

Published by the
Communist Party,
U.S.A.

JEWISH AFFAIRS

July-August,
1974

Price 35¢



IN THIS ISSUE

Nixon's Anti-Semitism

Editorial

The Fight Against Shankerism in District I

Lee Carr

Toward an International Peace Conference

Committee for a Just Peace between Israel and the Arab Countries

The Two German States: A Contrast

Excerpts from Democratic German Reporter

**HYMAN LUMER: THE MIDDLE EAST—
WAR OR PEACE?**

Editor: Hyman Lumer

Editorial Committee: David Fried, Jack Kling, Alex Kolkin

CONTENTS

Editorials

<u>Nixon's Anti-Semitism</u>	1
<u>The U.S., Israel and the GDR</u>	2
Hyman Lumer, <u>The Middle East: Toward Peace or War?</u>	3
Sol Flapan, <u>The PLO Visits Poland</u>	9
Lee Carr, <u>The Fight against Shankerism in District 1</u>	10
Committee for a Just Peace between Israel and the Arab Countries, <u>Toward an International Conference for Peace in Middle East</u>	15
<u>The Two German States: A Contrast</u>	
<u>Jewish Community Congratulates GDR on 25th Birthday</u>	18
<u>How the FRG Coddles Nazis</u>	19
<u>Prof. Uri Oznan on "Who is a Jew?"</u>	20

Communications

Phil Honor, <u>Apologists for Zionism</u>	22
Ellis Goldberg, <u>On Evaluating Sadat</u>	27
<u>Events and Views</u>	30

Cover: "A Jewish Wedding" by the Russian artist Yitzchak Ashkenazi (1856-1902)

Address: 23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010 Tel. MU 5-5755

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

Editorials

Nixon's Anti-Semitism

Among the less endearing characteristics of ex-President Nixon as revealed in his tapes is his crude anti-Semitism. This appears, for example, in the transcript of a conversation with H. R. Haldeman on June 23, 1972, in which the two were discussing the question of where Nixon's daughters could campaign for his re-election. Nixon said: "for example--now the worst thing (unintelligible) is to go to anything that has to do with the arts." He added: "the arts, you know--they're Jews, they're Left wing--in other words stay away." In previous transcripts Nixon had not infrequently used ethnic slurs including such expressions as "Jew boy."

Of course, it is no insult to the Jewish people to say they are interested in culture or, for that matter, that they are Left-wing. But it is a crass piece of anti-Semitism to say that one should stay away from cultural institutions because one should stay away from Jews.

Nixon had on more than one occasion denied being anti-Semitic, citing as proof his vigorous support of Israel and his appointment of Jews, including Henry Kissinger, to key posts. But this only demonstrates that being a "friend of Israel" is not incompatible with being an anti-Semite--something on which those in Zionist circles who accuse all opponents of Israeli government policy of being ipso facto "anti-Semitic" should ponder. Nor is Nixon alone in this; such peerless "friends of Israel" as Senator Buckley and Governor Reagan are certainly no less anti-Semitic.

Nixon's anti-Semitism is not an isolated phenomenon. It is part and parcel of his general chauvinism and racism. It is directly associated with his viciously racist policies with regard to the Black people and other oppressed minorities. And it is in keeping with the anti-Semitism and racism of the crew of ultra-Rightists whom he gathered around himself as his personal staff--the Watergate crew.

But there is one additional point which must not be overlooked. The kind of anti-Semitic expressions cited above is not confined to the Right; such expressions are all too prevalent in "respectable" circles generally. It is this "respectable," behind-the-scenes anti-Semitism which underlies the discrimination practiced against Jews in employment, education and housing, and to which the open, violent anti-Semitism of the ultra-Right directs its appeal. The distinguishing feature in Nixon's case is that his remarks were taped and made public.

This only points up the need to combat all manifestations of anti-Semitism and racism in general, and in particular to fight for legislation outlawing all anti-Semitic and racist utterances and incitements. It is this toward which the leading Jewish organizations and spokesmen should direct themselves rather than the misguided campaigns against so-called "anti-Semitism of the Left" and "Black anti-Semitism" which give aid and comfort to the real enemies of the Jewish people.

* * *

The U.S., Israel and the GDR

The establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Democratic Republic on September 4 of this year was an historic event. It sounded the death knell of the notorious Hallstein Doctrine proclaimed by the monopolist rulers of West Germany, who claimed the right to speak for all of Germany and refused to recognize the existence of an independent socialist GDR. Following as it does on the diplomatic recognition of the GDR by numerous other countries and on its admission, together with the Federal Republic of Germany, into the United Nations, the establishment of formal diplomatic ties with the United States represents a noteworthy victory for the forces of peace and socialism and a distinct setback for world imperialism. And fittingly, it comes on the eve of the 25th anniversary of the GDR, to be celebrated on October 7, 1974.

These developments are greeted by all friends of peace and progress, but they receive no welcome from the forces of Zionism. It is significant that Israel's ruling circles, which had no hesitation in recognizing the bloodsoaked junta in Chile and which supported the admission of the FRG to the UN, opposed the admission of the GDR. The reason given for this opposition was the GDR's refusal to give financial compensation to the victims of Nazism living abroad (although compensation was provided for those living within the country). The FRG, on the other hand, had granted well over \$800 million in compensation, almost all of it going directly to Israel, and the Zionist leaders of Israel found no difficulty in maintaining the friendliest of ties with the renazified, revanchist Bonn regime. But they had only intense hostility toward a socialist GDR which had completely eradicated Nazism and anti-Semitism among its people.

The GDR, whose denial of compensation was based on the contention that it was in no way a successor of the Third Reich, has now agreed to discuss the question. This may well lead to removal of the asserted grounds for official Israeli hostility, but there remains the basic source of hostility, namely, the GDR's denunciation of the aggressive, expansionist policies of the Israeli government. It is these policies which have led Israel into the bog of alliances

with the forces of reaction and racism and have increasingly isolated her from the anti-imperialist and socialist forces.

The glaring contrast between the two German states with respect to their attitudes toward racism and Nazism has been strikingly depicted by Claude M. Lightfoot in his book Racism and Human Survival (International Publishers, New York, 1972). It is also indicated in the two excerpts from Democratic German Report presented in this issue. The Zionist policies, it is clear, tie Israel to the enemies of the Jewish people and separate her from their friends.

* * *

The Middle East: Toward Peace or War?

By Hyman Lumer

Essential to the progress of detente and the cause of world peace is the resolution of the Middle East conflict, which continues to pose a most serious threat of war and nuclear confrontation. Progress toward a just and stable peace in the Middle East has been registered in the acceptance of the UN Security Council cease-fire proposals embodied in Resolution 238, and in the agreements for disengagement of troops. But these are merely preliminary steps. The basic obstacles to peace have yet to be removed and a successful outcome of the Geneva negotiations, as called for in the cease-fire resolution, is far from assured. On the contrary, the danger of renewed warfare has increased in recent months, and the situation has now reached a critical point.

A durable peace is possible only on the basis of 1) full implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 242, including the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories, and 2) assurance of the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people. The basic roadblock to peace, now as before, is the stubborn refusal of the Israeli ruling circles to accept these requirements and their insistence on continuing their policy of aggression and annexation. Indeed, their outlook is one not of peace but of a new outbreak of war. Their current policies point ominously in this direction.

Israel's rulers have learned nothing from the October war and its consequences. Though the Rabin government represents some significant changes in personnel, its policies are in most important respects virtually a carbon copy of the Meir policies. It continues to place primary reliance for Israel's security on the maximum buildup of armed strength. It rejects any idea of returning to the 1967 borders. It calls for continued building of Jewish settlements in the occupied territories. And it flatly opposes the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state. Moreover, with a bare majority of one in the Knesset, this government shows little inclination to buck the pressures of the Right-wing, blatantly annexationist forces headed by Menachem Begin. Clearly, it is not in the least prepared to carry out the terms of the cease-fire agreement.

To the Rabin regime, the disengagement agreements have meant not an opening toward peace but an opportunity to play for time--time to build up its armed forces, to secure multiplied U.S. military assistance, to seek private deals with Sadat and Hussein. The policy of the Israeli government is one of endless maneuvering and procrastination, designed to minimize concessions and preserve as much of the status quo as possible. It opposes the opening of joint negotiations in Geneva and presses instead for separate negotiations with each Arab state "without preconditions," that is, with no commitment on Israel's part to give up the conquered territories or to recognize the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs. Defense Minister Shimon Peres, in a recent television interview, called for a compromise settlement with Egypt, a peace treaty with Jordan and a determined stand against Syria. Thus, the Israeli government is counting on divisions among the Arab states--on the hope that Sadat will make a separate settlement and leave the others to their own devices and on Hussein's efforts to retain the Palestinian Arabs as part of a Jordanian state under his rule.

Hence the current pressure from both sides for immediate negotiation of a disengagement agreement between Jordan and Israel. The Israeli version calls for some withdrawal from the Jordan River and limited civilian rule by Amman in the West Bank. At the same time, Peres insists that the Jordan River must be retained as a "security border," which Jordanian troops would be forbidden to cross and that the right of Jews to settle in the West Bank must be guaranteed.

Hence, too, the pressure for separate negotiations with Egypt, seeking to utilize Sadat's shift toward dependence on the United States as the basis for a separate agreement in return for further withdrawals from the Sinai Peninsula.

It is evident that nothing of consequence has changed in Israeli foreign policy. But it is no less evident that continuation of the present expansionist policy can lead only to renewed war with the Arab states. Syria in particular has made this unmistakably clear.

The Israeli ruling circles seek to justify their actions on the spurious grounds that real peace with the Arabs is impossible, that the Arab states, whatever they may say, are motivated only by an insane drive to destroy Israel. Rabin points to the growing military strength of Syria, which, he claims, is now capable of launching a full-scale war against Israel on her own. Therefore, the Israeli people are told, the current cease-fire is only temporary and a new outbreak of war is imminent. New York Times correspondent Terence Smith writes (Aug. 8, 1974):

The sober view of the strategic realities surrounding Israel has raised concern among the leadership here about the possibility of a war within six months to a year. It has prompted a series of public warnings to this effect during the last ten days by Premier Yitzhak Rabin, Defense Minister Shimon Peres and Lieutenant General Mordechai Gur, Chief of Staff.

In fact, Israeli government leaders are calling for all-out preparations for a new war and are even speaking of the possibility of pre-emptive war. On this point a statement released by the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Is-

rael on August 4, 1974 says: "The Prime Minister called for 'deploying with the greatest speed for the possibility of war....' The War Minister 'prophesied' that war is liable to break out before the end of the year. He also declared that Israel has not renounced the option of opening war from her side." The statement emphasizes that "These declarations are being made against the background of additional declarations of the leaders of neighboring states about their readiness for a just peace with Israel by way of the Geneva conference, a peace based on the full implementation of Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, on respecting the rights of all peoples and states in our region."

These new threats of war are accompanied by provocative actions such as a practice callup of Israeli reserves, military maneuvers in the Golan Heights and the Sinai Peninsula, and the alerting of Israeli troops on all fronts. In short, for the sake of their bankrupt policies the Israeli leaders are calling on the people of Israel, still reeling from the effects of the October war and now suffering the highest rates of taxation and inflation in the world, to prepare for another bloodbath.

*

A particularly serious obstacle to peace is the attitude of Israel's rulers on the Palestinian question, which is increasingly assuming the center of the Middle-East stage. At issue are 1) guarantee of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including the right of self-determination; 2) recognition of the Palestine Liberation Organization, headed by Yasir Arafat, as the sole authentic spokesman for them; 3) implementation of the UN resolutions concerning their rights, including the right of the refugees to be repatriated or receive compensation for their property. The growing urgency of these issues is shown by the fact that the Palestinian question has been placed on the agenda of the current session of the UN General Assembly.

The PLO has voted to participate in the Geneva negotiations provided that the question of the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs is placed on the agenda as a separate point. It has also called for establishment of a Palestinian national authority on territories in the West Bank or the Gaza Strip which are evacuated by Israel. These actions are indicative of a growing readiness of the PLO to work for a political solution through negotiations with Israel, as are recent statements by leading PLO figures.

But all this the Israeli government simply ignores, adamantly rejecting the demands of the Palestinian Arabs cited above, and especially the recognition of the PLO. When Information Minister Aharon Yariv recently opened the door a crack by suggesting the possibility of negotiations with the PLO if it would acknowledge Israel's right to exist and cease hostile actions against her, Rabin was quick to slam it shut. He ruled out any possibility of contact or negotiations with the PLO, insisting that negotiations concerning the Palestinian Arabs can be conducted only with Hussein, despite the fact that the Palestinians in the main vehemently deny that Hussein speaks for them. He reiterated the Israeli government's opposition to the formation of a Palestinian Arab state, maintaining that the state of the Palestinian Arabs is Jordan and that an independent state would only serve as an instrument for the destruction of Israel. And he denounced the entire PLO as a gang of terrorists with whom no relations are pos-

sible, citing particularly the recent guerrilla attacks within Israel.

But these charges are unfounded and in fact are but a cloak for the annexationist designs of the Israeli ruling clique. On the other hand, the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people against the aggressors is a just struggle. The actions of both sides must be judged within this context. To be sure, as we have previously stressed, acts of individual terror which take the lives of innocent civilians cannot be condoned but must be unequivocally condemned, no matter who assumes responsibility for them.

Such terrorism could be ended, however, if the Israeli government were to recognize the rights of the Palestinian Arabs and to enter into negotiations with the PLO which unquestionably speaks for the Palestinian Arab people. But this is directly contrary to its aim of annexing the West Bank, wholly or in large part. Its policy, therefore, is directed toward the destruction of the Palestinian Arab liberation movement.

This is the real meaning of the ceaseless raids and mass bombings conducted by the Israeli government on Lebanese villages with extensive property damage and numerous civilian casualties, of the invasions of Lebanese territory and the assassinations of guerrilla leaders, of the hijacking of a Lebanese plane for the same purpose. These acts are no longer justified by their perpetrators only in the name of "retaliation"; they are declared to be pre-emptive acts intended to seek out and destroy guerrilla forces and bases wherever they may be found. In reality their purpose is to wipe out the entire guerrilla movement and in particular to compel the Lebanese government to duplicate the slaughter of guerrilla forces carried out by Hussein in 1970.

The effort to stamp out the liberation movement is evident also in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, where a new upsurge of repression is in progress, in response to the emergence of the Palestine National Front which is solidly based among the people and is leading organized mass struggles against the occupation in these areas. Starting in late April a wave of arrests and administrative detentions were carried out. By late August the total number came to 896 according to official figures (New York Times, August 23, 1974). Undoubtedly the actual total is considerably higher.

Administrative detention, in which no charges are placed and the detainee can be kept in prison indefinitely without trial, was resorted to because the authorities were unable to substantiate any serious charges. This has been widely noted in the Israeli press. Thus, Davar (July 14, 1974) states: "The Israeli administration cannot muster acceptable evidence against these tens of prisoners and thus is obliged to use administrative arrest warrants of questionable value." And Yediot Aharonot (July 7, 1974) says: "It is worth noting that even the security authorities do not claim that the latest detainees are suspected of sabotage activity, but explicitly cite political activity." In fact, the arrests and detentions, which include both Communists and non-Communists, are based on alleged membership in the PNF and are clearly intended to destroy that organization.

The prisoners were refused permission to see their families or attorneys, necessitating lengthy court battles, and many were brutally beaten and tortured. Despite the clear-cut evidence of torture in many instances, the Israeli authorities have not only flatly denied its occurrence but have refused to investigate any of the cases. The attorneys for the prisoners have conducted a heroic struggle for the right to meet with their clients and for official investigation of the charges of torture. Protest movements and actions against the arrests and tortures are growing within Israel and abroad, exposing the brutal suppression of the rights of the Arab people in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

It is obvious that it is these repressive, annexationist policies and not a few isolated terrorist acts which underlie the refusal of the Israeli leaders to deal with the PLO and to accept the establishment of a Palestinian state. The acts serve only as a pretext.

However, this is the road not to peace but to endless warfare. For the Israeli people themselves these policies spell, more ominously than ever, the road to disaster.

*

Today the feelings of optimism initially created by the cease-fire and the disengagements of troops are wearing off and the hard realities which must be faced are asserting themselves ever more sharply. Kissinger's "working of miracles" has evidently come to an end. The choice is clear: either joint negotiations in Geneva based on the full implementation of Resolution 242 and on assurance of the right of self-determination to the Palestinian Arabs, or a return to armed conflict. U.S. policy in the Middle East today leads in the latter direction.

If Israeli foreign policy has not substantially changed, neither has the Middle East policy of U.S. imperialism. It continues to be based on massive support to the Israeli ruling circles, with the aim of using Israel as an instrument against the anti-imperialist forces in the Middle East. To the \$2.2 billion provided to Israel during the October war (\$1.5 billion of it in outright grants), immense new sums are to be added. And plans are under way to place future military and economic aid on a long-term rather than a year-to-year basis.

The realities, it is true, also include the greatly changed balance of forces in the Middle East, to which U.S. imperialism is compelled, however reluctantly, to give some recognition. Hence U.S. aid is now accompanied by pressure on the Israeli government to "demonstrate its statesmanship by taking risks for peace." Kissinger's role, which has earned him the growing hostility of Right-wing Jewish circles, continues to be one of seeking to extract from the Israeli government some concessions which can then be offered to leaders like Hussein and Sadat as the basis for a partial solution that will leave the status quo mainly undisturbed.

At the same time, Washington is not pressing for resumption of the Geneva negotiations, due to take place some time this fall, but is backing the Israeli

maneuvers for separate negotiations with Jordan and Egypt, presumably through the mediation of Kissinger. Such efforts can only serve to sabotage the Geneva negotiations and the prospects for a genuine peace. Moreover, the U.S. government has as yet taken no stand on the participation of the Palestinian Arab representatives in the negotiations, which is vital to their success. In addition, Ford and Kissinger are engaging in thinly-veiled threats of retaliation against the oil-producing countries if they do not reduce prices.

In pursuing this line, both the Israeli leaders and their U.S. backers fail to grasp the extent to which the balance of forces has changed. They fail to reckon with the mounting opposition to their schemes among the Israeli people, with the greatly enhanced strength of the Arab liberation forces and with the powerful role which the Soviet Union plays as a bulwark of national liberation and peace in the Middle East. Those who believe that the USSR has been relegated to a back seat by the "Kissinger magic" are due for a rude awakening. It maintains close, friendly ties with key Arab states such as Syria, Egypt and Iraq, and it pursues a clear, consistent peace policy.

This was spelled out by CPSU General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev in his address at the World Congress of Peace forces in Moscow on October 26, 1973. "Is it not obvious," he asked, "that the struggle of the Arab peoples for the eradication of the consequences of the Israeli aggression is simultaneously a struggle for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East?" He noted further that "the Arab states will never give up their legitimate rights" and he stated: "The Soviet Union supports the Arab people's just demands firmly and consistently." To this he added: "Our firm stand is that all states and peoples in the Middle East--I repeat, all of them--must be assured of peace, security and inviolability of borders. The Soviet Union is prepared to take part in the relevant guarantees."

In this direction lies the only true road to peace in the Middle East. This is already evident to countless masses of people throughout the world, as is demonstrated by the almost total isolation of Israel in the world arena. And it is becoming evident to growing numbers in this country. What is needed with growing urgency is to give organized expression to this sentiment, to mobilize it as a force for bringing about a change in U.S. policy. The Ford Administration must be urged:

1. To call for the immediate resumption of the Geneva negotiations and to support the participation of the Palestinian Arab representatives in these negotiations;
2. To give full support to the legitimate demands of the Palestinian Arab people, as outlined above, in the UN General Assembly debate;
3. To insist upon Israel's full adherence to UN Resolutions 338 and 242 and recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs.
4. To demand an end to Israeli invasions of Lebanon, and to the arrest and torture of Arabs in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Such a policy on the part of the U.S. would be a powerful guarantee for peace in the Middle East and for the advancement of detente and peaceful coexistence generally. We urge our readers to make their sentiments on these questions known to Ford and Kissinger, to their senators and representatives, and to get their friends, neighbors and co-workers to join them. The interests of the people of our country are at stake, no less than those of the peoples of Israel, the Arab countries and the rest of the world.

* * *

The PLO Visits Poland

By Sol Flapan

WARSAW, August 6 - Poland and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) are agreed that a complete Israeli military pullout from all occupied Arab lands is a prerequisite for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

A parallel requirement is the restoration to the Arab nation of Palestine its legitimate rights in accordance with the United Nations Charter and decisions, says a final communique released here at the end of a four-day stay by a PLO delegation. The Palestinians came to Warsaw from five days of talks with Soviet leaders in Moscow.

During its stay here on August 3-6 the PLO group led by Yasir Arafat had talks with Political Bureau and Central Committee members of the Polish United Workers' Party (PUWP), this country's ruling party. There was also a meeting with officials of the Polish Committee of Solidarity with the Nations of Asia and Africa.

Arafat, chairman of the PLO's Executive Committee, transmitted to the PUWP officials his organization's gratitude for the unflinching support by People's Poland for the just struggles of the Arab peoples against Israeli aggression.

An example of this solidarity is the PUWP's favorable assessment of the fact that the PLO was recognized as the only representative of the Palestinian nation by the 6th Arab Summit in Algiers and by the Conference of Muslim Countries in Lahore, Pakistan.

Further, the question of opening a PLO office in Warsaw will be reviewed with "sympathy and understanding."

The Polish side, says the communique, published in today's newspapers, voiced its appreciation of the difficult but determined and dedicated efforts of the PLO.

Editorially, Trybuna Ludu (People's Tribune), daily newspaper of the PUWP, pointed out (August 5) that Arafat and his organization pursue a policy of "political realism." Arafat's Al Fatah, the basic and overwhelming part of the Palestinian liberation movement "rejects extremist demands by some circles for the destruction of Israel."

(At a Moscow press conference PLO executive member Abdel Mohsen Abu Saiser is quoted by TASS, the Soviet news service, as saying: "We do not come out against either the people of Israel or Jews in general.... We fight against Zionism, the reactionary movement which is inseparably connected with imperialism.")

The Arafat wing, continued Trybuna Ludu, "condemns terrorism which in the final analysis is grist to the mill of the most rapacious forces in Israel and its protectors in imperialist countries."

Finally, it agrees "to participate in the Geneva negotiations provided that the Palestinian question is discussed as a political matter" and not from narrow "humanitarian" positions.

Poland, declared Trybuna Ludu, stands foursquare behind UN Security Council resolutions which proclaim that the guaranteed rights of the Palestinian people are an integral part of any final settlement to the Mid-East problem. "We consider this an indispensable factor for the restoration of lasting peace in that part of the world."

There is an interesting P.S. to an Algiers-dated story on Maghreb reaction to the PLO tour of European socialist capitals filed by the correspondent of the popular Zycie Warszawy (Warsaw Life). According to the Arab press, this was Arafat's first visit to Warsaw. Not so, the Polish newsman informs his readers in today's paper. Back in the mid-1950s Arafat led a delegation of young Palestinians to the World Youth and Students Festival in Warsaw.

* * *

The Fight Against Shankerism in District 1

By Lee Carr

New York City's School District 1, on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, has for some time been the scene of sharp struggles. At issue is the question of a decent education for the school children of the area, of whom 73 per cent are Puerto Rican, 14 per cent are Black, 7 per cent are white and 6 per cent are Asian. But while the oppressed minority groups account for 93 per cent of the school children, they include only 40 per cent of the adult population.

The remaining 70 per cent is mainly elderly and Jewish in composition. Basing themselves on the latter, Albert Shanker and his cohorts in the United Federation of Teachers have conducted a vicious racist campaign for the control of the district, directed against the parents of the school children in their efforts to assure a proper education for their children. In typical Shankerite fashion, the campaign has focused on appeals to racism among the white residents and charges of anti-Semitism among the minority groups.

The nature of the educational problems is indicated by the following facts: Reading scores of the pupils in the district's 20 schools have shown only 18 per cent able to read at or above their proper grade levels. For many of the children Spanish is the primary language and they understand English (the language used in the schools) poorly or not at all. And only about 10 per cent of the full-time professional and instructional staff is Black, Puerto Rican or Asian as against more than 90 per cent of the pupils.

This is a prescription for educational disaster and the experience of many years bears this out. Under the conditions and programs imposed by the Central Board of Education many became disillusioned with education and dropped out. Those who remained got through high school only with difficulty and only a small fraction were able to enter the college and university system. This discrimination was reflected also in employment. Unable to enter teaching and other professional fields, these youth were relegated to the most unskilled and lowest-paying jobs or were condemned to unemployment, which today runs between 30 and 40 per cent among Black, Puerto Rican and other minority group youth. Thus, the intolerable conditions of education have contributed heavily to the state of poverty and misery in which the families of these young people are compelled to live. The fight for a better education for the children is therefore an integral part of the fight for a better life.

*

The parents of District 1 have not accepted these conditions and for many years they have waged a determined fight for a voice in the educational policies in the schools in the area. One of the first major efforts to change the situation came with the election of a District School Board in 1970. As a result of this election and of subsequent changes in the composition of the Board, Luis Fuentes was chosen as District 1 School Superintendent. Under his administration, many far-reaching changes were instituted. Among them were an expanded free breakfast program and an ethnically oriented lunch program, bilingual programs for Spanish- and Chinese-speaking students, and special reading programs.

In these developments, the parents and other sections of the community were for the first time involved in a real way in making decisions. Principals and other school personnel to be hired were screened by panels of parents in each school. A community newspaper in English, Spanish and Chinese was published to inform the community of the problems and achievements in the schools. The district office, formerly in an outlying area, was moved into the heart of

the district. Indeed, a new, healthy democratic wind was blowing on the Lower East Side.

It did not take long, however, before the racist elements in the leadership of the UFT and in the community, frightened by these developments, set out to undo them and to remove both Fuentes and the Board which had initiated them.

In the District School Board elections in May 1973, Shanker and his cohorts sponsored a slate of eight white candidates and one Black in opposition to the Community Slate. By spending tremendous sums of money and bringing in forces from all parts of the city, and with the usual help of the communications media, they succeeded in electing six of their slate out of a total of nine. However, the racist character of the campaign was so flagrant that a federal court judge threw out the elections on the grounds that they had been "conducted in a racially discriminatory manner"--thereby setting a new precedent--and ordered new elections in May 1974.

*

In the 1974 elections the UFT leaders and the racist elements in the community outdid themselves in the circulation of lies and distortions designed to frighten teachers and white residents in District 1, particularly the elderly individuals with no children in the schools, into a state of near-hysteria. Their leaflets and their advertisements in the Daily News and El Diario contained characteristic racist attacks on the Black and Puerto Rican people, reminiscent of the UFT propaganda in the 1968 strike against community control.

They tried to make Luis Fuentes the issue when in reality their attacks were levelled against the parents and the community. They contemptuously referred to the Por Los Niños (For the Children) Slate, chosen by the parents of the district and truly representative of them, as the "Fuentes Band." Wild charges were made that if the Por Los Niños Slate won, drugs and narcotics would be brought into the schools, bedlam would result, education would be wrecked, white teachers would lose their jobs, and the Jewish people of the Lower East Side would be placed in mortal danger.

Such wild charges were made in the face of the fact that when an order came through from the Central Board of Education to proceed with budget cuts eliminating teaching jobs, District 1 under Fuentes was the only district in the entire city which refused to cut the number of teachers. The Parents' Slate and the Council of Parents' Association Presidents--the so-called "Fuentes Band"--rallied to the support of the teachers in this fight. A minor rebellion developed, with UFT teachers starting to meet with community people to work out joint strategy for opposing the cuts. But UFT headquarters quickly clamped a lid on this.

Fuentes issued a statement that in spite of the ordered cuts no teacher in District 1 doing a job for the children would be dismissed. Perhaps this was why many more UFT teachers in District 1 appeared to be neutral or less active in 1974 than in 1973. They apparently began to see that it was the city and the Central Board that were threatening their jobs, not the parents of District 1 or

Fuentes. And perhaps it is because of this that the UFT had to employ a public relations firm to produce its leaflets and to hire paid leaflet distributors, as well as to do its mailings from central headquarters. More money was spent in this campaign than ever before, some of it to hire a fleet of taxis to transport elderly white residents to the polls on election day.

Such was the dishonorable role of the UFT leadership in this election.

The slate supported by the UFT, again nearly all white, won a narrow victory, capturing five of the nine places on the Board. Though treading carefully at first, they soon moved to fire Fuentes. They obtained an injunction barring him from functioning in his post. This was upheld by the state court and the injunction is now being appealed in the federal courts. Encouraged by this, they have begun to dismantle the programs launched under Fuentes and parent leadership. They have eliminated the position of lunch coordinator, thus endangering the program in which the parents choose the menus, review the bids of companies to supply the food, and administer the program. They have fired the reading coordinator and the parent liaison employee, both community-hired, and the curriculum and health coordinators. The person in charge of the Youth Leadership Program (an anti-drug program) has been replaced with a strong Shanker supporter. The bilingual program has come under heavy attack. The certificates of competence--special licenses allowing the hiring of bilingual teachers if no regularly licensed personnel is available--have been abolished, eliminating some 70 bilingual teachers. Pupils who were studying the basic academic subjects in Spanish while studying English were dispersed into classes taught in English, with predictably damaging results.

The majority on the new Board has also allowed a cut of over 100 paraprofessionals to stand, refusing to put them on tax levy programs, as they have the power to do and as Fuentes had said he would do if he were able to function. And it has now moved to get rid of the 14 principals in the district who had been screened and appointed by the parents, first singling out P.S. 188, the largest school in the district, which has two co-principals, one Jewish and one Black. This move has triggered strong parent resistance, resulting in a boycott of the school with at most 300 of the 1,400 enrolled attending. Large demonstrations have been held at the Board of Education and parts of Houston Street (a main artery of the Lower East Side) have been closed down in the parents' fight to reinstate the two principals. Parents' associations at other schools have supported these actions and vowed to initiate boycotts in their own schools if the Board moved to fire the principals they had chosen.

The struggle has not been without effect. Chancellor Anker has reinstated the two co-principals pending an open School Board hearing. In bringing this about, parent actions and support were decisive. Added to this is the fact that 95 per cent of the UFT teachers at P.S. 188 initially supported the fight for reinstatement, although pressure from the UFT leadership later reduced this to 30 per cent. And not least, the boycott and other actions were actively supported by white and particularly Jewish residents in the community.

Conditions are now clearly developing which make it possible to turn the racist offensive of the Shankerite majority on the District Board into a victorious advance for the people. This can be accomplished by building the widest unity of all groups in the community--white, Black, Puerto Rican and Asian, parents and teachers. It can be accomplished if the fight is directed not against the union or the teachers as such but, in league with the rank-and-file teachers, against the Shanker forces and their racist policies. And it can be accomplished if the efforts of the coalition are focused on fighting for the needs and interests of the oppressed minorities in the community, if it is recognized that this serves the interests of the entire community.

Specifically, it is necessary to wage a major campaign against racism in the white neighborhoods, and particularly among the Jewish people. They must be convinced that their interests are not opposed to those of the Black, Puerto Rican or Asian people but lie, on the contrary, in joining with them to fight for better schools, better housing, lower rents, decent medical care and a better Lower East Side for all its residents. They must be convinced that their interests lie in rejecting the Shankers and their nationalist and Zionist supporters in the community, who seek to thwart the democratic demands and aspirations of the peoples who are the victims of racism and to sow dissension between them and the Jewish people. They must be convinced that they cannot effectively combat anti-Semitism without fighting for the rights of all peoples and against national and racial oppression in all its forms.

The fight of the parents in District 1 for a better education for their children is not an isolated struggle. It is intimately related to the fight waged in Little Rock some years ago, to the more recent struggles in Ocean Hill-Brownsville and to the current battle in Boston. It is part of the same fight as the struggles for decent housing in Forest Hills and Canarsie, and is tied up with the many other such fights throughout the country.

In all these struggles there have been some white people who have stood side by side with their Black brothers and sisters and those of other oppressed peoples in their struggles for equality and freedom. In Boston, for example, there were those white people who welcomed the Black children with fruit and flowers. It is these who truly represent the democratic spirit of the people of Boston, not the racist hoodlums who threw rocks at the buses bearing the Black children. The task is to mobilize such white forces and to multiply their numbers, to build an irresistible unity of whites with the Black, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Asian and Native American peoples in defense of their mutual interests against the common enemy--the giant monopolies which instigate racial and national discrimination and oppression as a source of superprofits. For the achievement of this goal white Communists bear a particular responsibility, and in the present instance the responsibility falls especially on Jewish Communists.

* * *

Toward an International Conference on Peace in the Middle East

Resumption of Geneva Conference--Coming Step Toward a Just and Stable Peace

(Note: At a meeting in Rome on June 1-2, 1974, the International Organizing Committee for the preparation of an International Conference for Peace and Justice in the Middle East decided to call the Conference no later than October 1974. As of the date of this writing, it appears that the Conference will not take place in October but has been postponed to a later date. The statement which follows was issued in Israel in preparation for the Conference. The fact of its postponement, of course, in no way lessens the significance of the statement.-- Editor.)

With the signing of the agreements for disengagement of forces between Israel, Egypt and Syria, Israel and her neighbors have taken the first step in the direction of peace. However, to remain at this point and to take no further steps forward can negate the outlook for peace and return us to the path to war. As we have seen, war cannot lead to the solution of problems. The solution to the conflict in our region can and must be a political one.

The Geneva Conference, under the initiative of the UN and the sponsorship of the Soviet Union and the United States, which began in December 1973 as the outcome of the bloody October war, has created the basis for negotiations between those involved in the Middle East conflict, with the purpose of working out a way to a just peace. Resumption of the Conference without delay is the correct action for continuing the advance in the direction of peace between Israel and the Arab states.

The success of the Geneva Conference lies in the cooperation of all the interested parties in carrying out UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, for establishing a just and stable peace between Israel and the Arab states on the basis of the following conditions:

- Recognition of the right of sovereign existence and territorial integrity of the State of Israel and all other states in the region;
- Recognition of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, of its right to self-determination and to a just solution of the problem of the Palestinian Arab refugees;
- Withdrawal from all territories occupied by Israel in the June 1967 war;

- Guarantee of free passage of ships for Israel, just as for all other states, in the Suez Canal, the Straits of Tiran and all other waterways.

For the success of the Geneva Conference all sides must refrain from actions which can render the negotiations more difficult and must in particular:

- Repudiate all declarations and tendencies toward annexation of the territories occupied by Israel and halt the colonization of these territories;

- Repudiate all statements and plans whose effect is to harm the sovereignty, security and independence of the State of Israel or of other states in the region;

- Guarantee the participation of competent representatives of the Palestinian Arab people and abandonment of the opposition of the Israeli government to the right of the Palestinian Arab people to establish an independent state of its own if it so desires;

- End the terror and acts of violence which are committed against citizens on both sides of the border. No goal whatever justifies such acts against civilians, women and children;

- End the acts of repression and denial of human rights in the occupied territories and free the political prisoners.

We greet the initiative of the peace forces in various countries for the convening of an International Conference for Peace and Justice in the Middle East, to be held in October 1974 in Italy, with the participation of fighters for peace from the whole world, including Israel and the Arab countries. This international gathering can contribute toward resolving the question of a just and stable peace between Israel and the Arab states.

We address ourselves, therefore, to all those who are in agreement with this appeal to support the action for the achievement of these important and lofty goals.

We appeal to all fighters for peace and opponents of annexation in Israel for united activity and cooperation for advancement from the disengagement agreements with Egypt and Syria to a just and stable peace.

The Committee for a Just Peace Between
Israel and the Arab Countries

We, the undersigned, express our agreement with this appeal:

Mordechai Avi Shaul, Tel Aviv; Uri Avnery, Tel Aviv; Prof. Kalman Altman, Haifa; Michah Amodai, Tel Aviv; Yossi Amitai, Kibbutz Gebulot; Aryeh Arnon, Jerusalem; Uzi Burstein, Ramat Gan; Elon Brosh, Kibbutz Davir; Zvi Breitstein, Tel Aviv; Moshe Gabzeh, Petah Tikvah; Yoram Gozhansky, Bat Yam; Arthur Goldreich, Tel Aviv;

Salim Jabran, Nazareth; Abraham Hass, Tel Aviv; Esther Vilenska, Tel Aviv; Meir Vilner, Tel Aviv; Yitzhak Zemler, Holon; Yaacob Hen, Tel Aviv; Tawfiq Toubi, Haifa; Yabi, Tel Aviv; Natan Yalin-Mor, Tel Aviv; Sholom Kelev, Holon; Yitzhak Leor, Ramat Gan; Ruth Lubitch, Tel Aviv; Yosef Lipsky, Tel Aviv; Israel Leb, Jerusalem; Dora Meir, (Teitelboim), Tel Aviv; Shmuel Mikunis, Tel Aviv; Alex Massis, Tel Aviv; Eli Naftali, Ramat Gan; Shmuel Setal, Ramat Gan; Moshe Epstein, Kibbutz Gebulot; Biniamin Omri, Tel Aviv; Prof. Daniel Amit, Jerusalem; Eliezer Feiler, Kibbutz Yad Hanna; Pninah Feiler, Kibbutz Yad Hanna; Shmuel Fast, Kibbutz Haogen; Sylvia Frei, Kibbutz Merhavia; Dani Patar, Tel Aviv; Sini Petar, Kibbutz Horem Shalom; Salim al Kassem, Nazareth; Samih al Kassem, Haifa; Eli Kenan, Tel Aviv; Gershon Knispal, Haifa; Pinhas Kraus, Kibbutz Yad Hanna; Dr. Reuven Kritz, Kiryat Motzkin; Michah Rachman, Kibbutz Horem Shalom; Yaacov Riftin, Kibbutz Ain Shemer; Asher Shlomi, Kibbutz Gatton; Zeev Sadeh, Kibbutz Maavdot; Dr. Emile Touma, Haifa.

* * *

TO OUR READERS:

The third annual Jewish Affairs dinner will be held on Sunday, January 12, 1975, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in New York City. Tickets are priced at \$12.00 per person. This price is, regrettably, somewhat higher than last year's but in view of the greatly increased costs to us this is unavoidable. We are sure that you will understand and that this year's affair will surpass the very successful one held last December.

The dinner is also the occasion for soliciting greetings and contributions to Jewish Affairs. The rates for greetings, as before, are as follows: name only--\$2.00, name and greeting--\$5.00, 1/8 page -- \$10.00, 1/4 page -- \$25.00, 1/2 page -- \$50.00.

Reservations, greetings and contributions should be sent to Jewish Affairs, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010. Checks should be made out to Jewish Affairs.

You will receive further material later.

Fraternally,

The Editors

The Two German States: A Contrast

Jewish Community Congratulates GDR on 25th Birthday

(Reprinted from the Democratic German Report, July 17, 1974.)

The small Jewish community of the German Democratic Republic, survivors of the once flourishing Jewish community of Germany which was almost wiped out by Hitler, have published the following message to mark the 25th anniversary of the GDR, which will be celebrated on October 7th this year:

"Our German Democratic Republic has now been in existence for 25 years. In this peace-loving state we, like all other citizens, have completely equal rights, and we too apply the slogan: 'Plan together, work together, govern together!'

"We pay tribute to the all-round peace policy of the GDR and its success in applying the principles of peaceful coexistence.

"We pay tribute to the successful construction of socialism under the leadership of the party of the working class, the outstanding achievements in the field of social policy, and the way in which every citizen knows of a sure future.

"In our Republic we have built from the ruins a new and better house in which we can live and work in happiness and peace together.

"In our state humanism and human rights are both supreme commandment and reality: war propaganda, racist hatred including anti-Semitism, are severely punished.

"We reject all forms of terrorism, and work for the pacification of the Near East on the basis of Resolution 242 of the UN Security Council.

"In our peace-loving state, which we helped to build, everything is done to honor the memory of our six million brothers and sisters murdered during the fascist times.

"Our synagogues, destroyed by criminals, have risen again, and our cemeteries, which were desecrated, have been repaired and tended.

"In our socialist state everything possible is done to heal the frightful wounds inflicted upon us by fascism.

"We citizens of Jewish faith, thank all those who have taken part in this work. Thanks to the living; honor those who are no longer with us. All our

efforts are devoted to our state with the great policy of peace, so that war shall never again emanate from German soil.

"We pledge that we shall continue to devote our efforts further toward strengthening our humanist homeland, so that everywhere Sholaum—peace—may reign. To live in socialism means to live in peace."

(The word "sholaum" in the second-last sentence is the Hebrew word for peace given in the Ashkenazi pronunciation traditionally used in central and eastern Europe; the better-known form "shalom" is the Sephardi pronunciation.)

* * *

How the FRG Coddles Nazis

(Reprinted from the Democratic German Report, August 28, 1974.)

The extraordinary case of Beate Klarsfeld, sentenced to prison in West Germany for attempting to hand over to justice a convicted nazi murderer, was dealt with at some length in the previous issue of German Report.

The nazi, Kurt Lischka, had been sentenced to life imprisonment in absentia by a French court back in 1950 for his part in the liquidation of Jews in Paris, but he had never served a day of the sentence; it has subsequently emerged that he held an important post in the West German intelligence service throughout the 1960s. But the scandal about his case has drawn attention to the fact that several hundred other nazi criminals, sentenced to death or long terms of imprisonment by French courts, have been happily living at liberty in West Germany since the early 1950s. Not only that, but a remarkably high proportion of them appear to have made up the backbone of the US-financed Gehlen spy organization and other intelligence bodies which played a key role at the height of the Cold War.

Most of them appear now to have reached retirement age (do spies have a fixed retiring age?), but a few details may be worth noting.

One of these men, sentenced to a long prison term by a French court, is Erich Wenger. German Report drew attention to his case on September 20th, 1963; here is our old story:

"Section head of the West German 'Office for the Protection of the Constitution' is Erich Wenger, aged 50. He joined Himmler's black-uniformed SS on March 1st, 1933 (membership No. 169,000), and one year later was promoted to the rank of SS captain. From 1935 he worked in the headquarters of the Gestapo, and throughout the war was in charge of 'internal security' in the nazi embassy

in occupied Paris. After the war he was taken care of by the 'Evangelisches Hilfswerk' (Evangelical Aid), a 'charitable' body which made a point of looking after prominent supporters of the Hitler regime who were endangered by de-nazification measures. In 1950 he became an official of the newly-founded 'Office for the Protection of the Constitution'."

After his background had been aired, Erich Wenger was transferred out of the Constitution Protection Office (roughly the equivalent of the American FBI), and given a top post in the administrative branch of the Bonn civil service; he specifically retained seniority and pension rights, and is presumably still working away in his Bonn office today.

Werner Aretz, Hitler's top policeman in the occupied French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, had an almost identical career--SS officer, sentence as a war criminal, a top job in the Bonn secret police, transfer to a "non-sensitive" job when the story leaked out.

And then there is Peter Hüttemann, formerly an SS captain working in the nazi embassy in Paris. When he surfaced after the war he went straight into the job of district administrative officer of the Bundeswehr in North-Rhine-Westphalia.

But none of them reached the post-war heights scaled by Karl Theodor Molinari. As a Wehrmacht officer he had 106 French civilians slaughtered on June 13th, 1944. In April 1951 a French court in Metz sentenced him to death in absentia for the mass murder. In post-war West Germany he rose to the rank of general in the Bundeswehr, and was only retired (on full pension) after a public uproar in France.

There are plenty more names which could be named, but that may be enough to be going on with.

* * *

Prof. Uzi Ornan on "Who Is a Jew?"

The Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel declares that "Israel will maintain equality of social and political rights for all its citizens, without distinction of creed, race or sex." But according to actual laws and regulations, as Professor Uzi Ornan points out in the newspaper *Ma'ariv* (January 30, 1974), "anyone recognized as a Jew is granted special privileges which are not granted to those not so recognized." He says further, in part:

"Two Frenchmen who volunteered and came to Israel, one the son of a Jewish mother, the other the son of a Christian mother [though of a Jewish father].

The former is granted Israeli citizenship after three months (if he does not specifically refuse it); the latter may apply for citizenship only after three years. The first is not required to prove his knowledge of the Hebrew language before citizenship is granted him; the second is required to pass a test. To gain citizenship the former is exempted from but the latter is required to swear allegiance to the State. The first has the right to declare that he is a 'potential immigrant' and then will need no working permit; the second will need to live on his savings for three years, to live in a kibbutz or a monastery, or be lucky enough to receive a working permit if the Ministry sees fit to grant it."

The discrimination by no means ends with this. A long list of additional forms could be added.

In the Law of the Return, which applies only to Jews, a Jew is defined as one who is born of a Jewish mother or has been converted to Judaism. Now the National Religious Party proposes to carry this a step further and to add that the conversion must be according to the Halachic law of Orthodox Judaism, which means that it can only be performed by an Orthodox rabbi. It would exclude conversions by Conservative or Reform rabbis in other countries.

Since the great majority of conversions abroad are performed by these last two groups of rabbis, this new restriction would represent a major new step backward into religious bigotry. Moreover, says Ornan, it would "be construed as intervention by the secular State of Israel in religious affairs of overseas Jews."

He comments: "What would be our attitude to the U.S., for instance, were its laws to include one which would immediately grant American citizenship only to immigrants of the Christian faith? And would we not denounce any country which would allow only whites to purchase 95 per cent of its lands . . .?!" Calling for sanity, he proposes that "we really impart to our country the values of democracy, that we abrogate all privileges granted by virtue of creed. . . . [This] will remove the stigma of 'a racist and discriminatory state' from Israel and will enhance our status among both those living among us and in the entire world. . . ." (It may be added that Israel's status would be even far more enhanced if the disabilities and third-class citizenship imposed on Arab Israelis were abolished--Ed.)

(Note: The above is adapted from an account of Oman's article in the Israeli publication Viewpoint, March 1974.)

Communications

Apologists for Zionism

By Phil Honor

It is indeed deplorable that the Morning Freiheit, which has for many decades supported and mobilized the Jewish workers and progressive Jewish people in their struggle against reaction, has been swayed by emotional nationalism. It now subtly follows the line of the apologists for the Zionist rulers of Israel, especially on the Palestinian question.

The readers are exposed to a continual slanderous campaign against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries under the pretext of "friendly debate" and "constructive criticism." There are sniping attacks on progressive publications and journalists, whose disclosure of the aggressive policies of the Israeli ruling class and support of the Palestine Arab liberation movement are defamed as anti-Semitism.

This newspaper, on June 27, carried a column under the caption "Dishonorers of Socialism" which made an acrimonious attack on a noted journalist who is widely known as a staunch fighter against racism, imperialism and monopoly capitalism. The journalist was accused of spreading "impudent lies" and "dishonoring socialism" for sharply criticising Israeli bombing raids on Lebanese villages and Palestine refugee camps in reprisal for a guerrilla attack on an Israeli kibbutz in which three women and the four guerrillas were killed. Without naming the journalist or the publication, the Morning Freiheit columnist made it quite clear that he was referring to an article which appeared in the Daily World on June 22, 1974.

To prop up his accusations the columnist quoted the New York Times, where it was reported that the Israeli planes were careful to bomb only guerrilla bases. The readers were not told that in three days of Israeli air raids, 30 civilians were killed and 122 were wounded. These facts are common knowledge.

The "objective" columnist also ignored the fact that the journalist, who was maligned as a disseminator of "shameless lies," included in his article the following passages from a June 20 Daily World editorial:

Just as there is no excuse for individual terrorism, there can be no justification for official extermination tactics used by the Israeli state.

Acts of individual terror must be, and have been condemned by world opinion, including the Communist Parties of Israel and Arab countries . . .

but where terrorism is elevated to a state policy, it must be even more severely condemned.

Israeli ruling class attacks on Arabs because they are Arabs are genocidal and the punishment it metes out in "reprisal" is indistinguishable from the notorious fascist charge of "collective guilt"---Hitler's excuse for the slaughter of masses of people as punishment for the deed of even one person.

As if this was not enough, a socialist country--Poland--was dragged into this "objective" column. Incredible as it may seem, we read there that "Gomulka (the former Polish head of state) has impudently deceived the Polish workers and massacred them." The columnist writes: "Gomulka has been discarded on the trash-heap of history but his assistants continue his ignominious deeds . . . and he has adherents here, in the United States. One of his adherents had the effrontery to write that an 'incident' took place in Kibbutz Shamir . . . : "

The Morning Freiheit columnist does not find it necessary to divulge the source of his information, but he infers that this journalist is being encouraged by Polish officials to spread anti-Semitic propaganda in the United States.

Such intemperate attacks on Poland can be found in the Morning Freiheit quite often. An article, "A Report on a Trip to Poland," by S. Federman (October 30, 1973) tells us:

This country (Poland), which was for centuries the home of a great part of our people has closed its doors--with few exceptions--to Jewish visitors, regardless whether they are friendly to the present regime or not. Perhaps there is a historical logic in this. The [Polish] government, which destroyed the Jewish community not so long ago, and has forced the majority of the small remainder to leave the country where forty generations of their forefathers are buried, by unleashing an orgy of anti-Semitic vexations--such a government cannot allow guests from abroad to see with their own eyes the devastation of the Jewish community.

It is beyond comprehension how a newspaper with claims to be "progressive" and "objective" can print such malicious nonsense. Every honest, informed person knows that the Jews in Poland were decimated in the Nazi holocaust. The small Jewish community that remained there after the second World War, was saved by the victorious Soviet army that freed Poland from the Nazi hordes. It hardly needs saying that we are dealing here with an attack not only on Poland, but, indirectly, on the whole socialist sector, of which Poland is an integral part.

The May-June issue of Jewish Affairs carries an interview with Shmuel Tenenblatt, editor of the Folks-Shtimme, a Yiddish language weekly published in Warsaw. This comprehensive interview gives an illuminating picture of the expanded cultural activities engaged in by the small Jewish community with every possible assistance of the Polish government. It would be advisable for the Morning Freiheit and S. Federman to acquaint themselves with this information.

No less misleading is an accusation by the editor, P. Novick, that the CPUSA is "too harsh" in its criticism of Israel and "ignores the negative features on the Arab side." This statement smacks of nationalism and class collaboration. We are faced again with a complete lack of understanding of how Marxist-Leninists must approach the issue of peace in the Middle East. Novick stands with the nationalists, disregarding the fact that Israel is a capitalist country ruled by a Zionist, annexationist, aggressive, exploiting class that is allied with U.S. imperialism and is using all oppressive means at its disposal to hold on to the territories conquered in the 1967 war. Which Israel does Novick have in mind? The people? The exploited workers? The impoverished, overtaxed masses? The still more impoverished and exploited Arab population? Or the Zionist rulers who are waging an endless war, refusing to withdraw from the occupied territories, and who deny the national existence of the Palestine Arab people? Similarly, what Arabs is the editor of the Morning Freiheit writing about? King Hussein of Jordan? King Faisal of Saudi Arabia? The sheikhs? The dictators? Or the Palestine Arab people, who have been driven from their homes and persecuted, and are now engaged in a desperate struggle for their national rights and statehood?

The CPUSA, together with the international Communist movement, the Communist Party of Israel and progressive forces the world over, supports the struggles of the Palestine Arab people. The CPUSA stands for the existence of Israel within peaceful, secure boundaries. It calls for Israel's withdrawal from the Arab lands conquered in the 1967 war, in accordance with UN Resolutions 242 and 338. It calls upon the Israeli government to recognize the Palestinian national rights. As a true friend of Israel, the CPUSA points out that such a course is in the best interests of the workers and broad masses of Israel--both Jews and Arabs. This will enable the people of Israel to live in peace with their Arab neighbors and to proceed with their task of building a peaceful, democratic society.

The Communist Party of Israel (Rakach), is a frequent Morning Freiheit target. On February 7, 1974, the paper carried a report on the Israeli national election which was held on December 31, 1973. The compiler of the report, S. R., says: "The Rakach Communist Party of Israel led by Meir Vilner emerged in the national election of December 31, 1973 as the most important political party of the Arab minority.

He quotes the following Rakach statement carried by the Israeli progressive weekly, Der Veg, January 9, 1974:

The mass support for the Communist Party among the Arab masses is a result of its internationalist policy. The Arab-Jewish Communist Party of Israel is the faithful and determined fighter against the policy of national oppression, for respect for the national rights of the Palestine Arab people, for equal rights of the Arab population in Israel and for the rights and interests of the workers.

Then comes S.R.'s comment:

"A different view of the Rakach gains among the Arab voters in Israel was offered by Abraham Berman, a spokesman of the Maki Communist Party, in Frei Israel (January 23, 1974). Berman wrote:

"The reason for the large growth in the vote for the Rakach among the Arab masses in Israel is understandable. After the Yom Kippur War, an enormous growth of nationalist and chauvinist sentiment occurred among the Arab population. No independent Arab nationalist party exists in Israel and the Arab nationalists voted in great numbers for Rakach . . . This is the secret of Rakach's success."

"Berman states," writes S.R., that 'according to reliable calculations Rakach received over 48 thousand votes of Arab voters and about 4,500 votes of Jewish voters. Thus Rakach owes its four parliament seats to Arab voters, many of them Arab nationalists who had no other party to vote for', according to Berman's assessment."

This hodgepodge of racism, chauvinism and inaccurate information is being fed to the Morning Freiheit readers in a report that is supposed to "enlighten" them with an "objective analysis" of the Israeli election. The renegade group Maki, which has been repudiated by the international Communist movement and is on the verge of dissolution, is presented as the "Maki Communist Party." Thus, the readers are again misled by the falsehood that there are two Communist parties in Israel. The truth is that Rakach is the only genuine Israeli Communist Party. The election data cited by Berman are mendacious. The only verification offered is that they are based on "reliable" calculations, a term frequently used to launder tainted news items.

Berman looks at Arab voters as second-class citizens whose vote is on a much lower level than the vote of an Israeli Jew. And S.R. fully concurs in this point of view. They denigrate Rakach because it has a strong following among the Arab population. But who are the Arab "nationalists" to whom Berman and S.R. have a racist approach? They are an oppressed national minority that wages a fight for its legitimate rights just as Black people and other minority groups are waging in the United States. The Communist Party of Israel takes pride in being a leader in these struggles.

*

The Morning Freiheit bombards its readers with editorials that ostensibly are only meant to condemn terrorism, but actually go a lot further than that. Their main thrust is directed against the Palestine Arab people.

Undoubtedly terrorism has to be condemned. Principled progressives denounce such acts whenever they occur. However, a sharp line must be drawn not to implicate national liberation movements of oppressed peoples. This would be welcomed by the imperialists to whom all freedom fighters in Vietnam, South Africa, Rhodesia and anywhere else are terrorists.

In the editorials the problems of the Palestinian Arab people are glossed over in one or two sentences. Generally they are not even mentioned. But the epithets "murderers," "terrorists," "killers of Jewish women and children," "slaughterers of innocent Jewish victims," "barbarians," "spillers of Jewish blood" are repeated over and over again until the brainwashed reader begins to equate the acts of individual guerrillas, or small guerrilla groups with the struggles of the Palestine Arab people. We read in one editorial (June 26, 1974):

There is of course no comparison between the continuous murder of children with the Hitler holocaust in which one million children were slaughtered, among the six million Jews who were exterminated. But Oswiecim and Maidanek come to mind when we see the number of Jewish casualties on the increase and the terrorists trying to liquidate the Jewish state. The Hitler holocaust comes to mind because when Jews were murdered in the millions the whole world remained silent.

How can any fair-minded journalist place on the same level the action of four Arab guerrillas, in which they themselves were killed, with the Hitler holocaust? Why are the national oppression, suffering and misery of the Palestine Arabs not mentioned?

The writer goes further. He subtly denounces not only the Arab guerrillas but national liberation movements the world over. Witness the following passage:

The terror must be stopped. This is everyone's problem, not that of Israel alone. The Arab terrorists took to terrorism as a fighting method. It is the same in North Ireland, in the United States, in Latin America and many other places. If the Arab terrorists are not stopped no one anywhere is sure of his life. The United Nations must, once and for all, condemn terrorism and take firm steps against the murderers of women and children

In a May 17th editorial we find the following:

The murderers must be stopped! . . . These international gangsters are a danger to the whole world. The entire world, particularly the big powers, have the responsibility to stop this barbarism! . . . The Arab governments which maintain these murderers and their headquarters and support them financially and politically, bear the responsibility! The UN and especially the big powers, bear the responsibility by refusing all the time to take measures against international terrorism They have refused to condemn those who are responsible for the assassinations while the Israeli government has been condemned for squaring accounts with the murderers.

The position of the UN is well known. Every informed person is aware that this world body is against terrorism. But it would be highly unjust to deal even-handedly with desperate guerrilla grouplets and the Israeli government that violates the borders of neighboring countries under the pretext of fighting terrorism.

Even Arthur J. Goldberg joined in the condemnation of Israel for such provocative acts of aggression when he was U.S. Ambassador to the UN in 1966.

In another strident editorial on May 24, the UN is admonished to "clear the terrorists" from the refugee camps that it maintains. It hardly needs saying that such an action would require methods frequently used by the Israeli authorities and the reactionary King Hussein--military occupation, police surveillance, destruction of houses and so on. A reign of terror would have to be unleashed on the refugee camps.

Let's see how the Morning Freiheit deals with the Palestine problem when it is mentioned. In an editorial comment on Nixon's trip to the Middle East (6/18) we find the following statement:

"It is superfluous to point out that the question of the Palestinian Arabs and their right to self-determination and statehood is of the utmost urgency. But how does one go about realizing this goal? Who should be recognized as the legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arabs? Surely, not the fire-eaters and terrorists! Nixon's negotiations failed to provide the answer. The critical issue is still up in the air, awaiting a resolution that will be fair and just."

The Palestine Liberation organization, which gained general recognition as the representative body of the Palestinian Arab people, is not mentioned. The Arab liberation movement is maligned as "fire-eaters" and "terrorists" who must be excluded from the negotiations. But who is left to take their place? Obviously, submissive quislings have to be brought on the scene. But this is exactly what Rabin and Hussein are after.

The ideological deviations of the Morning Freiheit, its turn from proletarian internationalism to emotional nationalism, clearly show that the struggle against chauvinism and revisionism must be intensified in the progressive Jewish ranks in the United States.

* * *

On Evaluating Sadat

By Ellis Goldberg

Two articles in the most recent issue of Jewish Affairs raise the question particularly of current Egyptian foreign policy and of the direction of the non-capitalist path of development.

While quite informative, I believe both these articles really miss the point of various criticisms raised regarding Egypt these days by many, including Communists and revolutionaries.

It is not only Maoists, Trotskyites, Zionists and imperialists, as Mr. Foley says, who are wondering just what path Egypt is taking now under the leadership of President Anwar el-Sadat.

After all, as Igor Andreev noted in a recent article, the choice of the orientation of development is made in a sharp struggle, often with alternating passing of the initiative, now in the hands of the reactionaries, now in the hands of the progressive forces.

The questions arising as to Egypt's internal and external policy particularly since Sadat came to the Presidency have sent many currents and shock waves through the Arab world and beyond.

Although Foley characterizes Sadat as simply "a very intelligent Egyptian nationalist," one can be far more specific. Sadat's political background certainly is that of the Right wing of the Free Officers' movement which toppled Farouk in 1953. His social background, of course, is that of the petty bourgeoisie which entered the army in relatively large numbers and with such effect after the 1936 Egyptian-English treaty revision. By marriage and family ties he is linked now to Egypt's land-owning and old capitalist families.

To say Sadat is from the Right of the Free Officers' movement of course is not to deny his honest nationalism. It is only to recall that his is an extremely bourgeois-nationalist view.

There were after all other Free Officers who had a far different political background. One could mention, for example, Khaled Mohieddin, a genuine Leftist and Marxist who undoubtedly played a more important role in the actual carrying out of the 1953 coup, or even Ali Sabry whose personal ties of course were with the old royal family itself, but whose political outlook was to the Left inside the national movement.

Communists of course cannot fail to recall the severe criticism of Sadat and his policies launched by the Sudanese Communists after he aided Sudanese President Gaafar Numeiry in slaughtering them. Sadat, they say, withdrew Sudanese troops from the Suez front in 1971 so that they could return to Khartoum and crush the progressive officers' movement there.

Sadat's most recent actions in ousting Soviet advisers, in de-nationalizing certain enterprises and in allowing the Bank Misr to return to private hands, as well as his signature of the joint communique with Hussein acknowledging the Hashemite monarch's claim to represent Palestinians living outside the West Bank (i.e., in the refugee camps Hussein himself had bombed and strafed in 1970) can hardly be termed other than retrograde steps. Indeed the Palestine Liberation Organization has quite emphatically condemned the Sadat-Hussein communique.

Thus Foley begs the critical question regarding Egypt's truce negotiations: did Egypt merely step out first or did she break ranks? The question is hardly so open and shut as Foley makes it appear.

Sadat, it is quite clear, did not order his troops in Sinai to move up from the Canal in October after the initial crossing although he certainly could have done so. Yet if only Egypt was able to regain territory from Israel one may wonder if Syria might not also have done so had pressure on the southern front been maintained.

U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger claimed considerable credit not only for being present in the Middle East during the truce negotiations but also for his particular tactics of negotiations on bilateral terms between Israel and the Arab countries rather than at a peace conference where an entire political settlement could be worked out.

The basis of the Soviet criticism of Kissinger and implicitly of Sadat as well as criticism levelled by Syrian CP head Khaled Bagdash was precisely on this point: that bilateral meetings, far from being a mere step out, could represent a setback if they were not coupled with clear commitments to further talks at Geneva. This is not to say the truce arrangements were a failure, but only that in themselves they are hardly a settlement of the question of peace in the Middle East, especially because they leave the question of the Palestinian people still far from resolved. Should Israel now be able to negotiate an arrangement with Jordan similar to that reached with Egypt and Syria, there can hardly be any doubt of the dangers that will arise.

Spector in his article mentions setbacks. Continuing setbacks if they occur, however, will have a class character as well as a personal basis. We should remember the analysis put forward in 1972 by several Soviet authors of Egyptian society today, that while the old bourgeoisie saw its power cut back only as recently as 1962, there are practically no obstacles to the development of the petty bourgeoisie and its evolution into the middle bourgeoisie. Meanwhile the class of rural bourgeoisie is steadily growing.

Spector and Foley have made valiant efforts in these articles as well as elsewhere to provide the ammunition for progressive Jews and non-Jews to fight the virulent racism and anti-Arab sentiments by providing information regarding the real achievements of the Arab countries. Such ammunition, however, I believe needs to be coupled with the armor of a firm understanding of just where Egypt in particular is coming from and going.

Egypt remains a developing country where vast strides have been made in the struggle against imperialism, but in the words of one Egyptian Marxist who spent five years in prison, the non-capitalist way of development cannot be brought about without the decisive role of the working class and the leadership of its Communist party. This is the Marxist conception which must be emphasized in order not to lose the right path and not to be led astray.

(A response by Tom Foley will appear in our next issue.)

Events and Views

On July 29 a symposium on the Middle East was held at Hancock Park Elementary School in Los Angeles, sponsored by the newly-formed Southern California Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East. Participants in the symposium were Martin Hall, chairman of the Peace Action Council, Rabbi Sanford Ragins, and Mustafa Sim, businessman and editor and publisher of the monthly Palestinian Voice.

More than 175 people attended. Great interest in the reports of the panelists was displayed and wide discussion from the floor ensued. The feeling was general that the symposium, the first of its kind in the community, was very successful. The Committee plans to hold additional gatherings in the near future.

*

According to the April issue of Vestnik Statistiki, published monthly in Moscow by the Main Statistical Administration, Jews, who make up 1 per cent of the Soviet population, account for no less than 14 per cent of all scholars holding doctor's degrees. Of a total of 29,806 doctorates, Jews hold 4,182 and are exceeded only by Russians, holding 16,603. The Soviet doctorate is a more advanced degree than the Ph. D. in this country, which corresponds to the candidate's degree in the USSR. Of a total of 288,261 candidate's degrees, Jews held 23,775 or about 8.2 per cent. Of scientific workers as a whole, Jews comprise about 6 per cent. These figures, indicating the special prominence of Jews in the higher echelons of scientific and academic workers, speak eloquently on the status of Soviet Jews.

*

There appears to be a growing revulsion in leading Jewish circles against the blanket equation of anti-Zionism or even opposition to Israeli government policies with anti-Semitism which appears in the recent book The New Anti-Semitism by Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein of the ADL. The most recent example is a review of the book by Will Maslow, general counsel of the American Jewish Congress, which appears in Congress Bi-Weekly (June 21, 1974). Maslow sharply criticizes the book on this score and summarizes by saying: "When everything is included in the term 'anti-Semitism,' it loses its meaning. Little is gained by labeling even hostile and unfair critics of Israel as anti-Semitic, thus lumping them with those bigots who defame Jews, avoid contact with them and regard them as a menace to society. Crying wolf too often may have disastrous consequences."

* * *