

After the 14th of May 1948, and for the first three years of its existence, Israel was in the Non-Aligned Movement. David Ben-Gurion (Prime Minister of Israel 1955-1963) gradually began siding with the West. The question of 'which side' of the Cold War Israel should choose created fissures in the kibbutz movement. (Editorial note based on Wikipedia).

## **TO THE REACTIONARY WAR OF ISRAEL LED BY YANKEE IMPERIALISM, RESPOND WITH THE WAR FOR THE SOCIALIST LIBERATION OF THE MIDDLE EAST.**

**J POSADAS** — 5 June 1967. First day of "The 6 day war".

*"The intervention of the Soviet Union stopped imperialism from invading the Middle East... What Israel really wanted was the destruction of Egypt and Syria, but the Soviet Union intervened".*

*J Posadas.*

What happens in the Middle East demonstrates the advance of the revolution in a concentrated way. The Arab masses are going to intervene furiously. It is the first time in history that they weigh so much and make the decisions. Not only are the governments of Syria<sup>1</sup> and of Egypt<sup>2</sup> mobilising, but the masses too, and those in South Yemen, Iraq and Algeria. Syria calls to organise the popular forces of liberation; it calls on all the other Arab countries to do the same. One hears more and more often slogans like: 'burn everything' and 'take over the oil'. Matters are not going to stay at the 1956 level<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> In 1967, the government of the **Syrian Arab Republic** was headed by Salah Jadid. Jadid was a career military man. He would be overthrown by another military leader in 1970, Hafez al-Assad, father of the present Bashar.

<sup>2</sup> In 1967, the **government in Egypt** was led by Gamal Abdel Nasser. In 1952 he had led the movement that overthrew the monarchy, and in 1953, he had presided over a far-reaching Land Reform. He became formally president in 1956 and stayed in government until his death in 1970.

<sup>3</sup> In 1956, Israel invaded Egypt with French and British support. The aim was to remove Nasser, restore Israel's control over the Straights of Tiran, and re-establish Western control over the nationalized Suez canal.

This time, the masses are going to want to weigh directly and decide.

This war is a provocation by imperialism from the start. It aims at containing revolution in the Middle East. It wants the Syrian government ousted and replaced by a reactionary one. It wants the all the revolutionary measures cancelled and the workers militias disbanded. Imperialism wants the Arab masses too scared to follow the Syrian example.

*Israel is a fabricated country by imperialism to contain the development of the Arab revolution.*

Israel was formed by imperialism in 1948 as an instrument for use against the development of the Arab bourgeoisies. It wanted Israel to counterbalance the development of Arab movements. It wanted Israel to exert pressure - military included - against the development of Arab bourgeoisies.

Then imperialism sought out Israel to oppose the development of the Arab revolution. And the Soviet bureaucracy of Stalin's epoch<sup>4</sup>, incapable of understanding, approved the setting up of the State of Israel in pursuit of its policy of conciliation with imperialism.

Compared with its economic capacity and population size, the military capacity of Israel is entirely disproportionate. Its army corresponds to that of a country immensely more important. This is an imported country, USA-made and especially installed. The aim

---

<sup>4</sup> On the 17 May 1948, and only 3 days after Israel was set up, Stalin recognised it officially as a State. The USSR was the second country in the world to do so, after the United States.

being the creation of centre of opposition to the Arab revolution.

Israel was fabricated from the outside and then imported. It has no importance or value compared with the vast continent populated by Arabs. Israel is a country that did not develop on the basis of the economy. It was developed wholesale by imperialism with machines, people, technicians, science, money, specialised workers and everything. A small but fairly important peasant and worker's base came into being however. In its isolated ways, this layer tried to develop through the reformist conception of Socialism. It contains tendencies who wish to supersede the relations of capitalism. Many of these people support the kibbutz.

The kibbutz are a tale, a narrative. They are some class of Kolkhoz, and no experiments in collectivisation. The workers and peasants who join them are moved by a socialist sentiment, but the kibbutz are enterprises in the hands of dominant groups, or in the hands of people who own. In the mind of the workers and peasants working there, the kibbutz are attempts at collectivisation, but life for the masses is not collective in the kibbutz. Had this ever been so, its influence would have spread like wildfire throughout the Middle East.

In some small or remote kibbutz, aspects of collective life can be found around some matters like eating and sleeping; but this does not apply to the social distribution of the interests of the place. The kibbutz are not collective in that way. Their mode of social distribution accords with what every person puts in. It is not collective in the sense of everyone being master. This would not be possible of course. Imperialism would not have this.

Imperialism made the kibbutz as a means to attract the Jewish masses, as well as to find justification behind a pretence of progressiveness. Back in the days when the Arab revolution was in its beginnings, imperialism made the kibbutz to counteract the Arabs,. Those who joined the kibbutz – workers, peasants and poor petit bourgeois people – had other intentions. They had no such thoughts, but the process of capitalism, the Soviet bureaucracy and Stalin evolved this situation. It is not by accident that the workers, the peasants and the poor petit bourgeois join Communist parties and trade unions. They do this in defence of their own class interests.

*Imperialism makes war on Syria and Iraq because these adopt Workers State forms:*

The Arab revolution continues to grow, although it does so unevenly. The masses of Syria and Egypt brought down their monarchies<sup>5</sup> and developed the economies of their countries. They statised<sup>6</sup> the main sources of production; they nationalised commerce and heavy industry, and partially nationalised the light industries and the land. The masses of Syria and of Egypt intervene in production plans. And it is in Syria that the statisations and the nationalisations went the furthest. Syria has also created profound social forms, and forms of workers' power. There are workers and peasants' militias in Syria. And in Iraq too<sup>7</sup>. This gives a powerful boost to the social

---

<sup>5</sup> Muhammad Ali, **king of Egypt**, and **Faisal bin Hussein** in Syria.

<sup>6</sup> J Posadas is using this word instead of 'nationalisation' to indicate that it was not a national bourgeoisie that got hold of the nationalised property. The State did, allowing the country to benefit. This was particularly important in Egypt because of the oil, but there was oil in Syria too.

<sup>7</sup> **In Iraq**, the British-imposed Hashemite monarchy (founded in 1921) was soon overthrown, and in 1958, Iraq then became a Republic. In May 1967, one month before this document, **Naji Talib**, a military man, became **Prime Minister**. He was replaced by another military man who was going to be overthrown in the 'revolution' of July 1968. The general who took over introduced to Iraq the Regional Branch of the

development of the world. Deep down, this is the actual reason for this war.

The Middle East's Arab leaderships are not all bourgeois, nationalist or revolutionary. And not all of them propose to confront Israel either. In Jordan and Saudi Arabia, the bourgeois class is as much the enemy of the Arab revolution as imperialism itself, or as the Jewish bourgeoisie is, or the rest of the Arab bourgeoisies. Why didn't the Arab bourgeoisies all take part in the preparation of this war? They did not because they felt that, should they try, the immense pressure of their own masses – peasantry and petit bourgeois layers – was going to overthrow them.

In the situation as it stands, what you see is an absence of [the necessary] leadership, movement and programme. The revolution still goes forward, but in this empirical way.

Out of all the Arab States, it is in Syria, Egypt and partially Iraq that the State draws closest to the Workers State form. In those countries, popular control and the statisation of production advanced much more than the capitalist sector. The reverse is the case in Israel where what advances fastest is capital (financial, industrial and commercial) – the whole of it being represented by Yankee imperialism.

*The Soviet bureaucracy is less and less able to continue with pacific coexistence:*

The revolutionary process in the Middle East escapes not only the control of imperialism, but that of the Soviet

---

Arab Socialist Ba'ath Party. For many years, Iraq was ruled by revolutionary nationalist military governments.

bureaucracy too. In this war, a pressure originating from the structure of the Soviet Workers State forced the Soviet bureaucracy to intervene against imperialism. As a Workers State, the USSR cannot remain indefinitely committed to pacific coexistence. It is the Soviet Workers State that forced this change; it forced the Soviet bureaucracy to go and get involved. Of itself, the bureaucracy would do nothing, or it would move to continue to contain with new agreements with Yankee imperialism. Now that the Soviet bureaucracy has had to make a move, observe how it does nothing to help the development of the Arab revolution. Its intervention was only the result of the pressure exerted upon it by the pressure of the Soviet army and the Soviet masses.

The Soviet Union must call on the Arab masses to expel imperialism from the Middle East. The Soviet Union needs to call on the Jewish masses too, for the Jewish masses to impose their control over the land of Israel and the enterprises of Israel. A United Front is required between the Jewish masses and the Arab workers and nationalist governments. One must call for this. This is the way to transform this war into a revolutionary war across the Middle East.

Imperialism must not be allowed to prevail. The struggle in the Middle East must be united with the struggle of others in the world to crush imperialism and capitalism. One must fight to gain the upper hand, and for this, it is necessary to develop the revolution to the maximum.

The intervention of the Soviet Union stopped imperialism from invading the Middle East; but imperialism intervenes in other ways, indirectly, with warships and fighter planes, special detachments, technicians and weapons. And so the USSR must intervene directly: It

must send its troops, technicians and weapons in support of the development of the Arab revolution. The masses need to feel that the Workers States are taking part.

*This war is not between the Arab world and the Jewish world:*

The Soviet Union needs to support the Arab countries at this moment, but not indiscriminately. The task is to call for a United Front in the Middle East to expropriate imperialism: expropriate the lands and the oil wells; work towards a Federation of the Soviet Socialist Republics of the Middle East, with the full right of self-determination for the Jewish masses.

Such are the measures to propose. It is not a matter of supporting Arabs against Jews. The need is for the revolutionary war to expel imperialism not only from the Middle East and Africa, but from Israel as well.

To the reverse of this, the Arab bourgeoisies try to contain the revolution. Where they view this war in terms of race and religion, it is to conceal their bourgeois aims. There is no problem of race or religion! There is a social problem. The masses crave after their unity with each other, but the obstacle to this unity is their bourgeoisies. The task is to support the Arab revolution therefore. Not to support the Arab bourgeoisies against the bourgeoisie of Israel. One must be clear and most resolute in this matter. This question must not be reduced to one of race and religion. Those who do this are the bourgeoisies of the Middle East, imperialism itself and the Soviet bureaucracy. If the feudal regimes of Jordan and Saudi Arabia joined forces against Syria in this war, it was to stop the development of the Arab revolution.

We reiterate our calls for the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist United Front of the Middle East, and the Federation of the Soviet-Socialist Republics with the right to self determination for the masses of Israel.

This Federation will do away with all antagonisms between Jewish masses and Arab masses. There is no antagonism between the Jewish masses and the Arab masses. Both are exploited. Both must work to live, and both are victim of capitalism and imperialism. It is the bourgeois governments that pit them against each other.

This war must not be interpreted as between the Arabs and Israel. It is no such thing. It is the war of the reactionary interests of the bourgeoisies of S. Arabia and Jordan on a one hand, against the development of the Arab Revolution on the other.

*For the creation of mass and class organisms:*

The masses are still largely uninvolved; they are not called upon. In order to express themselves, they need organisms of their own. In the whole Middle East, it is necessary to set up independent organisms of masses and parties. The latter must uphold programs of economic planning and land collectivization with a view to creating Workers and Peasants' governments. And then their wider aim must be the Federation of the Soviet-Socialist Republics of the Middle East.

The positions of the nationalist revolutionary governments of Egypt and Syria remain quite limited. They still see the war in terms of religion and race instead of planning to transform it into a social war. The masses are more advanced than all this. The masses are way ahead of their leaders. It is the masses who have



persuaded their leaders to say: "let's expropriate, let's confiscate, let's put society under popular control".

The bourgeois leaderships – and this includes the nationalist revolutionary leaderships of Egypt and Syria – belittle and downscale the social character of the war; but this reduces the ability of the masses to resist. Here you see the limits of the nationalist revolutionary leaderships. The Nasser leadership does not arm the Egyptian masses for instance. It does not call on the masses of Egypt to expropriate the land. This is because he continues to conciliate with the feudal monarchies of Saudi Arabia and Jordan. Not all the nationalist revolutionaries of Egypt agree with this however. Egypt has intellectuals and military sectors who firmly support the revolution. These sectors are capable of being swayed by the proletarian vanguard, and this will happen.

### *The Federation of the Soviet-Socialist Republics of the Middle East:*

The Workers States and the Communist parties of Europe have the opportunity to use this war to strike hard at capitalism. They do not do this however. Their fear of the development of the proletarian revolution prevents them from using this war to defeat imperialism.

As for the capitalist world, it should have united behind this war, but it did not. Divisions appeared within it instead. De Gaulle and French imperialism are not completely supporting the US. They do not want to be seen as too closely associated with US imperialism, for fear of being expropriated of remaining possessions in the Middle East. The contradictions between the imperialists do not come from [clever] acts of conciliation

on the part of the Soviet bureaucracy. They come from the normal contradictions of capitalism. The contradictions between the imperialists can be used, but when one does, this must serve the development of the revolution.

The Arab masses learnt long ago that their unification is paramount, and that it can reach very high levels. We are in a phase of revolutionary elevation. This war highlights the historic necessity of the unification of the Arab world.

The Posadist IV International calls on the masses of the world to support the Arab revolution, and to support the United Front of the Arab masses with the Israeli masses.

This war shows also that imperialism prepares for war, and that it has no other option. Even if it manages to continue conciliating with the Soviet bureaucracy, the base for this co-existence grows thinner by the day. Actual nuclear war is drawing closer. When imperialism decides upon it, it will want to spring it on an unsuspecting world.

The development of the revolution is necessary throughout the Middle East, and in Israel amongst the rest. This wants for the Federation of the Soviet-Socialist Republics of the Middle East.

A United Front is needed to expel imperialism from the whole of Africa, the whole of Asia, the whole of Latin America. A world United Front of the masses is needed, with the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist program.

**J. POSADAS**, 5 June 1967.