

**PAUL  
NOVICK**

---

---

# **ZIONISM TODAY**

**The Zionist Movement  
Labor Zionism  
Palestine Realities**

**Questions**  
— and —  
**Answers**

**TEN CENTS**

---

---

*Published by*  
THE JEWISH BURO OF THE  
CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U. S. A.  
New York, 1936



# ZIONISM TODAY

An analysis of the proceedings of the nineteenth Zionist World Congress held in Lucerne, Switzerland, August 20-27, 1935, and a review of present conditions in Palestine.

By PAUL NOVICK

## 1.

**T**HE head of the political department of the Zionist Executive Committee in Jerusalem and the actual leader of the Zionist World organization, David Ben-Gurion, stated in his report for the executive committee at the 19th Zionist Congress in Luzerne:

"The year 1933 will assume a distinctive place in our history, similar to 1897 and 1917. In this year took place fundamental changes in the position of the Jewish people. Their existence in the Diaspora was definitely endangered." (*Kongresszeitung*, official stenographic organ of the Zionist Congress, No. 3, p. 4.)

Zionism has entered its third epoch. 1897—1917—1933.

Zionism has staked its cards on the endangered existence of the Jews in the "Diaspora," that is the existence of Jews in all lands other than Palestine.

This view is not *entirely* new. Since 1897 Zionism has thrived on persecution in the "Diaspora." Its growth was retarded whenever the Jewish masses fought for improvement in their respective countries. In the "epoch" of 1897 (Herzl Zionism) when Zionism based its major activities on the six million Jews of old Russia, land of revolutionary ferment, the movement made comparatively

little headway. The expected "exodus" to Palestine did not materialize. Zionism was still less successful in the 1917 epoch (Balfour Declaration) when the magnitude of the October revolution gave impetus to a revolutionary upsurge not only throughout Europe but the entire world. The Jews of Russia, Poland and other countries thought little of migrating to Palestine. Even those groups enthusiastic for the Balfour Declaration (an enthusiasm often artificially stimulated) evinced no desire to go. The era between 1917 and 1929 inclusive (with the exception of one year, 1925), saw relatively small emigration to Palestine.

However, since the Great Crash and its prolonged world-wide capitalist depression, its economic extermination and pogroms; particularly since the advent of Hitlerism in Germany, the epoch of "upbuilding" and "prosperity," the third epoch of Zionism began.

One of the delegates of the semi-fascist Judenstaat Party, which is strongly opposed to the Histadruth (Palestine Zionist labor movements, as well as Poale-Zion from various countries), engineer Strueker characterized this epoch as follows: "It was said here," he stated from the platform of the Lucerne Congress, "that history will have something to say about the role of Zionism *under the rule of the present executive committee.*" (That is, different from what delegates of the Judenstaat Party were saying.) "But there it will read: '*Under the rule of Adolf Hitler*' . . ."

Hitler was quite often mentioned at the 19th Zionist Congress, although very seldom attacked. The Judenstaat delegates on two occasions shouted derisively in the direction of the Histadruth delegates: "Heil Hitler." The Histadruth delegates answered in kind, shouting towards the Judenstaat people: "Schuschnig agents" (meaning, agents of Italo-Austrian fascism). This is the manner in which both wings voiced their sentiments in the epoch of 1933.

The "left" delegate, Sereni, from the benches of the Histadruth, piously declared:

"We have nothing to be ashamed of the fact that we used the persecution of the Jews in Germany for the upbuilding of Palestine. That is how our sages and leaders of old have taught us . . . to make use of the catastrophes of the Jewish population in the Diaspora for upbuilding." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 9.)

We heard similar views from the "National Poet," H. N. Bialik, a long time before. "Hitlerism, in the last analysis, is a blessing for our people," he stated in an interview printed in the New York Jewish *Morning Journal* of December 3, 1933. The Histadruth delegate, Sereni, (from the "extreme left" Hashomer Hatzoyir) expressed it with more subtlety: "the sages of old told us to build on catastrophes . . ."

The catastrophes brought some results. Still, there wasn't—and there couldn't be—any real joy, the joy of victors and builders.

Before the congress convened one of the members of the Zionist World Executive, Isaac Greenbaum, in an article in the Warsaw Zionist daily *Haint*, entitled "*Tragic Conflicts*," had something ominous to say about the sick economy of the Zionist *Yishub* (settlement) of Palestine.

"The owners of orange groves," Greenbaum states, "find themselves in a quandry. In England prices of oranges have fallen because the market is choked with the fruit. The coming season will be still worse. There will be more fruit. And because of the terrific *Hamsonim* (heat waves from the desert) which occurred last spring, there will be too many oranges of the kind that cannot be sold in England. The downgrade of the price index of this year has already made itself felt in the orange trade. New groves are not developed. As a result, fewer workers are required, fewer pipes and other articles used. There is an upset in the economic life of the country

which may lead to a crisis—though the situation can be localized. However, either way the orange industry may develop the economic life of the land is fraught with hazards that can be avoided only by selling to Germany." (*Haint* No. 178.)

But here Greenbaum sees more *tragic conflicts*. Palestine is made dependable on Nazi trade.

"*Between the interests of Erez Israel and the Diaspora,*" Greenbaum continues, "*an abyss begins to yawn.* The development of Erez Israel imposes sacrifices on the Jews in the Diaspora, the retreat from certain sections of the communities in the Diaspora, *actually the relinquishment of their struggle for rights.* This must lead to capitulation. It may result in demoralization and bring judgment to an unprecedented degree." (My emphasis.)

Judgment upon whom? Undoubtedly, Greenbaum is fearful of what will happen to Zionism when the Jewish masses in the countries where they live realize that *the interests of Zionism run counter to theirs.* Mr. Greenbaum's article emphasized conflicting interests which become ever sharper in the "third epoch" of Zionism when a number of its leaders openly depend on Jewish persecutions for its growth.

Mr. Greenbaum (who, be it remembered, is a member of the World Zionist Executive Committee) has expressed the attitude of the Palestine Yishub which is fearful of the policies of the Zionist leadership, fearful of entanglements with Nazism, as it is fearful of the entanglements with British Imperialism. "An abyss begins to yawn."

## 2.

There was *Batlanuth* (quack synagogue "philosophy") in the opening speech of the president (now the honorary president) of the Zionist organization, Nahum Sokolov. *Batlanuth* with a purpose.

Here assembled the congress of an organization pretending to represent the Jewish nation, no less. But the keynote speech of its president fails even remotely to echo the cry of the Jewish masses against their medieval persecutors—Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Streicher! The Executive Committee could have (if it willed) inserted into Sokolov's speech a protest and condemnation against Nazism. It chose, however, to hide behind the *Batlanuth* of a Sokolov. His tedious excursion into history, his philosophizing about the situation of the Jews throughout "all times" merely served to take the place of a definite statement on the tragic position of the Jews in capitalist countries, particularly in Germany. His talk of "eternal sufferings" only served as a "philosophical" cloak in place of the stark realism necessary to face the problem of the German Jews.

Those who remembered Sokolov's speeches at previous congresses, his attacks on the Soviet Union, no doubt found it difficult to restrain a smile as they listened to his statements—the Zionist organization "does not intend to take any position in international political affairs, or to criticize the internal affairs of a given country." . . . "It is generally difficult to orientate oneself in this respect because European politics is changing its alignments with such dizzying tempo." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 2, p. 2.)

At the 18th Zionist Congress in Prague, Sokolov was storming against the "destruction of the Hebrew language" in the Soviet Union, and against the "attacks on the Jewish religion." *That time* Sokolov displayed an abundance of courage. "We cannot permit," he shouted, "the Russian Jewry, the courageous and deserving Russian Jewry, to be struck from the book of the living, nationally and culturally, without any moral consequences." (*Kongresszeitung* of Prague No. 4, p. 1.) Obviously, the Hebrew language and Jewish religion (that is, if matters were

exactly as portrayed by Sokolov) are more important to the Zionist leaders than the Jewish masses themselves who are now being exterminated in Germany and other capitalist countries.

Note the difference in approach. In Prague, the subject was an enemy government—the Soviet government. Hence unequivocal denunciation. In Lucerne, when Germany was under discussion, Sokolov evinced amazing mildness.

In his opening speech he said:

“We can do nothing against the pitiless higher force, but we preserve our consciousness of the injustice that is being committed against us.”

That was all the “criticism” uttered by a professed leader of the “Jewish People” against a medieval bloody inquisition, the sadistic Nazi regime which exterminates and heaps daily humiliations upon German Jews.

Sokolov made the innocuous statement in the name of the Executive Committee—a statement no doubt carefully weighed.

However, despite this inane comment, the tragic conflicts Mr. Greenbaum mentioned prior to convening, cropped out in all their strength after deliberations began. They were felt again, when the transfer agreement with Germany came up. During these deliberations and discussions the inevitable inner contradictions of Zionism came into play. The Lucerne Congress represented a picture of internal crisis and decay exactly as did the former congresses. The fact that the revisionists seceded before the congress took place and convened by themselves under the wings of Austrian fascism in Vienna, merely obscured some of the *external* evidence of that decay. We did not witness the disgraceful scandals and free-for-all fights that took place two years before, in Prague. The Lucerne Congress had nothing on the agenda similar to the murder of

• Dr. Ch. Arlosoroff which deadlocked the Prague Congress (a murder which was not even mentioned in Lucerne although the earlier congress appointed an investigating committee). However, though irritating questions were quashed, the inner conflicts of Zionism could not be concealed, as is patent by the charges the two wings hurled at each other.

One of the leaders of Zionism, the "socialist" Berl Loker, head of the organization department of the Zionist Executive, openly stated: "We are witnessing a crisis in the Zionist movement." He spoke lightly of "November Zionism, Declaration Zionism, Prosperity Zionism." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 7, p. 9.) The "general" Zionist, Dr. I. Schwartzbord, (the congress had several "general" factions) declared in his speech: "The Zionist movement is experiencing a severe crisis. The larger number of schkolim (membership certificates) is a suggestive force, the cosmetic factor in the movement." This cosmetic element, according to Dr. Schwartzbord, cannot hide the "highest degree of partisan friction and partisan hatred" within the Zionist movement so full of "unrest and anarchy." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 7.)

All the talk of prosperity and unity, or the declamation of the representative of a faction named "World Unity," Rabbi Goldblum, that there is "One Torah, One Land, One Zionist Organization," could not conceal the inner struggles of Zionism, nor the exaggerations in the figures of the sale of "Schkolim."

The delegates at the Lucerne congress were split into the following number of factions: Misrahi (60 delegates), Paole-Zion Histadruth (199), Judenstaat Party (8), General Zionists (31), World Union of General Zionists (47), United General Zionists (45). There were also 65 delegates scattered among a number of other factions, while each faction had divisions within its own ranks. A strong

left-wing in the Histadruth agitated against the Nazi transfer agreement and against the deal with the religious Zionists of the Misrahi. (Altogether there were 455 delegates.)

As to the "cosmetics"—the figures of the sale of schkolim—the situation was as follows:

The official sales figures listed according to countries, shows that in 1934, 239,197 schkolim were sold (36,388 in the United States). That was a "regular" year without congress elections. One may assume that these quotations are closer to the truth of the actual strength of World Zionism, although the shekel entails few if any responsibilities, the 239,000 buyers of schkolim representing heterogenous groups.

In 1935 the Zionists sold 975,929 schkolim. The figures tell the story of the heated election campaign conducted by the various factions and parties and the extent to which peddling with schkolim was conducted. But it seems these "cosmetics" of the artificially enhanced schkolim sale during the congress year of 1935 failed to sufficiently satisfy Zionist propagandists. So they added the sums for both years, producing an impressive total and boasting about a million and a quarter schkolim. Thus they seek to create the impression of a million and a quarter sales of schkolim annually to regular supporters.

This is in line with the intensified propaganda outlined by the Zionist leadership at a conference of the Keren Hayesod (Foundation Fund) prior to the opening of the Lucerne congress. There it decided to enlarge and strengthen the propaganda apparatus although a large proportion of the propaganda funds had already been expended on the machine. In this connection it is important to note that in the United States, 34,000 Pounds (about \$170,000) were collected for the Keren Hayesod during 1934. Of this amount, according to the *Kongresszeitung*

No. 2, p. 6, 16,000 Pounds were listed as expenses! Only 18,000 Pounds—out of 34,000—reached the main office in Jerusalem, where in turn a large percentage was again spent on the apparatus.

The schkolim and election “cosmetics” were indeed thickly laid. Lucerne and Vienna (Revisionist Congress) competed with each other for a bigger showing of “votes.” Whereas, at the Congress in Prague the *entire* Zionist movement, *including the Revisionists*, could show only 800,000 schkolim for the *two* years previous to the congress, the Revisionists themselves, at their congress in Vienna, produced a total of not less than three-quarters of a million votes cast for them in the short period before the congress convened . . . (The Lucerne congress claimed a total of 700,000 votes.)

This juggling of votes and of schkolim, is again characteristic of the 1933 epoch of the Zionist movement.

### 3.

Wilhelmstrasse and Downing Street were not the only avenues of importance which occupied the attention of the delegates in Lucerne. There was another great street—Nalewki (main Jewish business street of Warsaw).

One of the speakers, delegate I. Fishman of New York, reminded the congress that Dr. Chaim Weizman (now the president of the Zionist organization) was once attacked for stating that Nalewki and other such streets of the business section of Warsaw were being transferred to Palestine. “At that time,” the speaker went on to say, “Weizman was condemned as the enemy of everything these streets represent. Today his words of warning have the endorsement of us all. And I say that we do not want in Erez Israel not only the Nalewki but the Kurfuerstendamm and Broadway as well.” (*Kongresszeitung* No. 7, p. 2.)

This was strong language. One can readily appreciate the sentiments expressed by Mr. Fishman and other delegates concerning Nalewki or Broadway. However, a movement which builds on persecution and catastrophes, could reap nothing better than Nalewki.

Nay, according to a recent statement by Weizman, conditions in Palestine must be much worse than on Nalewki.

About a month prior to the congress Weizman deplored the changes in the economy of Palestine. Years ago, he stated, we commenced with the usual form of agriculture, the production of grain. Then, we decided to go in for vineyards. We secured the best machinery from France. We spent enormous amounts of money (collected in the "Diaspora"). Subsequently, we decided wine was "no good." We began the production of almonds. Almonds!—was the cry of the *Yishub*. But it soon appeared that almonds are "no good," either. We started to plant oranges. Oranges! Orange groves! Prosperity! There is nothing better than orange groves! Until we realized quite recently that oranges also are "no good." And so we went in for *migrashim*, lots, real estate! Orange trees which were secured and developed with such terrific expense are being uprooted, orange groves are parcelled out and sold at speculative prices on the real estate market.

That is what the Zionist economy has accomplished in its third epoch! No wonder Weizman is sounding the alarm. No wonder Zionist writers are openly speaking of "National and Economic Bankruptcy." (Rachel Feigenberg, in the *Chicago Courier* of September 19, 1935; J. L. Wollman in the *Toronto Jewish Journal* of August 25, 1935.)

Which leads us to the central question—*soil, land*.

Zionism is paying dearly for its consistent denial that such a question (pointed out by its opponents) exists.

Zionism never wanted to acknowledge the fact that *there is no free land in Palestine*. By misleading its following, by appealing to chauvinism and patriotism Zionism sought to disregard the obvious. Once in two years, however, in summing up its activities from the congress platform, it is forced to face this question.

Enthusiastic nationalists who are misled by the metaphysics and emotionalism of Zionist propaganda must have been shocked to hear what the head of the Keren Kayemeth (National Fund) M. Ussischkin, had to say. Ussischkin stated:

“The problem of Erez Israel is solely and exclusively a question of land. I emphasize: solely and exclusively. When we will have land we will have everything that comes with it. Of this there can be no doubt. When we are without land nothing can save our reconstruction.” (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 1.)

Ussischkin asserted that in the two years which elapsed between the 18th and the 19th congress, only 36,000 dunan (9,000 acres) of land were secured by the National Fund. The entire land possession of the National Fund, secured during many decades for many millions of dollars amounts to 350,000 metric dunan, about 170,000 acres. (According to Graphic Facts issued by the United Palestine Appeal, New York, the Jewish National Fund collected \$20,000,000 between the years of 1901-1935.)

“My attitude is not an optimistic one,” Ussischkin emphasized. “Today, it is more pessimistic than two years ago.”

Again he pointed to the Jewish population figures of Palestine which in two years has grown about 11-12% in proportion to the general population, while the land fund grew *one and a half percent* (from 5% of the general area to 6½%).

The resolution on land adopted by the congress states that "the landlessness of the Jewish people . . . is the basic source of Jewish tragedy. The return of the Jewish people to Erez Israel is essentially a return to land." *But there is no land.* All speakers emphasized the fact that it is becoming ever more difficult to secure it, and that speculative prices must be paid for every inch of ground.

A correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, M. A. Tanenblatt, (a Zionist) reports that as much as 20 Pounds per dunam of land—or 80 Pounds (\$400) per acre—was paid during the year preceding the congress. (Cleveland Zionist daily *Jewish World*, August 23, 1935.) The same correspondent of that paper stated (July 25) that it was becoming "*difficult or almost impossible*" to extend the rural sections of the *Yishub*. "*Every day the securing of land is getting more difficult and more rare.*" . . . "*It is not for nothing that M. Smilansky (one of the oldest colonists in Palestine, a rich farmer) keeps lamenting: There is no land. Without land, without the possibilities of buying land, a nation cannot grow.*"

The most outstanding Zionist authority on colonization, Dr. Arthur Rupin, in his extensive report before the congress emphasized that *at least a third* of the Jewish population in Palestine *should have* gone into agriculture. But in 1931, when the recent census was taken, only 15% were thus engaged. Now, Dr. Rupin admitted, *the percentage is still lower*, adding: "The buying of land in Palestine is becoming increasingly difficult and when the soil is sold on the market exorbitant prices are asked for it." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 4, p. 3.)

But Dr. Rupin was rather vague. At one of the last sessions of the congress the official rapporteur of the colonization committee, Mr. Schkolnick, stated that *only twelve* (12) percent of the Jewish population in Palestine is engaged in agriculture. Yet, all signs indicate that

even this estimate is too liberal. There is serious doubt whether 10% of the *Yishub* is working on the land. Zionist opponents place the number between 6% and 8%. Anyone who wishes to get a *real* picture of Zionism or Palestine must discount Zionist figures whether they concern schkolim, votes, or agriculture in Palestine.

Let us, however, take some more of Dr. Rupin's figures.

In my book, "*Palestine, the Arabs, the Zionist Movement*" (Yiddish), published in 1932, I reprinted a report submitted by the Zionist organization in 1930 showing that there was a population of 7,556 souls in *all* "national" colonies. (Kvutzot, Moshavat, etc.) Now, according to Dr. Rupin, the population in these colonies is 11,000 . . . Together with the colonies still maintained by the Keren Hayesod—18,000. This is the increase "national" colonization can boast of during a period when the Jewish population of Palestine nearly trebled!

Fifty-five years of Zionist activity. Many scores of millions spent. The result: 11,000 souls, 18,000 souls in all "national" colonies, "including the cantor, the shochet, and the mohel," as Jabotinsky put it at the 16th Zionist Congress in Zurich which I had occasion to attend.

Is it any wonder that even Zionists speak of catastrophe when they touch upon this subject? "Erez Israel Before an Economic Catastrophe," screams the headline of the aforementioned letter from the Palestinian correspondent of the Jewish Zionist press in the United States and Poland, J. L. Wollman.

"The number of Jewish workers in the colonies today is not larger than it was six years ago," stated the leader of the Histadruth, Mereminsky, at the congress of the Keren Hayesod. (*Kongresszeitung* No. 1, p. 6.) His colleague, Shprintzak, supported him: "Despite advances Zion's watchmen are disheartened because *for many years no national colonization has taken place.*" . . . "Tens of

thousands of halutzim are becoming wage-earners." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 5.) And their mutual colleague, Hartzfeld, went still further: "You know that lately the colonies were almost entirely emptied of agricultural workers." . . . "For years we have been asking that the worker in the colony be given a room, a house, a roof under which to place his bed, yet we were unable to obtain this minimum." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 10.) And another Histadruth delegate, Chasan, stated: "The Jewish city has grown but not so the Jewish village." . . . "We must concentrate our efforts today in safeguarding the National Home from the fate of another Diaspora." (*Kongresszeitung* No. 6, p. 1.)

At the Lucerne congress, there were widespread charges that colonization had been arrested and *people were fleeing from the colonies*. The unhealthy "boom" in the cities, the speculation, the chaos of the Nalewki had attracted many who were without a roof over their heads in the colonies. Because of the *lack of land* only an insignificant number of the tens of thousands of the new immigrants could replace those who migrated to the cities. Dr. L. Piner, of the "World Union" faction stated at the congress that a middle-class family requires between one thousand and twelve hundred pounds (\$5,000-\$6,000) to settle, *exclusive of the cost of the land*.

And land is precious. Land is difficult to obtain.

It is true that the British administration, because of its own machinations, is blocking the way towards the utilization of the desert and swamp lands. But it must be remembered that the imperialist administrators *are committed to this policy* because England will not give up its dualist game, its playing of Zionism against the Arabs, tactics Weizman decried so bitterly at the congress. Moreover, even if the British administration *could* favor Zionism in relation to the land question as it is doing in other

matters, the problem would remain unsolved since even desert and swamp lands are not abundant and reclamation takes years of effort and expenditure of huge sums of money. The Hula concession, much ballyhooed by Zionist propaganda, will not be ready for colonization (according to Ussischkin's statement at the congress) before *seven or eight years*. (*Kongresszeitung* No. 5, p. 2.)

Immigrants coming to Palestine with the desire to engage in productive work cannot always be condemned for reverting to the old Nalewki businesses. Out of the 25,000 German Jewish immigrants since the two and a half years of Hitler's rule, only 2,000 (according to the *official* report of Mr. L. Jaffe) settled on land. And even this claim must be taken with some reserve, together with the alleged numbers of German refugees alternately placed between 25,000 and 30,000. (See page 37.)

Zionism entered Jewish life with the avowed intention to straighten the "eternal Jewish hunchback" and eliminate the "Menachem Mendel" from the Jewish horizon. The middle-man, the agent and luftmench, they promised, would be productivized. Yet the following result belies all their good intentions.

Officially, 12 percent of the population engage in agriculture, 88% live in the cities, (Tel-Aviv absorbing almost half of the entire *Yishub*). Orange groves are uprooted to make room for real estate speculation. Jewish workers flee the colonies where they are unable to secure adequate shelter. In the cities, according to Dr. Rupin (see also *New Palestine*, September 13, 1935) 50,000 Jews including women and children depend upon industry and handicraft for a livelihood. In addition, 14,000 without families were engaged in the building trades. Add to this total of 64,000 the 42,000 living on agriculture (12% of 350,000) and the grand total of 106,000 is reached. The balance of 244,000 (over two-thirds of the *Yishub*)

consists of professionals, middle-men, officials, luftmenschen, Menachem Mendels, speculators.

#### 4.

At the conference of the Keren Hayesod, delegate Dr. Zamonsky asked: For how many years will the Jews of Palestine be able to export 15,000,000 Pounds (\$75,000,000) annually?

The representative of the opposition (Judenstaat Party) touched upon a question which the leaders of Zionism were careful to omit—the export-import of Palestine.

Since the beginning of the capitalist crisis and the upsurge of Zionist immigration, the export-import of Palestine shaped itself in the following manner:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Export</i>	<i>Import</i>
1929 .....	£1,734,000	£1,167,000
1930 .....	2,078,000	6,985,000
1933 .....	2,592,000	11,122,000
1934 .....	3,218,000	15,133,000

Whereas, in 1929 the export exceeded the import, leaving an active balance of about 600,000 Pounds, the situation afterwards was sharply reversed. Zionist “upbuilding” kept boosting the import figures with dizzying tempo until in 1934 there was a deficit of nearly 12,000,000 Pounds, \$60,000,000!

At the congress, it was predicted that 1935 would witness imports into Palestine close to 100,000,000 dollars, leaving the export proportionately the same. Anybody even superficially acquainted with economics can readily appreciate what this means.

It emphasizes the precarious situation of Palestinian economy.

What did the mounting imports consist of? Were

they raw materials, machinery and tools? An answer to this question is essential because of the contention that a colony in the process of upbuilding "must" have an adverse export-import balance.

The official report of the Palestine Economic Corporation for the calendar year of 1934 (p. 10) states that out of 15,000,000 Pounds spent during that year on imported articles, only 1,076,894 Pounds went for "raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured." Against that, 9,168,281 Pounds were spent for "articles wholly or mainly manufactured." For the importation of food, nearly 3,000,000 Pounds were spent (2,902,093). For "miscellaneous and unclassified" articles over 2,000,000 Pounds. Therefore the deficit of \$60,000,000 during 1934 was due to the country's lack of resources. Palestine was forced to buy much of its *food* as well as other *necessities* from foreign lands. The money derived from private sources and from collections was returned to the "Diaspora" . . .

Delegates to the Zionist Congress lamented the fact that in Palestine *no permanent values are being created*. Expenditures were not earned in the country. The figures quoted substantiate this statement quite clearly.

How long can such "economy" last?

It came to pass that the organ of the most ultra-Zionistic faction of Zionism, the Tel-Aviv daily *Davar*, published by the Histadruth, was forced to state (August, 1935):

"What is the basis for the prosperity of Erez Israel? The secret of this "prosperity" is known to everyone—the influx of capital whose ample sums cover the adverse export-import balance. With these sums of money the Yishub does not build a sound economic foundation for future economic equilibrium. The main items of the imports are food-stuffs. The statistics for the import of machinery and tools look quite dreary. There hangs over the Yishub the constant danger of bankruptcy."

The economic atmosphere had become so strained, that some capitalists, even prior to the crisis, found it uncomfortable.

In general, the Palestinian exploiters have little to complain about. For them prosperity in Palestine *was* a reality. But this prosperity had little or no effect on the workers. We have seen how the leader of the Histadruth, Harzfeld, complained that the worker in the colony could not afford a roof over his head. We have it on the authority of Mr. A. Revusky who, in his book *Jews in Palestine*, states (p. 246) that in the "prosperity" year of 1932 only 18% of the Tel-Aviv workers earned \$2 a day and over, while 47% earned between \$1.50 and \$2, the balance earning between \$1 and \$1.50 (30%) or even less than \$1 daily (5%). The Palestine Economic Corporation reports that speculation which centered mainly in real estate, in "lots" and apartments, compelled the worker who wanted a decent home to pay as much as 50% of his earnings for rent—which supplies the reason why most Jewish workers in Palestine live in barracks or in old slummy houses. The real estate boom was a disaster to the toiling masses while the speculators reaped high profits.

But the era of such "prosperity" was bound to come to an end. Some of the speculators sensed this end in due time. The above mentioned correspondent of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Mr. Tannenblat, states in his article:

"British Jews already are leaving for England, taking with them both their investments and their profits. The British Jew does not want to bank indefinitely on speculation. He no longer sees the possibility for safe and sound investments."

Quite possibly the British Jews in question had already foreseen the Ethiopian War. We shall come to this later. But it must look pretty bad for the "economy" of the



































*only* motive behind the British Mandate. The "National Home" for the Jews which the Balfour Declaration was supposed to have had in view is merely an imperialist cloak. So are the promises British imperialism gave to the Arabs. Whoever attempts to build on such promises throws the life interests of the masses of the people into the vortex of *imperialist* interests.

3. By supporting the status quo of British imperialism and by building with the aid of British imperialists the relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine can only be worsened.

*The Communists are vitally interested in the peaceful pursuit and the productivation of the Jewish masses in Palestine.* Communists do not consider the Jews of Palestine the "chosen people" but neither do they regard them as step-children. The interests of the Jewish masses in Palestine as everywhere, demand that imperialism, chauvinism and racialism be combatted. These interests dictate *unity and solidarity among Jewish and Arab toilers.*

Communists have nothing but contempt for the maneuvers of the British administration in Palestine in relation to the so-called Legislative Council. Were the Zionists to fight the Council because it is intended as a plaything of the British High Commissioner, they would have been commended for their stand. But Zionist leaders of all factions and shades are against *any* Council or Parliament, against *any* introduction of democratic self-government in Palestine. For this, they deserve the contempt of all real progressives and genuine democrats. The struggle of the Zionist leadership against the introduction of real democracy into Palestine is again bound to harm the interests of the Jewish masses, in and out of Palestine, who are vitally interested in the maintenance of democratic liberties and in the struggle against autocratic rule.

All talk of the Zionist leadership about improving its











































