

# *part iii*

## **ON THE ROAD TO SOCIALISM**

## 1. A NEW EXAMINATION OF BASIC CONCEPTS WILL REPLACE THE ROUTINE POLEMICS

The present argument about Mapam's road to Socialism is a polemic about the Soviet Union and a new examination of basic Marxist concepts. We witness the division of opinion in our ranks about fundamental assumptions and forecasts of the future. Old rank and file comrades who were educated on revolutionary socialist Marxism before and after the October Revolution are participating in this argument. Young comrades characterized by a mixture of invigorating thinking, perplexity, and an often hasty disappointment and disillusionment with adolescent dreams also appear at their side on the discussion platform. The routine polemic that has also become customary with us will not be decisive in this meeting between two generations. First and foremost the ideological clarification of basic concepts and the elucidation of essential matters should be decisive in this debate. If we have succeeded in giving this character to the discussions preceeding previous conventions, we must pursue this policy even more assiduously after the shock we received in the Six Day War.

Lately it has almost become the fashion to confront Marxism which is based on historical and dialectical materialism and finds its political expression in the class struggle and the struggle of the working class for hegemony in the government with humanistic socialism that can be realized - although it hasn't been achieved anywhere as yet - without the struggle of working class to bring about socialism and repudiates the dictatorship of proletariat in principle. The bearers of socialist humanism, they contend, don't necessarily come mainly from the class of the exploited and the oppressed but from men of good will of all the social classes. This, they maintain, was true in the past, is true today and will be true tomorrow. This approach represents a kind of renewal of the days of Utopian Socialism in France after the French Revolution. As we know, the Utopian Socialists also appealed to both the exploiters and the exploited with their redeeming plans. There were wonderful personalities among them who innocently believed that an appeal to the good will, intelligence and sensibilities of men - who are essentially good by nature - will establish the kingdom of heaven on earth. In effect, their whole system of

persuasion reduced itself to an appeal to the individual and social conscience. The "Narodniks" in Czarist Russia, Gustav Landauer after the First World War and A.D. Gordon and his students from "Hapoel Hatzair" and "Gordonia" also continued to provide heroic personal examples, go to the people and make appeals to the conscience of man.

Marx himself never underrated the historic importance of the French Utopians. On the contrary, he cited three sources of Marxism: A) Utopianism and French political thought, B) modern Economics in England based on Ricardo, Mills and others, and C) Hegelian dialectics in Germany. All these elements served as a foundation for his theoretical edifice and the political conclusions of Marxism. We, too, never valued our predecessors lightly. On the contrary, there were very few people in Israel who were as attached to the personal example of A.D. Gordon as Hashomer Hatzair even though they disagreed even then with some of his theoretical and political assumptions. In our youth we admired enormously the members of "Lehavot" in Czarist Russia as described in Bzorovski's book. Now, too, we are continuing this tradition and are far from belittling the students of A.D. Gordon. As I said, we disagreed with a number of their basic assumptions such as their attitude toward Marxism and the October Revolution but we don't have any reason to doubt human and social value of the members of "Gordonia" and "Min Hayisod".

In our movement's pre-Marxist period we also adhered to symbols and concepts drawn from idealistic philosophy. Then we believed almost exclusively in the strength of voluntarism and the appeal to conscience. We believed not only in their decisive power but also in the unaided force of pioneering voluntarism. In the meantime we have learned that pioneer voluntarism is really important but no more so than the security situation and all the objective conditions.

As time went by - from the days of the Third Aliyah to the year in which Kibbutz Artzi was founded - a number of theoretical assumptions crystalized and they served as the basis for the program of Kibbutz Artzi that was ratified in the founding Council in 1927. This program

is based on Marxism and historical materialism adapted to Jewish and Israeli reality by Borochovism. This is a program that aims to coordinate Marxist theory with the special conditions of the struggle for national and social liberation of our people. We reject the teachings of De Mann accepted by some of the members of "Gordonia" which sought to present humanitarian socialism as the antithesis of Marxism and the class struggle. But we aren't opposed, heaven forbid, to the humanitarian foundation of socialism. It is clear to us that basically socialism and humanism are alike. On the contrary, it is Marxism that proves that the history of human society until now is identical with the history of the class struggle and strives to put an end to the war between the classes. Certainly there isn't anything more humanitarian than this aspiration to abolish a regime based on exploitation and the oppression of man by his fellow man. It is undeniably true that this class struggle isn't waged with silk gloves; the flag is red and the "International" is the anthem that tells of the cruel and drawn-out struggle but in the main this is a struggle that leads to the most humanitarian goals in the history of mankind.

We can't ignore the identity of those among us who flourish seemingly humanitarian slogans. And who preaches in favour of peace between the social classes and the love of Israel? The members of Cherut and the Liberals from Gachal. They enthusiastically exhort against class hatred. But in fact their deeds which are permeated by unrestrained class hatred are simply disguised under humanistic slogans.

## 2. SOCIAL DEMAGOGERY AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

The workers and the exploited aren't in love with the class struggle. It is a cruel necessity which employers and exploiters force upon them. The workers in Israel can't content themselves with a struggle for their vital interests - for bread and their personal and social status. They must also march at the head of the builders, defenders and absorbers of immigration; they must guarantee the existence of worker hegemony in the state and nation. In the war against the freedom of the workers' trade-union struggle, a worker-pioneer regime and worker hegemony in the state and nation, reaction in

in Israel - like reaction in other countries - has known how to conceal its class hatred by social demagogery. Its basic goals are the destruction of the workers' economy and hegemony in the government and the Histadrut which is in the hands of the Zionist Socialist parties, in order to put into effect a regime of compulsory arbitration, prohibition of strikes and restriction of the trade-union struggle. Israeli reaction has succeeded, however, in convincing large parts of the working class by its social demagogery. The Cherut propagandists became militant defenders of the price-index bonus and the wage bonus. In Gachal, Mr. Ben Eliezer, the head of Cherut in the Histadrut - that so-called defender of workers' interests who demands the payment of the price index bonus in stentorian tones and favours every strike - walks arm in arm with Mr. Soziov, the head of the manufacturer's association who opposes the payment of the price index bonus and rejects strikes. In front of both of them walks Mr. Begin whose speeches attract tens of thousands of workers who want to be deceived. Of course the members of Rafi conceal in the folds of their rhetorical togas the weapons of compulsory arbitration and the prohibition of strikes which they'll rush to employ if they are ever permitted, heaven forbid, to take power. This is their humanism and this is their love of Israel as revealed in the reality of the social struggle waged in our country.

Lenin warned that the trade union and its struggle are not in themselves sufficient to lead the working class to a revolutionary social change. We and the workers in other countries learn this lesson every day. In the U.S. for example, there are gigantic trade unions who organize mighty strikes and wage a bitter class struggle for the interests of their members. But this doesn't prevent their members from belonging to one of the two parties that rule the country. The reactionary parties in Europe know how to utilize the narrow interests of the masses of workers for their purposes to the detriment of the working class as a whole while the social democrats and communists often help by quarreling among themselves. If it weren't for the millions of workers who were befuddled by the right, the Nazis wouldn't have won in Germany and the fascists wouldn't have come to power in Italy. We learn the same lesson from the trade-union struggle in Israel. "Cherut"



which is saturated with enmity toward the workers' economy, worker-pioneer hegemony and socialism, knows, as we said, how to use social demagogery so successfully that in cooperation with the wage earners from the Liberal Party, they succeeded not only in competing with Mapam in the recent Histadrut elections but also received 100,000 votes which is a few thousand more than we received.

Mapam regards itself as the defender of the workers but its doctrine of the integration of the trade union struggle with national development doesn't promise them only benefits. Mapam also demands sacrifices from them. Mapam doesn't automatically identify itself with all the union demands and all strikes like the demagogues from Cherut on the one hand and the New Communist List on the other are wont to do. Before the last elections we didn't join the chorus of those who extorted those praised classifications that put the inflationary burden of hundreds of millions of Israeli pounds on the shoulders of the taxpayers. We didn't identify ourselves with the academicians and senior clerks who exploited the pre-election period to win various benefits. We support the just demands of the workers and first of all of production workers. We also don't withhold our help to the just demands of the professionals, but we don't identify ourselves with the cult of wage differentials and the aspiration to widen the social gap between production workers and the privileged strata of the services. In short, not all strikes and trade union fights are necessarily identical with social and political progress. A trade union struggle is justified when it advances the worker-pioneer regime and strengthens workers' hegemony in striving toward decisive social change in the state and nation.

### 3. ON THE UNITY OF THE ECONOMIC AND TRADE UNION FUNCTIONS OF THE HISTADRUT

Since the foundation of the Histadrut we were the most consistent proponents of the struggle for the unity of its economic and trade union functions. "Solel Boneh" served as an example of pioneering impetus in the Histadrut economic enterprises since the days of the Third Aliyah. It embraced thousands of workers who learned to combine the struggle for their trade union interests with responsibility for the workers' economy and the

Histadrut. With the approach of the fiftieth anniversary of the Histadrut we can conclude that we always drew strength from the combination of the various functions of the Histadrut. The reactionary right, on one hand, and the anti-Zionist left on the other, always attacked this unity of functions. They knew very well that they are the Samson locks of the Israeli workers. This and more. We recalled Lenin's evaluation of the important but limited role of the trade union struggle provided that it isn't isolated from the general political struggle of the socialist workers' party. Only by the leadership of a revolutionary socialist party can the trade union struggle help achieve national and international socialism. From this point of view there isn't any difference between communist and socialist parties to the extent that they are worthy of their names. All the socialist parties - no matter what international they belong to - saw the trade union struggle as a kind of spring board to change the regime and realize socialism, until socialism became a prisoner of reformism that aspires to a capitalist welfare state. The program of every party of this kind - either communist or socialist - promised to abolish the regime of exploitation, strive toward the abolition of classes, nationalize the means of production and implement socialist relations of production.

#### 4. COMMUNISM - SOCIALISM - REFORMISM

From the days of Marx to the present the way to bring about a basic socialist change on a national and international scale has been the subject of argument. This argument which has become more vitriolic since the October Revolution hinges on the correct strategy and tactics for taking power and the choice between democracy and dictatorship. In our country there isn't a single Zionist Socialist party - "Hapoel Hazair", "Achdut Haavodah", "Poeli Zion", "Mapai" or "Mapam" - whose program doesn't speak of the aspiration to achieve socialism, abolish the exploiting class and nationalize the means of production. In Israel the argument has mainly centered around the degree of integration between the class struggle and national development, to what extent it is necessary to combine concern for security with concern for peace, the integration of national spirit and the brotherhood of peoples and the way to guarantee worker-pioneer hegemony.

## 5. REFORMISM, STATISM AND THE CAPITALIST WELFARE STATE

Over the years these contradictions became blunter and others appeared. In our times we are not the only ones who declare our aspiration to realize socialism by democratic means; the Israeli Communist Party also follows in our footsteps and Dr. Sneh tells his audience on Kol Israel that our historic task demands broadening the base of responsibility. It seems to me that if Dr. Sneh now recommends the unity of the workers' parties it would be proper if he first begged the pardon of hundreds of the best members of Mapam whom he confused with his unbridled anti-Zionist criticism close to the time that he left Mapam. Now Dr. Sneh's criticism is being repeated by the leader of the New Communist List, Meir Wilner who quit the Israeli Communist Party headed by Mikunis and Sneh.

We shall be willing to draw a line through this sad episode but, unlike others, we won't be jubilant about this change of heart as long as Dr. Sneh and his comrades don't agree to the complete rehabilitation of the national liberation movement of the Jewish people, Zionism.

Together with all the other communists, the Israeli Communist Party favoured a policy of Jewish assimilation, rejected the international character of the Jewish problem and besmirched the Zionist movement by calling it a bourgeois nationalist movement that serves as a tool in the hands of international reaction even after the historic Holocaust and the immigration of Jews from the socialist countries. Sneh and his comrades didn't recoil from defaming the Zionist movement in spite of the return to agriculture, the nationalization of land, worker-pioneer hegemony and the process of the integration of diasporas. And yet all these achievements place Zionism in the forefront of national liberation movements and make it one of the most humane and progressive movements in the history of the last century. "Maki" promises us a re-examination and revision of its approach to the Jewish question and we must wait and judge the results.

We also witness an opposite process. In the parties that have just united there are those who prefer democracy to socialism in the



process of realization and present a more progressive capitalist system as a kind of realization of the vision of the prophets. Ben Gurion served as a guide to this change with his slogan "From a Class to a People". Those who followed him are attempting to sacrifice parts of the Histadrut. They use this slogan to exchange workers' hegemony for party rule which is allegedly statist. They regard the Histadrut as a "part" which must submit to the "whole", that is to say, national interest. In practice this theory means accepting the directives of the economic leaders of the state.

#### 6. ADAPTATION TO THE CAPITALIST LINE IS INCREASING

Instead of aspiring to broaden the nationalized state-public-workers' part, these "statists" want to withdraw the Sick Fund from the authority of the Histadrut. The general parties are, of course, enthusiastic supporters of this policy. After them come the members of Rafi and others of their stripe hidden among Mapai. Under the cover of "statism" Ben Gurion, as head of Mapai, succeeded in depriving the Histadrut of its educational role by withdrawing the workers' trend in education from Histadrut authority and transferring it to the authority of the state. This broke the worker-pioneer tie of hundreds of thousands of children of Histadrut members in cities and development towns.

All the Zionist Socialist parties continued to retain sections in their programs favouring the establishment of a socialist regime in Israel either in our time or in the future. But in daily practice, the process of adaptation to the capitalist way that helps consciously or unconsciously to establish a capitalist welfare state in Israel continues.

#### 7. A VERY INTERESTING EXCERPT FROM AN EXCELLENT BOOK

Articles by aesthetes who are disgusted by materialism which is allegedly sunk in historical materialism and the class struggle frequently appear in workers' publications. Since man does not live by bread alone these writers prefer the concern for the saving of the soul to the concern for the payment of the price-index bonus to the workers. I remember one

of the books of a fine Jew who wrote mainly in German and now lives in Israel. I mean the penetrating book of Max Brod: "On Christianity, Idol and Judaism".

It is doubtful that Max Brod is a Marxist. In the past he belonged to a circle that was founded in Prague in the days of human and national emancipation in the beginning of the present century. This group included Kafka, Hugo Bergman and others. In this book Brod distinguishes between the struggle against the "noble" catastrophe of humanity and the struggle against its "non-noble" catastrophe. The struggle against the "noble" catastrophe expresses itself in the perpetual soul searching of a person who stands before problems of life and death, existence and ceasing to be. This is the eternal struggle of all Jobs and Hamlets and it is one of the central themes in all literature and philosophy. It is an endless struggle that will never stop as long as man exists on the face of the earth. In contrast to this battle against a "noble" catastrophe Brod presents the struggle against the "non-noble" catastrophe (or we shall say, material catastrophe) of humanity. This is man's fight against hunger, ignorance, enslavement, debasement and all kinds of discrimination - class, racial or national. This is the struggle for slum clearance, more equality, democratic freedom and the abolition of economic exploitation and social oppression.

Max Brod proclaims that the struggle against the material catastrophe of mankind is the essence of humanism. We shall give priority to providing food for the hungry and raising up the exploited, enslaved and downtrodden because it is by these things that we shall be tested.

This excerpt can help restore the ideological and spiritual balance of those who seek personal refuge from the self interest that allegedly characterizes the class struggle in our country. This truth is equally valid for both the wage worker and the kiboutz member. The struggle for a fair and decent standard of living for the worker, the just share for the exploited in the national income and the well being of all the workers will determine the future of the kibbutz movement no less than the development of relations of equality and brotherhood within it. Those who attempt to wash their hands of the struggle against the "non-noble" catastrophe

of mankind will not find a lasting refuge from it by confining themselves to their kibbutz home or even to the entire kibbutz movement. They will not succeed in saving themselves by ignoring the situation of the most exploited. Those within our kibbutzim who don't want to have anything to do with this struggle will not succeed in keeping aloof from the wage workers' struggle and the same "evil band" called Mapam. It is worth recalling to all those who desire the good of their kibbutz and the kibbutz movement that there isn't anything more humanitarian than socialist policy because it is only a struggle for a better future for the workers' movement, the kibbutz movement, our people and all humanity.

It is true that in a political struggle one often has to roll up one's sleeves and enter the puddles of life with muddy boots in order to reclaim them and put an end to them forever. Successful avoidance of prosaic activities involved in uprooting evil within human society won't improve us. I associate this tendency to ignore somewhat the cruel necessities which the struggle for a better future entails with the tendency to neglect somewhat the severe and militant Marx of the "Communist Manifesto" and "Capital" and prefer Marx the young philosopher revealing new horizons.

#### B) THE INTERNATIONAL ASPECT

##### 8. UN-CRITICAL AFFIRMATION AND NEGATION

The attempts to prefer the super-structure and avoid the necessity of beginning accounts from the material production of mankind as the assumptions of historical materialism require also belong to ideological escapism. I am thinking about a number of hypotheses that we've heard in the attempt to sum up the fifty years after the October Revolution in the U.S.S.R. Unlike the authors of a considerable part of the one hundred articles published in the clarification platforms of "Al Hamishmar" and "Chotam", I don't think that we should make the Soviet Union a major issue in our forthcoming convention. Nevertheless, I can't refrain from dealing with this issue that stirs up public opinion so much nor can I treat it lightly and superficially.

As we know, Mapam doesn't favour self sufficiency. As members of a nation that has hostages among seventy nations of the world and in every regime, we can't permit ourselves the luxury of isolation. Isolation is impossible especially in this country which is located on the crossroads of three continents and whose present and future are dependent on the ingathering of exiles from all continents and all regimes. Of course, we mustn't ignore the lesson of the Six Day war in which we were left to our fate not only by our enemies but also by our friends. Today, as in the past, there isn't any way of achieving socialism in Israel except by the ingathering of exiles. We always emphasized the national and social emancipation of our people. Therefore, we never proclaimed ourselves to be communists and we never needed any instructions from any International to tell us what to do and what not to do. The fact that international communism rejected Zionism and the ingathering of exiles which are conditions of our special path to socialism sufficed for us not to regard ourselves as communists. All this is undeniable. But, on the other hand, we never forgot that the national and social liberation of any people - including our own - would not be guaranteed except by solidarity with the struggle of the oppressed workers in the entire world. Patriotism and Internationalism always favoured taking root in the homeland while opening broad windows to the international struggle of the workers' movement in favour of socialism and against capitalism. We used this scale in evaluating the October Revolution and the Soviet Union, their achievements and failures.

Paradoxically it was in the weekly of Kibbutz Artzi that doesn't deal with ideology very much that I read a dogmatic article in which there were three conclusions: A) the Soviet Union has ceased being the pioneer of socialism in construction; B) our young generation has even abandoned critical affirmation of Soviet socialism, and C) the young generation and the not so young author of the article divorce themselves from the October Revolution and all it stands for.

The author believes that this denial of anything positive - even with the most serious reservations - is necessary to improve our public

90

image. To his regret members who occupy leading positions in Mapam haven't learned this lesson yet.

Personally I'm not certain that our public image will be improved by accepting these suggestions. In the meantime something has happened that can make this sentence more severe. A proclamation that was accepted unanimously by the Political Committee of Mapam was published on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution. In this leaflet the distortions and failures of the Soviet Union including the policy of compulsory assimilation practiced in respect to the Jewish minority, the U.S.S.R.'s inimical conduct toward Israel before, during and after the Six Day War and her shipment of tremendous quantities of arms to the Arab states were subject to searching criticism.

Although it criticized and rejected completely all that should be rejected, the Political Committee of Mapam had the courage to emphasize Soviet achievements and approved what deserves approval. In spite of the severe shock we suffered in the Six Day War, the proclamation of our party did not refrain from continuing the policy we have always pursued.

However, there was one member of the Political Committee who attempted to improve our image in the pages of "Chotem" and "Bashaar" in exactly the opposite way. He uncritically approved of Soviet policy. But I believe that these two extreme expressions inspite of all the basic difference between them, will remain unusual manifestations. I hope that the approaching convention will know how to keep its head above water and preserve a balance that points out the shadows but doesn't hide the light and doesn't close the windows to the world of socialism in construction with its achievements and failures.

When the uncritical rejectors are asked how they explain the tremendous achievements of the nationalized economy inaugurated by the Soviet Union after the overthrow of capitalism they reply that the achievements of the nationalized economy aren't the achievements of a socialist economy as yet. They thereby hint apparently, that in their opinion this



nationalized economy is identical with state capitalism. They refuse to leave a shred of hope and declare that the realization of socialism in the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries is only a vanished dream.

The revelations of Nikita Khrushchev in his speech before the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party are especially helpful to these comrades. As we know, in the Moscow convention that met after these revelations there was still a minority that demanded that we keep faith with Marxism and Leninism in every respect. Another minority that was considered to be rightist suggested a wording that approved the main foundations of Leninism. The compromise adopted by the majority of the delegates of the convention declared that we must continue to approve Marxism and Leninism but not in their entirety - and the intention was to continue to approve of socialism in construction while criticizing it without resorting to the communist stamp. In the decisions of that convention the delegates still knew how to call things by their right names. Five years have passed since then and as a result of the shock of the Six Day War the present Soviet regime has been described by a number of our comrades as being even worse than the Stalinist regime. They blacken it from stem to stern. And now fifteen years after Stalin's death, these same uncritical discards demand that we divorce ourselves not only from Leninism but also from the Russian Revolution. I want to ask our comrades - young and old - has the Soviet regime since the revelations of Khrushchev deteriorated to such an extent that we must turn our backs on the past and even alienate ourselves from the socialist foundation in the Soviet Union? If the U.S.S.R. has sinned grievously from the Jewish and Israeli standpoint, is that sufficient reason to close our account and call it quits? In the light of this approach, I must indicate my gratification once more that the leadership of the party knew how to maintain its balance and emphasize the achievements alongside failures and deficiencies.

#### 9. ONE THING COMPARED WITH ANOTHER

I have a copy of the American weekly "Newsweek" devoted to the

fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution. The forward to its comprehensive survey which was written by many journalists begins with a general evaluation: "On its fiftieth anniversary the Soviet Union is a society that is becoming more open though it still isn't open; it is freer although it is far from being completely free." Afterwards the weekly describes wide eyed Soviet youth with unruly forelocks whose conduct indicates self confidence and further progress toward a better world when their turn to bear the responsibility for the fate of their homeland arrives. Unlike some of the friends of the U.S.S.R. among us, "Newsweek" which identifies itself with the cold war policy of the U.S. and is very close to the State Department doesn't conclude that this government is slipping into the abyss.

Paradoxically this American weekly decides that the opposite is true. Let us assume that this weekly isn't ready to ignore the facts out of purely selfish considerations. At any event its editors don't ignore the fact that not only the economy but also the society of the Soviet Union is becoming more liberal and the amount of freedom is increasing gradually step by step. They don't ignore the bureaucratic failures but at the same time they express the hope that by the centenary of the October Revolution all these distortions will disappear completely and vanish from this world without leaving a trace. However, this is scant consolation because the transition to democratic socialism can't wait another fifty years until it becomes a fact. But let us not forget that this isn't the voice of leftist and progressive America but the voice of that America which identifies itself with President Johnson's policy in Vietnam.

Is it really true that the nationalized economy of the U.S.S.R. doesn't contain any elements of socialism? Of course those who retreat from Marxism and historical materialism to the concepts of pre-Marxism utopianism in the manner of "Hapoel Hazair" and "Gordonia" will prefer to devote themselves to the "noble" catastrophe and problems concerning the salvation of the soul to the existence of a socialist regime with its distortions and failures alongside its advantages. When it was necessary

to defend the October Revolution from foreign intervention, the onslaught of the White Guards and the pogroms against the Jews, not only the members of Hashomer Hatzair but also the present members of Achdut Avodah and Mapai gave priority to the defense of the socialist regime.

From all that has been said above we must conclude that a regime in which the economy is nationalized and society is without classes of exploiters, still isn't - because of its severe distortions - a socialist society but nevertheless it has chances of advancing toward full democratic socialism. It is clear to everyone that genuine socialism is only possible in the context of complete freedom and democracy. In any event there was never any argument in our movement on the question: is parliamentary democracy preferable to a socialist regime in the process of construction even if the latter is in a transition period from the dictatorship of the proletariat to complete socialist democracy? Is it possible that an American weekly should be counted among the lenient approvers and some of our members be counted among the severe disdainers?

#### 10. CHARACTERISTICS OF A SOCIALIST REGIME

In Russia before the victory of the October Revolution - as in all the other capitalist countries - there was a tremendous gap between the means of production which were all in the hands of the exploiting and oppressing class and the relations of production between cruel exploiters and the oppressed, debased and exploited. The October Revolution removed the means of production from the hands of the employers and returned them to all the workers in the cities and villages. It inaugurated a nationalized economy for which all were responsible and removed the means of production from private and capitalistic ownership. In this way the contradiction between the forces and means of production on the one hand and the relations of production on the other were eliminated. A society without exploiting classes supplanted a society composed of exploiting and exploited classes. In my opinion the elimination of the conflict between the forces and means of production and the relations of production as well as the establishment of a society without exploiting classes should be regarded as the first

foundations of a socialist regime. But at the same time no socialist regime can exist for a long time if the dictatorship of the proletariat isn't replaced by full socialist democracy.

The October Revolution which transferred the forces and means of production to the rule of the workers abolished the capitalist regime and replaced it with socialist relations of production was a turning point in human history. It was a change from the past of slavery and exploitation of man by man to a future of socialist equality, democracy and freedom.

Since the October Revolution we have thought that the dictatorship of the proletariat is a temporary necessity to insure the transition to socialist democracy. Today, fifty years after the establishment of the Soviet regime, the vast majority of us think that the time has come to step up the tempo of the process of democratization. Bureaucratic centralism's imprint can still be seen in the spiritual life of the U.S.S.R. and in the regime of directives from above which is linked with unanimous voting and the choking of free debate.

The fact can not be denied that if, as a result of the October Revolution, a third of humanity has freed itself from the capitalist yoke and is struggling successfully against undernourishment, hunger and want, another third of humanity whose struggle for national liberation is behind it - is still in horrible distress. For example, those thousands who die of hunger in the streets of Calcutta every day whose corpses are collected and buried in mass unmarked graves. Anyone who really realizes the significance of this fact will be making a snap-judgement if he denies the land of the October Revolution the title of the pioneer of world socialism.

#### 11. ON CHANGE IN THE SUPERSTRUCTURE

Fundamentally the superstructure is just as important as the material base. If all of us agree with this assumption, can anyone

deny that the October Revolution not only put an end to hunger and malnutrition among one third of humanity but also carried out a mighty project of eliminating illiteracy, granting secondary education to at least half the population in the countries of socialist construction and granting academic education to tens of millions? And all these achievements are inconceivable without a nationalised economy and the rule of workers.

The above mentioned issue of "Newsweek" also tells about the rising power of that young intelligentsia that numbers tens of millions of citizens who were educated on the lap of the revolution. It points out that this intelligentsia cantake the credit for the increasing manifestations of social and spiritual pride in the developing Soviet society. Every manifestation of spiritual confrontation starting with Yevtushenko and ending with the young writers who were just sentenced and the rebelliousness of Litvinov's grandson testify very clearly that the new generation will not continue to bear their chains for long.

Or let us take as an example the problem of the emancipation of women. We have read that seventy percent of all the doctors and teachers and thirty per cent of the engineers in the U.S.S.R. are women. After the war against Fascism and the fearful loss of manpower millions of women did very hard work. Nevertheless, women succeeded in occupying positions in every part of the economy and society. They enjoy equality as workers. This doesn't mean that everything is all right. Women can receive more adequate representation in central and local governmental institutions. But they can console themselves that in this respect they have alot of company. If, for example, in the past we could boast of one woman who was one of the most important ministers in the government, in the meantime she has also been replaced. In a country like ours in which men and women shared the burden of pioneering equally, we have once more reached a situation in which the honor of woman is within her house and her representation in the institutions of the state and Histadrut are insultingly inadequate. In this respect Mapam and Heshomer Hatzair are not, to our sorrow, to be counted with those who swim against the current and this is so inspite of that excellent convention of Kibbutz Artzi dedicated to

56



improving the social position of the female members.

And on the subject of establishing equality between peoples: It is indeed true that the problem of the Jewish minority weighs upon and irritates all of us. Nevertheless, even Kol Israel, in its broadcast on the evaluation of the achievements of the October Revolution indicated that actually compulsory assimilation is only forced on the Jewish community. All other peoples - including the exterritorial peoples like the Germans - enjoy the right of self-determination and broad cultural and linguistic autonomy. And it is precisely on this background that the problem of the Jewish minority in the U.S.S.R. stands out so strikingly.

There isn't any area that belongs to the superstructure as much as science. The achievements of the Soviet Union in the development of science are known to all. Today, unlike the days of Stalin, the rulers of the Soviet Union don't dare to make judgments about the natural sciences, exact sciences, linguistics etc. and walk around not only as if they were omnipotent but also omniscient.

## 12. THE ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENTS OF PROFESSOR LIEBERMAN

To the extent that the economic administration also belongs to the superstructure it is difficult to agree with the yes men among us who argue that degeneration has left its mark wherever you turn. Khrushchev was the first one to introduce liberalization in this area and his two successors - Kosygin and Brezhnev - are dedicating themselves to systematic economic decentralization. In this sector considerable improvements have been made and this is so largely thanks to the reforms introduced by the Jewish Professor Lieberman. Today the whole world talks about "Liebermanism" as a system of more independence, responsibility and initiative starting with the individual factory and ending with all economic activity. This is a system to replace the inefficiency and exaggerated supervision which characterized bureaucratic centralism. And it is not without reason that both "Newsweek" and "Time", the American news magazines, indicate that due to Liebermanism and its influence the annual production of the Soviet economy rose

surprisingly.

### 13. EVEN AGRICULTURE ISN'T MARKING TIME

Until the present time it has been a truism that Soviet agriculture is the achilles heel of the economy and lags behind the productivity in the U.S. But the newspapers in the west conclude that after years of drought - and who knows what a drought is better than we in Israel do - in which the U.S.S.R. had to import wheat from the U.S. and Canada, Soviet agriculture reached a yield of wheat three times as large as that of the United States in 1966 (36 million tons of wheat in the U.S. as compared to 100 million tons of wheat in the U.S.S.R.). These magazines also inform us that this year, too, a bumper crop is expected. The Soviet Union only outproduces the U.S. in one production industry - coal production. In the other main industries the Soviet Union lags behind the U.S. although even in these industries the U.S.S.R. is already approaching American achievements.

I'll cite a few figures from the same source as examples:

Petroleum production:	U.S.S.R. - 265 million tons:
	U.S. - 404 million tons
Steel production:	U.S.S.R. - 99 million tons;
	U.S. - 134 million tons.

There are also such areas as automobile production in which the Soviet Union trails far behind the U.S.

### 14. DICTATION CONTINUES IN POLITICAL POLICY, LITERATURE, ART, HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY ETC.

Until now I have mainly described the positive aspects in the socialist countries. But there is another side to this story. The negative exists side by side with the positive. Until now we used to speak of "critical approval" of what is taking place in those countries. But this expression is no longer appropriate. "Critical" can no longer serve as an adjective describing the noun, "approval", because criticism has become a subject in

its own right. Approval remains approval but rejection is coupled with it. Just as we continue to approve of the constructive efforts, so do we reject the means of administration and government. We can't reconcile ourselves to this awful lag of the political, ideological and cultural superstructure behind the mighty economic and technological base that was created in the past fifty years. If revolutionary socialism approves of the dictatorship of the proletariat as a transitional regime to democratic socialism, we can only state that as far as the citizen's freedom of expression and freedom of decision are concerned almost nothing has changed in the U.S.S.R. since its inception and today the political regime is more hidebound and inflexible than it was in the days of Lenin.

It is superfluous to add that we not only reject but utterly oppose the assimilationist policy in regard to the Jewish minority and the Machiavellian great power policy of the Soviet Union in the Near East before, during and after the Six Day War.

The directives of the Communist leadership in the Soviet Union on such subjects as poetry, literature and art which sometimes border on inquisition are exasperating and provoking. The dividing line between human relations in a socialist society and human relations in a capitalist one based on the war of all against all should be based first of all on faith in man. But the Soviet reality bears witness to the opposite. There is a connection between the manhandling of Pasternak's literary work and the ban placed upon him and the trial and imprisonment of writers and artists for the expression of opinions that are incompatible with those of the rulers. Although such manhandling hasn't ended in the removal of heads for many years now, it is clear that as long as this regime continues, many areas of creativity will continue to be afflicted by perversions, blasted by icy disapproval and scorched by sterile enthusiasms.

#### 15. IT'S A LONG ROAD

The truth can be told: the claims of Lenin and his successors that,

as it were, it is possible to foretell the date on which the socialist economy will overtake capitalism have not been realized. For a long time the international communist movement has been fed on deceptive prognoses of the impending decline of the capitalist system. Reality contradicts these predictions. The capitalist system - especially in the U.S., Japan and Western Europe - has not only not collapsed but has entered another period of prosperity. Since the great depression in the late 1920's, President Roosevelt, the politician, and Lord Keynes, the economist, have linked arms in order to grant the capitalist regime a staying power that even Marx and Lenin didn't envision. They achieved this by long range planning, economic and financial regulation. Since that time long periods of depression and unemployment like those the U.S. and Europe suffered starting with 1929 and hastened the rule of Fascism and Nazism have been prevented.

All this doesn't invalidate the basic premise that in the last analysis only the socialist system can overcome hunger and undernourishment, prevent economic anarchy on a global scale and the danger of a new world war. The countries that are now freeing themselves from the yoke of colonialism will not attain true independence and complete security and peace except by complete national and social liberation, that is to say by making progress in one way or another towards establishing a socialist regime. Although the establishment of a global socialist system on the basis of solidarity and stable peace between nations is, for the time being, unachievable we fervently believe that the competition between the systems will finally be decided in favour of socialism.

We promised ourselves to praise the good and blame the bad. We must evaluate everything that has happened in the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries from the time of the revolution to the present from this balanced approach. Must we judge the achievements and failures of socialist Rumania favourably from now on because of its fair attitude toward Israel in the Six Day War and must we judge socialist Yugoslavia severely because this time she backed our enemies? Until the recent crisis we

preferred the Yugoslav regime to all the other socialist regimes and tended to forget that the Yugoslav regime also hasn't solved the problem of collectivized agriculture and its bureaucracy has also endangered industrial profitability. In Yugoslavia, too, they made - and are making - experiments; they are attempting to take one step backward in order to take two steps forward. The same is true of Rumania. It wouldn't be reasonable if we suddenly declared that she has become a guide to the perplexed in the realization of socialism because of Rumania's friendly attitude toward Israel. In short, we must be very wary of being carried away by passing evaluations that are only the result of coincidental conditions.

16. BUREAUCRATIC CENTRALISM - THE MALIGNANT DISEASE OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

There isn't any doubt that bureaucracy is a cancer that can eat away the body of socialism in the process of realization. Bureaucratic distortions rest on the door step of every centralized statist regime. It is necessary to overcome these evils in all the countries that are realizing socialism - the Soviet Union, Rumania, Yugoslavia, China etc., etc. These defects must be revealed conscientiously everywhere not only in these countries but also in Israel.

And the question is asked whether it was fated from the outset that the system of democratic centralism practiced by Lenin should become so distorted as to assume the truly monstrous forms it did in the years of Stalinist terror? Lenin predicted the dangers inherent in a prolonged centralistic regime in which all the decisions come from above and collective initiative is ignored.

17. WHAT HAS LENINISM TO DO WITH STALINISM?

A reliable and enlightening analysis of the events that caused the dissolution of the partnership between the Bolsheviks and the other leftist parties in Czarist Russia is given by Y. Pormanov in his article: "Democratic Socialism's Turn Has Come" (Al Ha Mishmar, November 10, 1967).



In this article the author surveys the development that led step by step from the dissolution of the Constitutional Convention to the sole rule of the Bolshevik party. He informs us that this convention was dissolved because of the development of a rift between the majority composed of Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries and the Bolshevik minority due to the intrigue with General Kornilov. The Bolsheviks couldn't abandon the All-National Founding Convention and rule by means of the All-Worker Congress of Soviets because the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries were in the majority there also. This body also refused to support the revolutionary regime. After seizing power Lenin tried to cooperate with the left wing of the Social Revolutionaries. It was then, we remember, that Lenin was wounded by a bullet from which he never recovered. That bullet was fired at a time when Lenin and the Bolshevik Party were retreating from military and equalitarian communism to the N.E.P. Thus the last possibility of cooperation between the Bolsheviks and the other workers' parties came to an end.

Comrade Pormanov doesn't refuse to call a spade a spade. Lenin and the Bolshevik party were faced with the choice between socialism and democracy, that is between parliamentary democracy and the establishment of a socialist regime at the price of giving up parliamentary democracy and even at the price of temporarily giving up general proletarian democracy. All his life Lenin attacked the monopolistic rule of a single party until he finally accepted it as the least of evils. At least he diligently maintained democracy within the party. Lenin had a liberal attitude toward every argument within the party. He didn't spare his opponents the last of his criticism but he never resorted to sanctions to punish the expression of individual opinion or even factions that formed within the party. There were arguments between Lenin on one hand and Trotsky and Kaganovich on the other. We know that Lenin wasn't satisfied with Stalin's dictatorial tendencies. He expressed this both during his lifetime and in his last will and testament. The argument between the factions grew fiercer after Lenin's death and was finally settled by the exile of Trotsky. Then the personal terror, show trials, decapitations and other signs of Stalinist rule began. This regime grew more powerful until it reached monstrous dimensions in the ruler's last years.

## 18. WILL THE PATIENT LIVE AFTER THE BRILLIANT OPERATION?

Further on in his article, Y. Pormanov surveys the history of the proletarian dictatorship and concludes that it is necessary to put an end to the era of dictatorship and centralism once and for all in order to replace them with socialist democracy based upon the activity of the masses in every sphere - political, economic and cultural. A regime must come into existence immediately which is based on democratic freedom and socialist humanism. We all know that true socialism is only possible in the context of complete socialist democracy but the fateful questions before us are: how will this present period end and how will the transition to democratic socialism occur? Here is how comrade Pormanov describes this process:

"Those who haven't put barriers between socialism and democracy, proletarian rule and free proletarian activity; to those whom a planned and nationalized economy without spiritual freedom and democracy is only 'economic' socialism and not integral humanistic socialism; to those who couldn't support the opponents of the Soviet regime but for whom there remained a place to live, which is meant just as it sounds, within the Soviet regime - only an ambivalent approvingly critical and critically approving approach and frequently a very uncomfortable position between the camps remains. But to their credit it must be said that as uncomfortable, impractical, indecisive and sometimes derisive etc as their position was, it can faithfully express the long range socialist goal and historical dialectics in which the positive and negative are joined together and both of them can push society forward. Because the socialist goal itself isn't simplistic, it is two-sided. It is the integration of economic forms demanded by the level of development of the forces of production with a humanistic, equalitarian and democratic content. To be sure equalitarian, humanistic, democratic integration isn't automatic; it is limited by inner contradiction and external obstacles. But it is just for that reason that it is a matter which requires struggle and constant striving for its realization. And the dialectic lies in the fact that in the course of development the utopian can become plausible and the impossible can become

necessary."

Stimulating words indeed, and though I don't agree with all the phrasing and can't accept every word I must say that he succeeded in describing concisely Mapam's basic approach. He knew how to utilize the unity of opposites that maintained the socialist regime and also characterized our attitude toward the Soviet Union and the other socialist states in construction. Pormanov doesn't spit into the well from which he drank. He doesn't decide that a nationalized economy isn't socialistic and he doesn't hasten to declare that if that's socialism, he isn't a socialist. He only points out - and correctly - how far this regime is from a socialist society and emphasizes the fact that only in the framework of socialistic and equalitarian democracy will true socialism be realized. I endorse this part of his analysis wholeheartedly. And although, as I said, I disagree with a number of Pormanov's assumptions, I want to give the reasons I agree with most of his analysis in detail.

A) After fifty years of the existence of proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union the demand for a speedy transition to democracy is growing stronger and has become an urgent necessity. As we have said, it is impossible to wait more decades for socialist society to be transformed from a vision to a reality. The desired change must occur quickly in our time.

B) On the other hand I hope that comrade Pormanov will agree that it isn't our task to tell socialist countries if complete democracy must be based on one party or a number of competing parties. Nevertheless, a cold war is in progress now, too. We must remember the fifth column that sprang up in Ukraine twenty five years after the October Revolution. We must note the slaughter of hundreds of thousands of Communists in Indonesia, the manner in which progressive regimes are being uprooted with fire and sword even among the nations that are liberating themselves in Asia and Africa.

C) The main obstacle to democratization is the prolonged existence of a regime of bureaucratic centralism. Bureaucratic centralism can't continue to dictate all the decisions to all the inhabitants. Because of this system fifty years after the revolution we still witness the same sorry spectacle when between 1,500 and 2,000 delegates of the Supreme Soviet from all parts of the country meet so that everyone of them will raise his hand like a robot and adopt the directives of a few members of the politburo. After all the delegates do their duty by voting unanimously in favour of endorsing the conclusions of the general secretary - whether the subject is the state budget or deposing a leader - they return to their homes from whence they came. If a show like this possible in a country in which 240 million people live of whom one half have had the benefit of a high school education and many millions enjoyed a university education, this is an intolerable situation. Sooner or later it will lead either to an explosion like the one in China or increasing distortion.

D) We witnessed the gruesome gagging of 3½ million Soviet Jews who completely identified themselves with us in the days of the struggle for life and death in which our country was engaged during the Six Day War. These millions of our people were compelled to listen to the evil calumnies with which the Soviet rulers defamed our defense against those who rose to destroy us. But we must remember that not only 3½ million Jews but an entire population of 240 million still walks around gagged and without any share in the decisions of the top leaders. This leadership continues to speak in the name of those same hundreds of millions whose opinions they never asked. We must make ourselves and everyone else realize that in the political sphere very little has changed for the better since the death of Stalin and almost all the hopes that that event occasioned were disappointed.

It isn't important whether the Soviet people decide in favour of pluralism or some other system. It is important to return to it its right to complete freedom of expression in every area of the superstructure. It is impossible for every first Secretary to decide to dictate the history of the Soviet Union and the Bolshevik party after he deposes the former secretary. I don't see any danger to the socialist system in the restoration of

the right of complete democratic decision to the people in the political sphere also.

E) Two years ago the U.S.S.R. announced the abolition of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the establishment of an "all people's" regime. This is an obligation that hasn't been met yet. In the meantime it has only made a number of western Communist parties who erased the slogan dictatorship of the proletariat from their programs long ago more comfortable.

The continued existence of the dictatorship of the proletariat did not cause its exchange for an "all people's" regime; it only caused a change in the dialectics of Machiavelian chicanery and the hypocritical use of linguistic camouflage so as not to make decisions in the direction of full democracy. In this way the leadership succeeds in presenting the same thing in a different guise. Therefore, it will only take a few years to show if the obligations entailed by declarations of the end of the era of the dictatorship of the proletariat will indeed be honored. This change has become a pressing and actual problem of the near future.

#### 19. ON THE CHANGES TAKING PLACE IN THE COMMUNIST CAMP

A struggle is taking place in the Communist camp. This struggle led to the split between two giants - the Soviet Union and China. Other socialist countries, also, have often expressed strong disagreements and there were crises between them and the U.S.S.R. We may remember the rift with Tito in the days of Stalin, the Polish October at the outset of Krushchov's reign and independent position of the Rumanian government lately not only in matters pertaining to socialist construction but also on various international problems including the quarrel in the Near East. All these contradictions, frictions and tensions have weakened the authority of the Soviet Union to such an extent that she isn't even capable of convening a world Communist convention to decide between the U.S.S.R. and China. But the Soviet Union also revealed considerable flexibility in adapting herself to the relations between the U.S.S.R. and the capitalist countries on the one



hand and the U.S.S.R. and her allies on the other. During Krushchov's rule Stalin's terroristic regime was denounced, a number of basic concepts were severely criticized and the advance toward socialism by different roads, including its realization by parliamentary means, was approved. Yugoslavia even went further and made a thorough examination of Leninist assumptions in respect to relations with the capitalist countries as well as internal administration and economy. The main European Communist parties also adapted themselves to the spirit of the times. They replaced the dictatorship of the proletariat with a marked approval of structural reforms while striving for the establishment of popular fronts with socialist and general parties.

#### 20. ON THE RIDDLE OF THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN CHINA

It isn't easy to interpret the significance of the events now transpiring in China. It is even more difficult to take a stand on the fateful struggle between the supporters of Mao and part of the veteran cadres of the communist party in China. Mao's supporters declare that they are acting to save the Chinese Revolution from bureaucratic distortion. They claim that this is a revolution in which large parts of the army and youth are participating and that it is a sort of melting pot to rid the Chinese society and economy of the slag that stuck to them. Although rumors say that there were also victims in these events, this revolution, too, was accompanied by manifestations that sometimes took a frightening and even grotesque form and that it is not without evidences of the cult of personality. We won't be able to draw any final conclusions from the reports we receive from China until the foam disappears from the surface of the water. Then, perhaps, we'll be able to conclude whether this was a necessary uprising against the distortion of the bureaucratic apparatus in order to restore revolutionary initiative and the equalitarian character of the Chinese Revolution or whether it was essentially only a cruel struggle for power. At any event, I would advise that in our evaluation of this momentous event we take a pragmatic approach. We should also evaluate the reasons for the split between the U.S.S.R. and China in the same way.

## 21. ON THE REJUVENATING POWER OF REVOLUTIONARY PIONEER VOLUNTARISM

The very existence of the struggle which is being waged in China against bureaucratic distortion in a regime of centralism and dictatorship is additional confirmation of the fact that there isn't any more severe danger to socialism in construction than the blight of bureaucracy. Bureaucratic centralism in the Soviet Union led directly to a period of Stalinist terror and struck the U.S.S.R. a blow from which she still hasn't recovered. This terror choked all revolutionary initiative of the masses and although the U.S.S.R. is now attempting to shake itself free of all this, the wounds haven't healed as yet.

Revolutionary pioneer voluntarism must be regarded as the climax of democratic socialism in the process of realization not only in Israel but in every country in which a new society is being established.

It is possible that if it were not for the fact that Stalinist terror throttled the revolutionary and pioneering elements in the U.S.S.R. the yearning of comrade Pormanov would have become a reality and on the fiftieth anniversary of the revolution all of us could have blessed the beginning of an era of complete socialistic democracy.

From the history of the kibbutz movement in our country we learn that with the aid of revolutionary pioneering voluntarism it is possible to establish a cooperative society on the highest level ever attained by human society even in a non-socialist state like Israel. This voluntarism is infinitely stronger than any external discipline. In this respect the kibbutz movement can serve as a model lesson not only for our country but for every national and social liberation movement in the world.

## 22. IS THERE A SUBSTITUTE FOR SOCIALISM IN CONSTRUCTION?

I can't support those who try to escape to some imaginary socialism and repudiate socialism which is in the process of being realized. Maybe some one will try to find this imaginary socialism in construction in

Parisian intellectual circles. I visit Paris from time to time and although I met independent socialists that have reservations about communism as we have, I didn't find any people who hastened to repudiate socialism in construction. A specific territory is required for the establishment of a socialist regime and if these thinkers don't have the manifestations of independence on the part of Yugoslavia and Rumania in mind I'm not aware of any place, except Israel perhaps, in which independent socialism is being achieved.

For example, all the signs indicate that the Labour Party will once more lose its majority to the Conservative Party in the next elections. Although Labour tried to nationalize the coal and steel industries, it can be assumed that the non-socialist government in France went farther in this respect. In the last analysis, Labour became entangled in desperate efforts to save British capitalism from its crisis at the expense of the wages and standard of living of the workers. But the conservatives can play this role more skillfully and perhaps even more carefully.

The consistent people among those in our midst who reject socialism in construction in a third of the globe don't even stop at the welfare state of the Labour Party or the Scandinavian socialists. There are even those who, if they were faced with a choice between a socialist regime - even a very faulty one - and a capitalist democracy like the U.S., would prefer the democracy even though it is capitalistic. We have already seen a process of this kind in a majority of the European Social Democrats. All of them divorced Marxism and every change that could bring about the nationalization of the capitalist economy, abolition of classes and the establishment of a socialist regime. This process hasn't skipped our country either.

At the base of all these assumptions is the idea that 50 years after the October Revolution the socialist regime still hasn't demonstrated any superiority either in national economic development or improving the average citizen's standard of living. These people wax enthusiastic about the economic achievements of the U.S., Western Europe and Japan especially. I already mentioned that in spite of all the prophecies of Lenin and Stalin

the capitalist system has demonstrated its power of adaptation and flexibility. Using some of the basic assumptions of Marxism, capitalism freed itself to a large extent from anarchic liberalism that prevailed in the previous century. But it is a fact that in these days of prosperity about 30 million citizens in the U.S. live below the necessary minimum required for a decent existence. Forty per cent (40%) of all the wealth of the capitalist world is now concentrated in the hands of the U.S. and this abundance was only achieved at the price of undernourishment and cruel exploitation that continue to be the lot of entire continents. Relative capitalist stability has also been purchased at the price of the Cold War, which is to say, an intermediary stage between war and peace, and the threat that atomic weapons will be used continues to hover over all humanity.

23. ON THE CRISIS IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE SOCIALIST WORLD  
AND OUR REPRESENTATIVES IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

With the establishment of the United Workers' Party the mutual program of Mapam and Achdut Avodah declared that we are an integral part of the world of the revolution. This was an exaggeration that didn't stand the test of reality. As representatives of the national and social liberation movement of the Jewish people we were never recognized by the communist movement. Therefore approval was only one sided. Later on we contented ourselves with a "connection" with the world of the revolution. This connection could have been justified if it became reciprocal in the course of time. To our sorrow, we failed. There was, indeed, a period in which we at least listened to each other but with the intensification of the Cold War the communist countries tended to pursue a policy of discrimination against us in the quarrel between Israel and the Arab countries. More than this: they raised the Arab states who cooperated with them to the status of allies. Finally they presented the Arab countries as models of the aspiration for peace in spite of the fact that those same countries openly threatened to obliterate us. On the other hand they slandered Israel by calling her an imperialist tool.

with delegations from communist countries gradually became a tool of Arab chauvinism although ostensibly it was supposed to be an institution standing above all national contradictions. The attitude of the peace movement toward us and even toward the Israeli Communist Party which of late cooperates with the two Zionist Socialist parties in the peace committee in Israel worsened to such an extent that the initiating committee of the Afro-Asiatic Convention that was held in New Delhi didn't even bother to invite the Israeli Peace Committee to its discussions. At the end of that convention an announcement was published containing the run of the mill calumnies of the Moscow press against our country. Since the Peace Committee in Israel wasn't even permitted to voice its disapproval of such conduct and since all the communist countries - except Rumania - supported the Arab position in the recent conflict in the Near East, our connection with the world peace movement has been seriously impaired.

But we must also remember that we have become accustomed to the fact that after a period of frost there is likely to be a period of thaw. In the meantime we must react to every affront manfully but without completely closing the gates behind us.

#### 24. CONCLUSION

Our loyalty to the revolutionary socialist principles does not conflict with the yearning for the unification of the Zionist Socialist parties; on the contrary; it is a contribution to this unity. It can contribute to the continuity of our joint struggle for a socialist Israel. In every national or class framework in which we participate we must represent the integration between economic constructivism and the class struggle. This integration is the backbone of worker-pioneer hegemony in the state and the propelling force in our special way to socialism.

The countries in which socialism is in the process of construction are evolving from proletarian dictatorship to socialist democracy. When the October Revolution was confronted with the choice between guarding parliamentary democracy and saving socialism, it chose the later. At that



time it started on the long road that leads to socialistic democracy. This process was halted to a large extent because of the degeneration of democratic centralism from the days of Lenin to bureaucratic centralism and the rule of terror that resulted. Mapam is numbered with those who demand a radical change in the ways of government in the socialist countries and an urgent transition to complete socialist democracy. Mapam sees this change as a necessity in the years before us.

Various roads lead to the realization of socialism. We are advancing in our special way whose main elements are as follows:

A) Ingathering of the exiles of our people; B) Integration of the class struggle with the upbuilding of the country; C) Development of the Histadrut as the forerunner of a Socialist Histadrut; and D) A pioneering regime and workers' hegemony striving to bring about socialism by democratic means.