

Volume
5
Number
2

JEWISH AFFAIRS

March-
April
1975

Price 35¢



IN THIS ISSUE:

The Anti-Sovietism of the *Morning Freiheit*

National Jewish Commission, CPUSA

On Black-Jewish Unity

Lee Carr

A Year of Memorable Anniversaries

USA-ISRAEL RELATIONS by Emile Touma

JEWISH AFFAIRS

A publication of the Communist Party, USA

Vol. 5, No. 2

March-April, 1975

Editor: Hyman Lumer

Editorial Committee: David Fried, Jack Kling, Alex Kolkin

CONTENTS

<u>The Anti-Sovietism of the Morning Freiheit, Statement of the National Jewish Commission, Communist Party USA</u>	3
<u>Editorials</u>	
<u>A Year of Memorable Anniversaries</u>	7
Lee Carr, <u>On Black-Jewish Unity</u>	10
Emile Touma, <u>USA-Israel Relations</u>	13
Philip Honor, <u>On the Death of M. Schatz-Anin</u>	22
<u>Statement on the Middle East Crisis, by the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East</u>	24
<u>Platform of the Israeli Committee for a Just Peace</u>	27
<u>Communications</u>	
Marvin J. Berlowitz, <u>Those Who Fan the Flames</u>	28
Harry Nelson, <u>An Excellent Antidote</u>	30
<u>Events and Views</u>	31
Cover: Detail from the Warsaw Ghetto Monument	

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¢

The Anti-Sovietism of the *Morning Freiheit*

Statement of the National Jewish Commission, Communist Party USA

Having departed from the path of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the editors of the Morning Freiheit have in recent years sunk further and further into the bog of anti-Sovietism and pro-Zionism. They have repeatedly accused the Soviet government of imposing forced assimilation on Soviet Jews, of depriving them almost completely of "opportunity for national identification." And they have charged the Soviet government and the CPSU with permitting widespread dissemination of anti-Semitic propaganda in the guise of anti-Zionism. They have published numerous lengthy articles and editorials on these themes building up, under the cloak of "friendly criticism," an ever more sinister picture of alleged "Soviet anti-Semitism." They have sought, moreover, to attribute Soviet Jewish emigration mainly to these factors, and thus falsely to place the onus on the Soviet leadership.

In the face of the growing anti-Semitism in this country they have chosen to focus their attack on the Soviet Union--on that country which liberated the Jews from tsarist oppression, which saved some two million of them from Hitlerite extermination, and which elevated them to a status of full, proud equality with all other Soviet citizens. By now their actions have taken on the dimensions of a clearly defined anti-Soviet campaign, based on deliberate distortions and exaggerations. Their allegations have become less and less distinguishable from the gross slanders purveyed by the Zionist enemies of the Soviet Union.

This is evidenced especially in their most recent campaign, which descends to new depths of anti-Soviet incitement.

Together with certain other self-styled Jewish "progressives," the Morning Freiheit editors have mounted a shrill attack on an article by Dimitri Zhukov, "The Ideology and Practice of Violence," which appeared in the popular Soviet magazine Ogonyok of October 12, 1974. The article is a review of a book recently issued by Nauka Publishers, Against Zionism and Israeli Aggression, containing a collection of writings from the Communist Party of Israel and other sources.

This review was first published in English translation, with editorial comment, by MAKI, the remnant of the former Mikunis-Sneh group of renegades from the Communist Party of Israel, in January

1975. It was reprinted by the Morning Freiheit, with comments by the editors, on February 16. Additional statements and articles have appeared since then.

But they did not stop with this. Copies of the translation and the editors' comments were widely mailed out and individuals and organizations were asked to issue statements of protest to the Soviet government against the publication of the Zhukov article. In short, a campaign was set in motion of a type worthy of the Zionist slanderers of the Soviet Union, a campaign deserving only of condemnation.

To be sure, in condemning it we cannot defend the Zhukov article itself. It contains a number of gross inaccuracies and statements with distinct anti-Semitic implications. He tends to identify Zionism not as a political movement, however reactionary and pro-imperialist, but as a secret conspiracy of Jewish capitalists. He cites as an authority for the alleged affluence of Jews the Nazi ideologue Werner Sombart, and he adds the astounding statement that in tsarist Russia less than one per cent of the Jews were proletarians--a complete perversion of reality. He also repeats uncritically a statement in the book under review that three-fourths of the profits extracted from Latin America by U.S. imperialism since World War II have gone to "the monopolies led by the Zionist 'elite.'" Clearly the article propagates anti-Semitic stereotypes and it violates the precepts of Soviet socialism and Leninist principles. It is unquestionably deserving of the severest criticism.

We must, however, totally disassociate ourselves from the distorted "criticism" of the Morning Freiheit editors and their "progressive" associates. Their attack, though launched under the banner of "a Leninist struggle against anti-Semitism," has in fact nothing in common with Leninism. And though they continue to adopt the guise of "friendly criticism," it can only be said that of such "friends" as these the Soviet Union has no need.

The question may well be asked: is the Morning Freiheit honestly seeking the correction of errors or is it motivated by other considerations?

To begin with, the translation published by the Morning Freiheit contains numerous distortions which alter the tone and meaning of the article and magnify its anti-Semitic implications. Thus, where Zhukov states that "a considerable part of the capital and industries in the developed world came into the hands of the Jewish bourgeoisie," the translation reads "a large majority." And where Zhukov speaks of Jewish capitalists controlling "a significant part of industry, finance and the news media" the translation reads "the greater part." These are obviously not trivial differences. They represent the Jewish bourgeoisie not as a significant factor in the capitalist world but as the dominant factor--an important distinction. Other examples can be given.

Nor can the use of such a distorted translation be viewed as incidental. It can only be regarded as deliberate--as part of a

deliberate pattern of distortion and bias which has come to mark the Morning Freiheit's treatment of the Soviet Union. And these distortions are added to by the exaggerated, inflamed comments of the editors.

Second, the editors seek to label the article as a deliberate piece of anti-Semitism--as a "piece of anti-Semitic filth," whose author, together with the editor of Ogonyok, should be prosecuted as a common criminal. Such a characterization is totally unjustified. While the article merits severe criticism, the fact remains that Zhukov's characterization of Zionism as reactionary and racist is by no means incorrect, and any criticism must begin with recognition of this fact. It is not in condemning Zionism that Zhukov errs; it is rather in his uncritical acceptance and propagation of certain anti-Semitic falsehoods and stereotypes, with the result that he ends up by giving ammunition to the Zionist forces.

It is from this standpoint that Aaron Vergelis, editor of Sovetish Heimland, criticizes Y. Yevseyev's pamphlet Fascism under the Blue Star (see "The Fight against Zionism from a Realistic Point of View," Jewish Affairs, December 1973). This is not, however, the point of departure of the Morning Freiheit, which has become increasingly an apologist for Zionism. One finds in its pages virtually no criticism of Zionism, but one does find endless attacks on those who do condemn Zionism, and not least on those who speak for the Communist Party. And one does find repeated attacks on Soviet writers on Zionism who are in effect charged with resorting to anti-Semitism in order to defame Zionism.

Third, the Morning Freiheit seeks to create the impression that the Soviet people are being subjected to an endless flood of anti-Semitic writings, of which the Zhukov article is but the latest. "How much longer," asks Freiheit managing editor Chaim Suller, "can this go on? How much longer will the Communist Party and the government of the Soviet Union permit the dissemination of anti-Semitism in Soviet publications?" (February 23, 1975.) What is clearly implied here is that the CPSU and the Soviet government deliberately permit the publication of such literature (since surely they must know it to be anti-Semitic and yet do not put a stop to it)--that, in short, they follow a policy of dissemination of anti-Semitism. With this, the editors of the Morning Freiheit reach out to join hands with the Zionist purveyors of the Big Lie of "official anti-Semitism" in the Soviet Union.

The fact is, however, that in the Soviet Union, unlike the United States, such objectionable writings are not encouraged or tolerated, and particularly glaring examples, such as the Kichko book and the Yevseyev pamphlet have not only been criticized but removed from circulation. There is, of course, no excuse for any instances of anti-Semitism. But to treat them as if they were the rule, as if they were typical of Soviet society, rather than a violation of its precepts and norms, is to create an entirely false picture. It is, in fact, rank defamation of the Soviet Union.

Those in Israel who have parted company with the degenerate leaders of MAKI have sharply repudiated such a position. Shmuel Mikunis, long the political darling of the Morning Freiheit, who recently resigned as general secretary of MAKI and subsequently from membership in it, declares in Undzer Shtime (January 1975): "It is clear that a Yevseyev in a socialist country is a very harmful and a painful incident. But it is only an incident, a weed in socialist life...." The February issue of Undzer Shtime contains an article by Moshe Gabzeh entitled "For the Right of Criticism and of Censuring Incitement." He is highly critical of Zhukov but is much more critical of MAKI. He writes: "This entire incitement [by MAKI] is nothing less than a betrayal of the foundations of internationalism and its mobilization in a crusade against the Soviet Union in which everything goes...We favor criticism of existing negative phenomena in the Soviet Union; however, we negate and denounce the reckless and unrestrained incitement against the Soviet Union." But if MAKI is to be denounced for its anti-Soviet incitement, the Morning Freiheit, which is guilty of the very same incitement, is no less deserving of denunciation.

Nor do the Freiheit editors stop with this. They also single out the Communist Party of Israel for a vile, slanderous attack, stating: "Zhukov claims...with the help of RAKACH quotations, and in the style of the anti-Semitic Protocols of the Elders of Zion, that the Jews dominate the world." But one needs only to examine the writings of the CPI on Zionism to find that they contain no such "quotations." And in fact none are given, either by Zhukov or by the Morning Freiheit. The editors' venom is really directed against the consistent and principled anti-Zionist stand of the CPI, which it attempts on that account to smear as spreading anti-Semitism.

With this disgraceful anti-Soviet campaign the Morning Freiheit and its supporters have descended to the level of the Zionist calumniators of the Soviet Union. That they defame Lenin by doing so in the name of "Leninism" only adds to their baseness and hypocrisy.

At a time when growing numbers among those who had formerly supported the Zionist-inspired aggressive policies of the Israeli government are changing their views and leaning toward a genuine policy of peace in the Middle East, the editors of the Morning Freiheit have chosen instead to follow the path of reactionary Jewish nationalism and opportunism to its end. They have chosen the path of the degenerate MAKI, which has now declared itself to be a Zionist party and has become affiliated to the World Jewish Congress. They have chosen the path that leads into the bog of vile anti-Sovietism.

The Morning Freiheit does not place the burden of its anger on the Zionist enemies of the Soviet Union. About their anti-Soviet machinations it has relatively little to say. It is also remarkably soft-spoken when it comes to protesting Israeli attacks on civilians in Lebanon or the brutal repression of the people in the occupied territories. And it is remarkably placid in the face of the suicidal policies of the Rabin government, which can lead the Israeli people to war and catastrophe.

The Morning Freiheit, it appears, is really roused to action only by manifestations of so-called "Soviet anti-Semitism." In this it resembles the Zionists and their anti-Soviet supporters, who can organize big demonstrations for the phony cause of "saving Soviet Jewry" but can muster only the weakest of protests against the real anti-Semitism of a General Brown, and then only with the reservation, widely expressed in Zionist circles, that we must not be too hard on him since he is a "friend of Israel."

Under the pretext of "fighting anti-Semitism" the Morning Freiheit is giving aid to the forces of reaction. It is directing its main fire not at the real peddlers of the lies of the Protocols but at that country which has smashed these lies, which has abolished forever the plague of tsarist anti-Semitism and placed Soviet Jews on a par with all other Soviet citizens, and which in World War II shattered the power of Hitlerism. It is because the Soviet Union has wiped out all national oppression, including anti-Semitism, that it stands forth today as the world's most powerful bulwark of peace, freedom and progress. And it is because of this that the forces of imperialist reaction never cease to press their anti-Soviet campaigns. It is to this unholy crusade that the Morning Freiheit is lending itself.

* * *

Editorials

A Year of Memorable Anniversaries

It is now 32 years since the launching, on April 19, 1943, of the unforgettable Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. Time has not dimmed the memory of this heroic struggle nor has it diminished the glory of the Jewish martyrs who carried out this magnificent act of resistance to the Hitlerite monsters. The commemoration of this anniversary is as pertinent as ever and its lessons have lost none of their cogency.

In itself the uprising was but a single incident in the vast panorama of the anti-fascist war, a struggle which made its own unique contribution to the victory over fascism, but whose full significance can be understood only in relation to the whole. And this fact is brought home with special force in the present year, when the Warsaw Ghetto anniversary is combined with a more momentous occasion--the 30th anniversary of the defeat of Hitler fascism.

Spearheaded by the Soviet Union, the world democratic forces delivered a crushing defeat to the forces of Nazism, and on May 8, 1945 the Hitlerite generals were compelled to accept unconditional surrender. This victory was not only a fatal blow to the Axis powers; it was also a major setback for world imperialism as a whole. True, the U.S. and British ruling circles succeeded, by joining forces with the USSR, in crushing a deadly imperialist rival. But it was the forces of socialism, national liberation and democracy which were vastly strengthened by this victory, whose effect was to plunge world capitalism into a new and deeper stage of its general crisis.

For the Jewish people the two anniversaries are indissolubly linked, for the military crushing of fascism put an end to the hideous nightmare of the holocaust, to all ghettos and extermination camps. They may justly take pride in the contribution of the heroes of the Warsaw Ghetto to this outcome, but what must never be forgotten is that they did not fight alone, that their struggle dovetailed with that of their Soviet ally, which played the basic role in the triumph over Hitler fascism.

It was the Soviet military forces which confronted the great bulk of the fascist armies while the U.S. and Britain delayed the opening of the second front until the very last moment, when their fear of Soviet triumph drove them to step in. It was the Soviet Union which suffered the destruction of the major part of its industrial plant and much of its agriculture, and which sacrificed the lives of 20 million of its people in this colossal struggle. And let it never be forgotten that it was the Soviet Union which, in these conditions of life-and-death struggle, saved the lives of more than two million Jews by removing them from the path of the Nazi hordes, while the capitalist states stood by and refused to lift a finger to save Jewish lives.

Many millions lost their lives in this great struggle, not least among them the six million Jews exterminated by the Nazi beasts. But it must also be noted that many Jews fought in the anti-fascist armies and that there were more than a few Jews among the victorious forces which achieved Hitlerism's downfall.

*

The smashing of Hitler fascism was accompanied by ringing declarations calling for the eternal outlawing of fascism and for bringing every last Nazi war criminal to justice. The Potsdam meeting of the Big Three (Britain, the Soviet Union and the United States) proclaimed on August 2, 1945: "War criminals and those who have participated in planning or carrying out Nazi enterprises involving or resulting in atrocities or war crimes shall be arrested and brought to judgment."

But such declarations, as we know, have by no means been uniformly carried out. We are only too well aware of the renazification of West Germany and of the many war criminals who continue to go un-

tried and unpunished, not a few of them finding refuge in the United States.

Authoritative over-all figures on the number of important Nazi war criminals brought to justice are lacking. However, some revealing facts emerge from an estimate presented to the West German Bundestag in 1965 by Ewald Bucher, then Minister of Justice (and a former member of the Nazi Party). According to his figures (see German Democratic Report, March 26, 1975), some 80,000 Germans had been convicted and sentenced for Nazi war crimes. The breakdown by countries is as follows: Soviet Union, 24,000; Poland, 16,000; Czechoslovakia, 16,000; GDR, 12,000; West Germany, 6,000; British, French and U.S. military courts, 5,000.

What stands out in these figures is the fact that the first four countries account for nearly three-fourths of the total while West Germany, the very center of Nazism, accounts for no more than 7-1/2 per cent. In striking contrast to the socialist GDR, fascism in West Germany, where monopoly capital still rules, is far from dead.

Much has happened since 1945. The balance of world forces has shifted more and more in favor of the anti-imperialist forces and it is these, headed by the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist camp, which are today the decisive force in shaping world affairs. In Cambodia and Vietnam, U.S. imperialism has suffered a crushing defeat. In Portugal and Greece, fascist regimes have been overthrown.

Increasingly, imperialism is being forced to retreat, to seek relations of detente with the socialist world. But it remains as predatory and aggressive as ever. Today we have Ford and Kissinger uttering threats of war against the Arab oil producing states. And as the economic crisis within the country deepens, efforts to make the working people bear the burden are being stepped up. The fascist elements of the ultra-Right are intensifying their activities. Racist incitement and anti-Semitism are on the rise.

The fight against fascist reaction is far from over. But the democratic forces of our country and the world are tremendously stronger, more mature and better organized than at the time of World War II. The day when fascism will be totally wiped from the face of the earth lies not too far off.

* * *

On Black-Jewish Unity

By Lee Carr

In recent years there has been much discussion about the deteriorating relations between the Black and Jewish peoples and about what can be done to improve them. A number of summit meetings and conferences of Black and Jewish leaders has taken place. Numerous speeches and articles have sought to probe the reasons for the "strains and frictions" which have replaced the cooperation of earlier periods.

Major addresses were given by Vernon E. Jordan Jr. of the Urban League and by Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett, President of the Black Newspaper Publishers Association. Important statements were made by Rev. Jesse L. Jackson of Operation PUSH. An interview with Bayard Rustin appeared in the Zionist publication Midstream.

With the exception of Rustin, whose interview was basically a defense of the policies of the Jewish organizations and of Albert Shanker, the Black leaders generally ascribed the weakening of Black-Jewish relations to the resistance of the leadership of the Jewish organizations to the democratic demands of the Black people. While there may not be unanimity on all matters of detail, on this basic point they are unquestionably correct.

*

The rise of Jewish-Black unity goes back to the New Deal period of the thirties. It was part of the larger unity between Black and white, between the Black community and the labor movement, which developed in the struggle against the efforts of monopoly capital--then, as now--to saddle the burden of the crisis on the workers. This unity was further strengthened in the fight against fascism and in the course of the anti-Hitler war. It continued into the postwar period although it was subjected to the stresses and strains created by the cold war and the rise of McCarthyism. And it reached new heights during the great civil rights struggles of the sixties. This was a unity based on recognition of a common interest, and in particular on recognition that the struggle for the rights of Black people was in the interests of the Jewish people.

Since the 1967 Middle East war, however, there has been a marked shift in Jewish attitudes and a marked deterioration of Jewish-Black

relations. Sections of the Black people supported the cause of the Arab peoples in line with their support of national liberation movements generally. They opposed Israeli occupation of Arab lands and took an anti-Zionist stand. This was promptly construed by the Zionist forces as a rise of "Black anti-Semitism," part of an alleged upsurge of a "new" anti-Semitism, an "anti-Semitism of the Left." Indeed, the main danger to the Jewish people was now said by many to come from the Blacks and the Left, not from the traditional Right-wing sources of anti-Semitism.

The Jewish people during this period were subjected to a tremendous wave of anti-Arab chauvinism and propaganda. An emotional and hysterical climate was created which led to blind support of the aggressive policies of the Israeli government and blind hostility to all who opposed them. Added to these developments were the racist incitements of the Nixon Administration in relation to busing, welfare and other issues. And in New York, relations were greatly exacerbated by the support of Jewish organizations and leaders to the racist teachers' strike led by Shanker in 1968 against the efforts of the Black and Puerto Rican communities to gain control over their schools. All this has contributed to an alarming growth of racism in the Jewish community.

This is manifested further in the nationwide campaign by leading Jewish organizations against preferential hiring and open enrollment, which are bitterly attacked as "discrimination in reverse." These measures, designed to correct generations-long discrimination against Black people and others in employment and education, are attacked as efforts to deprive Jews of jobs and educational opportunities for the benefit of Blacks and Puerto Ricans, to institute a new quota system directed against Jews. But in opposing such measures they put themselves in the position of pitting the rights of Jews against those of Blacks, Puerto Ricans and other oppressed minorities. And by doing so they join hands with the monopolist architects of racism who seek to perpetuate discrimination against all national and racial minorities, including Jews.

The gap has been further widened by the racist actions of Jews and others against the Forest Hills housing project and the disgraceful efforts to keep Black and Puerto Rican children from Brownsville out of Canarsie schools.

A source of great damage to Jewish-Black unity is Shankerism. We have already spoken of the 1968 strike in which the entirely legitimate demands of the Black and Puerto Rican parents, motivated by a desire to improve the grossly inadequate education of their children, was pictured as an attempt to drive Jewish teachers and principals out of the schools. On the basis of a few anti-Semitic utterances by Blacks he sought to mislead Jewish teachers and others in the Jewish community into believing that they were in mortal danger of being engulfed by a wave of Black anti-Semitism. The strike shattered not only Jewish-Black unity but also teacher-parent-community cooperation, vital for better education and in the teachers' interests.

Having learned nothing from the 1968 strike, Shanker is repeating this pattern. In School District 1 on Manhattan's Lower East Side, he has labored to elect an almost completely Jewish school board in a district where more than 90 per cent of the pupils are Puerto Rican, Black and Asian. In the name of protecting the interests of the teachers, he pursues a racist policy generally which increasingly alienates Jews from Blacks and Puerto Ricans.

*

If this situation is to be changed, if Black-Jewish unity is truly to be built, it is necessary to fight for elimination of the racist positions dominant today in the main Jewish organizations and their leaderships. The victims of racism cannot be asked, as a condition for unity, to abandon their struggle to end racist discrimination, to stop their fight for jobs and educational opportunities from which they have long been excluded. Nor can they be asked, in the name of unity, to become supporters of such a racist movement as Zionism or of anti-Soviet campaigns in the guise of "saving" Soviet Jews.

Genuine unity must be based on joint struggle for the common needs of both peoples, struggle directed against their common monopolist enemy. Vernon E. Jordan Jr. pointed in such a direction when he said in his talk to the Jewish leaders that "the real question facing Jews and Blacks is what we can do together to open up our society so that each of us can make the best use of his talents and fulfill his highest aspirations." Rev. Jesse Jackson put it more explicitly, saying:

We are not going to stop pushing for quotas and affirmative action but the fundamental shift that has to take place is that we should fight that which is making us fight each other. For example, with the proper amount of money spent on education, there would be enough seats for Black and Jewish students and staff.

In the deepening economic crisis, with its mounting unemployment, it is the newly hired Black and other minority group workers who are first to be laid off. The monopolist rulers of our country seek to take advantage of these conditions. They are intensifying their efforts to turn workers against one another--white against Black, Black against Jew, native-born against foreign-born, men against women, younger against older workers, each fighting the other for an inadequate and shrinking number of jobs.

It is necessary to counterpose to this strategy of division employed by the ruling class another strategy, one that aims to meet the problems of the crisis not at the expense of one group of workers against another but at the expense of the wealthy financial and corporate magnates that got us into this situation in the first place. And it is a necessary part of such a strategy to fight jointly to remove the inequities resulting from generations of discrimination and oppression.

This is the only road to real unity. It is the only road to victory for the people. And prime responsibility to work for such unity rests with the Jewish people and their leaders.

* * *

USA-Israel Relations

By Emile Touma

(Reprinted from the Information Bulletin, Communist Party of Israel, January 1975.)

USA Strategic Policy in the Middle East

Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. imperialists have been motivated in formulating their policy in the Middle East by their global anti-Soviet military strategy and their intent to exploit the natural resources in the region, and primarily oil.

This brought the U.S. into confrontation with the socialist community of nations, headed by the Soviet Union, on the one hand, and with the dynamic Arab national movement for liberation on the other. During the last two decades, consolidation of the expanding friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Arab countries contributed decisively to the revolutionary process in the region. The achievements of the Arab national movement in political and social emancipation reached spectacular dimensions.

It was to offset the revolutionary process in the Arab East, and ensure its basic interests that U.S. imperialism established ongoing collusion with the ruling circles in Israel who, guided by their Zionist ideology, endeavored to dissipate the rights of the Palestine Arab people and achieve territorial expansion at their expense. This promoted their anti-Soviet, anti-Arab policy, which was climaxed by the U.S.-inspired aggression in June 1967.

There is now a plausible consensus that the June 1967 war was designed to overthrow the progressive anti-imperialist regimes in Egypt and Syria, paralyze the general Arab national liberation movement, weaken Soviet-Arab friendship and cooperation, strengthen the position of imperialism in the Arab countries, negate the rights of the Palestine Arab people, and annex new Arab territories to Israel.

In the period between the June 1967 and October 1973 wars,

U.S. imperialism, in contradiction to world public opinion, supported the Israeli ruling circles fully in their intransigent policy of aggression, negation of the legitimate rights of the Palestine Arab people, and perpetuation of their military occupation of Arab territories, thus eliminating all peaceful options to settle the explosive crisis of the Middle East.

When, as a consequence, the October 1973 war broke out, and the Israeli army faced a debacle in the early phases of the war, the U.S. initiated massive military aid to buttress the fighting ability of Israel.

The Times of Israel and World Jewish Review of October 1974 brushed aside the press reports about a conflict between U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger and U.S. Secretary of Defense J. Schlesinger over the promptness of U.S. response, and revealed that "From the start of the war on October 6 until October 8 (1973) nothing had been sent, because the Israelis in one of their characteristic acts of overconfidence felt that they could handle the situation and did not need help. On October 8 however the requests came in and shipments started to be airborne to Israel within eight and a half hours."

Labor Member of the Knesset and ex-General Secretary of the Labor ruling party Arie Eliav did not exaggerate when he wrote appraising U.S. aid and its motivation: "Israel will not and cannot forget what the United States did to help her in October 1973. Her very existence was saved. At the same time, Israel preserved the interests of the Western democracies (read imperialist states - E.T.) in this area of the world." (From Land of the Hart, quoted by Jewish Observer and Middle East Review, September 27, 1974.)

In fact, Israeli statesmen repeatedly emphasize Israel's important place in U.S. and other imperialist global strategy.

Foreign Minister Yigal Allon, in an international symposium on the Middle East held at Tel-Aviv University on December 26, 1974, described Israel as a "strong stabilizing factor" (1) in the region and stressed that: "Her existence and function is an essential interest of the U.S. and Western Europe."

U.S. Tactics Under the Conditions of Detente

The changing balance of world forces, favoring the forces of socialism, national independence and peace, forced U.S. imperialism and its allies to move from the policy of confrontation with the Soviet Union and progressive mankind to the policy of detente and its corollary, peaceful coexistence between states of different social regimes. This was epitomized in the international arena, most characteristically by the many-sided agreements reached during the Soviet-U.S. summits on the limitations of strategic nuclear weapons and other spheres of mutual interest.

It was under the circumstances of "detente" that the war of October 1973 changed the strategic and political map in the Middle

East to the advantage of the Arab national movement for liberation. It created a positive climate for the massive process of nationalizing the oil industry in the Arab countries, thus weakening the economic positions of imperialism in the region.

The use of the oil weapon, banning the oil flow to the imperialist states during the October 1973 war, symbolized the strength of the Arab national movement on the one hand, and the diminishing power of imperialism to use violent means to achieve its aims on the other.

Thus in the changing circumstances which had compelled U.S. imperialism to retrench, without surrendering its objectives, the question of securing the oil flow gained in ascendance over the potential use of the Arab countries for strategic military purposes. And in order to secure the oil, two parallel tendencies are discernable in the present policy of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East:

- * On the one hand, to continue cooperating with the reactionary regimes of the rich oil-producing countries, particularly Iran and Saudi Arabia, to ensure the flow of oil to the U.S. and the other highly industrialized capitalist countries.
- * On the other hand, to prepare for military pressures and intervention, or at least to use the threat of such intervention to maintain access to Arab oil, in case cajoling failed and the cooperative regimes for this or that reason (and mainly national revolutionary pressures) failed to deliver the goods.

Here the U.S. takes into consideration two factors:

- * Possibilities to infiltrate its influence into Arab anti-imperialist regimes and thus shatter anti-imperialist Arab solidarity (which played a decisive role in the achievements of the October 1973 war) and weaken Soviet-Arab friendship and cooperation, the major force in the revolutionary process in the Arab countries.
- * The use of the military strength of Israel--though damaged in the October war--to threaten the anti-imperialist Arab countries.

It is a fact that U.S. imperialism was able, under the screen of aiding the political settlement in the Middle East after October 1973, to find cracks in the policy of the Egyptian government, due to the class motivations of its leaders. Utilizing this it was able to gain leverage and it still endeavors to use its ability to work out interim agreements, such as the disengagement agreement between Israel and Egypt, to strengthen its precarious positions in Egypt.

Moreover, U.S. imperialism can depend on the good services of the reactionary regime in Saudi Arabia to achieve its ends. The monarchy of Saudi Arabia is utilizing to the utmost the fact that it joined with the other Arab countries in using the oil weapon to gain pre-eminence in the councils of the Arab world--the Arab League and the Arab summit conferences. The aim is to strengthen the orientation towards imperialism and undermine the strong ties between the progressive Arab countries and the Soviet Union.

Further, the Saudi King Faisal, flanked by the sultans and emirs of the oil-rich Gulf principalities, is using their great financial resources to achieve these purposes. It is not difficult to recognize that his tactics have borne some fruits in Egypt whose government has reversed its basic economic policy and launched what has been termed an "economic opening" which welcomes foreign investments, both Western and Arab. This would naturally change the ratio between the public and private sectors in the economy and favor the national bourgeoisie.

However, there is a basic irreconcilable contradiction between imperialism, and particularly U.S. imperialism, and the Arab peoples fighting for political and social emancipation, and the successes of the former can at best be transitory. This brings to the foreground the use of Israel's military strength which has enough credit yet to play the role of the shock brigade against the Arab countries.

In order to invigorate this military stance with enough military push, the USA followed the massive provision of aid to Israel during the October war--earmarking \$2.2 billion for the purpose--with agreements to provide the Israeli army with more billions worth of armament within the coming years.

The dimensions of U.S. military aid have been so impressively large that the Washington Post of November 10, 1974, after detailing the big number of tanks already provided to Israel, noted that this was causing some unease in the U.S. army, claiming it has only 8,350 tanks in its arsenals, still short of its 10,000 authorized level.

That the U.S. imperialists were contemplating the use of Israel in their plans to seize forcibly the Arab oil wells has been repeatedly mentioned in the U.S. press for a long time, even before Kissinger and President Ford announced officially that the U.S. would use military force to this end, if the oil producing countries were strangling the West.

Thus, for example, Newsweek of October 7, 1974, explaining the military option to ensure the Arab oil, wrote that the intervention must be speedy and extensive to keep the oil wells intact, and added: "The initial attack would have to be carried out by the 82nd airborne division--the only U.S. force trained for parachute assaults--plus perhaps whatever allied and Israeli units could be persuaded to join."

However, columnist Jack Anderson writing in the Washington Post of November 8, 1974 was more specific and stated: "Ford is considering this probability to ensure the flow of oil and under the circumstances Israel would be given the green light to seize the oil wells of Kuwait."

But such an intervention is pregnant with catastrophic dangers under the present military balance of forces in the world. As the Soviet Communist Party organ Pravda of January 19, 1974 states, "this is at sharp variance with the tendency towards relaxation of tension and towards the development of relations between states on the principles of equality and cooperation."

Terming the threats blackmail, Pravda noted the U.S.-Israeli collusion, stressing that "in addition to military training in American deserts, warships of the U.S. Seventh Fleet conduct threatening exercises," and pointed out the role of the Israeli army as a pistol pointed at the heart of the Arab countries.

Without belittling the potential dangers of the U.S. threat, it must be noted that U.S. imperialism finds itself in isolation, deepened by the clear opposition of Western Europe, whose states refused to allow the USA to use their territories for supplying Israel with arms during the October war. They have also resolutely rejected U.S. attempts to establish an oil consumer bloc of the advanced capitalist states to confront the Arab oil-producing countries.

In the light of the fact that the present U.S. administration, even after the Soviet government's cancellation of the USSR-U.S. trade agreement*, clearly insists that it adheres to detente, the threat of military intervention in the Arab oil countries becomes part of the psychological warfare against the Arab countries. This was the crux of the Newsweek report of December 18, 1974, which stressed that Defense Secretary Schlesinger was brandishing the stick of Israel against the Arab peoples.

Noting Schlesinger's reaction to talk about military intervention, the same magazine wrote (December 16, 1974) that he advocated a policy of calculated "destabilization" to keep the Arabs guessing about U.S. intentions, in other words to keep the psychological pressure.

The Determining Factor--U.S. Imperialist Interests

The Israeli ruling circles fully identify themselves with the strategy of U.S. imperialism and are enthusiastic to act as the military shock brigade against the Arab national liberation movement and the anti-imperialist Arab countries.

* This was the result of U.S. manipulations to use it as an instrument to intervene in the USSR's internal affairs.

However, there have been divergencies in the U.S.-Israeli relations during the last decade (and it is not necessary to go further now), although not over strategy. The divergencies spring out of U.S. global and regional considerations, such as U.S. interests in the Arab countries and U.S. reluctance to allow polarization in the Middle East, with Israel siding with the U.S. and the Arab countries cooperating with the Soviet Union.

It was these divergencies which were behind periodic announcements that the U.S. would follow an "even-handed" policy in the Middle East conflict on the one hand, and talk of pressures on Israel to moderate its stand and make concessions on the other.

It is an acceptable fact that the USA exerted pressure on the Israeli government during the bilateral negotiations which led to the disengagement agreements between Israel on one side and Egypt and Syria on the other.

True, the Israeli official spokesmen rejected the accusations of the opposition that the Israeli government bowed to pressure, but they too admit, in elegant language, the need to accommodate themselves to U.S. interests. The present War Minister Sh. Peres formulated this fact in these words:

I will say in all honesty that we will conduct negotiations ...not only because we want to reach an agreement with Egypt...but due to our wish to preserve our close relationship with the USA...I do not say that this commits us to accept U.S. dictation, but it definitely obliges us to consider their views and it is better if we tell the truth.... (Jerusalem Post, December 6, 1974.)

In one concrete instance, Israel publicly dropped its objection to the U.S. decision to provide Egypt with a nuclear reactor for peaceful purposes. (Haaretz, December 15, 1974.)

The Israeli press recently revealed the measure of U.S. influence on the internal political scene when it leaked that it was the U.S. government which opposed successfully the establishment of a national unity coalition which would cover the extreme Rightist center bloc (Likud). The veteran leader (and spiritual and ideological mentor) of MAPAM which, together with the Labor Party, forms the Alignment, the decisive force in the present government, was blunt in saying that "such a coalition today would precipitate a crisis with the U.S. and lead us into war." (Jerusalem Post Magazine, December 13, 1974.)

The question to be asked today is: how does the U.S. evaluate the role of Israel in its policy in the Middle East? And consequently, what freedom of maneuver to further its expansionist and other policies do the Israeli ruling circles enjoy under the circumstances?

Before answering these two interrelated questions, it is neces-

sary to emphasize that the Israeli ruling circles, besides their accommodation to the U.S. official line, always banked on the ultra-reactionary circles in the USA, seeing their interests in the success of those circles. It is because of this orientation that they intensified their hysterical anti-Soviet slanderous campaigns, discredited the process of detente and peaceful coexistence, predicting its failures. They identified themselves with Senator Jackson's congressional actions to disrupt trade relations between the USSR and the USA. Naturally they were always cautious not to overreach themselves or hurt their official relations with the U.S. Administration.

Today the U.S. Administration is stressing its resolve to continue the process of detente, and has initiated steps to repair the provocative Congressional measure which precipitated the revocation of the USSR-U.S. trade agreement of 1972 by the Soviet Government.

President Ford, formulating his Administration's intent, said in his press conference on January 21, 1975, that the USA will continue to broaden and expand U.S.-Soviet detente because it is in the interest of both sides. He indicated that the U.S. Congress was to blame for the revocation of the USSR-U.S. trade agreement by inserting the freedom of emigration into the trade bill and by limiting the amount of government backed credits to the Soviet Union (necessary to expand trade between the two countries - E.T.) to \$300 million over a period of four years.

This statement and others were a strong rebuff to Jackson and his clique and censured, indirectly, the Israeli ruling circles who played the Jackson amendment to the hilt. It was also a warning not to use the Zionist lobby for such policies opposed to U.S. interests.

Ford, in an interview with Time, was blunt enough to stress the predominance of U.S. interests and said in answer to the question, "are there any concrete limits to our commitment to Israel?":

It so happens that there is a substantial relationship at the present time between our national security interests and those of Israel. But in the final analysis we have to judge what is in our national interest above any and all other considerations." (January 20, 1975.)

Moreover, it is not by accident that the U.S. press, usually sympathetic to the Israeli official stand, is showing increasing symptoms of criticism to Israel's policies, and that the columnist Jack Anderson should publish what he described as secret White House briefings which led him to conclude that "Washington sentiment turns against Israel." (Reprinted by the Jerusalem Post, January 2, 1975).

According to Anderson, President Ford stressed the dangers of stagnation in the Middle East which could lead to a new war, another oil embargo, and confrontation with the Soviet Union.

Kissinger blamed Israel's inflexibility which at one time jeopardized peace negotiations and said she "could help prevent a Middle East explosion by being more flexible."

Naturally, the U.S. Zionists try to explain this political manifestation by labelling writers as anti-Semitic or anti-Israeli. But the columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak answered this squarely and wrote: "Our column's frequent criticism of Israel's policy is not based on anti-Israeli bias....It has been our consistent thesis that U.S. policy in the Arab-Israeli struggle must be determined by American interests, not those of Israel, or of the Arab states surrounding it." (Reprinted by the Jerusalem Post, January 7, 1975).

In an attempt to delineate U.S. divergence from Israeli official ambitions of annexation, the two columnists continued: "We have always agreed with Henry Kissinger's thesis, stated at San Clemente in the summer of 1971, that the USA never agreed to undersign Israel's conquests. Until these conquests by Israel's sensationally successful military operations in 1967 are returned to the Arabs, we believe the large American military investments in Israel deserve scrutiny."

The concept that the USA has never been committed to undersign Israel's conquests of 1967 was formulated long before Kissinger by leading U.S. officials of the State Department. But the USA was reluctant to concretize it in political practice because it found it in its imperialist interests to allow Israel--or rather to encourage Israel--to perpetuate its occupation and carry out aggressive acts against the Arab countries. Israel's actions were pressure levers which the U.S. imperialists could utilize to infiltrate into the anti-imperialist Arab countries, generate social fermentations in them, and consolidate remaining positions.

The big question mark is: has the USA expended the utility of this Israeli stance?

After the October war the USA seemed bent on exploiting Israeli "concessions" such as retreats in Sinai and in the Golan Heights (though withdrawal was negligible) in order to gain influence in the Arab countries and further their ends.

Moreover, the U.S. imperialists who see their utmost tactical success in splitting the Arab countries and undermining their positive solidarity, expect the Israeli ruling circles to aid substantially in this process, by further partial "concessions." Hence their desire to work out another interim separation of forces agreement between Egypt and Israel. Such an agreement would break the Egyptian-Syrian common front and propel Egypt to the reactionary Arab camp of Saudi Arabia which colludes with U.S. imperialism.

By the same token the USA, which is profoundly interested in severing or at least weakening Soviet-Arab friendship and cooperation, favored Israel's "concessions" (further withdrawals) to Egypt

on the eve of the scheduled Brezhnev visit to Egypt in order to achieve this end.

In the light of all this the USA wants to limit Israel's freedom of action and subordinate it still further to U.S. interests. That the USA has the ability to do so is not questioned. Therefore it is possible to expect more U.S. pressures which would leave Israel little space for independent action.

As to timing, the London Economist believes that Ford's statement on limitation on U.S. commitments to Israel (in the final analysis U.S. interests are above any other consideration) signals "that the time has not yet fully arrived, that sentiment (read U.S. interests - E.T.) in the United States is still pro-Israeli, but that the store of good will for Israel, particularly inside the Administration, is being eaten away by hardliners and second-best resolutions in Israel." (January 18, 1975.)

Obviously the U.S. measure of pressure on Israel is being determined by two decisive factors. One, the danger of a Mideast war that could spark a wider confrontation, and two, a consolidation of the anti-imperialist Arab solidarity.

President Ford, on the eve of the Vladivostok Soviet-U.S. summit, stressed that: "It ought to be obvious to everybody that we cannot go on indefinitely with the very delicate circumstances (in Israeli-Arab relations - E.T.) or fail to take into account the legitimate interests of the Palestinian people....We have the problem of the potentiality that if there is a new confrontation between Israelis and Arabs we could face the possibility of another oil embargo, and the USA and the Soviet Union could also become involved. All of these have very serious international implications and make a peaceful solution all the more imperative." (U.S. News and World Report, November 17, 1974.)

He has repeated this thesis again and again since then.

It is the second factor that could delay U.S. pressures on Israel, or more correctly, delay pressures on the USA to act. The U.S. still hopes to lure Egypt into the snare of "peace by stages" and thus split the Arab anti-imperialist front. But experience has shown that this is a thin hope. The Arab National Movement has proved in the last decade that it could be decisive in dictating its anti-imperialist orientation on both, waverers and reactionaries. The October war and the Rabat Conference are two conspicuous significant instances.

That the USA would be forced to retreat and pressure Israel is being recognized by wider circles in Israel alongside the Communist Party. Because of that, more voices are being heard for cessation of complete dependence on the U.S. imperialists and for an independent policy. This is only possible if Israel withdraws from the position of an instrument in the imperialist global and regional policy and moves to a just peace with the Arab peoples.

On the Death of M. Schatz-Anin

By Philip Honor

The eminent writer, teacher, lecturer and Marxist scholar Professor Max Schatz-Anin passed away on January 13, 1975 in Riga, Latvia. He was 90 years old.

Professor Schatz-Anin was born in the township of Neir, near Riga. As a student he became involved in the revolutionary activities that began, at the turn of the 20th century, to spread among the Russian college youth. He soon distinguished himself as a writer, cultural activist and fighter for social justice.

Harassed by the tsarist secret police, Schatz-Anin had to terminate his law studies at St. Petersburg University hastily and to leave the country. He went to Berne, Switzerland to complete his education. There he deepened his knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, attending lectures by Lenin and other Russian emigre revolutionaries. In 1909 he published in German his doctoral dissertation on the national question, which was favorably received in revolutionary circles.

During the period of reaction following the 1905 revolution, Schatz-Anin joined the revolutionary underground in Russia, working among writers and intellectuals. He was arrested and subjected to mental and physical torture that shattered his nerves and affected his eyesight. In 1928 he became totally blind, but undaunted, he continued his various activities and his creative writing. His greatest accomplishments were yet to come.

During the period following the October Revolution he lived in Riga. Being a staunch friend of the Soviet Union and a committed Marxist-Leninist, he became a leader of the Left-wing Jewish circles in Latvia, which was then a reactionary police state. In the 1920s a group of Jewish workers organized a workers' center, the Arbeter Heim. Schatz-Anin was one of its initiators and became the director of this Yiddish cultural institution which played an important role in Riga's Jewish community.

It was closed by the fascist Latvian authorities and was later reorganized as the Jewish Workers University, also headed by Schatz-Anin. A compilation of his lectures at this workers' school was published in Russian in 1927 under the title Social Opposition in the History of the Jews. In his introduction to this historic work we read the following:

This book is based on the Marxist-Leninist postulate that in a class society we cannot have a unified people living in complete harmony. Under such circumstances the people are divided into two antagonistic classes. The Jewish people are no exception to this precept. Through all of Jewish history there unfolds a red thread of social opposition of the toiling and enslaved masses against the economic and political oppression of the ruling classes.... (Quoted in Sovetish Heimland, September 1971.)

I know from my own personal experience how Schatz-Anin was revered by Jewish workers, especially the youth. I was born in Latvia and was introduced to the revolutionary movement at an early age. Schatz-Anin was respected and loved in our circle, which was constantly exposed to danger. He was very skillful in circumventing the continuous police surveillance.

To cite one example, he conducted a series of lectures under the title "If You Want to Live, You Must Die," promulgating the idea that society has to break with past traditions in order to attain a higher level of cultural progress. But these lectures served a dual purpose. Their main thrust was to expose the stifling, reactionary atmosphere that pervaded the fascist Latvian state.

At the same time, he was active in an underground organization to aid political prisoners.

Under the fascist regime, Schatz-Anin could not publish his books in Latvia but had to send them abroad. He was a prolific author and produced many books as well as innumerable essays and articles on literature, history, jurisprudence, Marxism-Leninism and the ideology of Zionism. He wrote mainly in Russian, but also in Yiddish, German and Lettish. Among his best-known books are The Revolution as a Psychological Process, Art as a Precursor of Power, Social Opposition in the History of the Jews, Social Movements among Jews before 1917, and Positive Figures in Soviet Literature.

In 1937 this totally blind scholar went to Paris as a delegate to the World Jewish Cultural Congress, which was called to further Yiddish culture and to strengthen the fight against fascism. In 1940, after Latvia became a Soviet republic, he returned to Riga to continue his activities as Professor of Jurisprudence, lecturer and writer. During the Second World War he was saved from the Nazi holocaust by evacuation to the interior of the Soviet Union. He taught law at the University of Alma Ata and later at Moscow University. His articles appeared frequently in the Russian and Yiddish press. Recently his memoirs were published in Sovetish Heimland.

The obituary to Schatz-Anin published in Sovetish Heimland (February 1975) concludes with these words:

He worked tirelessly for the well-being of the working people and devoted his creative abilities to the enrichment

of Soviet culture and literature. His illustrious image as a writer and freedom fighter will long remain in our memory.

We shall always remember him as a firm Communist, a courageous revolutionary, a Marxist-Leninist scholar and a stalwart champion of Jewish culture.

* * *

Statement on the Middle East Crisis

Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East

(The following statement and the accompanying resolution were adopted by a National Conference for a Drastic Cut in Military Spending, held in Chicago on April 5 and 6.)

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 to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestine Arab people have increased the danger of a new Israeli-Arab war.

President Ford's and Kissinger's threat to use force, if need be, against the Arab oil-producing states brings ample evidence that the real purpose of Kissinger's "step-by-step" shuttle diplomacy was to protect the interests of the United States oil monopolies. Kissinger did not shuttle between Egypt and Israel in pursuit of peace. His real aim was to provoke dissension in the Arab ranks, evade the Geneva conference and strengthen the position of the Israeli aggressive forces by prolonging the status quo.

It is becoming abundantly clear that the Geneva conference is the only feasible vehicle for achieving Middle East peace. As co-chairman of the Geneva conference, the Soviet Union stands ready to help bring about a peaceful solution of the Mid-East crisis. Soviet leaders have stated on numerous occasions that in order to attain this goal Israel will have to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories and recognize the national rights of the Palestine Arab people. They have reiterated in recent statements that the Soviet Union is committed to supporting the rights of all countries in the Middle East, including Israel, to exist in peace and tranquility.

Commenting on the breakdown of Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy negotiations, Kurt Waldheim, Secretary General of the United

Nations, pointed out: "This development makes it all the more necessary to intensify efforts in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the Security Council to achieve a just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Such a settlement is of vital importance not only to countries of the region but also for international peace and security."

Sabotaging the Geneva conference, the Rabin government clings to its annexationist policies and denies the national rights of the Palestine Arab people. The Israeli rulers slander the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is recognized in the UN and by many countries as the legitimate representative of the Palestine Arab people, labelling it as a "terrorist" group with which they will never negotiate.

The people of the United States have a vital stake in Mid-East peace. Billions of dollars have been and are being allocated by the Congress and the U.S. government in military and economic aid to Israel. Our government will spend in the coming fiscal year huge sums of taxpayers' dollars for the support of the Israeli military machine. While the military budget and the expenditures for foreign military aid will far exceed \$100 billion in the coming year, the Ford administration is demanding further cuts of welfare allocations. The funding of schools, hospitals, housing, food stamps and other urgently-needed antipoverty programs is being constantly reduced. The appropriations of military aid to Israel and other Middle East countries at the expense of the American people must stop!

Public opinion in our country and the Congress are exposed to pervasive propaganda by Zionists, the Israeli lobby and spokesmen of Jewish establishment organizations. But sensible people in Israel and in our country are becoming more and more aware of the need to oppose the dangerous, fallacious policies of the Israeli government. The peace movement in Israel is growing.

A well-known Middle East commentator, Naomi Shepherd, reported from Jerusalem (New York Times, March 23, 1975):

There is a growing awareness in Israel that Palestinian nationalism must be satisfied if a final peace settlement with the Arabs is to be achieved.... A group of prominent kibbutz members, intellectuals and public figures recently suggested that Israel take the initiative on the Palestinian question. The group claims that many in the kibbutz movement share their ideas. They believe that Israel should publicly recognize Palestinian aspirations and declare Israel's willingness to give up territory to this end.

Here in the United States, voices of reason are being heard over the strident din of pro-Zionist propaganda. Former Senator J. W. Fulbright, Senators Percy and Abourezk, Rabbi Joachim Prinz, Chairman of the Governing Council of the World Jewish Congress, and Harvard Professor Stanley Hoffman have called for moderation and

conciliation in the solution of the Middle East conflict, to mention but a few.

We can have peace in the Middle East when the government of Israel consents to the reconvening of the Geneva conference with the participation of the PLO. The implementation by Israel of UN Resolutions 242 and 338, which call for Israel's withdrawal from all occupied Arab territories and the recognition of the national rights of the Palestine Arab people will bring a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

We have to clarify the issues to the people of the United States and counteract the nationalistic propaganda of the reactionary apologists of Israeli aggression. What is urgently needed at this time is united action by all sections of the people for a just peace in the Middle East.

RESOLUTION ON THE MIDDLE EAST

WHEREAS the war in the Middle East poses the danger of developing into a world-wide conflict, and

WHEREAS the Ford Administration is spending over \$100 billion dollars on military programs, much of it in arms shipments to Israel and other Middle East countries, and

WHEREAS a peaceful solution of the Middle East conflict is possible on the basis of implementing UN Resolutions 242 and 338, and would result in the security for all states and self-determination of all peoples in the Middle East,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Conference calls for the immediate resumption of the Geneva Conference on Peace in the Middle East with the participation of the Palestine Liberation Organization and under the joint chairmanship of the United States and the Soviet Union;

AND THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we agree with the purpose of this Conference and we go on record calling for a drastic reduction both in the military budget and military aid to the Middle East, and for use of the tax money for the pressing needs of the American people.

* * *

Greetings to Jewish Affairs

Best Wishes

D. A. Laker, Miami

Platform of the Israeli Committee for a Just Peace

(Reprinted from Israleft, March 1-6, 1975.)

The Israeli Committee for a Just Peace between Israel and the Arab Countries adopted the following resolution at a seminar held in Tel Aviv February 15. The Committee is a coalition of groups that hold positions just to the Left to far to the Left of Israel's present Government. The Committee includes members from the Mapam, Moked, Meri, Rakah, New Left, and Black Panther parties.

- 1) No true peace can be reached between Israel and the Arab world without the participation of the Arab Palestinian people.
- 2) The basis for peace will be peaceful coexistence of the State of Israel and the State of Palestine.
- 3) Israel should pave the way for a direct dialogue between itself and the Palestinian people, in which each side will be represented by its own recognized leadership.
- 4) The State of Israel should express its readiness to negotiate with the PLO on the basis of mutual recognition, cessation of violent operations and a search for a peaceful settlement between a sovereign State of Israel and a sovereign State of Palestine.
- 5) Israel's welfare requires an early convention of the Geneva peace conference, according to Security Council resolutions 242 and 338, with the participation of all the warring parties including the authorized representation of the Palestinian people. The joint participation in the Geneva conference will mark the beginning of official mutual recognition.
- 6) The participants of the seminar call for a unification of seekers after peace in Israel in order to repulse the onslaught of the Greater Israel people, the dangers of a new war and for peace and life.
- 7) The conference delivers a demand to the Israeli authorities for the immediate release of Bashir el Barguti--fighter for peace and friendship between peoples (on trial for membership in the Palestine National Front).

Among the speakers at the seminar were Dr. Emile Touma (Rakah), Yossi Amitai (Siah, New Left), Uri Avneri (Meri), Simha Flapan (Editor of New Outlook), Dr. Amnon Kapeliuk (journalist), Dr. Haim Darin-Drabkin (New Outlook, Mapam), Nahum Solan (Mapam youth faction), Charley Biton (Black Panthers), and Meir Pail, M.K. (Moked). The session was chaired by the journalist Natan Yalin-Mor.

* * *

Communications

Those Who Fan the Flames

By Marvin J. Berlowitz

(Reprinted from Newsrecord, Cincinnati, Ohio, February 18, 1975)

The recent full front page feature story on alleged Soviet anti-Semitism (NR, January 13) typifies the upsurge of Zionist complicity with the mounting imperialist, Cold War offensive against the rising tide of detente. The intent of this letter is not to deal with the vague innuendos of such pieces; I trust the academic community is sufficiently capable of accomplishing this.

As a man committed to struggle against all forms of racism and national oppression including the realities of anti-Semitism I find the myopia of the alleged concern for anti-Semitism extremely disturbing.

- Those who fan the flames of the Cold Warriors seem to have forgotten the real anti-Semitic dimensions of the Cold War as they culminated in the McCarthy era. Have we forgotten the frame-up of the Rosenbergs? the Sobels? the Hollywood 10 and scores of other Jewish victims of Cold War hysteria?
- The unqualified deification of Solzhenitsyn is equally puzzling. I wonder if Jews such as my grandparents who were chased across Russia's borders by Czarist hooligans would feel so positive about Solzhenitsyn's glorification of Czarism? I wonder if those Jews who feel victim to the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union would be as forgiving of General Vlasov's collaboration with the Nazi invaders as Solzhenitsyn seems to be.
- At this moment thousands of Chilean patriots are lying in graves, maimed and broken by torture, while others rot in concentration camps. Chilean Jews have been singled out for repression. The Chilean junta has enlisted the world's finest experts in Semitic genocide from the ranks of Nazi war criminals so plentiful in Latin American sanctuaries supported by American imperialism. This anti-

Semitism seems conspicuously overlooked. Are we silent because President Ford himself admitted that the Chilean junta was a C.I.A. product engineered by Kissinger in his role as Rockefeller's lap dog?

- As the apartheid, genocidal South African regime quakes with fear as it sees itself isolated by events in Angola and Mozambique, it too has singled out Jewish freedom fighters from among white progressives. Again, there is no outcry.

- General Brown's neo-Nazi ravings of "Jewish conspiracies and control" stimulated barely a token resistance.

- The recent full-page feature in Taft's local newspaper in which the Nazi party was able to explain fully its "program" stirred limited protest. Has anti-Semitism suddenly been minimized?

- The Ku Klux Klan has renewed its racist offensives in the contrived textbook disputes of Virginia. Our own Grand Wizard in Ohio pledges renewed commitment and activity. Is the Klan no longer a threat to Jews? So it would seem from the deafening silence.

- The statute of limitations recently ran out on Nazi war criminals. Such monsters can now roam free and very likely find openings in Interpol, or the C.I.A. or the "dirty tricks" squad. Again there is not even a trace of indignation.

It would seem that those of us who are truly committed to the struggle against anti-Semitism and all other forms of racism and national oppression certainly have our hands full without seeking windmills to charge in the Soviet Union.

Young American Jewry seems to have forgotten that anti-Semitism is deeply rooted in this country. My parents can still remember running from Father Coughlin's so-called Christian Front storm troopers as late as 1942. Have we forgotten how many of our brethren died in Nazi gas chambers because the "free world" closed its doors and ears to their pleas? My father remembers being in Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the West and seeing signs reading "No Jews or Dogs Allowed," and the epithets of "dirty Jew" and "Christ killer" still ring in his ears. It would seem that those of us truly committed to struggle against anti-Semitism and other forms of racism and national oppression have our work cut out for us here at home without charging windmills in the U.S.S.R. Let us have a rededication to American Jewish youth such as Schwerner and Goodman who were recently martyred as they fought fascism along with Chaney right here in the U.S. But then again distant windmills are safer than real struggle on the homefront.

* * *

An Excellent Antidote

By Harry Nelson

Enclosed you will find a check for \$3.50 for 12 issues of Jewish Affairs. I happened to get a copy of your issue of September-December 1974 and was impressed by the clarity and common sense of all the articles.

Although I have been a reader and supporter of the Morning Freiheit since its inception I have long been dissatisfied with its schizophrenic approach to the Jewish question. Jewish Affairs is an excellent antidote.

* * *

ON THE DEATH OF MEYER KLARFELD

It is with deep sorrow that we note the passing of Meyer Klarfeld, who died suddenly of a heart attack on April 6 in Boston. Comrade Klarfeld is well known as a veteran Communist, trade unionist and activist in the progressive Jewish movement over the past 50 years.

As a rank-and-file shoe worker, he helped to organize the shoe workers of Boston in the early thirties, working as a volunteer organizer. He was highly respected and admired by his co-workers and comrades as a man of principle, as one who proudly proclaimed himself a Communist and a fighter for socialism. He was a great admirer of the Soviet Union and worked to bring understanding of that great land of socialism to those among whom he worked.

For the past several years he had retired from work in the shoe factories. During this time he acted as representative of the Morning Freiheit in the Boston area.

To Comrade Klarfeld's wife and co-worker Mishka we offer our sincerest condolences.

Events and Views

The Palestine Information Committee, which supports the Palestine Liberation Organization, has issued a call for a Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People on May 15. It calls for 1) expression by all possible means of solidarity with the national rights of the Palestinian people, 2) solidarity with the political prisoners in Israeli prisons, and 3) solidarity with the struggles of political prisoners in Jordanian prisons. In New York a demonstration in behalf of these demands will take place on May 18 and there will be similar actions in other cities. We urge our readers to support these actions and to express their support for the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs in every possible way. In New York, further information can be obtained from Palestine Information Committee, c/o PLO, 101 Park Ave., Room 311, New York, N.Y. The telephone number is (212) 686-3530.

*

TASS reports an interview with Yakov Fishmann, Rabbi of the Moscow Choral Synagogue, on the observance of Passover. Services on the opening evening were followed by a seder for elderly single Jews. More than 100 tons of matzos were prepared and gift parcels were sent to Jews in a number of other countries. On the last day of the holiday, Kaddish was said for those who died in the war against Hitler fascism. Rabbi Fishmann stated: "All peoples on earth, including Jews, must remember that they were liberated by the great victory over fascism won by the Soviet Army together with the allied armies 30 years ago. We revere the memory of these soldiers-liberators."

*

A Correction: In the article by Hyman Lumer, "The Palestine Question," published in the September-December 1974 issue, an unfortunate typographical error appears, which escaped detection at the time. In quoting Yasir Arafat's UN speech, the article speaks of his dream of "one democratic Jewish state where Christian, Jew and Moslem live in justice and equality." The word "Jewish" obviously does not belong and the quotation should read "one democratic state." We are sorry about the error and whatever confusion it may have caused.

*

On March 13 Social Democrats USA presented its annual Eugene

V. Debs Award at a dinner in New York. The award is given, it is stated, to an individual who has demonstrated a commitment to the cause of working people in the Debs tradition. In typical fashion, this organization proceeded to dishonor the name of Debs by giving the award to none other than United Steelworkers' President I. W. Abel, whose only "commitment" has been to sell out the steel workers. Fittingly, the presentation was made by another "hero of labor," AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurer Lane Kirkland. Also fittingly, a special Norman Thomas Freedom Award was given to Valery and Galina Panov, the Soviet dancers who left for Israel after much hue and cry but are now in this country busily feathering their nests. All in all, a proper collection of "champions" of the working class and of human freedom. And a revealing insight into the character of Social Democrats USA.

*

This year the annual display of anti-Sovietism instigated by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry took place on April 13. The advertising preceding these disgraceful demonstrations, allegedly to "save" Soviet Jews, is replete with the usual lies and a few new ones. An alert public relations person came up with this one: "This year in Russia, it is still against the law to say 'Next year in Jerusalem.'" This is simply an invention. It is not against the law to say it and religious Jews do so on appropriate occasions, as can be readily ascertained. Even more outrageous is the following: "Three million Jews are trapped inside the Soviet Union. Jewish prisoners await their destiny in barbed wire labor camps. Visas are refused. Families are destroyed. Soviet Jews are fighting hard. Fighting for Jewish survival, not just personal freedom." As a picture of the condition of Soviet Jews, this bears not the remotest resemblance to the truth. Once again the Zionists lend themselves to the ends of the enemies of the Soviet Union and the foes of detente, a course of action which is a dedicated disservice to the interests of the Jewish people in this country.

* * *

<p>May 1, 1975</p> <p>In Loving Memory of</p> <p>Fanny Itzkowitz</p> <p>Deceased May 1, 1972</p> <p>Abe and the Children</p> <p>and Grandchildren</p>	<p>Greetings to Jewish Affairs</p> <p>Meyer Klarfeld</p> <p>Sadie & Nathan Ginsberg</p> <p>Greetings from a Mass. Friend</p> <p>Greetings from</p> <p>Jewish Cultural Club</p> <p>Winthrop, Mass.</p>
---	---