

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

JEWISH AFFAIRS

March-April 1974

Price 35¢



IN THIS ISSUE

Warsaw Ghetto

Editorial

Qiryat Shemona and "Retaliation"

Phil Honor

The De Funis Case

Celia Zitron

The Palestine Question

Emile Touma

**HYMAN LUMER: ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE
UNITED STATES**

JEWISH AFFAIRS

Vol. 4, No. 2

March-April, 1974

Editor: Hyman Lumer

Editorial Committee: David Fried, Jack Kling, Alex Kolkin

CONTENTS

Editorials

<u>The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: 31 Years Later</u>	1
<u>A Correction</u>	2
Hyman Lumer, <u>Anti-Semitism in the United States</u>	3
Phil Honor, <u>Qiryat Shemona and "Retaliation"</u>	10
Celia Zitron, <u>The De Funis Case</u>	15
Emile Touma, <u>The Palestine Question, Heart of the Middle East Conflict</u>	19
Julia Barnes, <u>Polish Jewish Editor Visits U.S.</u>	27

Communications

I. Schwalb, <u>Jews and Siberia in World War II</u>	28
---	----

<u>Events and Views</u>	29
-------------------------	----

(Cover picture: THE LAST WALK by H. Ostrzega.)

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

The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: 31 Years Later

April 19 marks the 31st anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising--that act of incomparable heroism which will never fade from our memories. It is in particular an occasion commemorated by all sections of the Jewish people, by people holding the most diverse political views. But clearly not all view these events in the same light and not all draw the same conclusions from them.

The Zionist elements draw their own--fundamentally false--"lessons." Anti-Semitism persists, they say, and with it the threat to the existence of the Jewish people. And whence does the threat emanate? First of all in the alleged persecution of Jews in the Soviet Union, whose rulers, charges the American Zionist, "have inherited the Nazi mantle." And unless they are safely removed to Israel, Soviet Jews are in danger of annihilation.

To this monstrous falsehood is added a second. The threat to the existence of the Jewish people, it is claimed, lies also in the insane drive of the Arab states to destroy Israel, to "drive the Jews into the sea." Thus the Israeli Jews, too, are threatened with annihilation.

Accordingly, the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising anniversary becomes the occasion for stepping up the poisonous anti-Soviet campaign and the support of the aggressive, annexationist and barbarous policies of the Israeli ruling circles toward the Arab countries. And this in the name of preventing "another holocaust." Such, to these people, are the "lessons" of the uprising. But this is the road to disaster for the Jewish people.

The menace of anti-Semitism comes not from the socialist Soviet Union, where its social roots have been destroyed and Jews live on a par with all other nationalities in the great Soviet family. Nor does it lie in the Arab countries, which have made it increasingly clear that they are prepared to live in peace with Israel provided that the conquered territories are returned.

The real meance of anti-Semitism lies first and foremost here in the United States. And its real roots lie in monopolist reaction, which employs anti-Semitism, as it does all forms of chauvinism and racism, as a weapon in its arsenal of exploitation and oppression. It is here that with the strengthening of fascist tendencies the danger of the flareup of violent forms of anti-Semitism is cause for serious concern.

The proper lesson from the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, therefore, is the need

to fight anti-Semitism and its monopolist and ultra-Right purveyors in our own country. These questions are dealt with more fully elsewhere in this issue.

* * *

A Correction

In an editorial in our last issue ("Arrogance and Ignorance") we sharply took to task an article by Sid Resnick which had appeared in the Morning Freiheit, extolling the reported election of a Communist as mayor of Nazareth as a demonstration of democracy in Israel. In our criticism of Resnick we too accepted this as a fact, basing ourselves on a report in the New York Times and on statements by leaders of the Israeli Communist Party that they expected to win a substantial majority of the vote in Nazareth.

It turns out, however, that the report was incorrect, that no municipal elections were held in Nazareth. We do not have all the details, but the following statement by Jacques Coubar in Nouvelle Critique of February 1974 is illuminating:

The Communists received 59 per cent of the votes in Nazareth [in the Knesset elections]. If the democratic rules had been observed, a Nazareth municipality led by Communists would have been inaugurated today. Municipal elections were held throughout Israel except in Nazareth. It is not the first time that this municipality [an Arab municipality] has been excepted. This discrimination is most flagrant and revolting.

But this knocks the props out completely from Resnick's apologetics for "Israeli democracy," especially since Nazareth is the one remaining Arab city in Israel. Can there be any more clear-cut demonstration than this of the racist, anti-Communist character of the Israeli state?

We are grateful to Alberto Moreau for calling this matter to our attention. He writes:

It turned out that racism denied the holding of elections in Nazareth. However, the analysis of Jewish Affairs is fundamentally correct. Israel is a racist state and the struggle against this racism must go on.

Let us hope against hope that Resnick will make amends. Is it possible? Will the Morning Freiheit do likewise?

* * *

On Anti-Semitism in the U.S.

By Hyman Lumer

Overt anti-Semitism in this country, it is asserted in bourgeois Jewish circles, is on the wane; organizations whose purpose is to spread hatred of Jews are dwindling in numbers and gradually disappearing from the U.S. scene, and open discrimination against Jews has declined. But this is a dangerous illusion. Organized anti-Semitic propaganda is far from disappearing; on the contrary, it shows signs not only of durability but of renewed growth.

The largest organized ultra-Right force is the John Birch Society. In 1972 it claimed a membership of some 60,000, annual expenditures of nearly \$8 million and some 400 bookstores and reading rooms. (See Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, The New Anti-Semitism, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1974, pp. 286-287.) Since then there appears to have been some further growth. Steven V. Roberts ("Your Friendly John Birch Bookstore," Commonweal, March 16, 1973) credits them with some 450 American Opinion outlets--"the largest bookstore chain in the country."

In the 1972 election campaign it undertook the distribution of literally millions of copies of a book by Gary Allen (None Dare Call It Conspiracy) which revived all the inventions of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and the Hitlerian "international Jewish bankers' conspiracy." More than 6 million copies were distributed and this piece of anti-Semitic filth continues to circulate.

The Presidential candidate of the ultra-Right American Party in the 1972 elections, John Schmitz, used this book as his chief piece of campaign literature. The American Party, it is worth noting, won more than a million votes in the elections.

Other traditionally anti-Semitic outfits continue to operate. Among them is the so-called Liberty Lobby, controlled by Willis A. Carto, a professed admirer of Hitler. Its Board of Policy has some 25,000 members and its Liberty Lobby and other publications reach 200,000 readers monthly.

Gerald L. K. Smith, leading anti-Semite and Hitler supporter of the thirties, is still very much alive. His organization, the Christian Nationalist Crusade, has an annual income of about \$300,000 and circulates some 26,000 copies of its monthly publication The Cross and the Flag. The National States Rights Party, born in the late fifties, continues to operate. It publishes The Thunderbolt,

viciously anti-Semitic and racist. Its leader, Jesse Benjamin Stoner, received nearly 41,000 votes in the Democratic primary for U.S. Senator in Georgia in 1972. The Ku Klux Klan, though small in numbers and fragmented, continues to operate. Its largest segment, headed by Robert M. Shelton, Jr., continues to publish the Klan hate-sheet, The Fiery Cross. The operations of these and other groups are described more fully by Forster and Epstein in The New Anti-Semitism.

*

Illustrative of the anti-Semitic filth disseminated by these outfits is a book by a Robert L. Preston, entitled How to Prepare for the Coming Crash. From its first appearance in late 1971 to March 1973, we are told, some 120,000 copies had been printed. "A tremendous economical crash," says Preston, "is about to destroy the entire financial structure of the United States." Who is responsible for this? The bankers, and in particular the central government banks, with great power over the issuance of money. And who is responsible for the establishment of these central banks? The Jewish bankers--the Rothschilds, Kuehn-Loeb and Company and others, operating in conjunction with the Rockefellers and the Morgans. Here we have the "international Jewish bankers' conspiracy" to take over the world in a new garb.

Another illustration is an article entitled "The Jewish Problem," originally published in Attack (No. 16), an organ of the ultra-Right National Youth Alliance and reprinted in Schism (Winter 1973). The article speaks of Jews as being "Jews first and Americans second," as having sinister interests of their own. Jews, it says, control the vital centers of the Western world. In this country they have a monopoly of the communications media, are "kosherizing" the cultural field and are moving toward control of science. They are taking over whole industries. The article ends with a call for action against this alleged Jewish takeover. "The future of our race and our nation," it states, "depend on our finding--and executing--the correct solution in the very near future." It then presents a list of anti-Semitic writings and concludes: "Read them, and then act!" What we have here, in short, is a thinly-veiled call for extermination of Jews.

Innumerable examples could be added. What is particularly disturbing, however, is not merely the existence of such anti-Semitic garbage but the fact that it is on the rise. And this dovetails with other disquieting developments, such as a rise in vandalization of Jewish institutions and increasing anti-Semitic content in movies and books. Particularly notorious is the movie Jesus Christ Superstar which perpetuates the charge that the Jews bear collective guilt for the killing of Christ. The same theme is peddled by Gerald L. K. Smith in an annual passion play presented on an estate at Eureka Springs, Ark.

*

Some maintain that the ultra-Right groupings--the Birchites, the Klan, the supporters of Gerald L. K. Smith, etc.--are but a minute lunatic fringe which has very little popular support and hence is not cause for serious concern.

But such a view is gravely mistaken. First of all, let it be remembered that this is what was once said of Hitler and his followers. Second, there are elements in the political Right-wing--the Wallaces, the Buckleys, the Reagans and others of their ilk, who do command a mass following--and who are thorough-going racists and anti-Semites.

Consider, for example, Buckley's campaign for election to the Senate in 1970 against Ottinger (who is Jewish) on the slogan "Isn't it time WE had a Senator?" It is significant--and disturbing--that Buckley won the election.

Third, the Right-wing forces base themselves not only on an appeal to racism in general but also on the "respectable" anti-Semitism which has long been prevalent in this country. According to the extensive studies of Charles Y. Glock and his associates at the University of California some years ago, two-thirds of U.S. non-Jews have anti-Semitic beliefs and half of these are outspoken anti-Semites. (See Charles Y. Glock and Rodney Stark, Christian Beliefs and Anti-Semitism, Harper and Row, New York 1966.)

This anti-Semitism expresses itself, among other things in the persistent discrimination against Jews in employment, housing and other respects. Joseph B. Robison writes:

While the Jewish community agonizes over the real and troublesome problems lumped under such terms as "affirmative action," "goals," "quotas" and reverse discrimination," a much simpler problem is being largely ignored--out-and-out discrimination against Jews as Jews, particularly in housing and employment....

The fact is that, all over the country, individual Jews are still being denied jobs and are being excluded from housing simply because the employer or the developer has a policy of "No Jews Wanted." Indeed, a recent report indicates that several hundred Jews in Florida have recently encountered discrimination in seeking condominium housing in that state. Other Jews are finding themselves excluded from jobs by employers who have arbitrary policies excluding Sabbath observers. ("Unfiled Cases," Congress Bi-Weekly, June 15, 1973.)

Innumerable examples of such discrimination could be cited. Yet little is done to expose and combat them.

To all this must be added the new manifestations of anti-Semitism which emerged with the oil embargo, exemplified in part by the widespread appearance of the slogan "We Need Oil, Not Jews." But the rise in anti-Semitism, the tendency to blame the Jewish people for the fuel shortages and high prices, for which the real responsibility lies with the oil monopolies, is far more serious than is indicated by these crude public expressions. And the oil companies are not at all unhappy about this, since it serves to divert the blame from them.

In sum, the menace of anti-Semitism in the United States is not diminishing

but is on the rise. Its source, like that of all other forms of chauvinism and racism, is monopoly capital. Anti-Semitism is an important part of its arsenal for dividing and stepping up the exploitation and oppression of all sections of the working people. And with the increase of fascist tendencies in recent years, most shockingly exhibited in the Watergate disclosures, the danger grows of the outbreak of open and violent manifestations of anti-Semitism. The need to sound the alarm and to develop a serious struggle against anti-Semitism is all too clear.

*

The Anti-Defamation League and other bourgeois Jewish organizations have also referred to a growing danger of anti-Semitism. Thus, in a report presented in November 1972, Lawrence Peirez, chairman of the ADL Fact Finding Committee, stated that "the emerging dimensions of the threat to American Jewry cannot be regarded as negligible." (ADL Bulletin, December 1972.) However, in the eyes of Mr. Peirez and his colleagues, the main threat is not the anti-Semitism described above but a "new anti-Semitism" which Peirez describes in these words:

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

A major component is the heavily increasing flow of Arab and Soviet propaganda.

A major trend is the use of euphemisms such as the terms "anti-Zionist" and "anti-Zionism" when "anti-Jewish" and "anti-Judaism" are really meant. (Ibid.)

These ideas are spelled out in full in the book The New Anti-Semitism by Forster and Epstein previously referred to. They add up to a complete perversion of the meaning of "anti-Semitism." Their strange logic starts with the premise that Zionism is a noble cause--the movement of Jewish liberation, vital to the preservation of Jewish existence. By the same token, the material expression of its goal, the State of Israel, is the sine qua non of Jewish existence. Hence to be anti-Zionist is to be opposed to the continuation of Jewish existence; to be "anti-Israel," even in the sense of opposing the aggressive policies of the Israeli government, is to support those who seek the annihilation of the Jewish people in Israel. In short, anti-Zionism and opposition to Israeli foreign policy are in practice equated with anti-Semitism.

The New Anti-Semitism does not attempt to spell all this out; it simply assumes it. And on the basis of such criteria the main threat to the Jewish people is placed not where it really exists--in the lap of monopolist reaction--but in the Arab world and the Soviet Union, in sections of the Black and other oppressed peoples, in the Left, in religious groups such as the Quakers and in similar quarters.

So far is this carried that it has evoked criticism in circles normally

favorable to the ADL. In a recent column in the New York Post, James A. Wechsler strenuously protested the book's equation of criticism of Israeli government policy with anti-Semitism. And J. I. Fishbein, editor of the Chicago Sentinel, has sharply attacked the book on similar grounds. He cites its attacks on the Christian Science Monitor, the syndicated columnists Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, Dean Francis Sayer of the Episcopal Church, the American Friends Service Committee, Senator Fulbright and other such groups and individuals on the grounds of "hostility to Israel." And he states:

The classical as well as the common definition of anti-Semite--pure and simple--is one who hates Jews. And "the destruction" of Israel implies the physical, actual destruction of the State. We challenge the Anti-Defamation League to prove that any of the publications and individuals mentioned above fall into that category.

The fact that someone sincerely differs with Israel--for whatever reasons he believes--doesn't make him an anti-Semite. For example, does anyone think that Senator Fulbright hates Jews or wishes to see Israel destroyed? He believes her policy is wrong and should be more flexible, but that doesn't make him our enemy....

This is a dangerous business on which the Anti-Defamation League has embarked. It can only make enemies out of people who are not our enemies but who have legitimate questions about Israel and its policies. We believe the League should stick to what its original purpose was--defending Jews against anti-Semitism here in America. (March 14, 1974.)

A striking case of the application of the concept of the "new anti-Semitism" is the all-out attack launched against Daniel Berrigan for a speech delivered to the Association of Arab University Graduates last October and published in American Report (October 29, 1973). Since its appearance it has become the object of bitter attack in certain Jewish circles and the subject of widespread discussion. We do not propose to discuss the speech in detail here, but wish only to note the following.

There is much to be critical of within it. Certainly we hold no brief for his anti-Sovietism. His language is in places intemperate and his charges exaggerated. But his speech is essentially an attack on the policies of the Israeli government, not on the Jewish people as such. Even if his analysis should prove to be, as his critics charge, "unbalanced" and in certain respects incorrect, this does not in itself make him an anti-Semite. Yet Berrigan's speech has created an unprecedented furor while the real threat of anti-Semitism has been pushed further into the background.

*

Anti-Semitism in the United States is intimately associated with other manifestations of chauvinism and racism. It is part of the pattern of racism which permeates and defiles our society, and whose central feature is the inhuman

racist persecution of Black people. Invariably the most outspoken anti-Semites are also the most vicious anti-Black racists. Of urgent necessity in the fight against anti-Semitism, therefore, is the building of Jewish-Black unity, as well as unity with the Puerto Rican, Chicano and other oppressed peoples, unity in a common struggle against all forms of racial and national oppression.

The New Anti-Semitism, however, deals with the question of anti-Semitism in isolation. It has little to say about the oppression of the Black or other peoples but devotes itself rather to the allegations of a growth of "Black anti-Semitism." To be sure, there have been expressions of anti-Semitism among the Black people, which Forster and Epstein faithfully record. But the main basis for such allegations is the widespread opposition among Black people to Zionism, their sympathy with the cause of the Arab peoples and their condemnation of the oppression of Arabs and darker-skinned, Sephardic Jews within Israel, which are fraudulently labelled "anti-Semitism."

The result has been a disturbing growth of racism within the Jewish community, which has found expression in various forms. In New York, it has been displayed in the support of the major Jewish organizations to Shankerism, expressed most sharply during the racist strike led by Shanker and his cohorts a few years ago against community control of the schools in the Black and Puerto Rican neighborhoods. It is displayed currently in their support of Shanker's efforts to get a Jewish school board elected in District 1, comprising New York's Lower East Side, where school enrollments are 96 per cent Puerto Rican, Black and Chinese. And it is displayed in their passivity in the face of racist outbreaks such as those in Forest Hills and Canarsie. On a national scale it is displayed in the disgraceful role played by the major Jewish organizations in spearheading the fight against preferential hiring and open enrollment in the name of "the merit system" and "equal opportunity."

All this has resulted inevitably in a progressive worsening of Jewish-Black relationships and a deepening chasm between the two. At the same time these Jewish organizations have taken to their bosoms the ultra-reactionary, racist anti-Semitic political spokesmen mentioned above. It is truly ironic that at a Warsaw Ghetto Uprising memorial meeting in New York one of the chief speakers was Senator Buckley, and that in the forefront of the recent mass rally against alleged "Soviet anti-Semitism" was the notorious Senator Jackson. In short, this is a policy which cuts the Jewish people off from their allies and seeks to tie them to their enemies.

There are, of course, pious declarations about the need to improve Jewish-Black relations. But the onus is placed upon the Black people. Forster and Epstein put it in these words:

For their part, most Jews view anti-Semitism among Blacks as a disheartening development. They believe it essential that Black people develop a greater sensitivity to anti-Semitism--just as Black people demand a greater sensitivity on the part of Jews and other whites to racism.

Nevertheless, most Jews also know that they cannot and must not abdicate their role in the struggle for equality; that they cannot allow the anti-Semitism they observe in the Black community to sway them from continuing to fight for Black justice. (Op. cit., p. 220.)

What is missing here is any recognition whatever of the growing racism among Jews and the need to combat it. On the contrary, the Jews are portrayed as the best friends of the Black people and we are assured that they will continue this noble role in spite of "the anti-Semitism they observe in the Black community." But the roadblock is not "Black anti-Semitism." Rather it is the racism which permeates the Jewish community as it does other sections of the white population, and which becomes progressively worse as a result of Zionist influence. The position of Forster and Epstein, in particular their placing of anti-Semitism among Black people on a par with the anti-Black racism which permeates this country is itself a flagrant exhibition of racism.

Finally, it must be noted that the equation of anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism lies also at the core of the shameful campaign to "save" Soviet Jews from a non-existent persecution. Space does not permit extended discussion; here we can only point out that the Jewish organizations and leaders involved in this campaign have placed themselves in alliance with reactionary anti-Soviet and anti-Semitic elements motivated not by concern for the Jewish people either here or in the Soviet Union but only by a readiness to use any club they can find with which to beat the Soviet Union. The campaign is thus a diversion from the fight against the real enemies of the Jewish people here in the United States and an effort to divide them from their staunchest friend, the Soviet Union.

*

Clearly, anti-Semitism is a serious problem and a serious struggle against it is required. Such a struggle is the concern not of the Jewish people alone but of all democratic and progressive forces. Of particular importance is the involvement of the trade union movement. And Communists should, of course, be in its forefront.

The struggle must be directed against the real sources of anti-Semitism--against the Right-wing forces of monopolist reaction and their agents, as described above, not against the allies of the Jewish people--the Black, Puerto Rican and other oppressed peoples, the Quakers, the Communist Party, the Soviet Union, etc. Accordingly the whole phoney crusade against a "new anti-Semitism" must be repudiated.

Further, the struggle must be conducted as part of the fight against all national and racial oppression. Of crucial importance is the unity of the Jewish people with the Black and other oppressed minorities. Such unity can be achieved only if the false focus on "Black anti-Semitism" is rejected, if there is a real effort to fight racism among the Jewish people and to bring them fully into the struggle for the liberation of all oppressed peoples.

Of key importance is a campaign for the legal outlawing of all racist and

chauvinist expressions and actions. Second, a comprehensive exposure of discrimination in employment and housing is needed, accompanied by a fight to enforce existing anti-discrimination legislation as well as to strengthen it. Third, the disgraceful opposition of Jewish organizations to preferential hiring and open enrollments must be fought and a joint drive organized in support of these measures, based on a demand for expansion of educational facilities and job opportunities sufficient to provide places for all.

And finally, the fight against anti-Semitism is tied to the fight for detente, for peaceful coexistence, and against those who would perpetuate the cold war and the fascist danger inherent in such policies.

* * *

Qiryat Shemona and "Retaliation"

By Phil Honor

The suicide attack by three Arab guerrillas, April 18, on the Israeli settlement, Qiryat Shemona in which 18 persons were killed was an act that is deeply deplored and condemned by responsible people everywhere.

The Communist position on terrorism is well-known. Principled Communists are strongly opposed to such reckless deeds. The Communist Party of Israel has frequently denounced terrorism, pointing out that it causes great harm to the cause of Arab liberation. Whatever the motives of the Arab guerrillas may be, such terrorist acts play into the hands of the Zionist rulers, making it easier for the Israeli government to pursue its aggressive policies against the Palestine Arab people.

At the same time the CP of Israel sharply condemns the reprisal raids carried out by the Israeli government on neighboring Arab countries. These are of an entirely different scope. They are unjustifiable and reprehensible.

The Arab guerrilla attacks, acts of individuals or small groups, are an outgrowth of the hopelessness and desperation of the displaced Arab people who are deprived, in many instances, of their homes and cruelly oppressed by the Israeli rulers. The lawless Israeli raids, in which hundreds of Arabs have perished, are carried out by official military forces as a governmental policy. They cause many casualties and considerable property damage and endanger the peace in that area.

On September 15, 1970, Tawfik Toubi, prominent leader of the Communist

Party of Israel and member of the Knesset (Parliament) sharply criticized from the rostrum of that legislative body the hijacking of airplanes by Palestinian commandos, stating:

The hijacking of four civilian airplanes with hundreds of passengers ... the blowing up of airplanes and the holding of about 50 of the passengers as hostages—these adventurist acts have rightfully aroused the indignation of public opinion all over the world.... Such criminal acts must be denounced regardless of the motives of their perpetrators.

Our Communist [Knesset] delegation has always criticized such adventurist actions as acts of international lawlessness, which cause suffering to innocent citizens and only serve the purpose of those who seek to inflame hatred between Jews and Arabs.... We demand the immediate release of all the passengers that are being held as hostages.

Toubi also condemned the attacks of the Israeli authorities, in the following words:

One also gets the impression that the adventurist acts of airplane hijacking and seizing of hostages is being utilized by the [Israeli] government as a cover-up for its policy of rejecting every effort to reach a just peace.... We denounce very energetically the numerous instances of seizing hostages by both sides.... Such inhumane acts on the part of the Israeli government nullify its moral right to condemn airplane hijacking and holding hostages in the Arab world.

We find the following comment on the Qiryat Shemona raid in the progressive Israeli newspaper, Der Veg (April 17, 1974):

We are still numb from the shock of the criminal killing in Qiryat Shemona, but in retrospect we have to ask: What should be done to avoid a repetition of such occurrences, to avoid the deep pain caused by the loss of lives of so many people, among them innocent children? ... A secure future of the inhabitants of Qiryat Shemona is closely linked to the security of the state of Israel as a whole. Such security will be possible only when we have peace, which is attainable now. The government of Israel must change its policies. It has to evacuate the occupied territories and affirm the national rights of the Palestine Arab nation.

*

Israel has never hesitated to commit illegal acts against the Palestine Arab people. The list of such wrongdoings is very long. Collective punishment, destruction of houses, ill-treatment of prisoners, administrative detention, mass evictions, illegal arrests, incursion on foreign territories are but a few of them.

The Israeli government has frequently made preemptive strikes on neighboring

countries under the pretext of "fighting terrorism." It will be enough to mention the massive 1968 raids on Palestine concentration on the east side of the River Jordan, the raids and mechanized military attacks, in 1973, on Syria and Lebanon and the murder by Israeli forces of three Palestinian leaders in Beirut, Lebanon. The New York Times correspondent in Lebanon, Juan de Onis, reports that the Israelis staged in December 1968 an airborne attack on Beirut's international airport in which the Israelis blew up 13 Lebanese airplanes, and that since then there have been 31 Israeli air raids and commando attacks, as well as a two-day invasion of southern Lebanon in September 1972. Lebanese officials claim that the Israelis have killed 30 Lebanese military and 138 civilians, as well as wounding 400 others in these attacks. (New York Times, April 21, 1974.)

Israel's assaults on civilian populations of neighboring countries have been repeatedly condemned in the United Nations as violations of international law. As far back as 1966 a staunch friend of Israel, Arthur J. Goldberg, who was then U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, reprimanded Israel for executing a raid on the Jordanian village Es Samu. He declared: "This deliberate governmental decision must be judged as the conscious act of responsible leaders of a member state, and therefore on an entirely different level from [a previous raid of Arab guerrillas]." (New York Times, November 20, 1966.)

The UN condemnations do not stop the Zionist rulers of Israel from continuing their incursions into neighboring Arab countries. A day after the Arab commando attack on Quiryat Shemona Israeli military forces struck at six villages in southern Lebanon. They killed two women, blew up 20 houses and seized ten hostages. The Israeli defense minister, Moshe Dayan, impertinently boasted at a press conference that "the [Lebanese] people will find it impossible to live there. Their homes will be destroyed and the whole area will be deserted."

*

The ruling circles of Israel know very well that such a severe attack on a governmental scale was not warranted. It was widely reported that the Arab raiders were members of a small, extremist, splinter group which rejects the moderate line that has been generally accepted by Yasir Arafat and the other leaders of the Palestine national liberation movement. Juan de Onis made the following observation in a report from Beirut (New York Times, April 13, 1974):

The group does not belong to Palestine Liberation Organization headed by Yasir Arafat.... More than a desperate act of violence, the raid appeared to political analysts here to be a thrust against moderates such as President Anwar Sadat of Egypt, and even Mr. Arafat, whose Al Fatah is in favor of the [Geneva] negotiations.

In a subsequent dispatch (April 20), de Onis was even more explicit, stating: "Captain [Ahmed] Jebreel [head of the extremist group] opposes Yasir Arafat and other moderates in the guerrilla movement who show a readiness to accept a peace settlement in the Middle East."

New York Times correspondent Terrence Smith wrote on April 14 that "the Israeli public reaction [to the raid on Qiryat Shemona] was not the straightforward demand for instant retribution that was heard frequently before the October war..." Thus we see that the attack on the Lebanese villages was not staged out of security considerations and not even as a response to public pressure. Moshe Dayan and his colleagues had other things in mind. They wanted to increase tensions and stir up international turmoil by holding the government of a neighboring country and the entire Palestine liberation movement responsible for the actions of three members of a small extremist dissident group. Their objective was to arouse world public opinion against the Palestinian Arab people and to perpetuate the hoax that the Palestine Liberation Organization, which is generally recognized as the leading representative body of the Palestinian Arab people, consists of "irresponsible terrorists" with whom it is impossible to negotiate.

The ruling circles of Israel are trying desperately to stem the tide of international public opinion, which is sympathetic to the Palestinian Arab cause. People everywhere are becoming more and more aware that a durable peace in the Middle East must include a just solution of the Palestinian problem. The UN has affirmed, on numerous occasions, the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people. The ruling circles of Israel are indeed defying the whole world by denying the rights of the Palestinian Arab refugees to repatriation or compensation, which are clearly spelled out in UN resolutions dealing with this problem.

*

Heedless of the military, economic and political adversities suffered by Israel because of the October war the Israeli hawks are still determined to pursue the policy of annexation. The pro-Zionist old guard is adamantly opposed to the self-determination of the Palestinian Arab people and to the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state embracing the West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip--a concept which is more and more accepted by the Palestine Liberation Organization. The negative position of the Israeli ruling circles on these questions is reflected in their obstinate opposition to the participation of the PLO in the Geneva peace conference.

Exacerbating the tensions in the Middle East by their incursions into Lebanon, their real purpose is to calumniate the main representative body of the Palestine Arab people--PLO--as "terrorists" and "international outlaws" that have no place at the Geneva negotiating table.

But to increase tensions, to "keep the pot boiling" is for Israel, at this juncture, a detrimental, self-defeating policy. Blinded by its racist, Zionist prejudices and adventurist past, enmeshed in political squabbles, the old guard fails to see the changes that have taken place in Israel since the October war. Israel desperately needs peace to mitigate its military, economic and political crises. The people are staggering under a heavy burden of ever-increasing military expenditures and an unbearable, constant state of war-alert. Hopelessness and defeatism are the prevailing moods in the country. Protests are mounting against

rampant inflation, low wages and rising poverty. The latest public opinion polls show that one out of every five young men is considering the possibility of leaving the country. Many of them are professionals and trained workers. Terrence Smith comments in his above-mentioned article:

There were some dark days immediately after the war especially for the younger generation that carried the brunt of the fighting and the casualties. Many younger Israelis began to question the very existence of the state.... Except for the war itself, the major depressant to the Israeli national morale has been the four months-old political crisis.

Smith correctly points out that there is, above all, a crisis of confidence in Israel. The Israeli people have lost their trust in their Zionist-adventurist rulers. Political mass demonstrations reflect this anti-establishment upheaval. Workers and young people are becoming more and more aroused.

Out of this upheaval a new leadership may emerge that will bring a lasting peace in the Middle East, based on UN Resolution 242. This will require mass struggle and a strengthening of the peace movement.

A just solution of the Middle East crisis may lead to the birth of an independent Palestine Arab state that will live in peace and economic and cultural harmony with its close neighbor--a peaceful state of Israel.

* * *

Just off the press!

LENIN ON THE JEWISH QUESTION

Edited and with an introduction

by Hyman Lumer

Price \$2.75

International Publishers
381 Park Avenue South
New York, N. Y. 10016

The De Funis Case

By Celia Zitron

In its historic 1954 decision, the United States Supreme Court ruled that school segregation violates the "equal protection of the laws" clause of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution. The plaintiff, on whose behalf the suit was brought, was a Black child--one of the millions forced to attend vastly inferior schools which were segregated by law in the South since 1896, and by practice in the North.

At that time, leading Jewish organizations welcomed the decision. In the many struggles to implement the 1954 Supreme Court decision in the South, and to extend it to other areas--means of travel, public facilities and accommodations, libraries, restaurants, churches, stores and shopping centers, jobs--many Jews, whether affiliated with a Jewish organization or not, were to be found among the freedom riders from the North, and as active participants in demonstrations and marches in the South.

But in the De Funis case, on which the United States Supreme Court heard arguments in February of this year, the most influential Jewish organizations--the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Committee--are on the other side. The plaintiff in this case is white. The legal brief and the oral argument on his behalf maintain that it is whites who are being denied equal protection of the laws by steps taken to increase the number of Black and other minority students at the Law School of the University of Washington.

*

Like the 1954 decision, the outcome if De Funis is upheld, could have repercussions--but this time negative--far beyond the University of Washington Law School. Its effects will be felt in the colleges and universities generally, and beyond that on the fight against exclusionary and discriminatory policies in industry, in some trade unions, in housing, in income.

In 1971, Marco de Funis, a Sephardic Jewish graduate of the University of Washington with a high scholastic and admissions test record was one of 1,600 applicants competing for 145 places in the Law School of the University. He was among those whose applications were rejected.

The files of applicants were examined by the Law School's admissions

committee, which considered the applications of minority students separately. It took into account their entire record and the possibilities of success in the study of law, in the interest of increasing the number of minority law students.

It also considered criteria other than scholastic and test records for white applicants, as do other colleges, universities, and graduate schools. Sixteen white students with lower scholastic standing than De Funis were admitted.

De Funis appealed to the state courts. He was upheld in a lower court and was admitted to the Law School. But the state's highest court reversed that decision. That did not affect his situation. He is scheduled to graduate from the University of Washington Law School in May. There was never any question of his being able to get training in the law, since his applications were accepted at four other law schools. Nevertheless, he appealed the state's decision to the United States Supreme Court.

The briefs on behalf of De Funis do not question the Law School's right to consider other than scholastic criteria in the admission of the other 16 white applicants in preference to him.

Questioned by Supreme Court Justice Lewis F. Powell whether "formal grades are the only things to be considered for admission, attorney Josef Diamond, who presented the oral argument for De Funis, replied, "No." The only criteria which are being challenged are those which seek to reduce, to some extent, the obstacles--generations in the making, and still in force--which perpetuate discrimination against minorities in the law.

*

Consider the situation at the Law School of the University of Washington, which its admissions policy is seeking to change: According to the statistical record presented to the Supreme Court by the Washington State Attorney-General, in the 67 years of the school's existence, there were only 12 Blacks among its 3,812 graduates--less than half of one per cent in over half a century. For 1969-70, there was an enrollment of 8 Black students out of a total of 356, approximately 2.2 per cent.

A study of figures for 10 leading law schools in 1970-71 shows that of 7,449 students, only 393 or 5 per cent were Black. And even this small number are in schools which have some form of preferential admissions policy.

No wonder figures for the legal profession (Judicature, June-July 1973) show that only 4,000 of the nation's 325,000 attorneys are Black, that of 21,294 full and part-time state and city judges--slightly more than one per cent are Black. The situation is far worse in the South.

In spite of such evidence, the Anti-Defamation League amicus brief rejected the University's contention that its policy seeks to provide "reasonable representation" of "historically suppressed and excluded" groups.

The Anti-Defamation League sums up its argument as follows: "The country has been taught for a generation that racial discrimination was immoral and unconstitutional. Now this is to be unlearned and we are told that this is not a matter of fundamental principle but only a matter of whose ox is gored. Those for whom racial equality was demanded are now to be more equal than others."

*

The ADL brief calls the University of Washington's admission policy a "quota" system, and it argues that "a quota system by any other name is still a divider... in a society desperately striving for equality that will make race irrelevant politically, economically and socially." (Emphasis added.)

The ADL amicus brief was drawn up by Alexander N. Bickel, professor of constitutional law at Yale University, and Philip B. Kurland, professor of law at the University of Chicago.

It is difficult to believe that these eminent law professors are so out of touch with reality as to believe that our society is "desperately striving for equality," and that, in fact, Blacks and other minorities are now seeking to be "more equal than others."

Yet it is on the basis of such unreal assumptions that they seek to stop moves to increase the number of Blacks and other minorities in the legal profession. That number is pitifully small not only in terms of percentages, but also in terms of the needs of the minority population whose members are framed and railroaded to long prison terms out of all proportion to their numbers in the population as a whole.

Nor is there any recognition that the very tests and records which they insist must be the sole criteria for minority applicants (though not for others) are no measure of their possible success in their law studies, or of their contributions in their future practice.

Walter Leonard, who is in charge of Harvard University's affirmative action program, in discussing the De Funis appeal, said: "When you begin to admit minority students, you begin to look at more than the mechanical scores. A minority student who in many instances has come through a very crippling educational background, one almost designed for failure, but who nonetheless has come through and has reached the point where he's knocking on the grad school door--well, just the fact of his survival that far becomes a sign of his toughness, and is predictive of his ability to survive as a student."

*

The ADL boasts in its January 29 news release that it was the first organization to file an amicus brief for De Funis--as far back as last August. Nor is this surprising. It has taken the lead, along with Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers, in attacking every special program intended to

lessen discrimination against national minorities and women--in education, in industry, in unions, calling it a "quota" system.

And it has, in effect, made the issue in the De Funis case one of Jews vs. Blacks and other minorities. It said in its news release that "an argument in behalf of one group would be inappropriate." It added, however, that the universities which excluded Jewish students till some 30 years ago "may again be able to do so in the name of enlightenment, if the Washington decision is not reversed."

There have been quotas in higher education in this country; in the not-too-distant past they excluded most Jews, and practically all Blacks and other minorities. The ADL is now applying the term "quota" to what is really its complete opposite, i. e., to the opening up of hitherto exclusionary institutions to Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Asians, and Native Americans. It has succeeded in too many cases in persuading Jews that they are being menaced by the inclusion of presently largely excluded minorities.

*

The great importance of the issues in the De Funis case is widely recognized. Sixty amicus briefs have been submitted for some 30 organizations. On the side of De Funis, along with the three influential Jewish organizations, stand the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and the AFL-CIO. But not all Jewish groups and far from all AFL-CIO unions are on that side. The National Council of Jewish Women and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, to their credit, are supporting the University of Washington. And so are such AFL-CIO unions as the United Farm Workers, the United Auto Workers, and the State, County, and Municipal Workers.

The university is also supported by the American Bar Association (which itself excluded Blacks till 1943), the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the Civil Liberties Union, most law schools, and at least two universities--Harvard and Rutgers.

The Supreme Court may by its decision help accelerate the very slow progress of extending the equal protection of the laws to minorities, and so affirm the 1954 decision. On the other hand, if it rules for De Funis, it will help accelerate Nixon's drive to wipe out all the gains made by the Black integration and Black liberation movement since the 1954 decision.

The fight for full democratic rights for minorities will go on, whatever the decision. But if De Funis is upheld, it will be a more difficult fight. Progressive Jews are rightly disturbed that in this effort to turn the clock back, the leading Jewish organizations should be in the lead. There should be a wave of mass protests from among their memberships that will compel the abandonment of this racist position, adopted in the name of equality.

* * *

The Palestine Question: Heart of the Middle East Conflict

By Emile Touma

Commenting on his talks with his Soviet colleague Andrei Gromyko, the Canadian Foreign Minister Mitchel Sharp said that Gromyko emphasized the imperative need for Palestinian representation at the forthcoming Middle East Peace Conference at Geneva, and then added, expressing his own opinion: I consider the Palestine problem as the heart of the Middle East conflict and unless it is solved it will be extremely difficult to reach a fair and just settlement in the area. (UPI, November 20, 1973.)

That is a correct appraisal of the Middle East conflict, and the Communist Party of Israel, which had consistently fought to force the Israeli ruling circles to recognize the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, could declare in the resolutions of its 17th Party Congress (held in June 1972): "Developments have proved how true our Party's stand regarding the impossibility of establishing a durable and just peace in our region, without ensuring the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people and those of the people of Israel." (Special issue, Information Bulletin, CP of Israel, 1972, p. 49.)

In fact it is possible to claim that the general consensus in the world holds that in order to solve the Palestine problem it is necessary to recognize the national rights of the Palestine Arab people and create conditions for their implementation, without encroaching on the rights of the Israeli people which have embodied their right to self-determination in the State of Israel.

Israeli Official Attitudes

Without going into the history of the Palestine problem we can state that one of the main objectives of the aggressive June 1967 war launched by the Israeli ruling circles against the neighboring Arab countries with the backing of U.S. imperialism was to achieve "territorial expansion and impose a 'settlement' that would liquidate the rights of the Palestine Arab people" (Resolution of the 16th Congress CPI, Special Bulletin 3-4/1969, p. 116).

However, events soon proved that this objective was untenable. Shabtai Teveth, an Israeli journalist close to the "establishment," had to admit that:

"In 1968 the 'terrorist organizations' (the Palestine national movement - E.T.) became a prominent factor; without them one could hardly hope to reach a peace settlement" (His book, The Cursed Blessing: the Story of Israel's Occupation of the West Bank, p. 284).

In the interim period between the June 1967 war and the October 1973 war, the Israeli ruling circles followed a double-edged policy changing the emphasis according to circumstances and specific objective conditions.

On the one hand they tried to establish a subservient leadership willing to form a so-called Palestinian entity under Israeli occupation, and on the other they launched an offensive both in the occupied areas (Western Bank and Gaza Strip) and the Arab countries to destroy the Palestine national movement under the pretense of fighting "Palestine terrorism." Generally speaking, emphasis on the first edge continued up to September 1970, and on the second in the period after.

The failure to establish a subservient Palestine entity in the occupied West Bank was due to two factors. First: popular opposition defeated any initiative by local quislings to create an authoritative body which could claim a representative character in the occupied areas. Second: expansionist Zionist ambitions excluded any possibility of a seemingly "honorable" compromise, acceptable to these quislings.

Shabtai Teveth, describing the attempts to conclude a separate peace with King Hussein and come to an arrangement with the West Bank Arabs, noted that the "Arab representatives" (those willing to compromise with the occupation authorities - E.T.) demanded a definite and binding declaration as to the Israeli government's final intentions concerning the occupied territories, and added: The cabinet, under the influence of the "Greater Israel" forces, could not do that (op. cit., p. 284).

Moreover, both the avalanche of expansionist statements about the Jordan river being Israel's security border and the extensive seizure of land and colonial settlement in the occupied areas made it abundantly clear that the Israeli ruling circles were oriented by the "Greater Israel" concept. Under the circumstances the "philanthropist"-inspired dialogues between Israelis and Arabs of the occupied territories became empty practices of oratory meant as grist for the Israeli propaganda for the outside world.

As has been noted, the emphasis on this edge was diluted after 1970. The choice of date is not accidental. For in September 1970 the Jordanian Hussein clique unleashed a murderous military campaign against the Palestine national movement, as represented in its military organizations, and the Palestine Arab refugee camps which were the backbone and buttress of this movement. During this month, which has become known as Black September, the centers of the Palestine national movement in Jordan were liquidated physically.

The Israeli ruling circles had from the first day of occupation instituted a

reign of barbarous terror against the Arab population in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Arab Jerusalem. Thousands were arrested, thousands of houses were demolished, because their owners or relatives became suspect of "terrorist" activities, and a dense climate of oppressive measures paralyzed opposition momentarily.

After the September massacres of 1970 the Israeli ruling circles considered the time ripe to intensify their onslaught on the Palestine Arab people--the word "people" here means the national organizations and the Arab refugee camps where the Palestine Arab people had settled and became a revolutionary reserve. The onslaught was escalated and intensified in the same measure as the conviction of Israeli ruling circles grew that their military superiority neutralized and overawed the Arab world, and particularly Egypt and Syria.

In 1973 the Israeli armed forces carried out savage air-raids and land mechanized intrusions against the Palestine Arab refugee concentrations in the neighboring Arab countries, Syria and Lebanon, under the pretense of fighting terrorism. Hundreds of Arab refugees lost their lives in these raids and the murder of the three Palestinian national leaders at their homes in Beirut (Lebanon) became a symbol of official Israeli impertinence that expressed indifference to world public opinion as formulated by Security Council resolutions condemning Israel.

Encouraged by their transient success, the Israeli ruling circles moved forward and the leading government party formulated a program for the 1973 Knesset elections, popularly known as the Galili Document (Israel Galili is an influential minister without portfolio), which concretized a massive colonialist settlement offensive in the occupied areas, designed to change their national character, produce established facts on a greater scale and pave the ground for the ultimate annexation of these Arab areas to Israel and in this manner institute "Greater Israel." The program was a practical, material negation of the legitimate national rights of the Palestine Arab people.

The October 1973 war transformed the whole complex situation in the Middle East. First, it demolished the many-sided structure of official Israeli concepts of their military deterrent--security borders, U.S. potentialities in the Arab world, and Israeli ability to be solely decisive in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Second, the sum total of the war--the end of which was formalized on the international level by the Security Council Resolution 338--showed that the Israeli ruling circles cannot hope to negate the rights of the Palestine Arab people.

Today the political scene in Israel is fluid. The election campaign and party loyalties disrupt the process of polarization between the ruling circles and the masses, as well as the process of differentiation within the various sectors of these ruling circles, whether in the government parties or the extreme rightist bourgeois opposition.

These two interconnected processes center not least around the rights of the Palestine Arab people. Increasingly more circles are reaching the conclusion

that no just and durable peace is possible in the Middle East without a resolution of the Palestine problem and specifically, recognition of the national rights of the Palestine Arab people.

However the upper echelons of the Israeli ruling circles are still adamant in their endeavor to continue the Zionist-inspired policy of expansion.

Not only is the extreme rightist bourgeois front (made up of the opposition parties Herut, Liberals, Free Center and State List) opposed to the recognition of the national rights of the Palestine Arab people. The government coalition, which declared its preparedness to implement the Security Council resolutions and carry out negotiations for a durable peace settlement in Geneva, does not show a constructive tendency and is apparently bent on continuing the old policy. The adoption by the Labor Party--the decisive factor in the coalition--of a 14-point program as their election platform on November 29, 1973 provided ample evidence of this posture.

Though there was a change in tone and a pledge to strive for a peace agreement, the program stresses that Israel will not return to the June 4, 1967 lines, proclaims united Jerusalem as the capital of the state--which means perpetuating the annexation of Arab Jerusalem--and rejects the idea of setting up an additional Palestinian Arab state to the West of the River Jordan. This in fact negates the right of the Palestine Arab people to self-determination.

Moreover, as an addendum, Israeli officials announce repeatedly that they are unwilling to negotiate with representatives of the Palestine National Movement--usually described as terrorists. And when they do recognize the existence of Palestinians--not the Palestine Arab people--they emphasize that their representatives should be part of the Jordanian delegation to the Geneva Conference (statement of Foreign Minister Abba Eban in Israeli press, December 2, 1973).

Developments in the Palestine Arab National Movement

One of the most important developments that emerged during the October war and its aftermath was the consolidation of Arab solidarity in the struggle against imperialism and aggression. There was general endorsement of Egyptian-Syrian policy as expressed in the two countries' acceptance of Security Council Resolution No. 338 which implies recognition of Israel, and insistence on the full national rights of the Palestine Arab people as a precondition for peace.

This idea was crystallized in the Arab summit conference held in Algiers at the end of November 1973. The conference further resolved to consider the Palestine Liberation Organization as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestine Arab people. This was no formal proclamation but a reflection of fact. The war and its consequences has galvanized the Palestine Arab people and they rallied around the Palestine Liberation Organization as their national leadership.

This was generally noted, and Newsweek described as an illusion the Israeli-diffused concept that the Palestine Arabs in the occupied territories had

acquiesced to the occupation and added that "the war and the chance that an independent Palestinian state might emerge has brought a dramatic change and even Israeli officials admit that the PLO has tremendous West Bank support" (December 10, 1973).

Facts in the occupied areas substantiated this claim. The Palestinian National Front in the occupied areas, the illegal militant organization in the West Bank, supported by the Jordanian Communist Party, issued a manifesto in the middle of November 1973 declaring itself part of the PLO and proclaiming the latter as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestine people. (Al Ittihad, November 20, 1973).

At the same time the "influential Supreme Moslem Council in East Jerusalem voiced its support for the decisions of last week's Arab summit conference in Algiers." The Jerusalem Post which reported the resolution concluded correctly that: "This clearly implies the Council's approval of the emphasis at Algiers that the PLO spoke for the Palestinians" (December 4, 1973).

The Israeli government Arabic paper Al Anba (News)--published to serve the policy of occupation--had to admit on the same day that the crisis of identity which tore and dispersed public opinion in the West Bank two months ago has practically disappeared and there is near-unanimity in public opinion, which turns around the concept of Palestine Arab independence.

In conjunction with these proclamations of attitudes, militants in the West Bank and Arab Jerusalem initiated a wave of violence against the occupation which took various forms such as bomb explosions and armed clashes. The violent response of the occupationist authorities--demolishing of houses, arrests and deportations (eight leading personalities were deported across the Jordan river to the East Bank on December 10, 1973)--sharpened the struggle of the Palestine Arab people in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, as can be observed in sit-down strikes and demands for the release of land seized by the occupationists (Al Kuds, December 4, 1973).

However the consolidation of the Palestine National Movement is facing a two-pronged attack.

On the one hand King Hussein of Jordan is trying to contain the Palestine National Movement by various means in order to create the conditions for restoring his rule over the West Bank once Israel withdraws, and on the other hand Israeli-inspired Arab quislings in the West Bank are arriving to establish a "Palestine representation" which would challenge the right of the PLO to sole representation and confuse issues.

King Hussein's attempts have taken the form of insisting on including the Palestinian representation as part of the Jordanian delegation, while at the same time flaunting the slogan of a plebiscite after Israel's withdrawal to allow the Palestine people in the West Bank to determine their future. In these endeavors

Hussein is working on both fronts. In the Arab countries he is trying to convince the officials of the validity of his claims by suggesting various formulas and in the West Bank his supporters are active in shaping a public opinion favorable to the Jordan monarch.

Significant in this respect was the fact that his emissary went to Beirut in early December 1973 and proposed to the Palestine Organization that he would reshuffle his cabinet by including ministers chosen by the organization or acceptable to it, and that such a government would form the Jordanian delegation to the peace conference. The organization--according to the Palestine News Agency--has rejected the proposal and other similar proposals which were designed to prevent separate Palestinian representation (Reuter, December 8, 1973).

In the West Bank the Jordanian ruler met with a similar rebuff. Even such an old Hashemite henchman as Hebron mayor Al-Ja'abari, who before the October war had toyed with the idea of a reconciliation with the King, had to declare that he considers the conditions which prevailed before the 1967 war over. He requested the King to bring in the Palestine people and the Arab nation to solve the problem (Al Anba, December 7, 1973).

Al-Ja'abari at the same time was thinking in terms of a conference in the West Bank to discuss Palestinian representation in the peace conference. Though he said that the idea was premature, the fact that it was raised in an interview by the correspondent of Al Anba shows the tendency of the Israeli ruling circles. This is substantiated by articles of known Israeli stooges in that paper. Naturally the staying strength of the PLO, supported as it is today by the Arab countries and the Palestine Arab people, will depend on its attitude towards the Palestine problem. Hitherto the various organizations which make up the PLO, and PLO itself, had designated their objective as the establishment of a Palestine democratic secular state. The implication of such a program was the dissolution of the State of Israel.

Revolutionary forces all over the world, the Communist Party of Israel among them, regard this program both as unprincipled, because it negates the right of the Jewish people in this country to self-determination, and as impractical under the present conditions in the world and in the region. Moreover, not only do the countries of the world recognize Israel and subscribe to its right of sovereign existence, but the Arab countries in their Algerian summit implied recognition of Israel in deciding to attend the Geneva Conference and reach a durable peace with Israel.

In the absence of definitive official announcements, the world press is speculating over the attitude of the PLO; the Daily Star of Beirut wrote: "The Palestinians [in their organizations - E.T.] appear to have given up, for the time being, their demand for the creation of a democratic state in Palestine of Arabs and Jews" (November 1, 1973.) However as early as late October 1973 Yasir Arafat stated that the Palestine Revolution stands today on the threshold of an historic stage necessitating an historic decision. He added that all the leaders of the PLO but one agreed on these general lines.

One: Unanimity that the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the Al Hamer district

(on the Eastern shore of the Lake of Galilee - E.T.) are Palestinian areas settled by the Palestinian people. It is not the subject of argument, neither is there a place for trusteeship; the people have the right to self-determination.

Two: Care that present rights should not be a substitute to historic ones but a step in the struggle for them.

(The statement was originally published by the PLO paper Al Muhrer - Alnida, November 1, 1973.)

These two ideas taken together imply that the PLO or its major component Fateh considers the time appropriate to accept present rights which would be implemented specifically by the self-determination in the Palestine areas mentioned after Israel's withdrawal. The PLO is opposed to any role for Jordan and stresses in its publications that the Arab League had not approved the annexation of the Arab areas of Palestine to Transjordan in 1949.

It is clear that the PLO is under various conflicting pressures. On the one hand the Arab states such as Egypt and Syria press the PLO towards realism and compromise while Iraq and Libya press it to reject the Palestine state in only part of the old Palestine (Alfajar, November 24, 1973). The PLO is also aware that certain Arab governments with the backing of the U.S. support Hussein's Jordan and would like to neutralize the PLO or if possible oust it from the Middle East picture.

This latter is becoming nigh impossible as the PLO gains support on all sectors. Of particular importance has been the consolidation of friendly relations between the PLO and the Soviet Union. The visit of a PLO delegation, headed by Arafat and other leaders to the Soviet Union at the end of November 1973 stressed this fact.

It is to be assumed that the Soviet Union, which is contributing extensively to the endeavors for a peaceful solution in the Middle East, and will play a leading role at the Geneva Peace Conference, will help the PLO to reach a principled and realistic attitude which would also respond to the legitimate national rights of the Palestine Arab people. One can gain this impression from Arafat's statement that the PLO visit to the Soviet Union was positive and constructive in the interest of the Arab nation and the Palestine people.

The Palestine Problem Today

The Palestine problem, despite all the claims of the Israeli ruling circles about its liquidation, never disappeared and was ever present internationally in the United Nations, in this form or other. The yearly UN decisions, reiterating the right of the Palestine refugees to choose between return to their homeland (in Israel) and compensation, was one such form.

After the Israeli war of aggression in June 1967 the UN, reflecting the

radical change in its structure, passed definite resolutions, in its yearly sessions, recognizing the legitimate national rights of the Palestine people. This year was no exception and a number of UN resolutions represented a paramount international outlook regarding the Palestine problem:

- One, reaffirming the right of the Palestine Arab people to self-determination, was passed by 78 votes against 6, with 35 abstentions. The U.S. voted with Israel against.
- The second noted that Israeli occupation authorities have persisted in adopting measures that obstruct the return of the displaced population to their homes and called upon Israel to carry out repatriation of these refugees. This resolution was passed by 101 votes against 4, with 14 abstentions.
- Two others called upon Israel to respect the Geneva convention on human rights of civilians in war time, and to desist from measures aimed at annexing Arab occupied territories.

Thus it is possible to say that three ingredients make up the Palestine problem today, as laid down by the international community.

1. The Israeli occupation of territories inhabited by the Palestine Arab people (West Bank, Gaza Strip, Arab Jerusalem, Hameh District) and the attempts by the Israeli ruling circles to create accomplished facts by colonial settlements as a prelude to their annexation.

2. Israel's rejection of the right of the Palestine Arab people to self-determination, with the backing of the U.S. and objectively in collusion with the Jordanian monarchy.

3. Israel's outstanding opposition to the UN resolutions on the Palestine refugees.

The solution of the Palestine problem can therefore be achieved by eliminating the three ingredients, i.e., by Israeli withdrawal from the Arab occupied territories, carrying out the resolutions on the refugee problem, and the implementation by the Palestine people of its right to self-determination. The conditions after the October 1973 war both regionally and internationally are favorable to such a solution.

We join with the many friends and co-workers of Michael Orman of Elsinore, California, in mourning his tragic death on February 27 at the age of 70. He was a staunch fighter for peace, equality and socialism. To his widow, Sylvia, we offer our deepest sympathies.

Editors, Jewish Affairs

Polish Jewish Editor Visits U.S.

By Julia Barnes

(Reprinted from Daily World, Mar. 23, 1974)

New York, March 22--Shmuel Tenenblatt, youthful editor of the Yiddish Folks Shtimme (Voice of the People) published in Warsaw, returned last week to Poland after a six-week visit to relatives in New York City. He also met and exchanged experiences with activists in Jewish and Polish culture and life in this city.

Among these activists were Hyman Lumer, editor of Political Affairs, and Conrad Komorowski, the Daily World staff writer. Repaying the courtesy Tenenblatt had shown him when he visited Poland, Komorowski brought the guest to the offices of the Daily World where he spoke informally with other members of the staff.

When Tenenblatt was told of the fund drives necessary to support the U.S. paper, he rejoiced that the weekly paper he edits has no such problems. He explained that the Polish government meets the full cost of the publication of the Folks Shtimme and subsidizes all other Jewish cultural activities such as concerts, poetry readings, libraries, Jewish theater and an historical institute.

Tenenblatt stated that of the approximately 15,000 Jews in Poland over 7,000 are Yiddish-speaking. However, not all of the subscribers to his paper are fluent in Yiddish. Therefore three pages of each issue are printed in Polish, the other seven in Yiddish, he said.

On March 7, Tenenblatt was the guest at an informal reception attended by 65 Jewish activists at the McBurney Y.M.C.A. on West 23rd Street. Among those who spoke in greeting were Alex Kolkin, chairman of the National Jewish Commission of the Communist Party; Sam Liptzin and S.D. Levine, writers for the Morning Freiheit; Simon W. Gerson, executive editor of the Daily World; Abe Wise, veteran trade unionist and member of the management committee of the Morning Freiheit and Esther Carroll, long-time militant in the International Ladies Garment Workers, retired now.

Tenenblatt answered the many questions from the audience about Jewish cultural life in Poland and reported the revival of Yiddish libraries and the increasing numbers of Jewish young people drawn into the Jewish movement.

He reported the popularity of the Yiddish Kaminska Theatre which is producing new as well as old plays and which played to enthusiastic audiences on a recent tour in West Berlin. He explained that audiences at these plays are not restricted to persons who understand Yiddish, as head-phones for simultaneous translation into Polish are provided.

Of his personal biography, Tenenblatt modestly said little. He is a university graduate. His wife is editor of the Polish section of the paper of which he has been the chief editor since 1968.

The guest concluded with a wish for closer contact between the Jews of this country and their brothers and sisters in Poland.

* * *

Communications

Jews and Siberia in World War II

By I. Schwalb

(The following is the text of a letter sent to the New York Times, which did not publish it.)

Dear Editor:

On November 21, 1973, an advertisement in your paper lamented the plight of an anonymous cab driver and his retention in Siberia by the Russians during World War II. He was a Polish Jew.

I, too, am a Polish Jew, and I, too, was taken to Siberia. To me, Siberia was a life-saving place. I only deplore that my relatives (about 40) could not escape to Siberia, this saving refuge. Had it not been for the policy of the Russians to evacuate Jews to Siberia, I too would have perished.

My relatives died because they obeyed the evil propaganda of the rabbis in Poland, that in Russia they would be forced to work on the Sabbath and to eat non-Kosher food. The real motive for the rabbis' concern was not so much their fear of having the religious commandments broken, as it was the dread of losing the members of their congregation and with that their own livelihood. And so, those who listened to them went to Hitler's gas chambers.

* * *

Events and Views

An item in the Jerusalem Post of December 2, 1973 announced that the Israeli Sports Federation was sending a team to the International Gymnastics Competition for Champions in Johannesburg, South Africa. "The invitation to the meet," the article says, "followed an exchange of visits during 1973 between the national gymnastic squads of Israel and South Africa, part of the stepped-up sporting contacts between the two countries in recent years--though racialism in South African sport has put some strain on these relations."

This says a great deal. At a time when other countries are refusing to participate in sports events in South Africa because of its barbaric apartheid policy, Israel is promoting "stepped-up sporting contacts between the two countries."

In view of the fact that all African countries which formerly had diplomatic ties with Israel have severed them, other than South Africa and its satellites, this emphasizes all the more the reactionary direction of the foreign policy of Israel's ruling circles.

*

The progressive Israeli newspaper Der Veg, in its issue of March 6, cites reports in the Israeli press of a considerable increase in applications to emigrate from Israel. Those who seek to leave are mainly younger people, in the 20-35 year age group. Among the main reasons given for wanting to leave are: the high cost in deaths and casualties in the October war; the lack of concern for providing housing and proper employment for returned soldiers; inability to cope with skyrocketing prices; lack of confidence in the Israeli government.

The largest part of the applications are for migration to Canada. The Canadian Embassy reports that the number received in January of this year is double that received in January 1973. Why Canada rather than the United States? The answer is usually that the desire is to move to a country where it is possible to live in peace and quiet.

*

In a joint newsletter dated March 1974, SANE and the World Federalists USA offer as the basic principles for the solution of the Middle East crisis the following: 1) recognition of Israel's existence by her neighbors, 2) withdrawal of Israel's forces from occupied territories, 3) recognition of the Palestinian people, including their rights to self-determination and repatriation. The newsletter calls also for UN enforcement of security of borders, negotiation of jurisdiction over Jerusalem, regional cooperation and restriction of the sale of arms. While it takes an "even-

handed" approach, blaming both sides, we feel that the proposals for peace go in the right direction and are on the whole worthy of support. They are an indication of the changing views in this country on the question of peace in the Middle East. Other peace organizations should take note of these proposals.

*

The Chicago Sentinel of March 14 carries a full page ad headed "Anti-Semitism, Racism and the Energy Crisis." It is signed by about 100 individuals, chiefly people active in the Jewish movement. The ad states in part:

"The energy crisis artificially created by the major oil companies with the assistance of the Nixon Administration, and timed to coincide with the Arab boycott, is being used to raise the prices of gasoline and fuel oil, to increase the already exorbitant profits of the oil monopolies, and to eliminate our weak ecological safeguards...."

"History has demonstrated the close interconnection between socio-economic political crises and the rise of organized anti-Semitism. Reactionary and fascist leaders have never hesitated to deflect public anger and frustration from themselves onto minority groups and especially that most convenient scapegoat - the Jew.

"So signs appear in a closed gasoline station in suburban St. Louis. 'Don't blame us for high prices, blame the Jews.' 'The Zionists put us out of business.' Auto bumper stickers in Los Angeles bear the slogan, 'We need oil, not Jews.'..."

The ad then calls for curbing the profiteering of the oil monopolies and a roll back of prices. It calls further for continuing the Geneva negotiations to a successful conclusion, and for prosecution of instigators and disseminators of anti-Semitic propaganda.

* * *