

il...ation bulletin

1968

10

communist party of israel
central committee·tel aviv

October 1968

P.O.B. 1843

Theses for the Sixteenth Congress of the
Communist Party of Israel:


COMMUNISM - DEMOCRACY - THE JEWISH PEOPLE

by Moshe Sneh

HX
632
A1
W9
No. 1107

MAIN





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries



Dr. Moshe Sneh
Member of the Politbureau,
Secretary of the Communist Party of Israel

- ★ Communism stems from humanism and its goal is humanism.
- ★ Socialism cannot be separated from true democracy.
- ★ Just as the achievements of the revolution do not abolish its distortions, the distortions of the revolution do not abolish its achievements.
- ★ The perversion of theory in practice requires correction of the practice and examination of the theory.
- ★ The task of the working class in every people and every country is not to imitate a foreign socialist model but to create the model of socialism from within.
- ★ Our fervent desire is a guaranteed future for the Jewish people in the socialist future of mankind.
- ★ Don't abandon the flag of communism; remove its stains!

A. COMPLETING THE BALANCE SHEET OF 50 YEARS OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

I

Recently the Great October Socialist Revolution celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. This mighty historical event and the changes caused by it changed the face of the world. The era of the decline of the capitalist system and the rise of the socialist system began. In addition to Russia, the homeland of the Great October Revolution, socialist regimes were established in another 12 European and Asiatic countries as well as in one country on the American continent; Socialism has become a world system; the victory of the Soviet Union in the Second World War was the decisive factor in the defeat of Hitlerism; many colonial and dependent peoples achieved independence, and the colonial system of capitalism collapsed almost completely. The socialist regime already includes more than a quarter of the area and more than a third of the population of the globe; on the other hand, the area and the inhabitants under imperialist domination declined from 59% to 14% and from 65% to 17% respectively. Socialist relations of production proved their superiority over capitalism in the rate

of growth of the means of production: the industrial production of pre-revolutionary Russia constituted 4% of world production but the present share of the U.S.S.R. in world industrial production is 20%; all the socialist countries increased their industrial production 20 fold as compared to 1937, and although their inhabitants constitute 35% of the world population, they are responsible for 40% of the world's industrial production. The socialist regime did wonders in spreading education and developing science and technology. The victories and achievements of socialism intensified the general crisis of capitalism added impetus to the workers' movement in the countries in which capital reigns strengthened and broadened the struggle for national liberation and the battles for peace and democracy throughout the world. In brief, the relation between international forces changed to the advantage of the forces of peace and socialism and to the disadvantage of the forces of war and imperialism.

II

But the complete account of the fiftieth anniversary of the revolution obligates us to consider not only its victories and achievements but also its failures, defeats, and deficiencies. A summary of the negative items in this account is necessary both to correct the distortions and prevent their occurrence in the future as well as to indicate the correct path to the remaining two-thirds of humanity for whom the revolutionary transition to socialism is still in the future.

At the twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (1956) and for a number of years thereafter the horrendous crimes that had been committed for a long time by ruling institutions in the socialist regime, in awful contradiction to all concepts of socialistic democracy and socialist legality, were decried. As a result of this denunciation the first steps were taken to root out these cancerous phenomena. But the process of democratisation was not completed in the Soviet Union; it was stopped mid-way and even retreated. The names of all the victims of the terror and distortion of the law including those of outstanding communist leaders have not been rehabilitated as yet; a number of democratic freedoms, especially in areas of political, ideological and cultural life without which true socialist democracy is impossible, are still missing; bureaucracy still devours democracy and causes democratic centralism to degenerate into bureaucratic centralism; the improper application of the just socialist principle "To each according to his work" still continues and as a result an exaggerated gap in wage scales remains; not all distortions of Leninist national policy still have been corrected; the tendency of big power hegemony in relation to other socialist states and communist parties still leaves its mark; it still happens that short-

range considerations of advantage shove aside long-range considerations of principle in foreign policy; the practice of pragmatically bending theory to justify actions still continues; and there is still a great distance between word and deed.

It isn't correct to regard Stalin's cult of personality as the one and only source of these distortions. It is much more correct to regard the cult of personality as one of the distortions which is itself the result of anti-democratic bureaucratic centralism — a result that later became a cause of additional distortions.

We shouldn't ignore the fact that while correcting the mistakes of the period of Stalin's cult of personality, mistakes of the same kind were made and in spite of the corrections new errors appeared. No doubt Khrushchov's leadership that has to its credit the denunciation of distortions and the shattering of the cult of Stalin was itself tarnished by evidence of a new cult of personality, but the sudden manner of Khrushchov's deposal and his disappearance from the public eye without any public explanation and justification are also counter to elementary concepts of political democracy. The tragic split between the Soviet Union and China occurred in the years of Khrushchov's rule, but the tension in the relations between the socialist countries had increased and the division within the world socialist system and the international communist movement has deepened, broadened and become more intense during the time of the present leadership that replaced Khrushchov. The means of pressure and intervention used against Czechoslovakia that set out on an independent and democratic path to develop a socialist regime prove that the world power aspiration was abolished in name only. This is also proved by the attempts to organize the communist parties according to the criterion of obedience to the guide line of one main party.

The negative phenomena in the development of People's China — the ideological distortions, subversive factionalism within the communist movement and the world anti-imperialist camp, the personality cult of Mao Tse-Tung, negative manifestations that accompanied the "Cultural Revolution", the use of force in the internal struggle — are very serious.

These negative phenomena in the internal affairs and external relations of the socialist countries are exploited by reactionary, imperialistic and anti-communistic forces to attack communism as such and cause disappointment and perplexity among faithful communists and progressives throughout the world. It is self-explanatory that here in Israel the distorted policy of the Soviet leadership in connection with the Middle Eastern crisis, the dragging behind Pan-Arabic chauvinism and launching a campaign of hate against Israel

that became (especially in Poland) a campaign against Jews in general, shocked the public more than anywhere else.

III

The communist movement won't be helped by denying or blurring the negative phenomena in the socialist countries. If, for example, it is claimed that the present degree of freedom in the U.S.S.R. to criticize the political line of the leadership on internal affairs and foreign policy or the degree of freedom to publicly debate problems of the history of the last fifty years, or the degree of freedom to express one's self in literature and art or the degree of freedom to express new opinions about Marxist-Leninist theories — is the characteristic and adequate degree of freedom for socialist democracy, such an argument only blackens the name of the socialist regime, because people rightly have a much more exalted concept of the characteristics of democratic socialism. And there isn't any point in the reasoning that freedom in a socialist regime must be limited in order to prevent capitalist ideology from making inroads, since we are talking about freedom of thought and expression in the framework of socialism on the basis of socialism. The answer that bourgeois democracy is only democracy for the advantage of the minority and disadvantage of the majority, that it is limited, hypocritical and corrupt, that it permits fascism and racialism and that it doesn't have any moral right to complain about the lack of democracy in the socialist regime — this answer, too, for all the truth it contains, does not answer the charge since we are not dealing with the complaint of the opponents of socialism but with criticism by supporters of socialism who repudiate the arrangements of bourgeois society anyhow and desire the full and faithful realization of socialist theory from socialist society, and the fact that it is free of the gloomy manifestations of the capitalist regime is not enough to satisfy their expectations. The defense that enumerates all the democratic achievements of the socialist regime beginning with the abolition of inequality between people in respect to the ownership of the means of production and ending with the participation of masses of workers in the local, regional and national councils (the Soviets) is also irrelevant since the friends of the socialist regime value its tremendous achievements and they only emphasize the lack in the socialist superstructure in order to adapt it to the stage of development of the socialist base and render it capable of advancing the base to a higher stage.

IV

Thus, while not accepting the approach which ignores and shies away from the negative aspects of the account of 50 years of socialist revolution, we reject even more vigorously the false ideas that allege that “the balance of re-

volutionary experience is a negative one” and “this isn’t socialism by any means” or “this socialism has no advantage over capitalism”.

If the bourgeois ideologists, revisionists and rightist social democrats had intellectual integrity and courage they would have to recall the situation of the great (bourgeois) French Revolution fifty years after its inception — the balance of blood, the scaffolds and the wars, the twistings and turnings as well as the distortions, the retreats and defeats, the restoration of the monarchy and the Bonapartist perversion, the whole price that Europe paid for the abolition of feudalism and the entire length of the period that the previous revolutionary transition in history required, in order to see the tremendous advantages and the rapid tempo of the development of the socialist revolution which is without comparison in the entire history of mankind in their proper light.

The theories that seek to blur the conflict between capitalist and socialist society prophecy that the two regimes will draw closer together (“convergence”) and argue that Marx’s theory which is based on the class conflict between capital and labour has — as it were — become outmoded since the highest stage of historical development is “the society of high mass consumption”, the United States, western Europe and Japan have already reached this stage, the Soviet Union is also striving toward it and the other socialist countries will follow in her footsteps in their process of development; the theories that abolish the rule and even the existence of conflicting classes between the two regimes in one breath and maintain that power in these two parts of the world is in the hands of a “new class” of “technocrats”; the theories that promise that “capitalism will become social and socialism will become more democratic” and that thereby the world class conflict and struggle will disappear; the theories that seek a “synthesis” between capitalism and socialism (recently adopted by De Gaulle); none of these theories is rooted in reality and their only purpose is to keep part of the workers away from the ideology and struggle of their class.

In the capitalist world (and the former colonial countries are part of it and their underdevelopment is the heritage that capitalism left them) — according to United Nations’ statistics — no less than $1\frac{1}{2}$ billion people, that is to say, approximately 75% of the entire population, suffer from hunger or undernourishment. In the United States alone according to Vice President Hubert Humphrey — 36 million people live in want, far below the subsistence minimum; it is an “awful shame” — in the words of President Johnson — that today 20 million people in the United States live in slums, mass unemployment has not skipped any developed capitalist country and at the end of 1967 there were 3 million unemployed in the U.S., 1 million in Argentina, 1 million in Italy, 600 thousand in Great Britain, 526 thousand in West Germany and 500 thousand in France. That is the way the “society of prosperity for all” really looks. And the class struggle, too, hasn’t abated. On the contrary, there is an in-

creasing number of strikes every year; the number of workers who went on strike doubled in the last decade and reached a peak of between 55 and 57 million strikers a year. The events of May, 1968 in France when 10 million workers went on a mighty political-economic strike also made a mockery of the false fable that capitalism, so to speak, has achieved stability, overcome the danger of crises, adapted itself to new conditions, and abolished class divisions; this fable was shattered after the crisis in the country that was presented as a model of “capitalist recovery”. Phenomena such as the “hunger march” in the U.S. or the student revolt throughout the capitalist world and especially the solidarity of the students, of the intelligentsia, with the working class at the time of the mass events in France prove the seriousness of the class conflicts in contemporary capitalist society and the formation of a revolutionary alliance between manual labourers and the intelligentsia for democracy and socialism.

The experience of the Social Democrats who came to power in many countries and for considerable periods of time teaches that although reformism can improve capitalism it can not abolish its essence – the exploitation of workers by capital – its contradiction and laws of development. There are also Social Democratic governments that even give up reforms very quickly and pursue a purely bourgeois policy (the Labour Government in Great Britain today). And there are Social Democratic governments (in the Scandinavian countries) that assiduously worked to improve the living conditions of the masses but reached the point where progress is only possible by a qualitative change in the relations of production from capitalism to socialism and were faced with the choice of making that change or getting out and handing over state power to parties that represent the monopoly capitalists; until now no Social Democratic government of this kind has succeeded in passing this point in the direction of socialism (in Norway and Denmark the big bourgeoisies have succeeded in driving them out of power and in Sweden this hour of trial is approaching).

There is no escape from the choice between capitalism and socialism and the outcome has been determined by all historical development. Thus, the revolutionary process of the transition to socialism has not reached its end; it began fifty years ago with the October Revolution and it is an objective necessity that this transition continue and include the remaining two-thirds of humanity.

V

In order to help convert the potential of the subjective necessity of the transition to socialism into actuality, communists must lay bare the defects that adhered to the socialist regime and examine their roots: don't spare the

defects for the sake of socialism – and don't despair of socialism because of the defects.

It is impossible to understand the distortions of the socialist regime without examining the development of revolutionary theory and practice in their mutual relations and influence. The October Revolution proved the validity of the Marxist theory that class struggles direct the history of human society, lead to socialist revolution that will sweep away bourgeois rule and establish the rule of the proletariat. But to some degree the October Revolution is also at variance with the basic assumption of Marx and Engels that the socialist revolution would occur in the countries of advanced capitalism and all at once.

Lenin changed Marxist theory on this question. After analyzing the unequal development of monopoly capitalism, imperialism, he concluded (in 1915–1916) that the revolution would not occur in the developed capitalist countries; the front of world imperialism, he declared, could be broken at its weakest point, in the beginning in a few countries or even in one country. On this issue the October Revolution confirmed Leninism which has been defined as 'Marxism of the period of imperialism and proletarian revolutions'. But the actual development of the revolution also contradicted Lenin's prognosis of additional revolutions in other more developed European countries; the resolutions of the Second Congress of the Communist International (1920) argued that revolutions were to be expected in a number of countries in the near future, and Lenin's address at the opening of the Fourth Congress (1922), the last one he ever made, concluded with a sentence about the excellent chances of world revolution; but the desired world revolutions that did break out were quickly crushed by imperialist intervention and counter-revolutionary activity. The socialist revolution, therefore, was only victorious in one country – a backward country, Russia. Reality itself posed the question whether it is possible to build socialism in only one country such as Russia, and the question was decided in the affirmative. But the practice to realize socialism in one backward country was made counter to the original theory of the socialist revolution.

Just as revolutionary theory is an ideological weapon used to realize revolutionary deeds, so must revolutionary reality be the basis for new generalities in revolutionary theory. And the reality of building socialism in one country under conditions of terrible backwardness at home and hostile capitalist encirclement abroad was not in keeping with Marxist theory in a number of major respects.

According to Marxist theory, Socialism would begin at the point where capitalism had reached the limit of its progress that is to say, on a material basis of a very highly developed economy, and from this base bring the development of the means of production to a still higher stage so that after a certain

transition period (the stage of socialism) it would be possible to base distribution on the principle "to everyone according to his needs" (the stage of Communism). But in contrast to this prognosis, the economic development of Russia was on a very low level and even this backward economy was seriously damaged in the course of the First World War and the Civil War. The accumulation of capital, the investment fund for increasing production and the necessary means of building a socialist economy, developing social and cultural services, strengthening defense etc., etc., were impossible to acquire unless the worker increased production to the maximum and curtailed his private consumption to a bare minimum.

According to Marxist theory, top-grade professional, technical and managerial forces who received their training under the previous regime should have been at the disposal of socialism from its beginnings — but in the actual situation of Russia, it was necessary to train almost the entire body of cadres in the course of action, choosing them from out of an uneducated population, the great majority of whom were illiterate.

According to Marxist theory socialist democracy would develop under conditions of a democratic tradition, democratic habits and democratic customs from the days of the previous regime; but the Czarist regime in Russia didn't leave any such democratic heritage.

According to Marxist theory socialism in every country would be helped by reciprocal relations with the other socialist countries; but the Soviet Union was forced to stand alone in a state of siege for almost 30 years and devote 18 years to wars of defense and repairing the damage caused by war.

According to Marxist theory the socialist state, the dictatorship of the proletariat, would exist as a socialist democracy in the transition period from the lowest stage of socialism to the highest, the communist, and slowly wither away; but the reality of U.S.S.R. lengthened this transitional period and made it more severe.

These were the main conditions that served as a background for the great historical distortion, because instead of taking the difficult but straight road, the way of the creative development of Marxism and its adaptation to the unimaginably severe conditions of Russian reality, while maintaining the democratic and humanistic imperatives as Lenin attempted to do until the end of his life — in the course of years a regime took shape that was the dictatorship of a bureaucratic apparatus characterized by perversions of Marxist-

Leninist theory, the use of terror to suppress all opposition to these perversions, alienation from the imperative of socialist democracy and violation of the essentials of socialist law and juridical procedure. Every bureaucracy involves hierarchy and thus a pyramid was erected whose base was the masses of unfairly treated people with limited democratic rights and whose summit was a sole all-powerful, allknowing ruler, Stalin. The cult of the leader which was completely opposed to Marxist-Leninist thinking and was the product of the bureaucratic distortion of democratic centralism itself became a factor that intensified this distortion many times.

As we have said, this development lies like a heavy weight on Soviet reality that hasn't succeeded in completely freeing itself from it to this day. This development left its mark on the model of the socialist regime in the U.S.S.R. For an entire historic period the Soviet Union was the only socialist country in the world, and even after the establishment of other socialist states the U.S.S.R. stood at the head of the world socialist system and the international communist movement; in these circumstances the uncritical glorification of the Soviet model spread and it was regarded as a universal model. However, from all that has been said it is clear that the Soviet model itself requires fundamental improvement and cannot serve as a universal model for present and future socialist regimes in the other countries of the world.

Just as Leninism was a theoretical adaption of Marxism to the conditions that gave birth to the October Revolution, so did the Soviet reality and the Soviet leadership after the October Revolution urge its interpretation of Marxism-Leninism on the entire communist movement, but now a new creative development of Marxism-Leninism is necessary to guide the revolutionary process both in the second third of the world – the most developed capitalist countries and also in the third third, in the underdeveloped countries of the “third world”.

Marxist theory has always held that socialism can't be separated from true, consistent democracy: “... just as there cannot be victorious socialism that doesn't realize full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for victory over the bourgeoisie without waging an all-sided, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy.”

(Lenin, volume 22, page 133, Fourth Russian Edition)

In practice however, this theory was for the most part violated.

B. TOWARD THE CREATIVE DEVELOPMENT OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST THEORY

VI

There are those who ask if in the light of the distortions described above, basic improvement of the socialist regime in the direction of democratization is possible. The answer is that such an improvement is certainly possible and even necessary.

The dialectics of development are such that the same circumstances that prevented or limited socialist democracy in the past have changed to so that they now exert pressure to widen and deepen it. What were those circumstances?

First of all, the economic situation and economic capacity were in a desperate condition and coercion played a dominant role. But today the Soviet Union has reached a very high level of industrial power and has made considerable progress in agricultural production. Not only is she capable of raising the standard of living of all the workers — which she is doing — but she introduced an economic reform the main features of which are the transfer of emphasis from the quantity of total production to the quality of the product, considerable autonomy for every plant and responsibility for its profitability, strengthening the ties between planning, production and marketing etc. These changes in the economic sector cannot succeed without the cooperation of all the workers in the knowledge and responsibility for the management of the affairs of the plant, branch and entire people's economy, that is to say, without fundamental democracy that begins at the place of work and extends to the most general problems of the socialist state.

Secondly, mass illiteracy served as a background for the limitation of democracy. Today, however, the U.S.S.R. has reached the highest stage in the world in respect to the spread of education among workers in city and village, the number who have had the benefit of higher education and the number of scientists and people engaged in spiritual creation. Millions of the intelligentsia cannot advance and develop their branches of research and creation except by the free challenge of old and accepted truths and free discussion between people with different and opposed ideas. In short, the intelligentsia cannot make its contribution to the building of socialism and communism without full democracy.

Third, the danger of hostile, imperialist encirclement limited socialist democracy. But today the U.S.S.R. is one of the two mightiest powers

in the world not only in the economic sense but in the military sense as well and is a decisive factor in solving international problems in all parts of the world. The influence on world public opinion and the prestige of the Soviet Union depend largely on her image in the eyes of the peoples, and every improvement within the Soviet state adds to her prestige and strengthens her international position.

Thus the circumstances that exerted pressure to limit democracy in the past have been converted into their opposites and today they exert pressure for the greater impetus of democracy. And what has been said of the U.S.S.R. is also true of the other socialist countries who more or less copied the Soviet model.

The distortions past and present are all in the superstructure of socialist society. These distortions come into conflict with the demands of the socialist base, the socialist relations of production. The distortions in the superstructure also hampered the base in the past but now they do so more than ever. A contradiction of this kind cannot go on forever; it demands a solution. We have seen how mighty the socialist regime is — in spite of all the severe and prolonged distortions that hindered its progress it nevertheless made wonderful progress in economics, culture and defense. If it weren't for the distortions in the superstructure the base would provide more wonderful and brilliant achievements. There can be almost no doubt that in the development before us the needs of the base will overcome the distortions of the superstructure and not vice versa. Without the fulfillment of democracy, socialism cannot be realized and before that happens the transition to communism is unthinkable. Our assumption that the socialist regime in the U.S.S.R. and the other countries will overcome their obstacles and complete the socialist relations of production with democracy worthy of the name is based on these objective considerations. This progress will be achieved, of course, while the new struggles with the old. There will be perhaps, temporary fluctuations and retreats but sooner or later the progressive, democratic new will defeat the reactionary bureaucratic old.

VII

There are those who are afraid that the repudiation of the universal character of the Soviet model is a kind of heresy in respect to the core of Marxism-Leninism. This fear itself is the result of the ideological education that was given to two generations of communists that taught that everything done in the Soviet reality is identical with communist theory and obligates it. As we indicated above the Soviet model fundamentally contradicts many assumptions of Marx and Engels. As for Lenin — before the distortions

began be clearly distinguished between the universal attributes of the October Revolution and its local attributes that are only characteristic of the special reality of Russia, he saw all the limitations and defects in the special conditions of Russia for the socialist revolution.

In April 1917, between the February and October Revolutions, Lenin already saw the need to indicate these limitations and defects in the following words:

“The great honour of beginning a series of revolutions brought into existence by objective necessity via the imperialist war has fallen to the lot of the Russian proletariat. But the idea of viewing the Russian proletariat as the revolutionary proletariat superior to the workers of other countries is completely foreign to us. We are well aware of the fact that the Russian proletariat is less organized, prepared and ideologically aware than the workers of other countries. It is not their special attribute but only the special combination of historical conditions that has made the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat of the entire world for a certain, perhaps very short time.”

“Russia – a land of farmers, one of the most backward countries in Europe. Socialism can not be victorious in it immediately and directly. But the peasant character of the country – can give great impetus to the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia and make our revolution an introduction to the entire world socialist revolution, a step toward it.”

(volume 23, page 361)

Two years after the October Revolution Lenin returned to this idea in another connection. Comparing Russia to the developed progressive countries he wrote:

“The dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia must inevitably have certain different attributes than the dictatorship of the proletariat in the advanced countries as a result of the very great backwardness and petty-bourgeois character of our country”.

(volume 30, page 88)

Lenin made a special effort to dispel the notion that the limitation of the voting right in Soviet Russia is one of the elements of the socialist regime (of the dictatorship of the proletariat) in general, rather than only a local Russian phenomena. A year after the October Revolution, Lenin reminded his opponents that in his book “State and Revolution” written before the October Revolution he did not say “a single word about limiting the right to vote” and added:

“And now I must say that the question of limiting the right to vote is a singular national question and not a general question of the dictatorship. We must approach the question of limiting the right to vote while learning the special conditions of the Russian Revolution, the special manner of its development... but it would be a mistake to guarantee in advance that the approaching proletarian revolutions in Europe will all, or for the most part certainly place limitations on the bourgeoisie’s right to vote. It may be so - - - but it isn’t necessary for the realization of the dictatorship; it isn’t an inevitable distinguishing mark of the logic of the concept dictatorship; it isn’t included as an inevitable condition of the historic and class concept of dictatorship”...

“In what countries, in what special national attributes of one capitalism or another limitation will be practiced (in full or in the main), this violation of democracy or that in respect to the exploiters — that is a problem of the special national attributes of this capitalism or another, of this revolution or a different one?”

(volume 28, page 235)

In the Eight Congress of the Bolshevik Party (March, 1919) Lenin returned to this subject and said:

“We are not by any means discussing the question of denying the bourgeoisie the right to vote from an absolute point of view, since from a theoretical point of view it is completely reasonable for the dictatorship of the proletariat to exert pressure on the bourgeoisie from every side without denying them the right to vote. Theoretically this is completely plausible and so we are not holding up our constitution as a model for other countries... No one drove the bourgeoisie out of the Soviets either before or after the October Revolution. The bourgeoisie left the Soviets themselves.

(volume 29, pages 162-3)

Lenin started from the premise that the difference in the form of the socialist revolution stems from the great differences between the political forms of the imperialist countries:

“Such diversity will also be revealed in the way that humanity takes from present imperialism to the future socialist revolution. All the nations will achieve socialism, that is inevitable, but not all of them will do so in exactly the same way, everyone of them will introduce a different shade of its own to this form of democracy or another, to this type of the dictatorship of the proletariat or that, to one tempo of socialist changes

in the various aspects of social life or a different one. Nothing is more absurd from an ideological point of view and more ridiculous from the practical standpoint than, in the name of historical materialism, to describe the future in this way in one shade of gray...”

(volume 23, page 58)

Immediately after the October Revolution Lenin regarded the contradiction between the advanced position held by the Soviet Union from the point of view of the stage of the class regime and its backwardness even “compared to the most backward western European countries as far as orderly state capitalist organization, the cultural level and the degree of preparedness to introduce socialism in the area of material production were concerned”, and from this fact be concluded that the experience of Russia, of one country, can not be a perfect uniform model:

“... Only by a series of experiments – everyone of which will be one-sided and defective because of a certain lack of adaptability – will uniform socialism be established by the revolutionary cooperation of the workers of all countries.”

(volume 27, page 312)

Thus anyone who wants to make the experiment of the Soviet Union a model of uniform socialism that also obligates other countries is only rebelling against the teachings of Lenin. Lenin limited the international significance of the October Revolution in the sense of “the historic necessity of repeating what happened here on an international scale” and was concerned to give it clear limitations, saying:

“Such significance should be given to certain basic elements of our revolution. It will of course be a great mistake to exaggerate this truth, to extend and apply it not only on some of the main lines of our revolution. In exactly the same way would it be a mistake to completely fail to see that after the victory of the proletarian revolution in only one of the advanced countries, a sudden change will occur, that is to say: Russia will no longer be a model country but will quickly become a backward one (in the “Soviet” and socialist sense).”

(volume 31, page 5)

And when a Soviet government was established in Hungary (March, 1919) Lenin sent a radio-telegram to Bela Kuhn in which he said i.a.: “There isn’t any doubt at all that mere imitation of our Russian tactics in every detail in spite of the differences in the conditions of the Hungarian revolution would be a mistake. I must warn you of this error.”

(volume 29, page 203)

The basic elements of the October Revolution that every socialist revolution will apparently have to adopt are as follows: capture of power by the working class; alliance between the workers class and the other working strata of society; abolition of private, capitalist ownership and the establishment of public ownership (state, cooperative) over the principle means of production; and planning a people's economy to advance socialism toward communism.

But whether the capture of power and the revolutionary transition from a capitalist regime to a socialist one will be accompanied by a violent struggle or not; whether the necessary coercion of bourgeois reaction by the socialist regime will be accompanied by force or not — that depends on the concrete conditions of the given country at the given time. After all, Lenin raised the slogan of peaceful transition starting with the “April theses” and ending with his appeal to the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionaries in this spirit in the daily papers of October 9th and 10th concerning Russia of the year 1917, (volume 26, pages 45–6).

If Lenin was ready — and even preferred at a certain stage — to maintain a multi-party Soviet regime with the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries in power and the Bolsheviks in the opposition, and didn't repudiate the representation of the bourgeoisie in the Soviets in principle, certainly a broad spectrum of socialist forms of rule is possible today in different countries. Likewise there isn't any obligation or possibility of maintaining a uniform model of the institutions of the Soviet regime, a uniform model of the democratic framework and the relationship between the investment and consumption funds, the plan and the market, Department A and Department B in directing investments etc. etc. On the contrary, a different model of the transition to socialism and its construction is required for each country or at least for every kind of country.

Thus the glorification and universalization of the revolutionary experience in Russia were completely foreign to Lenin's whole way of thinking; they were — and are — the product of the perversions of the Stalinist period.

VIII

Creative development of the revolutionary theory is impossible without an examination of the significance of a number of concepts in the light of practice and its generalization.

The dictatorship of the proletariat — its original and correct meaning is the rule of the working class in the socialist state in contrast to a capitalist

state which is a dictatorship of the bourgeoisie since the bourgeoisie dominates it. The term “Dictatorship of the proletariat” comes from the definition of the state – every state – as a dictatorship of the class ruling over the mode of production. The term “dictatorship of the proletariat” has nothing to do with the dictatorial form of executing state power. On the contrary, Marx and Engels who conceived the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and Lenin who continued its development, regarded the dictatorship of the proletariat as identical with socialist democracy, that is to say, the democracy realized by the ruling working class. This should be a democracy superior to any bourgeois democracy since it serves the vast majority of the people against a tiny minority of exploiters and adds economic, cultural and social democracy to political democracy.

Marx and Engels wrote in the “Communist Manifesto” that “the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to a ruling position, to conquer democracy”. The meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat is democracy in the hands of the working class; it is the state of the transition period in which the revolutionary change from capitalist society to communist society takes place (Marx in “Critique of the Gotha Program”). That Lenin only understood the concept of dictatorship of the proletariat to mean the class essence of state power can be proven by his following words:

“The forms of bourgeois states are extremely varied but they have one essence: all these states are in one way or another but in the last analysis absolutely the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The transition from capitalism to communism, of course, cannot help bringing a great abundance and vast number of political forms into existence but of necessity all of them will have the same essence: dictatorship of the proletariat.”

(volume 25, page 385)

Engels went further in identifying the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat with democracy when he wrote:

“What is beyond doubt is the fact that our party and the working class can come to power only in the form of a democratic republic; the democratic republic is even the special form of the dictatorship of the proletariat...”

On the basis of the experience of the Russian Revolution of 1905 and in keeping with the conditions of Russian reality, Lenin decided on the Soviets (Councils of worker and peasant delegates) as the form of rule in a socialist state, as the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as the form of workers democracy.

But the development in the Soviet Union afterwards caused the democratic contents to be squeezed out of the dictatorship of the proletariat, in other words – its bureaucratic perversion. And since this state of affairs continued for many years and its negative echoes reached hundreds of millions of workers throughout the world, a kind of identification was created in the consciousness of the masses between the concept ‘proletarian dictatorship’ and the violation of democracy, distortions of the law and shocking crimes. Therefore we must diligently endeavour to restore the original meaning to the concept of the “dictatorship of the proletariat” which is identical with socialist democracy; we should frequently use the term “rule of the working class” which on the one hand is an exact translation of the term “dictatorship of the proletariat” and on the other hand is proof against inadvertent misunderstandings and malicious perversions.

The socialist state – was intended by Marxist theory to designate a political form of the transition period from capitalism to communism, an instrument that would bring about this transition and wither away with the fulfilment of its limited role. However, the fact that the socialist revolution broke out first in only one country, and in a very backward country at that, lengthened the period of its existence and broadened the sphere of compulsion of the socialist state. Imperialist encirclement impelled towards increasing the state’s military potential and the adaptation of diplomacy, security services etc. to methods used by the enemy. Although the change from a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat to an all-people’s state was proclaimed at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., in effect the state’s instruments and procedures of compulsion affecting its citizens remained in force, and not only is there still a long way to go until the distribution of goods and services is carried out according to the communist principle “to everyone according to his needs” but even the socialist principle “to everyone according to his work” is still defective in its actual application.

This situation has an important bearing on the problem of alienation. At the beginning of Marx’ path (in his early writings), he made a study of the roots of human alienation which led to the revelation of its main root that lies in the relations of production of class exploitation and the historic necessity for a revolutionary change of these relations of production that will lead to a class less communist society in which man will be freed of alienation. Thus, humanism is both the point of origin and goal of Marxism, of communism. The question of the state has an important place in this problem. The rule of the state – any state – is an important source of human alienation but the role of the socialist state as the form of the transition to a communist society, a society without a state, is to pull up this root of alienation. The socialist state, therefore, has a contradictory nature in as much as it is at one and the same time both an instrument for the abolition of alienation and a

factor that itself engenders a certain degree of it. This contradiction can find a positive solution if the socialist state assiduously endeavours to develop socialist democracy vigourously and broadly, constantly utilizes the public supervision of the masses of citizens over the state apparatus, systematically transfers its authority from the state administration to public bodies, guarantees a considerable and constant rise of the material and cultural standard of living, and concerns itself to narrow social gaps between the workers in different professions, on different levels, manual and spiritual, rural and urban. And on the contrary, limiting democracy, strengthening state compulsion and prolonging the existence of a wide gap between the various strata of workers sharpen the contradiction, emphasize the alienating factor in the socialist state and detract from its image as an instrument for abolishing alienation. From this point of view, too, well-rounded and dynamic democracy in the socialist state is imperative to fulfill the historic mission of the socialist regime and make possible the transition from socialism to communism. Since manifestations of human alienation in the socialist states cause masses of workers in the capitalist world to recoil from the struggle for socialism, the democratization of the socialist regimes is also necessary for the advance of the revolutionary workers' movement in the capitalist countries. The theoretical development of the problem of alienation is required for its positive solution in the existing and future socialist regimes.

IX

At any rate, as far as the "second-third" of the world, that is to say the most developed capitalist countries is concerned, ideological preparation is demanded that will express the great difference in the revolutionary process expected there as compared to that which occurred in Russia or China. The revolutionary changes in history happen because of the objective necessities that cause them but they are brought about by masses of men and to that end it is necessary that the masses be imbued with an ideology that motivates them to subjective action in the direction of objective necessity. The theory, describing now the revolutionary transition to socialism in the advanced countries will be realized is an inevitable foundation for the ideological preparation of this transition. Capitalism in the developed countries has reached its highest and final state – state-monopoly capitalism. Marx and Engels already pointed out that this development prepares the socialist overthrow: "The capitalist mode of production itself indicates the way to carry out this overthrow by compelling capitalism to convert more and more large social means of production into state property. The proletariat takes over state power and first of all converts the means of production into state property." (writings, Russian Edition, volume 19, page 224). Lenin indicated that "state-monopoly capitalism is the complete material preparations for socialism, it is socialism's anteroom

it is a stage in the historic ladder. Between it (between that same stage) and the stage called socialism there are no other intermediary stages.” (volume 25, page 333). But at the same time Lenin warned: “... the most common error is the bourgeois-reformist claim that monopolistic or state-monopoly capitalism is no longer capitalism and can already be called ‘state socialism’ and the like.”

(volume 25, page 414)

The transition from state-monopoly capitalism to socialism is impossible except by way of severe class struggle which ends in the conquest of power. But the special conditions of social reality require forms of social struggle. The greater the intervention of the state in economic life, the tighter becomes the connection between the economic and political struggle of the working class, and the importance of the pressure of the working class on state power also increases. The class struggle in conditions of state-monopoly capitalism is mainly concentrated in two areas: A) the help and service of the state to monopoly-capitalism concerns on one hand and increasing state ownership and control over branches of the economy while limiting the ownership and control of the monopolies on the other - to which of these tendencies will state power give primacy and preference? B) composition of the state budget, system of taxation, price policy, wages, subsidies and the like serve as a mighty instrument in the hands of the state power to redistribute the national income to the benefit of what class will this instrument work, to increase the share of wages or capitalist profit in the national income?

Monopoly profits not only increases the degree of exploitation of the workers, of the various kinds of wage workers, but it also squeezes out the independent, petty, medium-sized and even larger than medium-sized producers. This is the objective basis for the establishment of a broad anti-monopoly front that can exert, constant and efficient pressure on the state power, the government, and secure partial achievements that curtail and limit the domination of monopoly capital. A broad mass struggle can, as Lenin expressed it, “convert half-way and hypocritical reforms on the basis of the existing order into a point of support for the workers’ movement advancing on the road to the complete liberation of the proletariat.”

(volume 15, page 406).

To this should be added the fact that to the extent that the intervention of the state in economics spreads, the part of the state apparatus which is not responsible for governmental compulsion but for socio-economic administration grows accordingly. The working class and its partners in the anti-monopoly front can win support and sympathy in this part of the state administration.

It is necessary to take into consideration the fact that monopoly capitalism in our times resorts not only to the intervention and aid of the state in order to save itself from bankruptcy, but also to curtailing the democratic freedoms of the people and violating the democratic rights of the workers. On this background the anti-monopoly front also receives the task of struggling for democracy in addition to its economic and political tasks; the more the battle for democracy branches out and becomes more militant, the more it requires socialist changes for its fulfillment. The battle against monopoly capital which in most countries is connected with mighty world centers of capital is consistent with the battle for the independence of the homeland, economic and political independence and non-participation in military alliances of imperialism; thus the anti-monopoly front also has the character of a patriotic front for peace and national independence and this character increases its power of attraction among the masses. These opportunities of the working class to unite with all the popular strata into a broad front, limit finance capital and advance from petty reforms to more fundamental ones and start a battle for democracy that can develop into a battle for socialism — all combine into a great historic opportunity of the peaceful development of the socialist revolution in the most advanced capitalist countries. By the way, it is necessary to discern that peaceful development means the transition to socialism without the use of force, the shedding of blood and civil war but not without the use of coercion by the new regime against bourgeois reaction, but coercion doesn't necessarily imply violence. And it is also necessary to note that peaceful development doesn't mean parliamentary decision free from the pressure of the mass struggle taking place outside.

The chance of preserving peaceful co-existence on an international scale and the chance of a peaceful transition to socialism in a number of countries are interrelated. The international circumstances and relations of forces that make it possible to prevent an atomic war also increase the chances of preventing armed imperialist intervention against a country that sets out on the road to socialism, and in this way the chances of achieving socialism by peaceful means have been improved. Likewise the peaceful development of the transition from capitalism to socialism increases the chances of non-intervention and, indirectly, the chances of peaceful co-existence.

All that has been said raises a number of basic questions for the communist parties in the developed capitalist countries. First of all, the question of abandoning self-containment for a broad, national, democratic front, a united workers front together with social-democratic and religious workers. Secondly the question of ending the tragic rift in the workers' movement between communists and socialists — a rift that occurred on the background of Russian revolutionary reality from the beginning of the present century until the socialist revolution (that took place) and afterwards on the background

of the expectation (that was disappointed) of “Soviet” revolution in the other European countries and thus, an anachronistic rift which should be patched up soon. Third, the theoretical and programmatic conclusion that the communist parties are ready for close cooperation with all supporters of socialism in spite of ideological differences (that is to say, with Social Democrats and religious socialists also) not only to establish a multi-party, democratic, socialistic regime but also in the entire subsequent period of building a socialist and communist society. It is obvious that in such a socialist society coercion of an ideology by the socialist state will be impossible and guarantees for free ideological argument between the different outlooks will be provided. Fourth, the question of the character of the communist party itself that went through a number of transformations – from the assumption of Marx and Engels in the “Communist Manifesto” that the “communists aren’t a special party opposed to the other workers’ parties” to the mass character of a parliamentary party that Marx and Engels sometimes criticized but regarded as their own, and to ‘the party of a new type created by Lenin according to the principles of democratic centralism for the purpose of seizing power by force and shaped in the Stalinist period by exaggerated centralism to the advantage of the bureaucratic hierarchy and the disadvantage of democracy – shouldn’t the character and organization of the party be adapted to the conditions in which it must work and the tasks it must fulfill?

All these questions require answers so that the communist parties will be able to advance the revolutionary process of transition to socialism in the most developed capitalist countries.

Lately the following question has cropped up in these countries: what class is capable of carrying out the revolution in a modern industrial society? One answer that has been given declares that the thesis of Marx and Engels to the effect that the working class is the most revolutionary class and that in freeing itself it will free the whole society, has – as it were – become outmoded since the workers are no longer starvelings and the students and young intellectuals are the ones who reveal revolutionary energy and daring. Dogmatic Marxists angrily counter this assertion of “new left” circles by labelling the movement of the young intelligentsia “adventurism”, “petty-bourgeoisie” etc. etc. However, both the answer of the anti-Marxist revisionists and the dogmatic reaction to it should be rejected and attention should be paid to the social class changes that raised this new question.

The amazing progress of technology and the automation of means of production caused changes in the productive forces and the relations of production without changing, of course, the capitalist system as such. Processes of production today require many more workers from the intelligentsia and indeed their numbers are growing. The number of students who will enter various areas

of social production in the future has also increased to millions. The share of spiritual labour in creating value has grown phenomenally in the conditions of modern technology and automation and as a result the share of spiritual labour in surplus value that capital appropriates for itself, also grew. We see therefore that no matter what wage the spiritual and technical workers receive, the ratio of their exploitation by capital is very high. The vast increase in the number of spiritual workers combined with severe capitalist exploitation caused the revolutionary energy that has accumulated in the intelligentsia and students. But all this development converted the vast majority of the spiritual workers into the wage slaves of capital as the "Communist Manifest" has already said. Thus the students and the vast majority of the intellectuals should no longer be regarded as a small bourgeois stratum but as an inseparable part of the working class and their revolutionary impetus should be seen as a contribution to that of the entire working class. The students and intellectuals shouldn't be raised above the workers nor should they be placed beneath the working class in intermediate strata but they should be organically united and integrated with the working class. And to the extent that part of them especially of the younger generation, are attached to anarchist ideas and even to extravagant conduct, the reason for this has a dual nature: on the one hand it is rooted in the despair engendered in many of the younger generation by the old, bourgeois society, the material and spiritual distress, the cruel alienation that accompanies it – and on the other hand, the reason is rooted in the disappointment suffered by the young generation due to the distortions in the new socialist society. Thus in revolting against the western "society of abundance" they do not raise the standard of the exemplary "society of the future" in the east but they revolt against society and its arrangements in general. They are disgusted with the bourgeois society at hand but they want a just and improved socialist society; in so far that they are ideologically influenced by their bourgeois or petty-bourgeois origin they are not the only exception in this respect in the workers' movement. The conclusions communists should draw from this fact are these: don't repel them; don't denounce them but bring them nearer and, most important of all, perfect the socialist model of society in theory and practice, in program and reality and then they will be faithful partners in the revolutionary climb to socialism.

X

The "third Third" of the world, the underdeveloped countries most of whom have recently liberated themselves from the yoke of colonialism, require a completely different revolutionary theory from the one that ideologically directed the revolution in Russia or the one capable of ideologically preparing the Western-European or North-American revolution. In this area called "the Third World" there is also a great variety of economic, social,

political and cultural situations. Most of the countries of Latin America need to cast off the yoke of the indirect rule of Yankee imperialism and the direct rule of the reactionary dictators before the question of socialism arises. The question before most of the countries of Africa is how to overcome the backwardness, the heritage of a colonial past, and establish new economics and culture without being caught in the trap of neo-colonialism and passing through the stage of capitalist development. Various Asiatic countries face these problems also. Nevertheless accumulated experience permits us to reach a few general conclusions that may serve as bricks in the theoretical building of the socialist revolution in the "third world".

First of all it must be clear that the path of liberation shouldn't be dictated to any nation from outside. In what country of Latin America an armed uprising will occur and in what country a broad patriotic-democratic front will come into existence for mass political and social struggle will be decided within every individual country according to its objective conditions and the subjective inclination of the forces of progress within it.

Just as it is impossible to lead the struggle of liberation of any country successfully from outside it is also impossible to create a substitute for internal social processes by means of help from abroad. For example, the economic and technical help of the socialist countries proffered to underdeveloped nations can help them skip the stage of capitalism in their development provided there exist social forces that are struggling for a direct transition to socialism within those countries and help from outside is required to strengthen the inner struggle. But if there isn't any inner struggle of this kind to such an extent aid from socialist sources by itself will be of no avail.

Socialism won't come to these countries from outside nor will it come from the top, from the mercy of dictators, military or civilian, surrounded by a military or bureaucratic clique. The combination of aid from outside to dictators imposing "socialism" from the top can not advance socialism either.

In order to advance socialism in underdeveloped countries, governments are required that really and truly aspire to establish a socialist society in the scientific meaning of the word - governments which enable the workers to participate democratically in the socialist projects of development and construction, governments that gradually broaden state and cooperative ownership of the means of production for the good of the masses of workers. But dictatorial rule that only proves the seriousness of its bombastic "socialistic" declarations by receiving help from socialist sources, choking democracy, forbidding Marxist education and propaganda, abandoning nationalized projects to bureaucratic corruption and basing its rule on the faithfulness of an ambitious officer corps - such rule will not succeed in leading its country toward a socialist future.

The part of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the U.S.S.R. and her victory over Hitlerism and the help of all the socialist countries in the mighty phenomenon of the liberation of scores of peoples and countries from colonial oppression was tremendous and magnificent. None of these countries has established a real socialist regime as yet and there has been a reactionary retreat in many of them from regimes that were, or were thought to be relatively progressive (Lumumba, El-Kassem, Ben-Bella, Sukarno, Nkruma). Not all the communist parties in these countries remembered two Leninist imperatives: national liberation movements should only be supported to the extent that they are progressive; they shouldn't be protected en bloc. A communist party can join broad fronts only on the conditions of preserving its independence and maintaining the right to carry on communist propaganda freely among the workers and peasants. In spite of all the changes that have occurred, these two imperatives of Lenin are as valid as ever.

XI

Important changes occurred in the international relations between the communist parties and they obligate an examination of the theory of proletarian socialist internationalism which is a cardinal principle and basic assumption of communist ideology without which the entire ideological edifice collapses. And behold, many good people stand amazed before the Soviet-Chinese relations of hatred, the pressure exerted on socialist Czechoslovakia by her socialist neighbours and the division within the international communist movement and they ask: where is proletarian internationalism?

The analysis of this problem, too, forces us to return to the decisive point of departure — the distortions in the realization of socialism in conditions of backwardness and illiteracy at home and siege and threat from without. For almost thirty years the Soviet Union stood as the only socialist country against the imperialist world which was hostile and lurking for prey — is it any wonder that communists throughout the world saw identification with the USSR as an expression of their internationalistic faithfulness? But even this noble relationship of the communist parties in the entire world to the homeland of the socialist revolution was abused by the Stalinist regime. First, it increased the proper obligation of every communist to defend the U.S.S.R. from the imperialists threats to an obligation to defend every step of Soviet power including the criminal steps that defiled the purity of communism. Secondly, this regime hid the truth from the eyes of the world, created an idealization of the reality in the U.S.S.R. in the communist movement and thereby prepared the terrible disappointment when the distortions were revealed. The disappointment was so great that the distortion even began to overshadow the true achievements and the positive aspects in the minds of men. Third, this regime often subordinated socialist principles in foreign policy to big power

interests and compelled the communist movement to give an ideological explanation and justification for every step of Soviet diplomacy (for example the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact or the definition of the Second World War in its first two years as a war between imperialists that was – as it were – of no concern to the communist movement). Fourth, with the appearance of other socialist governments (almost all of them came into existence after the victorious campaign of the Soviet Army in underdeveloped countries) this Soviet regime exerted its authority over them and imposed its model on them. At most it permitted unessential divergence such as the existence of a number of parties while preserving the rule of one party in effect. If the leadership of a certain socialist state tried to reveal a degree of independence (Yugoslavia, 1948), she was defamed as “fascist” and the entire country was excluded from the communist camp. Fifth, suppression of free thought even in respect to Marxism-Leninism that was practiced in the U.S.S.R. was broadened to include also the international communist movement and Comintern institutions; every departure from the line of the Soviet leadership was called “treason”, “agency of the imperialist intelligence services” etc.

After the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. there was some degree of self-criticism and a proclamation was published that based the relations of the the socialist states on equality, non-intervention in internal affairs etc., but the previous style was not uprooted and new arguments of the same type broke out – the most serious of which were the U.S.S.R. – China rift and the Soviet pressure on Czechoslovakia, What is new is the fact that now there are socialist states who don't recoil from pressure and name-calling and go their own way.

But the problem concerns all the communist parties and not only those in the socialist countries. In spite of declarations to the contrary attempts are being made to force upon the international movement the authority of one leading party by arbitrarily placing any party that does not accept it beyond the pale (the Communist Party of Israel for example). As a result tens of parties including half of the parties of the socialist countries refused to participate in a world convention initiated by the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R.

Every communist party must recognize the historical rights of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., the enormous international responsibility that the Soviet Union bears as the greatest socialist power and the historical authority that has objectively been placed in her hands concerning the fateful question of mankind, namely the question of war and peace. But on the other hand the Soviet leadership must recognize that just as the mighty achievements of the Soviet Union in socialist construction add impetus to the world revolutionary movement and encourage communist parties in the other countries of the world, so did the distortions in the U.S.S.R. which were copied

by other socialist countries cause tremendous damage to the development of communist parties in the capitalist countries, and that every party has the authority — not only in respect to theory but also in regard to action — to manage its affairs as it sees fit, that is to say, according to its understanding of its tasks in the national reality of its people and country.

Only on this basis of mutual understanding will a new unity of the communist parties and socialist states be created. This unity will be unity through diversity and general respect of the right of others to be different, unity that is not mechanical or forced but unity that is the result of the free will of the participants on the basis of a common world outlook and for general joint aims: the strengthening of peace throughout the world, the independence of peoples, democratic freedom and the advancement of socialism.

If an approach of this kind is accepted for the reciprocal relations in the communist camp and if these relations are based on democracy, independence and integration through differentiation which are characteristic of a high level of development in nature and society, then proletarian, socialist internationalism will score its great victory.

The realization of this principle of proletarian internationalism is a difficult historical process which is long and full of obstacles. The First International (1864–1876) that was founded by Marx and Engels was disbanded by them when the organization ceased to serve the idea, and the signal was given for the establishment of separate socialist parties in every country. The Second International (1889–1914) marked a period in which the socialist workers' parties grew and became mass parties until the opportunism of their leaders in the face of the First Imperialist World War put an end to its existence. The Third International (1919–1943) served as the framework for the creation, crystallization and strengthening of the communist parties after the October Revolution until a change in the international situation in the course of the Anti-Hitlerite War required its dissolution. The Informbureau (1947–1956) was an association of a number of European parties under the hegemony of the Soviet party and without a general framework which disbanded after the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. Afterwards it was the turn of world consultations (1957, 1960) which were an attempt to establish a political and ideological structure for the entire movement. This experiment failed and the struggle between the two socialist world powers over hegemony was also responsible for the failure of this form of international unity.

This rapid survey of attempts at unity and dispersion reflects the fluctuations between two vital imperatives: international solidarity of the wor-

kers of all countries in the struggle for socialism and communism on one hand – and the national sovereignty of every working class and communist party in conducting the struggle in its country for which it is responsible.

The adoption of these two imperatives to each other, fusing them into one dialectical unity – that is the task before the revolutionary workers' movement today:

“Internationalism in practice – is one and only one thing: dedicated work for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in one's own country, support (propaganda, sympathy material) of this struggle, of this line and this alone in all countries without exception.”

(Lenin, volume 24, page 54)

Such is the internationalism of the Communist Party of Israel: a devoted endeavour for advancement of the cause of peace, non-dependence, democracy and social progress in the Israeli reality, together with support for the corresponding endeavours of progressive forces in all countries; defending Israel's just rights while also respecting the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples; a solution for national problems in accordance with the international interest of freedom for all peoples and peaceful co-existence between all peoples.

C. ON THE EXAMINATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE AND THEIR SOLUTIONS

XII

For almost fifty years the entire communist movement regarded national problems, including the problems of the Jewish people, according to Stalin's composition: “Marxism and the National Question” (1913) which was accepted as a kind of fixed theory that shouldn't be questioned. The examination of the assumptions and conclusions of this study only began in recent years and a number of grave doubts and objections have appeared.

Today serious Marxist thinkers challenge Stalin's definition of a nation as “a historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture”; Stalin also concluded that “the nation isn't merely a historical category but a historical category belonging to a certain epoch, the epoch of rising capitalism”; and these premises were responsible for Stalin's exaggeration of limiting the character

of the national movement to the sphere of the struggle of the bourgeoisie for its national market to the point of declaring that “sometimes the bourgeoisie succeeds in drawing the proletariat into the national movement and then the national struggle externally assumes a ‘nation-wide’ character but this is so only externally”.

First of all, Stalin’s definition is defective in that it limits the concept ‘nation’ to the period of capitalism. Nations existed in pre-capitalist times although imperfectly and in lower stages of development. As for the period after capitalism — it was Stalin himself who was compelled to correct and supplement his words by creating the concept of “socialist nations”.

An equally serious mistake is the identification of national movements with one class, the bourgeois, and placing the working class outside the national movements and struggles (its participation is “only externally”). This crude mistake is attributed to the influence of Rosa Luxemburg’s completely false idea that is opposed to Leninism; she wrote among other things that: “A nation as a unified social-political entity doesn’t exist in a class society but on the contrary there are classes with antagonistic interests and rights in every nation” (Selected Writings, volume 2, page 148). Indeed, the nation changes with the change of economic-social forms but its existence is not limited to one form; the nation is not a one-class public but a many-class, inter-class public and within it — as within the national movement — the relation of class forces changes, the class changes that leave its stamp on the entire nation, on the entire national movement.

Likewise anti-dialectical is Stalin’s doctrine that unless all four characteristics are present a certain people can not be regarded as a nation, with all the practical political conclusions that result from this ideological distinction. Yet the two largest peoples in the world, the Chinese and the Indian, do not have a common language. Aren’t they to be considered nations? Reality is completely dialectical, constantly changing, and national groups speaking different languages can unite into one nation as in Switzerland, just as they can crystallize within the mixture of the nation with the aim of becoming separate nations in a territorial-political framework as in Canada and Belgium.

Stalin’s definition is defective because it is inflexible about what it includes and because the elements which it lacks. The Pakistani people, for example, were historically shaped as a nation in our times on the basis of a common religion, and the national movement that led to the partition of Hindustan into India and Pakistan was also a religious movement (“The Moslem League”). In general, Stalin’s study has been justly criticized for underestimating the spiritual motives and elements in the formation and nature of nations.

Origin of race should also be considered as a factor that may lead to the formation of a nation as a result of oppression and discrimination on the one hand and self-awareness and the struggle for liberation on the other — for example, the case of the millions of negroes in the U.S. who now have a tremendous national movement.

What is required, therefore, is a more dialectical definition of the nation that leaves a place for additional factors in the formation of nations and provides additional marks for the characteristics of nations but also postulates the possibility that the attributes which are missing will be added as well as the possibility that existing distinguishing marks will disappear. As an experimental suggestion we would define the nation as follows:

A nation is the historically created community of people of different classes that was formed by a number of unifying factors such as: common language, territory, economic life, culture, tradition, religion, race and the like.

The combination of a number of these factors can unite people into a nation but there isn't any necessity for all these factors to combine in order to form a nation.

XIII

The reality of the Jewish people is especially dialectical, that is to say, full of contradictions and changes. To the present day the question: Who is a Jew? which is important not only theoretically but also practically has not received an agreed-upon answer. Every superficial and dogmatic definition will be inadequate. The answer of Jewish clericalism that regards the Jewish religion as the criterion doesn't take into consideration the process of secularization that the masses of Jews throughout the world have undergone and the existence of millions of Jews who don't have any religious affiliation, as well as the existence of faithful sons of the Jewish people that religion doesn't regard as Jews because their non-Jewish mothers weren't converted to Judaism, The answer of Jewish nationalism, the Zionist answer, that regards every person of Jewish origin as a member of the world-wide Jewish people and potential citizen of the State of Israel isn't valid for many Jews who are indifferent or opposed to religion, assimilationists from the national standpoint that consciously belong to other nations in spirit and deed but don't deny that they are Jews in origin (ethnogenetic) nor do they alienate themselves from their origin and disassociate themselves from the Jews.

If our thinking is anchored in reality we realize that there exist side by side Jews by religion, Jews by nationhood and Jews only by origin. That doesn't mean that it is possible to divide the Jews into three separate categories.

ries by these three criteria since there can be a combination of criteria in the case of the same individual and in as much as this classification isn't immutable but subject to constant change. Many Jews who came from religious homes have revolted against this tradition in recent generations. Although they abandoned religion they continued to be – or began to be – nationally conscious Jews and this phenomenon is still quite common. Many sons of orthodox religious and faithful national homes also entered the surrounding environment, took root in its culture, assimilated – and remained Jews only by origin. There is also a reverse phenomenon; due to a momentous event or traumatic experience Jews in origin who had no connection with Jewish religion or nationalism suddenly choose active national Jewish life and sometimes become faithful religious Jews. In conclusion we may say that:

The Jewish people is the historically created community of people of different classes that was formed by a number of unifying factors – ethnogenetic, religious, and national.

The historic origin, the ethno-genetic factor, is common to all Jews and this origin is connected with Eretz Israel (in other languages: Palestine). About two thousand years before the birth of Christ the Hebrews, the Israelites, that is to say, the ancient Jews made their history in the region of Eretz Israel (whose boundaries changed, of course, with the time). But also after the Jews were exiled from Eretz Israel in consequence of the conquest by the Roman Empire they preserved their historic, religious and national tie to Eretz Israel in all their wanderings and changes of fate. Starting with the end of the 19th century the growth of anti-semitism caused a mass emigration of Jews (primarily from Europe), and as a result of the historic tie mentioned above and the fact that the gates of other countries were locked, an increasing stream of Jewish immigrants came to Israel. The vision of the return of the Jews to Eretz Israel received international confirmation and encouragement twice: in the League of Nations' resolution after World War I (not in the intentions of the government of Great Britain but in the international resolution which, though defective in many respects, was valid in international law) concerning the establishment of a "national home" for the Jewish people in Eretz Israel, and in the resolution of the United Nations' Assembly concerning the establishment of a "Jewish state" in Eretz Israel after World War II. The return of the Jews to the territory of their historic homeland was bound up with the establishment of a diversified national economy with modern industry and cooperative agriculture, the creation of a class of workers and peasants, the rebirth of the ancient Hebrew language, the renewal of Jewish national culture, the gradual intermixture of groups of immigrants from dozens of countries and all the continents and the creation of a nation that doesn't lack any characteristic of a nation. In conclusion: the process of the national concentration and rebirth of the Jewish people is taking place in Eretz Israel.

The Jewish nation in the State of Israel came into existence – due to the special conditions of time and place – in consequence of the ingathering of Jews that came from their diasporas; the State of Israel is the realization of the historic tie that has existed for almost 4,000 years between the entire Jewish people and Eretz Israel. Thus, it is only natural that there is a tie between Jews in other countries and the State of Israel.

The tie of Jews to the State of Israel isn't uniform and equal. It is possible to enumerate four stages or kinds: A) the personal attachment of a Jew who immigrates to Israel, intends to immigrate or prepares his children to immigrate; B) the active support – of a Jew that doesn't intend to leave the country in which he lives and to which he is connected by full and conscious citizenship but thinks that it is his duty to help the State of Israel either by contributions, economic investment, moral and political support or by placing his scientific or professional ability at its disposal; C) the passive sympathy of a Jew that is completely involved in the economic, political, public and cultural life of the country in which he lives and its nation and doesn't promote the welfare of Israel in any way but is interested in her development, follows her fate with friendly concern and sympathy; D) the active opposition of a Jew who wants to disassociate himself from the Jews in general or the tie of all Jews to the State of Israel and therefore demonstrates his negative and sometimes hostile, relation to the State of Israel.

But the Jew's connection to the State of Israel isn't static but subject to fluctuations and changes: a sympathizer can become a supporter and a supporter can become an immigrant and the opposer can also become a sympathizer, supporter or immigrant due to the influence of a personal or collective experience; of course, all these changes can also occur in the opposite direction.

The approach of communist theory to the problem of the Jewish people expressed itself in the unequivocal doctrine that the solution of the problem is the liberation of the Jew from his Jewishness, that is to say, social progress will also bring equality and liberation for the Jewish citizen (emancipation) and as a result he will assimilate in the nation in which he lives.

Thus, throughout the history of the Jewish people two diametrically opposed trends have existed within it: the trend of assimilation in the neighbouring peoples – and the trend of preserving religious and national identity, the aim of the struggle for separate existence in spite of compulsory assimilation on the one hand and the lure of assimilation on the other. Communist theory accepted the goal of assimilation as the progressive one and opposed the goal of preserving separate Jewish existence as being nationalistically

narrow-minded and reactionary. Communist and socialist thinkers received this approach from their predecessors as far back as the days of the great (bourgeois) French Revolution when in the Constitutional Convention was declared (October 12, 1789) that: "To the Jew as a person – everything; to the Jews as a people – nothing"... Not only Marx, Lenin and Stalin but also Kautsky, Bauer and Renner (Springer) followed this line. Although there were considerable differences in their grasp of the national question, on the Jewish question they all had one ideological answer: the assimilation of Jews is their salvation by the forces of progress.

But objective social development in the life of the Jews did not prefer the trend of assimilation but that of preserving and strengthening national existence. In recent times there were three mighty historic events that left their mark on Jewish life:

- A) the extermination of six of the ten million Jews in Europe by Hitlerite Germany;
- B) the establishment of the Jewish State, the State of Israel;
- C) the experience accumulated since the October Revolution concerning the solution of the Jewish problem in the conditions of a socialist regime.

Nothing is more alien to Marxism than the failure to examine theory in the light of practice, in the light of reality that has changed. Let us go, therefore, and see whether these events confirmed or denied this theory.

Even before the holocaust anti-semitism throughout the capitalist world and especially the anti-Jewish ideology of Hitlerism and the Nuremberg Racial Laws caused the differentiation of the Jews and their isolation (dissimilation). The planned and systematic slaughter of the majority of European Jews naturally increased self-awareness and the solidarity of Jews wherever they may be. Every Jew who remained alive knows and feels that he is alive only by chance – either because he was outside the area of the rule of the Third German Reich or because there wasn't enough time to put him into a gas chamber and furnace. Every Jew knows and feels that he was condemned to death only because of his Jewishness and that only by accident the death sentence wasn't carried out. Every Jew proudly bears in his heart the yellow patch with the star of David that our brothers were forced to carry on their backs as a sign of disgrace while being still alive, and as a shipping tag to the death camp. To come to this people now and advise them: "assimilate please, forget that you were Jews, free yourselves from your Jewishness so that you will be free" – can anything more cynical and cruel be imagined? At any rate it is impossible to give our grieving people such advice in the name of communism; communism came to liberate man from alienation, not to impose it upon him and order him not to be himself.

The establishment of the Jewish state will go down in history as one of dozens of similar events – the establishment of independent states in former colonial countries that liberated themselves by a struggle of peoples for national liberation on the background of the general and deepening crisis of capitalism and the collapse or its colonial system. This correct, rational scientific definition doesn't express, of course, the impression made by the establishment of the Jewish state on the emotional world of the individual Jew and the historical imagination of all Jews. And no wonder. After all there isn't any precedent in history – not a single instance – of a people establishing its political independence in its ancient homeland after 1878 years of wandering persecution and exile. In any case the tie of millions of Jews in all parts of the world with Israel was created – and this tie is personal, family, emotional, religious and national. The awakening of this approach to the state of the Jewish people among the Jewish minorities in the countries of the world couldn't help strengthening Jewish national consciousness and weakening the tendency of assimilation.

The Jews in the socialist countries have been influenced by two of the above mentioned prodigious events – the holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel – as were the Jews in other countries, but they were also influenced by an additional factor. The socialist regime doesn't abolish national differences. On the contrary it cultivates them, develops the national individuality of every people, brings to life the popular traditions of the past, encourages the development of its language and culture, and grants it national, territorial independence or at least national territorial autonomy. In this state of national crystallization the Jews found themselves an exception. In the atmosphere of national awakening among all the nations in the socialist countries it is only natural that national consciousness and feeling are aroused among the Jews also and there arises the aspiration to realize their membership in a national collective of their own. The integration of Jews absorbed in national collectives of other nations was at most only linguistic and superficially cultural but they didn't mix completely with those nations, continue their tradition, cultivate memories of the past, identify themselves with the history and distinction from adjoining nations. For that is what we are talking about – assimilation from the standpoint of national consciousness and feeling as well as spiritual and national identification – and that doesn't exist for the overwhelming majority of Jews in the socialist countries.

We find, therefore, that all the three important events of our historical period have infinitely strengthened the trend of national Jewish existence as opposed to the trend of integration and assimilation, the aim of national rebirth as opposed to the aim of assimilation.

As a matter of fact, in the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries there were complete episodes in which the needs and demand of Jewish reality were satisfied even though this was counter to established doctrine. It is possible to enumerate four major episodes of this kind. First, the establishment of a special governmental office of Jewish affairs at the beginning of Soviet rule and the establishment of a Jewish school system, Jewish papers and theaters – while in the field of theory denying cultural-national autonomy in principle – gave evidence of a far-reaching concern for the national needs of the Jewish minority in spite of the fact that they were a dispersed minority. This continued for the first thirty years of the Soviet regime until the axe was laid to Jewish culture and its finest creators were murdered without the benefit of due process of law. Secondly, in spite of the theoretical thesis that the Soviet regime doesn't deal with creating nations, the U.S.S.R. nevertheless occupied itself with the territorial concentration of Jews, first in the southern part of Ukraine and Crimea and afterward in Birobidjan which was declared an area of Jewish autonomy with chances of developing into an autonomous Jewish republic, in order to guarantee the national Jewish existence in the U.S.S.R., and efforts were even made to bring Jews there from countries outside the boundaries of the U.S.S.R. The failure of this experiment in practice doesn't detract from its importance in principle. Third, the Soviet government actively, consistently and energetically supported the establishment of the Jewish state in Eretz Israel in spite of her opposition to Zionism in principle and in giving reasons for her positive stand, the representatives of the Soviet Union in the international forum emphasized the need of the Jews for a homeland of their own, the right of the Jewish people to an independent state that will free it from dependence on the mercy of other peoples, the historic roots that the Jewish people have in Eretz Israel and the fact that a considerable part of the Jewish people linked its fate with that of Eretz Israel. Fourth, in spite of the theoretical thesis that the socialist regime abolished the Jewish problem and the need to seek a special solution, the socialist governments helped solve the Jewish problem in their countries by the immigration of most of them to Israel (Bulgaria, Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania).

We see, therefore, that the assimilationist theory about the Jewish people was not only opposed to the objective development in reality that curtails the dimensions of assimilation and strengthens the goal of national existence among the masses of the Jewish people, but also to the experience of the socialist countries concerning the problems of the Jewish people which were forced to contradict theory and ignore it on decisive matters. The obvious conclusions to be drawn from these facts is the necessity of adapting theory to reality, to the lesson of experience.

The adaptation of communist theory to the lesson of reality on the question of the Jewish people means to examine the question: what are the national desires of the masses of the Jewish people, the Jewish working class, the popular Jewish strata? and enable these desires to be realized. This is the approach in principle of Marxism-Leninism to national problems: satisfy national needs in order to clear the way for the workers to lead their class struggle for socialism. Above we discussed in detail what is taking place among the Jewish people in respect to national desires and therefore we can indicate directly what should be the correct communist approach to them:

A) The recognition of the right of the Jewish citizen who so desires to leave the boundaries of the socialist state in order to immigrate to the historic homeland of the Jewish people, the state of Israel;

B) The recognition of the right of Jewish citizens who so desire to develop their national culture and language with the help of the socialist state;

C) The recognition of the right of the Jewish citizen of a socialist state to assimilate and be included in the nation in which he lives if he so desires;

D) The recognition of the right of the citizens of a socialist state who are determined as "Jewish nationhood" to maintain continuous cultural and friendly connections with the Jewish democratic institutions in foreign countries.

The acceptance of a programmatic, principled approach of this kind is important for the communist parties in all the countries of the world, that is to say, in the capitalist countries too, so that the Jewish workers, the popular Jewish strata and the Jewish intelligentsia in these countries will know that they can expect in this respect from the future socialist regime and mobilize for the struggle on behalf of the victory of socialism in their countries with all their energy and enthusiasm. As for the socialist countries, it is necessary to correct their policy toward the Jewish people in the spirit of the suggested approach, in the context of a correction of all the distortions.

This will not be any "privilege" for the Jewish people but only the abolition of discrimination in theory and reality. All the nations enjoy the same rights that we demand for the Jewish people. No one finds fault with the attachment of the Irish in the U.S. to Ireland and there are also more Irish in America than there are in their homeland. And no one complains about the fact that socialist Poland maintains an organization of Poles throughout the world to keep them in touch with the homeland (Polonia Zagranieczna), or the fact that socialist Hungary maintains a world organization of Magyars. And no one disagrees with the resolution of the U.S.S.R. about encouraging the ingathering of the Armenians from all corners of the world in the Armenian Soviet Republic or with the national rights granted to the German minority in U.S.S.R.

We are positive that the above principled, programmatic approach to the problems of the Jewish people will bolster the civic loyalty and socialist patriotism of the Jews in the socialist countries and weaken the influence of bourgeois nationalism which feeds on the feeling that just national desires are slighted.

XVI

Special attention should be granted to the need to cultivate the democratic, progressive, humanistic heritage of Jewish history, culture and tradition. For a long historic period religion was the only form to express the spiritual life of the masses of the Jewish people and its best sons. In as much as the Jewish religion is the only religion among the Jewish people and the Jewish people is the only one that accepted Judaism, a kind of identification has been created between the national and religious concepts. This identification is a matter of the past but it is impossible to throw out treasures of fine human and national values from the heritage of our past because they were expressed in religious form and have been preserved in religious garb. There are fountains of social, moral and philosophic ideas and values in the ancient religious and modern secular Jewish heritage that can serve as a valuable resource for educating youth and mobilizing it for the battles for peace, brotherhood of peoples, national independence, democracy and socialism.

There are brilliant chapters of struggles for independence and free — domain in the history of the Jewish people that can serve as a source of national inspiration and pride to the contemporary progressive Jew from the Maccabean revolt, the war of Judah against Rome, the revolt of Bar Kohba — to the share of Jews in the revolutionary movements of the last centuries and the October Revolution. The vision of peace between all the nations of the world is the original vision of the ancient Israeli prophets. Values of social justice exist in ancient Israeli law and judicial procedure and powerful expressions of social struggle for the good of the poor, the oppressed and discriminated against are included in the books of the prophets. The commune of the Essenes in Judaea almost two thousand years ago is perhaps the first commune in history (with the exception, of course, of the ancient, pre-historic community). Outside Eretz Israel, too, our people created popular, democratic, humanistic and universal values that infinitely enriched Jewish culture in the middle ages and afterwards. The study, development and integration of all these values in the new progressive culture is an extremely important imperative the fulfillment of which can strengthen national consciousness and the progressive socialistic and human aspirations of the young generation of Jews.

What has been said pertains, of course, to the progressive values in the Jewish tradition in contrast to the reactionary impression of the exploiting classes on this heritage which should be excluded from the education and culture of our times.

In the last century the Jewish people created mighty spiritual values in Yiddish. After the destruction of the Jewish centers in eastern Europe the popular Jewish circles throughout the world accepted the task of preserving and developing the precious heritage while engaged in a difficult struggle with processes of linguistic and cultural erosion. The Communist Party of Israel regards it as her sacred duty not only to aid the efforts of progressive Jewish circles abroad as much as possible but also to guarantee the continuation of Yiddish literary creation in Israel and transmit its treasure to the young generation in Israel.

XVII

On the background of the incorrect theoretical position that envisioned Jewish assimilation and the disappearance of the Jews as a people in conditions of progress, serious distortions were — and are — being made in the battle against Zionism. A correct communist relation to a national movement makes an exact distinction between its progressive elements which should be approved and the reactionary which should be rejected. According to this distinction we, too, must examine our relationship to Zionism which is neither more nor less than a national movement.

“Negation of the Diaspora” which is a cornerstone of Zionist ideology should be rejected in theory and practice. This view declares that there isn’t any chance of Jewish national survival outside the boundaries of the State of Israel. This means that a considerable part of the Jewish people and perhaps most of it is fated to assimilate. But on the other hand Zionism declares that complete mass assimilation is impossible because it is superficial and temporary. What, therefore, will be the fate of the many Jews who won’t settle in Israel? The answer to this question provided by Zionist ideology isn’t uniform and suffers from an internal contradiction that can’t be removed. The “negation of the diaspora” is the result of a lack of faith in the progressive development of mankind, in the future of regimes in the world that will correct the distortions of the past and present and enable every national group and national minority, including the national Jewish minority, to live its national life on the basis of true equality and freedom and maintain mutually beneficial reciprocal relations with its historic homeland, the national state of its people. The process of Jewish immigration to Israel will, of course, continue but at the same time the connection between the Jews who

remain in the other countries and the State of Israel will become stronger and this, too, will be a factor checking assimilation and making possible national life of the Jewish minorities in the "diaspora". Immigration and assimilation — each of these processes will affect part of the Jewish people abroad but neither of them will affect the entire Jewish people. As opposed to the "negation of the diaspora" we approve of immigration to Israel and national life of the Jewish minorities wherever they may be.

A logical conclusion from the "negation of the diaspora" premise is ideological indifference in respect to what happens in the "diaspora", that is to say, the indifference of Jewish workers, intelligentsia, and public to the social class struggles and general, democratic, progressive political struggles in the countries in which they live. It is no coincidence that Jewish youth in America, for example, which is sensitive to every injustice and active in the struggle to stop the war in Vietnam and end discrimination against the Negroes doesn't reveal interest and activity on Jewish and Israeli problems. The conclusion of blurring the class contradictions within the Jewish society accompanies the conclusion of indifference to the struggles among the "gentiles".

Zionist policy collaborated with imperialist powers, especially with the British Empire from the days of the First World War to the outbreak of World War II, and afterwards with the ruling circles of the United States. In Eretz Israel the Zionist policy placed the new Jewish reality in the process of formation in opposition to the existing Arab reality; to the extent that Zionist leaders with a different political conception based on mutual understanding and affinity of the Jewish and Arab peoples were pushed aside by the leadership of the World Zionist Organization.

In view of the above-mentioned facts it is understandable that the Communist movement waged an ideological-political struggle against Zionism. But, as already pointed out, in the course of this struggle serious distortions were made.

Stalin's thesis that every national movement is a bourgeois movement even if the proletariat "apparently" participates in it, applied to Zionism, distorted the view of reality. It is correct that the decisive influence on the policy and leadership of the Zionist movement was in the hands of the Jewish plutocracy — first of France, Germany, Great Britain and finally of the U.S. But in the countries of Jewish distress, especially in eastern Europe before and after the holocaust, the Zionist movement had a popular and broad national character and included masses from the discriminated against, persecuted and despairing strata of society that regarded immigration to Eretz Israel as their only salvation. This distinction between the summit and the popular public mass base was lacking in the communist approach to Zionism.

It also lacked the discernment of the dialectical development of the relationship between the Jewish community in Eretz Israel and British colonialism, on other words, between the Zionist undertaking and the mandatory government. According to the agreement between the Zionist summit and the British government, the mandatory British administration was obligated to help establish the "Jewish national home". In reality this help was accompanied by severe hinderances and setting the two peoples against each other, but due to objective circumstances and subjective motives the Jewish community succeeded in achieving the crystallisation of a nation in the years of the British protectorate over Eretz Israel in spite of all such interference. And here one thing was transformed into its opposite; the Jewish community that was established under the protection of the British Empire came into total conflict with British policy and became a serious factor in the struggle for national liberation (1945-1948). The Jewish people in Israel was one of the main factors in the struggle against colonialism after the Second World War; it caused the British government to leave all of Eretz Israel and thereby played a major role in the battle against imperialism in the Near East.

In the struggle of the communist movement with Zionism insufficient thought was usually given to differentiate in the Zionist movement between the bourgeois right and the worker-pioneer left in which even a socialist left crystallized that revealed an ideological affinity to Marxism-Leninism.

The communist battle against Zionism also suffered from ignoring the constructive and socialistic-humanistic roles it fulfilled. With all its faults—the Zionist Organization, and especially its worker-pioneer wing, laid the foundations of a Jewish society in Eretz Israel and the State of Israel.

It goes without saying that the campaign of hate waged at present in a number of socialist states and with the participation of a number of Communist parties ostensibly against Zionism but actually against the Jewish people and the State of Israel should be reproved and rebuked. The identification of Zionism with imperialism and the comparison of Zionism with racialism and Nazism are insults to every Jew as a Jew. In opposition to the manifestations of anti-Arab Israeli chauvinism which appear parallel to anti-Israeli Arab chauvinism and national chauvinism in different countries in general, a constant struggle is being conducted in Israel by all the democratic forces and in this struggle the communists are often in one front with worker-Zionist circles.

Today the Zionist movement is in the throes of a severe crisis because it has lost its ideological basis. As long as Zionism strove to establish a state (or "national home") for the Jewish people in Eretz Israel the attitude to this aspiration was the dividing line between Zionists and other Jews. But after the State of Israel was established by the general effort of the vast majority

It also lacked the discernment of the dialectical development of the relationship between the Jewish community in Eretz Israel and British colonialism, on other words, between the Zionist undertaking and the mandatory government. According to the agreement between the Zionist summit and the British government, the mandatory British administration was obligated to help establish the "Jewish national home". In reality this help was accompanied by severe hinderances and setting the two peoples against each other, but due to objective circumstances and subjective motives the Jewish community succeeded in achieving the crystallisation of a nation in the years of the British protectorate over Eretz Israel in spite of all such interference. And here one thing was transformed into its opposite; the Jewish community that was established under the protection of the British Empire came into total conflict with British policy and became a serious factor in the struggle for national liberation (1945-1948). The Jewish people in Israel was one of the main factors in the struggle against colonialism after the Second World War; it caused the British government to leave all of Eretz Israel and thereby played a major role in the battle against imperialism in the Near East.

In the struggle of the communist movement with Zionism insufficient thought was usually given to differentiate in the Zionist movement between the bourgeois right and the worker-pioneer left in which even a socialist left crystallized that revealed an ideological affinity to Marxism-Leninism.

The communist battle against Zionism also suffered from ignoring the constructive and socialistic-humanistic roles it fulfilled. With all its faults—the Zionist Organization, and especially its worker-pioneer wing, laid the foundations of a Jewish society in Eretz Israel and the State of Israel.

It goes without saying that the campaign of hate waged at present in a number of socialist states and with the participation of a number of Communist parties ostensibly against Zionism but actually against the Jewish people and the State of Israel should be reproved and rebuked. The identification of Zionism with imperialism and the comparison of Zionism with racialism and Nazism are insults to every Jew as a Jew. In opposition to the manifestations of anti-Arab Israeli chauvinism which appear parallel to anti-Israeli Arab chauvinism and national chauvinism in different countries in general, a constant struggle is being conducted in Israel by all the democratic forces and in this struggle the communists are often in one front with worker-Zionist circles.

Today the Zionist movement is in the throes of a severe crisis because it has lost its ideological basis. As long as Zionism strove to establish a state (or "national home") for the Jewish people in Eretz Israel the attitude to this aspiration was the dividing line between Zionists and other Jews. But after the State of Israel was established by the general effort of the vast majority

of the Jewish people and the tie to the State of Israel is shared by all Jews, Zionism has lost its significance. If the intention is to rally the support of the Jews for the State of Israel, such support is much broader than the framework of the Zionist Organization, If the intention is "personal realization", that is to say, the immigration of Jews to Israel, most of the Zionists in the world don't do it and are opposed in principle to the identification of Zionism with the obligation of immigrating to Israel. Thus the Zionist Organization has changed from an instrument that connects Jews with Eretz Israel into an instrument that separates Jews in other countries from the States of Israel. Today the Zionist Organization is an agonizing body without inspiration and in recent congress it has been confronted with the question: to be or not to be. The tasks that it fulfilled in Israel were transferred to the state, and its task abroad, i.e. to give expression to the tie between the Jews in other countries and the State of Israel, the Zionist Organization can not fulfill. But its functionaries and bureaucratic apparatus don't permit it to draw this conclusion and declare its dissolution; thus, the Zionist Organization continues to exist only because of inertia.

XVIII

New Jewish communication, unification and organization on a world scale is possible and desirable if it is in keeping with the circumstances and demands of the times and is based on such unifying principles as; the struggle for peaceful co-existence in the world in general in which Jews live, on all the continents in all regimes and in the Near East in particular between Israel and the Arab countries; the struggle against Fascism, anti-semitism and national oppression everywhere; the support of the State of Israel and concrete expression of the tie between Israel and the Jews in other countries; and the cultivation of democratic Jewish culture and tradition and its transmission to the young generation.

The representatives of the Communist Party of Israel will raise the flag of peace and socialism in every organization and from every platform to the light of the vision of a guaranteed future for Israel and the Jewish people in the socialist future of the world.

