

Volume
5
Number
3

JEWISH AFFAIRS

May-June
1975

Price 35¢



In this issue:

Toward Peace in the Middle East

Herbert Aptheker

The Fight Against Anti-Semitism

Hyman Lumer

A Chapter on Meditation

David Shaham

Editorial

Greetings from the Communist Party of Israel

Ruth Lubitz

RESOLUTION ON WORK AMONG THE JEWISH PEOPLE

21st National Convention, CPUSA

JEWISH AFFAIRS

A publication of the Communist Party, USA

Vol. 5, No. 3

May-June, 1975

Editor: Hyman Lumer

Editorial Committee: David Fried, Jack Kling, Alex Kolkin

CONTENTS

Editorial

<u>The Demise of Kissinger's Shuttle Diplomacy</u>	3
<u>Resolution on Work Among the Jewish People, by the 21st National Convention, CPUSA</u>	4
Herbert Aptheker, <u>Toward Peace in the Middle East</u>	9
Hyman Lumer, <u>The Fight Against Anti-Semitism</u>	17
Ruth Lubitz, <u>Greetings from the Communist Party of Israel</u>	24
David Shaham, <u>A Chapter on Meditation</u>	27
<u>Declaration of the Paris Conference, by the International Conference for a Just and Peaceful Solution to the Middle East Problem</u>	29
<u>Events and Views</u>	31

Cover: "The Musician" -- Sculpture by Aron Futherman

Published bi-monthly by Jewish Affairs at 23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010. Phone: MU. 5-5755. Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at New York, N.Y.

Subscription rate: \$3.50 for 12 issues
1.75 for 6 issues
Single copies 35¢

Editorial

THE DEMISE OF KISSINGER'S SHUTTLE DIPLOMACY

The highly touted Kissinger shuttle diplomacy in the Middle East, it is quite clear by now, has collapsed beyond any serious hope of redemption. His policy of "step-by-step" negotiations as a substitute for Geneva has proven a failure. True, efforts to revive them continue, and new variations of the formula for a separate settlement with Egypt are projected. But these produce only increased confusion and delay.

The failure of the Kissinger diplomacy was inevitable, for his maneuvers were designed not to resolve the basic elements of the Middle East conflict but to by-pass them, to make deals with hopefully pliable Arab leaders like Sadat and Hussein which would, in effect, preserve the status quo and allow Israel to retain the bulk of its conquests. Furthermore, Kissinger ignored the central issue of the Palestinian Arab question, seeking to put this off to some time in the indefinite future.

These tactics dovetailed with those of the Israeli ruling circles, which also sought "partial solutions"---"solutions which would leave the status quo relatively undisturbed. The Rabin government has, in fact, learned nothing from the October war. It continues to seek the security of Israel in territorial annexation and in superior military force. It continues to charge that no peace is possible because the Arab states, whatever they may say, are motivated only by an insane passion to destroy Israel. War is inevitable and this time Israel will strike first, and will deliver another 1967 blow against the Arabs.

U.S. imperialism, in whose interests Kissinger labored, reckoned without this utter intransigence; it had hoped its Israeli allies would be a bit more "flexible." But it reckoned also without certain other factors---without the growing strength and unity of the Arab states, without the resistance in Egypt and elsewhere to the capitulationist policies of Sadat, and without the growing influence of the Palestinian Arabs.

What emerges most clearly in this picture is the continued determination of the Arab states to recover the territories taken from them in 1967 and the determination of the Palestinian Arabs to win their right of self-determination. What is clearer than ever is that no peaceful settlement is possible without satisfying these demands.

The road to peace lies only through the Geneva negotiations. It lies only through full implementation of Resolution 242, which

means return of all conquered territories. It lies only through agreement to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. So long as the Israeli rulers and U.S. imperialism refuse to accede to these just demands, the only alternative is renewed warfare, which in the end can bring only disaster to the Israeli people.

The fight to resume the Geneva negotiations and to persuade the Israeli and U.S. governments to abandon their present suicidal policies remains the central issue. This is becoming clear to growing numbers of people, here and in Israel, and the prospects for organizing such a struggle are steadily growing.

* * *

Resolution on Work Among the Jewish People

Adopted by the 21st National Convention, CPUSA

Some 6 million Jews live in the United States--by far the largest Jewish community in the world. Concentrated in the major urban centers of the country (nearly half live in the New York area), it is a compact, highly organized community with a substantial body of Anglo-Jewish cultural and religious activity as well as a continuing older Yiddish-language sector.

In its class composition it reflects that of U.S. society as a whole. At one extreme is the Jewish big bourgeoisie, reaching into the top ranks of U.S. finance capital; at the other extreme are some 15 per cent of Jewish families who are officially classified as "poor." The great majority, though no longer concentrated in the garment industry and in other traditionally sweatshop industries, are wage and salaried workers, suffering the same exploitation and sharing the same problems as other workers. Today they suffer together with others from the effects of unemployment and inflation and, along with other workers are being stirred into action. It is to this mass of working people that our Party must address itself. It is among them that our efforts must be concentrated.

The Jewish people have played a notable role in the working-class and democratic anti-monopoly struggles in our country in the recent period. Jewish workers and trade union leaders have been prominent in numerous trade union struggles. Jewish groups and organizations have been in the forefront of the fight for peace and made a significant contribution to the great civil rights struggles of the sixties. The Jewish masses must be recognized as a powerful force for progress and a highly significant factor in today's struggles against the monopolies, a factor which should not be neglected.

*

The Jewish people in the United States are victims of anti-Semitism which, like all other forms of racism and national chauvinism, is an instrument of monopoly capital for dividing the working-class and intensifying capitalist exploitation and oppression. Jews are subjected to discrimination in employment, housing, education, access to recreational facilities and other respects. Synagogues and other Jewish institutions are increasingly objects of vandalism. The Jewish people are one of the chief targets of the mountainous outpourings of racist filth by the rabid ultra-Right. And the big lie of the tsarist forgery, the Protocols of the Elders of Zion, fraudulently alleging the existence of a conspiracy of "Jewish bankers" to gain world domination, continues to find wide currency, not only in the ultra-Right but also in "respectable" bourgeois circles.

Central to the fight for the interests of the Jewish people, therefore, is the struggle against the virus of anti-Semitism and for full democratic rights and equality for the Jewish people in all respects. This struggle must be based on proletarian internationalism--on joining with all working people in struggle against all national and racial oppression. It must be based above all on unity of the Jewish and Black peoples, in particular on combatting racism among the Jewish people.

The struggle against anti-Semitism demands the exposure and repudiation of the poisonous ideology of Zionism, which asserts that anti-Semitism is eternal and incurable, that the national interests of the Jewish people are opposed to those of other peoples, and that the basic ties of Jewish workers are not with other workers but with other Jews, including the big Jewish capitalists.

Equating anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism, the Zionists strive to create false targets of so-called "anti-Semitism of the Left" and "Black anti-Semitism," thus diverting the Jewish people from the struggle against the class enemy--against the real source of anti-Semitism--and misleading them into paths of racism and anti-Sovietism. They call for "going easy" on the anti-Semitism of the Reagans, Buckleys and General Browns on the grounds that these are "friends of Israel." They oppose all compensatory measures to overcome the effects of centuries of discrimination against Black and other oppressed peoples and against women, labelling them "discrimination in reverse."

All these are roadblocks to the struggle against anti-Semitism, whose manifestations in this country are growing alarmingly. The absence of a serious campaign against anti-Semitism here, coupled with the Zionist concentration on its phoney crusade for "liberation" of Soviet Jews, gives encouragement to the forces of racism and anti-Semitism and it conceals the true situation of Jews in the socialist Soviet Union, where anti-Semitism has been virtually wiped out. What is called for is a major offensive against anti-Semitism in the United States. In particular, it is a prime responsibility of our Party to take the initiative in launching such a campaign.

Key in all our work among the Jewish people is the struggle against the pernicious influence of Zionism in the Jewish community. With the 1967 war in the Middle East, which produced a powerful emotional reaction among many Jewish people, Zionist influence greatly increased, and during this period the Zionist movement has become increasingly a bulwark of reaction among Jews.

There has been a distinct trend to the Right in bourgeois Jewish circles. It is reflected in: 1) the growing ties with Right-wing political elements and the shift of a portion of the Jewish vote to Nixon in 1972; 2) a sharp rise of racism in the Jewish community, as evidenced by the campaign against so-called "Black anti-Semitism," by the leading role of Jewish organizations in opposing preferential hiring and open enrollment, by such racist outbreaks as those in Forest Hills and Canarsie in New York, and by the rise of Shankerism in the teachers' union; 3) the upsurge of anti-Sovietism and the campaign by the leading Jewish organizations to utilize the Jewish people as the spearhead of opposition to detente in the name of fighting alleged "Soviet anti-Semitism"; 4) the emergence of the gang of fascist hoodlums calling itself the "Jewish Defense League."

The racism of Shanker and others of his kind is characteristic of Right-wing social democracy, which is crassly class-collaborationist, pro-Zionist and violently anti-Soviet. It is essential to fight against its influence among Jewish workers.

In combatting Zionism it must be recognized that the great majority of Jewish people are not Zionists but are moved rather by sentiments of national pride and by concern for the welfare of fellow Jews in Israel, sentiments which Zionism seeks to pervert for its own purposes. Hence the Jewish masses can be won away from Zionist influence, and it is the Party's task to strive to achieve this. Likewise, there exists among Jewish workers a long-standing tradition of militance and of support for progress and socialism. This tradition the Dubinskys, Shankers and their ilk have striven to destroy. It is our task to fight to restore it, to bring it forward as a living force among Jewish workers. Indeed, the conditions are now developing for new and greater initiatives in these struggles on our part.

*

The October 1973 war, which created a new balance of forces in the Middle East and shattered the illusions that the security of the Israeli people could be assured through military superiority and territorial expansion, has led to a growing questioning of Zionist premises, both in Israel and here. To a growing extent, the policies of the Israeli government are being subjected to criticism.

These policies, in conjunction with the maneuvers of Kissinger, have been directed to preserving the status quo, that is, to seeking "partial" and "step-by-step" agreements yielding bits of conquered territory in return for Arab capitulation, while rejecting

the just national claims of the Palestinian Arab people. These efforts have failed. It is now clearer than ever that a just and durable peace in the Middle East can be secured only through resumption of the Geneva negotiations, full implementation of UN Resolution 242 and fulfillment of the right of self-determination of the Palestinian Arabs, represented by the Palestine Liberation Organization.

Whereas previously the Party was almost alone among the Jewish people in its opposition to the aggressive, annexationist policies of the Israeli government and their support by the U.S. government, today there are growing breaks in the wall. Both in Israel and in this country, voices are increasingly being heard--both of prominent individuals and of organized groups, of Jews and non-Jews--calling for abandonment of the present policies which can lead only to war and disaster. Growing opportunities are developing, therefore, to build a movement of some breadth, particularly within the Jewish community, in support of the one genuine path to peace in the Middle East, thus eliminating this area as a major potential source of a new world war. To build such a movement is of utmost urgency, and it rests with our Party to take the necessary initiatives in this direction.

*

Our work in the Jewish field has been seriously affected by the ideological split which has developed in Party and progressive Jewish ranks--a split created by the opportunist course of certain Jewish leaders who have sought, through their control of progressive Jewish publications and organizations, to lead the progressive Jewish masses down the path of reactionary Jewish nationalism, racism and Right opportunism. This has necessitated a difficult, uphill ideological fight in defense of a Marxist-Leninist line on the Jewish question. We have made important headway in this struggle and have won a growing body of solid support for our Party's policies in this field; however, the battle is far from won. The editors of the Morning Freiheit have taken it almost completely into the camp of the pro-Zionist, anti-Soviet forces and have tied it more closely with the degenerate MAKI in Israel and with Jewish Currents in this country, which has long abandoned any serious pretense to progressivism.

In this struggle, we have built a valuable instrument in the magazine Jewish Affairs. It is an effective publication, but much more must be done to build and improve it. Its circulation is as yet comparatively small, and its editorial staff is not yet adequate to accomplish what is possible and necessary. Jewish Affairs can be built into an attractive monthly magazine capable of attracting a large body of readers, and all necessary effort should be put into accomplishing this.

We have also built a valuable instrument in the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East in New York. This has become an important base of activity, through public meetings, literature, demonstrations, ads and other actions, as well as a medium of contact

with other groups. It is distinctly a Left group with a relatively narrow base, but it can be built and can be important in the creation of a broader peace organization.

These accomplishments are a tribute to the work of the National Jewish Commission, which has carried on consistent work in its field. However, its work continues to suffer from certain weaknesses which have long characterized our work in the Jewish field. Our activities and contacts are confined almost entirely to the older Yiddish-speaking groups. We are in the main divorced from those who constitute the main body of the Jewish people, Anglo-Jewish elements, and from the Jewish youth. As a result we lack contact with the new developing peace groups and the necessary base for working to build a united peace front with the Party as an accepted participant. We are separated from the broader struggle for Jewish-Black unity and from the struggles being waged around the so-called "quota" question. Serious consideration must be given toward breaking with our sectarianism in this whole field of work.

The Commission needs to be strengthened through the addition of trade union, youth and forces involved in other Jewish organizations or activities. A full-time organizer should be assigned to this field of work, capable of travelling extensively, establishing contacts, building Jewish Affairs and strengthening and coordinating the Party's work organizationally.

It is also necessary to strengthen ourselves ideologically, to improve our understanding of the Jewish question, the nature of Zionism, the character of the Jewish community and the necessity of building the Party among its working-class elements. And it is necessary to make clear the importance to the entire Party of the struggles against anti-Semitism, against Zionism, against U.S.-Israeli maneuvers in the Middle East, and against racism and reaction in the Jewish community.

* * *

On the Occasion of his 80th Birthday
we extend to

COMRADE ABE WISE

Our Warmest, Most Affectionate

Greetings and Good Wishes

Comrade Wise, a veteran of 65 years of participation in the working-class movement and the struggle for socialism, and a charter member of the Communist Party, continues to play an active role in these struggles. We take this occasion to wish him and his devoted wife Eva many more years of good health and fruitful political activity.

The Staff of Jewish Affairs

Toward Peace in the Middle East

By Herbert Aptheker*

Speeches on the question of war or peace in the Mid-East delivered by Dr. Lumer and me at the third annual dinner in honor of Jewish Affairs, have been the occasion for fierce assaults by several writers in Freiheit. (Here let me distinguish between this leadership and the readers of the paper, who are in the main honest progressives seeking the truth.) Indeed, no less than six articles by Mr. Pevsner and Mr. Resnick and Mr. Novick were devoted to my own little contribution. Though in combined form there were several thousands of words, none was devoted to the substance of that talk, which was entitled "Some Questions and Some Answers" and which dealt with arguments most often used by those who support the present policies of the Israeli government. These questions and my answers treated the alleged need for secure borders; the reality and meaning of nationalism and nationality; the insistence upon Israel's small size as ruling out the reality of its aggressiveness; the insistence upon the "democratic" character of Israel as compared to her neighbors; and the nature of U.S. imperialism and the meaning of its policy of support for the Israeli government.

The Freiheit articles discuss many things--whether or not Aptheker is a Jew at all or is really an altogether assimilated Jew or is a Jew only for display purposes at gatherings such as this one; that Aptheker is really a terrorist and not a Communist; and that Aptheker at one time spoke of the Freiheit in a way quite different from the way he speaks of it today.

In order to convince me that I am a Jew--if only an assimilated one--Mr. Resnick quotes from a sickening book by Harold Cruse, a renegade who is incapable of recognizing the truth and who is the author of the most blatantly anti-Semitic book to be published by a major house in the United States in fifty years. As for citing a snippet of a speech I gave in India in 1968 where I referred to the Freiheit as the only progressive daily newspaper in the United States and Resnick's triumphant discovery that I have a different estimate of that paper today: I said that back in 1968 when Mr. Resnick was Comrade Resnick and when Mr. Novick was Comrade Novick. If Mr. Resnick wants to continue his researches he will find that

* This and the following article by Hyman Lumer contain the texts of speeches presented at a meeting on June 20, 1975, sponsored by the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East.

in a book of mine published in 1955 I refer in very positive terms to Comrade Johnny Gates; I would not do so today and I wonder if Mr. Resnick is able to guess the reason for this and is able to understand whether Aptheker has changed or Gates has changed--and whether Novick has changed or Aptheker has changed.

Enough for these former Communists bewildered and beguiled by nationalism and--as is usual in such cases--sinking ever more deeply into the swamp of opportunism. Indeed, Freiheit, in an editorial in its issue of June 5, reiterates on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the 1967 war, that in it Israel "fought for its existence" and that: "The Morning Freiheit has since the Six Day War expressed its opinion that Israel had then fought a defensive war." Well, of course, a war for existence and a war of defense is a just war and the results of a just war are not only to be defended but are to be hailed. Surely that is the logic of the analysis? But how does one reach such a conclusion about a war which saw the "imperiled" nation fighting "defensively" only on the territory of the "aggressors" and gaining as a result of its "defensive" warfare--on the soil of the "aggressors"--territory belonging to several of its neighbors, which acquisition adds 200 per cent to the area of "imperiled" Israel?

*

The position of the Freiheit was the position of the Maki, the split-off from the Communist Party of Israel, headed by Shmuel Mikunis; it was with that group that Novick consorted when he visited Israel; it was a representative of that group which the Freiheit undertook to bring to this country and provide with audiences. It is this group, this Maki--or the fragment of it that now remains--which refuses to join the United Peace Front of Israel, now embracing individuals from groups as varied as the Communist Party and elements of Mapam, Moked, Rakah, Meri, New Left, and Black Panther parties.

In November 1974, Mikunis resigned as general secretary of Maki and early in 1975 he resigned from it altogether. Maki has since joined, officially, the Zionist movement. Freiheit reported Mikunis' resignation as general secretary and his resignation from Maki, but it never reported the reasons Mikunis himself gave and in particular never printed his letter of resignation as general secretary.

In that letter--published widely of course in Israel and published in full here only in the Daily World, on page 2 of its issue dated February 1, 1975, Mikunis named three areas of substantive disagreement between himself and the leadership of Maki "which," he wrote, "in my opinion, are quite unbearable." They were, in full, as follows:

a) The significant silence on the part of Maki as regards the administrative arrests and investigation by torture of Arab Communists and democrats in the occupied territories, for their mere "sin" of demanding to end the foreign

occupation and to oblige the Israeli government to recognize the right of the Arab Palestinian people to self-determination;

b) The significant silence of Maki regarding the initiated policy of the Rabin government of murdering innocent people in the Arab refugee camps in the south of Lebanon by means of military actions by air, sea and land, on the "grounds" that this is a war against the Palestinian terrorists.

c) The Maki Central Committee resolution of the end of August, 1974, spoke of the return of the "overwhelming part" of the occupied Arab territories to the Arabs within the framework of a peace settlement whereas in November 1973, we signed a mutual declaration with the Rumanian Communist Party about the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from the Arab territories captured as a result of the June, 1967 war. 'The overwhelming part' means the annexation of some territories, and it is not the quantity that matters--whether claimed by Maki or the Alignment [i.e., the government coalition] but the principle of avoiding additional wars; as you know, any annexation whatsoever is a step towards a new war.

Those are the reasons given for Mikunis' resignation from Maki; it is clear why the Freiheit has found it inadvisable to publish the text of that remarkable and newsworthy document.

*

Mikunis referred to the violation of human rights perpetrated by the Israeli occupiers; this is a notorious fact known for several years to anyone who wanted to know. It is that form of conduct which always has characterized occupiers of the lands of other peoples--occupiers and annexationists and exploiters behave basically in the same way towards their victims no matter what the nationality of the guilty party may be. This awful behavior tends to be intensified where racism is present, as with Germans in Slavic lands, British in Ireland, in African and Indian lands, and North Americans in Latin-American and Asian lands.

At the end of 1974, a Commission of Inquiry into Israeli Violations of Human Rights in the Occupied Arab Territories--under the auspices of the World Peace Council--held hearings in the Mid-East. The Chairman of the Commission was Romesh Chandra of India. Its other members were Mr. A.B. Kamara, a Cabinet member of the government of Sierra Leone; Mr. L. Kohtala, a Social-Democratic member of the Finnish Parliament; Mr. R. Bhatia, a Congress Party member of the Indian Parliament; and Dr. Oleg Bouyanov, a legal expert from the Soviet Union. Testimony was taken from prominent Israeli citizens as well as from witnesses and victims in the occupied territories.

This Commission found "that the Israeli rulers are applying repressive laws in the occupied territories in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, and that thousands of Palestinians and other inhabitants of the occupied lands are being victim-

ized daily; trials of a political nature are heard before military courts with no right to appeal; prisoners and detainees are subjected to the most inhuman and barbaric tortures; and that widespread cultural repression is enacted by the Israeli ruling circles." The Commission in its findings also stated that these "crimes against humanity...are part of a system of institutionalized terror planned and determined by the topmost leaders in the Israeli government."

*

It remains necessary to repeat the essence of the nature of the so-called Middle-East question. I say repeat because I am going to paraphrase or quote from my remarks made in India in November 1967 when I was one of 1,200 delegates to the first International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples--a Conference chaired by the late Krishna Menon. We stated there the following "fundamental facts":*

1) That the question before us is not one of Arabs versus Jews but on the contrary is one of imperialism and colonialism versus national liberation and social progress. The question before us is the effort by imperialism to maintain the specially exploitative relationship with the so-called underdeveloped countries, many of whose inhabitants are "colored" peoples; the latter fact is of particular importance to the notoriously racist U.S. social order.

Involved here is not a question either of anti-Semitism in the broadest sense or of anti-Jewishness--and the beastly, ultra-reactionary nature and uses of the latter are never to be ignored or forgotten.

Israel's right to existence is not in question and has been repeatedly confirmed by the USSR and the major Arab states.

Fundamental to the question of the Middle East and of war or peace in that region has been and is the stake of the oil cartel in that region and the fabulous profits extracted by that predominantly U.S. oil cartel. In this connection the historic fact of the subordination of U.S. foreign policy to the desires of the oil cartel for the past fifty years and more must be remembered.

The U.S. government has supported not only the reactionary government of Israel but also reactionary Arab governments and in fact has given more arms to the latter than to the former. This emphasizes the truth that the question is not Arab versus Jew but imperialism versus national liberation.

The Israeli government prior to the 1967 war swore repeatedly that it desired no territorial aggrandizement and the U.S. government also asserted prior to that war that it supported the territorial integrity of all states in the Middle East. As the results of the 1967 war show, Israel and the U.S. government were both

* The text of this speech is in Political Affairs, January 1968.

lying. Israel appropriated vast territories, twice her own size, including important oil-producing territory in Egypt and has refused to release such territory, and she has been sustained in that refusal by the United States. It is this reality of annexation which is one of the basic sources of the danger of war in the Middle East, and it is this which has been repeatedly and overwhelmingly denounced by the United Nations. The rights of the Palestinian people have been especially violated and until these rights are recognized and restored, in accordance with UN resolutions, there can be no real peace in the Middle East.

*

Since this was stated in November 1967, the recognition of these realities has deepened and the isolation of Israel has been intensified. The unity of the Arab states--while not fully complete--has significantly increased; the social content of the Arab people's liberation movement has generally deepened; and in particular the political maturity, unity and status of the Palestinian people have been enhanced.

On the negative side, the intransigence of the Israeli ruling circles has not lessened, the rapacity of the oil cartel has in no way been reduced while its worries have grown because of the advance of the Arab liberation movement, and the crisis of Washington's foreign policy has immeasurably intensified, which has induced statements from President Ford and Secretary of State Kissinger and Secretary of Defense Schlesinger which in their contempt for international law and for elementary decency, and in their war-like nature are fully reminiscent of the worst blusterings from the mouths of Hitler, Goering and Goebbels.

We have had the President of the U.S. and his chief foreign affairs secretary openly threaten war upon the Arab peoples to assure the accessibility of their natural resources, and we have heard the defense secretary call for preventive war with the use of atomic and nuclear weapons and affirm that a lesson he has drawn from the debacle of U.S. imperialism in Asia is that "the next time" the U.S. must itself use all of its naval and air power (which can only mean thermonuclear weapons) upon the heart of the "enemy's" territory and not to fritter away its resources in "ancillary" attacks.

And intellectual servants of this ruling class, like Professor Robert Tucker writing in Commentary, the organ of the American Jewish Committee, have already prepared rationalizations and justifications for such wars conducted by such a ruling class. More recently, a person using the pseudonym of Miles Ignotus, and described in Harper's Magazine for March 1975 as "a Washington-based professor and defense consultant with intimate links to high-level U.S. policy makers," has published a full scenario for "Seizing Arab Oil" which goes into detail--how many divisions, how many planes, at what interval of time, in what way and landing where--for a war upon the Arab peoples in order, as the title frankly states, to "seize" their oil. The U.S. has not seen the likes of this for over twenty years,

since Collier's Magazine published a detailed fictional history of how the U.S. conquered the USSR in the Third World War!

Some words on the oil monopolies are in order. Their profits in 1973 reached record levels, but those profits were substantially exceeded in 1974. Thus Exxon reported after-tax profits in 1974 which were 28.5 per cent above 1973; Texaco, 22.8 per cent higher; Standard Oil of California, 15 per cent higher; Mobil, 22.5 per cent higher; and Gulf, 33.1 per cent higher--that is, higher than the record year of 1973!

The oil monopolies account for 72 per cent of natural gas production, 20 per cent of domestic coal production and they possess over 50 per cent of uranium reserves--the latter fact not without consequence in view of President Ford's recent proposal to turn uranium production over to private industry. Let it be noted that while in July 1973 the Federal Trade Commission charged the major U.S. oil companies with many monopolistic and profiteering crimes, as of 1975 the Justice Department has not moved a finger to bring any indictments.

The five largest U.S.-based oil monopolies as of 1974 had total assets of almost \$70 billion dollars--i.e., not too far from the yearly appropriations of the United States government for its "defense" expenditures.

The oil companies tell us in their advertising that they require huge capital to increase the nation's energy supply, but oil companies in fact use millions of dollars of capital to invest in profit-making that has no relationship whatsoever to fuel production. Witness Gulf Oil's investment in Holiday Inn, for example or Mobil using \$803 millions in cash to buy Marcor--the conglomerate that operates Montgomery Ward and the Container Corporation of U.S., or Gulf and Rockwell International, now negotiating a merger (New York Times, June 17, 1975).

We might add that not only do producers in the Arab countries benefit from sudden rises in oil prices. All oil producers do and in this the U.S. monopolies are leaders. Furthermore, most of the oil that we in the U.S. purchase comes from within the country and from Nigeria, Canada, Mexico and Venezuela. In 1973, 35 per cent of U.S. oil imports came from Venezuela. But oil from the Middle East has provided the steepest rate of profit for the U.S. monopolies and that area possesses the largest oil reserve in the world; for these reasons the U.S. replaced France and Great Britain as dominant in the Middle East after the First World War, consolidated its hegemony after World War II and means to continue that control. It means to do this even if it means, for example, keeping the Shah

of Iran on his throne by the CIA*--as was done, or, perverting or dividing the Arab liberation movement, or, if necessary, making war to "seize the oil"--and using Israel as a staging point, a permanent aircraft carrier and a junior partner in the projected rapacious attack.

*

It is vital to keep clearly in mind the nature of the present United States government. It is a government whose previous Administration was riven with corruption and thievery from the President on down to his Cabinet; an Administration that made cruel war illegally; an Administration that approved a plan for the imposition of fascist-like control over the U.S. people; an Administration whose racism was more virulent than anything seen in Washington since Andrew Johnson. It is now a government whose CIA head is the man who was responsible for "Operation Phoenix" in which 20,000 cadre of the liberation movement of the people in South Vietnam were murdered; a government whose CIA assassinated heads of government; tortured defectors and kept them in solitary confinement for years; forcibly drugged individuals; consorted with gangsters in dope-smuggling and murder; opened the mail, tapped the phones and kept dossiers on tens of thousands of its own citizens. It is a government which murdered democracy in Chile and whose present Administration bombed a war-torn Cambodia on a trumped up charge of sea-piracy; it is a government whose present Administration supports, in the bill known as S-1, the most fascist-like legislation ever seriously proposed in this country; an Administration that is reactionary and racist to the core and seeks to expend scores of billions on purposes of slaughter and world-wide intimidation while mercilessly cutting already miserably inadequate provisions for basic human needs.

This is the government which is Israel's "best friend." And even it is having second thoughts as to Israel, second thoughts induced in large part by the realities of its crumbling foreign policy. In Asia it has suffered disaster; in Africa it is hated; in the Arab liberation movement it is recognized as a chief foe; and now with developments in Turkey, Greece, Portugal and Italy it stands face to face with the total loss of the northern shores of the Mediterranean--having already lost the southern shores of that vital sea to the liberation movements of North Africa and the Middle East.

* This was part of the 1958 operation when the CIA had had Mossadegh removed from power in Iran. The Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations--headed by Sen. Frank Church--disclosed in 1974 a secret agreement with the Shah where in fact "despite a de jure 'nationalization,' the cartel managed to maintain de facto control over the production of Iranian oil."--see Edward J. Epstein, "The Secret Deals of the Oil Cartel," in New York magazine, June 23, 1975.

For the rulers of Israel to depend upon that government--quite apart from questions of ethics and worldwide public opinion--is for those rulers to tie themselves to a rotting corpse.

*

In Israel and in the United States developments have occurred which have a very positive aspect and, if nurtured, can force decisive changes upon both Israel and the U.S. and can prevent a new war in the Middle East--though just yesterday the Minneapolis Tribune (as reported in the New York Post of June 19), in an exclusive interview, quoted President Ford as believing that a new war impended.

In Israel the fantastic war burden as well as the worldwide capitalist economic crisis have brought enormous difficulties to its working class and poorer masses. This has intensified labor and trade-union and anti-racist struggles of the great majority of its population which is made up of non-European Jews and Arabs. A very broad and growing movement there, also, against the occupation and for a just peace is developing; in all these positive developments the valiant Communist Party of Israel plays a decisive role and we wish to pay particular tribute to it.

In the United States, the population in general and the Jewish population in particular are showing clear signs of second thoughts on policy in the Middle East and on the role and character of the present Israeli government.

In the U.S. recently, such politicians as Senator George McGovern of South Dakota, Senator Charles Percy of Illinois and Senator Richard Clark of Iowa have made statements of a new character for them, in terms of urging Israeli territorial withdrawal, and in terms of some recognition of at least the existence of a Palestinian people with a liberation movement.

The appearance in Israel of a broadly-based movement called "Yozma" (Initiative) and in the United States an analagous movement called "Breira" (Alternative) reflect with all their programmatic limitations serious re-thinking on the part of many people, including scores of rabbis. The limitations exist especially in terms of the Palestinian people and their rights to self-determination, as well as the question of Jerusalem, all of it appropriated by Israel, made into its capital and its size enlarged by about 300 per cent (as though an occupier had taken over New York City, added Great Neck, White Plains and Yonkers to it and then re-named it New York City).

These organizations call themselves initiative and alternative. Yes, what is required is an alternative to the Washington-Israel line and initiative towards real acceptance of the UN resolutions calling for the release of the occupied lands, the self-determination of the Palestinian people and a rational re-examination of the question of Jerusalem. The peoples of the world have repeatedly urged action in accordance with Resolution 242 of the UN Security

Council. The illegalities and crimes in the occupied lands must stop at once; the political prisoners held by Israel must be freed; and the Geneva Conference must be reconvened with the clear understanding that its essential agenda is the mode of implementing the already adopted UN resolutions on the Middle East.

For us in the United States, this means a stepped-up campaign of truth-spreading; the support of organizations like the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East and publications like Jewish Affairs. It means also that we have the obligation of fighting effectively for a real change in Washington. The main war-danger in the world sprouts from Washington and Washington is the capital of our nation. The policies of the United States can be changed only by the people of the United States, of whom we are an integral part. We are of them and they are of us. Hence it is our obligation and our duty to expend the last drop of our energy towards changing politics in the U.S. It is past time that the working people, the so-called common people--the salt of the earth, those who make it sweet and productive--men and women of all hues and all origins and all religions and no religions--take their destiny into their own hands. We need desperately a mass people's anti-monopoly, anti-racist, anti-war political party in 1976--the Bicentennial Year--is a fine time for that dream to become a reality. It can be done if we all set our hearts and minds to it and refuse to give up and refuse to doubt.

If we do that, our next two hundred years will be a fulfillment of the noblest possibilities in our immortal Declaration of Independence. In this century only the masses can make that Declaration real and its promises actualities. Then, there will be no war and no war danger in the Middle East or anywhere else; then the peoples of the earth will compete with each other only in determining who among all of us may contribute most to making the globe beautiful and really fit for human habitation.

* * *

The Fight Against Anti-Semitism

By Hyman Lumer

For some time now, bourgeois Jewish sources have been asserting that overt anti-Semitism of the traditional type has been declining--that Right-wing anti-Semitic organizations are dwindling in numbers and activity, that open discrimination against Jews has fallen off, that what persists is merely a body of latent anti-Semitism which,

it is true, is capable of flaring up into open expression, but which is at present also falling off.

This is not to say, however, according to these spokesmen, that the menace of anti-Semitism has decreased; on the contrary, they say, it has grown but has simply changed its character. A "new anti-Semitism" has emerged. In a report to the ADL in November 1972, Lawrence Peirez, chairman of the ADL Fact Finding Committee, described it in these words:

Anti-Semitism is no longer largely limited to the far right of the political spectrum but now comes from the far left, from otherwise respectable sources, and from extremist segments of minority groups.

A major component is the heavily increasing flow of Arab and Soviet propaganda. A major trend is the use of the euphemisms such as the terms "anti-Zionist" and "anti-Zionism" when "anti-Jewish" and "anti-Judaism" are really meant.

These concepts are spelled out in great detail by Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein of the ADL in their outrageous book The New Anti-Semitism (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974), in which they portray the main enemies of the Jewish people not as monopolist reaction and the fascist ultra-Right but as the Arab world, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the Black and other oppressed peoples, the Left, and sections of the Christian church. It is these, we are told, who, cloaking their hatred of Jews under a mantle of "anti-Zionism," are the real anti-Semites, the real foe.

The main danger comes not from the imperialist ruling circles, not from the ultra-Right forces, not from the Buckley's, Reagans, General Browns and George Wallaces, but from the Arab oil-producing countries whose rulers, we are warned in hysterical tones, are about to take over the world and to destroy Israel and the Jews, and who must be stopped by whatever means are necessary, including U.S. intervention by armed force. The main danger comes not from the John Birch Society, the Liberty Lobby or the Ku Klux Klan, but from the Left, not least from the Communist Party, and from pacifist clergymen such as Father Berrigan. And above all the main danger emanates from the Soviet Union.

This is truly standing things on their heads. This is truly embracing one's enemies and repudiating one's friends. This is truly falsifying reality.

It is not true that anti-Semitism--real anti-Semitism--is on the decline. On the contrary, with the deepening of the general crisis of capitalism, pro-fascist trends and activities are on the rise. Expressions of anti-Semitism are growing, and they are growing alarmingly. Not only is the outpouring of racist and anti-Semitic filth by the rabid ultra-Right increasing. The more sophisticated--and more dangerous--expressions which emanate from the "respectable" bourgeois circles are also becoming increasingly frequent.

Not so long ago we were treated to the "wisdom" of William Saxbe, then attorney general, to the effect that if intellectuals were mistrusted during the McCarthy period, it was because "the Jewish intellectual...was in those days very enamored of the Communist Party." Then came the revelation, on one of Nixon's famous tapes, of his advice to his daughters in campaigning for him that "the worst thing...is to go to anything that has to do with the arts," adding "the arts, you know--they're Jews, they're Left-wing--in other words stay away." And still more recently there were the infamous remarks of General George S. Brown that in the event of a new war in the Middle East, Americans must "get tough-minded enough to set down the Jewish influence in this country and break the lobby.... They own, you know, the banks in this country, the newspapers. Just look where the Jewish money is." Brown spoke of the alleged "divided loyalties" of Jews and suggested that all this supposed power is to be used for sinister ends. And now, to cap all this, we have the obscene declaration of the fascist demagogue George Wallace that the U.S. fought on the wrong side in World War II.

None of this is new. It all bears the familiar stench of the Nazi anti-Semitism whose ultimate result was the "final solution" of the gas chambers. Nor are such ideas confined to this handful of public figures. What distinguishes these individuals is simply that they spoke out where they could be heard. The anti-Semitic stereotypes which portray Jews as unscrupulous money grubbers who have gained control of the country's wealth, its communications media and its cultural life, of Communism as a "Jewish plot," of conspiracies of "international Jewish bankers" to seize control of the world in keeping with that notorious tsarist forgery, the Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion--these and other familiar anti-Semitic concoctions are far from dead. On the contrary, they are widespread in "respectable" bourgeois circles. And the fact that they are finding increasingly open expression, within these circles as well as within the rabid ultra-Right, should be a cause of serious alarm.

In connection with the 1976 Presidential elections, various maneuvers are already under way to place in the field one or another Right-wing "Conservative" ticket, ranging from the activities of the fascist American Party to conferences of self-styled "Conservatives" hoping to oppose Ford and Rockefeller with a ticket headed by Reagan or Wallace, and there is talk of establishing a national Conservative Party patterned after that in New York, whose chief spokesman is Senator Buckley. In the Democratic Party there is serious talk of the possibility of a Jackson-Wallace ticket. And Wallace himself has already made it clear that, one way or another, his hat is in the ring.

All these are rabidly racist, anti-Semitic elements, however much they may seek to cover themselves with a veneer of "democracy" and "Populism." These represent a real threat to the Jewish people in this country, a threat which calls for a most vehement reaction.

But how do the leading Jewish organizations, and in particular those self-appointed "guardians of the faith," the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, respond to these threats? First, as we have noted, they point the finger not at these sources but instead at the

Arabs, the Blacks, the Left and other opponents of Zionism. And above all they profess to find the greatest threat to the Jewish people in the Soviet Union, and against this non-existent menace of "Soviet anti-Semitism" they organize massive campaigns--demonstrations, mass meetings, delegations, full-page New York Times ads, expensive brochures, etc.

"Save Soviet Jews" is the watchword. But what about saving U.S. Jews? Here the watchword is not militance but caution. Demonstrations, we are told, will only stir up the anti-Semitic elements and make things worse. The road to settlement is private discussions in top circles where solutions can be worked out quietly and without fuss. And the ADL will, at the drop of a hat, cite you a long list of such "victories."

Furthermore, they say life is not so simple. Those who are being charged with anti-Semitism, it seems, are at the same time "friends of Israel." In the case of General Brown, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin referred to him as "one of Israel's strongest sympathizers" and added that "Israelis must beware of creating a situation in which the anti-Israel, anti-Semitic allegations such as Brown made recently become the rule rather than the exception." And in this country the Cleveland Jewish News announced at the time that the word from on top seemed to be "that the issue of Gen. Brown's virulent anti-Semitic remarks is best left--like old soldiers--to fade away, on the assumption that Brown has learned his lesson and the point of Jewish protest has been made." (Quoted in Chicago Sentinel, December 12, 1974.)

In short, go easy on Brown. Don't try to have him fired. He helped Israel get arms in its hour of need. Besides, you will only stir up the anti-Semites. And not least, if we should succeed in getting him fired it would only be used to prove that Brown was right in stating that the Jews are all-powerful. The ADL allowed the incident to pass with only a few murmurs of protest. More, neither the ADL nor any other leading Jewish organization had anything to say about Wallace's recent outburst.

Indeed, far from fighting anti-Semitism from such sources, the Zionist organizations have drawn to their bosoms extreme Right-wing political elements of the stripe of Buckley, Reagan and Jackson, elements which are racist, anti-Soviet--and anti-Semitic--to the core. These are hailed as "friends of Israel" and as "friends of the Soviet Jews." That they are motivated solely by support of U.S. imperialist policy in the Middle East and by an undying hatred for the Soviet Union is apparently of no matter. These, along with the George Meany's and others of his kind, are the "allies" of the Zionists in their self-proclaimed role of defenders of the interests of the Jewish people. And it is not precluded that even a George Wallace, in his pursuit of the Presidency, may end up in this hallowed camp of "friends of Israel."

Thus do these Jewish bourgeois organizations, and in particular the ADL, discourage any real fight against anti-Semitism and instead seek to draw the Jewish masses into the camp of imperialism and anti-Sovietism--into the camp of the anti-Semites. And they serve the

forces of reaction in other ways as well.

*

Anti-Semitism is not an isolated phenomenon; it is an intimate part of the whole pattern of racism and national chauvinism fostered by monopoly capital. To be fought effectively, the struggle against it must be treated as part of the joint struggle of all who are racially and nationally oppressed. It must be fought, on the basis of the principles of proletarian internationalism, as a struggle against the common ruling-class enemy. But the Zionists, motivated by their extreme Jewish nationalism, approach the fight against anti-Semitism rather as a fight of Jews against all non-Jews. The point is illustrated by an item in the May issue of the ADL Bulletin, which reads: "A Washington Federal Appeals Court decision prohibiting the use of 'Anti-Defamation Committee' by a Mexican-American group marked the third successful effort by ADL to protect its name." On the two previous occasions, decrees had been obtained from the New York State Supreme Court in 1967 against the Italian-American Anti-Defamation League and in 1972 against the Arab Anti-Defamation League, prohibiting them from using these as corporate names. The Appeals Court in its ruling said the choice of name could lead the public to believe that the group is "a branch of the old and well-known Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith."

The ADL was, of course, established as an organization for the protection of Jews, not as an organization to fight national defamation and discrimination in general. Let other groups similarly look after themselves. God forbid that such disreputable elements as Chicanos, Italian-Americans and--above all--Arabs should take advantage of the good name of the ADL to conduct their struggles--groups which, presumably, are themselves anti-Semitic. Let them find their own trade marks!

Now, one might think that in this land so permeated with racism and chauvinism the formation of every added anti-defamation organization ought to be greeted. And one might even think it a good idea to go a step further and to work to unite all such organizations into one single alliance to fight all racial and national defamation and to combat also the prejudices and hatreds which are built up among the oppressed groups themselves. But this, it is painfully obvious, is not the outlook of the ADL.

Of paramount importance in the fight against anti-Semitism is the establishment of Black-Jewish unity. Black-Jewish relations have greatly deteriorated during the past several years, thanks above all to the alarming growth of racism which has taken place within the Jewish community. To rebuild these relations is, to be sure, a vital necessity, and there is much talk about it within Jewish circles. But it cannot be accomplished without a serious effort to end current manifestations of racism such as the campaigns against "black anti-Semitism" or the leading role of Jewish organizations against preferential hiring and enrollment, which they attack as "discrimination in reverse," and which was most shamefully exhibited in the De Funis case, in addition to others.

But the quest for unity conducted by Jewish organizations and leaders today has a quite different basis. What they seek is a phoney kind of unity--one based on winning the support of the Black people for the U.S.-Israeli policy of aggression against the Arab peoples and for the Zionist anti-Soviet campaign to "liberate Soviet Jews." Efforts to win such support have found reflections in the Black community itself. Recently the Amsterdam News published an ad signed by 21 prominent Black figures, headed "Their Fight Is Our Fight" and calling for "Black solidarity with the civil rights struggle of Russian Jews." This was followed by a full-column editorial in the next issue, headed "Our Time to Choose." The editorial recalls the participation of Jews in the civil rights struggles of past years and calls on the Black people to come to the support of the Jewish people in their struggles for civil rights today. Civil rights for whom? Why, for the Soviet Jews, of course. And the editorial ends by calling on Black people to participate in the April 13 "Solidarity Day" demonstration at the UN against the alleged persecution of Jews in the USSR.

Ted Bassett, in a series of articles in the Daily World of May 20, 21 and 22, has brilliantly exposed the phoney character of such unity and the danger to the Black people in permitting themselves to be drawn into support of pro-imperialist and anti-Soviet campaigns. The pro-Zionist forces in the Jewish community, needless to say, hailed the statements in the Amsterdam News. ADL national director Benjamin R. Epstein wrote a letter to the paper saying he hoped that "the Blacks who participated in Solidarity Day will cherish the memory as my wife and I do the March in Selma." But such a statement only profanes the memory of Selma.

If such things as the so-called "Solidarity Day" are not in the interests of Blacks, neither are they in the interests of Jews. Selma was symbolic of a real and bitter struggle for human rights by the Black people in this country, a struggle which called for all-out support from the Jewish people. "Solidarity Day" has no such significance whatever. There is no civil rights struggle among Soviet Jews. There is in fact no place for such a struggle. For the Soviet people have built a socialist land which has smashed, once and for all, every form of racial and national oppression, including anti-Semitism, and in which all peoples, without exception, enjoy the fullest equality and opportunity.

What is really needed is unity in struggle to accomplish the same thing in this country. What is needed is unity of Blacks and Jews to wipe out the brutal oppression of Black and other minority peoples and the real anti-Semitism which exist here. What progressive and forward-looking Jews are called upon to do is to fight for an end to the whole scandalous anti-Soviet campaign and for the launching of a serious fight against the increasingly menacing anti-Semitism here--against the Birchites, the Ku Kluxers, the General Browns, the George Wallaces and all the others. It is against these that demonstrations should be held, that prohibitive legislation should be introduced and that punitive action should be taken. Here lies the basis for real Black-Jewish unity.

What is called for today is a well-organized mass campaign against anti-Semitism, a campaign which dovetails with the struggles of all oppressed peoples for full equality and democracy. The initiation of such a campaign is a prime responsibility of the progressive forces among the Jewish people.

*

In this connection, a word is necessary about the position of the Morning Freiheit and its supporters on these questions, a position we have found it necessary to condemn. For the Freiheit focuses its attacks increasingly on occasional expressions of anti-Semitism which occur in the Soviet Union rather than on the serious and growing menace of anti-Semitism in this country.

The most recent example is its almost hysterical reaction to the article of Dimitri Zhukov on Zionism which appeared in the popular Soviet magazine Ogonyok last October and its efforts to organize a campaign of public protest to the Soviet government against the article. Its reaction was one not of legitimate criticism but of anti-Soviet incitement, joining hands with the Zionist slanderers who seek to brand the socialist Soviet Union as the main source of anti-Semitism today.

The same trend is evident in the reaction of the Morning Freiheit to the Amsterdam News editorial. An article appearing on April 11 praises the editorial for calling on Black people to come to the support of the Jews in the face of rising anti-Semitism in this country. But it omits any reference to the editorial's stress on Black participation in the anti-Soviet demonstration at the UN on April 13 and it has nothing to say, moreover, about calls to support a non-existent "civil rights struggle of Soviet Jews." True, the April 11 issue also carries an editorial condemning the demonstration, but again with no reference to the appeals to Black people to join in such actions.

True Black-Jewish unity can be built only on a firm foundation of struggle against racism and anti-Semitism in this country, a struggle which is incompatible with anti-Sovietism and which demands the most solid friendship with the Soviet Union, the world's most powerful bastion against national and racial oppression. By failing to emphasize this and by failing to mobilize its readers for a struggle among the Jewish people along these lines, the Morning Freiheit does a disservice to the cause of Black-Jewish unity. It weakens the fight against anti-Semitism and gives comfort to the Zionist elements, the George Meanys and all other forces of anti-Sovietism, racism and reaction.

The burning need today is to open up a militant drive against the real fountainhead of anti-Semitism--the giant monopolists and their supporters--who are likewise the fountainhead of the abominable racist persecution of Black and other oppressed minority peoples in this country. Let us devote ourselves to the fulfillment of this need.

* * *

Greetings from the Communist Party of Israel

By Ruth Lubitz

(The following speech was presented to the District Convention of the Communist Party of New York State on May 25, 1975 by Comrade Ruth Lubitz, a member of the Political Bureau of the Israeli Communist Party. Comrade Lubitz was visiting in the United States as a delegate to an international seminar conducted at the UN in connection with International Women's Year. She spoke in Yiddish, with Esther Carroll acting as interpreter. We present here the full text of the speech in English translation, prepared with the assistance of Marcia Rivkin.--Editor)

*

Dear, good comrades:

I am very happy to be here with you at your important congress and I wish to greet you in the name of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel.

It is very difficult for us Communists to visit you. They fear us. But they seem to forget that the proletarian struggle against imperialism does not require visas. We come to you on the wings of international Marxism-Leninism.

I have already seen a number of things in your country. The imperialists are frightened about us, especially the U.S. imperialists. So things must, regrettably, remain as they are for the present. I am the first Israeli Communist who has been able to come here. But I hope that in the future it will be possible to meet more often as the times change more favorably.

From the report which you have heard we know that you have many difficulties with Zionists. We know that very well. In your country there are twice as many Jews as in ours--here about 6 million, among us about 3 million. When there are joyous occasions they are joyous both for you and for us. And when there are troubles, they are troubles for both of us.

The Zionists have put forward a new slogan which sees everyone who opposes Zionism as being also an anti-Semite. In opposition to this we declare that we fight against both Zionism and racism.

I have travelled to several cities and have met many fine people who are fighting for the traditions of democracy and peace. I saw the demonstration against racism in Boston, and I would be happy to arrange such demonstrations between Jews and Arabs in Israel.

I have seen the villas of the rich and the poverty of Harlem. I have seen healthy people, with good minds and capable hands, who walk the streets aimlessly because they have no jobs. Such is the face of capitalism in 1975.

We appreciate greatly the important work which you are doing. Your tremendous contribution and your correct approach helped greatly to achieve the victory in Vietnam.

Dear comrades, I come from a region where fighting goes on day in and day out. The maneuvers of the U.S. government and the policies of our own government are responsible for the fact that there is no peace in the Middle East. The disastrous policy of our government, which has placed itself on the side of U.S. imperialism, is bringing much harm and great difficulties to us. Our military budget comes to 60 per cent of the total budget. What remains, then, for food, clothing, housing, education, etc.? The official government report admits that some 200,000 children live in terrible poverty.

The real wages of the workers have fallen 5 per cent, and 20 per cent of the total population is compelled to live on social welfare. Poverty among the masses is growing. Meanwhile the rich grow richer and they invest their money in varied enterprises both at home and abroad.

The million or so Arabs who live in the occupied territories are greatly discriminated against and live under repression and terror. Palestinian and Arab leaders are imprisoned without trial.

*

The Communist Party of Israel, which is composed of both Jews and Arabs, demands an end to this repression and to the occupation. We say that a people which oppresses other peoples can never be free, and that we are not free. We tell our people that they should not depend so heavily on U.S. imperialism. We tell them that they should follow the examples of the fighters in Vietnam, Cambodia, Greece and Portugal, that only then will they be able to achieve victory over imperialism and over reaction at home.

We demand that the government withdraw from the occupied territories. We demand that the government grant the right of the Palestinian Arabs to self-determination. We say that we are two peoples born in the same land--Israel and Ishmael--and that we must live together in peace.

In opposition to the policy of our government, we maintain that there is a perspective for peace. We must take the road to

Geneva. There all parties involved must be represented, including the PLO. We must examine all the questions and problems that have prolonged the crisis for 27 years. Among them is the question of the right of the refugees to return to their homes or receive repatriations.

Our Communist Party, which includes both Jews and Arabs, is a symbol of the possibility of the two peoples living side by side. We are the bridge to peace between Arabs and Jews. More and more people in our country and especially the youth recognize that the political policy of our government brings only harm and must lead to bankruptcy. Our position is no longer isolated. We are now able to establish blocs and united fronts with Left and peace forces in support of a just peace policy.

On the first of May we led in organizing demonstrations of thousands of people, Jews and Arabs, old and young, in Tel Aviv and Nazareth, and including not only our political circles but others as well. We demonstrated under the slogans: against U.S. imperialism and for friendship with the Soviet Union, the friend of all peoples; for peaceful coexistence and detente; for a just peace in the Middle East; and against the policies of our government. We called for unity with the Arabs despite our government.

*

Dear comrades, in spite of all hardships the world is moving on a new path, against capitalism and toward socialism. We must be optimistic. I believe we will live to see the accomplishment of this task, and here I include myself also. We shall strengthen our forces and move forward. The caravan advances while the dogs bark.

Long live the Communist Party of the United States!

Long live the unity of the Communist Party of the U.S. and the Communist Party of Israel!

Long live peace!

*

(Comrade Lubitz received a standing ovation at the close of these remarks. She was followed by Comrade Sylvia Newcomb, Secretary of the National Educational Commission of the CPUSA, who offered greetings in words and song in Yiddish, as follows:)

We heartily welcome you to our country and to the 21st Convention of our Party. Please accept the greetings of myself, of all of us here, of the entire leadership of our Party. Our Party has great respect for the Communist Party of Israel, for its heroism in the fight for peace and brotherhood in the Middle East and for socialism in Israel. This song typifies our common struggle and is addressed to the class we must mobilize to achieve our common aims:

And you plough and you haul
 And you spin and you sew
 And you hammer and you spin.
 Tell me, my people, what do you earn?

But where is your table prepared?
 But where is your holiday garb?
 But where is your sharp sword?
 What happiness is allotted to you?

Men of labor, awake!
 And learn your great strength!
 When your strong hand but wills it,
 All wheels remain still.

* * *

A Chapter on Meditation

By David Shaham

(Editorial note: The following article appeared in Al Hamishmar, the daily newspaper of Mapam, on March 28, 1975. Its author was editor of the now deceased Labor Party weekly, Ot. The English translation is reprinted from the U.S. weekly publication Swasia of June 6, 1975.

The article is of particular interest in the light of the self-righteous clamor against attacks on Israeli civilians by Arab guerrillas and against statements by PLO spokesmen that such attacks may be justified. Here we have a horrifying picture of the attitude of Israeli military rabbis toward the killing of Arab civilians alongside of which the pronouncements of Al Fatah appear mild indeed. The case described is not unique; we have on hand several similar examples. It is worth noting that articles in the Soviet press which have presented such charges have been attacked as "anti-Semitic." It would be somewhat awkward, to say the least, to make such a charge concerning the article which follows.)

*

Some time ago I happened to be in a waiting room. Having nothing to read, I took a booklet that was lying around and began

to leaf through the pages almost unconsciously. I admit that I would not ordinarily open a booklet called "After the War: Chapters of Meditation, Rule, and Research" and published by the Central Command Headquarters/Israeli Army Chaplaincy. It is even more unusual that I would read such a booklet. But I had to wait longer than I expected, and since the other booklets in the pile looked even less interesting, I began to read.

I must admit that I wasn't sorry for a minute. I learned many important things by reading that booklet.

I found one nice feature: At the end of every chapter, filled with endless notes and references, there was a short summary where the sentences were marked with the letters of the alphabet and the principles of religious law and analogy contained in each sentence were listed.

Trusting Arabs

I glanced at the section written by Rabbi Abraham Avidan (Zamel), Military Rabbi of the Israeli Central Command, and I found the following among the rules in the summary: "In not any case can one trust an Arab, even if he gives the impression of being civilized...." I wondered what the precise meaning of the rule was, since the syntax is ambiguous. Does it mean--the strict interpretation--that in no case should an Arab be trusted, even if he or she gives the impression of being civilized, or--the lenient interpretation--does it mean that not in all cases where an Arab gives the impression of being civilized can that Arab be trusted until other things are considered? Meanwhile, another question occurred to me. How does a person (and especially an Arab) give "the impression of being civilized"; what is that impression, and how do you recognize it?

I assumed that if I read the whole article I might find the answers, but as I read on I encountered even more difficulties and became even more amazed.

Blood and Blood

The Central Command rabbi claims that in war we are not obliged to distinguish between blood and blood, that is, between the enemy's soldiers and civilians. He says, "Even if it is technically possible to distinguish civilians from armed forces, in so far as the killing of civilians is performed against the background of war, one should not, according to religious law, trust a Gentile, and one should beware of the possibility that even a peaceful civilian may aid the enemy."

And if this is not clear enough, Rabbi Avidan adds, "During a war, when the troops of Israel are charging the enemy, they are allowed--and they are obliged according to the law--to kill also good civilians, or rather civilians who appear to be good. About this it is said 'The best of the Gentiles you should kill' and no Gentile can be trusted not to aid the enemy."

The worst anti-Semite could not slander Jewish religious law any better. According to Rabbi Avidan these laws command us to kill even good civilians: "You shall kill the best of the Gentiles." These laws permit the Israeli army to kill civilians even when they can be technically distinguished from soldiers. Here it is not an anti-Semite who is defaming us, but a person who holds an official position in the Israel Defense Forces, a "spiritual leader" of our soldiers, a rabbi commanding certain actions in an official publication of the Israeli army.

Muslim Sayings

I invite all those among us who quote beautiful sayings of Muslim religious scholars from Al Azhar University in order to prove that no chance for peace exists with the Arabs, Muslim fanatics whose religion commands them to treat us as an inferior race that should be killed off, to read the words of the Israeli Central Command rabbi. I would not be surprised if [the Arabs] in turn quote the rabbi's words as proof that the religion of Israel commands us to kill and annihilate all the Gentiles, and that it is thus clear that we do not want peace. It has been said, "You can see the mote in your brother's eye, but not the beam in your own." I have tried to see it.

NOTE: Shaham's article prompted Israel's Chief of Staff to withdraw the booklet "After the War" from circulation. Commenting on the booklet, Israel's Chief Military Rabbi said, "It deals with an abstract question of religious law which has no implication for everyday life, and no one considers applying it as a principle of behavior for IDF soldiers during war or peace..." (Yediot Ahronot 5/6/75).

* * *

Declaration of the Paris Conference

(A conference on peace in the Middle East was held May 3-4, 1975 in Paris, called by the International Conference for a Just and Peaceful Solution to the Middle East Problem, and issued the following statement)

The International Conference for a Just and Peaceful Solution to the Middle East Problem, convened in Paris on May 3-4, 1975, by the Continuing Liaison Council of the World Congress of Peace Forces, which was attended by representatives of 18 international organizations and national organizations from 30 countries, including representatives of peace forces of the Palestine Arab people and the Arab

countries and the peace forces of Israel, was an important event reflecting the concern of world public opinion with a just and peaceful solution to the Middle East problem. The unprecedented number of participants of varying political opinion and religious beliefs was a further testimony of the importance attached to the Conference.

The Conference met at an important historical moment in the wake of the glorious victory of the peoples of Vietnam and Cambodia over U.S. imperialism. This victory, together with other victories achieved by the liberation movements supported by the peoples of the world as well as the consolidation of the process of detente, give new impetus for concerted efforts for the realization of an everlasting and just peace in the Middle East.

Following the failure of the "step-by-step policy" of U.S. Secretary of State Dr. Henry Kissinger, world public opinion has been increasingly aware of the fact that a just and lasting peace in the region lies in a total solution of the Middle East crisis.

This solution lies through the implementation of Security Council Resolution No. 338 of October 22, 1973, which calls for the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from all Arab territories occupied since 1967 and the guarantee of the security and independence of all the states and peoples of the region and through the fulfillment of the internationally recognized rights of the Palestine Arab people. Peace in the Middle East demands the solution of the Palestine problem which lies at the heart of the conflict, on the basis of the Resolution No. 3236 of November, 1974 adopted by the 29th Session of the UN General Assembly, which recognizes the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people to return to their homeland, to exercise freely their right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty, which means to establish their own national authority.

The International Conference for a Just and Peaceful Solution of the Middle East Problem declares that the Geneva Conference for Peace in the Middle East should be reconvened as a matter of urgency in order to take measures for the implementation of the above-mentioned objectives.

It is essential to the fulfillment of the aims of the Geneva Conference that the PLO, the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people, must participate in the Conference on an equal basis with the other parties.

Let us use all means in order to mobilize world public opinion for the immediate convening of the Geneva Conference with a view to bringing about a complete and just solution of the Middle East problem.

Let us hold seminars, organize initiatives, collect signatures, address cables, letters and declarations to all parties concerned to mobilize the broadest circles the world over to act for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Let us act now, before it is too late.

Events and Views

The demand for the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs and for liberation of political prisoners in Israel and the occupied territories brought forth a large protest demonstration at the UN headquarters in New York on Sunday, May 18, 1975. Similar demonstrations took place in a number of other cities.

Many of these victims of political repression, subjected to administrative arrest (without charges, trial or definite term of imprisonment) under the Emergency Laws originally established by the British during the period of the Mandate, are suffering extreme physical and mental hardship and are being subjected to extensive torture by the Israeli authorities. This has been substantiated in numerous hearings and investigations by the Red Cross, by UN agencies and others. Though well known, however, these facts have been mainly buried by the U.S. press.

The demonstrations were called by the Palestine Information Committee, which works in support of the PLO. An important feature in them was the participation and support of non-Arab groups, among these the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East in New York which issued the following statement:

The failure of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger's latest diplomatic maneuvers in the Middle East has deepened the crisis in that region. The adventurist policies of the Israeli rulers, their stubborn refusal to relinquish the occupied Arab lands and recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestine Arab people have increased the danger of a new Israeli-Arab war.

The Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East endorses the purposes of this demonstration calling for the freedom of political prisoners in both Israel and Jordan, and the strengthening of the struggle for the national identity of the Palestine Arab people.

We are for resuming negotiations at Geneva, and for the rights of the Arab peoples.

We urge united action by whites, Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Jews and Arabs in the struggle for a just peace in the Middle East.

The demonstration at the UN was followed by a march to the Israeli UN Mission headquarters on Second Avenue.

Some ultra-Leftist, disruptive elements sought to inject divisive, adventuristic slogans rejecting the right of existence of the State of Israel. It was made clear, however, that these were not the slogans of the organizers of the demonstration.

It is to be hoped that these actions will be but the first of a succession of ever-broader united front actions in behalf of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs.

*

In May 1973, 97 per cent of Soviet Jewish emigrants went to Israel. In May 1975, 45 per cent went to other countries. A growing number have settled in the United States--some 8,000 in the past few years. This pronounced shift accompanies a sharp drop in the total number of emigrants. In the first half of 1974 the number was one-third less than in the first half of 1973. For all of 1974, according to preliminary estimates, the number of immigrants was 60-65 per cent below anticipations. Added to this is the fact that emigration from Israel has substantially grown during the past year. (See New York Times, May 21, 1975, New Times, No. 5, 1975.)

* * *

Subscribe or give a gift subscription to Jewish Affairs

(Check appropriate box)

- Enclosed find \$3.50 for 12 issues at new subscribers rate.
- Enclosed find \$5.50 for 12 issues at new subscribers rate and either book
- LENIN ON THE JEWISH QUESTION
- or -
- Hyman Lumer's book "Zionism: Its Role In World Politics"

Please send subscription (and book) to:

Name _____	Name _____
Street _____	Street _____
City _____ State _____ Zip _____	City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Clip and mail to: JEWISH AFFAIRS
23 West 26th Street
New York, N.Y. 10010

(212) MU 5-5755