

AGAINST IDEOLOGICAL NEUTRALISM

As just mentioned, even in the years during which we kept to the line of non-alignment, Mapai demonstrated its spiritual and ideological adherence to the "free world", i.e. the West. We too supported non-alignment though we were not neutral from an ideological point of view; we associated ourselves of our own free will with the growing socialist world.

What do we mean by association with the socialist world, which is in the process of realizing its goals as laid out by the October Revolution? It is, first of all, a free and independent association. This is in essence a positive approach which does not preclude open criticism of both principles and tactics. We do not intend to place the question of our attitude toward the socialist world at the hub of our Congress proceedings. We have little to add or detract from the resolutions of our last Congress, which took place following the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist party. In the resolutions of our last Congress we took special pains in delineating all the major and minor issues on which we take issue with the political line of the Soviet Communist party. Our major reservations were stated as pertaining to the attitude of the Soviet Union towards the Jewish minority within its borders, to the Zionist movement and to the State of Israel.

These are not cut and dry matters. In 1948, at the very time when the elite of Soviet Jewry, its authors, artists, and leaders, were being exterminated and a tighter policy of forced assimilation of Jews was being enforced — during those very days, the Soviet Union was at the forefront of the nations who supported the establishment of a Jewish state in a portion of what

was then called Palestine. Moreover, at that time, with the Stalinist regime reaching absolute degeneration, and with the beginnings of persecution of Jews as Jews — the Soviet Union increased its support of our country and even influenced its allies to offer us aid in arms and immigration, all this in the midst of a War of Liberation.

As we review the decade which has passed since Stalin's death we notice immediately that many of the faults have since been corrected or are in the process of being corrected, but the forced assimilation of the Jewish minority is still continuing at full speed. Now as before the helmsmen of the Soviet Union do not pay heed to the voice of justice and logic, since they refuse to grant the Jewish minority in their country one of two choices: a) integration within the broader Soviet populace, including guarantees of national and cultural self-determination; b) emigration to Israel. There are socialist countries who did pay heed to the voice of justice and logic and did grant the Jewish minority this choice. Something of the sort took place in Yugoslavia, Poland, and Bulgaria, where the problem of the Jews was solved by offering this choice to the Jews resident there. The vast majority chose the return to Israel and only a small number preferred to remain in their country of residence. It is quite possible that a section of this small minority will eventually join their families in Israel.

A more knotty problem is the attitude of the Soviet Union to the peoples of the region in which we live. This attitude finds expression in a one sided preference for the Arab countries and active participation in their armament. The Soviet Union offers Nasser's Egypt bountiful supplies of such aggressive weapons as supersonic long-range heavy bombers, at the same time ignoring the presence of neo-Nazi missile experts in that same country. Meanwhile the Soviet Union finds moral justification for condemning Israel because it

succeeded in acquiring defensive missiles from America. This unqualified support for the Arabs in their quarrel with us is especially noticeable in connection with the refugee question — this in glaring contradiction to the Soviet stand on the problem of the refugees who were expelled from her neighboring socialist countries.

In recent years, the Soviet Union completely conceded, for this reason, a role which it could have played in achieving peace. Though it is correct to say that the representatives of the Soviet Union had refrained, at peace conferences, from acting directly for rapprochement between the delegations from Israel and the Arab countries, they at least did not present Israeli representatives with accomplished facts, which the latter could not possibly accept. Unfortunately at the assembly of the World Federation of Democratic Youth in Warsaw, a serious mishap occurred. The Soviet Union's delegates wholeheartedly endorsed the antagonistic proposals of the Arab delegations, among them the enactment of a day of remembrance for the "expulsion" of the refugees from Israel and condemnation of the State of Israel for its diversion of the Jordan waters for irrigation purposes, as a supposedly aggressive act against her neighbors. We should like to believe that this wrong will be corrected. In conclusion we are obliged to note that, of late, relations between our country and the Soviet Union show a trend toward widening the already wide rift.

THE ESSENCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE SOVIET UNION AND CHINA

We expressed reservations, both at the last Congress and recently, concerning the attitude of the Soviet Union toward small countries.

Yugoslavia maintained her socialist regime and independence under all circumstances and was a striking example of the struggle for national liberation for

those countries striving to maintain their non-alignment and independence. Lately, we have noticed signs of a new understanding between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

We wholeheartedly supported the aid given by the Soviet Union to the Cuban Revolution. The tactical withdrawal of the Soviet Union at the time of the severe crisis in the Caribbean Sea in October 1962, was a necessary one and saved Cuba from American invasion. But the Soviet Union's dealing with the United States over the heads of the Castro government points to the problematic approach of the socialist metropolis in Moscow toward the independence of small countries.

I suggest to the Congress that we not overindulge in probing the unknown as far as relations between the Soviet Union and People's China are concerned. No one will deny that there is an historic partnership between these two Communist states, although this partnership has been accompanied by tension and disagreement on a number of central problems. We hope that there will not be any open breach between these two powers, though we may assume that the tension between them will continue, stemming, as it does, from differences in historic, economic and political conditions.

One of the main points of discord between these two powers is the Soviet Union's attitude to the neutralist countries. In order to cultivate its contact with the neutralist countries the Soviet Union must supply their economic and military aid at the expense, according to Chinese opinion, of the socialist countries that need this aid. Another point of difference between the Soviet Union and China is connected with the Soviet policies toward the Western states, which are designed to secure competition under peaceful co-existence between capitalism and socialism.

From what I have been able to deduce, so far, I draw the conclusion that China does not oppose the need to prevent war. The difference is that China is

continuing, in contrast to the Soviet Union, to walk a tightrope between "cold war" and "hot war", stressing, at the same time, the military superiority of the socialist bloc and its ability to impose peace on the imperialist camp by means of more unbending policies than those followed by the Soviet Union. As a case in point, the Chinese point to the results of the Korean War and the struggle over the neutralization of Laos, claiming that, in these cases, the American "paper tiger" was subdued by the superior forces of the socialist camp. They severely criticize the supposed improvement of the imperialist position as the result of the Soviet betrayal of certain obligations toward the Cuban people.

China does not favor the friendship cultivated by the Soviet Union with neutralist countries such as India and Ghana. She regards them as bourgeois-national states, and her aggressive attitude toward India is an outstanding illustration of this point of view. As we know, the Indian Communist Party uncompromisingly supported the Indian government when the latter accused China of aggression. We sympathize with the line of self-restraint which the Soviet Union has followed towards India.

But, as we have stated, we hope that an open breach between the Soviet Union and China will not be reached. The fact is that, despite the Soviet government's obvious discomfort in connection with the Sino-Indian conflict, it has been careful not to take any step which could be interpreted partisan or anti-Chinese. It is also clear that were a conflict to break out between the Soviet Union and any capitalist country, China would support the Soviet Union.

I have no doubt that if a majority in the UN compelled the United States and its partners to end their boycott of People's China, the tension between that country and the Soviet Union would be considerably weakened. If the tremendous material difficulties now facing China, during this period of foundation laying,

were decreased, it would serve to moderate her foreign policy. Such difficulties were the lot of the Soviet Union during the years of the first and second five-year plans, and throughout the period of collectivization and early industrialization. However, it is my opinion that our Congress should not concern itself unduly with issues on which it is not sufficiently informed. For instance, we do not really know the true situation in the Chinese communes, or the degree of industrialization, or China's level of development in other fields. I have seen reports which praise China's development to the skies; at the same time I also hear opinions which emphasize her weak points. It is possible that there has been a certain retreat, after the "Great Leap Forward", with progress now proceeding in a more methodical and calculated way, People's China now faces the struggle of its pioneer stage, with all the great difficulties which this entails. Still, we should not ignore a number of interesting facts. First of all, we should point out the most important fact — that China's leadership is composed of the same people who began the revolution in the thirties, and who led the legendary "march to the north". Sometimes there is a tendency toward one method of achieving socialism or another, but this has never involved depositions or head-lobbing. Despite the various turns in direction, the revolution continues to be led by the very same leadership. It is impressive to see how the Chinese Communist Party stands united behind its leadership. All in all, we see that, although they are severe, the conflicting positions of the great communist states are more concerned with tactics than principles. We may assume that these differences are temporary in nature. While supporting the policy of peaceful co-existence fostered by the Soviet Union, we should observe maximal freedom of judgment as to the whole complex of questions under discussion within the socialist camp.

ON CREATIVE MARXISM AND NON-DOGMATIC LENINISM

In order to prevent any misunderstanding I should like to make it clear at the offset that I shall not attempt to draw final conclusions on any of the questions of Marxist theory. My intention is to clarify, to the best of my ability, some timely issues and to prevent any misunderstandings which might form obstacles to our development. First and foremost I should like to turn my attention to defining and classifying certain concepts and their meaning in our lives and struggles.

The revelations of the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party made it necessary to draw conclusions from the Stalin period. This period was marked by retrogression in the ideology and practice of Marxist-Leninist teachings. Nowadays, we tend to be especially attentive to detail as well as bold relief, so as not to fall victim to dogmatism. Our party's last Congress took place in an atmosphere created by the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Its overwhelming sentiments were freedom from dogmatism and doctrinary teachings, faithfulness to vital, creative Marxism and non-dogmatic Leninism.

The most essential sphere in which we called for independent judgment at our last Congress was the basic definition of what is common between Marxism and Leninism, and what is not. I recall that the participations in the debate were grouped around three formulations. A minority of some twenty comrades demanded that we support Marxism-Leninism without any reservation whatsoever. A second minority of about thirty called for extensive corrections. They suggested that we declare our loyalty to Marxism but deemed it sufficient to support the major fundamentals of Leninism; The decisive majority, however, voted for identification with Marxism and Leninism. By

dropping the hyphen they intended to emphasize our independence of the ideological and practical interpretations of questions of Marxism and Leninism deriving from Communist Party Congresses.

That debate has become, in effect, a vestige of the past. I know of no comrades among us today who do not repudiate the depravities of the Stalinist period or who keep to the dogmatic Marxism-Leninism of those times. None of us disagree that we must preserve our independence of judgment and steer clear of the official version of Marxism-Leninism accepted by the Communist Parties. What we want, after all, is to assert our loyalty to the principles of Leninism, while retaining independent judgment in matters of idea and practice, which time and place have brought about. With anti-Marxist and anti-Soviet villification running rampant in our country, the majority felt that we must boldly underline our loyalty to both Marxism and Leninism.

The storm of the anti-Marxist and anti-Soviet diatribe has grown stronger with the years. It isn't surprising, then, that the preparations for our forthcoming Congress were met with vile commentaries in the hostile press, even before the official opening of pre-Congress discussions in the party branches. This same press makes much ado about every hint of variance in our views, building around them imaginary factions. For instance, the recent discussion on ideological collectivity in our kibbutzim was called by these newspapers "a revolt in the ranks".

I am sure the coming Congress, as the last one, will carry on its proceedings in the spirit of loyalty to principles and independence of judgment, and will draw unanimous conclusions as regards our mission. I am not sure that the spotlights turned on our Congress will allow for a satisfactory ventilation of

theoretical problems. Nevertheless, I shall consider here a number of such problems, even though we shall be unable to do them justice at our Congress and will be obliged to refer them for separate examination to smaller frameworks.

DURABLE AND TRANSIENT IN MARXIST THEORY

The foremost permanent foundation of Marxist theory is the scientific and philosophic method of historical materialism and dialectical materialism.

The second permanent foundation is the appreciation of surplus value as a tool used by the masters of the means of production, to draw a maximum of profits from the labor of the worker and to pay that worker a minimum wage. Through this brilliant definition, Marx uncovered the mechanism of capital accumulation in the hands of the ruling capitalist class, and the expropriation and impoverishment of the working class.

The third permanent foundation of Marxism is the fact that in capitalist society, the forces of production and the means of production negate relations of production. This negation, found at the very core of the capitalist order, cannot be destroyed nor can harmony be achieved between the forces of production and the relations of production in economy and society, except by the establishment of a socialist order.

The fourth permanent foundation can be expressed as the designation of the way to socialism through class struggle in the state and through transfer of control over the means of production from the exploiting capitalist class to society at large.

The fifth such foundation is the advocacy of proletarian dictatorship as a necessary transition period from the capitalist state to socialist democracy. It is true

that Marx did not fully appreciate the importance of the national and agrarian questions or suppression of peoples and peasantries, as a stimulant for social revolution. He could not foresee, therefore, that the most progressive revolutionary workers party would appear in East Europe, of all places — in Czarist Russia, and not in the industrialized West. Many revolutionaries, both in the East and the West, were unable to imagine that a socialist regime could be established in one country, encompassed by enemies, endangered by intervention and general siege, as was the case in the Soviet Union between the two world wars. But the fact remains that Marx did envisage proletarian dictatorship, which later arose out of the October Revolution, as a condition for instituting socialism and guaranteeing the transitory phase before socialist democracy.

There is a third foundation, which deserves a place among the durable values of Marxism. It is internationalism, or the international solidarity of the working class, struggling for its rightful share of the national product and governmental power. In our day, internationalism also takes on the appearance of aid to the liberation wars of suppressed nations. Were it not for this international solidarity, the Soviet Union would not have been able to hold out during the twenties. Internationalism is the keystone of the struggle for peace and the national emancipation of suppressed nations. Internationalism receives added impetus from the presence of a bloc of socialist states, who comprise a bastion of strength and a nucleus from which this international solidarity can grow.

I have named six durable foundations of Marxism, but this is not all that goes to make up the Marxist tradition. I could mention the inter-relation of the base and the superstructure, and so forth.

Now I must go on to those Marxist foundations

which are of a more transient nature. Not all the hypotheses of Marxism are irrevocable. Marxism is a viable theory, which combines revolutionary practice together with creative struggle. According to Marx, what counts in struggle is not how to interpret reality, but how to change it, with the help of the premises of Marxist theory.

Here are a number of examples to illustrate what has come to be regarded as transient in Marxism: In the 19th century, during the period of elementary accumulation of capital, there was still a convincing ring to the slogan of the Communist Manifesto, "The worker has nothing to lose but his chains". Today, this slogan may be meaningful in those countries where labor is at a sub-subsistence level, countries which account for a half of the world's population. This category would include many countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa. But the emancipation of nations from the colonial yoke and the progress of the socialist states which provide an example of complete national and social emancipation — free the suppressed laborers of today from the proletarian feeling of a century ago, that "The worker has nothing to lose but his chains". Today's workers, even those of the most backward countries, are free of this feeling, because their path is lit with hope for national liberation and the possibility of socialist victory. In any case, were a speaker in the United States, the Common Market or Scandinavian countries, to return to that slogan, he would undoubtedly bring a smile to the lips of the listeners.

If we want to be honest with ourselves, we must also admit that the theory of absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class needs re-evaluation. Class struggle succeeded, in the course of over one hundred years, and especially in the Western countries, both directly and through the state legislatures, in achieving a considerable improvement in the living standard of the worker and his personal security.

In addition, the very existence of the Soviet Union forced the capitalist governments to grant the worker a fairer standard of living and even a certain amount of social security.

After comparing theory and practice in present-day Europe and America, it becomes impossible to continue supporting the theory of absolute impoverishment of the proletariat. Workers are now guaranteed much more than the minimum wage of the nineteenth century. We may assume that workers in these countries are now insured against absolute impoverishment, primarily because of the absolute impoverishment of the laboring classes in underdeveloped countries, and the maximal exploitation of the latter for the sake of additional capital accumulation in the countries where the workers enjoy a decent standard of living. From whichever way you approach it, when it comes to the more developed capitalist countries, the theory of absolute impoverishment of the proletariat won't hold water.

As for the concept of relative impoverishment of the proletariat, it might as well be replaced by the commonly used term "social gap". It is well known that this social gap is steadily widening even in those countries where the worker has a relatively high wage and living standard. In these countries, there is a widening gap between the minimal wages of workers and the maximal profits of capitalists. In one of the preceding chapters, ("Relations of Capital and Labor in our Country"), I discussed this phenomenon in terms of Israel. I pointed out that the share of the wage-earners in the national income of recent years has become smaller, though the number of wage-earners has risen. This shows the widening gap between classes, or, if you wish, the relative, not absolute, impoverishment of the workers.

It would also be worthwhile, as history has shown, to reformulate the theory of crises. Of course

capitalist economy is not immune to crises, but what does this mean? If we mean a structural crisis in the capitalist economic structure, such as those of the two world wars or that of the year 1929, we may state assuredly, that the antagonistic contradiction at the very core of capitalist economy is still the basic reason for anarchy in the capitalist economy. Some say that, although modern capitalist economy has successfully overcome the type of recurrent crises common to the nineteenth and early twentieth century, and shakes free of the depressions that start up from time to time — this is only a temporary stability, a rosy color on the surface, caused by fever and consuming disease below. They say, and not without grounds, that the more developed capitalist countries are saved from more severe crises by the existence of an army of unemployed, by huge arms budgets, by maximal profits gained from the exploitation of the under-developed countries, and by holding back the forces of production. At the same time, we must not forget that the German "economic wonder" took place without Germany's relying on a reserve of unemployed and without direct exploitation of under-developed countries.

Two men were most instrumental in helping prevent crisis in the West. One was an economist and scholar, Lord Keynes; the second, a statesman named Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I repeat: from the end of the last world war to this day, capitalist economy has suffered set-backs and short recessions, but these cases have been transitory, followed by quick economic recovery.

Even the official Communist press has ceased to predict automatic crises and a sharp decline of capitalism in their wake. Nowadays one hears little of a rapid decline of capitalism following upon the elimination of imperialism.

In fact, the former centers of colonial empires have not suffered rapid economic decline. On the con-

trary, their economies have shown surprising stability. The regime of political enslavement has been replaced by one of economic dependence.

A classic example is the French one. What happened in France after the liberation of its former colonies in Black Africa, and especially after the Evian agreement between France and Algeria? Not only was there no impoverishment in the metropolis, after the seven-year bitter war with Algeria, but France became one of the pillars of the European Common Market.

All the factors add up to one conclusion: The preferability of the socialist regime over the capitalist should be sought in the structural maladies of capitalism and the advantages of socialist economy over capitalist. The capitalist superstructure is incapable of breaking free of the anarchic and antagonistic base upon which it is built. Its freedom from structural crises is still being paid for by the absolute impoverishment of the "other half" of humanity. But capitalism will not long be able, in an era of automation, to coordinate modern means of production with modern relations of production, which depend upon maximal exploitation of the workers and the underdeveloped countries. Socialist economy already ranks first in terms of economic planning, coordination of national and international economy, and integration of modern means of production and relations of production. This superiority will be more obvious with the continued weakening of contradictions between city and village, physical and mental work, and with the achievement of equality for women in economy and society.

THE MODERN TEST OF THE NATIONAL AND AGRARIAN QUESTIONS

There are also some who claim that the Marxism of the nineteenth century did not prove itself, and that since then there has been a change in the evaluation of two factors, upon which depends the success of pre-

sent-day national or social revolution. I am speaking of the national question and the agrarian question. As against this claim, it should be stated that, with the October Revolution of 1917, Bolshevism began a new page of history, because, among other things, it found the root of these two problems and activated their latent power for the success of the socialist revolution.

It is undeniable that, in the 19th and early 20th centuries, Marxism tended to have a cosmopolitan approach, ignoring the national question. History upset this approach. Suddenly, everything fell apart in the maelstrom of World War I. Overnight, a number of outstanding socialists forgot their international outlook; became super-patriots, and brought about the downfall of the International and internationalism. On the other hand, the Bolshevik Revolution sent a clarion call of freedom to the various peoples of the Russian Empire. Undoubtedly, the activation of the national factor in the interest of the revolution was one of the prime agents of socialist victory in the Soviet Union. We can only now realize how great an influence is wielded by the national factor in the struggle for colonial disintegration and the liberation of suppressed peoples. We must not forget: The October Revolution is a milestone at the beginning of the process of national liberation from colonial suppression and from the system which is approaching its end.

The internal regime of the Soviet Union, China, Yugoslavia or the other socialist countries, is based on emancipation of the various nations within their realm. This emancipation takes place there together with the laying of the economic and social foundations for the socialist regime.

There is another factor not sufficiently appreciated

in the nineteenth century, which later was recognized as both a powerful motivating factor and a great obstacle to the achievement of the socialist revolution. It is the vital connection of the city and village, and the integration of the peasantry in the processes of achieving socialism.

We know that, to this day, the problem of integrating the peasant and agriculture in general within the program of socialist construction is a weak point in all the socialist countries. Certainly, mechanization of agriculture and the preparation of an educated and disciplined generation of farmers, will eventually create a successful bridge between city and village, to the point where agriculture will be structurally and organically integrated within the broader socialist society. But the builders and fighters still have a long road ahead. There could be no better example than that of agriculture in the socialist countries, of how long a road still remains before the achievement of socialism. With all due regard for innovations and mechanization, it will be a long time before grain is grown by assembly-line methods or domestic animals bred by automation. Agriculture will not be encouraged except by free cooperative association, attachment to the soil, and improvement of skills on both the individual and collective levels.

Search and experiments will go on for a long time to come, before a form of economic organization and social association is found which is more suitable to socialist agriculture. The debate will go on as to the means of bridging the gap between city and village. We hear, from time to time, of new probings and experiments in China, the Soviet Union or Yugoslavia. The Chinese communes have changed form several times within a relatively short space of time; and these are still the beginnings. Indeed, there is no problem

more involved and unbending than that of integrating agriculture within the wider sphere of socialist productive relations.

Everything that has been said here about the transient premises of Marxism is no less true of Leninism. Here, too, we are coming to believe that certain things, which were very meaningful in the days of the October Revolution, are now outmoded. Take, for example, the problem of peaceful co-existence.

In Lenin's day, during the siege and intervention, when the Soviet Union fought for its life in an atmosphere of antagonism and intrigue, it would have been hard to imagine that the day would come when a Congress of that same Bolshevik Party would reach the conclusion that war with imperialism is no longer inevitable, that not only socialist countries, but also capitalist and imperialist countries, are capable of rejecting the course of war in favor of economic and political competition as a guarantee of peaceful co-existence between different social orders. It may be an armed peace, accompanied by Cold War which sometimes flares into active war in odd corners of the world. But the danger of total annihilation inherent in nuclear weaponry restrains the rival sides and makes them conscious of the need to maintain a balance of power and an armed peace.

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM

Whereas some of the Marxist premises have, with time, changed in meaning and require periodic reassessment, the method of thought of dialectical and historical materialism has stood the test of time.

How disconcerting, then, is the following disclosure: At the end of the eighteenth and in the nineteenth centuries, before the discoveries that extended

human knowledge to unimagineable dimensions, there was already an unflinching faith in human wisdom, the objective character of material reality and the correctness of the dialectical-materialistic approach in philosophy. It was an era of belief in man's ability to unravel the secrets of the universe. Those were the hardest times for clericalism, mysticism and other metaphysical outlooks. Reaction had to concede the separation of religion from state. The clergy were on the defensive continually.

If we examine the history of the Jewish people's movement of renaissance, Zionism, we shall see that it too was essentially secular and progressive. In the time of Herzl and Ruppin, religion did not come to the fore, despite the fact that religious conviction was more widespread then, even among Zionists, than today. The Zionist labor movement, including the Marxist "Poalei Zion" and "Hashomer Hatzair", and the non-Marxist "Hapoel Hatzair", was a secular one.

This has now been reversed. Some imagine that they have unburdened themselves; they scorn objective truth and brand socialism as blind faith. They follow a cult of doubt in everything, regarding this as a sign of man's spiritual freedom. I think that man's spiritual greatness can be evaluated by the extent to which he remains true, throughout life, to his secular and progressive world outlook. The aging man, whose long wait for spiritual inspiration troubles him, needs additional courage in order to hold on to the secular beliefs of his youth. Many find refuge, toward their twilight years, in religious escape. In these days, when so many try to escape from themselves, I regard with awe and homage those whose old age did not put their youth to shame. One such man was Anatole France. Another, may he be with us for many years to come, is our brave mentor, Yitshak Greenbaum. Is it accidental that almost all the reformist movements try, in the process of their degeneration, to find a *modus vivendi*

with the religious elements? How many are the leaders of reformist movements who were non-believers in their prime but, with old age, begin to compromise with religion, adjust to it and, finally, bend their knees.

Mapai has been no exception to this rule; it is, in fact, an extreme example. There are a number of reasons for this: Mapai suffers from internal laxity, and also compromises with the clerical elements because of considerations of expedience. Its members are readmitted to the religious fold through the back door, by means of "Jewish consciousness"; they fill synagogues on holidays.

Are we to be carried along by this blind rush and desert the march to the victory of human intelligence? Shall we fall in with the cult of the "impenetrable"? Why, it is this very unknown which has been fought by enlightened men for thousands of years, so that human intellect might release the light of progress!

The Austro-Marxists tried in the past to weave historical materialism together with Kantian philosophy. Max Adler was most outstanding in this field. I know that some of us might find such a combination appealing; I do not wish to deny their right to such an attitude. There can even be religious people within our membership, though Mapam is by nature secular. These members are perfectly acceptable, as long as they find satisfaction in all the other fields in which Mapam acts and activates its members. Still, we have to continue to struggle with such unnatural combinations.

We have a university in Jerusalem. The spirit fostered there is a mixture of Western liberalism and religious philosophy. What equates the different distillations of this mixture is the antagonism to Marxism and dialectical materialism; and it is the latter that deserves our support and defense.

I believe that dialectical materialism is an integral

part of Marxism. It is a thought process with celebrated achievements in the education of a generation of socialist builders among a third of humanity. You may find in those countries dogmatism, bureaucracy, lack of democracy. But there is certainly no disappointment in education founded on secular culture and the dialectical-materialist world outlook, which guides the struggle for a change in the face of our world. It is precisely because the atmosphere around us has become so contaminated that we must equip our youth with those fundamentals of Marxism capable of imbuing them with lasting power against clericalism and those unenviable aspects of American life which swarm about us.

ON SOCIALIST HUMANISM

There is no reason for prejudice against the American people. We could learn a great deal from them, starting with economic factors and ending with cultural ones. American literature, for instance, has a magic force all its own. One might mention, among others, such American writers as Jack London, Walt Whitman, and the Steinbeck of "Grapes of Wrath".

The trouble is that some of our younger writers take as an example only those writers who represent the more degenerate aspects of American life, writers who see anything healthy and clean-cut as superficial, who look for depth in social decomposition and sexual depravity.

Socialist realism, as symbolized by Gorky, became falsified during the Stalin era. The so-called realism of that period falsified reality, became an instrument of cover-up, wielded by a regime of fear and terror. Since the days when the USSR began to free itself from the darkness of the Stalin era, new poets and writers have appeared and have become part and parcel of the golden chain of Russian humanism. This chain started with the Decembrists and Pushkin, and is

carried on by those thousands of youngsters who congregate around Pushkin's monument, in one of Moscow's squares, to hear such poets as Yevtushenko, Vosnesensky and many others. Those thousands are hungry for new words, rhymes, thoughts and images; they foreshadow the era of Socialist Humanism in the Soviet Union.

Yevtushenko is not, as Western critics thought, an angry young "beat poet". His is the voice of the Thaw. He believes in man and in socialism. So, in the end, if I have to choose between those literary works which busy themselves with sexual perversion and social degeneration, and those works which do not exploit the darker human passions, but try, instead, to draw inspiration from a belief in man and in socialism — it becomes an easy choice.

We educated our younger generation to be able to judge freely, but such a freedom to judge doesn't mean that one has to look back (upon the pioneer era) in anger. The freedom to judge by yourself doesn't mean you have to pick a quarrel with the older generation in order to start everything anew.

Some time ago, before the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party, some of our members were perhaps too closely identified with developments in the Soviet Union. Now, on the contrary, you find comrades who go so far on the road of de-stalinization, that they reject good and bad alike. They so abhor Stalinist injustices, that they now oppose any kind of proletarian dictatorship — even the Yugoslavian. They also are against democratic centralism, even if it is free from bureaucratic symptoms. Some of them even doubt that the socialist regime is preferable, and are ready to adhere to a formalist kind of democracy.

This is an old story. It has been heard, again and again, from Nietzsche's and Shopenhauer's days to our own times. This principle sees force and emotions as more important than conscience and wisdom. It bows

to the myth of the unknown and the mysterious. This ideological super-structure, which likes to cover itself with "non-conformist" labels, is only another way to hide adherence to the latest fashion in our country. These, so-called "freedom defenders" regard belief in socialism as "unnecessary ballast", and defend all that is doubtful and all who doubt.

A great Israeli author, Haim Hazaz, has written against this spirit of levantinism. The trouble is that Hazaz only perceives the symptoms of the sickness, but is unable to reach its roots. These roots grow of course, as the country turns its back upon labor and pioneer education, and becomes anti-socialist; A defeatist spirit infiltrates the schools, universities, and Army. Even our own ranks are not unaffected.

THE CHANCES FOR A SOCIALIST VICTORY THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

I have spoken about durable and transient factors in Marxism as a whole, and have stressed that, among the most durable factors, are dialectical materialism and socialist humanism. One of the long-enduring elements of Leninism, the revolutionary praxis of Leninism, proves itself in the struggle between the socialist and the capitalist systems.

In an age of Cold War, carried out in the shadow of the possible total destruction of mankind, the best way to ensure socialist victory is through peaceful co-existence. This is true in spite of the fact that capitalism has not caved in like a simple card-house — as Lukac was wont to expect. One should not expect further "October Revolutions". The proof of socialism's success, in the future, will be "the day after the revolution", the daily, methodical plowing towards the socialist goal.

In the competition between the capitalist and socialist regimes, one must stress that capitalist monopolies have proven to be much more vigorous and

adaptable than one thought before. Nonetheless, Marxism uncovered the chronic weaknesses of capitalist society. Capitalism is unable to overcome the contradictions inherent in the existence of a few big nations, which exploit the rest, and of a majority of poor nations, who suffer this exploitation. True, colonialism has been decimated. However, the new nations, which were created on the ruins of colonialism, are still unable to take care of the enormous yearly increase of their population. The Latin-American continent is full of so-called independent states, which boast their own presidents and parliaments, created in the North American manner. Yet this population lives in a state of misery and ignorance, and supplies a reservoir of raw material and labor power for the giant U.S. trusts.

In other words: no national independence deserves the name without liberation of the masses from social and economic exploitation. National emancipation is not enough. It must be followed by social emancipation. For such impoverished countries, free Cuba has become the classic example of how a people should take its destiny in its own hands. That is, of course, why the American trusts and their Latin-American hangers-on are so up in arms. They are simply afraid that other South American countries might follow Cuba's example, and go the way of national and social emancipation. And this goes for Africa and for Asia too. In those continents, the peoples are still feeling their way, hesitating between East and West. However, sooner or later, they shall understand that the only way to free themselves is to adhere to the struggle for complete social and national emancipation of all peoples.

Greater democratization of the socialist countries will result in more influence on those peoples. The socialist countries should endeavor, first of all, to free themselves from exaggerated bureaucratism. They should hasten development from a proletarian dictatorship towards socialist democracy, so as to bring those

peoples who free themselves from colonialist exploitation into their sphere of influence. The bureaucratic sickness, which is based on the rule of an elite over the masses, will disappear when ignorant masses are replaced by millions of educated citizens who are able to govern themselves and judge by themselves.

This democratization shall surely become a fact. When that happens, the socialist economy shall become the stronger in its competitive struggle against the capitalist economy, based on the exploitation of man by man and of one people by another.

The advantages of the socialist economy shall become more evident in the Age of Automation, when the machines shall free man, more and more, from unnecessary toil. When that happens, all states shall have to answer the question: should they let the few become richer, exploiting the masses of the jobless, or should they shorten working-hours, while increasing production and establishing fair distribution, according to the principles of a society based on social equality? The dizzying advance in technology, and the resulting growth of productive forces, are forcing capitalist economy to accept partial nationalization. In a society based on increasing automation, this contradiction between technical developments and the growth of productive forces, and the backwardness in relations of production, shall become more and more evident. In the end, this contradiction shall become an obstacle which may only be removed with the aid of further socialization and greater equality.

I once spoke about possible changes in the future of mankind, after war had ceased to be a means of decision. If further nations should adhere — as they most surely will — to the socialist camp, that camp shall eventually encompass about two thirds of humanity. Under these conditions, various solutions shall be

forwarded by those living in the remaining third, the capitalist one, in order to bridge the differences between the two regimes. At the same time, proletarian dictatorships shall gradually give way, in the socialist countries, to socialist democracy. Meanwhile, the necessity for all-inclusive planning of production and mass pressure shall lessen the inner contradictions of capitalism, which will be forced to give way gradually to socialism.

Some of our comrades are impatient over the tempo of democratization in the socialist countries. At Moscow conferences it is often stated that proletarian dictatorship has already given way to a more democratic regime. The truth of the matter is that the gap between words and fulfillment is still wide. We may, therefore, understand the impatience of those comrades, but on reflection, we arrive to the conclusion that even in Yugoslavia, a more progressive country than the rest, the limitations and guarantees which ensure the continuation of socialist rule, and are typical of proletarian dictatorship, have not yet been abolished. It is true that the economy of that country is undergoing further decentralization and democratization. But we, who are after all sympathetic onlookers, do not have the right to say when these limitations should be fully abolished. Not for us to say, for instance, that one should prefer Milovan Djilas as against Tito. Djilas is ready, even now, to give up limitations which ensure socialist rule, but we are convinced that the victory of Djilas' opinions would endanger the existence of socialism in that country.

The lack of such limitations and guarantees would, likewise, endanger the existence of socialist Poland and the rest of the socialist countries. If the Polish Cardinal Wyszynski bows, for instance, to a "modus vivendi" inside the socialist state — Gomulka's government is forced, similarly, to allow certain concessions to the Catholic clergy, as well as to the peasants who oppose

collectivization. All this is valid and sufferable — under one condition: that the socialist state retain guarantees which ensure the march towards socialism.

Our orientation is towards the revolutionary world. Yet, we shall not surrender our ideological and political independence, which is based on the premise that we demand of the Revolution a rapid transition towards socialist democracy. Nonetheless, we believe that the socialist governments should be sure to retain the necessary guarantees, which would allow them to preserve uncompromisingly the basic tenets of the socialist regime.