torious working class of the Soviet Union to build and entrench firmly socialism; it enabled the proletariat in the capitalist countries to strengthen its forces and to develop its vanguard, the Communist Party; it enabled the national liberation struggle of the Chinese and the Indian peoples to unfold to an unprecedented degree. This is portentous for the fate of world imperialism.

ZIONISM AND THE IMPERIALIST WAR

BY PAUL NOVICK

I

ON SEPTEMBER 9, 1939, the Zionist Jewish Agency for Palestine issued the following appeal:

"Fate has decreed!

"His Majesty's Government today declared war against Hitler Germany.

"In this critical hour the Jewish community is called upon to institute a triple guard: for the defense of the fatherland, for the peace of the Jewish people and for the victory of the British Empire."

To leave no room for doubt as to what the Zionist Jewish Agency meant, the head of this agency in Palestine, the "Socialist" David Ben Gurion, issued a call, "War and the Jews in Palestine," outlining the views of official Zionism on the present war and the role Zionist leadership has assigned to the Jewish people. In this call, published in the "Labor" Zionist *Jewish Frontier* for November, 1939, Ben Gurion states:

"There can be no difference of opinion regarding the complete solidarity betwen Jews and the British in this war. With no less fervor than any Englishman does every Jew pray now for the victory of the British Empire. It is not only a common enemy which binds us to England, but also the fact that the Jewish people cannot forget that Great Britain was first to recognize us as a people, to reaffirm our historic connection with *Eretz Israel* [the land of Israel] and to help us in no small measure to rebuild our Homeland.

"Our fate is bound to that of Great Britain. Her war is our war."

Ben Gurion's statement is a libelous attack on the Jewish people. It is not true that "every Jew" is praying "for the victory of the British Empire," or that Jews generally are engaged in that pursuit. It is most emphatically not the case. Certainly, Jews in the United States, even conservative Jews, are least of all worried about the fate of the British Empire. Ben Gurion merely expresses the policies of official Zionism. He gives a clear picture of the role the *Zionist leadership* has assumed.

The White Paper issued by the Chamberlain Government in May, 1939, aiming at the destruction of the National Home it promised to Zionism, did not stop the true servants of British imperialism from offering their services and their prayers as soon as war was declared. The "appeal" of the Jewish

Agency follows its call "for the victory of the British Empire" with a reference to the White Paper, hastening to emphasize that "our opposition to the policy of the White Paper was not directed against England and the British Empire." On the strength of this White Paper the British Government on February 28 issued an order restricting the sale of lands to Jews in a majority of districts in Palestine (retroactive as of May, 1939). This edict evoked a wave of protest meetings and demonstrations on the part of the aroused Jews in this British imperialist colony. The result: 397 Jews were wounded, two of whom subsequently died. Among the wounded there was the leader of the Left Poale Zion (Workers of Zion) Zrubovel; the secretary of the workers' council in Tel Aviv, Lipshitz; and the poetess Alisheva. The Zionist leadership exerted all its efforts to muffle the outcry of the Palestinian Jews. The bloody treatment Chamberlain accorded the Palestinian Jews (true to tsarist or Hitlerist style) made no impression on his servants. No protest meetings or demonstrations or picketing of consulates was organized in the United States. The president of the world Zionist organization, Dr. Chaim Weizmann, in a speech delivered at Symphony Hall, in Boston, on March 3, stated:

"Whatever the provocation, I and those whom I represent will not deviate from the position enunciated in my letter to Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain at the outbreak of the war. Our loyalty to the Allied cause remains steadfast." (*New York Herald Tribune*, March 4.)

No amount of humiliation and of persecution of Jews on the part of British imperialism, not even bloodshed will halt the services and prayers of the Weizmanns and Ben Gurions.

Is there anything new in this role of the Zionist leadership, a role of servants of imperialism?

II

In a letter addressed to the German Kaiser in September, 1897, Dr. Theodore Herzl states that with Zionist settlement in Palestine, German influence will come into that country. The letter was not dispatched, as Herzl confesses in his diaries, but it represented the view expressed by him to sundry people who were in a position to reach the ear of the Kaiser. Thus, in his entry of September 3, 1897, he relates in his *Tagebuecher* (Vol. V, p. 109), an interview with the Grand Duke of Baden: "I particularly drew attention to the fact that with the Jews there will come to the Orient *German* influence."

Dr. Herzl was the founder and, until his death in 1904, the revered head of the world Zionist movement. He laid the basis for "political Zionism" with his booklet *Judenstaat* (*Jewish State*), published in 1895. He was instrumental in the convening of the first Zionist Congress in 1896 at Basle, where the program of his *Judenstaat* was adopted. He went from duke to prince, from the Sultan to the Kaiser in quest of a charter for

Palestine. He visited the tsarist Minister of Interior Von Plehve shortly after the Kishinev Pogrom, of which Von Plehve was the instigator. He called congress after congress of the world Zionist movement, which he inspired.

What he said to the Kaiser and to the Grand Duke gives us some idea of his political credo and tactics. However, the character of the founder of the Zionist movement, who until this day remains a source of inspiration for Zionist leadership, will be best depicted by what he himself says in that bible of Zionism, *Judenstaat*:

"Suppose His Majesty the Sultan were to give us Palestine," he dreams, "we should there form a portion of the rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilization as opposed to barbarism." (p. 29, English edition.) . . . "I think a democratic monarchy and an aristocratic republic are the two most superior forms of a state. . . . I am a staunch supporter of monarchical institutions because these allow a continuity of policy." (p. 86.)

In his diaries he is more outspoken: "Democracy is political nonsense which could only be decided upon by a mob during revolutionary excitement." (Vol. I, p. 141.)

Clearly, we have to do with a reactionary, a servitor of imperialism. But it will be worthwhile to examine the antics of this Dr. Herzl a bit closer. In his letter to the Kaiser he also states:

"If the German Jews emigrate, this will cause the return of the German-American emigrants. In this way you will gain *unadulterated nationals*, you prevent a collapse which might be difficult to limit, you *weaken socialism*, to which the persecuted Jews have turned because other parties have expelled them, and you gain time to solve the social question." (My emphasis—*P.N.*)

Herzl never tired of pointing out the role of Zionism as an instrument against socialism, for diverting the attention of the Jewish people from revolutionary activities. In his letter to the Kaiser one can clearly discern streaks of *racism*. Herzl offers the Kaiser an inducement: In place of Jews he will gain "unadulterated nationals."

A few more points of information about this founder of Zionism. In his diaries he speaks of the custom of dueling which he will introduce into Palestine. He devotes a full page to the various forms of dueling which he will permit:

"I need the duel, in order to have proper officers and in order to refine the tone of good society on the French model. . . . I shall make our high priests wear imposing ceremonial dress; and our Curiassiers wear yellow trousers, white tunics; officers with silver curiasses." (p. 46.)

Herzl was a member of the editorial staff of the Vienna *Neue Freie Presse*, organ of Austro-German imperialism. For a time he was the correspondent of this newspaper in Paris. He was all for Austro-German imperial interests and he really meant to introduce German influence into Palestine and the Near East. In the interview granted

to him by the Kaiser while on a visit to Jerusalem, Herzl most positively pressed home the point he mentioned in his unmailed letter and in the interview with the Grand Duke of Baden.

At the beginning the Kaiser tended to scorn Zionist services. The Polish Zionist, Dr. Joshua Thon, in his reminiscences of Dr. Herzl, relates what the Polish politician Trapczinski, who was a member of the Reichstag before the war and had access to the Kaiser, told him regarding this matter. The impression Herzl made on the Kaiser was a rather comical one, Trapczinski said. German imperialism at that time was introducing German influence into Palestine through German farm settlements (some of them are still in existence near Jaffa) and by establishing various religious institutions in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and other parts of the "Holy Land." It was only later, prior to and during the World War, that German imperialism grew more alert to the Zionist movement, realizing that it could be utilized as an instrument in the struggle against British imperialism for the "Berlin-Bagdad line" and domination of the Near East.

Zionist leadership under Herzl and, after Herzl's death under David Wolfsohn, continuing to orient itself to German imperialism, was willing. The Zionist movement itself was definitely a Germanizing factor. The official language of the Zionist Congress and *Congress Bulletin* was German. The central organ was published in German (*Die Welt*). There was an attempt to Germanize the Hebrew schools of Palestine in 1913.

During the war, when Turkey was allied to Germany the hopes of the Zionist leadership were raised.

"The German Government was fully alive to the importance of rallying Jewish opinion to her side," the Zionist Revisionist William B. Ziff states in his *The Rape of Palestine* (Longmans, Green, 1938): "The German ruler had once declared to Herzl when he came back from Palestine that he was willing to undertake the 'mandate' for the Zionist settlement in Palestine if Turkey would agree. News reached the British Foreign Office that Baron Rosen, German Ambassador to the Hague, had been in conference with leading Dutch Jews." (p. 55.)

After the Balfour Declaration was issued by the British Government on November 2, 1917, promising Palestine as a "national home" for the Jewish people, the German Government made several other overtures. On December 17, 1917, Talaat Pasha told a correspondent of the *Vossische Zeitung* that he was prepared to offer German Zionists some form of chartered company with local self-government of a limited character and rights of immigration into Palestine. By July, 1918, the German Government finally secured the concessions from Turkey, but by that time Palestine was already in the hands of the Allies. As a matter of fact the scales were tipped with the entry of the United States into the war. Hegemony of Zionism definitely went to pro-British bourgeois Jewish leaders. With the defeat of German imperialism the pro-German element in Zionism was reduced to a minimum.

III

That the Balfour Declaration was issued by the British Government as a means of gaining support in the world imperialist war against Germany is now generally admitted. The Royal Commission itself (Peel Commission) in its report issued in July, 1937, frankly admits that: "The Balfour Declaration was issued in 1917 in order to enlist the Jewish support for the Allies" (p. 24); that the British were afraid that "Syria and Palestine might be made the base for Turko-German attack on the Suez Canal." The war-time Prime Minister of Great Britain, Lloyd George, in a statement in the House of Commons on June 19, 1936, was even more candid: "It was important for us to seek every legitimate help we could get. We came to the conclusion from information we received from every part of the world that it was vital we should have the sympathies of the Jewish community."

But this truth was told—nineteen years later. In 1917, while still Prime Minister, Lloyd George, like Lord Arthur Balfour and the other builders of the Empire, engaged in the most grandiloquent talk calculated to create the "necessary" illusions among the persecuted Jews in the various countries of Europe and among Jews generally. Great Britain was nothing but the savior of the Jewish people, with no interests of its own in the matter of Palestine. "Great Britain extended its mighty hand in friendship to the Jewish people to help it to regain its ancient national home and to realize its age-old aspiration," Lloyd George loftily declared. Bourgeois Zionist leadership kept up a constant tom-tom among the Jewish people to arouse enthusiasm for the Allies, through meetings, parades, celebrations and what-not. The Zionist following sincerely seeking a solution for the suffering Jewish people was kept in a state of exaltation, ready for any sacrifice for the cause of Great Britain and its allies. Britain was the Great Liberator! The end of persecution was in sight!

Nor was this all. Zionist leadership undertook to mislead thousands of Jewish youth who enlisted in a Jewish regiment under the leadership of Vladimir Jabotinsky, at that time a member of the world Zionist executive. Many of these youth laid down their lives in order to help bring about the victory of British arms in Palestine.

Nor was this all. The late Jacob de Haas, a former secretary of Dr. Herzl and at the time of the World War one of the chief leaders of Zionism in the United States, admitted the following in 1928, after a series of disappointments with British policies:

"Did the British [during the war] need to obtain a contact in Odessa . . . a trustworthy agent in Harbin? . . . The New York office [of the Zionist organization] rendered all these services, asking nothing but receiving much, the respect and

good-will of the men whose signatures counted in great affairs." (The *Menorah Journal,* February, 1928.)

The implication of this is quite clear. De Haas' admission, by the way, substantiates the contention of Soviet authorities that the Zionist organization was and is acting as an agent of British imperialism, "in Odessa," etc., etc.

Did Zionist leadership really believe that Great Britain was merely interested in solving the Jewish problem and in establishing a Jewish national home in Palestine? Of course not! The Balfour Declaration was one of the shabbiest forms of British imperialist double-dealing, part of a whole line of trickery to mislead both Jews and Arabs. Prior to the Balfour Declaration (in 1916) there was the agreement between the British representative Sir Mark Sykes and the French representative Georges Picot, which provided for the division of the land bridge between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf into five distinct regions. According to this agreement Palestine was to be "subjected to a special régime to be determined by agreement between Russia, France and Great Britain."

Prior to this, in 1915, there was the promise made to the Arabs in the letter of the then British High Commissioner in Egypt, Sir Henry McMahon, addressed to the Arab King Hussein. The British Government claims that McMahon "meant" to exclude Palestine from the areas promised to the Arabs, but the letter was so phrased as to create the impression among the Arabs that Palestine was included.

Zionist leadership certainly knew about this letter. They knew that in 1917 British airplanes showered the Arab population with leaflets and proclamations signed by King Hussein. One of these proclamations, quoted in the Report of the British "Commission on Palestine Disturbances of August, 1929" (Shaw Commission), spoke of "liberating all Arabs from the Turkish rule"; it called upon the Arabs to fight for "the preservation of religion and the freedom of the Arabs generally"; it spoke of an "Arab kingdom." (p. 126.) This and similar proclamations were spread by the British among the Arabs in Palestine, as well as other regions of Arabistan. Some of the leaflets showered upon Palestine from British airplanes were addressed "To the Arab Officers and Soldiers in the Turkish Army in Palestine."

Zionist leadership certainly knew about these proclamations as well as about the activities of Lawrence of Arabia who, with the aid of enormous funds supplied by the British Government, was organizing the Arabs to fight the Turkish army. Lawrence was more lavish in his promises on behalf of the British Government than was Sir Henry McMahon. Zionist leaders who most certainly were kept informed by their representatives in Palestine and Egypt knew that the British Government was playing a double game. Soon after the Balfour Declaration was issued the Soviet Government, in publishing the secret documents of the tsarist Foreign Office, uncovered the Sykes-Picot agreement. Both before and after the declaration was issued the nefarious role played by British imperialism was known to Zionist leadership. The blind could see that even the wording of the declaration itself was part of the contemptibly tricky game to utilize both the yearning of the Jewish people for a solution of their problems and of the Arab people for independence. Nevertheless, the Weizmanns and the other leaders of Zionism kept up the harangue about the "glory" of this declaration and the "liberation" British Government has promised, guaranteed, etc.

Anybody at all acquainted with the struggle between German and British imperialism for the railway to Bagdad knew that the British Government was interested in securing Palestine for itself, for British imperialism. Palestine is situated on the Suez Canal, athwart the life-line of the British Empire. It is the only section of Arabistan (outside of Syria held by the French) facing the Mediterranean Sea. It is situated along the land-route to India. It possesses the Harbor of Haifa where the pipeline for Mosul oil, in Iraq (Mesopotamia), terminates. Palestine is a most valuable strategic position for British imperialism. This was well known in 1917. Chatham House in London, which represents the unofficial forum for the builders of the Empire, admits all that and even more in its report, *Great Britain and Palestine, 1915-1936.* Palestine, the report says, is vital "for the whole British Commonwealth with its . . . Moslem population of 100,000,000." (p. 9.) Opponents of Zionism, prior to the Balfour declaration and particularly afterwards, kept pointing out the true role of British imperialism in relation to Palestine. Zionist leadership would have none of that. They had nothing but hallelujahs for British imperialism.

Soon after the declaration British imperialist provocations began to bear fruit. There was bloodshed in Palestine in 1920, there was bloodshed in 1921, and there was more bloodshed in the ensuing years (1929, 1931, 1933, 1936-1938). Zionist leadership blamed everybody but British imperialism. They blamed the Mufti, forgetting that he was a creature of British imperialism, appointed to his post by the first British High Commissioner in Palestine, Sir Herbert Samuel, despite the opposition of the Moslem High Council at that time! (After the founding of the Communist Party in 1924, certain Zionist leaders at last discovered the culprit: the Communist Party!)

At no time would Dr. Weizmann and his fellow Zionist leaders permit themselves to take any action that might offend British imperialism. Dr. Weizmann was praised by Lloyd George for his services during the world imperialist war as chemist in the Admiralty Chemical Laboratories where he devised a substitute for the exhausted English supplies of acetone, used in making the basic material in gunpowder. After the war he helped British im-

perialism supply the proper explosives for Palestine. The policy of Zionist leadership, particularly that of the "socialist" wing who to this day do not permit the admission of Arab workers into the labor unions of the Histadruth (Jewish Labor Federation), excellently serves the line of British imperialism: divide and rule.

On the eve of the second imperialist war, when agents of the British Colonial Office openly spoke of a "Jewish militia of fifty thousand men" which was being considered by "military experts" of Great Britain (cable by Augur, to the *New York Times* of January 19, 1936), Zionist leadership saw no cause for alarm or objection. On the contrary, the late Lord Melchett, a leader of British Zionism, stated in a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* that the ". . . imperial solution of the Palestine problem would provide the British Empire with a healthy and intelligent population in the Near East always ready in the case of necessity to take up arms in an imperial cause."

In his *Thy Neighbor* (H. C. Kinsey & Co., 1937), Lord Melchett speaks at length of the benefits Zionism will bring to the British Empire also from a military standpoint. The President of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, Dr. J. L. Magnes, strongly took issue with Dr. Melchett. In a letter to the *Manchester Guardian* answering Melchett, Magnes ironically declared: "This poses the question very neatly."

Very neatly, indeed.

IV

"Did the British need to obtain a contact in Odessa . . . a trustworthy agent in Harbin? . . . The New York office rendered all these services, asking nothing but receiving much, the respect and good will of the men whose signatures counted in great affairs."

De Haas who wrote these lines was too modest. As one of the chief leaders of the Zionist organization of America at that time, he might have known that many an American Zionist leader was not at all content with the role of a servant of British imperialism.

For American imperialism, too, was interested in Palestine. The aforementioned report, *Great Britain and Palestine, 1915-1936*, discloses that President Wilson was not at all anxious to have Palestine secure for Britain.

"He sent a private American commission—under A. C. King and C. R. Crane—which received petitions and interviewed delegations all over Palestine in June-July, 1919. The chief points in the report affecting Palestine were strong sentiment favorable to complete independence for a United Syria (including Palestine) but if supervision were necessary, the United States was preferred, rather than Britain." (pp. 17-18.)

The interest President Wilson took in Syria and Palestine had little to do with solving the Jewish problem or any of the problems of persecuted nationalities. Mainly, it had to do with the famous Chester Concession and the interests of Standard Oil in the oil fields of Mosul-Iraq. The Chester Concession, granted by the Turkish Government to Rear Admiral Colby Chester in 1909 for the building of ports and railways and the exploitation of mines by American capital, covered a territory stretching from Angora down to Mosul and therefrom to the border of Persia. After the World War the Chester Grant again came to the fore. The Ottoman American Developing Co. was subsequently organized or reorganized, with General George W. Goethals as president. The concession was finally put into effect by order of the Turkish Government in 1923. The interests of Standard Oil in Mosul were the cause of a note addressed by Wilson's Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby (November 20, 1920) protesting to Great Britain against the exclusion of American interests from mandates established under the League of Nations. The particular object of Colby's protest was the understanding between Britain and France reached at San Remo, April 25, 1920, excluding Standard Oil from the Mosul oil deal.

American imperialism has always been alive to the importance of Palestine as a strategic position for the domination, commercial and otherwise, of the Near East, and one must either be naive or insincere to state as did de Haas that American Zionist leadership under Justice Brandeis and Judge Julien W. Mack "rendered all these services, asking nothing." De Haas, in his book, *Louis D. Brandeis*, informs us that it was under Brandeis' influence that Zionists went to Milwaukee in September, 1917, to assist Samuel Gompers in mobilizing the American labor movement for the imperialist war. The real purposes of that war have long been clearly established. President Wilson performed the task of supplying flowery "idealistic" messages and speeches to the prosaic interests of American monopoly capital. The letters of Bainbridge Colby recently published by the State Department offer additional material to establish the role of "idealistic" Wilsonism during the last World War. One can therefore be forgiven the suspicion that "idealistic" Zionist leadership connected with Wilsonism had at least some regard for "American interests" in the Near East.

Here perhaps is the key to the schism between the Brandeis-Mack faction of Zionism and Dr. Weizmann. The Brandeis-Mack faction split away from the Zionist organization of America (rather from Weizmannism), in 1921, when it was clearly established that the so-called Jewish National Home in Palestine was merely an instrument of British imperialism. Likewise, it had become clear that the world Zionist leadership under Dr. Weizmann had resolved not to be provoked regardless what British imperialism did to the Balfour Declaration and to Palestine itself.

What is true of the effect of imperialistic rivalries on Zionist developments in the United States is also true of France where the Zionist movement is extremely weak. French imperialism, as seen from the Sykes-Picot agreement of

1916 referred to earlier, staked much on obtaining Syria together with Palestine. In 1926, a representative of the French Government, in an interview with the then editor of the Palestine Hebrew daily, *Doar Hayom,* regretted the fact that such a leader of the bourgeois Jews in France as Sylvain Levi, did not understand Zionism. If he were to grasp the significance of Zionism, the French imperialist stated, Levi could have been at the head of world Jewry, thereby assisting in raising the "moral prestige" of France.

The Brandeis-Mack faction attempted to perform the task M. Levi failed to grasp, but without much success.

As an instrument and servant of imperialism, Zionism could not but be affected by the rivalries between British, French, and American finance capital. For the present, it is British imperialism which has sole claim to this instrument.

V

It is no wonder, then, that Zionism, with a record of imperialistic service—or aspirations to serve—with a program that requires the foisting of a Jewish majority over the Arab population of Palestine (as is implicit in Zionism and as was openly stated by one of its foremost leaders, M. Ussishkin*) should at an early stage develop expansionist aspirations—imperialism in embryo.

One must again turn to the "Socialist" Zionist leader, David Ben Gurion, who is often brutally outspoken. We heard him call for "a military alliance with England" for the purpose of securing "the victory of the British Empire." However, this is not his sole purpose.

In August, 1935, in a speech at the Nineteenth Zionist World Congress at Lucerne, Mr. Ben Gurion thus outlined the expansionist perspective of Zionism:

"The borders of Palestine do not extend from Dan to Beersheba, but from at least 250 kilometers farther south. The Red Sea has played a great part in Jewish history. During Solomon's time the first effort to create a Jewish fleet was made, but not with a Jewish personnel. We must not let ourselves be dominated by present-day conditions, but must hold to the historic line. Our economic structure, husbandry as well as industry, which is principally based on the home market in *Erez Israel* must seek a connection with the great hinterland of Palestine, with Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Persia, perhaps even with India. We must be independent of the artificial route of the Suez Canal. We must find our own way toward all the Asiatic countries." (*Kongresszeitung,* official organ of the Zionist Congress, No. 3, p. 4; also *Jewish Frontier,* October, 1935.)

Immediately after the issuance of the Balfour Declaration Dr. Weizmann made the statement that "Palestine is to be as Jewish as England is English" for which he was sharply called to order by Winston Churchill in his White Paper of June, 1922. Quite naturally, Zionistic expansionist aspirations came into conflict with British imperial interests just as Ben Gurion's sweep towards the Red Sea and

* *Palestine Undivided,* Tel Aviv, May, 1938.

beyond would unfailingly bring him into imperialist hot water. But the imperialistic and conquestadorian aspirations of Zionist leadership are there. More clearly are these aspirations, formulated by the Jewish fascist leader, Vladimir Jabotinsky, who openly advocates the removal, even by force, of Arabs, not merely from Palestine, but from Transjordania as well. Jabotinsky and his followers are openly advocating the slogan that Palestine must be conquered by the "sword." But this imperialistic, anti-Arab and anti-Jewish policy is simply Jabotinsky's old line. As far back as 1925, as head of the propaganda department of the world Zionist executive, Jabotinsky stated:

"Zionist colonization must be either terminated or carried out against the wishes of the native population. This colonization can, therefore, be continued and make progress only under the protection of a power independent of the native population—an iron wall which will be in a position to resist the pressure of the native population. This is, in toto, our policy towards the Arabs. . . . A voluntary reconciliation with the Arabs is out of the question either now or in the near future." (E. Liebenstein, *The Truth About Revisionism,* League for Labor Palestine, New York, 1935, p. 9.)

And again: "During colonization there is no justice, no law, no God in heaven" (p. 53), as Jabotinsky stated in 1928, in a speech in Tel Aviv, *while still a member of the world Zionist executive.* As head of his own New Zionist Organization (N.I.Z.O.), an out-and-out fascist body, he nevertheless was warmly received by the Zionist press in the United States on his visit to this country last March, and there are constant negotiations for a reunion between the N.I.Z.O. and the parent body.

In furtherance of their aspirations, and hoping for a *quid pro quo* from British imperialism, the Zionist leaders seek to draw the Jewish people into the imperialist war. "Military aid to Great Britain and her allies must be given," Ben Gurion proclaims in the above-cited article in the November, 1939, issue of *Jewish Frontier.* "The military authorities may call on our technicians and professional men for the needs of the British Army." Ben Gurion does not mention the fact that there are many thousands of misled Jewish youth already mobilized in Palestine for the needs of the British military. And while Ben Gurion called upon American Jews to be "ready," Jabotinsky arrived here with the explicit purpose of establishing a "Jewish Army" for the Allies. This was his main slogan at a meeting New York Zionist-Revisionists arranged for him at Manhattan Center on March 19. Jabotinsky admitted that a victory for the Allies would bring no hope for Jews in Europe; yet his aim is to become a partner in this war by placing a "Jewish army" at the disposal of the Allies.* A partner—

* *The New Palestine,* official organ of the Zionist organization of America, in its issue of March 22, comments editorially on Jabotinsky's address: "The setting of the stage was Revisionist in color and tone but there was a general Zionist audience in the hall and Mr. Jabotinsky's address could have been delivered without causing the slightest ripple of dissent in a meeting of official Zionist auspices."

for what purpose? For a Palestine more than double the present size (including Transjordania) where colonization would be carried through *without* justice, law or God.

Almost without exception Zionist leadership is anti-Soviet, in most cases violently so. The solution of the Jewish problem in the Soviet Union was the greatest blow Zionism has received. The fact that two million more Jews, formerly persecuted under the semi-fascist Polish government were liberated, made matters still worse—for Zionism. Zionist leadership continuously speculates on the persecution of Jewish people in various lands as a stimulus for immigration to Palestine. The destruction of the scourge of fascism in Germany would hardly be welcomed by Zionist leadership, since this would stop the flow of emigrants towards Palestine. The Jews of former Polish Ukraine and White Russia are no more candidates for emigration and can no more be told that Zionism will solve their problems; their problems have now been truly solved by the Soviets. No wonder the Zionist leadership of the World Jewish Congress (Dr. Nahum Goldman, etc.) has "recognized" the Polish "government" in France consisting of known pogromists. Zionist leadership hopes for a day when the two million Jews would be brought "back to the fold."

VI

The present imperialist war has again demonstrated that the interests of Zionism run counter to those of the Jewish people, who have nothing to gain from the imperialist war. We have seen Jabotinsky admit that "even" a victory of British-French imperialism will not bring a solution for the plight of the Jews in Europe. The *Congress Bulletin,* organ of the Zionist American Jewish Congress, in its issue of April 12, states:

"The energy generated in us by the European catastrophe will have to be spent on internal consolidation and preparation for the day when we, the only Jewry left intact, will appear before the makers of a new world to demand compensation for our people's sufferings."

The Zionist leaders have no objection to extending a war which will bring untold suffering to millions of Jews in Europe, most of whom will be uprooted, many exterminated. Zionist leadership is gratified by the thought of asking for compensation; but the Jewish people wants no *compensation*—it wants to preserve Jewish life—by participating in the struggle to stop this hellish imperialist war!

Zionist leadership, however, is eager to extend this war. During the first World War this leadership took some time before it decided on which side of the imperialist scale to throw its weight. That was the period when Zionist orientation went through the process of switching from German imperialism to British. In the present war the veteran servants of British imperialism jumped in with full force at the very outset. The Zionist Jewish Agency of Palestine, as we have seen, calls for the victory of the British Empire. In the United States, the leader of American Zionism, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, declares with his customary oratorical flourishes that "our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, are with the democracies. Their fate is our fate, our future is bound up with their future." Lest there be misunderstanding as to what he means by "democracy" and "dictatorship," Mr. Wise states: "We are not morally neutral as between England and Germany, between France and Russia." (Quoted from his annual report as President of the American Jewish Congress before the conference of that body on February 11, 1940.) Mr. Wise is at war with the Soviet Union—for reasons outlined above. At the infamous Madison Square Garden meeting on December 13 Wise made a ferocious attack on the Soviet Union (the main issue was "Finland" and Herbert Hoover was an "attraction" at the meeting). Wise gave full endorsement to the expressions and efforts of Dr. Nahum Goldmann, chief executive of the World Zionist Congress, to secure the formation of a Jewish legion.

The idea of a "Jewish army" has appeal for American Zionist leadership. In the editorial on the Jabotinsky meeting quoted above, *New Palestine* sympathetically outlines his demand that "the Zionist movement must . . . make its own contribution to the prosecution of the war by placing a Jewish army at the disposal of the Allies." (*New Palestine,* March 22, 1940.) And the president of the Zionist organization of America, Dr. Solomon Goldman, in a speech delivered before the twentieth annual convention of women's Zionist organization of America (Hadassah), boasted that in Palestine "one hundred and ten thousand men, twenty-five thousand women have indicated their readiness to serve in the armies of the democracies." This doubles Augur's estimate of 50,000 Jewish young men British military experts hoped to obtain through Zionist services in Palestine.

Contrary to the wishes and interests of the Jewish people in the United States as well as Palestine, Zionist leadership is trumpeting for war and has already made contact with military authorities, as admitted by Dr. Nahum Goldmann openly in the *Congress Bulletin* of April 3, 1940, and confidentially in the *Day Book of the World Jewish Congress,* which is being circulated among the "elite" of Zionist leadership. That *Day Book* contains a "strictly confidential" letter to Stephen S. Wise "from the Central Bureau of the World Jewish Congress" in Geneva, dated December 9, 1939. The letter reports that in Paris members of the executive committee sent a communication to "Premier" Sikorski of the Polish "government" established in the French capital, "declaring that the World Jewish Congress recognized his Government as the sole sovereign power in Poland and hence in the Lublin area." (*Day Book,* p. 49.) This "government" consists of known anti-Semites and pogromists, such as General Jusef Haller whose hands reek with the blood of Polish Jews. Also, this "govern-

ment" has hopes of "restoring" the Western Ukraine and White Russia under its regime. Its anti-Semitic character is so pronounced that even the *Congress Bulletin* (April 12) is forced to express polite editorial regret over an attack contained in the official organ of this "government," *Glos Polski*, on the idea that in the contemplated Polish Republic the rights of the Jewish minority be guaranteed. Naturally, the World Jewish Congress does not propose to withdraw its "recognition" of this "government." On the contrary, the *Congress Bulletin* notes with pride that a certain Dr. Ignac Schwarzbart, who has a long record as traitor to the interests of the Polish Jews and a servant of the anti-Semitic government while still in Warsaw, "joined the Polish National Council at the behest of the World Jewish Congress."

The old line all the way through, the line of serving imperialism, a line of cooperating with pogromists.

VII

There can be no question that most followers of Zionism are sincerely seeking a solution of the Jewish problem. This does not change, however, the basic role of Zionism which from its inception has been an instrument of imperialism and reaction.

Ever since its inception Zionism has been an instrument of the Jewish bourgeoisie to hamper the struggle of the Jewish masses everywhere for their rights; a means of diverting the attention of the Jewish workers from the class struggle and of keeping them separated from the progressive forces of other nationalities. This is the case in every persecuted nationality: the reactionary chauvinistic elements strive to utilize the sufferings and despair of the people in order to mislead it, to isolate the progressive elements of that nationality with the wall of chauvinism.

While Zionism has always been telling the Jewish workers that in their struggle for liberation they must rely on themselves alone and must have no partnerships with the workers of other nationalities, it now, as always, calls for partnership with the reactionaries of other nationalities, the imperialists and war-makers. While revolutionary internationalism and the revolutionary struggle of Jewish workers together with workers of other nationalities was always condemned by the Jewish chauvinists as a betrayal of Jewish interests they now call for a Jewish army to fight for the imperialist cause. But ever since the birth of Zionism progressive Jews have been pointing out that the Jewish question cannot be solved independently of the struggle of the progressives of other nationalities.

After the Kishinev Massacre of April, 1903, Lenin told the Jewish workers that the forces of the Jews alone are not sufficient to overcome the Von Plehves and other persecutors but that they must unite with the Russian and other workers for this purpose. The Russian Revolution and the complete emancipation of the Jews together with

other peoples in the former tsarist "prison of nationalities" has fully proved the correctness of the Leninist teaching. The Jewish people can expect nothing but new betrayals and more bloodshed at the hands of British and other imperialists. It is the policy embodied in the Soviet Union which is now the safe haven of over five million Jews, a policy of friendship among nationalities, a policy of the rebirth of nationalities under a socialist order that must be supported by all progressive Jews.

It is not within the scope of this article to review the achievements of the Jewish people under socialism in the Soviet Union. We witness there the flowering of Jewish culture. There has taken place a veritable rebirth of the Jewish people economically, with hundreds of thousands of Jewish farmers, with a Jewish proletariat in heavy industry—an almost completely productive people (because of government assistance, because of the absence of any discrimination against Jews in heavy industry). The Jews in the Soviet Union have not only achieved equal rights; there are Jewish national districts in the Ukraine and the Crimea (where Jewish collective farms are concentrated) and there is the Jewish Autonomous Region of Biro-Bidjan—Jewish statehood—where Jews are acquiring all the characteristics of a full-fledged nation.

Eight days after the October Revolution, on November 15, 1917—the Soviet Government, over the signatures of Lenin and Stalin (at that time People's Commissar of Nationalities), issued the Declaration of the Rights of the Nationalities of Russia which proclaimed:

". . . the equality and sovereignty of the nations of Russia,—the right of the nations of Russia to free self-determination; the removal of every and any national and national-religious privilege and restriction; the free development of national minorities and ethnographic groups."

This declaration, the fulfilment of a policy for which Lenin and Stalin fought ever since the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Party in 1903, is embodied in Article 123 of the Stalin Constitution, adopted in 1936, safeguarding all these points and calling for the prosecution of all national and racial discrimination and prohibiting special privileges for any national group to the detriment of others. As to anti-Semitism, there could be no sharper and more decisive statement than that made by Stalin in reply to an inquiry by the correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency on January 12, 1931. Stalin stated:

"Replying to your inquiry, national and race chauvinism is a survival of the man-hating ethics characteristic of the period of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism, as an extreme form of race chauvinism, is the most dangerous survival of cannibalism. Anti-Semitism benefits the exploiters, for it serves as a lightning conductor to divert from capitalism the blows of the toilers. Anti-Semitism is dangerous for the toilers, for it is a false track which diverts them from the proper road

and leads them into the jungle. Hence, Communists, as consistent internationalists, cannot but be irreconcilable and bitter enemies of anti-Semitism. In the U.S.S.R. anti-Semitism is strictly prosecuted as a phenomenon profoundly hostile to the Soviet system. According to the laws of the U.S.S.R. active anti-Semites are punished with death."

The eradication of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union is not a matter of "kindness" and "decency" of this or that government leader: Anti-Semitism is "profoundly hostile to the Soviet system" which is building socialism. Under socialism, *all* national and racial discrimination and persecution is *impossible*. The lesson from this to be drawn for the Jews in the United States as well as other countries is clear: *socialism*—and only socialism—will solve the Jewish question. Alongside the every-day struggle against anti-Semitic attacks and discriminations there must be a struggle against *capitalism*, the source feeding the dark forces of the anti-Semites, the lynchers, etc.

It is not within the scope of this article to discuss the problems of the Jews in Palestine. Suffice it to point out that Communists are vitally interested in the security, the welfare, and the national and social liberation of the Jews living in Palestine. In its memorandum submitted to the Woodhead Commission, August, 1938, the Communist Party of Palestine stated that "they [the Jewish people] are interested in the solution of their national, social and economic problems and they are prepared to accept any solution which will grant them national, social and economic rights in Palestine as in every other country of the world." The demands embodied in that memorandum include: "national, cultural and religious autonomy for the Jewish section of the Palestinian population." The memorandum states: "The Arab countries would again throw open their doors to Jewish refugees from countries of fascist suppression as they have done many a time during the past centuries. . . . Once the nightmare of British imperialist domination" is done away with.

At the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, August, 1935, the representatives of the Communist Party of Palestine stated: "We hate the Jewish Zionist bourgeoisie but we extend a fraternal hand to the Jewish toilers for a joint struggle against imperialism, against Zionism, against the bitterest enemies of the Arab and Jewish peoples in Palestine." The Communist Party of Palestine has been conducting a movement for an understanding between Jews and Arabs, which is still one of the main tasks in Palestine, an understanding that will bring about friendship and cooperation between both nationalities based primarily on a united bona fide trade union movement, with Jews and Arabs equally participating, and which will result in a common struggle against the "nightmare of British imperialism." Some excellent results were achieved prior to the outbreak of the war. The majority of both Jews and Arabs realize the harm of chauvinism, of national hatred, fanned by British imperialism. The recent ban against Jews issued by Britain aims to *prevent* this Jewish-Arab understanding from coming into effect, and to placate the Arab kings, to mislead the Arab people in order to exploit them for war. But the need for an understanding and for a common Jewish-Arab struggle against British domination and for a free Palestine remains, and the forces exist which actively seek this understanding.

In the United States, the struggle against economic and social discrimination (of which Jewish youth in particular are victims) and against anti-Semitism and race hatred generally, present a major task for the working class and *all* progressives, especially for Communists, non-Jews as well as Jews. Anti-Semitism is an instrument of reaction, a means to divide the people in order to exploit them and perpetuate its rule.

The anti-Semites utilize the speeches and statements of the Zionist leaders in the United States and elsewhere to brand the Jews as warmongers. But just as the warmongering servants of Wall Street do not represent the American people who strive for peace (as shown by the Gallup Poll), so the leaders of Zionism do not represent the Jewish people, who are opposed to imperialist war. During the elections for delegates to the World Zionist Congress in 1939 the Zionist movement could not get more than 80,000 votes among the five million Jews of the United States. It is rather the Jewish People's Committee with its stand against the imperialist war and for keeping the United States out of the war which represents the interests and aspirations of the Jewish people.

But precisely because of the publicity the Zionist leaders are given and because of the positions they occupy, Zionism represents a dangerous instrument for dragging the Jewish people into the war and thereby for aiding the forces working to drag America into the war. *The United States News* of April 19 boasted that there are many nationalities in the United States, such as the Scandinavians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, and Austrians who because of "blood ties," are for the Allies. No doubt agents of Wall Street and British imperialism are attempting to mislead these and other national groups who, as part of the American people, are for peace. Similarly, the agents of Wall Street and British imperialism attempt to mislead the Jewish people, thereby aiming also at the interests of the American people generally. Zionism is an instrument of imperialist oppression and imperialist war, and as such must be exposed and fought by the forces of peace, socialism, and national liberation.