

VANGUARD NEWSLETTER

Published monthly by independent revolutionary socialists

Editors: Harry Turner, Hugh Fredricks, Robert Davis

P. O. Box 67, Peck Slip Station, New York, N. Y. 10038

Vol. 2, No. 6 Price 10¢ (\$1.00 per year) Labor donated June 1970

Contents: An Outline of Quebec Nationalism	p. 45
Inflation and the Economy --What Inflation Is	48
"Events Without History"	50
Nationalism and Internationalism The Arab-Israeli Question --Leninism and the Middle East	52

AN OUTLINE OF QUEBEC NATIONALISM by Jack Rose

✓ We reprint below a timely article from the April 1970 issue of LABOR ACTION, the monthly publication of our co-thinkers in Canada.

✓ As Cde. Rose shows, our unequivocal support for the right of the Quebecois to separate from Canada, is a step toward uniting the English and French-speaking workers for the socialist revolution.

✓ For our readers' information, the Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere is the sister organization of the Canadian

League For Socialist Action. As Cde. Rose points out, the LSO, as does the LSA and SWP, and as is to be expected from an international opportunist political tendency, also opportunistically adapts to Quebec petty-bourgeois nationalism.

✓ We plan to reprint other articles from our sister publication, LABOR ACTION, so that American workers and revolutionary socialists can acquire a greater understanding of the Canadian class struggle. ✓

* * * * *

In looking at Quebec today, one sees a number of conflicting forces with important stakes in what happens.

On one side there is English Canada pictured as a fiendish oppressor, when actually it is one of the weaker forces involved. To the south lies the powerful but strangely silent (in this case) United States. It is this country which has the power to apply the pressure which could tear Canada asunder. Of course there is England, but England's role is that of a vacuum of its former power. To understand the correlation of these forces, their tendencies, and where labor stands, one must see these things in their historical perspective.

The crisis goes back to Quebec's beginnings as a French colony.

Founded in the 17th century, Quebec began slowly, principally being agricultural. As it slowly developed throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, the English colonies to the south developed quite rapidly--building the foundations for a powerful nation. The causes of this uneven development were hardly due to the differences in geographic location but to differences between France and England. England was a developing capitalist nation pushing for expansion. This enabled it to build a strong colonial empire. France was tied down by many feudal structures and relations. Important also was the contrast in im-

migration. France with more than double the population of England created a colony of 60,000 people in 1750 compared to 1,000,000 in the English colonies. The causes were many, stemming basically from France's desire to keep peasants in their place (to till the land and to fight wars) and to keep persecuted minorities persecuted. At the same time, English rulers were creating vast numbers of landless peasants through the Closure Acts. These former peasants either became the industrial working class of England or emigrated to the colonies. In addition the rulers were glad to be rid of bothersome minorities. Thus Quebec's relative backwardness and weakness started quite early and is a prime cause for the current crisis of separatism.

After its inauspicious beginning, Quebec was conquered by Great Britain in 1763. This was Quebec's start as an oppressed nation. Henceforth it was cut off from its cultural and economic origins. As Quebec continued to develop under the rule of England, this break did not lead to a dynamic independent growth like that of the US, but rather to a defensive holding action against British rule, leading to stagnation. The British made the laws and supplied a few crumbs for Quebec's capital accumulation while the Catholic Church continued to provide static social and cultural bonds. After a short period of this rule, the American Revolution broke out and succeeded. The effect on Quebec's history was enormous. The developing American behemoth stood on its own for the first time and raised the question of whether Quebec and the rest of Canada would continue outside it or not. Also it injected an essential element of flesh and blood to start English Canada with the aid of "empire loyalists." This process of close interconnection in the development of English Canada, Quebec, and the US (playing the most independent role) is the major theme in the histories of these nations.

After the American Revolution of

1776, the capital development of Quebec was subordinated to that of English Canada. In fact, there was hardly any at all. Throughout the period from 1783 to 1867 Quebec remained essentially an agricultural nation with only an infinitesimal amount of industry. Likewise, in English Canada the development of capital, though more extensive than that of Quebec, was clearly subordinate to England and was treated in a colonial manner, exploiting the natural resources, keeping the economy at a low level, and producing mostly agricultural products. In the US during this time the antagonisms between the growth of a "free" capitalist industrial North and the maintenance of slavery for the one-crop plantation system in the South came to a head and produced the American Civil War. After this civil war, the balance of economic and political power among the US, Canada, Quebec and England changed once again. The US was strong and united and about to grow into the strongest imperialist power of all time. Recognizing the danger of an expanding US to British interests in Canada, the British rulers decided to give the Canadian bourgeoisie independence in order to speed up the process of Canadian industrialization. Also, in the deal of confederation was a more important role for Quebec. Quebec was to be given a special status-- a secondary role albeit--in order to help English Canada maintain independence from the US and to protect British financial interests. This special status enabled Quebec to go through a limited capital development. Quebec's development, however, always lagged behind English Canada, which in turn lagged behind the US. As one with hindsight can see, this brew, the Canadian Confederation, failed in its goal to continue the dominance of British capital in Canada.

Independence led to the building of the Transcanadian railway and the opening of the west for further development and investment. Since the Confederation, British capital has

weakened while American capital has more than taken up the slack and now owns more than 60% of Canadian industry. This process has not been confined to Canada but has occurred on a world-wide scale, especially after World War II, when the US assumed unchallenged leadership of world capitalism while Great Britain, with large amounts of stagnant, obsolete capital, lost, along with its colonies, a great deal of relative strength. War-torn Europe and Japan were rebuilt under the political and economic domination of US finance. Former colonies in Africa and Asia came to "Independence" and began to import US investments.

This growth of American influence and power after World War II was more a reflection of the decay of the other capitalist powers rather than a real qualitative growth of US capital. This is particularly true in Quebec and English Canada, where one sees quite clearly the decline of British capital with a corresponding decline in British influence. As for native Quebec capital, it never developed. Canadian capital was confined mainly to insurance, finance, banking, real estate--anything but manufacturing, which was left to the Americans to invest in, both in Quebec and the rest of Canada.

The resulting effect on Quebec was a situation where the French bourgeoisie had no independent power of its own other than the power to maneuver to get more special privileges from Ottawa using the threat of destroying Canada through separation. The development of French-speaking labor has been subject to more extreme gyrations because of the position of Quebec. Quebec has been developed industrially only after high-profit investment opportunities in English Canada have been played out. Thus, while expansion has been quite rapid, economic crisis has hit Quebec much harder in every period. In times of economic crisis, when the bosses are forced to attack the standard of living of the working class, very repressive

regimes, such as the Duplessis government have arisen to crack the whip to keep laboring people in line.

The fall of Duplessis led to a rapid expansion in industry which increased the strength and importance of the working class and correspondingly increased the provincial bureaucracy. This satisfied to a certain extent the aspirations of the Quebecois petty bourgeoisie. The growing world crisis of capitalism has curtailed the growth and expansion of the Quebec economy. Unemployment has skyrocketed to semi-depression levels, nearing 10% and producing great agitation. The growth of the mood for separatism is essentially the expression of the frustrations of the petty bourgeoisie in the face of the developing crisis. The practically bankrupt provincial government has no means to expand their already overly large bureaucracy to satisfy middle-class desires. The political expression of this growing frustration has been concentrated in the Parti Quebecois headed by the former Liberal René Lévesque. This party has little to offer for French-speaking workers other than making French the only official language in the province. What it will accomplish for Quebec is a bit mysterious. Its only hope is to break the weak bonds holding Canada together and get a better deal out of American capitalism through a special relationship with the US. The resulting situation politically-speaking will only substitute Washington for Ottawa while the real owners and exploiters remain the same. As for the other separatist tendencies, they are essentially radical expressions of the Parti Quebecois without its direct link to the bourgeoisie. With all their demagogic rhetoric about "Quebec Libre", national liberation struggles, socialism, and what not, these groups offer no program directed to arm the working class and unite it to gain a truly socialist Quebec directed in the interests of all laboring people.

In this context it is difficult

to see why a so-called revolutionary socialist group such as the Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere accommodates to radical petty-bourgeois groupings-- especially to worms like Lemieux. This former supporter of the arch-reactionary Duplessis prefers to have the support of French-speaking bosses rather than that of English-speaking workers. Politicians like Lemieux do not advance the struggle for socialism one inch. Part and parcel with LSO's accommodation is its support for unilingualism. This support ignores the need to unite English and French-speaking workers and raises antagonisms between them which are not based on real differences of interest. The Labor Action Committee supports absolutely the right to self-determination of the Quebec nation up to and including the separation of Quebec from the rest of Canada. It is only in this way that the working class of English Canada can be broken from the defence of the territorial integrity of the Canadian imperialist bourgeoisie. By struggling on a platform which has as its central focus the fight against national chauvinism, the Labor Action Committee seeks to unite the English and Quebec working classes in the struggle for a common socialist republic.

What is needed in Quebec is for

labor to take up the struggle in its own interests. A program around which this struggle can organize must flow from the needs of labor and, most importantly, must unite all working and oppressed people in Quebec and English Canada. It must struggle for the right of French workers to work in their own language with no language discrimination in hiring, firing, wages, seniority, or promotion. This does not mean unilingualism, which tends to build walls between English and French workers. A central struggle must be the struggle for the formation of a labor party, which is essential in breaking the working class from the apron strings of the bourgeois parties. The NDP /New Democratic Party/, as is pointed out in other articles in this publication, is not at present such a party. A labor party should recognize Quebec's right to self-determination as a nation and should unite workers in Quebec and English Canada on the basis of an anti-chauvinist program. It should lead the fight against all anti-labor legislation, for a minimum wage of \$3.00 an hour, for a work-week of 30 hours at 40 hours pay, for the nationalization of basic industry with workers' control of production in their interest, for a workers' socialist Canada.

INFLATION AND THE ECONOMY - What Inflation Is

As we stated in our last issue, "For Marx, inflation is the filling of the 'conduits of circulation' with 'paper money'...".

But what is money? In the first place, it functions as a measure of the value of commodities. For this reason, it can also function as a means of exchange, as a medium of circulation and a means of payment. It is able to function as a measure of value because it is a representation, in the final analysis, of the gold commodity.

Social laws under capitalism, as we explained earlier, undergo modification, and operate, basically, as tendencies, assert themselves in the long run, through individual

accidental encounters which seem to violate these laws.

On this basis then, as we have said, commodities tend to be exchanged at their values, which are, in turn, determined by the amount of socially-necessary labor-time expended in their production.

That gold is as much a commodity as any other, can be seen from the rise of prices of the world's commodities on two occasions--in the 16th century, after the discovery of America and in the mid-19th century, when large amounts of gold,

either appropriated at little cost, or with far less labor incorporated in it, was placed in circulation.

Gold became money and its preferred form, because, of all commodities, its properties are best suited to this purpose, e.g., a highly concentrated form of value, divisible, durable, etc. But as money, it also possesses the disadvantages of a high specific weight, and, with use in circulation, wears away.

In Marx's time, the money supply was composed of gold and silver coin, banknotes and paper money.

A banknote, as its name implies, was, in effect, a commercial credit certificate issued by a bank, which was secured by bills of exchange on real goods. But paper money, also called "banknotes", were issued by or for a state to cover budget deficits.

Can the paper currency of a state be stable without a gold backing? Yes, it can. Any national economy in which commodity exchange takes place requires an amount of money in circulation in proportion to the total of prices of commodities in circulation, in relation to their speed of turnover.

An expanding economy, even though it is only keeping pace with the growth of its population, requires an increase in the money supply proportionate to this expansion.

As a means of exchange, the same paper money is repeatedly and rapidly transferred from the buyer of commodities to the producer and/or intermediary, who in turn, must also become a buyer.

The symbolic representation of gold will be accepted as if it were the genuine article, and will remain stable provided that the amount does not exceed that required to fulfill its function as a medium of circulation. When, and to the degree that it does, its relationship to gold also depreciates, and in the same proportion.

And the money supply today? It is, of course, no longer gold coin. Silver is also no longer in circulation even as small change in the US.

The main forms of the money supply,

conventionally defined, are coins and "paper", Federal Reserve Notes ("banknotes") and checking account deposits, also known as "demand" deposits.

The money supply, more broadly defined, in addition to that listed above, includes time and savings deposits, saving and loan shares, savings bonds, and short term US government obligations (due within a year). This last, is today approximately three times the amount of US gold reserves.

Approximately 95% of all "business" is transacted in the form of checking account deposits. This form of money, which makes up about 3/4ths of the "narrow" money supply, exists only as a notation in the account books of banks, as an abstraction.

When the Federal government requires money to cover its budget deficits, in addition to other methods of creating it, it borrows from the member banks of the Federal Reserve System. These banks then provide loans to the Treasury in the form of checking accounts, which it can draw upon.

In addition, these banks are only required to keep, approximately, 20% of reserves to deposit liabilities. For every dollar on deposit then, the banks can loan four.

However, not only does the Treasury borrow from these banks, it also spends its funds there. Treasury checks are deposited, considered by the banks as reserves in this form, and in turn, are used to float 80% in new loans.

As the American economy has faltered vis a vis her other imperialist rivals, as it has over-extended itself in the role of gendarme for the world capitalist system, and, especially since 1965, with the expansion of the war in Indochina, inflation has become more virulent.

From 1945 on, the money supply has more than doubled, and the purchasing power of the dollar has proportionately decreased.

This is the technical side of the inflation. Its economic roots and its effects on the economy has still to be evaluated. (to be continued)

"EVENTS WITHOUT HISTORY" by Harold Robins

President Nixon chose James D. Hodgson to replace George P. Schultz as US Secretary of Labor on June 10th.

This event was front page news in the press and other news media. Interviews were solicited from the trade union leaders of the nation and from some employer associations. The change was treated as an event completely lacking in policy significance. It was implied that US government policy would be carried out by Hodgson as it was by Schultz. Nevertheless, something has changed, as we shall see from some comments in the capitalist press.

Nixon chose Schultz and his successor, Hodgson, taking them from corporation management positions experienced in bargaining with trade union leaders. Both have extensive backgrounds in "sweetheart" relationships with "important" trade union leaders. The NY Times of June 12, 1970, quite correctly stated that:

"Though the Labor Department has usually been headed by union men, just as the Secretary's office in the Commerce Department has been a business man's preserve, the AFL-CIO extended its congratulations to Mr. Hodgson and the machinists [union] 'breathed a sigh of relief.'

" When he [Hodgson] left a job as vice-president at the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation to join the government last year, he brought with him Mr. Usury, the machinists' union official with whom he had fought [!!!] over innumerable contracts."

This is a fairly adequate presentation of the facts and relationships in this case, and it very closely corresponds to the "sweetheart" relationship between officials of corporations, unions and governmental agencies since the "New Deal" was initiated by the late President Roosevelt. It is worthy of note here that Lockheed Aircraft is one of the top industrial compa-

nies in the "military-industrial complex" which is so powerful in influencing US government pro-war policies. It is also well to recall that Lockheed, along with other big war industry companies, such as Douglas Aircraft (taken over by Mac Donald Aircraft), Ling-Temco-Vought, etc., are known to be in serious financial straits because of the special management setups which direct these flowering corporations and load the payroll so heavily with retired military parasites.

Hodgson was one of Lockheed's top management people. He has been put in charge of the US Department of Labor, and the collaboration with the AFL-CIO union leaders is carefully preserved.

The "sweetheart" deals between capitalist enterprises and the trade unions they select to represent "their" workers is not exclusively a relationship found between Lockheed and the IAM (machinists union). A similar setup prevails throughout the entire industrial setup of the nation. The late Mr. Walter Reuther, whose recent death was mourned as a serious blow to the "labor movement" by the capitalist press, had negotiated arrangements with the auto companies which gave the UAW the inside track in signing up workers hired in any newly constructed auto plant in the US and Canada. The machinists union has a similar setup with Koppers Coke in the same territories. For its part, these national trade union leaders help to maintain national bargaining procedures which give the corporations free rein in making decisions in local plants, while union objections are tied up in national bargaining procedures. Militant union members who fight the abuses of the companies are quickly weeded out of the plants by the "sweetheart" setups.

The result of such union-corporation relationships was made crystal

clear in a pamphlet published some 15 years ago by the Ford Foundation's Center for Democratic Studies. Mr. Paul Jacobs conducted a symposium of UAW appointed representatives to discuss the attitude of the shop workers towards their union officials. In the reported escalation of this discussion, one UAW organizer bluntly stated that the workers look upon UAW officials as they would look upon company union leaders, and this organizer admitted that there was sound reason for this attitude of the workers.

The replacement of Mr. Schultz by Mr. Hodgson is significant as an indication of a new government-corporation-union leadership relationship.

Since World War II, the Secretary of Labor was selected by representatives of the former CIO unions while the Assistant Secretary of Labor was chosen by the former AFL craft union leaders. During the mid-1960's, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz tried to fire his Assistant Secretary of Labor, a Mr. Reynolds, and Mr. George Meany publically threatened that Wirtz would not be permitted to get rid of "his" assistant. Even during the Eisenhower years, "Ike" had appointed a craft union leader, Mr. Durkin, head of the Plumbers Union as Secretary of Labor, but Durkin resigned soon after and was replaced by Mr. Mitchell, who represented the department store employers in bargaining with a former CIO industrial union from the department store field.

Some of the particular significance of the new policy of Nixon toward the trade unions is more and more emerging. Less than a week after the new Secretary of Labor took office, it was revealed that a "deal" had been made between Pres. Nixon and Mr. Meany, President of the AFL-CIO to back a substitute postal bill in the current congressional hopper without a small retroactive wage raise which the original bill provides. Also absent is a "little matter" involving higher wages to be paid postal workers for higher regional living costs.

Why would the head of the largest American trade union organization advocate this wage cut for union workers? Because the substitute bill would establish national bargaining and hence would eliminate the independent unions who forced the last history-making postal strike.

However, the Secretary of Labor has to deal with the enforcement of federal law which supposedly provides for honest trade union elections. The fight between the Teamsters-UAW-District 65 trade union center and the AFL-CIO over organizing the many, many millions of unorganized workers, who are pushed toward the trade unions by the spiraling rise in prices and taxes, brings the US Dept. of Labor into this developing conflict.

Mr. Schultz, the outgoing Secretary of Labor, had tried to cover up the flagrant violations of federal law which permitted the president of the United Mine Workers to appoint 19 out of 26 executive board members of that union. This practice had been established by the late John L. Lewis in the late '20's, when he expelled a majority of the coal operators in that period.

Since 1960, federal law required that the 19 appointed board members be elected, but this flagrant, well-known violation was ignored by every "liberal" and conservative government administration. Only after the murder of Joseph Yablonsky--who had challenged the incumbent UMW leadership--and his family, did the federal government under Mr. Schultz take the first steps in the courts to compel UMW compliance. Schultz had to go, if the "sweetheart" deal between corporations, unions and government was to continue.

With the promotions of Mr. Hodgson and Mr. Usury, we have a notable indication that the federal government is making a shift to aid those trade union leaders involved with the "military-industrial complex" against all challengers, so far as the US Departments of Labor and Justice are concerned. There is "more to this than meets the eye".

NATIONALISM AND INTERNATIONALISM

The Arab-Israeli Question --Leninism and the Middle East

"Truth", said Trotsky, "is always concrete". He meant by this that the real never coincides with the ideal, that the content of all formulas, in a world where only change is constant, is also constantly changing, that it is necessary to determine the specific in the general as well as the general in the specific, and to understand them, not simply as identity or opposites but, as both

Dialectics is especially necessary on the national question, and nowhere more than in the Middle East.

The watchword of the Communist Manifesto, "Working Men of All Countries, Unite!", sums up the fundamental principle of scientific socialism, that the working class, whose struggles begin on the national arena, is an international body, is a unity in its mode of existence and in its fundamental interests.

It is the responsibility of revolutionary Marxists to bring this understanding to the working class enclosed in national states, in a world where, as a result of the uneven development of capitalism, some nations oppress others, and where, within nations, national, ethnic and racial minorities suffer a special oppression, where the workers, in one degree or another, have been infected by their ruling classes with the virus of chauvinism and racism.

How then, can revolutionists fulfill their responsibilities to the workers, in the concrete national and international framework in which class struggles are waged?

How can this be done in the Middle East, where, as we have shown, Israel functions as "a client state of the US"; where the Israeli state was founded on the ideology of Zionism, which succinctly summed up its attitude toward the Arab masses at the turn of the century in the phrase, "A land without people, for a people without land"?

But was there any alternative in the post-war period but Israel, in circumstances in which the refugees were denied admission into the advanced capitalist countries? Cde.

Robins is of the opinion that the Jews were "forced by capitalist liberalism to push out" the Arabs. This manner of posing the problem ignores the responsibility of Zionism for the "closed doors of the capitalist states". And in fact, the Zionists made certain that the European Jews would be "forced to turn to Israel" by refusing to consider and work for any other "solution" but the Zionist one. Is there any question that a world-wide campaign by the Jewish organizations, together with a broad spectrum of anti-fascist support, would have opened the doors of the advanced capitalist countries, e.g., the US, Great Britain, France, etc., to the bulk of the Jewish refugees? How many would have chosen Palestine? But this would have meant the end of the Zionist dream for a "Jewish homeland". The Zionist leaders, fully co-operated with the "liberal" capitalists in keeping the doors of the advanced capitalist countries closed.

This "solution" has been responsible for transforming the centuries-old peaceful relationship between Arab and Jew into a bitter hatred, which now places in mortal danger millions of Jews and Arabs.

The other side of the coin must also be examined: how can revolutionists fulfill their obligations to the Arab and Jewish masses, in circumstances where, not "Arab socialist" but, military-bureaucratic regimes exist who are attempting to achieve a capitalist development of the productive forces through the use of the state, and who have nationalized some imperialist hold-

ings and domestic capital, while also attacking and suppressing the independent organizations of the working class?

Is it "realistic" even to hope to unite Jewish and Arab workers and peasants against their "own" capitalisms, in the light of the hatreds and fears which have been aroused?

A Marxist program for the Middle East must begin, not with a myopic focus on this area, but must relate the part to the whole, must understand the situation there in relation to the world socialist struggle. It must take into account, not only what presently exists, but what is developing and objectively required, in the Middle East and on a world scale in the light of world economic developments. The maturing crisis of world capitalism will inevitably sharpen the class struggle everywhere, will shatter the social equilibrium in all countries, the advanced and the under-developed, the degenerate and deformed workers' states, as well as the capitalist.

One thing is or should be clear, any "socialist" who bows to the status quo, who proposes a "solution" within the framework of capitalist relations, and who depends upon either the Israeli or Arab states, demonstrates his political bankruptcy.

The contributions of Lenin on the national question are of especial significance to the resolution of the Arab-Israeli question in a revolutionary way.

Lenin arrived at his position on the right of nations to self-determination because he understood that the workers who are reared within nations, who are contaminated with and suffer from national prejudices, will not acquire a recognition of their international identity on behest, but will have to be convinced by word and deed that they are one class and share the same fundamental interests. It is, therefore, necessary for the revolutionary socialists to teach the workers of the oppressor nations, that they, in their own class interests, must fight for the rights

of the oppressed nation, including the bourgeois-democratic right to separate, to erect a national state of its own.

In overcoming the prejudices of the workers, in making them understand that their class interests extend beyond the national to the international arena, they also teach the workers of the oppressed nation the meaning of proletarian internationalism. It then becomes possible for the revolutionary socialists of the oppressed nation to convince them not to separate, but to unite with the former, in joint struggle for the socialist revolution and socialist construction.

How can this understanding be applied to the Middle East? Not by using the formula, "the right of nations to self-determination" for Israel to justify or excuse the expulsion of the Palestinian Arabs from their lands! To do so means to empty it of all its revolutionary content. Applied in this manner, it is transformed into its opposite, and serves to unite both Jewish and Arab masses with their "own" bourgeoisie.

But what about the "cultural backwardness" of the Arab masses as compared to the Jews? Would not both peoples be better off apart, "at least for the present"?

Tsarist Russia was a vicious oppressor of scores of submerged nations and national minorities, many of whom were "culturally backward" as against the Great Russians. But the Bolsheviks succeeded in winning them for the socialist revolution through the application of the Leninist position on the national question.

Those who pose the question of "cultural backwardness" in this manner, show that they have not understood the potential for advance in the "backward", or the backwardness in the advanced, of qualitative changes in the consciousness of both. What else was the Russian Revolution but a manifestation of this law, of a more "backward" working class coming to power before the more "advanced" workers of the west?

In the Middle East, the law of uneven development is also expressing itself in the leap in consciousness of the "backward" Arabs, and in a regression in this respect by the more "advanced" Jews.

The utilization of the state by the Bonapartist regimes in an attempt at developing the productive forces, expresses in a distorted way the needs of the Arab masses for a modern industrial society. The "socialist" demagogy of the military bureaucrats is a double-edged sword, which indeed, they may soon feel, as the Arab masses move beyond selective nationalizations to the social revolution. In the meantime, along with the rising tide of national passion, the Arab masses are coming to the realization of the need for the socialization of the means of production, against imperialism, and increasingly against "their" capitalisms.

The Jewish masses within and without Israel, on the other hand, are losing what Lenin characterized as their "world historic progressive" spirit, are moving from an identification with proletarian internationalism to national chauvinism under the tutelage of Zionism.

But would not the return of the "culturally backward" Palestinian refugees, and the resultant Arab majority, mean a massacre of the Jewish masses? Those who adapt to Arab nationalism deny this possibility, and disavow Shukeiry, the former head of the Palestine Liberation Organization, who promised to "drive the Jews into the sea". They point, instead, to the recent statements of Yasir Arafat of Al Fatah, which opposed Zionism, but not the Jews as such. However, when national, racial, ethnic and/or religious animosities are inflamed, such assurances cannot be taken seriously.

Only the Leninist, revolutionary, solution offers a way out. The return of the refugees to Israel can unite the Arab and Jewish masses if the Jewish working class fights for this right, and proves to the refugees that it is on their side against its bourgeoisie. The Arab

masses can, in this way and only in this way, learn the lesson that their enemy is the existing capitalist relations in the Arab countries as in Israel, which imperialism strives to maintain as against the working class, even in the shape of military-bureaucratic "socialist" regimes.

And the fedayeen, the Palestinian guerrilla attacks on the civilian population of Israel? Can they be justified? As long as Israel continues to occupy the Arab territory conquered in 1967--and with the obvious intention of retaining part of it--and thus further inflames national passions, resistance to her is inevitable, and is justified. But the nature of the resistance is the question for revolutionary socialists. Clausewitz's dictum holds for them also, that war is the continuation of politics by other means. The resistance to Israel as a conquerer must be of a revolutionary character, must therefore, also strive to unite the Arab and Jewish masses against their ruling classes. The actions of the Palestinian guerrillas against Jewish civilians--which is killing Arabs as well--while understandable in the circumstances, is no more supportable than the terror and counter-terror by Israel against the Arabs.

The main task which follows from this perspective is the transformation of the Israeli soldiers who occupy Arab lands into a weapon against the Israeli ruling class. This policy requires revolutionary agitation, propaganda and fraternization. Resistance of a military character against the Israeli occupation, e.g., the west bank of the Jordan, the old city of Jerusalem, etc., must be subordinated to this political task, must also teach both the Jewish and Arab masses that there is no alternative to proletarian internationalism.

The great need in the Middle East as elsewhere is a revolutionary party, a Leninist vanguard party, which can unite the Arab and Jewish masses for the socialist revolution.

(to be continued)