

# JEWISH AFFAIRS

Vol. 2, Nos. 4-5

25¢

April-May 1971

## CONTENTS

### Editorials

<u>The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising</u>	1
Hyman Lumer, <u>The UN Resolution: Key to Peace</u>	2
Marc Beallor, <u>Trends Among Jewish Youth</u>	8
Sol Flapan, <u>A Meeting of Polish Jews</u>	13
<u>The Fight for Peace in the Middle East-- Here and in Israel</u>	15
<u>In the Occupied Territories</u>	
<u>Don't Say "I Don't Know"--Now You Know</u>	17
<u>Fawsi Al Asmar, Administrative Arrest-- Prevention or Punishment</u>	18
Felicia Langer, <u>Children in the Shadow of Prison</u>	19
<u>Events and Views</u>	20
<u>Bail for Angela Davis!</u>	22
<u>Senator Fulbright on "Self-Reliance" and Anti-Communism</u>	23

Published by the Communist Party, U.S.A., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010  
Editorial Committee: DAVID FRIED, JACK KLING, ALEX KOLKIN

SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON "SELF-RELIANCE" AND ANTI-COMMUNISM

(From a speech at Yale University, April 4)

For reasons which may warrant our sympathy, but not our support, Israel pursues a policy of antiquated--and to a degree delusional--self reliance. As Foreign Minister Eban expressed it, "a nation must be capable of tenacious solitude." In fact, Israel is heavily dependant on the U.S. Only last December Congress appropriated a half billion dollars for military assistance to Israel. Since 1948 the U.S. Government has provided \$1.4 billion in direct economic assistance to Israel; this does not include military aid. Included have been aircraft, missiles and electronic systems more advanced than those provided to NATO and SEATO. I do not see how this can be reconciled with a policy of "tenacious solitude."

Premier Meir says we ought not to press for Israeli withdrawal from the conquered Arab territories because as she puts it, "This is not the border of the USA...." If Israel, as the Premier says, really were prepared to "stand up for itself" without involving others, it might make sense to let the Arabs and Israelis work out their differences, or fight them out. We all know, however, that this is not the case, that American interests of the most crucial nature are involved, that another war in the Middle East might well set us against the Russians and that, therefore, we have the right to bring an influence to bear.

Israel has a different conception of American interests in the Middle East, an essentially cold war conception. Picturing herself as the bastion of democracy in the Middle East, Israel professes to be defending American interests by holding the line against a surging tide of Communist imperialism. I perceive in this some of the same old Communist-baiting humbuggery that certain other small countries have used to manipulate the United States for their own purposes. When it comes to anti-communism, as we have noted in Vietnam and elsewhere, the United States is highly susceptible, rather like a drug addict, and the world is full of ideological "pushers." It is a fine thing to respect a small country's independence. It is quite another when really because of our continuing obsession with communism we permit client states like Israel and South Vietnam to manipulate American policy contrary to our interests, and probably to theirs as well.

\* \* \*

## EDITORIALS

### THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING

April 1971 marks the 28th anniversary of the heroic Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. Words cannot describe the glory of those martyrs who, knowing their cause to be hopeless, nevertheless fought the Nazi monsters to a standstill and in the end gave up their lives only at the highest cost. Hitler's infamous Third Reich lasted but a scant dozen years, but in the memory of mankind the unmatched heroism of the Warsaw Ghetto fighters will endure forever.

There will be many celebrations of this anniversary and much praise of the deeds of these fighters. But if we are truly to honor their memory, much more than words of praise is required. What is demanded of us is a relentless struggle against today's successors of the forces whom they fought--the present forces of neo-fascism, racism and anti-Semitism. To fail to fight against the disturbing rise of Neo-Nazism in West Germany is in fact to desecrate the memory of the Warsaw Ghetto martyrs. To fail to fight the manifestations of anti-Semitism and the ravings of the ultra-Right fascist groupings in this country is to pay mere lip service to their sacrifice.

But most important, we are called upon to combat the intense campaign of anti-Soviet slander which runs rampant within the Jewish community today. At the very time of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising the Soviet Union was engaged in saving the lives of countless numbers of Jews by removing them from the path of the Nazi onslaught. And later it was the Soviet Union which labored to provide a refuge for the uprooted Jewish refugees in Palestine, when none of the capitalist countries would accept them. It is the Soviet Union which has liberated Russian Jews from the ghetto and conferred on them equality with all other peoples.

Those who would celebrate the anniversary of the Uprising by slandering the Soviet Union not only dishonor the memory of the Warsaw Ghetto martyrs. They give grist to the mill of the worst enemies of the Jewish people. For among the instigators and supporters of the shameful reactionary crusade against a non-existent Soviet persecution of Jews are the most notorious racists and anti-Semites in the country, who now pretend concern for Jews--in the Soviet Union.

Their real aim, of course, is not the well-being of Soviet Jews but the undermining of the Soviet Union as the leader of the world forces of progress. Those Jews who have allowed themselves to be misled by the false anti-Soviet propaganda would do well to ponder seriously the meaning and consequences of alliance with such anti-Communist--and anti-Semitic--elements. This is not the least of the lessons which the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising teaches.

\* \* \*

THE UN RESOLUTION: KEY TO MIDEAST PEACE

By Hyman Lumer

Again the Jarring talks are deadlocked. And again the responsibility rests with the Israeli government. The central point at issue remains the question of Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories.

In February Dr. Jarring, seeking a basis for progress in the negotiations, addressed a series of questions to both sides. In response to his query the Egyptian government asserted once more its full acceptance of the UN Security Council resolution of November 1967. It reiterated its readiness to recognize the sovereignty of Israel and its right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries, provided that Israel would in turn accept the provisions of the resolution emphasizing the inadmissibility of acquiring territory through war and calling for withdrawal from the occupied territories.

And to this the Egyptian government added the following new and significant proposal: "When Israel gives these commitments, the UAR will be ready to enter into a peace agreement with Israel containing all the aforementioned obligations as provided for in Security Council Resolution 242."

This is a concession whose importance it would be difficult to overestimate. For many years the Israeli ruling circles have declared that a peace treaty with the Arab states was its foremost political aspiration. And immediately after the 1967 war Prime Minister Levi Eshkol stated that Israel had not waged the war to acquire territory and would gladly relinquish the conquered areas in return for a treaty of peace.

Now such a treaty is offered by the leading Arab state. What is Israel's reaction? A continued refusal to make any official commitment whatever concerning withdrawal. First peace must be negotiated, it is said; then withdrawal can be discussed.

There is, however, a quasi-official expression of the position of Israel's rulers on this question. In an interview on March 12, Prime Minister Golda Meir said the following with regard to frontiers. Israel must retain (1) East Jerusalem, (2) Sharm el-Sheikh with a corridor to it from Eilat, (3) the Gaza Strip, (4) the Golan Heights. The border around Eilat must be renegotiated. In addition the Sinai Peninsula must be demilitarized and the demilitarization policed by a mixed force including Israeli troops. Similarly, the West Bank must be demilitarized, with Israeli troops stationed along the Jordan River for enforcement.

A conference of the Labor Party, of which Golda Meir and the majority of cabinet members are leading figures and which holds nearly half the seats in the Knesset, incorporated these demands in a resolution adopted on April 7. The resolution also calls for continuation of the policy of establishing Israeli settlements in the occupied territories as long as no peace settlement exists.

In short, the head of the government and the dominant political party declare that they will withdraw only to "secure and defensible" borders and that this requires retention of a large part of the occupied territories as well as inroads on the sovereignty of the UAR and Jordan in the remaining areas. This, moreover, is presented as a minimal position. The Right-wing elements led by Menachem Begin call for annexation not only of the conquered territories but also of added areas in the East Bank on the grounds that all these are part of the original Land of Israel.

Clearly, the Israeli ruling circles--all of them--reject the principle of withdrawal and continue to adhere to the expansionist policies which led to the 1967 war and have prevailed ever since.

An effort to break the deadlock is contained in the negotiations for the reopening of the Suez Canal. But the prospects of doing so are also very dim, and here, too, it is the Israeli position which is the main obstacle.

On February 8 Dr. Jarring proposed, as a basis for reopening the Canal Israeli return to the 1967 border with the UAR on the understanding that satisfactory negotiations could be concluded for (1) freedom of navigation through the Canal for Israel, (2) an international security force at Sharm el-Sheikh and (3) the establishment of suitable demilitarized zones to guarantee the security of the border. The UAR government expressed readiness to accept partial withdrawal as an initial step toward full withdrawal.

The Israeli response was typical. Israel should pay no price to reopen the Canal, said Golda Meir, since she did not close it. Moreover, it was the UAR and other countries which stood to benefit from its reopening, not Israel. Indeed, the Eilat-Ashkelon pipeline, built with the aid of foreign capital, provides a lucrative alternative for shipping Mideast oil to Western Europe and the reopening of the Canal would eat into these profits.

The Israeli government, therefore, agreed to reopening of

the Canal under the following conditions: a) the Israeli troops would withdraw for a relatively short distance (perhaps 10-20 miles); b) this withdrawal would not be considered a first step toward further withdrawal; c) Egyptian troops would not be permitted to cross the Canal afterward; d) the cease-fire would be made permanent; e) Israel would have freedom of navigation in the Canal. These conditions, which offer little and demand much, constitute a rejection of the Jarring and UAR proposals. They reflect a determination to retain some form of control over all or most of Sinai and to hold on to Sharm el-Sheikh. And they offer no real security to the UAR in opening and operating the Canal. Small wonder, then, that they have been flatly turned down. (These proposals, it should be noted, were contained in a statement to the U.S. government. In this case, too, the Egyptian government has received no formal offer.)

\*

The contrast between the conduct of the UAR government and that of Israel is very striking indeed. The former has displayed a highly responsible attitude toward the negotiations. It has made crystal clear its full acceptance of the Security Council resolution and has added its offer to sign a peace treaty. Thus, for the sake of a peaceful solution it has made important departures from previous positions. The Israeli leaders, on the contrary, have shown no softening whatever. They have clung rigidly to their initial positions and in fact have not entered the negotiations in good faith. Rather, having been forced to do so by the pressure of world opinion and by domestic pressures, they have merely used them as a base for maneuver.

It is only too clear that the policy of annexation continues undiminished, that the tactic is one of endless stalling while the succession of accomplished facts is maintained. Today, despite protests from many quarters, new housing projects are going up in West Bank territory outside of the city limits of Jerusalem. According to a story in Ha'aretz (April 20, 1971), Ze'ev Sharef, Israeli Minister of Housing, at a press conference, "revealed that pursuant to a government decision on urban settlement, with housing, schools and kindergartens which everyone will be eligible to join, will be established in Sharm el-Sheikh, and that a rural settlement will be founded in Nuwebah."

In their persistent, unyielding adherence to their aggressive, expansionist policy, the Israeli ruling circles count heavily on the support of U.S. imperialism; indeed, without such support their present position would be utterly untenable. With regard to this, Senator J. W. Fulbright states (New York Times, Mar. 13, 1971):

The principal reason that there has been no progress on a negotiated settlement is the belief on the part of Israel

that the United States and the Senate will back it, no matter what position it takes.

Its attitude is most unfortunate, because I do not see any possibility of a negotiated settlement so long as Israel believes we are completely at its disposal.

The Israeli reliance on U.S. support is not without some foundation, for despite its repeated declarations of "impartiality" the Nixon Administration has been heavily on the side of the Israeli government throughout. A year ago President Nixon stated that U.S. policy in the Middle East was to "maintain the balance of power," by which he meant maintaining Israeli military superiority in the area, and that toward this end Israel would be supplied with whatever arms were needed. Later, Israel was granted a \$500 million loan for arms purchases, and Congress adopted a bill authorizing the President to supply unlimited arms to her. No other country holds such a privileged position.

With regard to the question of withdrawal the U.S. line has been one of incessant maneuvering. The Rogers plan of December 1969 called for virtually complete withdrawal, allowing only for such "minor border adjustments" as might emerge from the negotiations. But subsequently, when Assistant Secretary of State Joseph Sisco was questioned about this on a television program, he asserted that the U.S. did not call for withdrawal from all occupied territories, and for that reason had opposed inclusion of the word "all" in the UN Security Council resolution. On the other hand, in December 1970 he told a group of businessmen of Arab extraction that the U.S. stood unequivocally for complete withdrawal. But a few days later a State Department spokesman publicly repudiated this, declaring that the U.S. supports only "the idea of a withdrawal." In short, the policy is one which makes a show of supporting the UN resolution but is "flexible" enough to permit the support of the Israeli government in its maneuvers.

The recent trip of State Secretary Rogers to the Middle East, trumpeted as an effort to bring about agreement on reopening the Canal, was in reality a continuation of the maneuvering of U.S. imperialism, designed to bolster both its own position and that of Israel. If the aim were truly the securing of agreement, it would have best been implemented by supporting the Jarring initiative. Instead, Rogers seeks to substitute himself for Jarring as mediator in the hope of extracting concessions from the Arab states in favor of Israel. But these maneuvers cannot lead to peace; they can lead only to war. For there is no path to peace other than the full acceptance of the UN resolution and its implementation. All efforts to the contrary are bound to fail.

A memorandum of the Israeli Embassy in Washington on March 10 stated: "Israel is ready, in peace, to withdraw from the cease-fire lines. But this time the withdrawal will be to boundaries that are secure, and shall be rendered so by geography." (Emphasis added.) But in this day of jet planes, missiles and nuclear weapons the idea that security can be achieved by shifting a border by some dozens of miles is sheer delusion. Peace can be achieved only through agreement, and agreement demands genuine concessions. In this case it demands a commitment to get out of the occupied territories. As Charles Yost states in a recent article in Life:

It is wholly unrealistic for Israel to say that it will negotiate without conditions but that it will not return to the pre-war line even with Egypt, that it must have Sharm el-Sheikh and an access road to it, or that it must have its own forces along the Jordan as the Allon Plan proposes. Egypt and Jordan would never agree to these territorial changes. There would be no "agreed" boundaries and hence no peace settlement. To insist upon these extensive territorial demands, and others, is simply to refuse to make a peace settlement on the only terms on which it can be made, simply to mislead the Israeli people as to what is and is not possible, simply to turn down in effect the long-awaited, fervently-desired offer of the Arab states to make "a peace agreement with Israel."

Nor will the present opportunity for a peaceful settlement last forever. If Israel's rulers continue their stubborn refusal to break with past policy, to accept the UN resolution and thus to open the door to fruitful negotiations, the negotiations must sooner or later break down, leading to a resumption of fighting and all the dire consequences this entails. The situation is aptly summed up in the Quaker study, Search for Peace in the Middle East, in these words:

It is the judgement of the authors of this paper that the present Israeli policy of prolonging indefinitely the military occupation of Arab territories and of disclaiming responsibility for the plight of the Arab refugees, plus the repeated statements by Israeli leaders that some, if not all, of the lands taken over since June 5, 1967, are now permanently Israeli, make direct negotiation of an Arab-Israeli settlement virtually impossible. It is our further judgment that such a stance will be ultimately self-defeating for Israel and can only bring continued violence and make virtually inevitable a fourth-round war, with unforeseeable consequences for all Arabs, all Israelis, and many other peoples across the world.

The present Israeli policy has already proven itself bankrupt, politically and economically. Continuing efforts to carry



it out through growing dependence on U.S. imperialism are doomed to futility and can only lead Israel to disaster. It is not surprising, therefore, that a growing opposition to government policy is rising within Israel. The ad published recently in Ha'aretz by the Movement for Peace and Security (We Must Say "Yes" to Jarring!), which is reproduced elsewhere in these pages, is one significant indication of this opposition.

Another, from quite a different quarter, is the stand taken by David Ben-Gurion in a recent interview in the Saturday Review (April 3, 1971). He said:

Peace, real peace, is now the great necessity for us. It is worth almost any sacrifice. To get it we must return to the borders before 1967. If I were still Prime Minister, I would announce that we are prepared to give back all the territory occupied in the Six-Day War except Jerusalem and the Golan Heights...and these we should negotiate about.

While we do not agree fully with Ben-Gurion's position, it is far closer to reality than that of the government and could, if it were adopted, open the doors to serious negotiations.

At this moment the fight for peace hinges on the fight for acceptance by Israel's leaders of the UN resolution in its entirety. This battle is important not only to the peoples of the Middle East; it is vital to the future of the people of every country, and not least of the United States. Hence the urgent necessity of building an organized movement for this purpose here. There is a real basis for such a movement, since growing numbers of American Jews, especially among the Jewish youth, are beginning to question the policies of the Israeli government.

Equally important for Middle East peace is the guaranteeing of the long-denied rights of the Palestinian Arabs. We cannot here deal with this important question in detail, but shall do so on another occasion. Suffice it to point out that satisfaction of the right of the Palestinian Arabs to self-determination has two preconditions: a) an end to the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, and b) solution of the Arab refugee problem on the basis of the right of the refugees to return or receive compensation for their property. Thus, in respect to these questions too the fight to implement the UN resolution is the key issue of the day.

\* \* \*

## TRENDS AMONG JEWISH YOUTH

by Marc Beallor

The history of the Jewish people, spanning thousands of years, is the history of a people's struggle against oppression. From the enslavement of the Jews by the Egyptian pharaohs, to the pogroms of Eastern Europe and Czarist Russia, culminating in the genocide of six million Jews by the Nazis in World War II, the heritage of the Jewish people is written in blood.

For centuries, anti-Semitism has been a tool of the exploiting classes which Jews everywhere have had to fight. As a result, Jews have often been associated with progressive and revolutionary movements. Jewish youth in particular have played a prominent role in the recent struggles in the USA.

Today, however, confusion surrounds the Jewish movements. The rise of such reactionary organizations as the Jewish Defense League, the seemingly wide support for Israeli aggression and occupation and the hysterical campaign against non-existent "Soviet anti-Semitism" appear to be a contradiction, given the history of the Jewish people.

The purpose of this article is to try to clear up some of this confusion. In order to challenge the Right-wing currents, which are sharpest among the youth, we must understand them.

First one needs to understand Zionism and the importance of the State of Israel in relation to the "Jewish question." Political Zionism arose as a movement in the late 19th century. Theodore Herzl, considered the founder of political Zionism, wrote a pamphlet entitled The Jewish State in which he projected a separate Jewish state as the only solution to anti-Semitism, which, he said, follows the Jews automatically wherever they go. From the outset, the goal of the Zionist movement was to convince Jews to settle in Palestine. There was never an approach to fighting anti-Semitism where it existed.

Zionism is an extremely reactionary form of bourgeois nationalism. It rejects struggle against anti-Semitism, which is a weapon of the ruling classes. It plays upon the intense national pride and identity of the Jewish people, forged by thousands of years of struggle against oppression. It has one goal only--that of a separate Jewish state. It is this narrow nationalist, separatist goal that pits Jewish people against non-Jews, such as the Arabs.

Most Jewish people feel a deep attachment to Israel. They feel a deep attachment to the state that is based on their common culture and national identity. However, due to the strong

influence of Zionism, many cannot believe that the responsibility for the wars of 1956 and 1967, and for the current crisis, lies with the leaders of Israel. They cannot believe that a Jewish state could itself become an oppressor state. Zionism has led many Jews to believe that the Arab people, out of an intense, irrational hatred of Jews, are out to "drive Israel into the sea," when in fact it is the aggressive and chauvinist policies of the Israeli Zionist leaders that threaten the existence of Israel.

However, many Jews are rejecting the claims of the Zionists and the capitalist press here and are, in growing numbers, coming to oppose the policies of the Golda Meir-Moshe Dayan government. In Israel itself there is a growing movement of Jews and Arabs for peace.

Zionism is a chauvinist ideology. In order to justify the expulsion of Arabs from Israel; to justify the concept of a purely Jewish state in a territory where Arabs have lived for centuries; to justify the occupation of Arab territory and the oppression of Arabs in Israel, Zionism employs racism and chauvinism.

With the June 1967 war against the Arab states of Jordan, Syria and Egypt, this chauvinism was greatly intensified. It had its consequences in the United States as well. The rise of anti-Arab chauvinism in this country has inflamed racism and white chauvinism among Jews against Black Americans and other minorities.

Another aspect of Zionism (and this enables us to see more clearly its class essence) is its anti-Communism, and, in particular, its anti-Sovietism. The Soviet Union has been the major supporter of the Arab peoples seeking national liberation. Without Soviet aid, the anti-imperialist Arab states could not survive against imperialism. Zionists therefore portray the Soviet Union as an enemy of the Jewish people (in fact, as the main enemy). They say that the Soviet Union supports the Arab states to help wipe out the Jews. They use the imperialist myth of "Soviet anti-Semitism" in their efforts to prove that the Soviet Union is an enemy of the Jewish people. While this article cannot go into detail on this question, the fact is that the myth of Soviet oppression of Jews is one of the greatest hoaxes of all times. It is no coincidence that it is backed up 100 per cent. by the capitalist news media and publishers.

It is not surprising that Zionism and imperialism are in agreement on these basic questions. The policies pursued by the Zionist ruling circles of Israel are pro-imperialist policies. They are policies in support of U.S. imperialism, designed to overthrow the anti-imperialist governments in such countries as Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Libya, the Sudan and Algeria. U.S. imperialism needs a foothold in this key area of the world. The Middle East

contains over two-thirds of the world's known oil reserves and is militarily strategic in its location. U.S. imperialism uses the rulers of Israel to do its dirty work. Its victims are both the Arab people and the people of Israel. Nothing threatens Israel's existence more than the adherence of its Government to imperialism's aims.

To win support for its policies, Zionism has therefore had to resort ever more to hysterical chauvinism, racism and anti-Sovietism. This has had a profoundly negative impact on Jewish youth in the United States. U.S. imperialism is "seizing the time" in using Zionism to weld a force among Jewish youth in support of its policies.

\*

It is in this light that we must see the Jewish Defense League and the spread of reaction and racism among the Jewish youth.

The Jewish Defense League does not fight anti-Semitism. Nor does it fight in the interests of the Jewish people. The activity of the JDL has consisted of attacking Black people and Puerto Ricans in certain communities in Brooklyn; attacking the Black Panther Party; bombing the offices of Aeroflot and Amtorg, two Soviet agencies here; bombing the Communist Party offices; invading the offices of the Daily World; harassing Soviet diplomats; beating up Arab spokesmen with lead pipes; and parading as stormtroopers against the so-called "Red and Black menace."

Ideologically the JDL carries out a campaign against the Black liberation movement. It spreads racist lies about the Black community and portrays Black people as an enemy of the Jewish people. It supports the genocidal war in Indochina. It attacks the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the Left and revolutionary movement here. Its two areas of ideological concentration are anti-Communism and racism.

Meir Kahane, leader of the JDL, worked for the House Un-American Activities Committee for several years. He worked mysteriously under the name of Michael King in Washington and wrote a book entitled The Jewish Stake in Vietnam.

One of the reasons the JDL has managed to attract young people around it is that it projects a "militant" image. The leaders of the JDL use militant-sounding rhetoric to win over demagogically Jewish youth concerned about anti-Semitism. It is militancy based on anti-Communism and racism. It is fascist militancy. The real struggles of the Jewish people in their own interests are what must be militantly projected.

There are many Jewish organizations which have denounced

the JDL. However, none has been really able to counter the JDL, since ideologically, on the questions of Zionism, white chauvinism and anti-Sovietism, they basically agree.

\*

There are many Zionist youth organizations which have existed for a good number of years. Some consider themselves to be socialist, Marxist or labor-oriented, such as Hashomer Hatzair or Habonim. They take progressive positions on many issues except those related to Israel and the Soviet Union. Their purpose is not to fight anti-Semitism here but, as Zionists, to convince as many Jewish youth as possible to emigrate to Israel for life (Aliyah). Because this is their sole goal they have failed to attract sizable numbers of Jewish youth, and only a small percentage of their members actually emigrate to Israel. While having some disagreements over tactics, they basically support the Zionist positions and the occupation of Arab territory. Because they reject struggle in the United States and because of their basic adherence to Zionist ideology, they are unable to fight the Jewish Defense League, even though they recognize its reactionary and fascist nature.

There are also groups like the Radical Zionist Alliance (which claims five thousand members) and the Jewish Liberation Project, which recognize the need for Jewish youth to participate in the struggle for peace and against racism. They call for support of the Black liberation and other liberation struggles. They reject the JDL and other reactionary trends within the Jewish movement. While they too disagree with some of the policies of the Golda Meir government, they have not fully broken with Zionism. They are trying to find common ground between Zionism and revolutionary thinking. But they are still caught up in the anti-Soviet movement. Zionism and revolutionary ideology are contradictory. Zionism is a reactionary ideology, it is bourgeois in its class essence. They are moving in a Left direction but until they break with bourgeois nationalism they will not be able effectively to counter the JDL.

There are other groups of varying sizes, cropping up around the country, which are made up of Left-moving Jewish youth. They are part of the growing numbers of Jewish youth who are searching for a role in the revolutionary movement while maintaining their identity as Jews.

There are thus two basic trends among Jewish youth. One is the trend toward reaction, the other toward the Left--toward recognition of the aggressive and pro-imperialist policies of the Israeli government and the role of imperialism on the one hand, and toward socialism on the other. Neither of these trends is totally new but they make up the dynamics among Jewish youth today. We must work with and develop the Left, revolutionary trend, while attacking the trend toward the Right.

This requires work on two levels. First, we must work with the more progressive Zionist groups to isolate the JDL, to involve them in the struggle against war and racism. We should form united fronts among Jewish youth groups on this basis.

Secondly, we must wage an all-out ideological campaign on the burning questions of the Middle East and role of Israel; on the Soviet Union and Soviet Jewry; on the role of Zionism; and on where the Jewish youth movement should direct its efforts.

Of special importance is the fight against racism. Jews are being pitted against Black people. We have the responsibility, our Jewish members in the first place, of convincing Jewish youth that the fight against anti-Semitism is closely linked to the fight against racism. In fact, anti-Semitism and racism are fostered by the same enemy--monopoly capital--and must be fought together. Jewish youth must be won to the understanding that only through their struggle against racism can Jewish-Black unity be achieved and anti-Semitism defeated.

\*

Jewish youth, like all youth in the USA, are searching for answers and a way out of the oppression and crises of capitalism. We must bring Marxism to them and win Jewish youth to our ranks. Only by doing away with the class that fosters racism and anti-Semitism, the capitalist class, can these twin evils be exterminated forever. The struggle for democracy, for the full appreciation of all people's struggles, can only be completely won with the overthrow of capitalism.

We must bring Jewish youth organizations and Jewish youth fully into the overall youth movement. We must work together where we can and discuss our differences frankly. We must attack those groups like the JDL that are reactionary and fascist, but work with those groups that are progressive-leaning even though they may take reactionary positions on the Jewish question.

With such an approach, that is principled but flexible, we will win Jewish youth to the fight for democracy and socialism.

. . . . .

**JEWISH AFFAIRS** is published monthly by the Communist Party, U.S.A. Price per copy 25¢. Subscriptions: one year \$2.50, six months \$1.25. Address all correspondence to **JEWISH AFFAIRS**, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.

. . .

A MEETING OF POLISH JEWS

By Sol Flapan

WARSAW, Mar. 17 - Election meetings are to be held in all branches of the Cultural and Social Society of Jews in Poland between now and the end of the year. This activity will lay the groundwork for convening the Society's Sixth Congress by the end of 1971 or the beginning of next year, it was decided at a recent plenary session of the Society's Executive Board.

A report on the organization's activities, the ensuing discussion by 19 Board members and invited guest Wladyslaw Skrzypczak of the Administrational Department of the Polish United Workers' Party's Central Committee, were the two main points on the agenda.

This policy-making meeting held in the Society's newly-built headquarters in Warsaw also heard Board president Edward Rajber speak on the preparations to mark the 28th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising on April 19.

Lastly, the Board adopted a declaration which denounces the latest Zionist-instigated anti-Soviet hate campaign. The peak of the newest Zionist cold-war operation, it says, was the notorious Brussels Conference allegedly "in defence of Soviet Jews."

Particularly revolting for activists in Poland's Jewish community is the "offensive of slander against that country which, in the hour of its deepest grief, saved the world from fascism at the cost of 20 million of its citizens." The Soviet Union is remembered as "that country which rescued millions of Europeans including many Jews from dozens of lands from total annihilation which Hitler fascism had prepared for them."

The declaration recalls that the Society has repeatedly nailed the reactionary character of Zionism. It says the Brussels provocation once again confirmed that anti-Communism is the be-all and end-all of the Zionists who have tied themselves to the most reactionary forces. Zionism never reflected the true interests, aspirations and desires of the Israeli people nor of the Jews living in other countries.

The organized Jewish community in People's Poland has thus once again gone on record as roundly protesting the Zionist-inspired anti-USSR campaign. It reaffirmed its complete solidarity with those Jewish organizations, with those Jewish brothers--full fledged citizens of their Soviet homeland, and with the Communist Party of Israel, who have raised their voices against Zionist provocations.

International solidarity in the battle with reaction is also symbolized in the Warsaw Ghetto tradition. This was emphasized by Edward Rajber who described that heroic rebellion as an integral

part of the history of the anti-fascist resistance movement of Poland and of all Nazi-occupied Europe.

"While remembering our heroes and our honored dead, it is also incumbent on us to recall the gallant Polish people who came to their assistance during the long nightmare of Nazi occupation thereby risking their lives and those of their families," he declared.

"We must remember," he continued, "those Polish Workers' Party people, soldiers of the People's Guards [armed force of the PWP] and fighters of other anti-Hitler armed formations who rushed with direct help to the embattled Ghetto."

Solemnly pronouncing the oath of the Ghetto fighters "We shall never forget - we shall never forgive," Rajber urged a redoubling of efforts to bring to justice those Hitler hangmen who are still strutting around scot-free in West Germany, Austria and in some South American countries.

He called for marking April 19 at outdoor and indoor memorial meetings.

Here in the Polish capital, he reported, this year's anniversary events will be opened by a public exhibit of 275 paintings by Jewish artists, many of whom were murdered by the Nazis in the Warsaw Ghetto and whose works were painstakingly collected after liberation by the Jewish Historical Institute.

On April 19 itself, there will be the traditional wreath-laying ceremonies at the Warsaw Ghetto Monument. Delegations of political and public organizations from Warsaw factories and offices will pay their respects. Their slow-step approach to the monument which depicts Ghetto fighters in action, will be accompanied by a roll of muffled military drums while a Polish Army honor guard will stand at "present arms." A memorial meeting will be held that evening in the Jewish State Theater where a stage and film montage documenting the struggles of the Polish people - Jews and gentiles - against the Nazis will also be shown.

One of the first discussants, Stanislaw Laufner of Czestochowa in industrial Silesia urged that the Ghetto anniversary celebrations be given a universal character. He suggested that Folks-Shtimme devote much of its April issues to publishing material on the fraternal assistance rendered Jews by Poles during the Nazi holocaust.

Meanwhile, a number of speakers recommended that the Jewish clubs of the Society around the country contact Polish cultural and public organizations so as to initiate close cooperation with them. This is a fact already in several places.

In Warsaw, reported Marian Fuks, the Jewish Historical Institute receives the most cordial support from the Polish Academy of Sciences.



Szymon Zang, the delegate from industrial Katowice, stressed that the Jewish community must join the Polish working class's "we will help" promise given to the new leadership of the PUPW.

Board member Julian Sztejnberg said that the People's Council of his home town of Swidnica shows great concern for the Jewish community there. The elected authorities of this town of nearly 47,000 inhabitants in southwestern Poland visit the Society's club occasionally and invite club activists to attend Council-sponsored seminars and other meetings. "That inspires us with much encouragement," he said.

Here and there, however, relations are not so intimate. This was openly criticized by some and indeed, the issue was forthrightly tackled by the invited guest from the Polish United Workers Party.

Wladyslaw Skrzypczak admitted to certain distortions in the country and to misunderstandings on a number of issues. And there is an occasional expression of ill-will by some individuals, he confessed. These negative features will not disappear in a flash. But the conviction must prevail, he emphasized, that the Party's policy will resolve these distortions.

"And you, too, will feel this," he assured the leaders of the Jewish community. "Everything which was a break on our march forward, which aroused dissatisfaction, will be eliminated from our life."

• • •

THE FIGHT FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST--  
HERE AND IN ISRAEL

(The following newspaper ads are indicative of the developing movements for a change in the present policies of the Israeli government both in this country and in Israel.)

FOR A JUST AND DURABLE  
PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Gunnar Jarring talks to implement the UN Security Council Resolution of November 11, 1967, offer hope that a peaceful settlement can be achieved in the Middle East. But there is grave danger of failure.

After "emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war" the Resolution calls for: "a. Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict; b. Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries

free from the threats or acts of force." On the basis of mutual acceptance of these two principles, the Resolution projects the solution of all outstanding questions.

The governments of the UAR and Jordan have repeatedly affirmed acceptance of the Resolution in toto, most recently in response to a query by Gunnar Jarring. They have stated that they are prepared to recognize Israel's rights to exist in peace and security. In return they call for Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories and a just settlement of the Palestine refugee question. UAR President Anwar El Sadat has also expressed readiness to sign a peace treaty with Israel.

The solution can only be political. The one way to a secure and just peace in the Middle East is full acceptance of the Resolution by both sides. Only thus can meaningful negotiations proceed.

We urge, therefore, that Americans demand of the Nixon Administration a U.S. policy in the Middle East that presses for full acceptance of the UN Security Council Resolution of November, 1967; that the Administration reject annexations, armaments and military threats. Our Committee believes that such a policy is the only road to a just and durable peace in the Middle East. Any other policy can only lead to a war which will engulf the whole world.

Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East  
100 East 16th Street, New York, N.Y. 10003

(New York Times, March 25, 1971)

---

WE MUST SAY "YES" TO JARRING!

Last week a very important change occurred in the Israel-Egypt conflict which is as old as the State of Israel. For the first time an Egyptian President has announced the readiness of his country to recognize the existence of the State of Israel and conclude a peace agreement with it.

Until 1967, and even thereafter, Israel officially regarded readiness on the part of the Arabs to recognize Israel and conclude peace with it as its main political goal.

The Egyptian President's pronouncement is based on conditions that have both positive and negative aspects, but it was made on the background of the Jarring plan in which the possibilities of peace and security are balanced.

The plan includes the principles of recognition of the State of Israel and a peace agreement with it, renunciation of annexation and Israel's withdrawal from Egyptian soil to the international boundary, freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal and the Straits

of Tiran, and international supervision of Sharem e-Sheikh, supervision which Egypt will not be able to cancel without the agreement of all the world powers.

It is possible to insist upon the correction of certain details in this plan; however, Israel should adopt all of its principles. Its rejection of this plan is liable to mean forfeiting a great opportunity which we now have: to achieve peace and security, as a nation acting of its own free will and not in accordance with the dictates of the world powers or the Security Council.

**ISRAEL MUST ANSWER JARRING'S INITIATIVE  
IN THE AFFIRMATIVE!**

The Movement for Peace and Security  
P.O.B. 29244, Tel Aviv.

(Ha'aretz, March 5, 1971)

IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES      . . .

DON'T SAY "I DON'T KNOW" — NOW YOU KNOW

(From an article in Tel Aviv University's Student Weekly,  
No. 12, January 1971.)

On January 27th, in the presence of youth movement leaders, I talked with a European newspaperman who had visited Gaza four times in the past few weeks. He is pro-Israel and pro-Zionist and is a correspondent of an influential European newspaper. This is what he told me:

"Gaza looks like a conquered city in which the fighting had just stopped. Soldiers of the Border Patrol frequently patrol the streets in pairs. They walk on both sides of the street with 50 centimeter clubs in their hands. Some hold whips. The clubs and the whips show that the brutality is not spontaneous but the policy of at least those who equipped the soldiers with these weapons. I saw people who had been beaten. Their hands and feet were swollen. People who had been indiscriminately beaten in the street came to first aid stations. The blows were not meant to kill the victims but to hurt, frighten and humiliate them.

"As I walked along the street I saw two policemen on the other side approach a storekeeper. They examined his documents and after one of the policemen returned them, they took him by the collar and hit him on the head. The man fell down unconscious. Then one of the policemen lifted him up, punched him twice in the face. After that they walked away. The same pair beat up a number of passers-by without stopping them.

"An Israeli officer told me that in the Government prison suspects are beaten until they give the desired information. In that prison a terrorist who refused to talk was beaten to death. A cynical officer commented: 'Fools! If they were certain he was a terrorist (he was caught with grenades on his person) why didn't they let him go and shoot him as he walked out?'"

• • •

#### ADMINISTRATIVE ARREST: PREVENTION OR PUNISHMENT

By Fawsi Al Asmar, former editor of the  
Arabic edition of Ha'olam Haze  
(Ha'aretz, December 9, 1970)

After two hunger strikes by prisoners under administrative arrest--one on March 3 in which 18 administrative prisoners in Damun jail on Mount Carmel near Haifa participated and the other on April 19 by 1,000 prisoners in Israel and the territories--the Minister of Police and the Defense Minister explained that administrative arrest is preventative rather than punitive.

(Administrative arrest is arrest without charges, without trial and for an indefinite period. It is provided for in the Emergency Regulations of 1945 originally adopted by the British rulers in Palestine to be used against both Jews and Arabs rebelling against British oppression. Today it is widely employed by Israeli authorities against Arabs in the occupied territories. - Ed.)

However, confinement, which restricts individual liberty, is punishment. I would like to quote the remarks of Knesset Member Gideon Hausner in a booklet containing his speech against the Nazi criminal Adolph Eichmann: "To compel a man to be in prison without enabling him to prove his innocence to a court of law or know the date of his release is in itself a tremendous criminal provocation."

Administrative prisoners incarcerated in prisons are subject to prison conditions, with certain modifications. If this is only preventative arrest, the prisoner should have the same conditions he would have if he were under house arrest. However, prison conditions are designed to punish criminals. Moreover, the following itemization of the conditions of arrest will prove that administrative arrest is in many respects more severe than ordinary arrest.

(The author then presents a catalogue of discriminations against administrative prisoners. The following, concerning visits, is typical. - Ed.)

An administrative prisoner is allowed visitors only once a month, limited to members of his family (wife, children, grandchildren, parents, brothers). The number of visitors is limited to three per visit. On the other hand, everyone has the right to visit regular prisoners. Administrative prisoners may be visited only on Monday, which

is a work day, whereas the visiting day for regular prisoners is one of the days of rest, namely, Friday, Saturday or Sunday, as the visitors prefer. . . .

Administrative imprisonment cannot be considered preventative arrest but must be regarded as punishment that is more severe than that meted out to prisoners whom the courts have found guilty after they had the opportunity to defend themselves.

. . .

### CHILDREN IN THE SHADOW OF PRISON

By Felicia Langer

(Zo Haderckh, organ of the Communist Party of Israel,  
December 2, 1970.)

On a hill, high above the town of Hebron, towers the building of the military governor. There are offices, the courtroom and the prison. The permit offices are in newly built premises at the foot of the hill. You might not know that the inhabitant of occupied Hebron needs permits--a permit to visit his relatives in other parts of his split-up homeland, a permit to enter Jerusalem, and of course a permit to visit imprisoned members of his family. In short, there is a flourishing permit business....In the yard of the military government premises, the Israeli "settlers" have established themselves, close to the prison walls. But now permanent housing estates are being built for them, as if they were to stay there forever. In the fenced-in yard, around the buildings, children are playing. There are swings, and all sorts of children's games are played. One of the walls bears the inscription: "State-Religious School, Hebron, City of the Patriarchs."

There are wonderful sights for the children: An Arab prisoner doing some earthwork near the prison, and around him armed guards.

On one of the school walls there are inscriptions from the Prophets. They speak of justice, of good works and of the Almighty God who is so merciful.

These children are not the only ones in the vicinity. There are other children of their age, but it seems the sunlight and the blue of the sky have not been created for them. Their fate is moisture, cold stone floors and chains. These are the young sons of Hebron, so very close to the paradise of swings and beautiful inscriptions; here they are inside the closely packed prison cells. The invader has taken care that they should not enjoy even those privileges enjoyed everywhere in the world by minors who have transgressed the law. Why is that so? Because their crime is love for

their homeland, which has caused them to exchange the playfields for dark prison cells....

"Exclamations are heard: "Donkeys, cows, you don't understand a thing!" A policeman teaches sense to some persons requesting permits. They are sitting on the ground, hour after hour. Thus they sit there, in the heat of summer, and thus in the cold of winter. What would they not do for the longed for permit!

I looked at these children, who play there innocently. And I pitied them, pitied their young souls, pitied them for having such fathers, who have established their palace of learning in the shadow of prison. I pitied them for their young souls which are being twisted, for hearts that are being hardened, for their ears that are being closed, so as not to hear the cry of their neighbor. And all this is being done to them while they are still soft and gentle-- for when they will grow up, they will no longer live in a world of oppressors and jailers, and of the jingle of chains.

The signboard says clearly: "Hebron, City of the Patriarchs." Arabs are forbidden to enter without the permission of the armed guards. This is a sort of natural reservation for the prisoners of Hebron and the continuation of the "patriarchal" traditions - decorated with side-curls and armed with pistols.

If I believed in God, I would call out to Him, to look at this silent atrocity, and to pronounce judgment upon all this, in accordance with His Ten Commandments....

But I do believe in the voice of reason, in simple human reason, which cries out: Stop! Hands off the land not belonging to you! Do this for your children's sake!

(Felicia Langer is a courageous Jewish attorney who has devoted herself to the defense of Arabs in the occupied territories imprisoned by the Israeli occupation authorities.)

• • •

#### EVENTS AND VIEWS

At the recent convention of the Women's Division of the American Jewish Congress, held in Boston on March 28-31, the question was raised by a number of the delegates of restoring priority to the fight against the war in Indochina as against the crusade to "liberate" Soviet Jews. A resolution calling for support to the April 24 demonstration in Washington was submitted to the resolutions committee. It was sidetracked, however, on the grounds that (a) the demonstration was being held on the Sabbath and (b) that it involved people who were enemies of Israel.

But the supporters of the resolution were not to be denied. They introduced the following resolution on the floor of the Convention:

We pledge to join in and support the April 24th March for Peace in Washington together with hundreds of thousands of other Americans who demand an end to the senseless Indochina war.

Although it has long been the policy of the American Jewish Congress not to join in actions on the Sabbath, the overriding concern with ending the war demands and requires our participation in this important event.

It was passed by a vote of 450-1. And some of the officers indicated that they were prepared to go and bring others with them.

From Warsaw with the dateline February 18 comes the following item:

"There can be no toleration of obscurantism in socialist Poland." So ruled the District Court in Otwock, a Warsaw suburb, in handing down its sentence in a case concerning an anti-Semitic act.

This remark headlines a report in this week's Folks-Shtimme, newspaper of the Social and Cultural Society of Jews in Poland, on the recent trial of Jerzy R. who was arraigned by the District Attorney for sending a letter to the Society's board containing language "insulting national sentiments and dignity."

The court sentenced him to five months in jail, but in view of his repentance during the investigation and the trial, and taking into consideration what was described as a "difficult family situation," the court decided on a three-year suspended sentence. Hence the defendant's name is not reported in the press.

But the court made it clear that Jerzy R.'s behavior arouses universal condemnation and violates the elementary legal, moral and political norms of the country, including the Constitution. The passage in question is Paragraph 2 of Article 69 which states: "The spreading of hatred of contempt, the provocation of strife or the humiliation of man on account of national, racial or religious differences are forbidden."

An article in the Jerusalem Post, dated January 5, 1971, states:

Defense consumes 90 per cent of the country's tax contributions, 32 per cent of its imports (and 64 per cent of the import surplus), 25 per cent of its manpower. Outlay on the armed forces in the last three years (1968 to 1970) exceeds all that was spent in the first

19 years of the State's existence, including all three wars. Finance Minister Pinhas Sapir paid a warm tribute to President Nixon and the American people, confessing that he did not know how Israel would have coped with the vast foreign currency expense had it not been for the \$500 million loan recently approved by Congress.

(What Mr. Sapir fails to say is that the \$500 million will have to be repaid, on top of previous debts, and in dollars. Some 17 per cent of next year's budget is earmarked for the payment of principle and interest on government debt.)

--

An article by Daniel Bloch in Davar (January 21, 1971) on Israel's treatment of its Arab minority states:

It is amazing that only now are we coming to the realization that the Arabs should be integrated in top level positions in the Knesset and Government. It is a cause for wonder that to this day there are only a few Arabs among important Israel Government officials and that their number, in the middle ranks, is insignificant. Moreover, there is not a single Arab in the executive institutions of the Histadrut (the trade union organization--ed.).

o o o

BAIL FOR ANGELA DAVIS!

Angela Davis has now spent seven months in solitary confinement, under conditions which are undermining her health and making it impossible to prepare her defense properly. Though not convicted of any crime and presumed innocent, she is being unconstitutionally denied bail while a convicted mass murderer like William Calley is released to his own quarters and permitted all sorts of freedoms while appealing his conviction.

A campaign has been launched to win Angela Davis's immediate release on bail. Letters and telegrams demanding her release should be sent to the following individuals:

Albert Harris, Deputy Attorney General, State of California  
 Evelle Younger, Attorney General, State of California  
 Hon. Ronald Reagan, Governor, State of California  
 Hon. Richard Nixon, President, U.S.A.  
 Hon. U Thant, Secretary General, United Nations

A People's Petition Demanding Bail for Angela Davis has been issued by the New York Committee to Free Angela Davis. Copies may be obtained from the Committee. Its address is 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10011. The phone number is 243-8555.

\* \* \*