our economic structure, husbandry as well as industry, which is principally based on the home market in Erez Israel, must seek a connection with the great hinterland of Palestine, with Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Persia, perhaps even with India. We must be independent of the artificial route of the Suez Canal. We must find our own way toward all the Asiatic countries." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 3, p. 4.)

Familiar language. We have heard such statements, based on "history," on "extension of trade" from the exponents of imperialism in many countries. But there was, in addition, an element of *Menachem-Mendelism* in the sweeping statements of Mr. Ben-Gurion . . . He was performing his operations on the map of the countries of the Near East, extending or removing boundaries, creating his own spheres of influence, as if he were sitting in the colonial office in London . . . The real leader of the Nalewki of the *Yishub* was speaking!

But there is no mistaking his ambitions and the length he is ready to go in the support of British imperialism, to achieve his ambitions.

Mr. Louis Lipsky, honorary chairman of the Zionist organization of the United States, and member of the world Zionist Actions Committee, amplified Mr. Ben-Gurion's statement upon his return from the Lucerne Congress. Said Lipsky:

"Jabotinsky boasts that he wants a bigger Erez Israel. He wants an Erez Israel on both sides of the Jordan. But the labor party (Histadruth) through its wonderful leader, Ben Gurion, made it clear that Trans-Jordania is not sufficient, we must also have the neighboring countries for millions of Jews. But whereas Jabotinsky loves to operate with exclamations the labor party wants to secure it all through actual upbuilding." (*Jewish Morning Journal*, October 3, 1935.)

Mr. Lipsky no doubt had in mind a Zionist edition of dollar diplomacy. But he was speaking quite clearly of securing the "neighboring countries." This is what Mr. Ben-Gurion meant by his statements. No wonder delegate M. Grossman of the Judenstaat Party complained at the congress that two years previous, when the Revisionists claimed that the Jordan must be the center of Palestine instead of its boundary, (that is, the other side of the Jordan shall also belong to Palestine) they were accused of having imperialist aspirations. Now, Grossman stated: Trans-Jordania is not sufficient for Ben-Gurion, he wants the Red Sea and the countries beyond!

In the 1933 "epoch" the leaders of "labor" Zionism appear even more imperialistic than the leaders of Revisionism.

There can be no question that whatever dollar diplomacy, or pound diplomacy, the Ben-Gurions have in mind it would have to be promoted within the framework of British imperialism, assisting British imperialism and leaning on it, especially in the Near Eastern countries.

Until recently we heard Zionist leaders say that the Arabs must be made to move into "unsettled Trans-Jordania." The Revisionist leaders talked of making the Arabs "move" into the other parts of "unsettled Arabistan." Now, it seems, they will be asked to move beyond the Suez Canal and the Red Sea, if not farther . . .

Naturally, no declarations of war against the Arab masses were made at the congress. The era of war declarations has passed. The congress was even careful enough not to mention the old (and permanent) slogans of Zionism, Kibush Haaretz and Kibush Hoavoda (The conquering of the land and the conquering of labor.) With the exception of the Histadruth leader, Ber Katzenelson, who reprimanded the executive for permitting the employment of Arabs in those sections where Yemen Jews

live, most speakers at the congress talked of having "peaceful relations" with the Arabs. But, is talk of "peace" new among supporters of imperialism? There can be no question that Ben-Gurion's statement about settling many millions of people—a million *families*—in the coming years, as well as his statement about extending the Zionist sphere of influence beyond the Suez Canal and the Red Sea, will be accepted by the tens of millions of Arabs in the Near East in the same spirit as other colonial peoples accept the "peaceful" aspirations of imperialists. The Arab peoples must consider Ben-Gurion's statement as a new offensive against them.

The Ben-Gurions are not naive enough to overlook the adverse impression their talks of extending the "sphere of influence" and removing boundaries is bound to create. The Ben-Gurions no doubt anticipated that the Arab press would *reprint* their statements. But it seems that the leaders of Zionism have decided to come out more openly than ever as the instruments and supporters of British imperialist force.

This creates a new danger for the hundreds of thousands of Jews now living in Palestine!

The war situation in Africa created a war scare in Palestine. British battleships are swarming around the Palestine coast. The harbor of Haifa (where the oil pipe line from Iraq terminates) is being strengthened. Great Britain guards the important strategic position of Palestine. Spokesmen for the British government both inside and outside the Zionist movement, speak openly of making Palestine as secure and as important an outpost in the Near East as Singapore is for the British Empire in the Far East. (Lord Melchett, in a letter to the Manchester Guardian, November, 1935, which evoked a sharp reply from Dr. J. L. Magnus; while Augur in the New York Times of January 19, 1936, stated that Palestine is the most

secure place for British airplanes in the Near East, and that according to military experts, Great Britain could mobilize *tomorrow* 50,000 Jewish youth for the cause of the Empire.)

The intensified activities of British imperialism in Palestine have called forth further intrigues on the part of agents of Italian imperialism, its deadly enemy. This is one reason for the sharpened conflict between Revisionism and the official Zionist organization. It is a conflict between two orientations on two conflicting imperialist systems. Jabotinsky openly supports Mussolini. Not by accident was the Revisionist Congress held in a country ruled by Mussolini's puppets—Austria. But these orientations, involving the Jewish masses in the bloody game of British or Italian imperialism, *represents a danger for the Jewish masses in and out of Palestine*. The leaders of both wings of Zionism, particularly such reckless leaders as Jabotinsky and Ben-Gurion, actually play with the lives of the Jewish masses in the extension (a la Nalewki) of boundaries, spheres of influence, etc., etc.

This dangerous and adventurist game is bound to *worsen* the already aggravated relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine, an aggravation created by the policies of Zionist leadership.

The *Arab* servants of British imperialism are just as "clever" as the Zionist servants. Some of the Arab feudal leaders say:

"The Arabs have gained experience from the World War and its results. On one hand they know the value of all agreements and promises which imperialist governments make during war times. On the other hand, the Arabs now have three Arab states: Iraq, Said, and Yemen. This is an experience which makes it possible for us to utilize the situation in the best way . . ." ". . . The stage of the coming war will be Egypt and Palestine. The Arabs will there-

fore be able to contribute towards the victory or the defeat of the coming war." (New York Jewish Day, September 23, 1935.)

The *Arabian* Ben-Gurions and Jabotinskys also practice the imperialist game at the expense of the masses. There are among them, too, conflicting imperialist orientations, one towards British and the other towards Italian imperialism. British imperialism tries hard to gain the ear of these Arab leaders. It tries to plant among the Arab masses agents similar to the late infamous Colonel Lawrence. Once more it resorts to promises. Hence the "dualistic" policy of British imperialism which induced Weizman's bitter complaints at the congress. (*Kongresszeitung* No. 7, p. 13.) Weizman lamented the "weariness" of the British empire. Obviously, he wants British imperialism to be "strong" in dealing with the colonial peoples; much stronger than at present. The "weariness" of the Empire, that is its machinations and its double-crossing policy generally, motivated the British colonial secretary, Malcolm MacDonald, to emphasize (in his telegram of congratulations to the Lucerne Zionist Congress) the "responsibility" of Great Britain towards the Arabs.

By supporting the *Yishub* with British bayonets, by talking about a "Greater Palestine," by leaning still heavier on the same (treacherous) imperialist bayonets, the interests of the Jewish masses can gain *nothing but defeat and misfortune*. Their life interests dictate a *struggle* against imperialism, in *all* its forms, a united struggle of Jewish, Arab and *all* toilers as well as other progressive forces.

7.

Conclusions.

1. The increased immigration into Palestine during 1935 has justified the increased interest of Jewish groups

who look upon immigration as a solution to the Jewish problem, or as a solution at least, to the Jews of Germany. While it should be emphatically denied that emigration is *in any way* a solution of the Jewish problem in the capitalist countries one must have a positive attitude towards those groups who can and will emigrate. They must be aided.

The Communists are not against the emigration of groups of Jews, from Germany or Poland, into Palestine or any other country. The Jewish Communists have declared on many occasions that they are for free immigration into Palestine *on the basis of free labor, without discrimination of race or nationality, without infringing on the interests of the poor peasants.* On this basis and on *no other!* At present *there is no free immigration* into Palestine. Nobody can go to Palestine if he is not a capitalist, or if he is not a trusted Zionist deserving a certificate and able to pass the literacy test in Hebrew . . . At present there is *selective* immigration into Palestine, immigration under the slogans of "Conquering" the soil and labor, an immigration and settlement under the spur of racialism and force. *The Communists are against such "immigration"* because it runs counter to all principles of true Communism and to the solidarity of the toilers of all nations and races. The Communists are against it because it is bound to create an unhealthy *Yishub* and is inimical to the interests of the Jewish masses in the countries of the so-called Diaspora (which means almost *all* Jews). By creating a settlement with the aid of force and discriminations, by creating a new Ghetto, Zionist leadership gives aid and comfort to those who discriminate against Jews in the United States, Poland, Germany, etc.

Needless to say, immigration figures must not be inflated for propaganda purposes. Yet, there is talk about saving "the" German Jews by emigration. There is

talk about Palestine being the only place for this purpose. Let us see, then, the official figures of German immigration into Palestine

1933	5,392
1934	6,941
1935	6,946
	<hr/>
TOTAL	19,279

(The figures for 1933 and 1934 are taken from the report supplied by Great Britain to the League of Nations in September 1935. The figures for 1935 were quoted in a Palcor cable to the *Jewish Morning Journal*, January 22, 1936.)

Most probably, these figures pertain only to Jews holding German citizenship (that is, *former* German citizens, according to present Nazi laws). Added to these were Jewish citizens of other countries (Poland, etc.) coming from Germany. The total for the three years is hardly more than 25,000.

Nobody can deny the importance of providing for these groups, were Palestine able to give them productive work. But it is *irresponsible* to talk about saving all German Jews, and the millions of Polish Jews to boot, by emigration to Palestine, and "only" to Palestine!

As matters stand, various lands *outside* of Palestine took care of over 30,000 Jews from Germany for the same period. The irresponsible talk of Zionist propagandists and the justification thereby of the transfer agreement with the Hitler government, must be branded for what it is worth.

2. The war situation in the Near East has substantiated everything the Communists were saying about Palestine serving as a fortress for British imperialism. The strategic value of Palestine to British imperialism is the

only motive behind the British Mandate. The "National Home" for the Jews which the Balfour Declaration was supposed to have had in view is merely an imperialist cloak. So are the promises British imperialism gave to the Arabs. Whoever attempts to build on such promises throws the life interests of the masses of the people into the vortex of *imperialist* interests.

3. By supporting the status quo of British imperialism and by building with the aid of British imperialists the relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine can only be worsened.

The Communists are vitally interested in the peaceful pursuit and the productivation of the Jewish masses in Palestine. Communists do not consider the Jews of Palestine the "chosen people" but neither do they regard them as step-children. The interests of the Jewish masses in Palestine as everywhere, demand that imperialism, chauvinism and racialism be combatted. These interests dictate *unity and solidarity among Jewish and Arab toilers.*

Communists have nothing but contempt for the maneuvers of the British administration in Palestine in relation to the so-called Legislative Council. Were the Zionists to fight the Council because it is intended as a plaything of the British High Commissioner, they would have been commended for their stand. But Zionist leaders of all factions and shades are against *any* Council or Parliament, against *any* introduction of democratic self-government in Palestine. For this, they deserve the contempt of all real progressives and genuine democrats. The struggle of the Zionist leadership against the introduction of real democracy into Palestine is again bound to harm the interests of the Jewish masses, in and out of Palestine, who are vitally interested in the maintenance of democratic liberties and in the struggle against autocratic rule.

All talk of the Zionist leadership about improving its

relations with the Arab population while simultaneously opposing the free democratic expression of that population is bound to worsen the situation in Palestine.

4. By staking on reaction, on persecution, Zionism has again proven that the interests of revolution run counter to the interests of Zionism.

The destruction of Hitlerism in Germany and of anti-Semitism in Poland, the upswing of revolution in these two countries would deal a death-blow to Zionism. Likewise, the upswing of the anti-imperialist struggle in the colonial countries, uprisings and revolution, would deal a death-blow to the imperialist plans of the Ben-Gurions and Jabotinskys.

In a *revolutionary* Germany, or a *revolutionary* Poland, where the Jews would gain their full rights and economic, political, social and cultural equality—who would *dare* talk about Zionism as a solution? In *liberated* countries of the Near East where all minorities would have equal rights and full possibility for national and social development—who would dare come forward with the plans of a Ben-Gurion?

Because Zionism draws its life-blood from persecution and reaction in the so-called Diaspora, from imperialistic oppression in the colonial countries, it is an enemy of revolution, an enemy of equal rights, and thereby an enemy of the Jewish masses. Mr. Isaac Greenbaum put it accurately (in the article quoted at the beginning of the first chapter) that Zionism stands in full contradiction to the interests of the Jewish masses in their respective countries where they *will continue to reside!*

The interests of the Jewish masses demand a united front with the toilers of all nationalities in a struggle for *immediate demands*, against anti-semitism and discriminations which will strengthen the forces of revolution for the final solution of the Jewish question, as it did in the

Soviet Union. *The forces of the Jewish masses alone are not sufficient* for an effective struggle against anti-semitism.

Zionism is not a solution but an aggravation of the Jewish question. Emigration, even if not accompanied by dangerous slogans and racial discriminations never was and never will be a solution. Emigration from Czarist Russia, when the doors of such countries as the United States, Canada, Argentine, South Africa, etc., were wide open did not solve the question of the Russian Jews. It was the revolution which solved it. Emigration to the small and poor country of Palestine will surely not be the cure.

Zionism is an *aggravation* of the Jewish problem. It aggravates the position of Jews in the lands where they live because of its policies in Palestine and because it is interested in reaction and persecution. It aggravates the position of Jews by stressing that they "have no country," they "don't belong" where they live. It aggravates their position by its philosophy that anti-semitism is "eternal"—something which progress, civilization or even revolution cannot eradicate. It aggravates their position because it diverts their attention from local problems to Zionism and Palestine, because it separates them from the toilers of other nationalities with whom they must unite in a common struggle against reaction and fascism. Zionism is a hindrance to united struggle and the solidarity of the masses, a hindrance to the revolution which alone will solve the Jewish problem.

Questions and Answers

(Based on a series of questions in various public discussions of Zionism.)

“HISTORIC RIGHTS”

QUESTION: *Why should not the Jews have their own country? Why must Communists be opposed to that?*

ANSWER: Communists are not at all opposed to the idea that Jews should be concentrated in one country, similar to other nationalities. But we cannot operate with “ifs.” We must face realities. Because of certain historic developments, Jews have settled in many countries and have sunk their roots in many lands. The four and a half million Jews in the United States will remain there, no matter what one may “wish.” It is therefore idle to affirm that Jews have a “right” to live “like others,” or acknowledge their “right” to Palestine. Any country *without exception* belongs to the people who live and toil there. If we are to take into consideration “historic rights” we would have to re-divide the entire world, perhaps re-shape all boundaries. “Historic rights” cannot be recognized when they interfere with the rights of the working people in a given place, when these rights lead to conflict and war. It is usually the war-mongers who talk so much about “historic rights.”

Jews of the United States, or Poland, Roumania, Germany, Argentina, etc., who are *permanent citizens* of their respective countries must join with the toilers and other progressive elements within their countries in a common effort for immediate improvements and a final solution.

ZIONIST "WORK" IN THE "DIASPORA"

QUESTION: *But the Zionists don't deny the necessity of joining in such struggles! Is this not part of their program?*

ANSWER: One of the main objections of the Communists is that Zionism *diverts the attention* of the masses towards something which is not a solution but an aggravation of their problem. Whether there is a plank in the Zionist program calling for work in the "Diaspora" is immaterial. Since 1905 when the Russian Zionists held their congress in Helsingfors, Finland, and adopted their program for work in the "Diaspora" (because of the tremendous pressure of the Jewish masses who saw in the revolution of that year a way out) these planks failed to materialize. Zionists, as a rule, *don't* engage in such activities. They devote all their time and energies to Zionism and Palestine and they endeavor to enlist the masses for the same purpose. It is no accident that the Jewish labor movement in the United States was almost 100% *anti-Zionist* at a time when the needle trades founded their unions. The few labor leaders recently converted to Zionism were then *anti-Zionist*, anti-nationalist and even assimilationist. Had they then been Zionists they could not have devoted their energies to the up-hill struggle for unionism. Zionism exacts the utmost for the *Zionist* movement. Zionism *over-accentuates* the national issue, inculcates chauvinistic nationalism, thereby separating the Jewish masses from the general mass with whom they must combine for the *real* solution of their *real* problems.

JEWISH CHAUVINISM

QUESTION: *Why do you speak of Jewish chauvinism? Are not the Jews an oppressed nationality? You talk so much about uniting—don't the Zionists represent a peoples' front where all shades of opinion are united?*

ANSWER: Of course, the Jews are an oppressed nationality. But it is incorrect to say that there cannot be any chauvinism among the oppressed. Leninism which alone has shown the way for the solution of the national problem definitely states that the workers of the oppressed nationalities must fight the chauvinism of their own nation. According to Leninism, it would be to no avail were American workers to fight Jewish chauvinism. Such agitation would be misconstrued or it might develop into anti-Semitism. It is up to the Jewish workers themselves to fight Jewish chauvinism.

Also, it is misleading to say that the Zionist movement represents a peoples' front. If it were, it could similarly be said that the German social patriots were, during 1914-1918, part of a "peoples' front." A peoples' front cannot embrace the *entire* nation. The task of a peoples' front is its struggle against fascism, reaction, imperialism which evils must also be fought among Jews. Since Zionism builds on reaction and imperialism, and by means of racialism, it is misleading to call it a peoples' front. While fighting the base slanders of the anti-Semites who assert that Jews are bankers and exploiters, while pointing out that the great majority of the Jews are toilers, one cannot overlook the small number who *are* part and parcel of Wall Street, London City, etc. And these few, alas, supply Zionism and the Jewish Agency with leaders, imposing their policies. Is *that* a peoples' front? Whoever says that is either mistaken or uses the term for demagogic purposes.

It is hard to see how one can deny Jewish chauvinism when Jewish brown shirts (Revisionists) are in existence. Chauvinism is one of the main instruments of Fascism. This brown-shirted Revisionism, *born and developed within the Zionist movement*, was, until recently, also part of the "people's front" . . .

LAND—LABOR ZIONISM—THE KVUTZOT

QUESTION: *Still, I cannot see why you are against immigration into Palestine which is an unsettled country. How can you overlook the activities of the Labor Zionists who are building Socialism in Palestine and have established the Communist Kvutzot?*

ANSWER: Palestine is *not* an unsettled country. This contention, we may say, is one of the basic follies of Zionism. The World Almanac discloses the fact that small agricultural Lithuania with a population of 2,500,000 has an area of 20,000 square miles as against Palestine's 1,300,000 and 10,000 square miles. Palestine, therefore, is *more densely populated than Lithuania*, especially so, when one takes into account its sand dunes, swamps and barren hills. (According to the Zionist authority A. Revusky, out of the 25,000,000 dunams of Palestine's area between six and eight million dunams are under cultivation.) It is true that swamps and sand dunes can be fertilized. But so can *all* countries be fertilized and be made to maintain several times their present populations. This speculation is a thing of the future and a poor basis for immigration *now*, as Palestinian developments have shown. By the time these ideal ends are attained the present population of Palestine will have grown considerably. We must deal with realities. There is no land for immediate cultivation, or for cultivation within the immediate future. (See pp. 13-16 of this pamphlet.)

Attempts to intensify Palestinian agriculture have been made for decades without the hoped-for results. Successively, the production of wine, almonds, tobacco and oranges, followed each other, and though some gains were made they were far from revolutionizing agriculture to the extent that great numbers can be settled on reclaimed land. Despite the years of effort and large expenditures of money,

the number of Jews officially reported living on agriculture is approximately 40,000.

Moreover, intensified *capitalist* agriculture does not at all mean that more people are making a living on the land. Quite the contrary is the case, as witnessed in the United States, as well as in the orange-grove district in *Palestine itself* where, in spite of gains in production the population living on agriculture has been almost stationary.

The Halutzim represent an earnest and admirable element. But it is irresponsible for the leadership of "Labor Zionism" to talk about "Socialism" in a semi-feudal imperialist colony, where an unproductive ghetto is being built. (See page 17.) Socialism cannot be built before the workers assume power. This means the toilers of all nationalities must unite. But the policies and activities of the Histadruth *prevent* such unity and are, therefore, a *serious setback* to the Socialist goal.

The Kvutzot, irrespective of their idealistic and well meaning members, have no relation to Communism. They are *communal* colonies where the inhabitants pool their earnings. There are a number of such colonies in the United States, Canada and other countries. So in Palestine, there are Christian religious communes. But they are not Communistic, they are subject to imperial-capitalist economy, are overpowered or supported by it (or Zionism), as the interests of imperialism and capitalism demand.

The Kvutzot are the window-dressing of Zionism. They barely constitute a factor in the Palestine Yishub. No wonder Zionist propaganda about the Kvutzot fails so often to mention specific facts. There are hardly more than 2,500 people living in all the Kvutzot of Palestine. According to A. Revusky's "Jews In Palestine" (p. 133) there were in 1933, 2,057 adult members in 25 Kvutzot. This at a time when Palestine saw the immigration of *tens of thousands* of Halutzim. There must be serious and basic

reasons for such phenomena! The reasons inhere in the economy of Palestine (lack of land, etc.) There are some thousands of Halutzim in the Kibutzim, temporary settlements in a state of flux, with an overwhelming majority of members gravitating towards the city.

LABOR ZIONISM AGAIN

QUESTION: *Then, do you make no distinction between Labor Zionism and General Zionism? Do you put the 70-80,000 members of the Histadruth on the same scale as all other Zionists? How do you account for this large membership if the productive forces among the Jews of Palestine are, according to you, proportionately small?*

ANSWER: Indeed, there *is* a distinction between the Histadruth and other sections of the Jewish population of Palestine. We hold that the Histadruth membership is very often misled by the Ben-Gurions but we do not forget that we are dealing with workers, class brothers. We do not forget that there is a process of radicalization going on among these workers. They rejected the Ben-Gurion-Jabotinsky agreement (see p. 25). *Almost all Jewish Communists in Palestine are former members of the Histadruth.* There *is* a distinction between the rank and file of the Histadruth and its leadership. We must also differentiate between certain leaders of the Histadruth itself. But as far as the present policy of the leadership headed by Ben-Gurion is concerned, it is as *Zionistic* as that of Dr. Chaim Weizman, president of the Zionist Organization, thought the latter, too, quite often masks his Zionistic policies behind the shield of "Labor" most general Zionists who are anti-labor in their home countries, often members of the exploiting class, have only praise for "Labor" in Palestine, because Labor Zionism means to them—the line of Ben-Gurion, the giving up of the

class struggle, the line of intense nationalism, approval of the Mandate, British imperialism, a "Greater Palestine" with its sphere of influence beyond the Suez Canal and the Red Sea (see page 30). "Labor Zionism" means, therefore, the complete substitution of the class interests and international interests of labor, to Zionism. It is—pure and simple Zionism hiding under the shield of "Labor."

Class interests demand primarily, the solidarity of Jewish and Arab toilers, the building of *united trade unions* of Jewish and Arab workers. This runs counter to the interests of Zionism, breeder of racialism, the conquest of Labor (Kibush Hoavoda), the abandonment of strikes, etc. "Labor Zionism" chose the latter, being the strongest exponent of this chauvinistic line. Being *the* power in the Zionist movement it is responsible for all the follies of the movement.

Whether the Histadruth possesses a membership of 80,000, or of 50,000 cannot change our *positive* attitude towards the rank and file. But it is important to know that here, too, there is an unhealthy padding of figures, as is the case with Zionist figures generally (see page 22). The trade unions of the Histadruth are "exceptional" in that they do not accept non-Jews (Arabs in particular) as members. They are also "exceptional" in that they include among their membership individual *owners, wives* of members, as well as some of the children of members . . .

This will explain the supposed "discrepancy" between the *official* membership figures of the Histadruth and the figures of the productive elements quoted by me (see page 17) which figures are *not mine* but official Zionist figures!

There can be no doubt that the Jewish workers in Palestine, as the Jewish workers everywhere, have built up institutions which are admirable "as such" (The Kvutzot, the Cooperatives, etc.) These institutions show what

the Jewish workers could do in a free Palestine. But institutions in themselves are never a criterion, in any capitalist country. One must see for what purpose they are used. One must not overlook the Palestinian problem as first and foremost a *political problem*, an anti-imperialist problem. If any institution, sound enough by itself is used as an excuse for racist policies, for supporting imperialism and the Mandate, *it loses its integrity* and objectively becomes an instrument of imperialism. In order to *preserve* its integrity such an institution must become an instrument in the struggle for *solidarity* among Jewish and Arab toilers, an instrument in their united struggle against Effendi feudalism, against Arab and Jewish capitalism, and against the main enemy—imperialism.

THE SOLUTION OF THE JEWISH PROBLEM

QUESTION: *This would mean the relinquishment of the struggle for a Jewish majority in Palestine. How then, do you propose to solve the Jewish question? Do you want us to wait for the social revolution? Meanwhile, what should the German or Polish Jews do?*

ANSWER: You have raised a number of questions which have little to do with Zionism and Palestine. But, let us for a moment go back to the Palestinian problem. What does it mean: "Struggle for a Jewish majority" if not a racial struggle? I have heard a certain leader of the Arabs in New York by the name of Dr. Shatara state (in a debate with the vice-president of the Hadassah, Mrs. Epstein) that the Arabs sympathize with the Jews, but if Zionism means the displacement of the Arab majority residing in the country for 1,300 years, the Arabs will fight. Even if you do not agree that we *cannot* guide ourselves by "historic rights" of 2,000 years ago, even if you do not agree that *all* countries belong to the toiling people living

there (and you *must* agree to these postulates if you lay any claim on a progressive approach towards such important questions)—what are you proposing to do about it? Fight the Arabs? That means war. That means becoming a tool of imperialism. All of which will only aggravate the position of the Jews both in and outside of Palestine, because of the treacherous nature and double dealing of imperialism!

The question: "What, then, is the solution of the Jewish problem?" is no argument for Palestine, or for any other country which would "gather the Jews" into a "National Home." Since Jews will continue to reside in their respective countries, the task is to combine their forces with the working population and other progressive elements for a common struggle against reaction, against anti-semitism and discrimination. This does *not* mean Jews have to wait for social revolution.

Social Revolution itself is not a remote possibility. Those who before the war argued that the Russian Jews could not wait for the Social Revolution but must follow the "shorter route" to Palestine were wrong, as history has proven. But Communists *never* bank everything on social revolution. The struggle for *immediate improvements* as a means of strengthening the forces of revolution is one of the basic tenets of Leninism. By fighting reaction in the United States, or Poland, the Jews can expect *immediate results*, something which Zionism cannot give them. By fighting to *smash Hitlerism* the German Jews can quickly solve their problems. It is sheer irresponsibility to present Palestine as the solution for these millions of Jews—Palestine which is already sufficiently populated, has an unstable economy and a certificate quota of 1,900 for a period of six months!

According to a statement of the director of the Immigration Department, H. Barlas, printed in the Warsaw

Zionist *Haint* of February 2, 1936, the quota granted by the British government was 4,500. Out of these 1,250 were deducted for tourists who remained "illegally," 350—for "emergency cases" and 1,000 for an equivalent number of certificates advanced prior to October 1935. As a result, the Zionist organization was left with 1,900 certificates for the six month period of October 1935—March 1936.

To talk of Palestine as a place of refuge for millions can only *harm* the Jews of Germany and Poland.

At a conference of the Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress held in the Commodore Hotel, New York, on February 25, 1936, Dr. Frank Bohn, chairman of the Emergency Committee for Aid to Jews in Germany, said the so-called Samuel-Plan for the "exodus" of 100,000 Jews from Germany is an "enormous folly," a "deplorable mistake." He declared: "*I cannot let this occasion pass without protesting with all my strength against the plan.*" Rabbi Stephen S. Wise followed him with the statement: "*There will be no exodus from Germany. The German Jews have a right to remain.*" Even people who at the beginning regarded the suggestion seriously (100,000 Jews emigrating from Germany in four or five years, half of the number scheduled for Palestine) realized how harmful the plan was to the interests of the Jews not only in Germany but in other countries. *There can be no modern exodus!* We must assist those groups fleeing from Germany or Poland by helping them to settle in countries where they can be productivized and where they will not create another acute problem. The countries where refugees can be settled are the United States, Canada, South America, South Africa. But proper assistance to German-Jewish refugees is unrelated to the ultimate solution of the Jewish problem in Germany. (See also page 37 of this pamphlet.)

According to the statement of the Joint Distribution

Committee (Morning Journal of March 30, 1936) 59,000 Jews left Germany since the advent of Hitler. Of this number not more than 24,000 settled in Palestine, 55% migrating to other countries. Inasmuch as general Jewish immigration into Palestine during January and February 1936 diminished (as a result of the economic crisis) to less than half of the preceding year for the same period, it becomes evident that immigration of German Jews is on the decline. (The figures for all Jewish immigration into Palestine were 2,000 each for January and February 1936 against over 5,000 for each of these months in 1935.)

PEASANTS DISPLACED

QUESTION: *What concrete proof have you to substantiate your claim that fellahin (peasants) are driven off their lands?*

ANSWER: Zionists themselves admit that 90% of the lands bought by them come from the Effendi, the rich land-owner (Arthur Rupin in his report before the Shaw Commission and many others). The same Zionists also state that there were no peasants on these tracts of lands, which is preposterous. No wonder they sometime use the argument that the peasants are given "other" land—which raises the question why the "other" land was not bought instead . . .

Suffice it to say that the Zionist leaders desperately fight the proposed law, or regulation, providing that the peasant, including the tenant-farmer, shall, after sale, be permitted to retain sufficient land to eke out a livelihood. Suffice it to quote from the official report of the Zionist Executive Committee to the 16th Congress in Zurich, in 1929, where it said (p. 15, English edition):

"A most important agricultural enactment, and one which is bound to affect the whole policy of Zionist agri-

cultural colonization, is the law promulgated in 1928 for the *protection of tenants* in the event the land cultivated by them being sold by the landowner. The Zionist Executive submitted certain observations with regard to this law, and these received due attention from the Government.” (My emphasis.)

Mind you! A law protecting the tenants is “bound to affect the whole policy of Zionist agricultural colonization”! Is further proof necessary to condemn the Zionist policy towards the peasants? Doesn't this convict “Labor Zionism” which is the main force in Zionism? And if the Hashomer Hatzoyir condones this policy, as it does, isn't it just as guilty?

HASHOMER HATZOYIR—THE CONQUEST OF LABOR

QUESTION: *The Hashomer Hatzoyir believes in revolution; it is anti-imperialistic—how is it possible, as you claim, that it approves the displacement of the tenant farmers?*

ANSWER: I have no doubt the rank and file of this movement is sincere. It is a radicalized element. However, the members are still permeated with Zionism and nationalism, although they do not admit it. Their action belies their “revolutionary” slogans. It is a *fact* that they shield the Zionist agricultural policy. Neither at the 16th Congress (where I was present) nor at any other occasion, have they protested this policy. They are *assisting* it even while they talk “revolution.” It is a *fact* that despite their anti-imperialistic talk they do not agitate against the Mandate. It is a *fact* that they are against democratic self-government for Palestine. It is a *fact* that they did not vote against the pact with Mizrahi at the Congress in Lucerne (see page 25). The most shocking thing about the

leaders of Hashomer Hatzoyir is their enthusiastic adherence to a "people's front" which includes exploiters and *imperialists* (for instance, the British chain store magnate, Simon Marks, who is the vice-president of the Zionist Federation of Great Britain) while they vehemently object to the *anti-imperialist* people's front among the Arabs! (For more particulars on this subject see my pamphlet: "Palestine—The Communist Position, the Colonial Question," where the "famous" case concerning a leaflet of the Communist Party of Palestine is dealt with.)

There is also the question of Kibush Hoavoda (the Conquest of Labor), the discriminatory policy towards Arab workers which the Hashomer Hatzoyir assists by all sorts of rationalization. In the pamphlet just mentioned I prove, with the aid of Zionist material, (statements of Ben-Gurion in particular) that the Histadruth practices this dangerous and criminal policy. Neither at the 19th Congress nor at any other public gathering of Zionists, or of the Histadruth have protests been heard from the representatives of the Hashomer Hatzoyir.

Some of the first to deny that discriminations exist, follow the statement immediately by the assertion that Arabs work for low wages. But if you ask: "Why don't you organize them?" The answer is: "We did not come to Palestine to organize the Arabs." (Ben-Gurion's words). Then, what *is* the situation? There are racial unions. There is a racial labor policy. Whether the Histadruth here and there comes in contact with Arab labor or occasionally lends it support does not change the general role.

It occurs to neither of the "left" wings of "Labor Zionism" to support the anti-imperialist struggles in Syria and Egypt. "Labor Zionism," including the Hashomer Hatzoyir, is fearful of these conflicts lest the restless Arab population of Palestine, which conducts general strikes and demonstrations in sympathy with the Arabs in Syria

and Egypt, should not again rise against the British Mandate. But, if there are no anti-imperialist *deeds*—what are the anti-imperialist “slogans” worth? To shield the Lord Melchetts and the Simon Marks’ in the Zionist “people’s front”?

USSR, GERMAN TRADE, BIRO BIDJAN

QUESTION: *While it is true that very little can be said in favor of the transfer agreement with the Nazis, it looks as if you are setting a double standard. Why don't you object to the trade agreement between the Soviet government and Germany? Isn't your attitude towards Biro Bidjan part of this double standard? If you object to Palestine as a solution for the Jews, why don't you object to Biro Bidjan?*

ANSWER: The Soviet government is under trade agreements with Italy, Poland, and other fascist and semi-fascist countries. You know it must have diplomatic and trade relations with capitalist countries no matter what their form of government. Formal severance of trade relations with Germany would only rob the Soviet government of its means to play one government against another and of an opportunity to exert its influence in international relations (sanctions, for instance). It would also increase the war danger. Instead of *formally* breaking off trade relations, the Soviet government *actually* reduced its trade with Germany to almost zero. In 1932 the Soviet government bought from Germany 327,700,000 rubles worth of goods; in 1933, 148,061,000; 1934, 28,758,000; 1935, 21,000,000. Palestine, on the contrary, has *enormously increased* its German imports. The transfer agreement actually turned the *Haavara* (Zionist transfer agency) into an agency for Nazi export throughout the Near East. The Zionist organization has a trade agreement with *no*

other country but Germany, a fact which conflicts violently with the interests of the *Jewish people* who are now boycotting German goods.

It is wrong to assume that Biro Bidjan is a "red Palestine." The Icor, or any organization working for Biro Bidjan, does not claim to solve the Jewish problem by emigration to Biro Bidjan. Some groups may go there, from Poland, Germany, or even the United States. But this does not furnish a solution for the Jews who live in a capitalist world and who will have to solve their problems within their respective countries. Biro Bidjan is the highest achievement of the Jews under Soviet power. A Jewish Soviet Republic is being created where the Jews will not only be productized and enabled to develop their own culture, as they are doing in the Ukraine, White Russia, etc., but Biro Bidjan will also give the Soviet Jews *state equality* with other nationalities among the Soviet republics.

COMMUNIST POSITION ON THE JEWISH QUESTION

QUESTION: *Then, you do recognize the advantage of a Jewish State, if it is a Soviet State?*

ANSWER: Undoubtedly. But you cannot create a Jewish State in a settled country, by encroaching on others, by virtue of imperialism, as in Palestine. This can bring nothing but disaster. The creation of a Jewish State in any capitalist country is impossible.

QUESTION: *Would you say that in a Soviet United States where large and sparsely inhabited territories can still be found, a Jewish Soviet Republic may be set up as well?*

ANSWER: Quite possible.

QUESTION: *Why, then, don't you put forward such a slogan? Do you, Communists, have ANY positive answer to the Jewish question aside from the struggle against anti-semitism?*

ANSWER: There are many national slogans which can be put forward only after the workers seize power, as pointed out by Lenin and Stalin (see Stalin's *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*). Under capitalism, such slogan as "National Culture," or "National Territory" can only mean bourgeois culture, nationalism, separatism. They merely divert the attention of the masses from their *class struggle*. They can only be used by the Jewish bourgeoisie against its "own" workers, that is against the people itself!

The struggle against anti-semitic discrimination, is a *positive* struggle. It can bring immediate improvement without waiting for the social revolution (which alone, of course, will bring complete solution). Communists develop Jewish proletarian culture. There are a number of Jewish proletarian cultural organizations in the U. S. A.—singing societies, theatres, etc. Jewish literature is being published. Zionists identify national culture with the Hebrew language—a wrong attitude. Yiddish is the *living* language of approximately 10 million Jews and is by right *the* national language. If the American Jewish youth is to be taught another language besides English, it should be Yiddish. But languages cannot be an end in themselves. You can have Jewish mass culture in English—literature, drama, etc., reflecting the life and the struggle of the Jewish masses.

The contention that a Hebrew "Cultural Center" in a small colonial country will be a living cultural source for millions of Jews throughout the world can hardly be taken seriously. Look at the absence of any real cultural ac-

tivities within the Zionist movement in the United States! Living culture must be based on the life, activities, daily struggles and aspirations of the masses.

HEBREW LANGUAGE

QUESTION: *Is it for this reason that Hebrew is suppressed in the Soviet Union?*

ANSWER: Communists do not object to Hebrew as such. It becomes objectionable when used for nationalistic purposes, when the Yiddish language is reviled and suppressed for the sake of Hebrew, as in Palestine. There is a Hebrew *Literacy Test* for Halutzim desiring to obtain certificates for admission to Palestine. Hebrew is turned into a medium of oppression. Since any manifestation of nationalism, whether Ukrainian or Russian, is being suppressed in the Soviet Union, Hebrew, when it becomes a nationalistic cult, is also suppressed. But there is Hebrew literature in the Soviet libraries, Hebrew is being taught in institutions of higher education, and Communists in Palestine use Hebrew as a means of propaganda.

OPPOSITION TO ZIONISM DEFINED

QUESTION: *How would you voice your objections to Zionism, point by point?*

ANSWER: I would place my objections in the following order: 1. It diverts the attention of the Jews from their real struggles; 2. It thrives on reaction and persecution; 3. It is a tool of imperialism; 4. It is an instrument of reaction and capitalist exploitation; 5. It operates by racial discrimination, separating the Jewish masses from other nationalities; 6. It is a hindrance to social revolution. For these reasons Zionism is harmful to the immediate

interests of the Jews and stands in the way of the final solution of the Jewish problem.

UNITED FRONT WITH ZIONISTS

QUESTION: *Then, there cannot be any united front with Zionists, even with Labor Zionists, can there?*

ANSWER: Yes, there can and *ought* to be—if they agree to fight Fascism and reaction. Communists have sharp and fundamental disagreements with Socialists, Progressives, Liberals, Churchmen. A united front does *not* mean the relinquishment of basic principles. We openly say to these elements that we will continue to advocate the Dictatorship of the Proletariat through Soviet Power as the only way to abolish capitalism and build Socialism. We reserve for ourselves the right to criticize the Zionist program. Naturally, once a United Front, or People's Front is concluded the Communist criticism will have to assume a different character, since the Zionists, by sincerely working inside the People's Front will have proven that they are *ready* to fight Fascism and reaction—by actually fighting.

To Be Published

The Communist Position
on the
Jewish Problem
in the United States

By Clarence A. Hathaway

More About Palestine

PALESTINE

**THE
COLONIAL QUESTION**



**THE
COMMUNIST POSITION**

By
PAUL NOVICK

5_c

FREIHEIT BOOK STORE
50 East 13th St., New York