

JEWISH AFFAIRS

Nov/Dec 1987

\$1.25

**On the 70th Anniversary
of the Bolshevik Revolution**

Herbert Aptheker

**A World of Women,
A Congress of Peace**

Ruth Selman

Small Planet Korzak

Sol Flapan

The Unsolved Problems

Joseph Lipski

Untying The Middle East Knot

Meir Vilner

Yasser Arafat

New Thinking on Soviet Jews

Jon Weisberger

Yiddish Section

David Seltzer



STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation (Act of August 12, 1970, Section 3685, Title 39, United States Code)

1. Title of Publication: JEWISH AFFAIRS
2. Date of Filing: December 28, 1987
- 3A. Annual Subscription Price: \$6.00
4. Location of Known Office of Publication: 235 West 23rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10011
5. Location of the Headquarters or General Business Offices of the Publishers: 235 West 23rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10011.
6. Names and Addresses of Publisher, Editor and Managing Editor:
 Publisher: JEWISH AFFAIRS PUB., INC., 235 West 23rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10011.
 Editor: DR. HERBERT APTHEKER, 235 West 23rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10011.
 Secretary Treasurer: LEWIS M. MOROZE.

7. Owner (If owned by a corporation its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual must be given.)

JEWISH AFFAIRS PUB., INC., 235 West 23rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10011
 DR. HERBERT APTHEKER, 235 West 23rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10011

8. Known Bondholders, Mortgagees, and other Security Holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of Bonds, Mortgages or other Securities (if there are none, so state): None.

10. For completion by Nonprofit Organizations authorized to mail at Special rates (Section 132.122, Postal Manual).

The purpose, function, and nonprofit status of this organization and the exempt status for Federal income tax purposes (Check one)

- Have not changed during preceding 12 months
 Have changed during preceding 12 months

(If changed, publisher must submit application of change with this statement)

11. Extent and Nature of Circulation:

A.	Total No. Copies		
	Printed (Net Press Run)	1600	1600
3.	Paid Circulation		
	1. Sales through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales	515	515
	2. Mail Subscriptions	1059	1959
	C. Total Paid Circulation	1574	1574
	D. Free Distribution (including samples) by Mail, Carrier delivery or other means	none	none
	E. Total Distribution (Sum of C and D)	1574	1574
	F. Copies Not Distributed		
	1. Office use, leftover		
	unaccounted, spoiled after printing	26	26
	2. Returns from news agents	none	none
G.	Total (Sum of E & F—should equal net press run shown in A)	1800	1800

I certify the statement made by me are correct and complete.

Lewis M. Moroze, Managing Editor

(Signature of editor, publisher

business manager or owner)

JEWISH AFFAIRS



Vol. 17, No. 6

November/December 1987

Editorial Committee

Herbert Aptheker, *Editor*
 Lewis M. Moroze,
Managing Editor
 Louis Kalb, *Production Manager*
 David Fried
 Jack Kling
 David Seltzer

On the 70th Anniversary of the
 Bolshevik Revolution

Herbert Aptheker 2

A World of Women A Congress of Peace

Ruth Selman 4

Small Planet Korzak

Sol Flapan 7

The Unsolved Problems

Joseph Lipski 9

Time for Unity

Richard Davidson 10

The Only Way To Peace

Meir Vilner 11

We Are Optimistic

Yasser Arafat 12

New Thinking on Soviet Jews

Jon Weisberger 15

Yiddish Section

David Seltzer 24

Jewish Affairs is published by the Communist Party, U.S.A., at 235 West 23rd Street, N.Y., N.Y. 10011, 7th floor (212) 989-4994, ext. 209. Subscriptions: \$6.00 per year (bi-monthly). Second class postage paid at the post office in New York, N.Y. ISSN: 0021-6305. Postmaster: Send address changes to *Jewish Affairs*, 235 W. 23rd St., N.Y., N.Y. 10011.

ON THE 70th ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

by Dr. Herbert Aptheker

The demands of the Bolshevik Revolution for Peace, Bread, Land meant a new quality of democracy. It meant a freedom not of what may *not* be done by government but what *may* be done and *must* be done. It meant a freedom made real by workers and peasants, by those who, as they create value, also are the genuine creators of history. Those who can create a society truly of, by and for the People, the latter including *all* — the impoverished, the neglected, the insulted, the victims of racism and of colonialism. It meant undoing the subjection of women, nurturing human beings as nature was nurtured, conquering the secrets of nature, but not ravishing it.

It meant denying the exploiters' myths of inferior peoples, of chosen peoples, of an elite allegedly destined to rule.

It meant affirming the possibility of progress and denying the wisdom of resignation. It taught the need and propriety of resistance, and demonstrated that the collective was the way towards individual and social fulfillment.

It projected and made possible the age-old goals of peace, good living conditions, satisfying work, creative pursuits, happy people. It seriously projected a world free of socially-induced disease, insult, injury, fear and insecurity; a world no longer cursed with crime, with preventable diseases, premature death, the waste of talent, illiteracy, unemployment, homelessness. It insisted that was resulted not from the devil's will or an alleged innate aggressiveness of humans, but rather from socially-induced hatreds, socially-incited hostilities for purposes of averting internal challenges, gaining new positions of power and accumulating additional vast treasure houses of wealth.

The Bolshevik Revolution was itself a trial by fire and endured through many such trials — civil war, intervention, blockade. And it endured the penalties of being first, of breaking new ground without precedents — and doing this while being surrounded by hostile states.

Then, the ultimate threat of fascism — fascism created and fed by monopolists who detested socialism. Finally, despite heroic efforts which postponed the coming of war and made possible better preparations, world war came. There came the assault of Hitlerism upon the

USSR, a Hitlerism with all continental Europe chained to it. And simultaneously, the USSR was straggled by militarist-imperialism on the East.

The fire did not consume, it tempered. The struggle for a united front and collective security, while not victorious in thwarting the growth of fascism and its conquest of Europe and its assault upon the Soviet Union, did slow that down, did give added time for ideological and physical preparation. It did create a background of anti-fascism.

Thus was forged the coalition that fought World War II; that coalition did destroy fascism on the West and military-imperialism on the East. Basic to that coalition was the main target of the forces making war, namely, the USSR. Its immortal resistance, its heroic fight-back, broke the back of fascism and thrilled the peoples of the world. Those people assisted the struggle as they could and they profoundly admired the decisive and superb performance of the armed forces and the peoples of the Soviet Union.

The Bolshevik Revolution, its maintenance and the successful outcome of the Second World War remade the World decisively and positively.

The "alternative" of fascism was — at least for some time — dealt a devastating, if not fatal, setback. The fascist goal of destroying socialism failed, and the prestige of the victorious social system reached new heights. Tens of millions of people, having been betrayed by monarchs, nobility, landlords and monopolists, chose the path of socialism. Soon the USSR no longer was ringed by hostile States but rather by fraternal ones; all shortly gathered themselves together into political and economic alliances of great power.

Simultaneously, the system of colonialism and its ideological prop, racism, were dealt near-mortal blows, so that one after another of the formerly nationally oppressed peoples broke their political — and sometimes their economic — chains. This was true not only of this or that nation; it was true of entire continents. Most dramatically is this reflected in the growth of the United Nations from a score of nations into well over one hundred and from an entity originally dominated by imperialist powers into an entity wherein nothing meets greater hostility than precisely racism and colonialism.

No qualitative transformation of the scope and intensity of that marking the post World War II world could continue in a straight path without set-backs and road blocks and false starts and erroneous turns. And of course, the monopolist powers had not changed their natures; only their relative power had been altered. They

set their goal to undo the post-war revolutionary transformation with counter-revolutionary machinations.

Hence, the coming of the Cold War, the effort to retain colonialism, to camouflage it with neo-colonialism, to undertake small and not so small wars (those in Korea and Vietnam had casualties mounting into the millions). Withal, was instituted a fantastically costly armaments program and a frantic search for the ultimate weapon which, if only monopolized, would make possible the salvation of reaction.

Here appeared the central and critical tasks of the post-war era: to continue the momentum of national liberation, to preserve and strengthen democratic and socialist forces and also to achieve the goal of disarmament and of a world free of war.

In these vital tasks of the post-war era — as in the era — as in the era between the two world wars — it fell to the pioneer land of Socialism to lead the struggle. Again the USSR did not fail in its awesome responsibility.

Again, suffering the penalty of being first and of leading this effort after enduring colossal losses, naturally mistakes, aberrations, and worse, occurred. No doubt such failings would have occurred even if all the inhabitants of the Soviet Union were angels, operating in a friendly world; alas, the inhabitants were mortals operating in a world with much of it still dominated by fanatically hostile rulers.

Withal, world war did not occur, anti-colonial and democratic impulses were not ultimately thwarted. Now has appeared the time and the opportunity for a supreme effort to ensure global peace, to terminate the arms race, to eliminate the horrendous weapons capable of limitless annihilation.

Presently appeared the opportunity and the necessity for refreshing the system of socialism — now in its mature stage' to cleanse it of drawbacks, anachronisms, obstacles. Now with the inspiring opportunity of a globe at peace, of a century luxuriating in disarmament, of a world confidently embracing the sovereignty of working men and women, remnants of the past, repressions of the past were all to be left to the past.

Here is the meaning, I think, of the vibrant confidence and heroic thrust of the USSR and its General Secretary, Mikhail Gorbachev, whose acts and challenges — from unilateral stopping of nuclear testing to projecting half a dozen nuclear-free zones in the world, to urging an end to chemical weapons, to nuclear weapons, to *all* weapons — have sent a current of hope

(Continued on page 8)

A World of Women . . . A Congress for Peace

By Ruth Selman

Imagine 150 American women representing every state in the Union. Imagine Asian-American, Afro-American, White, Latino and Native American women bridging every strata of economic life and including a major sampling of occupations and professions. Imagine women of every age — students of occupations and professions. Imagine women of every age — students to retired grandmothers and even great grandmothers. And then finally imagine them all being ushered through the gates of the legendary Kremlin walls and into the massive Hall of Congresses where they are suddenly dwarfed by a mighty crowd of 3,000 other women from every part of the inhabited globe, many in their stunning traditional garb, their voices blending in a chorus of many languages and regional dialects — and you have a picture of the Opening Session of the World Congress of Women held June 22-27 in Moscow.

What brought all these women together, many traveling thousands of miles as did our American delegation for a stay of only one week? What unifying interest aside from their universal sisterhood could bring together so many divergent cultures, problems and needs?

For myself, traveling as a writer, as a representative of Educators for Social Responsibility and as one of two delegates from the Greenwich Village Coalition Against Nuclear Arms, it was the major slogan of the congress that drew me there: TOWARD THE YEAR 2000 WITHOUT NUCLEAR WEAPONS . . . FOR PEACE, EQUALITY, DEVELOPMENT! Before this June, I had never heard of the Women's International Democratic Federation (WIDF), the umbrella organization that organized and hosted the Congress. It was breathtaking to discover that such an organization existed, one that embraced all the women of the world: the long-suffering Argentinean grandmothers and mothers — *madres de Plaza de Mayo*, American women working to preserve abortion rights, the struggling Native American women, the determined militant women of South Africa embattled against apartheid, the black church women fighting for their children's survival in the ghetto's of the U.S., the women of Nicaragua, Spain and Mozambique, the women of the bloody Middle East, the women survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Federation embraces them all, but especially those of the third world who are in the vanguard of battles against oppression, illiteracy, poverty, disease. All of these women were represented

at the Congress and they came to report, to listen to reports, to reach out to one another, but especially to register their commitment to the chief priority: preventing nuclear war, halting the arms race.

The Soviet Government, in hosting this gathering reiterated its desire for an end to the arms race as did General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev in his welcoming address. All the stops were pulled out and we were front page news and nightly fare for an entire week on Soviet T.V. Welcome mats were out wherever we went. The Moscow circus turned out to greet us at a giant rally and children everywhere handed us flowers and sang and performed for us. It is not clear how much publicity we received in other countries outside the Eastern block, but there was certainly a blackout of news about us here in the States. After all, what is so newsworthy about 3,000 women gathered together from every part of the world voicing their desire for peace and their determination to work for it?

The Congress opened with a Plenary Session on the morning of June 23 at which a number of women leaders from various countries gave welcoming addresses and spoke of women as being the world's natural peacemakers. Gorbachev spoke of women's universal striving for emancipation and focused on the history of women's liberation in the Soviet Union since the revolution. He also admitted bluntly that although Soviet women are vigorously and equitably involved in social production and in political, scientific and cultural activity, their age-old burdens as mothers and wives have not been eased and they are still not represented fully in the highest government bodies. These problems, he said were on the agenda of the huge restructuring program. "Perestroika" going on in Soviet Society today, a massive attempt to deal with inequities and inconsistencies in the social, political and economic sphere. He further spoke of the growing unity of all peoples as demonstrated by this Congress of Women. "It is women who perceive more fully and emotionally the absolute priority that preserving peace has over everything else."

On the podium, amongst the several hundred women leaders, our American delegation was represented by Cheryl Craig, the eloquent Civil Rights attorney from Pittsburgh and president of Women for Racial Rights attorney from Pittsburgh and president of Women for Racial and Economic Equality (WREE), Cora Weiss, president of Women for a Meaningful Summit, and Jacqueline Jackson, wife of Jesse Jackson, Democratic candidate for the 1988 presidency, and a peace activist in her own right. Freda Brown, president of the World Federation outlined the format of the Congress:

Nov/Dec 1987

There were to be 8 commissions (panel discussions with audience participation) and simultaneous translations into English, French, Spanish, German, Arabic and Russian at all sessions.

From these panel commissions, under such headings as *Problems of Development and Women, Women, Children and Families, Mass Media and Women* etc. there were spinoffs held informally in the evenings and parallel to the larger discussions. These dealt with the Middle East where Arab and Israeli women and Palestinian women met face to face; sessions on violence against women; meetings of women writers, artists, parliamentarians; and there were special dialogues such as the Soviet-American dialogue where delegates from the Soviet Union and the American group exchanged views on the problems facing our respective countries regarding the status of women.

Throughout the week women lined up to deliver reports of the situation in their individual countries and sat patiently listening to the reports of others, many of whom had never appeared before such a body in the past, had never before been able to talk about the critical problems facing them daily as women in their societies. They spoke passionately, from the heart and they were received with warmth and sympathy.

I am lucky to have family in Moscow. There are, as it happens, three generations of women. So perhaps I may tell you a bit about them.

These are women, Jewish women, professional women: Aunt Feera is 84, ailing a bit now, but very cheerful and full of questions about our family here in the States. She visited here exactly 20 years ago in 1967 and spent 8 months touring about, enjoyed the trip but was glad to return home. She worked as an editor of children's films, that is, educational films and even after her retirement at the age of 55 she continued working and still receiving her pension. She, as well as her daughter and granddaughter are divorced. (The divorce rate in the S.U. is about as high as it is here. But they make it a little more difficult when there are children involved.)

All 3 generations are non-observant Jews although they were very pleased, the first time I visited there in 1971 to show me the Moscow Synagogue.

The two older women have a rather comfortable two room apartment with a kitchen and bathroom, the European kind with a separate cubicle for the commode and the wash-up area. Until four years ago all three shared this apartment. But now there's a 4th generation, a little boy named Vanya. Now Vanya and his mother have their own apartment nearby in the area known as

Novo Moscov.

My cousin Maya, who is about my age has until recently worked as a textile engineer, managing a textile plant. She has that hefty Russian look but actually she is quite athletic and skis in her leisure time.

Glasnost or no glasnost, neither of these women want to talk about their personal lives. It is very difficult to talk to them about the men in their lives, why they were divorced and what sort of personal lives they have been living all these years. Feera's granddaughter, however, Marina, the mother of little Vanya, spent an afternoon with me at my hotel and was very frank in discussing her private life. We communicated for one hour in sign language. She speaks no English and I speak very little Russian. But her second language is German. So what I did was speak Yiddish with a German accent and we seemed to get along that way. The gist of what she said to me was . . . "Alle menseszenen Zelbst . . . zelbe . . ." All men are alike. "Yich been endicked mit mener." I am finished with men.

Another part of my family, on my father's side, lives in Kiev. My cousin Yacov spent a day with me. It was quite an effort for him. He took the train from Kiev . . . 13 hours on the train all night just to be with me for one day! I managed to cancel out of all the Congress meetings I had that day and spent the entire afternoon and evening talking with him in the hotel lobby, except for a couple of breaks at the cafe.

At one point he rolled up his sleeve and revealed a number: Dachau. And then he proceeded to tell me an astonishing story:

Before the war . . . a non-Jewish friend who was leaving the country, left his personal ID papers with Yakov. When Yakov's Red Army unit was captured by the Germans and taken to Dachau, Yakov immediately chewed up and swallowed his own Jewish ID and substituted the other. With his fluency in speaking the Ukrainian language, (Most Jews were apparently not known to speak Ukrainian) — they never challenged him. He survived at Dachau as a non-Jew. When he was freed after two years he weighed 89 pounds. (He's almost 6 ft tall).

We talked about Chernobyl. What was it like? What are the residents experiencing now? . . . He said they still can only drink canned milk. Fresh vegetables and fruit are brought from areas considered not contaminated and are therefore very expensive.

Later we went for a walk in Gorki Park. I asked him about Glasnost. Would he give me an example? He bought a copy of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVADA,

which is the organ of Communist youth in the U.S.S.R. He read and translated the headline story. (Yakov speaks Yiddish). This plant manager, Yakov explained, had run off with the union funds and spent them apparently on wine, women and song, or rather vodka, women and song . . . He did it over a long period of time. Finally, he was caught and brought to trial. "Before Glasnost," Yakov said, "it would all be hushed up. No one would know about it. He would get caught and go to jail. But no publicity. Now everybody runs to buy newspapers to see what will happen next, to read about his romances and how he spent the money . . ." and then he adds . . . somewhat ruefully: "I don't know if it's necessary to have so much dirt . . . he used the yiddish word "shmutz" for everybody to read. Who needs to know all that? I think it's a bad example for the young and for other countries to see."

Yakov, like my other family members, are all very protective of the Soviet Union. He, as well as my Moscow family do not understand the Jews who are leaving or who want to leave. "They are traitors. The Soviet government educated them, gave them free health care, educated their children. Many are skilled professionals. And now, when there is such a labor shortage, a people shortage, really . . . they want to leave?" He perceived it as a brain drain, which of course it is in many respects.

U.S.S.R. has a very low birth rate. People rarely have more than one child. The 20,000,000 people lost in WW II still have not been replaced. The figure 20,000,000 means that virtually every single family lost someone. The survivors in my family are just that . . . survivors. There were brothers and sisters and wives and husbands and children who just disappeared into the Nazi maw. The Ukraine was overrun.

As the week drew to a close, a universal theme emerged from all the commissions, workshops, dialogues, meetings and round tables at the Congress: **THE WOMEN OF THE WORLD MUST BECOME DECISION MAKERS!** This theme was reflected in all the reports to the final plenary session in the Kremlin where a representative from the United Nations declared that the political process will remain incomplete until women — half the world's humanity are fully represented in the decision-making bodies of the world. But the power of women depends on how emancipated they are. There can be no equality when they are handicapped by men's legal privileges. And without equality they cannot become decision makers, they cannot fully be empowered to make peace.

(Continued on page 8)

SMALL PLANET KORCZAK

By Sol Flapan

WARSAW—Oh, those perfidious Soviets. They've gone and done it again. For the N-th time they've exposed the Big Lie about Soviet anti-Semitism. This time by naming a heavenly body after a Polish Jew.

On the initiative of the USSR's Institute of Theoretical Astronomy, a planet newly discovered by Soviet astronomers has been formally catalogued as "Small Planet (2163) Korczak 1871 sp 1".

Korczak refers to the Polish Jew Henryk Goldszmit (Anglicized as Goldsmith) who went through life under the pen name Janusz Korczak.

Precisely 45 years ago this month, on August 6, 1942, this mild mannered, frail 64-year old lover of children and guardian of orphans was murdered as were 700,000 others in the nazi-German death camp of Treblinka. He had been deported there the day before from the Warsaw Ghetto together with the school pupils in his care.

Emaciated, in tatters, the youngsters had marched obediently behind their beloved "Old Doctor" to the "umschlagplatz" (assembly point). There, the children and their teacher were loaded onto cattle cars and taken to that grim place of no return. "The only way out (of Treblinka or Auschwitz) was as smoke through the crematorium chimney," it was morbidly said in those frightful days of nazi occupation.

The Resistance Movement proposed to Korczak a difficult and risky one-man rescue operation. A great pedagogue had to be saved. But this scholar/humanist, friend/advocate of the child, refused to abandon his parentless charges.

News of this voluntary march to death by Goldszmit/Korczak reaffirming his unbreakable faith in and adherence to the lofty principles of guardianship over children—especially the defenseless ones, the orphans—was received here in Poland and worldwide as a gallant but tragic protest against nazi racism and genocide.

Perhaps no other physician, no teacher or writer has won so much profound popularity as this unassuming person. Here in Poland nearly 100 public schools, educational centers, scout troops have been named after him. Over 20 similar child/youth facilities abroad also bear his name. And now so does a small planet out in space thanks to Soviet astronomers.

Henryk Goldszmit was born in Warsaw in 1878 (some sources say 1879) into a well-to-do Jewish fam-

ily. His father was a lawyer; his grandfather a physician in whose steps young Henryk followed, studying medicine and specializing in pediatrics. It was then that he launched his literary career. He entered a contest run by the erstwhile *Kurier Warszawski* (Warsaw Courier) newspaper with a drama titled "Which Way?" That earned him the Ignacy Padarewski Prize. He signed his entry "Janusz Korczak" which he took as his pen-name.

From the mid-1930s that name was joined by yet another, "The Old Doctor," which was the title of a popular series of radio chats addressed to parents. The credo of those broadcasts as of all his writings, and indeed his life's work, is eloquently summed up in an earlier (1918) paper "How to Love the Child."

Korczak's pediatric calling and his literary work always went hand in hand. Back in 1911 he resigned from hospital duties and became manager/principle of the Home of the Orphan on Krochmalna Street, a predominantly Jewish neighborhood. By then he had already authored a number of children-oriented and children-inspired books.

The storm of World War I (1914-1918) drove Korczak eastward to Kiev. He returned to Warsaw four years later to his orphanage and to his writing, launching what became a golden literary chapter in his life. Masterpieces of his writings for children appeared in 1923, namely, "King Macius the First" and "King Macius on a Desert Island"—Macius being a diminutive and endearing name for Maciej.

This was followed in the ensuing years by successive novels and tales for children as well as child care literature for adults.

All his writings are imbued with his innovative, humanistic pedagogical ideas and his dreams about the building of a just and equitable world as viewed through the eyes of his children in the Home of the Orphan, later renamed Our Home.

Korczak, who treated all his orphan charges as his very own children—he never married—repeatedly told them: "I offer you but one thing. And that is a longing for a finer life. It does not yet exist. But it will come—a life of truth and justice."

In his "How to Love the Child" series of articles addressed to parents he penned these ever timely words: "New generations arise. Up comes a new wave with its shortcomings and merits. You must forge better conditions so that youngsters grow up better."

Korczak does not appeal. He does not beg. He demands equal rights for children—the right to personal dignity, to health and free development, to a just share in the division of social wealth. This Janusz Korczak bill-

of-rights for children found reflection years later in a United Nations adopted Declaration of the Right of the Child with Poland in the forefront promoting this idea. These Korczak basics have become an integral part of the progress made in People's Poland in the area of children-oriented activity.

According to The Old Doctor youth ought to be encouraged to co-engineer their own upbringing; the principles of self-governance ought to be inculcated in youth who should be active participants in determining their rights and duties.

Korczak's ideas are being promoted and developed by the Polish Korczak Committee founded in Warsaw in 1946. The Committee's comprehensive cooperation with scores of like-minded facilities, the publication of Korczak's works, the organizing of Korczak competitions and exhibitions and a host of other initiatives popularizing the person of Janusz Korczak and his ideas have found emulators on all continents. Prestigious Korczak Committees are active in 20 countries around the world. And an International Janusz Korczak Association has appeared on the world scene chaired by Jerzy Kuberski of Poland organizing scholarly sessions, exchange of experience projects, publications and youth groups the bottom line of which is dissemination of the ever green ideas of The Old Doctor.

It has been said that Janusz Korczak and his work belong to the world. Now he belongs to the universe. The planet named after him has been registered at the Smithsonian Institute's astrophysical observatory. Earlier during this anniversary month the chair of Poland's Literary Union, Wojciech Zukrowski, was presented by first secretary of the USSR's Writers Union, Vladimir Karpov, the certificate naming the relevant planet after Janusz Korczak. □

Sol Flapan is the Polish correspondent of *Jewish Affairs*.

(Continued from page 10)

Israeli-Palestinian peace. For this purpose, it is vital to achieve the broadest unity of all those who oppose the occupation, who are concerned about Israeli's future and who desire an Israeli-Palestinian peace, to be anchored in a peaceful Middle East. In the present day international and regional atmosphere, this is a realistic aim and its achievement is a possibility. □

Joseph Lipski is Israeli Correspondent for *Jewish Affairs*.

NO AID TO CONTRAS

(Continued from page 4)

through the hearts of humanity and have challenged, perhaps even embarrassed, rulers accustomed to old hatreds.

In addition to other positive moves, the USSR has opened, unilaterally, several of its military installations and tests to inspection by American scientists and officials. This would seem to end the problem of mutual verification so often emphasized by Washington.

With all this background, and with the profound urgency of the need, there appears reason to hope that the announced forthcoming summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev will take place. Should this occur, there also appears now to be a reasonable chance — given mutual desire — that agreement will be reached and, at long last, the actual process of nuclear disarmament will begin.

As the 20th century ends and a new century beckons, let the future be worthy of the aspirations of Lenin: Socialism, he insisted, means Peace; Socialism means Democracy. That Peace and that all-peoples' democracy is the objective now as the Soviet Union — and all enlightened humanity — joyously celebrates its 70th year of historic accomplishment!

A world free of weapons; a world at peace. A world without masters and slaves. A world worthy of the beauty of children. This is the world that can be achieved through mass struggle, now in this era that confronts us, thanks to the magnificent reality of the USSR on its 70th birthday. □

(Continued from page 6)

And so another unifying theme and desire emerged as the Congress closed: Women of the world must continue to reach out to one another, give hope and courage to one another, and as friends do on parting, plan to meet one another again at frequent world congresses.

As a delegate and a reporter for this Congress I find it sad that the news media in the U.S. ignored such a gathering. What the media missed was the fact that the unprecedentedly board and prestigious range of participants in this Congress confirmed that women have taken up the peace cause in earnest, and that this great, inspiring creative force cannot be denied.

Dr. Helen Caldicott, renowned lecturer, author and one of the founders of Physicians for Social Responsibility, expressed it best and drew a standing ovation at the Congress when she declared: "Women are like teabags. You don't know their strength until they're in hot water!" □

Ruth Selman, PhD is a peace activist, lecturer, writer.

THE UNSOLVED PROBLEMS . . .

by Joseph Lipski

The unsolved problems of the "Six Day War" are still being discussed, because there are as yet many doubts about this issue. There are many questions and a great deal of confusion. I believe that a clarification is necessary because these doubts hinder the understanding of the present day problems.

Some people jump from the War of Independence of 1948 to the "Six Day War" of 1967. Why don't they mention the Sinai-Suez War of 1956? Is this done accidentally? They do it for the purpose of concealing the real meaning and nature of the "Six Day War." They argue, for instance, that after the war of 1948 the Arab states prepared a war of revenge to overcome their defeat and to throw Israel into the sea. This intention is proved by the fact that the Egyptian government took steps to block entrance to the Red Sea, mobilized the army and called the Arabs "to throw the Jews into the sea."

These declarations caused anxiety among the people and thus the "Six Day War" was justified as a war of defense, because it was hard and quite impossible to believe, that the Israeli government is capable of preparing a war, that the government would not use all possibilities to avoid a war, to avoid casualties, if another choice exists, and still. . . .

Why, in my opinion, have the advocates of the version that the "Six Day War" was a war of defense, jumped intentionally from the Day of Independence of 1948 to the "Six Day War"? Because in the meantime the Sinai-Suez War broke out. It was openly and clearly organized and conducted by the Israeli government. As we remember, this war, too, was justified with the motive of defending the country against the terrorist attacks of the fedayeen who were said to endanger Israel's existence.

What did occur? It is true, that there were attacks, but they were not the reasons prompting the Israeli rulers to start the Sinai war. Not Israel's security was the concern of its rulers. Today everybody knows, that the Sinai-Suez war was planned in close cooperation with the French and British governments who wanted to reconquer the Suez Canal. This fact is generally known and that is why they skip, on purpose, this inconvenient event that can cast doubts also on the motive that in the "Six Day War" the Israeli rulers were concerned only for the defense of Israel.

At this opportunity it is important to remember that the war against Lebanon, too, was started for the pur-

pose of "defending the peace of Galilee." Today it is already known, that this was a plot, in cooperation with the US government, attempting to establish a "New Order" in Lebanon, to strengthen the American strategic position in the region. Today the government is accused openly, and in particular the present Minister A. Sharon, of conspiring to launch the war that cost Israel alone 650 dead and many disabled soldiers and a great deal of material and political damage.

I recall the Sinai-Suez war as well as the war in Lebanon, because both started with the same motives that led to the outbreak of the "Six Day War," namely that the aim was to put an end to the terror, that the purpose was only to defend Israel. . . . Who remembers today that the attack on the Israeli Ambassador in England was a signal to start the war in Lebanon? Now it is already clear that all this was a lie.

But the question is asked: Was there another choice and was it possible not to start the "Six Day War"? There is no doubt, that the Sinai-Suez war, as well as the Lebanon war, could have been avoided, that there was another alternative. Merely not to launch them. In the "Six Day War" there was an alternative, too, notwithstanding the means used by Nasser, notwithstanding the alarming cries of throwing Israel into the sea. Even such personalities as Ezer Weismann and H. Bar-Lev, and even Moshe Dayan have stated at various occasions, that on the eve of the "Six Day War" Israel's existence was not threatened. Moshe Dayan declared 5/30/75, in his lecture at the Tel Aviv University: "I cannot say that Egypt had decided to attack Israel in 1967."

Let me also add, that even one day before the "Six Day War" there were those inside the government opposed to starting the war. M.H. Shapiro, who was the Minister of the Interior at that time, asked: "How is it possible that Egypt plans an attack against Israel when Nasser's political activities and the Arab attitude signify that they are afraid of a war and are not prepared to start it?" The leaders of the Mapam and of the Religious National Party criticized the Minister of Security, stating that "he exaggerates unnecessarily with an inexact description of the situation, to persuade the doves" (from the book by A. Gilboa "6 Years, 6 Days").

Let me also quote M. Begin, who wrote that "in November, 1956, we had a choice. The explanation given for the start of the war was the necessity to liquidate the fedayeen who did not endanger Israel." On the "Six Day War" he writes: "In June 1967 we had a choice. . . . We started the war not because we had no choice. We could have waited, we could have sent the

army home. I don't know if an attack would have taken place against us. There is no proof for it, there are proofs to the contrary" ("Yediot Aharonot", 8/20/82).

I wish also to quote from a recently published book by a high officer, who was for many years chairman of the Commission for Military Long Term Planning, Emmanuel Wald. The title of the book is significant: "The Curse of Broken Tools." The book published by the Schocken Publishing Company, analyzes the wars that took place and was written upon the suggestion of the former Chief of Staff, Moshe Levy.

In this book, the author writes about the "Six Day War": "The Israeli political echelon was mistaken in its estimate, that in May, 1967, Nasser was prepared for war" (page 82). And to strengthen his argument, he quotes General Yitzak Hoffi's opinion, (he held the post of Chief of Operations in the General Staff at the time of the "Six Day War") and he says: "In June 1967, we were not in danger of annihilation or of physical extermination" (page 84).

There was an alternative to avoid all wars waged so far. The Yom Kippur War too, could certainly have been avoided, if the Israeli government had agreed to proposals made by the UN in 1971. However, it continued to prefer the military option and to trust its military strength, in its military superiority. It forgot its promise that its aim is not to occupy territories, that it wanted only to remove the danger to Israel's existence. We remember Moshe Dayan's declaration that he likes "better Sharm A-Sheikh without peace than peace without Sharm A-Sheikh." We already live several years without Sharm A-Sheikh and without Sinai. Some still try to keep the occupied territories with one and half million oppressed Palestinians, who refuse to live under the occupation.

One can certainly raise complaints, claims and accusations against the Arab side, because some of their actions were wrong. However, I have criticized the Israeli policy that has not done everything to avoid wars, a policy that has not used all political possibilities.

But I wish to add, that today the conviction is growing, that, notwithstanding the existing differences of opinion regarding the character of the "Six Day War", it is necessary and vital to wage a joint struggle by all opponents of the occupation to get rid of the occupied territories. They are a disaster for Israel and keeping them causes daily casualties. There is the alternative of leading a policy toward the yearned for

(Continued on page 8)

TIME FOR UNITY

By Richard Davidson

This is for Antal F. Borbely, M.D.

First begin with a conference; a talk; an hour to dream.
The force behind the people's movement.
What can it be? The next step; the forward shout.
It is here written.

It is here spoken.
It is here presented before the multitude.

The word; Unity.
Not just a word but deeper than the word.
The swinging up of the Working Class.
The treble Clef of hope.
The song sung in the cool hours of summer.
All peoples to listen.
All peoples to move forward.

Beyond the inch of space that reaction wrote.
Beyond the troubled times the faith of tomorrow.
We are a people's chant.
We are a people's love.

Can it be where the clock ticks and the skies grow alert?
Can it be a plan?
A drawn conclusion?
A song beyond notes?
Can it be the fist against the Contras' tactic?
Can it be the slogans: HANDS OFF CENTRAL AMERICA.

LEAVE NICARAGUA ALONE!
Can it be, the call for peace?
The words tuned against the nuclear leer.
The vision that says: "ALL TOGETHER ARE EQUAL AND FREE.

PLANT SEEDS INSTEAD OF BOMBS."'
The vision in the hearts of our people,
The real vision
Untampered by the media,
Not sliced down by a commentator's tongue,
Raised to a new height,
A unity of citizens marching against the arms race.
A unity of human beings declaring themselves before the destiny of nations,

Beyond the bastions of king and statesman.
For we are a human cry.
To hear the clear coo of the Dove Of Peace.
The coo that slams against the concrete of cities,

(Continued on page 20)

UNTYING THE MIDDLE EAST KNOT

We republish below "The Only Way To Peace," by Meir Vilner, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Israel and "We Are Optimists," by Yasser Arafat, Chairman, Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Both articles appeared originally in the *World Marxist Review*, 9/87.

For the past four decades the Middle East has been a bleeding wound on our planet. There have been many attempts to defuse the conflict situation but so far none have been successful. The idea of holding an international conference on a Middle East settlement has lately been gaining momentum. *WMR* asked two of the region's leading political figures to share their view of what the prospects are for convening such a conference and for bringing it to a successful completion, and what is preventing it from being held.

THE ONLY WAY TO PEACE

Meir Vilner

CC General Secretary, Communist Party of Israel

Israel's continued occupation of Arab lands is fuelling growing tension in the region and may lead to yet another war that would be more devastating than any we have previously seen and put international peace in peril. *It is urgent, vital, and in keeping with the interests of the peoples of the Middle East and our entire planet to eliminate this hotbed of war by establishing a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace.* In the situation prevailing on the international scene and in our region the only way to achieve this is by convening an international conference under the aegis of the United Nations. This explains why the idea for this conference now has more support than in the past.

There are differences in how this issue is viewed by the two major political blocs forming the present "national unity" government in Israel (Likud and Maarah). However, the significant thing is what unites them, what has been for a number of years and still is — with the approval of the US administration — the obstacle to a definitive and just settlement of the Middle East conflict.

What is this common denominator?

Both blocks deny the right of the Arab people of Palestine to self-determination, refuse to recognise the Palestine Liberation Organization as its representative, and out of hand reject the idea of a Palestinian state.

They insist on territorial acquisitions, object to Israel's withdrawal from Arab lands seized in 1967, and declare that Jerusalem, including the occupied and annexed Arab part of the city, must remain under Israeli sovereignty and that the question of its future is not negotiable. Both Likud and Maarah back the "iron fist" policy towards Palestinians in the occupied lands. They laud the strategic alliance with the USA against national liberation movements, against the independent states not only in the Middle East but in other parts of the world that have no desire to follow in the wake of US policies, and against the Soviet Union and the socialist community. Both have subscribed to Israel's official inclusion in the "star wars" programme promoted by the Washington administration. Both are attacking the interests and rights of the working people and pursuing a policy of discrimination towards the Arab population of Israel.

Once we understand what *unites* these two governing blocs we can see the substance of the *differences* between them on the question of an international conference on the Middle East and a settlement of the entire Israeli-Arab conflict.

LIKUD Position

Headed by Israel's present Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, Likud does not accept the idea of holding such a conference, contending that there is nothing to talk about. Its watchword is "Eretz Israel" ("The land of Israel"). Likud's proponents deny recognition not only of the rights but of the existence of the Palestinian people, and want Israel to annex all the occupied Arab lands.

MAARAH Position

For its part, Maarah, led by the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres, has lately been saying that with some reservations it is in favour of convening an international conference. One reservation is that it should be attended not by PLO representatives but by Quislings included in the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation. Another is that after the first sitting the conference should disband and there should be direct talks between the Israeli representatives and the Jordanian-Palestinian delegation formed along the pattern suggested by Maarah. A third condition is that the Soviet Union's participation in this international forum would depend on whether it restored diplomatic relations with Israel and acquiesced to demands that amount to interference in an internal affair, namely on the question of emigration. It is self-evident that to make preconditions for the participation of one or another side or country in an international conference is to torpedo the possibility of convening it.

Peres has admitted that he is not interested in the conference as such but feels that it should be held as a pure formality since King Hussein of Jordan is making direct talks with Israel conditional on the existence of an "international umbrella."

In other words, what Peres is suggesting is not an international conference but talks between Jordan and Israel with the participation of some Palestinian collaborationists under the aegis of the USA. The purpose here is to conclude another separate deal on the Camp David pattern, by-passing the Palestinian problem and isolating Syria. More, there are projects for "dividing functions" between Israel and Jordan in the occupied Palestinian lands: Israel would exercise the military power while Jordan and its puppets would take care of municipal affairs, utilities, and similar matters. In this way they are planning to blot out the rights of the Palestinian people.

None of these plans hold out the promise of a comprehensive, just, and lasting peace in the region. On the contrary, they are aimed at perpetuating the military threat. From this it follows that the views of Likud and Maarah about an international conference diverge not over the issue's substance but over tactics.

Regardless of which of the two blocs they represent, the Israeli ruling circles could not have gone on occupying Arab territories without support from Washington. US imperialism is the principal force that has hitherto been, along with the Israeli rulers, obstructing a peaceful settlement in the region.

But this is not to say that there is no hope of holding an international conference on the Middle East. Apart from its regional implications, the Middle East crisis is a paramount global problem. It is affecting peace throughout the planet and influencing a wide spectrum of state-to-state relations. The prospect for holding a conference thus depends to a large extent on the situation in the world, particularly on the state of the relations between the USSR and the USA.

USSR Position

In the course of all these years the Soviet Union has been pressing for a comprehensive, just, and durable peace in the Middle East in keeping with the interests of all of the region's peoples and countries. It initiated the idea of holding a UN-sponsored international conference of all the sides involved in the conflict, including Israel and the Palestinian people in the person of their acknowledged and sole lawful representative, the Palestine Liberation Organisation, and also the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. Let me

re-emphasise: *in the situation now taking shape in the world and in our region this is the only way to extinguish the Middle East hobnob of war.*

The UN General Assembly has passed several resolutions worded in this spirit. Massive pressure can compel the US administration to consent to the holding of an international conference on the Middle East. The very fact of such a conference would add a dynamic dimension to the quests for an all-embracing settlement of the Israeli-Arab conflict and galvanise the efforts on the scale of the planet, region, and individual countries to ensure the successful consummation of this forum.

C.P.I. Position

The stand of the Communist Party of Israel on problems related to a Middle East settlement rests on the resolutions adopted by the United Nations and is aimed at ensuring the rights of all the peoples in the region. Underlying the settlement should be Israel's withdrawal from all the lands seized by it in 1967, the creation of a Palestinian state on the West Bank of the Jordan, including the Arab section of Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip, and the return of the occupied Golan Heights to Syria.

In a nutshell, the essence of the solution is two states for the two peoples: the Israeli and the Palestinian.

Meir Vilner was born in Vilna (Poland) in 1918. He went to Palestine in 1938. In 1940 he joined the Communist Party. In 1943-1948 he was a member of the CC and the CC Political Bureau, and a CC Secretary of the Communist Party of Palestine. He has been a deputy to the Knesset since 1949. A CC and CC Political Bureau member of the Communist Party of Israel since 1948, he was elected the party's General Secretary in 1965.

WE ARE OPTIMISTIC

Yasser Arafat

Executive Committee Chairman, Palestine Liberation Organisation

The Geneva Peace Conference* was to have been the instrument for settling the Middle East problems. The efforts made at the time allowed foiling the attempts of the USA and Israel to hinder a just, comprehensive, and lasting settlement of the Middle East conflict and the Palestinian problem. In this context let me recall the understanding that the Arab delegation to the conference would include PLO representatives. Moreover, in the joint Soviet-US statement on the Middle East of October 1, 1977^o the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and the fact that they had their own representative were recognised by the USA for the first time.

However, developments took an unexpected turn. A visit to Jerusalem by Anwar Sadat subverted the Geneva Conference. Then followed the Camp David deal, which our people saw as a catastrophe to their cause and to the Middle East problem as a whole. The war between Iraq and Iran likewise has had extremely dangerous consequences.

Later, with the blessing of the US President Ronald Reagan and the then Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin a new conspiracy was launched — the Israeli army invaded Lebanon and besieged Beirut. Together with the militarist elite in Israel, world imperialism headed by the USA believed that they had destroyed the PLO and dealt finally with the Palestinians.

An Arab saying goes: "They are of different minds in the palace and in the village." The invasion of Lebanon became the longest war fought by Israel. Its military strategy was aborted: it thought it could carry hostilities over to the enemy's territory and inflict a lightning defeat on him, as was the case in the previous quick actions that took only a few days or even hours. The siege of Beirut lasted 88 days. According to information available to the CIA, Israel suffered more casualties in Lebanon than in all other armed conflicts with Arabs.

More, despite the difficulties that the Palestinian revolution had to face after the forced withdrawal from Beirut — the attempts to create problems artificially in its ranks, and undermine the movement's unity from within — we and our Lebanese allies were able to fight an exceptionally effective and successful war of attrition in southern Lebanon. The Israeli Defence Minister Yitzhak Rabin acknowledged that the "Operation Peace for Galilee" of 1982 had failed (this was said in 1987, after a lapse of five years).

Unprecedented staunchness is being displayed by our people in the occupied territories. That which is to be observed there today is *mass rising in the true sense of the word*. At the close of June, for example, Arab residents of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, including those holding Israeli citizenship, staged a one-day protest strike with the motto "Day of Equality." This strike, involving 280,000 people, demonstrated the anger of the Arab people of Palestine at the oppression, enslavement, and racial discrimination practiced by the Israeli authorities against our people.

All the universities on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip were closed for several months. Israeli troops took them by storm, breaking into the campuses and killing and wounding. The events in the Al-Duheisha, Balata, Qalqiliya, Rafah camps and elsewhere are evidence, I repeat, of a real uprising. In the course of this uprising

Nov/Dec 1987

our people are reaffirming their unity and cohesion around their recognised leader, the PLO.

Similarly rugged courage is being displayed by the people living in the Palestinian camps in Lebanon. Some of these camps, for instance, Sabra and Chatila, have on several occasions been the scene of slaughter by the Israeli military and their surrogates. Regardless of the organisation to which they belong, all the people in these camps have fought and are continuing to fight shoulder to shoulder under the PLO banner.

This unity of the people in and outside the occupied territories has had a very beneficial effect on the situation within the ranks of the Palestinian revolution. The consolidation of Palestinian unity achieved at the 18th session of the Palestine National Council reaffirms that *our people are an integral entity, whether they live on occupied lands or in refugee camps, and that their leadership personified by the PLO is the instrument of revolutionary action*.

Note must be made of the considerable role played in this by our Algerian brothers and Soviet friends, who actively helped to unite the Palestinian contingents in the course of a long dialogue that took in various places — Algiers, Aden, Tripoli, Prague, and Moscow. Last year I spoke in Berlin with Mikhail Gorbachov, who expressed support for the efforts to consolidate the PLO ranks. Moreover, it was agreed that it was important to convene a conference on a Middle East settlement.

Later, during the visit of the French President Francois Mitterrand to the Soviet Union it was suggested that for this purpose there should be a preparatory committee consisting of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. This idea of holding a UN-sponsored international forum on the Middle East with the participation of the sides involved in the conflict, including the Palestine Liberation Organisation on a basis of equality with the others, as well as the permanent members of the Security Council was supported at the conference of heads of state and government of non-aligned countries in Harare and at the summit of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference in Kuwait. Earlier, it was upheld by the Arab summit in Casablanca. The EEC members adopted a statement declaring their interest in the search for the search for a Middle East settlement on the basis of the principles enunciated by them in the Venice Declaration, i.e., the realisation of the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination and PLO participation in an international conference on the Middle East. The need for such a conference has been repeatedly affirmed by the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community. The Soviet stand was clearly stated in the

joint communique on the results of the Moscow visit by a delegation of the PLO Executive Committee at the close of June. This communique says that the conference should be authoritative and its purpose should be the establishment of peace based on the UN Charter and relevant resolutions and on international law. Provision must be made for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab lands, including those of Palestine, and for the implementation of the inalienable rights of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine to return to their homes, to self-determination, and to the creation of an independent state.

Thus, despite the present difficult situation in our region, there is now for the first time an *actual international consensus on the question of an international conference on a Middle East settlement*. It should be borne in mind that, willy-nilly, the situation in the Middle East directly affects the destinies of the entire planet. The threat emanating from here is not confined to the region alone. Generally speaking, the Europeans and we are in one and the same boat — they are in the northern end and we in the southern. From the south our region also abuts on the borders of the Soviet Union. Any new Arab-Israeli war would inescapably undermine world peace.

In the face of the present consensus the US administration has likewise declared that in principle it agrees that there should be an international conference. But it has its own aim. It would like to use this forum as should be an international conference. But it has its own aim. It would like to use this forum as an umbrella for further outrages of the Camp David kind. Currently we are witnessing a US-Israeli plot to drag Jordan — again under the screen of an international conference — into a separate deal. Our people in the occupied territories have resolutely rejected this plot. A general Arab stand in opposition to it has begun to take shape.

We are therefore saying that there is an urgent need *to hold an Arab summit in the autumn of this year* in order to spike at Camp David No. 2 and not only to come to an agreement on convening an international conference (such agreement was already pledged in Casablanca) but also to draw up a joint plan of action at the conference with account of the new phenomena and changes in the Palestine situation and on the world scene.

The imperialists, the Israeli rulers and their surrogates in the region are seeking to undermine the success achieved at the 18th session of the Palestine National Council. It is being alleged that its outcome only complicates a Middle East settlement. Remember, the first

major decision passed at the session was to subscribe to the holding of a UN-sponsored international conference on the Middle East with the equal participation of all sides, including the PLO, and the permanent members of the UN Security Council. How does this decision complicate the search for a just, comprehensive, and lasting peace?

Also, under various pretexts attempts are being made to bribe Palestinians. This is the aim, above all, of the so-called "development plan" for the West Bank and the Gaza Strip to which the USA has so far contributed 44 million dollars. Israel is annually getting direct aid amounting to 3,700 million dollars and indirect aid on the order of another 4,000 million dollars. And here the sum is only 44 million dollars. Is that enough for a development programme? Of course, not. It is no more than a sop for making new Quislings among Palestinians.

This attempt will not work. There are no Quislings among our people. As I have already noted, they are today more closely united than ever before around the Palestine Liberation Organisation.

That is why I am optimistic. A bulwark of this optimism is also the stand of the friendly Soviet Union, which has put all its weight and prestige on the side of the Palestinian people's just cause. This cause has the support of all decent, freedom-loving forces of the world, the socialist community, non-aligned states, and African and Islamic countries, which have expressed solidarity with the people of Palestine, with the Arab nation in the face of hostile challenges.

Yasser Arafat was born in 1929 in Jerusalem. An engineer by profession, he is a graduate of Cairo University. He was active in the student movement and was one of the founders of the Palestinian Fatah organisation. He has been Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organisation and the supreme commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the Palestinian revolution since 1969.

*This conference opened on December 21, 1973, and was attended by representatives of the USSR and the USA, as co-chairmen, Egypt, Jordan, Israel, and the UN Secretary-General. — *Ed.*

†This statement recorded, in particular, the intention of the two sides to do their utmost to facilitate the resumption of the Geneva Conference not later than in December of the same year. — *Ed.*

‡Code name for the invasion of Lebanon. — *Ed.*

NEW THINKING ON SOVIET JEWS

By Jean Weisberger

By the time Natan Sharansky (the former Anatoly Sharansky) arrived in Columbus, Ohio at the end of November to recruit for the December 6 'Freedom Sunday for Soviet Jewry, it was apparent that the new mass thought patterns defined and analysed at the 24th Convention of the Communist Party USA were making themselves felt among Jewish-Americans.

"The arms negotiations are too important to say there must be a direct link between it and emigration," Sharansky said in an interview with the *Columbus Dispatch*. His attempt to soft-pedal the anti-disarmament, Cold War nature of the planned demonstration was clearly a response to the deep support for arms control among Jewish-Americans. Indeed, the so-called 'direct linkage' position had been repudiated by leading sectors in the Jewish community almost two years ago. When Morris Abram, Sharansky's neoconservative US mentor and head of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, had called for the demonstration to "make the point that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted on arms."

Abram's attempt to sabotage the arms control process was promptly rebutted by Jewish figures as conservative as Martin Peretz and Leon Wieseltier of *The New Republic*, who blasted Abram's proposal. "[W]hile Soviet Jewry is a terribly important matter, preventing nuclear war is more important by many orders of magnitude. . . . If there is a nuclear war, Jews are going to get burned just as quickly as the goyim," Wieseltier said. To Abram's fallback to an 'indirect linkage' argument, which holds that Soviet Jewish emigration is an issue of 'trust', and therefore an index of 'Soviet credibility', Wieseltier responded that he didn't "understand Abram's distinction between implicit and explicit linkage. . . . [I]f he wants to make (trust) conditional on Jewish emigration, that is linkage. . . . I think the organized Jewish community is showing a certain arrogance . . . of setting up purely Jewish interests as the be-all and end-all."

Nevertheless, it is clear that far too many Jewish-Americans were persuaded to participate in what was, despite their hopes, a Cold War rally designed to slow down the improvement of US-Soviet relations. This is not surprising; decades of anti-Soviet propaganda designed especially for Jews have left their mark, and there is little doubt that many of the participants were simply expressing a basic solidarity with a group of Jews who, they have been told, are oppressed. In this regard, it is

interesting to note that expectations of the turnout for the demonstration were being scaled back before the rally, and the campaign to win participants was conducted in a low-pitched (though high-pressure) fashion. Around the East Coast and the Midwest, the word was given out by organizers that the demonstration would refrain from anti-disarmament rhetoric, and that it was simply 'an opportunity for the Jewish community to come together.' The perceived need for such an approach was an indication of the declining level of anti-Sovietism among Jewish-Americans, and a corresponding rise in interest in the new processes under way in the USSR.

Of course, the processes of perestroika, glasnost and democratization are not to the liking of all Jews - especially the former refuseniks whose careers depend upon bellicose and extreme anti-Sovietism. Sharansky again attempted to set the tone in Columbus when he quoted an unnamed friend "still trapped in the Soviet Union" to the effect that "there is no glasnost for the people - it exists only in speeches and articles," following this outburst a few days later in the New York Times with the insinuation that General Secretary Gorbachev is a swindler. While a few Jewish emigres, such as Alex Goldfarb, have taken a more reasonable view, others have echoed Sharansky and even tried to outdo him; Ida Nudel, for example, saw fit to refer to "the black, anti-Semitic soul of the Soviet Union" in an interview given to the *Jerusalem Post* in November. For such 'champions' of human rights, the new thinking of the Soviet Union is simply a cause for alarm, if not outright panic.

For a growing number of US Jews, though, the implications of changes in the USSR are more intriguing, and these are being greeted by the beginnings of a wide-ranging reassessment of Soviet Jewish life and a growing rejection of the mainstream Zionist underpinnings of the Soviet Jewry movement. This reevaluation is just getting under way, and faces many obstacles, but it is worth examining in some detail in order to understand it and assess how best to encourage and reinforce the new trend.

It is not surprising that the clearest signs of these new thought patterns are visible in the progressive and liberal sectors of American Jewry. These circles are genuinely committed to nuclear disarmament, are the most suspicious of and alienated from the Soviet Jewry movement's leadership, are the least attached to the Zionist tenet of the centrality of Israel to Jewish life (and therefore less wed to the concept of emigration to Israel as the fulfillment of Soviet Jewish destiny), and are not ideologically committed to the portrayal of the USSR as

the 'Evil Empire.' Many fit Tunisian Communist Party General Secretary Mohammed Harmel's description of "those who are critical of some aspects of life in the USSR and its policies without being really anti-socialist." Some have long been independent of the Soviet Jewry movement, though most have accepted its portrayal of rampant anti-Semitism and institutionalized discrimination against Jews in the Soviet Union.

The troubling contradiction (from their point of view) between the role of the Soviet Union in the global struggle for peace and the need for better US-Soviet relations on the one hand, the Soviet 'oppression' of Jews on the other has led to a curious kind of dissonance in the writings of some of the 'rethinkers.' Nora Levin, professor of modern Jewish history at Oratz College and a frequent writer on the subject of 'Soviet anti-Semitism', gives evidence of this contradiction in a number of articles written this year. In "The Complex Reality of Soviet Anti-Semitism" (*Genesis 2*, Summer 1987), Professor Levin recites a highly contentious history, characterizing Soviet policy regarding Jews as one of "gyrations" and "tactical shifts." While acknowledging that "[i]t is, of course, possible to be anti-Zionist without being anti-Semitic," she asserts that "Soviet propaganda has to a large extent blurred the distinction." According to Levin, Soviet Jews face "obvious and growing discriminatory competition for advancement, while [n]ot all fields of endeavor are open to Soviet Jews." Interestingly, she provides no documentation of these serious charges, though it must be noted that this is far from unusual, even among academic authors.

What is new and more important, however, is Professor Levin's conclusion. "The main thrust of Western Jewish activity has been in behalf of emigration," she writes, and "[t]he tendency has been to write off the Jewish future of those who remain but I think this is a wrong judgment and a wrong strategy. . . ." Professor Levin suggests engaging in new thinking about old approaches and politics. I would briefly suggest three areas: 1) a re-examination of the Jackson-Vanik Amendment; 2) a new look at the question of giving the Soviet Union a role in Middle East peace talks; and 3) seeing if certain recent Soviet signals regarding the expansion of Yiddish might offer opportunities for utilizing Yiddish, or Russian, as an instrument of Jewish culture, instead of concentrating on Hebrew.

In another article, published in the *Philadelphia Jewish Exponent* in June, Professor Levin added a fourth recommendation - a study of the CPSU's 26th Congress documents, especially Gorbachev's remarks on national problems.

Levin's interest in the revival of Yiddish in the Soviet Union is shared by a number of writers. In the same issue of *Genesis 2*, Sid Resnick presented a summary of the growth in Yiddish publishing in the USSR, contending that it is a 'factor that needs to be reckoned with in any broader assessment of the Soviet Jewish situation.' Resnick has also been covering developments in Soviet Yiddish writing and education in the *Freiheit*. He correctly notes that Yiddish is, in fact, the language of a significant number of Soviet Jews, whereas the emphasis on Hebrew that has been a staple of the Soviet Jewry movement has clear ideological undercurrents that explain, if not (in his view) justify Soviet restrictions on this apparently benign interest.

Another important example of these steps toward a new approach to the Soviet Jewry issue is the work of New Jewish Agenda. At the "Solidarity Sunday" demonstration in New York this year, Agenda members distributed a statement which, after calling for the re-evaluation of visa refusals to long-term would-be emigrants (a process initiated by Soviet authorities almost a year ago), the assurance that private Hebrew teachers are covered by recent Soviet legislation on private employment, a more rigorous enforcement of prohibitions of anti-Semitic material, and the development of "the capacity of those Soviet Jews who so choose to more fully continue their Jewish heritage," went on to call for a "sober, realistic and comprehensive assessment of Soviet Jewish life."

The Agenda statement calls for respect [for] the wishes, self-identity and understanding of ALL Soviet Jews . . . we believe that exaggerated claims of a Soviet Jewish 'holocaust' abuse the memory of those who perished at the hands of the Nazis and exacerbate tensions rather than promoting the goals of pluralism, peace and open emigration. To fully support Soviet Jewry we must support the right of Soviet Jews to make their own choices. . . .

The statement goes on to charge that neither the Reagan Administration nor the Israeli government is motivated by human rights concerns. "For the Reagan Administration," NJA says, "our concern is a tool to be used in recruiting American Jews to the 'Evil Empire' approach to US-Soviet relations. For the National Unity Coalition in Israel, Soviet News represent potential Occupied Territories Settlers and a solution to Israel's skilled labor shortage."

(Part of New Jewish Agenda's approach to the issue was elaborated on by Mike Hirsch, a member of Agenda's Disarmament Task Force, at a meeting held in

September to commemorate Soviet Yiddish writers killed by Stalin's security service in 1952. According to Hirsch, "We must put Jewish values and a larger vision back into the Jewish movement," countering reactionary Jewish leaders who have "become real-politik schemers, appearing for photo opportunities with Ronald Reagan while he invokes war on Nicaragua." In the middle of Hirsch's speech comes a remarkable passage:

Demagogues use hyperbolic language in discourse that is meant to arouse and distort. Audiences make associations on the basis of their own values. 'Our struggle is the struggle for the biggest part of our nation that is in captivity,' Sharansky told an audience recently. Consider the wealth of ideological assumptions resonating in such a statement. The biblical allusion to 'captivity' and freedom through flight (deliverance equals emigration) is not lost on his listeners. But is emigration a reasonable or desirable option for all Soviet Jews? And what of those who choose to remain? The implication is that those who remain are quislings and collaborators. Stalin had a facile litmus test for who was a patriot and a Communist; now Sharansky has a litmus test for who is a Jew! We did not accept Stalin's test and American Jewry, even would Jewry, cannot accept Sharansky's.

Here Hirsch makes a critically important and, for much of the US Jewish community, a sorely-needed point - that the 'Jewishness' of Soviet Jews cannot be measured only by the extent to which they wish to leave their homeland or oppose socialism and Soviet power.

Hirsch subsequently presents in a condensed way the viewpoint of many of those who are engaged in the rethinking of the Soviet Jewry movement's aims and tactics. In this passage we see, in almost summary fashion, both the strengths and weaknesses of the new approach:

A reactionary emigre's values are not ours, but neither are they the values of millions of American Jews who rightly see that a problem exists and wish to help. If too many refuseniks line up with the Reagans and the Shultzes, it is nevertheless the values of fairness, decency and tolerance alluded to by the refuseniks that resonate with millions of American Jews. We need to broaden the message, to say much more than 'Let My People Go.' We cannot leave the good intentions of American Jews to the Cold Warriors.

We can, in fact we must, articulate the needs of Soviet Jews, supporting their right to emigrate or their right to remain and practice their religion and culture as they see fit. This does not obligate us to accept the world view of every emigre uncritically. We can support open emigra-

tion and insist that Jews be allowed to emigrate to any country that will have them - be it Israel, the US, or anywhere else. We must also be supporters and even spokespersons for those Jews, the overwhelming majority of Soviet Jews, who choose to stay. Lastly, our support for our sisters and brothers must be independent of the cold war. We are not chauvinists, and nuclear war or international tensions are not bargaining chips.

At this point, it is useful to recall some facts about Soviet Jewish life. While the re-evaluation of the Soviet Jewry movement is proceeding rapidly, and while its increasing emphasis on the "overwhelming majority" of Soviet Jews who have no desire to leave their homeland is salutary, much of the material that has been examined here continues to accept, implicitly or explicitly, the portrayal of Soviet Jews as unable to speak for themselves, and the charges of discrimination against Jews made by the Soviet Jewry movement.

This article is not the place to engage in a detailed analysis of Soviet Jewish life. Nevertheless, it is clear that the claims of discrimination have little basis in reality. Soviet Jews form an urban, highly educated, politically active, but statistically aging part of the multinational Soviet society. Despite some anecdotal evidence of individual cases of discrimination, there is little to suggest that Soviet Jews are barred from access to education, good jobs or political activity, or are subject to restrictions on religious practice that differ from those applied to other groups of believers.

Charges of discrimination, rather, are based upon a confidence in the historical amnesia of the Soviet Jewry movement's audience. Claims have been made, for example, of "growing discriminatory competition" (as Nora Levin says) with Jews in the universities for at least 30 years. Surely, if they were true, there would now be few, if any, Soviet Jewish university students! Yet this is clearly not the case. In fact, what figures exist show that the Jewish student population has remained relatively consistent both as a percentage of Jews, and in terms of absolute numbers when correlated with population trends. The declining proportion of Jews in the total student population cannot be taken as evidence of discrimination, for Jews are a declining component numerically of the Soviet population, and it is well known that the student body has been expanding as educational opportunities open up. The same holds true in skilled and professional employment - the charges of discrimination and declining Jewish participation have been made for years in the apparently well-justified belief that audiences are unlikely to recall the details in a few years' time.

This point was long ago acknowledged by a number of responsible western experts, two of whom, Alec Nove and J.A. Newth, wrote in *The Jews of Soviet Russia Since 1917* (1970) that the existence of discrimination "cannot be proved by any of the official statistics to which we have access. Endeavors to use these statistics for this purpose would expose the users to devastating and deserved counter-attack. The Jewish population is very heavily 'tilted' towards the professions, and its age-composition suggest that its total numbers must diminish statistically. . . ." Those who are engaged in rethinking the Soviet Jewry issue would do well to heed these words before accepting uncritically the distortions, exaggerations and outright falsehoods of the movement's leaders.

The 'new thinkers' are on their strongest ground when they call for the development of a greater variety of outlets for the expression of Jewish culture in the Soviet Union. Here their concerns echo those of many in the USSR. Indeed, it must be said that, while there are a growing number of vehicles for the preservation and expansion of Jewish culture within the Soviet Union, it remains to be demonstrated that these are adequate to fully meet the needs of Soviet Jews. It is likely that increased opportunities to study the history of Jews in the Soviet Union, the contributions that have been and are being made by Soviet Jews to the building of socialism, and a closer study of the problems that still remain for Jews would be eagerly welcomed by Soviet Jews. This is particularly true when the insufficiency of such opportunities may have helped to create some fertile ground for attempts to build such institutions on a more anti-Soviet, Zionist-based framework. It is also of some significance in light of the existence of such anti-Semitic organizations as Pamyat (Memory), which can be taken as indicative of problems in Soviet education and publicity on anti-Semitism and chauvinism, though the Soviet press has lately given ample space to strong criticism of the anti-Semitism of Pamyat leaders.

Having said this, it is necessary to once again firmly reject the calls for new varieties of 'cultural autonomy' that have recently been heard. Such positions, which were indirectly articulated at the same event at which Mike Hirsch of New Jewish Agenda spoke, amount to little more than a revival of Bundism. Readers are referred to Hy Lumer's excellent edition of *Lenin on the Jewish Question* for further details on the Bund and Lenin's polemics with the Bundists. Here I will only say that the type of approach prescribed by the neo-Bundists suffers from all of the defects pointed out by Lenin,

particularly in its likely effect of detaching Soviet Jews from citizens of differing national backgrounds, and, in Lenin's words, fostering "the spirit of the ghetto." In addition, there is an unhealthy strain of chauvinism in the desire to make Soviet Jewish issues and externally-measured 'progress' on them the litmus test of the depth of the new processes under way in the USSR.

How, then, should we assess this new trend? It seems clear that it is an essentially healthy process, one that challenges the myths and fables created and nourished by the Soviet Jewry movement's leadership, and likely to have the effect of strengthening the pro-disarmament, pro-peace sentiment of the Jewish-American community. We need to understand that the casting off of old habits and prejudices is a dynamic process, which calls for sharp tactical thinking and flexibility in determining how best to encourage the process and infuse it with a greater understanding of socialist reality. In discussing these questions, we must be able to clearly distinguish between those who are our friends, mistaken though they may be, and who are our enemies, maliciously motivated and uninterested in joining in a search for truth.

How do we make such an evaluation? One important way is to look at the activities of those with whom we are in dialogue. It can generally, though not always, be presumed that those who are active in the struggle for disarmament, for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East, demonstrably opposed to racism, and active in the fight against anti-Semitism in their own country are not helplessly entangled in the chains of anti-Sovietism, but rather are speaking out of a legacy of propaganda and misinformation. Indeed, it is possible to assert that if there is agreement that nuclear disarmament cannot be held hostage to Soviet emigration, and that the refuseniks and Soviet-haters are not the sole voice of Soviet Jews, then the rest may be up for discussion. The important thing is to work with these forces on concrete initiatives to improve US-Soviet relations, disarmament measures and remove the Soviet Jewish question from a Cold War framework.

As Gus Hall said in the CPUSA's 24th Convention report:

This is *not* the time to sit and examine our navels. This is not the time to be harping and carping about petty details, about abstract theory, whether each formulation in a resolution, article or speech is to everyone's liking. This is not the time for subjectivity, pettiness.

(Continued on page 20)

ANTI SEMITISM AND ZIONISM

Selected Marxist Writings
Edited by Daniel Rubin

Includes writings by Lenin, Henry Winston, Gus Hall, Herbert Aptheker Hyman Lumer and Lewis M. Moroze. Published by International Publishers, \$5.95. For J.A. readers \$5.00 including postage.

Zionist Tenet and the Right of Asylum

A young Jewish refugee, a 29 year old computer programmer from South Africa has been denied status as a refugee in England by a British court ruling.

This decision is bound to create a legal precedent not alone for Jews considering leaving racist South Africa but for other Jews seeking asylum.

The young South African has refused to serve in the South African army for political reasons and has, therefore, asked for refugee status in Britain.

He has already lived and studied in Israel but has rejected the idea of living there since he has no desire to serve in the Israeli army either.

In hearing the case the British court ruled that even though the 29 year old computer expert is, in fact, a refugee from South Africa, he is not entitled to obtain refugee status in England in view of the fact that Israel is his "first and natural country of asylum."

(Continued from page 18)

Our unique contribution, our Communist *plus*, has meaning only if we are riding the wave, only if we are involved, only if we take initiatives, only if we are in the struggles - if we are doers. Only then is thinking and talking truly revolutionary, when it leads to action.

This is a time for refreshing, for renewal. So, let's get out and mix it up! □

Jon Weisberger is active in the Jewish community, and has written frequently for *Jewish Affairs*.

Jewish Affairs

() Please enter my subscription for _____ year(s)
at \$6.00 per year

() Please renew my subscription.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Please find enclosed \$6.00 for a gift subscription for:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

פאר אנטוואָפּענונג און פּרילעקן צוזאַמענלעבן, אַפּוואָרפּנדיק די אַרטיק "גענאַסידן", וואָס פּאַרטנלעקן דעם האַרזאָנט פּאַר די האַפּענונגען פּון אַרגענטינער פּאַלק. וואָס די יורשים פּון פּאַרווער קאַנרעס האַלטן זיך ווי אומצושייבאַרע אַנטיילנעמער.

דער אַרגענטינער איקף איז שטאַלץ מיט זיין פּאַרווער אַפּשטאַם און אינטערפּרעטירט די רויע ווירקלעכקייט פּון דער פּאַרוואַנדלונג, פּון דער יידישער אַרגענטינער געמיינדע אין אַ טייל פּון נאַציאָנאַלן לעבן מיט איר אייגענלעכטער פּראָגרעסיווער פּירונג אין איינקלאַנג מיטן געדאַנק פּון די פּראָגרעסיווע טיילן פּון דער יידישער געזעלשאַפט היינט צו טאָג, וואָס ווערט געגעבן דורך דעם קאָמפּלעקס פּון אונדזרע אינסטיטוציעס און אין אירע מיליאָנטישע, סאַציאַלע פּאָליטישע אַקטיוויטעטן, אַן אירפּאָר און געלעגנהייט פּון מאַסן-אַנטייל, נישט אויסמיידנדיק, נאָר פּאַרפּעסטיקנדיק די קולטור-ירושא, וואָס ווערט אויסגעדריקט אין דראַנג פּאַר אַ כעסערע געזעלשאַפט און אַ באַפּרייטער מענטשהייט, פּונקט ווי עס האָבן דאָס געטאָן די איריפּנקלערטע שרייבער, אַרטיסטן, לערער און געזעלשאַפטלעכע טוער, וואָס האָבן זיך פּאַרזאַמלט אין די טעג פּון סעפטעמבער 1937.

די געדענקטע דאַרפן געבן אַ געלעגנהייט צו פּאַרשפּרייטן יעדעס וועגן אַפּשטאַם פּון איקף און זיינע פּאַרגייער, זייער לעבנס-וועג, אַדאַנק דעם בעקאוועדיקן אַרט, וואָס איז דערגיכט געוואָרן אין דער יידישער און אַרגענטינער געזעלשאַפט. ספּעציעל איז עס וויכטיק פּאַר דער ווייטערדיקער עקזיסטענץ פּון דער אַרגענטינער יידישער פּראָגרעסיווער באַוועגונג, וואָס איז אַנגעשלאָסן אין די נאָכעלע קאַמפּן פּון אַרגענטינע פּאַלק.

(Continued from page 10)

That circles the avenue,
That presses into the sidewalks of our generation.
The cry that knows no boundary,
That keeps all flags in gun-stilled splendor.

Can it be, this unity to storm against apartheid?
To salute a free South Africa?
To wrest racism out of the earth like cancer.
Can it be, after the conference, the hour to dream,
The hour to move!
We are pioneers in the valley of new decisions.
We are the shakers of a coming age.
When Man will grasp his neighbor's hand,
And eyes will meet in friendship and deed. □

Richard Davidson is a regular contributor to *Jewish Affairs*.

סוריווע: פארוי די שטאָט פון ליכט, די הויפטשטאָט פון פּאָלקספּראָנט.

"חברים און פריינט — האָט געזאָגט אין זיין דערעפענונגס-וואָרט ד"ר חיים סלאָוועס — אונדזער קאָנגרעס ווערט דערפונט אין איינע פון די טראַגישסטע מאַמענטן פון דער וועלט-געשיכטע. עס גרייט זיך צו אַ שלאַכט פון טויט און לעבן די וועלט פון פרייהייט און קולטור און די ציינשע קרויכעס פון פּאַשויס און כאַראַכטריע. אין שכיינעסדיקן לאַנד (שפּאַניע), דאָ און אייראָפע, ווי די ווייטע געבעטן פון אַזיע, האָט זיך שוין אָנגעצווּנדן דער פינצטערע מלחמה-פּיער, וואָס דראָט אַרומצונעמען די גאַנצע ערד.

ער האָט וויביריט דאָס פּלאַם יקע וואָרט פון כאַשעוון זאָקן קאַמען רעָלאָן: "רעכט און ישוער זיינע אונדזער אייביקע געצייג, מיט וועלכע מיר וועלן דערגרייכן דעם פּראָגרעס פאַר דער מענטשהייט. עס איז דעריבער נאַטירלעך, וואָס מיר שטעלן זיך קעגן די זעלבע סאַגים, די זעלבע פינצטערע קרויכעס וואָס טראַגן אַיצער דעם נאַמען פּאַשויס. נאַציוס מיט זייערע "דוטשעס" און "פירערס", וואָס באַדראָען, די וועלט מיט זייערע שוועס. איינעם וועלן מיר צעשטערן די נעץ, אין וועלכע זיי ווילן אַרייננעמען דער גאַנצער מענטשהייט."

אין דער לענג פון די סעסיעס אין וועלכע עס האָבן אָנטייל גענומען די בעסטע פּאַרשטייער פון דער יידישער קולטור פון 25 לענדער, איינגעשלאָסן אָרגענטינע מיט דער פיגור פּינע קאַץ, האָט זיך אָפּגעשפּיגלט דער באַוואוסטזיין אַז די פעלקער פון דער וועלט מיט די יידישע קאָלעקטיוויטעטן דאַרפן זיך אייניקן אין קאַמף קעגן דעם אַנוואַקסנדיקן אַוואַנס פון נאַצי־פּאַשויס. דאָס פּאַרטיידיקן די פּאָלקס־עטענצן פון דער יידישער קולטור איז געווען בלוטיק געבונדן מיט דער שאַפונג פון אַן אייזערנע פּראָנט קעגן דעם שוידער, וואָס איז פּאַרקלאַמירט געוואָרן אין די דייטשישע און איטאַלענישע הויפטשטעט, וואָס האָט געפּאַדערט אַ ריכטיקע, אַרענטאַציע אָף די געבויטן פון ליטעוואַרע, מוזיק, מאַלעריי און דערצינג. וואָס ווערן אויסגעוויקלט דורך פּאַרשיידענע כאַראַקטעריסטיקעס אין די געהערקע צענטערס אין וועלכע אינטעלעקטואַליטעט איז געווען געבונדן מיט דער צייט.

די פּאַרזאַמלונג פון דער שפּעצער, בויער און פּאַרשפּרייטער פון דער יידישער פּאָלקס-קולטור אין דעם טראַגישסטן מאַמענט פון אַלע צייטן האָט געדאַרפט איבערצייגן מיט די לויטערסטע אידעאלן וועגן די גלייכע רעכטן פאַר אַלע מענטשן פּראָגרעס און אווילזיין און האָט געמאַכט אַ קאַטעגאָרישן הייסן רוף: "דאָס יידישע פּאָלק איז פּאַרפאַנעטעט אין זיין ווילן צו לעבן. אַ יידישע פּאָלק, אַ יידישע אַרבעטער-מאַסן

זיינען דורכגעדרונגען מיט די כאַלוימעס פון אַ באַפרייער וועלט, מיט אַ סיסטעם פון סאָציאַלן יוישער מיט דער זיכערקייט צו דערהויבן דעם מענטש פון דער צוקונפט און די פעלקער אָף אַ העכערער שטופּע."

נאָכן סוף פון דער קאָטסטראָפּאַלער צווייטער וועלט-מלחמה, ווען עס זיינען פאַרניכטעט געוואָרן די דינאַמישסטע קולטור-צענטערס פון יידישן פּאָלק, איז פאַר די לעבנסגעבליכענע געמיינדעס געשטאַמען די אויפגאַבע צו געבן אַ דיאַלעקטישן המשך פאַר דער קולטוק, פאַר וועלכע עס האָבן געוואָרט די קאָנגרעס-לייט פון פּאַרוז מיט אַ האַלבן יאָרהונדערט צוריק.

אזוי אַרום האָבן די אָרגענטינער געמיינדעס, אירע יידישע פּאָלקס־סעקטאָרן מיט דער שייין פון יענעם אינטערנאַציאָנאַלן צוואַנגענענאַר, זיך געשטעלט די נאָכעלע אַבער זייער שווערע אריפגאַבע, פּאַרצוועצן די שפּערישע אַנשטרענונגען צו פּאַרשפּרייטן די שייין פון דער יידישער קולטור אין נייע היסטאָרישע קאָנדיציעס. עס האָבן אין דעם אָנטייל גענומען די אַלטע און נייע דוירעס, די וואָס האָבן געקרייט דעם אַקעצן און די וואָס זיינען שפּעטער דאָ געבוירן געוואָרן. אַפּהיטנדיק זייערע פּראָעלעטאַרישע טראַדיציעס האָבן זיי צוגעטראָגן זייערע סאָציאַלע, קולטורעלע און דערצייערשע טעטיקייט פאַר דער צוקונפט פון זייער נייע פּאַטערלאַנד.

דער רעזשעטער אייקווי־קאָנגרעס האָט אָנגעצייכנט די ריכטליניעס פאַר זיין עפּאָכע — פּאַרטונקלט מיט דער סרייפּע, וואָס אירע קלאַר־זעוועדיקע דענקער האָבן פאַריסגעזאָגט. אַסאך האָבן זיי נישט געוואָלט הערן, זיי האָבן אַלצייכנס פּאַרענדיקט אין אַש. די זעלבע ליניע גייט אָן ביז היינט צו טאָג. די קאָנגרעס-מענטשן פון 37-טן יאָר זיינען געווען גערעכט אַריבער דער טראַגעדיע. זייער געדאַנק באַהערשט די היינטיקע טרייע און קאָנסעקוענטע נאַכגייער, וואָס האָבן געמאָכט פון די פינף אַרצענדליקער אַרץ אין אָרגענטינע געוואָרנט אין זייער אַלטן זיך אַריינגעוואָרפן אין אַנטי־פּאַשיסטישן קאַמף: שפּעטער אָרגאַניזירט און דורכגעפירט סאַלידאַרישע אַקציעס מיט די פעלקער, וואָס האָבן געפירט די אַנטינאַצישישע מלחמה. זיי האָבן באַגריסט און געשטיצט די שאַפונג פון דער ישראָל-מדינה, זיינען געווען איבערגעגעבענע פּאַרשפּרייטער פון קולטור און אַל צייטן, האָבן געוואָלטן הויך די אידעאלן פון פרייהייט, שלום און פּראָגרעס אונטער אַלע באַדינגונגען, זיי זיינען געווען טרעגער אין קאַמף פאַר דעמאָקראַטיע און מענטשן-רעכט און זעצן פאַר דעם קאַמף אַויסצוטיילן די הומאַניסטישע ווערטן פון יידישן פּאָלק, פּאַרענדיק אַ יושערידיקן שלום אָפּן נאַנטן מורח אין אַכט נעמענדיק די נאַציאָנאַלע רעכטן פון יידישן און פּאַלעסטינער פּאָלק, טיילנדיק דעם וועלט-פּאַרלאַנג

אין פראַנקרייך

העכער 40 יאָר נאָך דער צווייטער וועלט־מלחמה זעט מען פאַר צו צעבלאָזן אַנטיסעמיטישע שטימונגען אין פראַנקרייך. — מערקט אָפּ די אַגענטור פראַנס פרעס אין אַ קאָמענטאַר, געוויימעט דעם וווקס פון אַנטיסעמיטיזם און דער אַקטיוויראַציע פון נעאַנאַציסטישע עלעמענטן אינעם לאַנד. סוואַסטיקעס אָף די ווענט פון סינאַגאָגעס, פּלוגבלעטלעך מיט באַליידיקנדיקע אויספאַלן אָפּן אַרעס פון די יידן, וואָס ווערן פאַרשפּרייט אין די ליציען, באַזונדערע אַנטיסעמיטישע אַקציעס — דאָס אַלץ קומט פאַר אינעם איצטיקן פראַנקרייך אין דער צייט, ווען אין ליאָן גייט דער פּראָצעס איבערן נאַציסטישן פאַרברעכער קלאַוס באַרכיע, — טיילט מיט די אַגענטור.

לויט די אַגענטען פון דער אַגענטור, ציילן איצט אָן אין פראַנקרייך העכער צוויי טויזנט פאַרערער פונעם פירער. וועלכע גייען אַרײַן אין באַשטאַנד פון פאַרשיירענע נעאַנאַציסטישע גרופּירונגען. זיי פאַפּאַגאַנדיין אַקטיוו מענטשנפּייטלעכע אידײַען, צעבלאָזן אַנטיסעמיטיזם, פרווון באַרעכטיקן די פאַרברעכנס פונעם פאַשיזם. ערעו דעם, ווי ס'האַט זיך אָנגעהויבן דער פּראָצעס איבער באַרכיע, זיינען אין אַ סאָך ליציען פון פאַריזש און פון אַנדערע שטעט, אין די לאַקאַלן פונעם לערער־פאַרײַן פאַרשפּרייט געוואָרן אַנאָימע פּלוגבלעטלעך, אין וועלכע עס זיינען אָפּגעלייבט געוואָרן די פאַקטן פון פאַריזשן יידן אין די היטלערישע קאַנצלאַגערן. אין דעם זעלבן טאָג איז דערשינען דער ערשטער נומער פונעם זשורנאַל "אנאַלן פון דער איבערגעקוקטער געשיכטע", אין וועלכן ס'איז צווישן אַנדערס פאַרעפנטלעכט דער אַפּוס פונעם טרויעריק־באַוווטן ראַבער פאַריסאָן, וועלכער האָט ניט לאַנג צוריק אַרויסגערופן שטורמישע פּראַטעסטן פון די דעמאָקראַטישע קרעפּטן פון פראַנקרייך אין צוזאַמענהאַנג מיט זיינע "וויסנשאַפטלעכע" ווערק, וווּ ער לייקט אָפּ די עקזיסטענץ פון די נאַציסטישע קאַנצלאַגערן. די

היטלערישע הענקער. און פרוווט ריינוואַשן די היטלערישע הענקער. פירער מיט אַ וואָך זיינען אָפּן פאַרטאַל פון דער סינאַגאָגע אין נאַנט אַנגעמאַלט געוואָרן אַ האַנקריי אין פּראַפּאַשיסטישע לאַזונגען. עס איז אויך פאַרשוועכט געוואָרן אַ ריי יידישע כעסאַלמענס.

"ווען די פּאָליציען האָבן מיך געפּרעגט, צי האָב איך חרטה וואָס איך האָב דערהאַרעט די קיינע. האָב איך געזאָגט "יא", ווייל אַנשטאַט האַרגענען איין יידישקע, וואָלט איך געקאָנט פאַריכטן אַ סאָך מער, אויפּרייסנדיק אַ באַמבע אין דער סינאַגאָגע" — אַזוי האָט געשריבן אין זײַן בריוו צו דער שוועסטער דער מיטגליד פון דער אולטראַ־רעכטער פאַרטיי "נאַציאָנאַלער פראַנט" ר. ליקענס.

מיט דריי יאָר צוריק האָט ער אין קאַן דערהאַרגעט די 75־יאָריקע א. סערף מיט צוועלף מעסער־שענער. ער האָט זי דערהאַרגעט, ווי ער האָט געזאָגט, דערפאַר, וואָס זי איז אַ יידישקע. ליקענס האָט דערקלערט דער פּאָליציי: "די יידן זיינען סאַנים פון דער ווייסער ראַסע, און איך וויל, אַז מיינע טאַטן זאָלן אַנטשפּרעכן מיינע אידײַען".

ביים דער אונטערזוכונג באַ אים אינדערהיים האָט די פּאָליציי געפונען נעאַנאַציסטישע ליטעראַטור, פּאַטאַגראַפיעס פון פאַשיסטן, צווישן דעם מערדערס קומירן זיינען געווען היטלער און זשורמ. לע פען, דער פּאַרויצער פונעם "נאַציאָנאַל פראַנט". אָף וויפל פראַנקרייך אַקטיוויזירן די אולטראַ־רעכטע קויכעס זייער טעטיקייט, שרייבט די לינקע "פרעסע, קאָן ניט דאָס, וואָס עס איז פאַרגעקומען אין קאַן, גישט זײַן קיין וואַרענונג וועגן דער געפאַר, וועלכע קומט פון די ראַסיסטישע טעזיסן.

זש.מ. לע פען דאַרף זײַן אָפּן געריכט אַלס אָן אידעס. אַ סך אַקוואַקאַטן פון ליאָן, וועלכע דאַרפן אַרויסטרעטן אָפּן פּראָצעס איבערן אַפּשיסטישן הענקער קלאַוס באַרכיע אַזאַן נאָמען פון די געליטענע, וועלכע באַקומען נעאַנאַציסטישע דראַונגען און אַפּלייקענונגען פון דעם, אז עס האָבן עקזיסטירט גאַזקאַמערן און גענאַציר.

האַלבער יאָרהונדערט פון אַרגענטינער "איקוף" — אידישער קולטור פאַרבאַנד

* * *

געדרוקט אין דער צייטונג "אונזער לעבן"
פון ב. אַירעס, דעם 20־סטן יולי, 1987

* * *

קאָנערעס — די אַרגאַניזאַציע, וואָס האָט שפּעטער געהייסן "יידישער קולטור פאַרבאַנד" אין אַ פּאַסיקער

מיט 50 יאָר צוריק צווישן 17־טן און 22־טן עפּטעמבער 1937 איז פאַרגעקומען דער ערשטער וועלט־

אין מייערעוו־דייטשלאַנד

די ישראלדיקע צייטונג "דרשערוואלעם פאסט" האָט מיטגעטיילט וועגן איינער אַ "דערפֿינדונג" פֿון אַ מייערעוו־דייטשישן פֿאַבריקאַנט, וועלכער האָט אַרויסגעלאָזט די ערשטע פֿאַרטיע פֿון אַן אייגנאַרטיקער טיש־שפּיל. אין דער "אַנאַטאָיע צו דער שפּיל ווערט אָנגעוווּן, אַז זי איז אויסגערכענט סיי פֿאַר קינדער, סיי פֿאַר דערוואַקסענע. ס'איז אַ גאַנץ פֿאַשטעטע שפּיל — אַ קוביק מיט ציפֿערן, אַ שפּיל־פעלד און פּישקעס. די "אייגנאַרטיקייט" באַשטייט אין דעם, וואָס אַפֿן פעלד זיינען אָנגעמאַלט... קאַנצענטראַציע־לאַגען און אַף די פּישקעס — יוּדן. עס שפּילט אויס יענער, ווער עס שיקט אָפּ אין די קאַנצעלאַגען וואָס מער פּישקעס...

אין דער דייטשישער פֿעדעראַטיווער רעפּובליק גייט אַ לעבֿהאַפֿטער אַנדל מיט דער דאָזיקן שפּילעכל...

אין שפּאַניע

די שפּאַנישע פּאָליציי האָט אַנטפלעקט אין דער באַרסעלאַנער סינאַגאָגע צען מינוט פֿאַרן אופֿרייס אַ באַמבע, וועלכע עס האָבן אונטערגעלייגט אומבאַוווּסטע פֿאַרברעכער. די באַמבע איז געווען אָנגעלאָרן מיט 10 קילאָגראַם טריניטראַטלאָולאַל.

אין טערקיי

ווי ס'איז שוין פֿריער געווען מיטגעטיילט, האָבן טערקישע נעאַפּאַשיסטן דורכגעפֿירט אַ בלוטיקע אַקציע אין אַרע טאַמבולער סינאַגאָגע "נעווע שוואַלם". מע גיט איבער, אַז כּעשאַס דער דינסט האָבן זיך אַהין אַריינגעריסן צוויי באַנדייטן, פֿאַרהאַקט די טיך, געצענט אַ שיסעריי, געוואָרפֿן גראַנאַטעס, אָנגעצונדן די דערמאַרדעטע און זיך אַליין אופֿגעריסן מיט "גראַנאַטעס. עס זיינען אומגעקומען 21 יוּדן.

אין איטאַליע

מיט העכער 20 יאָר צוריק האָט מען אין אַ דאָרף אין אַסטאַ (איטאַליע) אַנטדעקט די כּורוועס פֿון דער עלטסטער שול אין דער וועלט. מע האָט דאָרט אויך געפונען אַ מיקווע און אַן אויוון אָף צו באַקן מאַצעס. איצט האָט מען זיך דערוווסט, אַז כּוליאָגענס זיינען אָנגעפּאַלן אָף אַט די כּורוועס און זיי צעשעדיקט. עס זיינען צעשטערט געוואָרן אַ טייל פֿון די פֿאַרבליבענע ווענט פֿון דער סינאַגאָגע און קאַלאָגעס, אָף וועלכע עס זיינען געווען אויסגעקריצט יידישע סימבאָלן — אַ לולעוו, אַן עסרעע, אַ שופיער און עטלעכע מענוריעס.

די אַרכעאָלאָגישע רעליקויעס זיינען פּאַקטיש אַן אַן אופּזיכט. ווען די קעהילע אין רוים האָט זיך געווענדט צו דער איטאַליענישער רעגירונג, מע זאָל איר איבערגעבן די אופּזיכט איבער די יידישע קאַטאַקאָמבעס אין רוים. וועלכע זיינען אַלט העכער 2 טויזנט יאָר, האָט מען אין

קלוסק־קלאָן, און קנאַפע 3 טויזנט האַלטן זיך באַ דער גענעראַלער ליניע פֿון דער אַרגאַניזאַציע "אַרדענונג". אייניקע זיינען אָנגעקומען ווי באַבאַכטער, אזא איינעם, וועלכער איז געווען אָנגעטאָן אין אַ בלויער אויפֿאַך מיט אַ האַנטקרייץ־צייכן אָף דער כּרוסט, האָב איר געזען אינעם ערפֿאַרט ספּאַקאָן. ער האָט געזאָגט, אַז ער שטעלט פֿאַר די "אַנטיקאָמוניטישע ליניע פֿון וויסע אַמעריקאַנער אין דענווער. אַ ביז גאָר אומאַנגענעמע פֿאַר איז געקומען פֿון ענגלאַנד, דערקלערנדיק, אַז ווי שולען פֿאַר דעם "נאַציאָנאַלן פּראָגנאָ" (אויך) אַ נעאַנאַציסטישע אַרגאַניזאַציע). איבערגיין די גרענעץ האָט זיך אינגענעבן אַן ערעך 50 קאַנדער נאַציסטן.

אין קאַנאַדע

100 מאַצעכאוו זיינען אין איין נאכט אַפֿן סאוואַנ־כּסטלעם אין מאָנטרעאַל אומגעוואָרפֿן געוואָרן און 22 מאַציוועס האָט מען אין דער זעלבער נאכט איבערגעקערט אין יידישן טייל פונעם כּסטילעם אין מאָנ־ראַיאַל.

ס'איז אויך מיטגעטיילט, אַז זיבן געביידעס פֿון יידישע פירמעס זיינען באַשמירט געוואָרן מיט צייכן פונעם "באַפֿרייונגס־פּראָגנאָס פֿון קוועבעק". דער דאָיקער "פּראָגנאָס" אָן אַנטיסעמיטישע אַרגאַניזאַציע, איז שוין געווען פֿאַרמישט אין אַ צאָל אַנטיסעמיטישע אַקציעס פֿריער. די סינאַגאָגע אין קאַצענטלוק, אין דער פֿאַרשטאָט פֿון באַנטיקאָול, איז באַשמירט געוואָרן מיט האַנקנדיגן און מיט אַן אופּשפּריט אָף דער טיר "אַ טויט די יוּדן!" טערי לאַנג, דער פּרעזיקאַריקער פירער פונעם קאַנאַדער צווייטן פֿון דער אויגעריפֿענער "קירכע פֿון דער אַרשער נאַציע", האָט געמאַלדן אַז ער וועט עפענען אין דער זעלבער פּראָווינץ אַ לאַגער אָף זיין פּרעזעלעכער פּערמע, וואָס געפינט זיך 120 מייל פֿון קאַלאַרי. דער לאַגער דאָרף זיך גרייט און האַרבסט 1987 און וועט האָבן אַ באַראַק פֿאַר 20 מענטשן. דאָ וועלן פֿאַרקומען איבונגען פֿון די אַנטיילנעמענער אין דער "קירכעס"־פּילאָסאָפּיע.

קריסטלעכע רעליגיעזע פירערע זיין קאלגאוי האָבן דערקלערט, אַז זיי וועלן אויפֿהייבן אַ קאַמף קעגן לאַנגס לאַגער. דער פּרעזידענט פֿון דער יידישער פּעדעראַציע אין ערמאַנאָן (אַלבערט) דורשדיט גאַלסעד האָט געזאָגט, אַז זיי יידישע קעהילע זיך נישט באַמינן אַפּצושטעלן די כּורוונ פונעם לאַגער. אַלבערט דאָרף אָבער באַוווּן, האָט זי אָפּגעמערקט, אַז די דאָזיקע מענטשן "זיינען נישט געוונטשענע". אַ פֿאַרשטייער פֿון דער גענעראַלער אַרוואַקאָטן־אַגענטור ווייווד מליקן אַצט צוגעזאָגט דורכפֿירן אַן אויספֿאַרשונג, קעזיי פּעסטצושטעלן, צי לאַנג קלייבט זיך אַרגאַניזירן מיליטערישע איבונגען אין זיין לאַגער.

אַלע דיסקוטירן אַרום די פּלענער פונעם נעאַנאַציסט, נאָר קיינער אין קאַנאַדע שטעלט אים דערוויליג נישט אָפּ...

וידוע ענינים

דער אַנטיסעמיטיזם אין

די מיירעוורלענדער

זעצט פאַר צו בושעווען

געדרוקט אין מאַסקווע "סאָוועטיש-היימלאַנד" סענטיאַבער 1987 (געקירצט)

זיען אַרײַן אין זײַערע רײַען די פאַרמערס. אַט פאַרוואָס זײ זײַנען אזױ געפערלעך.

די באַוועגונג פון די נעאַנאַציסטן פאַרברײטערט זיך. עס האָט זיך אױסגעבילדעט אַ צױלער צױיג פון באַטלערס אַרגאַניזאַציע — "אַרײַשע נאַציעס" (אין דעם פּאַל גײט אַ רײד וועגן "רײַנע אַנגלאַסאַקסן). אין דעם אַלטן וואַלד-ישעוּ האָבן די נעאַנאַציסטן צױשן סאַטנע-בײַמער אױסגעבױט פון האַלץ און רײפּלירטן אײון אַ שטאַב קוואַרטיר, ענלעך אָף אַ פּעסטונג. אײנצײטיק האָט זיך אַקטױוויזט אַ נײַע גרופּע קעמפּער פאַר "אַ וױסער, נײַט סעמיטישער אױבערמאַכט". צו וועלכער ס'האַבן זיך פאַרײַנקט די קירקלוקס-קלאַ און די אַמעריקאַנער נאַציסטישע פאַרטיי פונעם פאַרשטאַרבענעם לײַקאַל ראַקעל.

צױשן די גרױסע גרופּעס אָפּן שטיל-אַקעאַנישן צאַפּן-מײדעוּ, וועלכע אַרבעטן זיך אונטער באַטלערן, דאַרף מען אָפּמערקן די אַרגאַניזאַציע "אַרדענונג". די דאָזיקע עקסטרעמיסטישע גרופּירונג אױז גענרינדעט געוואָרן אין 1982 בראַש מיטן אײַצט שױן פאַרשטאַרבענעם ראַבערט מעטיוּ. אױ ציל אױז די זעלבע, ווי באַ באַטלערן, — אַרױסרײַבן פונעם "אומבאַפּעלקערטן ראַיאָן" אלע יידן, נעגערס, אײנדיאַנער, כײנעזער און אַנדערע "נײַט-אַרײער" און שאַפן אַ טעריטאָריע בלױז פאַר וױסע אַרײער.

זײ זײַנען זיך צונױפגעפּאַרן פון גאַנץ אַמעריקע אױף אױטאַבוסן און אױטאָמאָבילן, אױף אַראַפּלאַנען און אין צוגן — מיטגלידער פון פאַרשידענע באַוועגונגען "פאַר אױבערמאַכט" מיט וועלכע עס וועט קאַמעדעווען דער פּאַסטאַר באַטלער.

(אין אַ פאַרשונג, וואָס אױז געמאַכט געוואָרן נײַט לאַנג צוריק, ווערט געזאָגט, אַז די אַלגעמײנע צאַל מיטגלידער פון אַזעלכע אַרגאַניזאַציעס גרײכט כײַז 10 טױזנט. די מערהײט געהערן צו פאַרשידענע אַפּאָוויגן פון קר-

אין די פאַרײַניקטע שטאַטן

מיטגלידער פון קירקלוקס-קלאַ און אַנדערע אַנטיסעמיטן האָבן אין דעם שטעטל הײדן-לײק (שטאַט אײראַכאַ) דורכגעפירט אַ נעאַנאַציסטישן פאַראַד מיט פּאַנען פון דער ווערמאַכט. מיט האַנקרײצן אױף די אַרעמבענדער, פאַדערנדיק צו באַזײטיקן די "דעגירונג פון ציעמיטישער אַקופּאַציע" אין די פאַרײַניקטע שטאַטן. דער צוואַמענוקס אױז באַצײכנט געוואָרן אַלס "וועלט-קאַנגרעס פון די נעאַנאַציסטן". פאַרײַנקונג פון אַרײשע נאַציעס", וועלכע האָט געפאַדערט צו שאַפן אין דאָזיקן ראַיאָן אַ "נאַציאָנאַלע הײם" פאַר וױסע אונטער דער הערשאַפט פון מאַנבלען.

דער "וועלט-צוואַמענפאַר" אױז פאַרגעקומען אין די גיטער פונעם גאַלעך רײטשטייט באַטלער, אַ געוועזענעם אױיאַ-אינזשעניער, וועלכער שטייט בראַש פון דער קירכע "עזרס קריסטוס". אין אַן אײנטערווױז פאַר דער צײטונג "נײַראַק טײמס" האָט באַטלער דערקלערט, אַז די מיטגלידער פון דער באַוועגונג "פאַרײַניקונג פון אַרײשע נאַציעס" וועלן זיך נײַט אָפּשטעלן, כײַז זײ וועלן נײַט דערגרייכן זײַער ציל. הײדן-לײק ווילן זײ קרױנען פאַר דער הױפּט-שטאַט פונעם קונפּטיקן וױסן סווערענעם נאַציאָנאַלן שטאַט פון אַמעריקע, ווױזן מע וועט קענען אױפּפאַרן בלױז האַבנדיק אַ ספּעציעלן פּאַסט. פון דאָרט וועט מען אַרױספירן אָף העליקאָפּטערע (אַדער אַראַפּוואַרפן פון זײ) אלע אומגעוונטשענע "נײַט-אַרײער". — "הײל, וויקטאָריע!" — האָבן די נעאַנאַציסטן געשריגן. — האָב ליב אַמעריקע! האַרגע די יידן! אַ טױט די נעגערס!

פּאָליטיש קאָן מען זײ נישט אופּנעמען ערנסט, — זאָגט מײרע באַלענד פון וואַשינגטאָן, וועלכע פאַרנעמט זיך מיט שטודירן די באַוועגונג פון די אַמעריקאַנער עקסטרעם-רעכטע. — זײ ווערברין אַבער גיך אַנהענגער.