

JEWISH AFFAIRS

25¢

Vol. 2, Nos. 10-11

October-November 1971

CONTENTS

Editorials

- | | |
|---|----|
| <u>How Not to Fight for Angela Davis</u> | 1 |
| <u>The Case of the Cuban Jews</u> | 2 |
| Phil Honor, <u>The Strange Case of Dr. Sneh</u> | 4 |
| Sol Flapan, <u>Folks-Shtimme's 25th Birthday</u> | 9 |
| <u>Actions by the Committee for a Just Peace
in the Middle East</u> | 11 |
| <u>The Israeli Delegation to the USSR</u> | 15 |
| <u>Statement of the Delegation</u> | 16 |
| <u>On the Return of the Good-Will Delegation
from the Soviet Union</u> | 17 |
| Nathan Yalin-Mor, <u>Improvement in Relations
with the Soviet Union Depends on Israel</u> | 19 |

Communications

- | | |
|--|----|
| David Fried, <u>Blinded by National Chauvinism</u> | 21 |
| <u>Events and Views</u> | 23 |

Published by the Communist Party, U.S.A., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010
Editorial Committee: DAVID FRIED, JACK KLING, ALEX KOLKIN

HOW NOT TO FIGHT FOR ANGELA DAVIS

In our January issue we carried an article by Lee Carr which dealt with the disturbing rise of racism within the Jewish community and its expression in the virtually total boycott of the Angela Davis case. Subsequently the West Coast progressive weekly People's World reprinted it on February 13 under the head "Anti-Semitism and Angela's Case."

It was hoped that the article would inspire its readers to do battle against this reactionary trend. But in certain quarters it appears to have had quite a different effect.

A number of months later the Morning Freiheit carried a story headed "Angela Davis and the Jewish Community." It was written by Mr. Sid Resnick, self-appointed guardian of Jewish purity, who takes Lee Carr severely to task. Why, he asks, does Mr. Carr single out the Jews, thus creating the impression that of all ethnic groups the Jews are the worst offenders? And why does he deal with the Jews in such harsh terms instead of displaying patience and trying to win them over?

His voice finds an echo in the October issue of Israel Horizons, organ of Americans for Progressive Israel-Hashomer Hatzair--the "socialist" wing of the Zionist movement. An editorial entitled "The Jews and Angela Davis" also asks why Carr singled out the Jews. And it adds: "This, to us, smacks of primitive anti-Semitism in which Jews are singled out for blame in situations not of their making."

Both Mr. Resnick and the editors of Israel Horizons protest their devotion to the cause of Angela Davis. And both accuse the Communist Party of doing harm to her case. "Help Angela Davis?" says the editorial. "Yes, in spite of the crudities and stupidities of her own party."

Now, one would think that a growth of racism within the Jewish community would arouse concern among Jewish individuals who consider themselves to be progressive and socialists, and would lead them to speak out against it. But no, they express concern only over the seeming singling out of Jews for criticism, as if the existence of racism elsewhere makes it somehow less reprehensible among Jews. Moreover, where should Jews fight against racism if not among their fellow Jews? And finally, there is a special problem in the Jewish community, namely, the pernicious influence of the racist concepts of Zionism. This leads to equating the anti-Zionism which is widespread among Black Americans with anti-Semitism and the launching of a campaign against so-called "Black anti-Semitism" as the main threat to the Jewish people, a campaign whose most blatant exponents are the fascist gangsters calling themselves the "Jewish Defense League."

Have either Mr. Resnick or the editors of Jewish Horizons ever spoken out against this fraudulent charge of "Black anti-Semitism"? Not at all; on the contrary, there is every reason to believe that they consider it as valid, that they,

too, equate anti-Zionism with anti-Semitism and look upon Black militants as enemies of the Jewish people. There is every reason to believe that they, too, have boycotted the Angela Davis case.

To be sure, they both protest their devotion to the cause of her freedom. Says Resnick: "Ideas and programs to gain support for Angela Davis among Jews and non-Jews are to be welcomed." Says the Israel Horizons editorial: "Americans must rally to her cause, whatever they think of her politics, to see to it that there is no frameup and another miscarriage of justice." But one can search in vain in the copious writings of Mr. Resnick or in the pages of Israel Horizons since the inception of the case for any serious expression in defense of Angela Davis--indeed, for any expression at all.

Hence their complaints that the Lee Carr article does damage to the cause of Angela Davis are sheer hypocrisy. They themselves do nothing in her defense and they resent criticism of the Jewish Establishment for its boycott of the case. One can only conclude that they, too, are affected by the same racist influences.

True, Mr. Resnick points to an ad in the California Jewish Voice of Los Angeles on May 24, signed by 24 Jewish progressive leaders and activists, in behalf of Angela Davis. To this may be added the more recent ad of the Jewish Committee for a Fair Trial for Angela Davis, mentioned elsewhere in this issue. But these are mere drops in the ocean, the barest beginnings of a fight in the Jewish community for the freedom of Angela Davis. Such a fight can be made a reality only by combatting the alarming growth of racism in the Jewish community and only by rejecting the hypocritical protestations of the "progressive" Sid Resnicks and the self-styled "socialist" Zionists.

* * *

THE CASE OF THE CUBAN JEWS

Soviet Jews, it is alleged by the anti-Soviet slanderers, want to leave the Soviet Union because they are denied access to Jewish culture and are forbidden to propagate Zionism. The August 1971 issue of World Jewry, organ of the World Jewish Congress, contains an article by Lavy Becker ("Cuban Jewry Today") in which he speaks by contrast of the freedom of Cuban Jews "to live a full Jewish live." He writes:

Before the revolution the 12,000 Jews in Havana (there were an additional 2,000 spread throughout the country) had five synagogues (one of them in the form of a community center); a day school for some 600 children; rabbis, cantors and teachers. Their Yiddish writers and poets had a following throughout the world. It was a strongly Zionist-oriented community and played its part in world Jewish affairs as a member of the World Jewish Congress.

What is the situation since the revolution? Becker says:

In the light of the Soviet Union's campaign against Zionism, it is remarkable that the Jews of Cuba are free to carry on any and all Zionist activities they wish. They are permitted to have a meeting hall, offices, library and archives in a downtown location.

There is no longer a separate Jewish school, Becker reports, and the building has been nationalized by the Cuban government. But the Jewish children who remain (the number has been greatly reduced by emigration), instead of attending schools in their neighborhoods, "are kept together in this one school so that they can receive an extra two hours a day of instruction in Jewish studies, taught by three teachers whose salaries are paid by the government."

The five synagogues are still open and are kept going despite reduced membership by rental fees from the government for the use of their halls.

In the face of this presumably ideal situation, it is all the more remarkable that the overwhelming majority of Cuba's Jews have left the country since the revolution. Today, according to Becker, only about 1,400 Jews remain in Havana and another 450 in the rest of Cuba. And those who have left have mainly gone not to Israel but to the United States.

How is this exodus to be explained? Why is it that more than 12,000 Jews had found it possible to live under the bloody dictator Batista but found it impossible to live in a socialist Cuba? Clearly the reasons were not national or religious oppression. There can be only one other answer. The emigration was motivated by economic considerations, by class factors. These were in the main petty-bourgeois elements--businessmen, professionals and others to whom socialism represented only an obstacle to their continuing personal enrichment. They could do better in a capitalist society.

This raises some interesting questions. Of the Jews who left Poland (few of whom went to Israel), how many were similarly motivated? And of the small but noisy minority in the Soviet Union who make such a clamor about wanting "to live as Jews," how many are really animated by a desire to live as wealthy Jews?

Of course, such an outlook is not at all peculiar to Jews. It reflects the mentality of the petty bourgeois, of the small producer who seeks to become a big producer, of the small businessman who seeks to become a big businessman, and who finds such bourgeois ambitions thwarted in a socialist society. Its expression among Jews is distinguished only by the attempts to cloak it in the self-righteous garb of fleeing anti-Semitism.

THE STRANGE WORLD OF DR. SNEH *

By Phil Honor

The disruptive activities of the Israeli revisionist group--Maki--have a twofold aim.** The leaders of the splinter-group viciously attack the international Communist movement which has rejected them. Determined to provoke dissension in Communist ranks, they align themselves with and support renegade cliques wherever they come to the surface. The Communist parties which are in the forefront of the struggle against the aggressive, expansionist policies of the Israeli rulers, and which call upon the people of Israel to repudiate the reactionary concepts of Zionism and to reach a just and secure peace with their Arab neighbors, are being maligned by Dr. Sneh and his collaborators as "anti-Semites."

The extent of Sneh's chauvinism is evident in an article by him in the September 1970 Information Bulletin of Maki, entitled "When Will Rakah Rejoice?" While the main thrust of this virulent writing is aimed at the Communist Party of Israel, Dr. Sneh cannot miss his "golden opportunity" to attack the Soviet Union and direct his poisonous arrows at some other parties, among them the Communist Party, U.S.A. and the Communist Party of France.

On the Soviet Union we find in his article the following gem: "The bacilli of pan-Arab chauvinism which were adopted by the huge laboratory of Soviet propaganda, out of considerations of power-domination, for the purpose of fermentation and dissemination, have brought the epidemic of hatred of Israel to both shores of the Atlantic Ocean."

In his attack on the CPUSA Sneh quotes single sentences and cut-off passages out of context in order to distort their meaning. He quotes a sentence from a statement on the Middle East issued by the CPUSA on April 9, 1970, and draws conclusions which are a direct opposite of the position of the U.S. Party in relation to Israel and the question of peace in the Middle East and Asia.

*The following is an excerpt, in English translation, from a pamphlet in Yiddish now in preparation.

**In 1965 a split occurred in the Communist Party of Israel. Rakah, which adheres to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and is leading the struggle against the Zionist imperialistic policies of the Israeli ruling circles, is recognized by the international Communist movement as the Communist Party of Israel. Its leaders are Meir Vilner and Tawfiq Toubi.

The revisionist-chauvinist grouping, Maki, gives its full support to the aggression of the Israeli government. The chairman and principal spokesman of this group is Dr. Moshe Sneh. Its general secretary is S. Mikunis.

Sneh writes: "So Israel is threatened with ruin and the Jewish members are threatened with expulsion from the CPUSA if they won't join the holy ideological struggle against the materialistic--Zionist--Israeli aggression." This accusation is a wanton distortion of the truth. The statement of the CPUSA emphasizes:

Our Party approaches the conflict in the Middle East from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint of proletarian internationalism. We stand for the rights of all states in the Middle East, including Israel, to exist in peace, security and freedom. This has always been our position. By the same token, we stand for the right of self-determination of the Palestinian Arab people, whose exercise demands in the first place, a just solution of the refugee question.

As we see, the statement stresses Israel's right to exist as a sovereign state. At the same time the Jewish comrades are called upon to intensify their fight against bourgeois nationalism, urging them in the name of Communist discipline, to place themselves in the forefront of this struggle. The "threat of expulsion" of which Dr. Sneh speaks is purely a product of his imagination.

Unabashed, Sneh proceeds from one fabrication to another. He quotes another sentence from the statement, distorts its meaning completely and accuses the CPUSA of fostering the concept that the state of Israel has been established as a "racist-Zionist" state. He quotes the following excerpt: "An end to equation of the concept of the State of Israel with the racist Zionist concept of a Jewish state." Dr. Sneh is enraged by this sentence. He states:

And I was not aware that a Jewish state is a "racist Zionist conception." I recall the resolution of the U.N. General Assembly of November 29, 1947, stating that a Jewish state is to be established in Palestine and, relying on this resolution, a Jewish state was proclaimed on May 15, 1948. . . . I recall that the Soviet Union. . . was one of the members of the United Nations that supported the establishment of a Jewish state. . . .

*

A careful reading of the full passage of the CPUSA statement, from which the sentence that enraged Dr. Sneh has been maliciously extracted, will show that the "theoretician" of Maki is guilty of a monstrous lie. The truth is that the CPUSA calls upon its Jewish members to conduct an educational campaign against the imperialistic ideology of Zionism and to intensify the struggle against the aggression of the Israeli government, which has adopted the reactionary, racist program of international Zionism--a program which is against the best interests of the people of Israel and could endanger the very existence of the Jewish state. We read in the statement of the CPUSA:

"Communists must be in the forefront of all these struggles. Jewish Communists in particular are called on to lead the fight against the policy of making Israel a tool of imperialism, against the aggressive actions of Israel's rulers. It is necessary to work among the Jewish people in this country and among the people of the U.S. generally, to achieve the following ends:

"1. Reversal of present Israeli foreign policy; abandonment of annexationism; acceptance of the U.N. resolution in its entirety (which means agreement to withdraw from the occupied territories), thereby opening the doors to implementing the resolution.

"2. Exposure of the poisonous ideology of Zionism in the eyes of the Jewish masses and destruction of its influence among them. An end to equation of the concept of the State of Israel with the racist Zionist concept of a Jewish state.

"3. Development of an all-out fight against the slanderous attacks on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

"4. A struggle against the Zionist-rooted policy of soft-peddling the fight against anti-Semitism in the United States and the launching of an all-out militant campaign against anti-Semitism. Condemnation of the so-called Jewish Defense League and a fight to end its fascist-like hoodlum activities.

"5. A campaign against the rise of racism and chauvinism among sections of the Jewish people."

As can easily be seen we do not find in the statement a shred of evidence to substantiate Dr. Sneh's calumnious accusations that the CPUSA identifies the state of Israel with a "racist-Zionist state." The fact is that the Party urges the Jewish masses to resist the rulers of Israel who seek to impose their Zionist-racist ideology on the Israeli people. It is they who equate Israel to a Zionist-racist state.

Sneh goes still further in his falsifications. He states, "The leadership of the CPUSA demands that its Jewish members start an active struggle against their conception of the State of Israel as a Jewish state because this is a racist-Zionist idea, God forbid." This accusation is just as fallacious as are his previous slanders. From the quotations presented here in full, without distortions, it is obvious that the CPUSA fully supports the existence of Israel as an independent state in the Middle East, with secure borders. This approach is based on the principle of the right of self-determination for the Jewish people as well as to the Palestinian Arab people. In line with this position, the CPUSA opposes, as do all other Communist parties, the aggressive policies of the Israeli ruling circles, which can only bring disaster to the people of Israel.

Sneh has bogged down so deeply in the quagmire of chauvinism that he considers every opposing viewpoint to the annexationist-reactionary political line of the Israeli rulers as an expression of anti-Semitism. He has brazenly retreated from positions of class struggle to bourgeois class lines and he has lost long ago his ability to differentiate the Israeli rulers from the masses of Israel.

*

Dr. Sneh follows up his irresponsible attack on the CPUSA with an equally ignoble assault on the Communist Party of France. He applies the same technique. For example, he quotes a sentence from a speech by the French Communist leader Roland Leroy and mutilates its meaning.

Addressing a conference of Jewish Communists in Paris in May 1970, Leroy said: "For the benefit of the French people, for the benefit of the Israeli people itself, for the benefit of world peace, and naturally for the benefit of Jews all over the world, it is imperative to fight against Israel's reactionary policy." Clearly, Leroy is calling upon the Jewish comrades to fight the aggression and annexationism of the Israeli ruling circles as being contrary to the best interests of the broad masses of Israel as well as the Jewish people throughout the world.

Dr. Sneh, however, turns this sentence topsy turvy and reaches an amazing conclusion. He states: "This means that there is no connection between the Jews in the diaspora and the state of Israel but it is the duty of the Jews to lead in their country an anti-Israeli struggle."

We are faced with the same chauvinistic approach, in which Dr. Sneh tries to imbue all progressive Jews with the idea that the struggle against the imperialistic ruling clique of Israel is tantamount to a "betrayal" of the Jewish state. He can see only the interests of the Jewish bourgeoisie; the interests of the toiling masses of Israel have ceased to exist for him. However, this does not stop the leaders of Maki from mouthing "class struggle" slogans in order to keep their hold on some misguided followers.

As was mentioned before, Sneh, Mikunis and their disciples are exerting every effort to establish closer ties with renegade groups outside Israel, as well as to create friction and dissent within the international Communist movement. Let us take a closer look at these schemes. In the November 1970 issue of the Maki Information Bulletin we find an interview with S. Mikunis in which he reported on a trip to Rumania and Sweden that he had just completed.

The interview was given in an optimistic tone; reading behind the lines, however, it becomes obvious that the results of Mikunis' travels were very meager. His attempt to hide the revisionism of Maki from the Communist leaders whom he encountered was also a miserable failure. He had to admit that they were utterly opposed to the expansionist policies of the Israel ruling circles and to the concept that the June 1967 war was a war of self-defense. This was

especially evident in Mikunis' talk with the leader of the Norwegian youth movement. The interviewer had to divulge some revealing information on this matter. He stated:

Regarding the boycott imposed upon Maki by the world Communist movement, Comrade Mikunis pointed out:

"I met only the representatives of the Rumanian and Swedish Communist parties. At some occasion I met also the secretary of the Norwegian Communist youth. I felt that he is influenced by the idea that the Six Day War was no defensive war."

Apparently in order to enhance the morale of his followers Mikunis also said:

This conversation convinced me again that it is worthwhile to meet as often as possible representatives of various Communist parties. Not everybody is prepared to go into the depth of the Middle East problem. I have become aware that a number of Communist parties that have started to think independently are beginning to re-examine also their approach to the Middle East in the spirit of Maki.

This assertion must be discounted as wishful thinking which the general secretary of Maki was unable to substantiate with a shred of evidence. He named a few splinter groups of the same ilk and said: "The general demand is that every Communist party must be invited to congresses and conferences...." Not surprisingly, Mikunis fails to inform us where this "general demand" is coming from. For it is well known that a general demand to invite renegade groups to international conferences is nowhere to be found except in their own publications. These groups are, just as Maki is, excluded by the international Communist movement.

Mikunis' real intentions become obvious in this pronouncement:

So it is possible to speak about foreseeable changes in Communist parties in various parts of the world in a shorter range. This is important not only for the Communist movement but also for Israel. The understanding for the patriotic, internationalist conceptions of Maki becomes also an understanding for Israel's problems and legitimate rights."

It hardly needs saying that his prophecy of "foreseeable changes in Communist Parties" has nothing to do with reality, but is mostly intended to lift the sagging spirit of what remains of the rank-and-file membership of Maki. More important is his indirect admission that the purpose of the "patriotic" program of Maki is to whitewash and justify before the international Communist movement the expansionist policies of the Israeli government. Mikunis deludes himself

with false hopes, waiting in vain for divisive splits in Communist ranks. Such splits will not be forthcoming. He says:

I am not taking, of course, any pleasure in splits in Communist parties; but it is a fact that there are today many splitting parties, more parties in the position of Maki. On the one hand, this is deplorable. But on the other hand it creates a chance for the strengthening of the elements that are taking a stand against the policy of boycott, taking the road of recovery from the old - towards the new.

It is quite clear what "from the old - towards the new" means to Mikunis. Maki and the other renegade cliques are placing their hopes on a change-over from Marxism-Leninism to revisionism; from class struggle to class collaboration. The "new" means to them a further spreading of cold-war propaganda. It means to pave a way for CIA intrigues against the socialist sector of the world, to undermine the ideological struggle in the socialist countries against counter-revolutionary diversionism.

* * *

FOLKS-SHTIMME'S 25TH BIRTHDAY

by Sol Flapan

WARSAW, Nov. 15 - "We are here!" are the concluding words of the Ghetto resistance song. Born in the anti-Nazi struggle during the German occupation of Poland, "We are here" has become the unofficial anthem of Jews in this part of the world.

And "We are here" is the headline and theme of the lead story in this week's edition of the Yiddish-language newspaper Folks-Shtimme which has just marked its 25th anniversary.

The birthday party for the journal of the Social and Cultural Society of Jews in Poland was held in Srodborow, a cozy rest center in a pine woods sixty minutes by commuter train from Warsaw, reports Folks-Shtimme. There, the Society has its own vacation home which is also used for conventions, conferences, formal dinners like the Folks-Shtimme anniversary, seminars for Jewish community house counselors and other events.

"Folks-Shtimme never was, nor is it today just another Jewish newspaper," declared editor Samuel Tenenblatt in his keynote address. "It was and remains a paper with a socialist outlook. It's a tribune for everything which serves progress and peace. It's a tribune for the expanding and developing values of our national culture," he said.

"If in any way we can help in spreading the glory and in defending our coun-

try and nation of which we are an integral part--that is reason for pride," he added. He noted there are still many things in the country which hurt and vex. These shortcomings are all the more glaring as the Polish United Workers' Party lays them bare in its consistent efforts to implement its program of change announced last December.

"We cannot, and we refuse to stand on the sidelines," declared the head of Folks-Shtimme. "We want our contribution to be part of that drive towards the better."

He decried the "Don Quixotes" and the "alibiers" who equate the existence of Folks-Shtimme with a "miracle." This is no miracle, Tenenblatt stated emphatically. It's a stubborn will to maintain and propagate the wonderful traditions of Poland's Jewry--no matter what the size of the Jewish community here.

He denounced the summer patriots here and abroad, some of whom have solemnly proclaimed the approaching demise of Folks-Shtimme; indeed, the exact date for the funeral has been trumpeted more than once.

Tenenblatt assailed those who passed over in silence Folks-Shtimme's silver anniversary--an apparent allusion to Paul Novick, editor of the New York Morning Freiheit. According to Folks-Shtimme (October 16) Novick refused to send a message of moral support, branding such felicitations a "crime."

But despite Novick's ban, "happy birthday" messages poured into Folks-Shtimme's office from all over including from progressive American Jews like Sam Liptzin of New York and Irachmael Farber and Chaim Shwartz of Los Angeles, who sent in poems which were printed in the November 6 and 13 issues. The IKUF writers' union of Los Angeles also sent greetings.

Pride of place of all the messages went to the one from the Press Bureau of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers Party which hailed Folks-Shtimme for its 25 years of efforts in "mobilizing the Jewish community for the socialist development of Poland." Printing this, Trybuna Ludu, daily organ of the Party, added its own best wishes "for the success of the weekly's staff in their responsible journalistic work."

The unaffiliated Zycie Warszawy and the popular evening tabloid Express Wieczorny also remembered Folks-Shtimme.

Fraternal greetings were received from the Ukrainian cultural Society in Poland and its journal Nashe Slovo.

"We share your joy in your successes and enthusiasm in social and cultural work for People's Poland--our common homeland," says the Ukrainian message.

The First Secretary and Press Attache of the German Democratic Republic's

embassy here wished the entire Folks-Shtimme staff "further successes, health and creative efforts in their responsible work for the People's Republic of Poland."

Various expressions of encouragement came from Communist, progressive and conservative organizations and religious congregations and from individuals in many countries.

The after-dinner speeches avoided banalities. Rather, they reflected the militancy of Folks-Shtimme over the years. Poet Elijah Raizman, for one, hailed Folks-Shtimme as a paper which "has a face. It is not a pseudo-Jewish paper simply printed with Yiddish letters, but it is Jewish in the true sense of the word."

Octogenarian Itzrokh Gordin, a participant in the Polish, Russian and American working-class movements, recalled that Jews have been living in Poland for hundreds of years.

"They suffered here, they died here. With Yiddish on their lips our mothers were incinerated in the Nazi crematoria.

"Now, once again a Yiddish language paper appears in Poland. True, for a small community, but one which needs the Jewish word."

"We are stubborn," said Gordin. "We will not voluntarily leave the stage of history. Despite the attempts of the liquidators of the exodus-from-Poland mob, socialism will be built in our country and with the active participation of Poland's Jewry."

"We are here," proudly proclaims the organized Jewish community of People's Poland.

* * *

ACTIONS BY THE COMMITTEE FOR A JUST PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

On Friday, October 29 a public meeting was held at the Hotel Diplomat in New York City, under the auspices of the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East. The audience voted unanimously to send the following communications:

Mayor John V. Lindsay
Office of the Mayor
City Hall
New York, N.Y.

Dear Sir:

At a meeting in New York City of the Committee For A Just Peace In The Middle East attended by hundreds of people, a resolution was adopted to protest

in the strongest terms the terroristic outrages of the Jewish Defense League against Americans and the shocking attacks on the personnel of the U.N. missions, the latest being the shooting into the U.N. Mission of the Soviet Union where small children were sleeping. This nearly culminated in murder. We demand that action be taken immediately to put a stop to the outrages of the Jewish Defense League on our city streets before somebody is killed. The misnamed Jewish Defense League is a fascist terrorist group who are a menace to Americans and to the foreign visitors who staff the missions of the member nations of the U.N. It is a disgrace to our town when these vicious acts of violence of the Jewish Defense League are allowed to go unpunished. The Jewish Defense League does not speak for the Jewish people. The Jewish Defense League's acts of violence are contrary to Jewish traditions. By the same token the vicious racism and attacks against Black people on the part of the Jewish Defense League are completely alien to the traditions, humanism and aspirations of the Jewish people.

In view of the growing menace to the lives of citizens and foreign visitors alike because of the violence of the Jewish Defense League, we believe that in order to safeguard the people of New York the Jewish Defense League must be outlawed and its leaders prosecuted. We strongly urge you, Mr. Mayor, to take immediate steps for the outlawing of the Jewish Defense League.

Yours truly,

COMMITTEE FOR A JUST PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Alex Kolkin, Chairman

*

President Richard M. Nixon
White House
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. President:

At a meeting in New York City of the Committee For a Just Peace In The Middle East attended by hundreds of people, a resolution was adopted to protest in the strongest terms the terroristic outrages of the Jewish Defense League against American citizens and the shocking attacks on the personnel of the U.N. missions, the latest being the shooting into the U.N. Mission of the Soviet Union where small children were sleeping. This nearly culminated in murder.

The misnamed Jewish Defense League is a fascist terrorist group who are a menace to Americans and to the foreign visitors who staff the missions of the member nations of the U.N. It is a disgrace to our country that these vicious acts of violence of the JDL go unpunished.

The Jewish Defense League does not speak for the Jewish people. The

JDL's acts of violence are contrary to Jewish traditions. By the same token, the vicious racism and attacks against Black people on the part of the JDL are completely alien to the traditions, humanism and aspirations of the Jewish people.

The outrages of the JDL must be ended before somebody is killed. We strongly urge you, Mr. President, to take immediate steps for the outlawing of the Jewish Defense League and for the prosecution of Meir Kahane and the other JDL leaders.

Yours truly,

COMMITTEE FOR A JUST PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Alex Kolkin, Chairman

*

To Secretary General U Thant:
To Member States of the United Nations:

In the interest of world peace and in the interest of bringing justice and the rights of sovereignty to both Israel and the Arab states, including the just rights of the Palestinian Arab people, we of the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East wish to communicate our views on this important problem.

Our committee considers it of prime importance that a peaceful solution to the Middle East conflict must begin with the full acceptance and implementation of the United Nations resolution of November 22, 1967. This resolution calls for a peace without territorial annexations and for the recognition of Israel's right to exist as a sovereign state, within secured borders, as well as the rights of the Palestinian people.

The governments of the U.A.R., Jordan, and Lebanon have accepted the U.N. Resolution in its entirety. In addition the major state in the Arab world, Egypt, in answer to questions posed by Ambassador Jarring, has stated that it is prepared to sign a peace agreement with Israel provided Israel withdraws from the occupied territories. This represents, on the part of the Arab world, a concession of the highest importance.

After the 1967 war the leaders of Israel stated that they did not seek a single inch of territory; that what they wanted was only security. Their foremost aim was that the government of Egypt sign a peace agreement with it.

Why then is there now no peace settlement in the Middle East?

Prime responsibility for this situation must rest with the leaders and government of Israel. It has refused to accept the UN resolution of November 22,

1967 except as a vague guideline for discussion. It has refused to withdraw from the occupied territories and has moreover adopted a policy of establishing settlements in these territories, a policy of accomplished facts. It has annexed all of Jerusalem, evicting Arab inhabitants and building housing projects for Israeli citizens in its place, in clear violation of the decisions of the United Nations. It has refused to accept the United Nations resolutions on settlement of the refugee question. Clearly its policy has been, with one tactic or another, to hang on to all or part of the occupied territory.

For its own interests in the Middle East the Nixon Administration supports the annexationist policies of the leaders of Israel, although giving lip service to the November 22 resolution and to the idea of a political settlement.

Failure to settle the Middle East conflict is not only fraught with danger for the states in that area. The lack of a settlement has created a climate that gives opportunities to such reactionary, pro-fascist groups as the Jewish Defense League and others to harass, attack, and attempt to assassinate UN diplomats and their families, including children; and to attempt to undermine and create conflict particularly between the government and peoples of the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

We therefore call upon the United Nations at this session, not just to once again reiterate its support for the resolution of November 22, 1967, but to aggressively organize world support and pressure behind this resolution and to include, if need be, the use of sanctions to carry out its provisions.

The people of Israel and the people of the Arab world desperately want and need peace. War between them would be a disaster.

In the interests of world peace, in the interest of ending the agony of war for the long-suffering people of the Middle East, both Jews and Arabs, we strongly urge the United Nations to take action to enforce its resolution of November 22, 1967 and put an end to the Middle East conflict at its current session.

We request your comments and would like a delegation of our organization to meet with you on this question.

Respectfully yours,

COMMITTEE FOR A JUST PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Alex Kolkin, Chairman
Sam Weintraub, Co-Chairman
Max Gundy, Secretary

Evelle Younger, Attorney General
 State of California
 Sacramento, California

Refusal to grant bail to Angela Davis, in the face of the recommendation for it by your own Probation Department, is a serious violation of constitutional rights. Such refusal is injurious to Miss Davis' health and greatly undermines her opportunity for defense.

Our meeting of several hundred people at the Hotel Diplomat in New York City on October 29, 1971 strongly associated itself with the demand of millions in this country and abroad that Angela Davis be immediately released on reasonable bail.

Yours truly,

COMMITTEE FOR A JUST PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Alex Kolkin, Chairman

* * *

To Our Readers:

Since Angela Davis has been transferred from San Rafael to an underground, unheated 6 X 8 foot cell in the Palo Alto, California jail, her health is even more gravely endangered than before. Release on bail is more urgent than ever. Write to Attorney General Younger. Get your organization to act. Write or wire to Sheriff James Geary, 2700 Grant Avenue, Palo Alto, California, to demand that Angela Davis be given decent accommodations.

THE ISRAELI DELEGATION TO THE USSR

In early September a delegation of six prominent Israeli figures visited the Soviet Union on the invitation of the Soviet Peace Committee. It included Moshe Eidelberg, senior activist of the Israel-Soviet Friendship Movement; Nathan Yalin-Mor, journalist and public figure; Dan Miron, professor at Tel Aviv University; Ruth Lubitch, member of the political bureau of the Communist Party of Israel, also of the presidium of the Israeli Peace Committee; Dr. James Jacob Rosenthal, jurist and journalist on the staff of the daily, Ha'aretz; Ya'acov Riftin, leader of the Union of Left Socialist-Zionists.

We present here, for the information of our readers the texts of the statement issued by the delegation on its return and a lead article in Zo Haderekh, organ of the Communist Party of Israel, also excerpts from an article by one of the delegates, Nathan Yalin-Mor. While there are a number of points in the

article with which we differ, we feel it is nevertheless of interest as expressing a view which departs significantly from official Israeli positions.

* * *

STATEMENT OF THE DELEGATION

The following is the full text of the joint statement made by the delegation on returning to Israel:

1. On termination of our two-week's visit as guests of the Soviet Peace Committee, we express deep and sincere gratitude for the invitation and the cordial hospitality accorded to us.

2. We came to the Soviet Union as Israeli citizens of various views, but united in the aspiration for peace in our region, in the awareness that peace will be established by full implementation of the Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967, and in the hope for the improvement of relations between Israel and the Soviet Union.

3. We were deeply impressed by the life in the Soviet Union; we met many Soviet people, engaged in industry and agriculture, public personalities, scientists and artists of important status. We saw that all have in common the aspiration for peace and for improvement of the relations between their country and ours.

4. In our meetings with the institutions of the Soviet Peace Committee in Moscow, Leningrad, Odessa and Kishinev we saw that in the Soviet Union there exists a great apprehension regarding peace in the Middle East; that the recognition by the Soviet Union of the right to existence of the State of Israel is unshakable and is deeply rooted in all circles of the public; that there exists an aspiration towards a peace settlement between Israel and the Arab countries, which will secure the right to existence of all the peoples and countries in the region; that it is the current view that a sincere consent to implement the Security Council Resolution in all its parts in order gradually to eliminate the existing mistrust will open up a possibility for contacts and talks and will bring peace to our region.

5. We were strengthened in our view that the improvement of relations between Israel and the Soviet Union is a national interest of utmost importance for Israel and is an absolute necessity for achieving peace.

6. In our many meetings with Jews of all circles of the public, we gained the impression that though decisive parts of the Jews in the Soviet Union are well integrated in the life of the country and consider it on their homeland, there are some who, out of different reasons, such as unification of families, non-adjustment to a life in the framework of the regime of the Soviet Union, and also the longing for a national life in Israel, wish to immigrate to this country.

We know that many of those have long since been permitted by the Soviet

Union to leave its bounds, and we hope that this permission will be expanded and will apply to all those who wish to emigrate. We assess that the convenient conditions for the solution of this problem will be created with an advance toward peace in our region and with the improvement of the relations between Israel and the Soviet Union. In the talks we had it became clear to us that the Jews who consider themselves as loyal and equally entitled citizens of the Soviet country are interested in the tightening of ties with the people in Israel and wish that in Israel everything possible should be undertaken in order to bring nearer a just and lasting peace, and the improvement of relations between Israel and the Soviet Union.

7. We hope that our visit is the first step towards further contacts and towards return visits.

ON THE RETURN OF THE GOOD-WILL DELEGATION FROM THE
SOVIET UNION

(Zo Haderekh, September 15, 1971)

The attention of the Israeli public has been turned these weeks to the six Israeli public personalities who had been invited by the Soviet Peace Committee to visit the Soviet Union. From the departure of the delegation until its return public opinion in Israel has shown the greatest interest in the six emissaries of good-will. Very many are interested in hearing and reading their assessments and impressions. Almost every day reports about the tours, meetings and talks of the delegation in the Soviet Union have been published in the Israeli press.

The sworn enemies of the Soviet Union, who are maddened by their hatred of the country of the October Revolution, have for years now conducted anti-Soviet incitement, and in recent years have raised it to a level of hysteria. They systematically make use of all mass media in Israel in order to brainwash the masses in Israel and to present the Soviet Union as an enemy of Israel.

Under these circumstances the very invitation of Israeli public personalities of different political and ideological views to visit the Soviet Union evoked feelings of appreciation and also joy among many circles of persons of good-will in Israel. A considerable part of the Israeli public is concerned about the existing state of affairs and understands that the Israeli Government not only fails to act according to the national interests of Israel, not only fails to do anything for peace and for the improvement of relations with the Soviet Union, but moves in the opposite direction. It prefers a situation of permanent war danger and continuation of severed relations with the Soviet Union to peace without annexations and normal relations with the Soviet Union.

Meantime the Israeli public personalities have returned from their visit in the Soviet Union and have reported about their impressions-- each according to his views and attitude. Over certain matters opinions were at variance. How-

ever, the main and decisive thing the six emissaries of good-will have in common is a sincere concern for the true national interests of the State of Israel. Therefore all six reject the anti-Soviet propaganda and criticize the policy of the Government in the question of peace.

On termination of their visit in the Soviet Union the members of the delegation published a joint communique. In their statement they express their deep and sincere gratitude to the Soviet Peace Committee for the invitation and for the cordial hospitality.

Particular importance attaches to what is said in the joint statement of the delegation on the subject of peace in the Middle East.

The delegation points out that in the Soviet Union there exists great apprehension about peace in the Middle East; that the recognition by the Soviet Union of the right to existence of the State of Israel is unshakeable; that the Soviet Union strives for a peace settlement which will ensure the rights of all the peoples and countries in the region; that it is the current view in the Soviet Union that a sincere agreement to implement the Security Council Resolution in all its parts will enable the establishment of peace in our region.

This is indeed a correct assessment of Soviet policy regarding Israel and regarding peace in our region.

On the matter of the Jews of the Soviet Union, which figures on a subject for artificial incitement campaigns on the part of the ruling circles in Israel against the Soviet Union, the delegation evaluates in its joint statement that its members have gained the impression, in their many meetings with Jews of all circles of the public, that decisive parts of the Jews of the Soviet Union are integrated in the life of the country and consider it as their homeland. At the same time, there are those who wish to immigrate to Israel for various reasons.

In the statement of the delegation it is said that the Jews in the Soviet Union who consider themselves as loyal and equally entitled citizens of the Soviet State, are interested in the tightening of ties with the people in Israel and wish that in Israel everything possible should be done in order to bring nearer a just and lasting peace and for the improvement of relations between Israel and the Soviet Union.

In their appearances the members of the delegation point out the strong wish for peace, which moves the hearts of all Soviet people; the essential fact that the Soviet Union distinguishes between the Israeli people and its true interests and the policy of the Government.

The visit of the Israeli public personalities in the Soviet Union has proved to many that the change of the official Israel policy, the consent of the Israeli Government to a peace without annexations on the basis of the full implementa-

tion of the Security Council Resolution will lead to peace and security as well as to the improvement of relations with the Soviet Union.

* * *

IMPROVEMENT IN RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION DEPENDS ON ISRAEL

By Nathan Yalin-Mor

(Excerpts from an article in New Outlook, October 1971.)

The invitation was signed by the Soviet Peace Committee and specified that the invitation was meant to provide the Israelis with the opportunity "to get acquainted with the Soviet way of life."

Neither the identity of the inviting body nor the reason given for the invitation should be taken at face value.

It is well known that in the Soviet Union there are many public bodies each of which is an instrument of the central authorities. This provides the Government the possibility of putting out feelers in certain matters, and lends flexibility to an apparently rigid system. If the experiment failed, it could be written off as a mere mishap of an unofficial public organization.

The six of us met to exchange views on the visit. We decided to make it clear that we must not be regarded as a monolithic delegation but, rather, as six Israeli citizens invited on their personal merits.

The day after we arrived we met with the leaders of the Peace Committee. The secretary, Alexei Chemienko, greeted us warmly and promised that we would "have the opportunity to voice our opinions about problems irritating both peoples as well as to listen to the Soviet views. We shall think together how to solve the problem of the Middle East."

After his words of welcome, Mr. Chemienko gave us the proposed itinerary for our visit. The itinerary surprised us, for we had discussed among ourselves our reaction to a possible attempt to prevent us from meeting Russian Jews. The proposed itinerary made the discussion academic for it included cities with large Jewish populations: Moscow, Leningrad, Odessa and Kishiniev.

We were shown two kolkhozes, whose chairmen and administration were Jews. They had only praise for the Soviet regime, a regime that, according to them, gave people of all nationalities equal rights and opportunities. Like everybody else, they spoke of the desire of the Soviet people and the Government for peace. Their sentiments were no doubt genuine.

In one of the kolkhozes in the Moldavian Republic we met with an unexpected

incident. When we came out after a Jewish-style dinner prepared by an elderly Jewish woman of the kolkhoze, we found ourselves in front of a few hundred people to greet us. All belonged to the older generation. Not one was less than fifty.

What about the younger generation? The younger generation is an enigma. Most of them are probably integrated in Soviet life, studying hard, trying to get a better share in what is becoming an affluent society, as compared with past conditions. Few of them know Yiddish. They are aware of their Jewishness, and see no necessity to conceal this fact. But the objective processes in Russia, as in the United States, favor assimilation to the Russian culture.

We met Jews managing big industrial complexes and heading important medical institutions, professors of high standing, engineers and scientists of all kinds. Yet signs of fear may be detected in talks, especially with Jews of the elder generation, who still remember the past. This seems to me a self-imposed fear, since there is now no sign of persecution. Those who are afraid anticipate a possible return to a hard line.

No one is afraid to admit his Jewishness. However, this problem is becoming complex since the new trend in the country is to weld all the nationalities into one Soviet Nation. This has distressed the people who are eager to safeguard their national identity - Jews, Armenians, Georgians, etc. This distress is also the reason Jews want to immigrate to Israel.

I met young Jewish men who applied for exit permits. I took a walk with two of them. After a long conversation I asked them how many Jews would immigrate to Israel if Russia permitted unlimited emigration. Both hesitated for a while and solicited the views of the other. Finally, one spoke up: "Unfortunately, no more than 50,000; first, because in many families the opinion about going to Israel is a controversial one and second, because many people are afraid to apply for exit permits. Courage is not a mass product and is not inherited at birth. Perhaps things will change after the procedure is simplified and accelerated."

Having disassociated myself from the official policy of the Israeli Government, I looked for an occasion to tell my hosts in Moscow what, in my eyes, is wrong with the Middle East policy of their Government. The opportunity came two days before our departure, after coming back to Moscow, during a meeting arranged for us with more than two dozen important Soviet personalities. Each of our group was called upon to give his impressions.

In my remarks, I first expressed my impressions of the places we visited. I then went on to list the things Russia had done to encourage anti-Soviet propaganda in Israel and alienate the people of Israel; the severance of diplomatic relations with Israel on three occasions while it did not break off rela-

tions with the United States for sending her troops to Indochina; the parallel the Soviet press draws between Israel and the Nazi regime, a reproach that can only lacerate the people of Israel; the failure to distinguish between the Israeli Government and the people of Israel, while making that distinction even in the case of the Nazi regime; the failure to specify peace and security and to spell out the name of Israel in the formula for the partial settlement involving the Suez Canal; and the hostility Russia has expressed towards Israel while heaping praise on the Arab countries, though in Israel communists are allowed while in the Arab countries they are persecuted and executed, proving a lack of even-handedness in dealing with the two sides.

I was followed by A. Poltorak, a prominent official of the Institute of State and one of the prosecutors at the Nuremberg trial. He said conflicts are ended in several ways: the best one is by talks. He then said it was "up to you whether you will be able to put an end to anti-Soviet propaganda in your country." After the meeting I asked Dr. Poltorak for a further explanation of his remarks. He replied, "Of course I had in mind talks between the two parties, Israel and the Soviet Union, to the conflict."

We left the Soviet Union with the conviction that Moscow had a smile for Israel and was ready for a new start in relations. We were also convinced that much depends on the attitude of the Israeli government. Will it be ready to reconsider its position towards the Soviet Union for a dialogue of reason instead of perpetuating mutual invectives?

If Israel answers these questions in the affirmative our visit may in retrospect be regarded as a turning point.

* * *

COMMUNICATIONS

BLINDED BY NATIONAL CHAUVINISM

By David Fried

Jewish Currents (October 1971) carries an article by Louis Harap entitled "The Middle East Crisis: Who Is Responsible?" Mr. Harap begins with the following statement: "To assign responsibility for the current precarious situation in the Middle East is an exercise so complex that it is better, perhaps, to give up the search altogether and concentrate on solutions."

This is indeed a "brilliant" observation by one who once claimed to be a Marxist-Leninist. It comes at a time when it is becoming increasingly evident that truth is on the side of the Israeli peace forces as to who is really responsible for the Israeli aggressions and persecutions, both in the occupied territories and against Arabs and Sephardic Jews within Israel.

Mr. Harap also states that "after World War II, Britain and the U.S. vied with the Soviet Union. In each case the contending powers carried out their

rivalries by maneuvering the relations of Jews and Arabs into antagonism." In one sweep, he denies that the Soviet Union is a socialist state and implies that it and the imperialist powers are alike in their policies.

In the face of today's defensive and offensive missile systems, he brushes the cobwebs from an old "explanation" of Soviet conduct and states that what motivates the Soviet Union in seeking to acquire influence in the Middle East is "defense of its southern border." He adds: "The entire history of Soviet participation in the area can be understood only within this perspective, though in recent years its policies have been extremely one-sided."

To say this is unadulterated slander. It is to deny what any Marxist-Leninist should understand--that the basis of Soviet foreign policy is opposition to imperialism and support of national liberation struggles everywhere. It is through the growing strength of the anti-imperialist forces that the Soviet Union seeks to defend its borders, not through great-power maneuvering.

Mr. Harap states that the Soviet Union, in favoring the formation of the State of Israel, played a progressive role. Then he says: "How then, can we explain why, 20 years later, the Soviet role was reversed...?" But the fact is that Soviet policy hasn't changed at all. The Soviet Union has always assisted countries to secure and maintain their independence, both Israel and the Arab countries. If Mr. Harap thinks the Soviet Union has reversed itself, it is because he refuses to accept the fact of Israeli aggression against the Arab countries. Mr. Harap, you have your chauvinist glasses on.

Further on he writes that "the Soviet Union played the game of big power politics in the interest primarily of securing her own southern flank." Given Israel's attachment to the West, he adds, the alleged shift in Soviet policy is understandable. "But," he claims, "the new policy was pursued so ruthlessly as to ride roughshod over Israel's rights." And further: "Israel could do no right, the Arabs could do no wrong."

Here Mr. Harap's chauvinist mentality comes to the fore. If he accuses the Soviet Union of ruthlessly going overboard in its attitude toward Israel, is it perhaps because he himself believes Israel can do no wrong, the Arabs can do no right? He makes no mention of Israel's intimate ties with imperialism, of U.S. intelligence supplying her with aerial photos of Arab military installations and airfields. Nor does he mention such acts by the Israeli forces as the napalming of Arabs or the bulldozing of Arab houses. Nor is anything said about Israel's aggressive policies, carried on with the support of U.S. imperialism. According to Mr. Harap, the Soviet Union's "uncritical support of the Arab States in the UN and in all diplomatic dealings played its part in creating the uncontrollable situation that resulted in the June, 1967 war." Here he answers the question in the title of his article: it is the Soviet Union which was responsible.

Israel, he says, is fighting for its statehood, and this apparently justifies all it does. But Mr. Harap, in his blindness, cannot see that the continued

occupation of Arab lands, the persecution of their inhabitants and the de facto annexation of these territories may well lead to the demise of the Israeli state. The real enemies of Israel are the imperialists, the Israeli hawks, and magazines like Jewish Currents.

* * *

EVENTS AND VIEWS

On November 23, some hundreds of New Yorkers marched in a demonstration before the Israeli Mission to the United Nations. Called by the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East, the demonstration demanded an end to the war in Indochina and to Israeli aggression in the Middle East. It also protested the criminal activities of the fascist "Jewish Defense League" and called for its abolition. And it condemned the role of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East.

Counterdemonstrations were held by the JDL and the Radical Jewish Alliance. And after the demonstration the JDL hoodlums, in true gangster fashion, attacked several individual demonstrators and beat them up. But this could not alter the fact that the demonstration was a most enthusiastic and effective action, one which made the voice of the Left and progressive forces heard against the reactionary line of Zionism. We hope there will be many more such actions to follow.

The Morning Freiheit, in an editorial appearing on Sunday, November 28, sharply attacked the demonstration. It was wrong, the editorial asserted, to demonstrate before the Israeli Mission because, among other reasons, the Jewish Defense League is not a product of Israel, and to charge Israel with aggression is not the way to mobilize masses of the Jewish people. This stand is in keeping with the Morning Freiheit's capitulation to Jewish nationalism and its failure to conduct any kind of struggle against Zionism or the reactionary Israeli foreign policy. We shall have more to say on these questions in our next issue.

*

The September 17 issue of Congress Bi-Weekly, published by the American Jewish Congress, carried a full-page ad headed "Bail for Angela Davis--An Appeal to the Jewish People." The ad was sponsored by the Jewish Committee for a Fair Trial for Angela Davis, whose coordinator is Sam Pevsner. A later issue of the Bi-Weekly discloses that some readers had protested its publication; however, the editors stood by their action. The ad has also appeared in other Jewish publications. It represents a welcome crack in the wall of silence imposed by the Jewish Establishment in the Angela Davis case.

* * *

JEWISH AFFAIRS is published monthly by the Communist Party, U.S.A. Price per copy 25¢. Subscriptions: one year \$2.50, six months \$1.25. Address all correspondence to **JEWISH AFFAIRS**, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.