

JEWISH AFFAIRS

JANUARY/FEBRUARY 1982
60¢

**For A Comprehensive peace
In The Middle East**

By Zehdi Labib Terzi

**Essentials For A comprehensive
Peace In The Middle East**

By Mark Solomon

**International Capital
And the Nazi-Fascist Movement**

By Herbert Aptheker

**Activity To End Racism, Anti-Semitism
Urgently Necessary**

By John Pittman

Telling The Truth About Paul Robeson

By Lloyd L. Brown

The Night Before Babi Yar

By Alexander Borschagovsky

Babi Yar 1, Babi Yar 11

By Antar Mberi



PAUL ROBESON

N.Y. ISSN: 0221-6305

Building an All People's Front

The multi-national, multi racial people who comprise our nation have by now endured a bitter year of Reaganomics. Coupled with the monopoly unloosed catastrophes Californians suffered the effects of torrential rains and murderous mud slides. In every other sector of our land, including the "sun-belt," masses of our people were subjected to death dealing freezing temperatures and snow storms made more deadly by capitalist greed and exploitation.

We are, during this winter of our discontent, fully mindful of the impact of Reaganomics for our working-class and the middle sectors: our elderly are starving, freezing to death or being incinerated in their slum dwellings; school children are denied low-cost lunches and are being fed left-overs; the unemployment rate is fast reaching the double digit rate — for Black youth it is close to 50%; unemployment and SUB benefits are running out for scores of thousands; 20,000 homeless youth roam the streets of New York; cynicism and despair drive our youth into right-wing and obscurantist cults; our schools are graduating functional illiterates; increased college fees and cuts in scholarship funds are depriving workingclass youth of a college education and the "first strike" Reagan administration would draft our youth for the Rapid Deployment Forces to drown the national liberation movements in blood in order to seize the world's natural resources; and racism and anti-Semitism stalk the land.

Racism and anti-Semitism are now open policy of the Reagan White House, most sharply revealed during the AWACs debate and in relation to tax exemptions for segregated schools.

Here, we must note that the officialdom of the 37 leading Jewish Organizations — the Jewish establishment organizations — conferred with Reagan about his anti-Semitic outbursts and then committed themselves to absolute secrecy — a veritable signal to the K.K.K., the nazis and their ilk to go ahead. The A.D.L. of the B'Nai B'Rith attacked the National Teachers Association for stating in its guide on teaching about the K.K.K. that the Klan is but "the tip of the iceberg." Here again they would shield the purveyors of racism and anti-Semitism but they show no reticence about befouling the air with unabashed lies about government sponsored anti-Semitism in Poland.

(Continued on page 20)

JEWISH AFFAIRS

Vol. 12, No. 1

Jan./Feb. 1982

Editorial Committee

Herbert Aptheker, Editor

Jack Kling

Lewis M. Moroze, Managing Editor

Alex Kolkin

David Fried

David Seltzer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Articles

Editorial	2
For A Comprehensive Peace in the Middle East <i>Zehdi Labib Terzi</i>	3
Essentials For A Comprehensive Peace in the Middle East <i>Mark Solomon</i>	4
International Capital and the Nazi-Fascist Movement <i>Herbert Aptheker</i>	8
Activity To End Racism, Anti-Semitism Urgently Necessary <i>John Pittman</i>	11
Telling The Truth About Paul Robeson <i>Lloyd L. Brown</i>	15
The Night Before Babi Yar <i>Alexander Borschagovsky</i>	17
Poem: Babi Yar I, Babi Yar II <i>Antar Mberi</i>	18
Yiddish Section <i>David Seltzer</i>	24
Frontispiece	

Jewish Affairs is published bi-monthly by the Communist Party, U.S.A. at 235 West 23 Street, N.Y., N.Y. 10011, 7th floor (212) 989-4994, ext. 209. Subscriptions: \$3.00 per year (six issues). Second class postage paid at the post office in New York, N.Y. ISSN: 0021-6305.

209

For A Comprehensive Peace In The Middle East

The following address was delivered at a public forum held at the Methodist Church Center for the United Nations on Saturday, December 5, 1981. The Committee For A Just Peace Peace in the Middle East, sponsors of the forum, granted us permission to publish the speech.

Zehdi Labib Terzi is the P.L.O. Representative to the United Nations.

Peace is the target and the question is how to achieve, ensure and guarantee peace. Concrete action or a declaration of intent is needed.

An international consensus has emerged. Peace in the Middle East is a condition conducive to international peace and security. The emerging consensus is that the question of Palestine is the core of the conflict in the Middle East and consequently it is the key to peace. There is unanimity, including in the U.S.A., that a comprehensive settlement conducive to peace cannot be achieved until and unless the "Palestinian problem" in all its aspects is resolved.

Thus, the issue of peace or no peace in the Middle East rests on resolving the "Palestinian problem" in all its aspects. The aspects are human, political, economic etc. In our opinion — and again there is unanimous support to this — the fate of the Palestinian refugees must be addressed and the "refugee problem" must be resolved. The only solution is to enable the refugees to return to their homes and property. The right of return is a principle in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and this right is not contingent on any other consideration. The right of the Palestinians to their homes has been upheld by the unanimous vote at the United Nations — Israel abstained in the vote — but could not vote against the decision.

But in practice Israel not only prohibits the Palestinians from exercising this right but has created and still does create conditions to force the Palestinians to leave their homes. Whatever the conditions or circumstances that compelled or compel the Palestinians to leave their homes — the right of return stands firm — and the Palestinian justly defends his right to return. All attempts and measures to negate and deny and obstruct the exercise of this right are deliberate attempts to obstruct endeavours for peace.

Another component of the "aspects of the Palestinian problem" is the right to self-determination. I believe it was Woodrow Wilson who formulated this concept — it

was not an exercise in linguistics. It was and still is hard substance. The exercise of the right of the Palestinian people of its right to self-determination is an aspect, a prerequisite, a condition for achieving peace. I am not aware of any people — or any nation — willing to accommodate at the expense of its own rights — thus the Palestinian people — and the overwhelming majority of the international community voted in support of this right of the Palestinian people at the United Nations in July 1980. The vote was 112 in support of this right and only 7 voted against it. Israel voted against this principle of self-determination for the Palestinian people. Israel persists in its policy reflecting such a rejection of the principle through the imposition of oppressive military occupation practices, and in so doing practices racist policies against the Palestinians under occupation.

I must say here that the policies adopted by the Israeli government are not "emergency or contingency measures." They reflect a concept or an ideology. An American Rabbi who was in the area has just issued a book "They Must Go." Meir Kahane describes the Palestinians as a malignant growth and prescribes their elimination from Israel and from the occupied territories. But he is not the first to say such things. Mr. Weitz — of the colonization department of the Jewish Agency in 1940 said that all Arabs should be *transferred* to the neighboring countries "not one village, not one tribe, should be left."

In 1916, Jabotinsky "saw in the evacuation of the Arabs from Palestine the basic prerequisite for the implementation of Zionism."

In June 1981, Begin, in an election campaign statement apparently suggested that the "Arabs" be integrated and Peres was enraged: "This is not our Zionist project, this is suggesting a binational state" he cried. So one can safely conclude that a condition for peace — namely, respect for the rights of others — brotherhood — is missing. As a matter of fact this condition is to be eliminated, even if it is by force. These are some of the facts. They show that it is Israel that stands in the way of a just, comprehensive peace.

What do the Palestinian people want? When I speak on behalf of my people it is because I am so authorized by my people. "The Palestine Liberation Organization is our sole and legitimate representative" say the Palestinians.

The Palestine Liberation Organization is the representative of the Palestinian people, declared the United Nations. Let me tell you what we want. In very simple English, we want to return home and live in peace.

(Continued on page 4)

Essentials for a Comprehensive Peace In the Middle East

Mark Solomon

The following was the second speech delivered at a public forum held at the Methodist Church Center for the United Nations on Saturday, December 5, 1981. The Committee For A Just Peace in the Middle East, sponsors of the forum granted us permission to publish this speech. Dr. Mark Solomon is Professor of History at Simmons College and Co-Chairman of the U.S. Peace Council.

It is a great honor to be with you today and to share this platform with the Honorable Zehdi Labib Terzi who has so ably and courageously represented the inseparable cause of the Palestinian people and world peace before the United Nations and before the entire global community.

In recent days, the threat of war in the Middle East has intensified. Not only have United States arms sales to the region increased enormously, but planning for direct U.S. intervention has already commenced. "Operation Bright Star II," in Egypt, involved hundreds of U.S. military forces training for desert warfare. At this moment the Pentagon and the Reagan Administration have available for attack in the Middle East 33,000 paratroopers of the 82nd and 101st Airborne divisions, two marine divisions (20,000 each), 600 to 1,000 fighters, bombers, and other aircraft, 700 cargo planes, tankers and troop carriers, two to four aircraft carrier groups plus a command vessel with three destroyers.

(Continued from page 3)

Chairman Arafat addressed the international community in 1974 and said in simple terms, let's return home and live in peace and harmony as citizens of one democratic society in one country, all equal, no discrimination — no privileges, sharing the prosperity and the labor.

When this option did not meet with unanimous support, the Palestine Liberation Organization then agreed to another option — offered by the international community — the Palestinians will be enabled to return to their homes, and the Palestinian people will exercise their self-determination and establish their independent sovereign state in that part of Palestine from which the Israelis must withdraw — namely the Palestinian territory occupied since 1967. The Palestinian state will then assume its responsibilities and decide its relations in

Five days after Jimmy Carter announced his "Carter Doctrine" which declared that the U.S. would use military force to protect unspecified U.S. vital interests in the Middle East against alleged outside aggressors, former Defense Secretary Harold Brown announced his unpublicized "Brown Doctrine."

Brown contradicted his president, saying that so-called Soviet Expansionism was not the greatest threat to the Middle East, but "turbulence" in the region — or more accurately, liberation movements for indigenous ownership and control of resources constituted the most serious threat to U.S. "vital interests." (As Michael Parenti pointed out, "The American people would balk at sending their sons off to die for Exxon . . . so interventions are for 'vital national interests,' 'national security,' etc.")

But the economic and strategic roots of U.S. involvement in the Middle East are clear: after World War I, American capitalism, riding the crest of new international power as the leading creditor nation in the world, clawed its way into the powerful British and French oil spheres on the Arabian peninsula and other parts of the Middle East. This was the start of relatively uninterrupted U.S. exploitation of the region. Growing involvement in the transport, refining, and distribution of oil led to massive maximum profits for U.S. corporations. After World War II the economic coherence of the U.S.'s trilateral partners, Western Europe and Japan, was increasingly dependent on access to Middle East oil. Oil has now become a strategic resource to fuel the

accordance with international law and other norms and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Israel and the United States of America reject this approach. Our question now is how can we work together to achieve peace in the Middle East.

The fact remains that the only vehicle is the United Nations and the international community has a lot at stake. The USA, the USSR and others equally share the responsibility and, in our opinion, must be involved. The main question is — do we want peace and how could we achieve peace? Those who obstruct endeavours for peace must be identified, namely, those who have rejected the options of the international community, those who have converted the area into an arsenal of the most developed weaponry, and those who in reply to peace efforts sign a strategic alliance, those who instead of sending aid, teachers and doctors, conducted a military operation under the disgusting misnomer — "bright star" — those and their allies are the real enemies of peace. □

Jewish Affairs

enormous U.S.-NATO military machine. Added to these factors is the present-day reality of multi-billion dollar construction contracts in such countries as Saudi Arabia (led by Weinberger's Bechtel corp.) as well as far-flung varied corporate activity in the oil states (Saudi Arabia hosts 450 U.S. companies.)

With these massive stakes in the region, imperialism has consistently sought to exercise powerful pressure against movements for decolonization. Reactionary client states were sought and brought to act as "surrogates" and policemen for foreign corporations. These states, such as the Shah's Iran, were heavily armed to create a vast military force against revolution in their own lands and elsewhere. Not coincidentally arms sales lined the pockets of the U.S. military-industrial complex, recycled petrodollars, and linked American and client military forces in strategic alliances.

In the 1950's, as Great Britain's role as regional imperial policeman declined, the United States became ever more active. In 1957 President Dwight D. Eisenhower declared the "Eisenhower Doctrine" against "communist revolution" in the Arab world. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles sought to create anti-communist military alliances among the right-wing regional states to crush the real object of feverish concern—national independence. However, the "gendarme" scheme was never too successful and in 1958 the direct interventionist "fire brigade" use of U.S. marines was introduced in Lebanon. Today, we have returned to the Eisenhower-Dulles "fire brigade" with a vengeance. A giant rapid deployment force is being prepared for direct U.S. battlefield engagement in the Middle East, should the tides of national freedom continue to be irresistible. The U.S. has negotiated airfields and ports for use of the R.D.F. striking forces—on the Mediterranean coast of Egypt, at Ras Banas on the Red Sea, at Berbera near the mouth of the Red Sea, in Omar near the Strait of Hormuz, at Masirah on the Indian Ocean and at Mombasa, Kenya. This process began in 1979 when Brzezinski conducted a military review which resulted in plans to expand the U.S. naval presence in the Indian Ocean and speed up "contingency planning" for intervention in the Gulf area, after the shattering, unanticipated fall of the Shah of Iran. Despite the insanity of trying to seize and protect 700 oil wells spread over a territory greater than Western Europe and containing more than 7,000 miles of oil pipeline, Harold Brown in 1980 stated that U.S. paratroopers would be flown into Saudi Arabia and other places should friendly regimes be threatened by "turbulence," with U.S. assault units moving on 24-hour notice.

The real purpose of intervention—to crush indigenous movements for liberation—has been camouflaged under the fiction of the need to counter a "Soviet Threat." To quote Parenti: "... remember that it is the ruling classes of Western capitalist nations—above all, the United States—which control Middle Eastern oil supplies. Neither the Soviets nor any other socialist nation owns wells or refineries in that area, nor have they ever attempted to make a 'grab' or even a 'claim' to Arab-Persian oil. The worrisome Soviet claim seems to exist only in the festering imagination of the cold warriors." Such experts as, Marshall Goldman of Harvard, have ridiculed CIA claims of a Soviet "oil thirst," pointing out that the U.S. is the world's greatest oil importer while the Soviet Union is the world's greatest oil producer and exporter. The International Petroleum Institute has recently documented vast, untapped reserves and untapped oil regions in the Soviet Union that have not yet been explored.

The Rapid Deployment Force is being assembled close to Soviet borders; Brzezinski's infamous "arc of crisis" which supposedly necessitated a U.S. presence, rather strikingly runs along those borders. Yet the Soviets have responded to these provocations on the margin of their own security zone with important, unpublicized proposals for regional (and hence global) peace and stability. Soviet President Brezhnev went before the Indian Parliament on December 10, 1980, to offer a five-point program which strongly challenged the arrogant assumptions underlying the Carter and Brown Doctrines.

Brezhnev offered the following: to join the United States, NATO, Japan and China in agreement: 1) not to set up military bases in the Persian Gulf area and on adjacent islands and not to deploy nuclear or any other mass destruction weapons there; 2) not to use or threaten force against Gulf countries or interfere in their internal affairs; 3) to respect the status of nonalignment chosen by states in the area; not draw them into military blocs with nuclear powers; 4) to respect the right of states in the region to their natural resources; 5) not raise obstacles to normal trade and use of sea lanes. Implicit in the offer was a great-power guarantee of freedom of sea lanes for oil tankers, respect for the sovereignty of all regional states and the consequent emergence of a peaceful, secure, nuclear-free, non-aligned Middle East. Former Secretary of State responded to these proposals with the complaint that Brezhnev had said nothing about Poland in his Persian Gulf offer (!). — a remarkable bit of political buffoonery in the face of a great opportunity to be rid of this alleged "Soviet threat" to oil and regional

security.

* * *

The greatest beneficiary of the "Soviet threat" military buildups has been the succession of ruling groups in Israel—which has received over the years nearly 10 billion dollars in military equipment. Nearly half the debt for Israel's purchase of such military equipment has been forgiven by Congress. No other nation has been saturated with such arms on such favorable terms.

But just as the Soviet threat is a fiction to mask the drive to crush national movements, Israel's acquisition of arms is not to defend its population against the Soviets or anyone else. In the words of James Petras: "Israel's relevance to military planners revolves around its role as a political contraceptive against revolutionary nationalist movements in the Middle East." Middle East specialist Leila Meo pointed out—"... the United States provided the financial and military muscle for Israeli policymakers to absorb Arab lands, to trample upon the rights and aspirations of Palestinians, and to be integrated . . . as part and parcel of imperialism's thrust into and colonization of Africa and Asia to exploit and displace native populations."

What has been the direction of this policy of Israeli leaders who in the early 1950's abandoned the last vestiges of non-alignment and turned westward away from the life and hopes of the region and towards service to empire? To quote Meo: "Israel with unlimited U.S. military and financial aid has consistently defied U.N. resolutions on the restoration of Palestinian rights, has encroached on other Arab lands, and has used its command of Arab skies and its oversupply of U.S. bombs and bombers to kill and maim hundreds of Palestinian and Lebanese civilians in Beirut and elsewhere. . ." Need we add the shameful role of Israeli leaders in acting as U.S.-sponsored supplier of arms to Somoza's Nicaragua, the hated apartheid regime of South Africa, and the current Salvadorean junta?

What kind of security, independence and democratic development are promised by such unprincipled service to counter-revolution? What prospect for peace is held out by a U.S.-Israeli collaboration based upon a growing Israeli role of shock troop and military base against change in the whole region? What kind of stability is promised by crushing the rights of others and by stridently opposing the predominant regional aspiration for realization of what even Camp David calls the "legitimate rights of the Palestinian people?"

The fevered ambitions of oil monopolies and cold war military planners, in essence, are diametrically opposed to the interests of the vast majority of the peoples of the

Middle East, including the people who live in Israel and Israeli-controlled territories. There are those who say that Camp David was a glowing example of Israeli willingness, with prodding from Washington, to compromise for peace. It is now clear that the Camp David accords were essentially a military arrangement—a disengagement of two hitherto antagonistic U.S. client states—replete with secret military provisions, United States-led "peacekeeping forces" in the Sinai Desert, and construction of new land and air bases in the area. This hardly constitutes a prescription or preparation for peace. At this time Camp David is bankrupt in terms of its self-declared objective of fulfilling those "legitimate Palestinian rights." It is bankrupt because its main sponsors resist Palestinian self-determination out of hostility to national self-determination.

At this moment the situation in the Mid-East has become more complicated and the danger of a first-strike by United States forces and their clients has increased. A popular insurrection against the Sultan of Oman or any collapse of a group of right-wing states, currently held together with baling wire, could bring marines directly into combat—joined by cannon fodder provided by other U.S. clients. Such intervention could ultimately require hundreds of thousands of troops and even the use of "tactical" nuclear weapons, thus inviting a global holocaust. Nevertheless, the historic overthrow of the Shah of Iran, the weakness of Gulf client states, a growing challenge to U.S. regional domination by Japan and Europe, the death of Sadat,—all have impelled Washington, for the first time in years, to send U.S. ground forces into training exercises in the region and to plan for *direct* interventions.

Renewed emphasis upon the Saudis has led to concentration on the eastern flank of the area. The entire political process in the United States was mobilized by major monopolies to push through the AWAC sale and massive additional military equipment—all in the name of new "strategic consensus against communism." A "Reagan codicil" to the Carter Doctrine makes it clear that the U.S. military will be employed in the area not only to combat purported *external* threats, but to attack *internal* threats to U.S. corporate and military interests. On October 1, 1981, Reagan made it clear that he was ready to pursue military options in the internal life of others countries, if these countries were driven by the popular will to install governments which the U.S. might consider inimical to its interests.

At the heart of a widening and perhaps desperate drive to stem popular movements, lies the Washington-inspired effort to further undermine Palestinian self-

Jewish Affairs

determination. There is an inseparable relationship between growing U.S. emphasis upon the Gulf/Horn of Africa and the Palestine issue. Every aspect of national liberation is being subjected to the threat of intervention. The shield as usual is the "strategic consensus"—the unity of all reactionary states against an alleged "Soviet threat," in which the Palestinian question is to be subordinated to the larger issue of dealing with the so-called threat. At the same time, the Israeli hawks must be given an enhanced role to counter-balance a surge of support for the weak Saudi regime. In response to Begin's desperate 8-point program to turn Israel into little more than a military base and staging area to counter the AWAC sale, Defense Secretary Weinberger and Israeli defense minister Sharon have concluded an agreement (the bulk of the document remains secret) to "conduct joint military exercises, including naval and air exercises in the eastern Mediterranean." A memorandum also alluded to "the establishment of joint readiness activities, including access to maintenance facilities." The *Boston Globe* added that "presumably this could mean that U.S. warplanes and warships might be serviced in Israel. . . ." That newspaper concluded, "the United States has supplied arms to Israel, has supported it diplomatically and logistically in its wars with Arab countries, has informally exchanged intelligence with it and has received from it captured Soviet-made arms for analysis. But never before have the two countries agreed formally to act militarily."

If ever there was doubt about the U.S. role in the region, this additional step to center stage as leading regional actor is indisputable. The U.S.-Israeli memorandum limply says the agreement "is not directed at any state or group of states within the Middle East." But who will buy that? Where are these Soviet forces that presumably are poised to leap at the oil pipelines? They are not to be seen. But the relentless undercurrent of popular movements, especially the movement of Palestinian people and others continues to flow and gather force. And that is the real objective of the "strategic consensus." Thus, the Begin regime, in a lunge to maintain its so-called "special relationship" with Washington in light of the new emphasis on the Saudis and the "strategic consensus," has peddled the last shadow of Israeli sovereignty, has further sacrificed the hope for real peace based upon the realization of Palestinian self-determination, and has moved ever closer to offering Israel's youth to the interests of Exxon, Texaco, and the Pentagon.

But that is not the whole story. Inevitably, the attempt to offer the whole of Israeli territory as a military base
January-February, 1982

and supply depot for imperialism is accompanied by a surge of racism and injustice directed towards Arab and Jew alike. Jewish demonstrators against the closing of Beir Zeit University are beaten at Ramallah, while the worst abuses are heaped upon the lives and property of West Palestinians. Yet within Israeli political life resistance grows. Of course there are those, who oppose Begin, claiming that he did not get enough from Washington. But significantly, there are growing numbers who ardently oppose the nearly-total subjugation of Israel to the Pentagon and U.S. oil interests, and who recently nearly toppled the Begin regime in a no-confidence vote.

There are important European voices who for their own reasons and interests oppose the "strategic consensus" and who demand fulfillment of Palestinian rights as a precondition for normal economic and political relations with the Middle East. Indeed, in the global arena Reagan and Begin have become increasingly isolated while the standing of the P.L.O. has reached new heights.

In the United States our real progressive and peaceful interests are clearer than ever. And the prospects, I believe, for dialogue on the basis for a comprehensive peace are better than ever. During the AWACs debate, the *New York Times* suddenly published a 1971 Richard Nixon tape filled with vile anti-Semitic attacks upon the leaders of demonstrations against the Vietnam war. Release of that tape at the height of the AWACs controversy was perhaps not accidental. It was a means of telling the U.S. public and supporters of Israel that at the highest levels of government there is a strain of anti-Semitic bigotry and that anti-Semitism could be called into play to bend the will of the so-called Israeli lobby to the strategic needs of U.S. imperialism. That episode (including the use of Nixon to attack the "Jewish lobby" and to juxtapose Reagan vs. Begin) underscores the fact that Washington cares not a fig about anybody's dignity and security (including Israel). It wants militarily strong, reliable regional policemen ready to fight for corporate and Pentagon interests.

We are witnessing the last gasp of the fantasy about our "moral commitment to Israel." If there were indeed a moral commitment, no stone would be unturned in an effort to join the people of Israel with their neighbors to seek peace as segments of a larger Mideast community seeking development, independence, democracy, non-alignment, a nuclear-free region, and indigenous control of resources. Any regional state that serves empire can-

(Continued on page 11)

International Finance Capital And the Nazi-Fascist Movement

Herbert Aptheker

We print here the address delivered by our editor, Herbert Aptheker, at the 2nd Annual Symposium sponsored by the Meikeljohn Civil Liberties Institute at Berkeley, California on December 6, 1981.

There is a body of literature which seeks to psychologize Hitlerism and fascism in general, in terms of alleged "frustrations" or "neuroses" of this or that segment of population. One of the most distinguished authors contributing to this genre — the late Hannah Arendt — placed the subject this way:

The question continues to oppress us: how could a man with this poor baggage of deranged ideas and prejudices become Chancellor of Germany? How was it possible that a state whose people and culture ranked high in the world's civilization should have entrusted its fate to this deluded man who believed he had been chosen to lead a holy war against the Jew?

Hitler certainly had such a belief but that is not why he became Chancellor of Germany; furthermore, one does not simply "become" a head of state. One reaches such a position on the basis of social forces and class alignments and realities of power; specifically, a partisan of the bourgeoisie who reaches pre-eminent position in a bourgeois state does so because those dominating that state have created him, supported him, financed him — and placed him in his exalted position.

It is not helpful to use undifferentiated categories such as a "people and a culture." The author of the quoted paragraph in her entire work treats Germans as a homogenous mass and adopts an attitude which can only be characterized as chauvinist in regard to them, making Germans into a people uniquely prone to the manipulation of and madness generated by Hitler. As to this "people and culture" — which people and which culture? that of Bismarck or Liebknecht, of Hitler or Thaelmann, of Goebbels or Goethe, of Spengler or Marx, of Goering or Brecht?

As for Hitler's program, it was not — as is often alleged, including by Hannah Arendt — his obsessive anti-Semitism that was at the root of his rise to Chancellor; rather, it was his commitment to destroy Marxism, to annihilate the Communist Party, to extirpate the powerful and class-conscious German trade-union movement and, logical corollary, to wipe out Bolshevism in

its home and offer the resources of the USSR to the appetites of Thyssen, Krupp, Flick, J.P. Farben and their fellow vultures.

Hitlerism was the fascism specific to Germany. Fascism is the preferred form of state power on the part of the most reactionary, most chauvinist, most aggressive components of the monopoly bourgeoisie; it represents the negation of reason, the denial of science, the avowal of brutality, the quintessence of sexism and racism, the glorification of war. It exists in order to assure and enhance the power and plunder of the top monopolists by ruthlessly suppressing all labor, popular, democratic and radical expressions, organizations and movements.

Its trump card, its "Big Lie," is anti-communism. On that basis it builds its system of racism, anti-Semitism, anti-realism — its system of suppression, militarism and war.

What was the Big Lie of Hitler? Nazism's Big Lie was its depiction of communism and of the Soviet Union. It was not anti-Semitism, racism, elitism, male chauvinism. The latter were "adornments" the better to trap victims by the Big Lie. The Lie itself was — and is — one which pictures Marxism, socialism, communism, as the embodiments of evil, as satanic. In particular, Hitler's Big Lie held that Marxism, socialism, communism, were so awful that their threat to national existence could not be tolerated; hence, they were to be outlawed and extirpated.

That was the main content of Hitler's Big Lie; on that basis, Jews — allegedly the carriers of Marxism — were to be annihilated; on that basis, democracy — allegedly the ally of Marxism — was to be suppressed; on that basis, trade unions — allegedly the creation of and training grounds for Marxism — were to be prohibited; and on that basis the Soviet Union — lair of the Marxist monster — was to be destroyed.

Past experience shows that the policy of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism is the trump card of fascism, its main propaganda technique. On the basis of that experience, one must affirm that a policy of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism makes impossible effective struggle against fascism and war — or, for that matter, against racism and anti-Semitism.

Millionaires believing they faced the collapse of their system brought into being and financed fascism. Thus, Mussolini's early supporters included leading Italian industrialists like Odero and the Perone brothers and Pirelli in the rubber industry and Toeplitz, Volpi, Polano in banking capital and, as Gaetano Salvemini showed in his posthumously-published study of *Italian Fascist Activities in the U.S.* (1977), important backing by J.P.

Jewish Affairs

Morgan. Mussolini's image, as portrayed by leading media in the United States, was almost uniformly favorable and often enthusiastic as John P. Diggins showed in his *Mussolini and Fascism: The View from America* (1972).

When Franco's counter-revolutionary coup was under way, it had not only the financial and military support of international fascism, but also support from "National Committees" set up in various capitalist countries, including the United States. In this country, that Committee included such people as Basil Harris, vice-president of the International Mercantile Marine Corporation; Ogden Hammond, a leading banker; Joseph P. Grace of the shipping trust; a J.P. Morgan partner, Thomas Woodlock, then of the *Wall Street Journal*, and Leon Fraser, president of the First National City Bank of New York City.

In the United States, let it be recalled, the Birch Society — that recent experiment in setting up a mass fascist organization — was founded by a former vice-president of the National Association of Manufacturers and prominent as known angels of that society were Cola G. Parker, a former president of NAM; E.G. Swigert, also a former president of NAM; and Martin J. O'Connor, III, another former vice-president of NAM.

It was the Vanderbilt family that paid for an aborted fascist coup against FDR early in the 1930's as Major-General Smedley Butler testified at a Congressional Hearing under oath — testimony smothered in resounding silence. Just the other day, a California State Senator — John Schmitz — suggested that the United States might well stand in need soon of a military coup. This person is not a village idiot — he may be a moral idiot but he also is a former Congressman and is now a State Senator — and among his financial backers are the billionaire Hunt brothers.

Watergate's deepest significance was its demonstration of profound pro-fascist currents in the highest echelons of ruling-class components within the United States.

Hitler was overwhelmingly a creature of international monopoly capital — that fact remains despite efforts by bourgeois historians in West Germany, England and the United States, like G. Ritter, F. Meinecke, W. Hofer, H. Quint and Louis Lochner, etc., to deny it. The facts in this regard cannot be wished away. Recently they have been gathered together in a stout volume which, despite serious weaknesses in analyses and history, does have the virtue of putting the bulk of this material within the cover of a single book*.

Leading industrialists, financiers and Junkers of *January-February, 1982*

pre-Hitler Germany and their organizations gave him scores of millions of marks, beginning in the early 1920's. It is worth noting that this included the wealthiest Jewish industrialists in Germany — the Silverberg family, especially Adolf and his son, Paul. The German Army and Navy also secretly funded the Nazi party and armed it. (Of course, it is well known that Hitler began his illustrious career as a teacher and a stoop pigeon for the German Army after the First World War.)

In the United States, money poured into the Hitler effort from several very wealthy families; above all, millions were forthcoming from Henry Ford, whose benefactions were publicly acknowledged in an award to Ford bestowed upon him by Nazi diplomats in the United States. In England — notably the head of the Bank of London, Sir Montagu Norman — and in France, Belgium, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, Hungary, Romania and Finland millionaires and nobility and royalty (including the monarchs of Bulgaria and Romania) gave him money and support. When he seized power as ruler of fascist Italy, Mussolini at once supplied Hitler with money and weapons; Gömböcs in Hungary did the same.

Bourgeois leaders of the world often made public their support of fascism. In England, the *Financial Times*, *Daily Mail*, *Morning Post*, and London *Times* gave Hitler a favorable press; in the United States, the very influential Hearst newspaper chain was an avid supporter of Mussolini and Hitler; Ribbentrop and Mussolini himself contributed regular columns to that chain. Such mass circulated papers as the New York *Daily News* deserved the title, widely applied to it, of the "Daily Nazi."

Some few examples: Winston Churchill, speaking in 1927 before the Organization of Roman Fascists: "If I had been an Italian, I am sure I should have been entirely with you from the beginning to the end of your victorious struggle against the brutal appetites and passions of Leninism." Judge Gary, president of U.S. Steel, speaking in the United States before the International Chamber of Commerce Congress in 1923: "We should be the better for a man like Mussolini here too." W.M. Kiplinger, the financial adviser, wrote in *Nation's Business*, organ of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, March, 1935: "Many thoughtful people believe that our form of government must be changed to something resembling the fascist form," and in May, 1935: "Many big busi-

* James Pool and Suzanne Pool, *Who Financed Hitler? The Secret Funding of Hitler's Rise to Power, 1919-1933* (Dial, 1978)

nessmen think well of it [fascism] and secretly hope for it."

The main reason Edward VIII was forced to give up his throne was not his selfless devotion to Wally but rather his fanatical partisanship towards Hitler, which became an open and intolerable embarrassment among dominant English circles in the 1930s. Here is a paragraph from a speech by the Duke of Windsor in 1937, speaking in Leipzig:

I have traveled the world and my upbringing has made me familiar with the great achievements of mankind, but that which I have seen in Germany, I had hitherto believed to be impossible. It cannot be grasped, and is a miracle; one can only begin to understand it when one realizes that behind it all is one man and one will, Adolf Hitler.

Hitler began to pay back his financiers as soon as he took power in 1933; first by executing scores of thousands of Communists and Socialists and then smashing the trade-union movement and in general, establishing "law and order." Thus, between 1932 and 1939 the number of multimillionaires in Germany increased by 180. In 1932 German industrial corporations reported a net loss of 2.5 billion marks; in 1935 — after three years of Hitlerism — they reported a net profit of two billion marks. While real wages stood at an index figure of 104 in 1932, they were down to 98 in 1936.

The main payoff, however, came on June 22, 1941 when, with all Europe tied to his chariot, Hitler unleashed his unprecedented assault upon the USSR. His neck was broken, Europe was liberated and Humanity saved.

* * *

Capitalism breeds and needs racism. Senile capitalism — imperialism — intensifies racism, and imperialism gone mad — which is fascism — makes racism the equivalent of a fanatically held religion. While the anti-Semitism and the racism of Hitlerism — and of European reaction and fascism in general — have many roots and sources indigenous to that area, it also is a fact that Hitler's racism and anti-Semitism borrowed from and was in part inspired by these poisons as preached and practiced in the United States. A book would be needed to develop properly this international quality of racism and anti-Semitism and in particular the connection between Hitler's propaganda and practices and those earlier manifested in the United States. Here time permits but a few brief comments.

The racist "eugenics" movement in pre-World War I

United States — originally funded by Mrs. E.H. Harriman, widow of the railroad tycoon — had as its ideological master one Dr. Harry H. Laughlin. His book, *Eugenical Sterilization in the U.S.* (1922), published by the Municipal Court of Chicago, served as the inspiration for the passage, by twenty-seven states (as of 1948), of elitist and racist laws under the aegis of which scores of thousands of "inferior" people were sterilized.

Laughlin's reasoning found the highest judicial confirmation when the U.S. Supreme Court in *Buck v Bell*, 1927, upheld the constitutionality of Virginia's law with Justice Holmes himself approving, as he declared, this "means of coping with the socially undesirable in our midst."

This Dr. Laughlin was the recipient of an honorary doctorate in medicine from the University of Heidelberg in 1938; and Hitler's Hereditary Health Law enacted in July, 1933, was modeled upon U.S. laws. In its first year of operation over 55,000 people were sterilized; its logic was the practice of euthanasia, begun by decree in 1939 and by law in 1941, by which 50,000 were put to death — all in preparation for the mass slaughters of Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals, Slavs, Soviet war prisoners, Communists, by the millions in ensuing years.

Dr. Paul Popenoe suggested in the *Journal of Heredity* in 1928 that some ten million people in the United States ought to be sterilized; this Dr. Popenoe was to be, ten years later, an ardent supporter of Hitler. Professor Walter B. Pitkin, a best-selling author of the Hoover era, urged in the preface to his *Twilight of the American Mind*, published by Simon & Schuster, (1928), "Exterminate the feeble-minded and the morons! Multiply the superior stocks!"

A book published by Harper in 1935 — in its 24th edition by 1939 — argued against maintaining prisons and mental institutions, demanding:

Why do we preserve these useless and harmful beings? . . . Why should society not dispose of the criminals and insane in a more economical manner?

This author believed that serious offenders and dangerous mentally ill people "should be humanely and economically disposed of in small euthanasic institutions supplied with proper gases . . . Philosophical systems and sentimental prejudices must give way before such necessity."

The one who wrote these words — in a best-seller, published by Harper in the 1930s — was Dr. Alexis Carrel of the Rockefeller Institute in New York City and a Nobel Prize winner — thus demonstrating that the

(Continued on page 16)

Activity to End Racism, Anti-Semitism Urgently Necessary

John Pittman

Evidence accumulates to show that threats to the security and to the human and civil rights and liberties of the U.S. population now constitute a definite growing trend, fostered by the incumbent federal government.

New Jewish Agenda's founding in December 1980 and its resolve, in the face of the rightwing election gains of November 1980, to fight to end anti-Semitism, racism and sexism, and to defend the vital interests of the masses in a number of other areas, occurred not a moment too soon.

By now readers of *Jewish Affairs* have been informed of some of this evidence. In the September-December 1981 issue, Philip Honor presented significant data, including the estimates of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith that, whereas in 1978 the organization logged nationally 49 cases of firebombing, swastika-daubings, anti-Jewish graffiti, and vandalism against Jewish institutions and property, it counted 129 instances in 1979, and 377 in 1980.*

Such incidents occurred throughout 1981 also. For * *Editor's note: figure for 1981 is well over 900.*

(Continued from page 7)

not serve independence; it cannot serve itself; it cannot serve the indivisible cause of peace.

Despite continuing difficulties, one gets the distinct impression that the intractable and often savage policies of the Begin regime (the bombing of civilians, the land policy, etc.) has engendered growing disquiet in this country. But more important there is a greater willingness to listen to alternatives and to seek new answers. Importantly, there is an opportunity to finally take the question of peace in the Middle East away from the narrow and essentially false juxta-position of Jew and Arab. The issue is the interests of the majority of the peoples of the region against reaction, cold war, and imperialism. The issue is one of all progressives against the use of states within the region to sow division and to play the role of military ally of aggression and empire. And for the people of the United States the issue is whether the government that speaks and acts in our name will seek a comprehensive peace or continue to threaten war and destruction for Arabs, Israelis and others—and ultimately threaten intervention that can grow into global conflict.

There is no need to belabor the point that the massive

instance, a 50-year-old woman and two male accomplices, aged 48 and 32, were convicted last November 21 by a Nashville, Tennessee federal jury of plotting to blow up a synagogue, some Jewish-owned businesses, and a television transmission tower. The woman and one accomplice were members of the Confederate Vigilantes of the Ku Klux Klan; the other accomplice was a member of the American Nazi Party. The plot was laid several months after Ku Klux Klansmen had shot and injured four Afro-American women in nearby Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Last May 7 a New Orleans Federal grand jury indicted ten men who had been apprehended as they were about to sail across 2,000 miles of the Caribbean to attempt the violent overthrow of the government of Dominica, a 29-by-16-mile island of the Windward Group inhabited by 81,000 descendants of African slaves. Six of the heavily-armed men were linked to the Ku Klux Klan. A columnist of the (Long Island) *Newsday* commented (6-28-81): "Additionally the Klan is conducting quasi-military training operations in remote camps . . . The Federal government, which has never shown any real desire to curb Klan activity, would do well to take note of this serious threat to domestic tranquillity. Will these schemes, like the one against friendly Dominica,

export of armaments to the region does not satisfy the security or economic needs of the people of this country or the Middle East. Indeed, peace in the Middle East is inseparable from peace in Central America, Europe, and other parts of this fragile planet. And peace is essential to our immediate struggle to stop the criminal destruction of human services in our own country and to redirect massive military spending to put our people to work, to wipe out racism, and to create a better life in general. The components of a comprehensive peace must include acknowledgement of the right of self-determination across the board, starting with realization of Palestinian rights. It must include military disengagement by the Pentagon and movement toward regional non-alignment, democratic development, and elimination of all foreign military bases. At the core, the creation of conditions which would allow all who live and work in the Middle East to live together as a coherent regional community provides the basis for solving even the thorniest of problems.

We have all seen great changes in our lifetime. With a determined effort built upon the most enlightened self-interest we shall see the dawn of peace and real fraternity in the Middle East. □

be stopped in time?"

In response to the columnist's question, the answer is no. In the words of Philip Honor, far from acting to combat schemes of the increasingly active anti-Semitic and racist forces, "the Reagan administration is easing the way for more and more anti-Semites and racists to enter the Washington scene . . . The Reagan administration in pursuit of its aggressive war-provoking foreign policies and the economic, political and social oppression of the broadest sectors of the people at home, has emboldened the far-right. Reagan's recent anti-Semitic utterances place him solidly in the camp of the far-right, widening their outreach."

The validity of this judgment is verified by recent press reports and by statements of the United States Commission on Civil Rights and its chairperson, Arthur S. Flemming. For example, *The New York Times* reported last Dec. 14 that the "underlying theme of the new policy (of the Reagan administration — J.P.) is that there should be less compulsion by the Federal Government — the Labor Department, Congress and the courts — in eliminating discrimination.

"Thus, for example, William Bradford Reynolds, the Assistant Attorney General for civil rights, said recently, 'We are not going to compel children who don't choose to have an integrated education to have one.'"

This remark by a Reagan aide is encouragement — as seven authors of a December 4 letter to *The New York Times* expressed it — to school boards "to violate the law" handed down 27 years ago by the Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education*. That decision was not self-fulfilling and would not and could not overcome the resistance of segregation any more than the Civil War amendments to the Constitution were able of themselves to eliminate the overt and residual, institutionalized political and socio-economic means of repression of chattel slavery. Implementation of *Brown v. Board of Education* and subsequent civil rights legislation required enforcement by the Federal government. And this the Reagan administration has repudiated and begun to dismantle under the pretext of ending "compulsion" of individuals, states and localities. As cruel and hypocritical a fraud as was ever perpetrated on the people of this country!

The consequences of this abandonment of its responsibilities under the Constitution and the principles of established civil rights law and policy by the Reagan administration are spelled out in two reports of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. The first report entitled *Civil Rights: A National, Not a Special Interest*, and issued last June 25, declares:

"Reducing allocations for specific civil rights enforcement activities will mean that millions of Americans will continue to be victims of discrimination in education, employment, housing, and government services. Cutting these programs designed to overcome the effects of past discrimination will delay achievement of equality . . . The Commission's analysis suggests that the administration's budget threatens the progress made during the last several decades and the progress yet necessary to realize the moral vision that has guided their nation in its grandest moments. Given the historical constitutional obligation resulting from the Civil War amendments, the Commission believes that the President and the Congress have a fundamental responsibility to assure the Nation that in their budget plans there shall be no retreat from the objective of liberty and justice for all."

In a 56-page statement issued December 9, the Commission strongly supported affirmative action, including the selective use of numerical goals and hiring quotas, to achieve equal job opportunities for minorities and women. It said: "The Federal courts of appeal on numerous occasions have approved quota remedies to prevent a recurrence of discrimination even where such remedies might favor persons who are not identifiable victims of discrimination. Affirmative relief, therefore, including quotas and preferential treatment, cannot be denied simply because it may be detrimental to the interests of some white males."

And on December 8, Arthur S. Flemming, who had been dismissed the previous month by President Reagan from his post as chair of the Commission, explained to *The New York Times* the Commission's position on affirmative action. He said: "Built into the institutions of our society, whether it's a public agency or a private agency, is the factor of institutional discrimination. Unless you recognize its existence and do something about it, it will govern what happens to your agency in terms of opening up opportunities for minorities and women. Affirmative action is simply using the normal tools of management to achieve the objective that you want to achieve in the area of equal employment opportunity." Incidentally, Flemming admitted that he was forced out of the chair of the Commission "because of a divergence of convictions between the commission and the administration on basic civil rights issues."

The foregoing evidence bears directly on Agenda's commitment, announced at its founding conference, to "firmly oppose all forms of anti-Semitism and racism and right-wing terror . . . In doing so we seek to unite with a broad-based anti-racist coalition including

Jewish Affairs

Blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, Native Americans, ethnic minority groups as well as labor, left and other progressive political organizations."

The implementation of such a commendable goal and realistic strategy requires a real struggle against a number of obstacles. In breaking with the head-in-sand approach of elements of established Jewish organizations and institutions bent on locking the Jewish people in an alliance with U.S. monopoly capital, Agenda faces ideological battles with foes of affirmative action and its tools, as well as with Jewish spokespeople who pretend to see no evil and hear no evil in developing events. These impediments to clarity and unity take diverse forms.

For instance, the Anti-Defamation League engaged in a debate with the National Education Association over that organization's issuance of a curriculum for its 1.7 million teachers. The NEA's curriculum, according to the Anti-Defamation League, presents a questionable view of American history and emphasizes statistics showing economic gaps between Afro-Americans and whites while ignoring recent gains by Afro-Americans. The League took umbrage at a passage in the curriculum which said: "Thus, it is important to remember that the Klan is only the tip of the iceberg, and the most visible and obvious manifestation of the entrenched racism in our society." The League asserts that the Klan is only an aberration in U.S. society, and is not "the tip of the iceberg" in a racist society.

The Anti-Defamation League is wrong on both counts in this debate. Willard McGuire, president of the teachers' organization, gave an answer with which 50 million members of subordinated and repressed minorities could agree. He said: "There are many examples of racism in our society and, while we have made progress, racism still exists." The June, 1981 report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights also answered the League. It said: "The re-emergence of the Ku Klux Klan and other proponents of hate-ideologies serve as graphic reminders that virulent, overt bigotry has not disappeared from our political landscape. Discrimination also comes in many more subtle — but not less pernicious — forms. In virtually all sectors of society, massive social and economic inequalities between white males and the rest of the population persist, indicating the existence of entrenched and pervasive systems of discrimination that are able to thrive without the open expression of prejudiced beliefs."

This report further documents the economic gaps between Afro-Americans and other subordinated and repressed

January-February, 1982

minorities and the white majority. What is most unacceptable about the League's position is not that it belittles the threat from the far-right and terrorist elements, a common attribute of sycophantic individuals and organizations currying favor of ruling circles, but that it tries to impose this outlook on other organizations. Further, even a task force of the League has admitted to *The New York Times* of last Feb. 18 that the increase in anti-Jewish incidents might be "the tip of an iceberg" expressing "a pervasive and deep-rooted anti-Semitism which has lain dormant for the last 20 or 30 years." Most important, however, is the effect of such a stance on the 50 million members of racially and nationally oppressed minorities. Surely such a position will make the organization of alliances with these minorities doubly difficult.

In mounting the ideological struggle to implement its plans for building an anti-racist coalition, Agenda will confront not only the head-in-sand ideologues, but also the Reagan administration officials who propound views that attempt to justify maintenance of the status quo of inequality and injustice.

For instance, the aforementioned William Bradford Reynolds is on record as saying that "you can't cure discrimination with discrimination" in reference to hiring practices that take account of race, color, sex or national origin. Termed "reverse discrimination," such preferences are said not only to violate the rights of white males, but also to violate the principle that government action should be "color blind," a concept Reagan is fond of using. But that is a phony argument, first, because government has never been color blind as even the slightest familiarity with U.S. history will attest; and second, because as Justice Harry A. Blackmun of the Supreme Court expressed it, "In order to get beyond racism, we must first take account of race."

Effectively to build an anti-racist coalition calls for clarity on such questions. Certainly Agenda can count on cooperation from many organizations and individuals of other minority groups to develop the necessary process of clarification.

Civic organizations, their leadership and membership currently calling for an intensification of activity to put an end to racism and anti-Semitism will be encouraged to know that the Communist Party of the United States of America is now on record for a *new overall campaign against racism*. The November plenary meeting of its central committee adopted a report of its general secretary, Gus Hall, which called for a campaign against racism "that fights on the basis on concretes, of the new manifestations of racism, and, at the same time, raises the need for the overall struggle against racism." Fur-

Getting Together on What We Agree

By Edith Beck

Emphasizing that we can draw people together on issues on which they agree, we went to work. And so, the "Community Unity Coalition" was formed. The readers should find it rather interesting to trace back the birth of this now vital union of organizations.

"Jewish Affairs" editors, supporters and readers should draw great satisfaction from the story of the development of "Community Unity Coalition." Some time ago a group of readers of "Jewish Affairs" formed a support committee to assist in its growth as well as to offer financial support for this much needed publication. We sponsored successful affairs; raised funds — one such affair is unforgettable. That was when Herbert Aptheker, our editor, came to visit us. The Yablon Center was packed — people standing all over — in the hallway, on the steps; many had to go home because of lack of space. Dr. Aptheker, always the teacher and orator, was at his best. The evening was not only educational and stimulating — we also raised funds for our publication. Assessing this success, we asked ourselves, "What now?"

Then it came to us — "Jewish Affairs" means amongst other things to really become a part of the community!

The murdered children of Atlanta were fresh on our minds and amongst our urgent concerns. We felt that it was important that our large Jewish community should not only issue statements of concern but should express our solidarity with the people of Atlanta. And so we got to work. Here was a good basis to get the various groups in our community together, a good start for joint efforts on issues of common concern.

We got together with the progressive Jewish Cultural Clubs. Together we called the Jewish Centers, Synagogues, Churches, Civic Organizations, Unions,

(Continued from page 13)

thermore, the CPUSA emphasizes the urgency of such a campaign, while paying tribute to Agenda's leadership of peace demonstrations which took place last November in a number of cities.

Certainly this development should be additional encouragement and assurance of the success of the broadening efforts to wipe out the scourge of racism and anti-Semitism.

John Pittman is a member of the Nationalities Department of the CPUSA.

Black Organizations and Leaders and National Minority groupings. At our first meeting 21 organizations were represented. At this meeting we formed the "Community Unity Coalition."

Our first action was to call a large public gathering in "Sympathy and Solidarity With The Atlanta Parents." The meeting was held in the beautiful hall at Temple Beth Em. There were speakers representing trade unions, religious institutions, the Board of Education, racial and national minorities and the media. The place was packed. The enthusiasm and united spirit were electric! We made no collection appeal, but the people showered us with money. Over 100 people left their names, offering to help.

"Community Union" has become a regularly functioning organization, representative of the many groups and peoples in Los Angeles. We meet regularly at our neighborhood Lutheran Church whose Minister is a leading member of the coalition.

We are currently planning an enlarged conference. Its theme will be: "Racism, Who Needs it? Who Benefits From It?" The plan calls for 8 workshops: (1) Racism and Unemployment; (2) Racism in the Media (images and stereotypes); (3) Cut-Backs: its affect on the young and old in the economic, education and medical sectors; (4) The New Right (so-called Moral Majority), K.K.K., nazis; (5) Racism in Education; (6) Origins of Racism and (7) Racism in Immigration; Racism and Law Enforcement.

Prominent people, expert in these fields, were invited to lead these discussions, which will be chaired by members of the coalition. It is scheduled for January 17, 1982 at Los Angeles City College. This conference will not only be educational but will organizationally draw closer the many groups in Los Angeles interested in combating racism, whatever form it takes.

Once more, let me repeat that it was through the work of supporters of "Jewish Affairs" from its inception, that this growing coalition came about.

Just maybe, we are proving what "Jewish Affairs" is all about — its outlook calls upon its readers to become a part of the Jewish community and yes, as progressive Jews, we must become an integral part of our general community, with all of its problems and concerns. And yes, we are not forgetting our magazine. We are now planning some undertakings, after the Conference, to raise funds for our very important publication.

We are alive! We are active! We are doing! Thought you'd like to know.

Edith Beck is a supporter and contributor to Jewish Affairs.

Jewish Affairs

Telling The Truth About Paul Robeson

By Lloyd L. Brown

A Note by the Writer: The following public statement is being made at the request of Herbert Aptheker, noted historian and a former editorial colleague, who asked me to comment on a recent article that gravely impugned the character of Paul Robeson. As his longtime friend, collaborator and designated biographer, I feel it my duty to set the record straight concerning Robeson's integrity. — Lloyd L. Brown, New York, December 4, 1981.

How shocking it is to see that Paul Robeson has become the target of a posthumous accusation more cruelly unjust, I think, than any directed at him while he still lived! This time it is not his judgment, his left-wing politics or his patriotism that is impugned. More than five years after his death, that which was most precious to Robeson — his integrity — has recently been challenged head-on by his only son in a public speech, the text of which appeared in the November 1981 issue of *Jewish Currents*.

In that speech, entitled "How My Father Met Itzik Feffer," Paul Robeson, Jr., asserted that in 1949 his father, while visiting Moscow, was surreptitiously told that a murderous anti-Semitic campaign was being waged by the Soviet government against leading Jewish cultural figures, and that Robeson's informant, a friend named Itzik Feffer, a Soviet Jewish poet, revealed that he and his colleagues were being framed-up and would soon be slain.

Thus, according to Pauli (as Robeson's friends always called his son), his father had first-hand knowledge of ongoing anti-Semitic crimes and foreknowledge of Feffer's doom, but did only two things about it. First, soon after hearing Feffer's tragic story, Robeson publicly avowed his friendship with Feffer at a Leningrad concert; and secondly, sometime later he confided the "terrible story" to his son.

As Pauli tells it, his father did nothing else about it. Not a mumbling word to anyone else in America. Not a whisper to any of his close friends and co-workers — Ben Davis, W.E.B. Du Bois, Alphaeus Hunton, Louis Burnham, George Murphy, or Lloyd Brown, his literary collaborator and chosen biographer. Not a hint to his good friends at the *Morning Freiheit*, which he continued generously to support, or to the Jewish trade unionists who, later that year, stood with him against the racist mob at Peckskill. To believe Pauli's story one can

January-February, 1982

only conclude that from 1949 on, despite Robeson's public stance as a champion of human rights, he was an utterly unprincipled man who was involved in a monstrous cover-up and took his guilty secret to the grave.

"He told me that story," Pauli insisted to me after I found out about his speech, "and indeed I swore not to say it as long as he was alive. He's been dead six years, so I'm certainly going to tell it. It's the truth."

On the contrary, Pauli's story is "wholly false" and "pure fiction." Those quoted words of emphatic denial are *Pauli's own words, written after his father's death*, concerning the publication of an account of Robeson's alleged meeting with Feffer that appeared in an anti-Soviet bulletin published in Illinois.* In his letter of "outraged protest," which was printed in the next issue of that bulletin, Pauli wrote:

"Your description of events that supposedly occurred during two of Paul Robeson's post-war visits to the U.S.S.R. are wholly false according to my father's personal recounting of those visits to me. Many published statements prove that your hearsay stories are pure fiction." (Emphasis added. — L.L.B.)

Now, five years later, when he reverses what his father told him, Pauli also revises the various "hearsay stories" that have previously been published on that subject. His so-called "authentic account" has changed the year of the Feffer-Robeson meeting from the obviously false 1951 (when Robeson was not permitted to travel) to 1949 when Robeson did in fact visit the U.S.S.R. More significantly, all of the other hearsay accounts say that when Feffer visited Robeson in his hotel room (the name of the hotel is variously given), Robeson had no idea that Feffer was being persecuted and only learned about it many years later. *Only Pauli's account makes his father a knowing accomplice to a cover-up.*

In addition to Pauli's documented unreliability as a witness (My father told me this/My father told me the opposite), there is other solid proof that he has given Jewish Currents readers a story that is "wholly false" and "pure fiction." He told about a Leningrad concert, held soon after the alleged Robeson-Feffer meeting, where he says his father paid tribute to Feffer and other Soviet Jews whom he heard were being victimized.

But there was no Robeson concert in Leningrad that year. Though Pauli described that non-event with eye-

*Bulletin of the Center for Soviet and East European Studies, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, No. 17, Spring 1976. Paul Robeson, Jr.'s, protest appeared in No. 18, Fall 1976, p. 1.

witness detail, he gave no date for it and cited no source for the account. In my Moscow research for a Robeson biography, I learned about eight concerts by Robeson during his two weeks in the U.S.S.R. in 1949 — seven in Moscow and one in Stalingrad. All of his concerts were reported in the Soviet press, and on June 16, the day after the singer's departure, Pravda's summary account of Robeson's visit shows that no concert was held in Leningrad. (Robeson did not return to the Soviet Union until nine years later.)

In presenting his fiction as if it were fact, Pauli related the "Leningrad concert" part of his now-it-can-be-told story as though it too had come directly from his father. For example: "As he looked over the audience, Paul saw an amazing sight." But, of course, Robeson saw nothing since neither he nor the audience was present at the dramatic scene so vividly described by Pauli as having taken place in "the largest concert hall in Leningrad." His tale must be viewed as a clumsy invention to authenticate his wretched attempt to scandalize his father's name.

And how did Robeson feel about the triumphal concerts that he actually did sing on that visit, during which, as the *New York Times* reported on June 15, he had received "greater acclaim than had been given in recent years to any United States visitor"? At his farewell concert he said:

"I am leaving the Soviet Union in a state of spiritual elation. I feel as if I am sprouting wings which carry me to a new, still more intense struggle for peace. I wish to tell all of you in farewell: I was, I am, and shall always remain a devoted and sincere friend of the Soviet Union."

If Robeson instead had a "terrible story" for only one pair of ears after his return, the record shows that publicly he was unstinting in praise of what he termed the "ethnic democracy" he had found in the U.S.S.R. Less than a week after he left Moscow, he told a "welcome home" rally of 5,000 persons in Harlem that the entire Soviet Union was then doing honor to the "dark-skinned Pushkin" in an anniversary celebration, and added: "Yes, I love the Soviet people."

And later that year, only five months after he had heard (according to his son) a renowned Soviet Jewish poet tell him a grim story of racist persecution, Paul Robeson told an audience at the Waldorf Astoria celebrating the Russian Revolution that he had observed that in the Soviet Union "whether one is a renowned poet or a peasant farmer — black, brown, yellow or white — Christian, Jew or atheist, he enjoys the same human dignity, the same human rights."

None of us who heard him then and witnessed his heroic stand during the years of the Cold War that followed, when he defended the framed-up Rosenbergs and all other victims of persecution — risking his life to do so, can leave the slightest doubt about Paul Robeson's monumental integrity.

Perhaps because Pauli's own feelings about the Soviet Union are as bitterly hostile as his father's were friendly, he has now allowed himself to be used as a hostile witness against his father's character. In his published speech, Pauli made passing mention of Shakespeare's *King Lear*. How ironic, I thought, that he should refer to a play wherein it is written:

*How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is
To have a thankless child!* □

JEWISH AFFAIRS

For progressive analyses of the major issues of the day. For clarity in the struggle against racism, anti-Semitism and national chauvinism. For progressive workingclass culture in the struggle for socialism and peace.

() Please enter my subscription for _____ year(s) at \$3.00 per year (6 issues).

() Please renew my subscription.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

(Continued from page 10)

racist Nobel Prize winner of our own day — Dr. Shockley — is not unique.

Reaction's logic seeds fascism's practice. When the President of the United States told a gathering of police chiefs in New Orleans — as he did a few weeks ago — that criminal conduct has its source in the evil quality of human beings, in their innate proneness towards wrong-doing, and that ideas of social causation are false, he revealed a medieval stance that characterizes fascism's anti-scientific outlook.

The growth and spread of anti-Semitic assaults in the United States — reaching almost one thousand separate reported incidents in 1981 — and the intensifying of racist practices and propaganda (supported by the White House itself), suggests the urgency of mass unity in struggle against these scourges. The kind of grass-roots activity described elsewhere in this issue of JEWISH AFFAIRS by Edith Beck is exactly the kind of efforts that are both imperative and perfectly possible. □

Jewish Affairs

“The Night Before Babi Yar”

By Alexander Borschagovsky

The Moscow Jewish Drama Company put on the play, “The Night Before Babi Yar.” A review of the production of the play appeared in “Sovietish Heimland” no. 7, 1981. The text of the play is introduced by Alexander Borschagovsky.

There are works which have a special place among those one has written in the course of a long life. In prose, they are usually called the magnum opus, but a drama, and even a short story, can be the direct and profound expression of the writer’s soul, his experience of life, and the dominant theme of all his work.

My drama “The Night Before Babi Yar” has interested me ever since that morning on the November 7th, 1943 when, with the advancing army, I entered newly-liberated Kiev and, meeting a fellow countryman from Byelotserkousk, listened to an account of Babi Yar which I found hard to believe. He had been one of the unfortunates in the burial squad at Babi Yar and had miraculously survived as a result of a last desperate bid for liberty. Of the same age as myself, he was white-haired and inwardly ravaged by two terrible years at the mass graves and at the bonfires in which the fascists frantically hastened to burn the evidence of their crimes.

I wrote and rewrote the play over many years, trying to achieve simplicity — tragedy is entitled to put on only simple garments. I would write the drama eagerly, right through from beginning to end, and then would put it off for a long time. This continued until November 1976, when I made out the last fair copy in the peace and quiet of Karlovy Vary. I often felt prey to doubts: was it necessary, years after the event, to subject the reader, and even more so the spectator, to that grievous and tragic past again? How was I to prevail in spirit over the crushing and oppressive burden of the event itself, over such anguish and suffering?

I was surrounded at Karlovy Vary by people of various nationalities and languages. Visitors who had come from many different countries to the medicinal springs lived together without experiencing the slightest hostility, let alone strangeness. Why was it here that I should be irresistibly drawn to rewrite a play about the time when the forces of fascism were active in the cause of disruption, driving people to destructive hatred and fratricide?

The possibility and the feasibility of human fraternity are what at this time had become — not by design, not by choice of reason alone, but with all the fullness of my *January-February, 1982*

being — the dominant idea and theme of all my work as a writer. Even the extensive historical material of my novel “Where the Blacksmith Will Settle,” whose action unfolds in the USA during the Civil War, boiled down for me, in the final analysis, to the idea of the brotherhood of free peoples, to the simple and immutable idea of equality of blood and race, of the inevitable doom of chauvinist violence, behind which can always be found reactionary social forces that stand to gain by inequality and bloody strife.

This dangerous and enervating war goes on even when the guns are silent and the sky is no longer appalled by the drone of enemy warplanes. We are approaching the end of the great 20th century, an age of social and scientific revolutions, and yet there is so much blind — I would even say medieval — hatred, misunderstanding and prejudice! Irish people of the same stock are plunged into bloody internecine conflict simply through belonging to different Christian churches. Canadians who have been living side by side for two centuries but speak different languages — French and English — are ready to take up arms against one another. Blind nationalism and religious fanaticism are convulsing tragic Iran, threatening the roots, the very foundations of the revolutionary changes that were about to be made. The Black children of Atlanta are perishing, many millions of Blacks are suffering, though they have done so much for the welfare and prosperity of their homeland, which is still no mother to them, but rather an evil stepmother. The criminal zionist leaders of Israel are driving a whole people further and further along the dangerous road to what will inevitably become a new tragedy, all the more terrible, the longer the journey down that false and unjust road continues.

However helpless the individual may be in this ominous global crisis, he is obliged to act, and if he acts with the millions, he is a power. Faith in the possibility of brotherhood, in its feasibility, in the spiritual health of the people — these are the foundations for which there can be no substitute.

That is what “The Night Before Babi Yar” is about.

The pitch-black night of fascism has descended on a people. They do not yet realize that they are doomed; premonitions and fears dwell in them side by side with hope. They are being separated according to race in an attempt to sow the enmity and hatred which will, more effectively than anything else, kill all that is human in them.

People gather together in one room who did not even know of one another’s existence an hour ago. Circumstances dig a gulf between them, driving them to ir-

reconcilable hatred, but in one tragic night they become as close as if they were kinfolk. Brothers and sisters.

It would not be worth while living without such a faith in the possibility of brotherhood.

This brotherhood is not an invention of the literary men or the dramatists, for it permeates the whole of our Soviet history, it has enhanced our revolution, it runs through the whole proud chronicle of our resistance to fascism.

People, who from the very start have striven for brotherhood, live everywhere, and this aspiration is not the privilege of any one country; but in my own homeland there is a special, I would say higher, experience of internationalism and national fraternity. I think that this experience, apart from my intentions as an author, has left its beneficial mark on the behavior and ideas of the characters in "The Night Before Babi Yar," from the teenagers born after the October revolution to the old people.

Teenagers from my past life and the lives of people close to me appear in the drama. There is a heartrending plot detail — the order of the commendatura for a flat being vacated — which brings under one roof two families and which is not invented by the dramatist, for only life itself could create it. That, indeed, is what

happened: this plot detail was suggested to me by the harsh life led by my wife Valentina in occupied Kiev with our year-and-a-half-old daughter, Svetlana; how my wife asked a neighbor to leave her son with her for a time until everything was sorted out; how she walked for a long time in an endless street column of Jews, beseeching her neighbor to leave her the little boy; how she came to the already dangerous point of no return, when one of the German escorts noticed her with her daughter in her arms and drove her away, not even understanding that he had thereby saved her life. . . .

This personal experience in effect gave me the play; but for a long time it still hampered me from giving it artistic completion, from breaking away from the restrictions of the personal and drawing closer to something general and in some degree typical.

I am delighted that the play is to appear on the pages of "Sovietish Heimland," and I am proud that it has been translated by Note Lurye, one of my favorite prose writers. He is a marvelous authority on the living language of the people, a man of irreproachable literary taste and incapable of falsifying. I am not in a position to judge his translation, but I am sure that the essence of the play, its dialogue and variety of the cadences have lost nothing in his rendering. □

Babi Yar (I)* **Antar Mberi**

They did it in '45
the fascist generals
of Hitler
marched
Jew and non-Jew
out
into desolate fields
on the outskirts of the district
and shot them down
without trial
or sentence
shot them down
by the thousands

Nothing remained
nothing was left behind
not names or addresses
birthdates or anniversaries
nothing
nothing but heaps of human ashes
burnt up bones

Among these ashes
it still is cried
in Kiev
you could find
shreds of clothing
scorched teeth
a tiny sock
children's shoes

* Babi Yar: a district of Kiev's outskirts in the Ukraine, where Hitler's troops murdered masses during WWII indiscriminately. A monument mourning and condemning this atrocity has been built on the site by the Soviet people.

Babi Yar (II)

I who have borne witness
to centuries of unaccounted murders
to Black deaths and Red deaths
Brown deaths and Yellow deaths
and there are poor white deaths to talk about

I who have borne witness

to history imperialized
from the bottom of the bottom
have stood at the feet of Babiyar
deep in the soul
of the Ukraine
asking my country
these simplest of questions

Where are the monuments
to mourn our mass murders
our invisible war
years of Black slaughters
eras of Red massacres
decades of Brown holocausts
days on days of Yellow bloodbaths
and there are more poor white deaths to talk about

Why
do your Confederate Generals
still confront us
pass defeat
why
do they ride arrogantly
along the highways
against us
sabers drawn
striking through the nights
of terror
astride reared hooves of stallions
of monumental steel
and monumental magnates

Why
do your Confederate Generals
ride with feet of fresh blood

A group of friends of JEWISH AFFAIRS who live in the Warbasse Houses, gathered at one of the homes to discuss the current scene and building JEWISH AFFAIRS.

We raised \$460.00 in memory of M.F. who devoted his entire life to the struggle for peace and justice in the world.

We honor his memory.

and corporate cotton
still in stirrups
bust up unions
from the Oval Office
of the 'new' South
today

Today, my country
which does not want to be
my country
where is your monolithic voice
your democratic voice of iron
let it come rushing
from every quarter rushing
molten and mass
(how weak it rises in this vital hour)

My country
again you ask us to nurse you
into some sense of cogent history
some ultralinear line of progress
again we must teach you how to sing
but the only songs we are singing
will make you mad and bring you out
marching through the streets
beside us
or against us

Antar Mberi, poet, is on the staff of the Daily World. A compilation of some of his works, "A Song of Harlem," was issued by Humanities Press Inc., Clifton, N.J. 84 pp. 1980.

**EVA AND ABE WISE
JEWISH AFFAIRS MEMORIAL
FUND**

**IN MEMORY OF
JOSEPH BORUCHOWICH,
ROSE WORTIS,
FANNIE GOLUS,
ISIDORE WEISBERG AND
MANYA PERLMAN RADZIE**

Zina \$50.00
Dora Elson \$50.00
Dave Pearlman \$75.00
Sarah Glicksberg \$20.00
Rose Chernos \$200.00

(Continued from page 2)

Reagan arrogantly wears his racism on his sleeve — he removed Arthur Fleming from the Chairmanship of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission for taking his responsibilities too seriously. This removal will soon be followed by the dissolution of the Commission. Reagan revealed gross ignorance as well as his racism in his discussion of the Weber Case and in his plan to grant tax exemptions to segregated schools. A people's fire-storm of protest compelled him to change his tactics. Crude hypocrisy is not foreign to Reagan who is capable of praising the life and ideals of Dr. Martin Luther King while deliberately turning a deaf ear to the pleas of millions of whites and Blacks to make the birthday of the martyred peace and human rights advocate a national holiday.

In this period of nature and U.S. monopoly gone amuck one is prone to conclude that we shall long remember the deadly impact of these natural and political catastrophes. While history will properly record these natural and monopoly-triggered disasters, the future will take greater note of the will and determination of wide sectors of the people to join in common cause with each other to improve the quality of life by combatting U.S. monopoly control.

In assessing the strength and significance of the people's upsurge against Reaganomics, in his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party, Gus Hall, general secretary, said:

"A very important feature of the mass upsurge is the explosive response and participation in recent conferences. . . . A noteworthy element of these actions has been the spontaneous response factor. In most cases, when hundreds were expected thousands showed up. . . . Another important element is that while the spontaneous element was exceptional these conferences succeeded in adopting advanced positions on most issues."

Among these gatherings are included the founding conference of New Jewish Agenda and the historic labor-led Solidarity Day March on Washington on September 19, 1981. Currently coalitions are forming across the land to follow up on Solidarity Day with continuing struggles on the economic front, which is central to all others, and with plans to drive the Reaganites from the halls of Congress, state houses and state and local legislative bodies, replacing them with candidates approved by labor and responsive to the people's movements and demands.

During this period we witnessed the positioning of a giant U.S. naval and military armada in the Middle East. The Egyptian people were duly impressed with their meaning when U.S. parachutists swarmed down upon their land like locusts bearing the sign: "AMERICA'S # 1; DON'T YOU FORGET IT!" This, in the name of the Camp David "Peace" Accords! But close to 1,000,000 of our youth refused to register for this aggressive role, echoing the peace chant: "Hell No! We won't go for Texaco!"

Displaying extreme arrogance, intransigence and subservience to U.S. policy in the Middle East, the Likud government rammed through the Knesset the Reagan-Begin Strategic Military Alliance, an alliance that not only places the future of Israel and the Middle East in jeopardy but the very future of the world itself. Widespread opposition to the anti-Sovietism embodied in the treaty was revealed in the debates. This treaty is the first and only treaty specifically labelling the USSR a threat. Among those who rejected this Hitler-like big lie was Abba Eban, no admirer of the Soviet Union.

We also witnessed the seizure of the Golan Heights by the Begin government, the chief surrogate of U.S. imperialism in the Middle East. In the face of rampant nationalism, chauvinism and jingoism imposed on the people of Israel by the Likud governing coalition, mass protests broke out against the seizure — 10,000 demonstrated in Tel Aviv alone.

Most significantly there was a wide outcry in the U.S. Jewish community against the excesses of the Likud government. New Jewish Agenda demonstrated in protest in front of the Israeli U.N. Mission. Phillip Klutznick, the world renowned U.S. Jewish leader, persists in his calls for peace in the Middle East through negotiations with the Palestinians. He has been subjected to vile attacks by the Jewish establishment. The anti-sovietism that infects a wide sector of the U.S. Jewish community and the liberal sector holds back the development of a sustained struggle for a just peace in the Middle East.

However, worthy of note is the growing concern by liberals about the intransigence and aggressive policies of the Begin government. An expression of this concern was the special edition of the *Nation* of December 5, 1981 entitled, "Myths About the Middle East." This was an effort to "pierce the haze" around Israel and the Middle East.

Despite the siege atmosphere created in Israel by the Begin government with its denial of basic democratic rights, the forces seeking peace and justice are deter-

(Continued from page 2)

mind to fight. Meir Vilner, general secretary of the heroic embattled Communist Party of Israel, has called for the building of a broad peace front to combat the dangers flowing from the Reagan-Begin Strategic Alliance that would make of Israel a military base for the U.S., a stationary military target.

Further, in Israel a group comprising an editor of the Tel Aviv daily, Yediot Hachronot, writers, poets, historians, a Peace Now leader and others placed an appeal in Ha'Aretz announcing the formation of the Temporary Action Committee "to create a broad coalitions of citizens prepared to fight against discrimination . . . against government policy which demands territorial annexation. (We are) for peaceful co-existence with the Palestinian people."

"This coalition," the statement continues, "is not bound to any political party and will cooperate with all groups and people working for the same goals — within Israel and outside it."

The Israeli Peace Committee Against Israeli-American Strategic Cooperation has published an appeal in Israel's large daily newspapers expressing grave concern about new Israeli-U.S. military bonds. The appeal is entitled: "Don't Let Israel Become a Foreign Military Base." The appeal charges that the new cooperation "will increase the cold war and arms race" and "harm the security and independence of Israel . . . and endanger her very survival."

Throughout the world we witnessed the millions marching and organizing for a nuclear arms freeze, disarmament and detente. In the U.S., peace forces are

now seeking millions of signatures on the petition for a nuclear arms freeze and for demonstration throughout the country to demand that Reagan participate in the U.N. Special Session on World Disarmament to take place in June. Plans now call for hundreds of thousands gathering in front of the U.N. on Saturday, June 12th.

To sustain the upsurge there must be struggle. In his report Gus Hall stated:

"Our guiding principle for projecting any form of struggle and our conditions for support to a form of struggle is that its aim is to mobilize masses of people — mass rallies, mass protests, mass sit-ins and teach-ins and, of course, strikes."

We, in the Jewish community must now step-up our efforts and pursue them in a consistent manner in the Jewish organizations and other civic groupings with which we are affiliated. We, as progressive Jews appreciate full well the interconnection between economic oppression and racist and national oppression. It will take tireless efforts to effect economic changes and to build people's coalitions to bring about a people's victory in the November elections.

An historic gathering, The Extraordinary National Conference to Combat Reaganism, is scheduled to take place this spring. It will be a way station to assess our efforts and plans and to project further steps in building an All People's Front of struggle.

In the historic struggles ahead a useful tool will be a copy of Gus Hall's report issued by New Outlook Publishers under the title, "What the Reds Say Today." Copies are available at Jewish Affairs. □

L.M.M.

**We extend our sincere
condolences to**

MAX

on the death of his wife

GUSSIE MAGER

A staunch fighter for peace

CHARLES NEMEROFF

READING CIRCLE

GREETINGS TO JEWISH AFFAIRS

Ray Green	\$25.00
Anne Yellin	\$10.00
Ray Shapiro	\$25.00
L. and M. Kanter	\$10.00
A. Friedheim	\$10.00
Paul Goldberg	\$20.00
L. and M. Kalb	\$20.00
Meyer Case	\$50.00
A. Liebman	\$25.00
Lem Harris	\$10.00
Benjamin DeLeon	\$10.00
David Kolodoff	\$ 5.00
Abe Itzkowitz	\$25.00
Charles Strongwater	\$25.00
Meyer Gerst	\$ 5.00
Rebecca Gurewitz	\$ 5.00

GREETINGS TO JEWISH AFFAIRS

Ray Green	\$25.00
Anne Yellin	\$10.00
Ray Shapiro	\$25.00
L. and M. Kanter	\$10.00
A. Friedheim	\$10.00
Paul Goldberg	\$20.00
L. and M. Kalb	\$20.00
Meyer Case	\$50.00
A. Liebman	\$25.00
David and Edka Seltzer ..	\$25.00
Jack Friedman	\$20.00
Lem Harris	\$10.00
Benjamin DeLeon	\$10.00
David Kolodoff	\$ 5.00
Abe Itzkowitz	\$25.00
Charles Strongwater	\$25.00
Meyer Gerst	\$ 5.00
Rebecca Gurewitz	\$ 5.00
Paula Alexander	\$ 5.00
Tania Rosenberg	\$ 5.00

Miriam Chamberlain ...	\$ 15.00
Sophie Rutland	\$ 10.00
Bella Schmidt	\$ 10.00
B. Weiss	\$ 25.00
Fay Feldstein	\$ 5.00
Ralph Glick	\$ 5.00
Ben Stadler	\$ 7.00
Anna Levine	\$ 50.00
Ella Frankel	\$ 10.00
F. Bass	\$ 25.00
Sheldon Glickman	\$ 10.00
Max Gitlin	\$ 25.00
Frieda Burke	\$ 5.00
Hyman Davis	\$ 10.00
Clarence Sharp	\$ 10.00
S. Gold	\$ 5.00
Marian Green	\$ 5.00
Alfred Sherman	\$ 10.00
Gertrude and Bob Decker	\$ 25.00
Lilly Bydarian	\$ 5.00
Jack	\$ 25.00
Jennie Feldman	\$ 10.00
Frank Siegal	\$ 20.00
Esther Brall	\$ 10.00

Sam and Sarah Gouldin ...	\$ 10.00
E. Perrer	\$ 20.00
Kay Front	\$100.00
Dora Large	\$100.00
Pearl	\$ 25.00
C. and A. Zitron	\$ 25.00
Meyer Goldberg	\$ 35.00
Eddy	\$ 5.00
Nathan Albert	\$ 50.00
J. and J. Cohen	\$ 25.00
A. and J. Bauman	\$ 10.00
S. Amsel	\$ 10.00
Anna Gottfried	\$ 30.00
Sasrah Glicksberg	\$ 25.00
Leah	\$ 25.00
Florida Friends	\$600.00
Minna Bayer	\$ 25.00
Nax Ziebel	\$ 12.00
Frances Boris	\$ 10.00
W. G. Binkley	\$ 7.00
Dave	\$ 5.00
Bernard Gayman	\$ 7.00
Eastside/Westside Friends	\$ 50.00

דאס האט אים אלעקסאנדער טראכטנבערג געשיקט נאך אייר
בוך. און זי האט אויף מיר אנגעוויזן, דעהערט דעם נאמען
אלגין, האב איך זיך שנעל אויסגעדייט און אים באטראכט.
ער איז צוגעקומען מיט ליכטע אינגלשע טייט. זיינע
ברילן האבן נאך מער געשיינט פונעם ברייטן שמיכל אויף
זיין געזיכט.

— פון וואגען קענט איר אלעקסאנדער טראכטנבערג?
— פון רענד סקול.
— געמסט דארטן קורסן?
— נאך ניט.
— לערנט זיך, יונגערמאן, אלעקסאנדער איז א גוטער
לערער.
— ער האט מיר א קלאפ געטאן אין פלייצע און א צופרי-
דענער ארויס.

" " "

דאס איז געווען דאס ערשטע מאל וואס איך האב זיך
באקענט מיט א בוך אין אידיש, וואס האט צערודערט מין
נשמה, מיט א אידישן שרייבער וועלכער האט מיך ארייני-
געפירט אין דער וועלט פון געוואנגען און קאמפן און מיט
אן אדעסער לאנדסמאן, וועלכער האט מיך דערווענטערט צו
דער סאציאליסטישער אידעאלאגיע און באוועגונג.

ר'דס "צען טעג וואס האבן אויפגעזעצט די וועלט". און
אז דו וועסט דעם בוך איבערלייענען קום אריין צו מיר. איך
וויל מיט דיר האבן א געשפרעך וועגן בוך. פארשטאנען?
ער האט אויף שנעל אנגעשריבן דאס ברויול, מיר עס
דערלאנגט און ווידער קרעפטק א טרייסל געטאן מין האנט
און געזאגט:

— ליינען און האב הגאט!

אין דער צען-שטאקיקער געביידע

יענעם אונטן גלייך נאך דער ארבעט, האב איך געכאפט
דעם רויטן "באס" אויף יינאן סקווער און אורעק צו איסט
בראדוועי. איך בין אריין אין דער "פארוערטס" געביידע,
ארויף מיטן עלעווייטאר און געבליבן שטיין אין א בוך-גע-
שעפט מיט אידישע ביכער.

א יונגע פרוי האט ביי מיר צוגענומען דאס ברויועלע
און גענומען זוכן דעם בוך. ענדלעך האט זי אים מיר דער-
לאנגט און בשעת זי האט גענומען אויסמאכן א פארקויף
בלאנק האב איך גענומען בלעטערן דעם בוך.
אין דער טר האט זיך באוויזן א בלאנדער מאן אין גלע-
זער מיט א וייער איידעלן געזיכט. ווען די יונגע פרוי האט
אים דערזען האט זי פריידיק אויסגערופן:
— גענאסע אלגין, איר האט דא אייערן א פארערער.

פון האליוועלס קאבינעט. דאס איז געווען דאס בילד פון א שיינעם מאנספארשויך מיט דורכזיכטיקע אויגן אין א פוטער- נעם טולילפ און א פוטערנעם הוט. איך האב באמערקט, אז אויף דער רעכטער זייט ביים סאמע, ראנד פון געמאלענעם בילד איז פאראן א נאמען. איך האב זיך שטיל צוגעשארט צום בילד.

האליוועל האט איבערגעריסן דאס קארעגירן פון אן אפ- דרוק און מיט אינטערעס מיר נאכגעפאלגט מיט די אויגן. ווען איך האב זיך איינגעבויען צו ליינענע די ווערטער „ראָ- בערט האליוועל“, האָב איך דערשילט זיינע בליקן. איך האב זיך שנעל אויסגעדרייט צו אים און געפרענט:

— דאָס זייט איר?

— נין, דאָס האָב איך געמאַל.

— איז ווערזשע איז דער מאָן?

— דזשאַן ריד.

און האליוועל האט מיט א צעשטראַלט געזיכט מיך אַרומ- גענומען מיט זיין קרעפטיקער האַנט אַרום דעם אַקסל און צוגעגאַנגען צום בילד.

— דאָס איז מיינער אַ יוגנט-חבר פון אוניווערזיטעט. זיין נאָמען איז דזשאַן ריד, אַ באַרימטער שרייבער און שור- נאַליסט. ער איז אַמגעקומען אין דער באַלשעוויסטישער רעוואַלוציע אין רוסלאַנד. ער האָט אַנגעשריבן אַ גרויס ווערק „צען טעג וואָס האָבן אויפגערוהערט די וועלט“, דאָס איז בלויז אַ קאַפּיע פון דעם אַריגינאַל בילד וואָס איך האָב אַוועק- געשענקט אַונזער „אַלמאַ מאַטער“, דעם האַרוואַרדער אַוני- ווערזיטעט.

איך בין געשטאַנען אַ פאַרגאַפּטער און געשלאַנגען זיינע ווערטער. האליוועל האָט געוואוסט, אז איך בין בלויז אַ האַלב יאָר אין לאַנד און קען נאָך ניט גענוג קיין ענגליש. האָט ער מיר אַ פרעג-געטאַן:

— אין וועלכער שפּראַך איז דיר גרינג צו ליינענען?

— אין רוסיש אָדער אידיש.

— נוט, איך וועל דיר קריגן דזשאַן ריד'ס בוך אין

רוסיש אָדער אידיש.

— און ער האָט אַ קלונג געטאַן דער טעלעפּאָניסטקע:

— קריג מיר די רענד סקול און פאַרבוינדט מיך מיט

אַלעקסאַנדער טראַכטנבערג.

ווען ער האָט זיך פאַרבונדן מיט וועמען ער האָט גע- וואָלט, האָט ער זייער פּריינטלעך דערקלערט:

— מיין טייערער אַלעקסאַנדער, איך וויל פון דיר אַ

טובה, דאָ געפינט זיך ביי מיר אַ בחור'ל מיטן נאָמען דעיוויד,

וועלכער איז בלויז עטלעכע חדשים פון דיין לאַנד. איך וויל

פאַר אים קריגן דזשאַן ריד'ס בוך „די צען טעג“ אין רוסיש,

אָדער אידיש. קאַנטס אים קריגן? נוט, איך שיק אים גלייך

אַריבער צו דיר.

האליוועל האָט אַיפּגעהאַנגען דאָס טעלעפּאָן-טרייבל און

אַ צעשטראַלטער געזאַנט:

— דעיוויד, גיי גלייך אַריבער צו דער רענד סקול אויף

15טער גאַס עכטן יוניאָן סקווער און פרעג פאַר אַלעקסאַנדער

טראַכטנבערג. ער איז דיינער אַ לאַנדסמאַן פון אַדעס. ער וועט פאַר דיר קריגן דעם בוך. זאָרג זיך ניט פאַר געלט. איך גיב דיר אים אַ מתנה.

דער אַדעסיט מיט די שוואַרצע וואַנצעלעך

ווען איך בין אַריינגעקומען אין דער געביידע פון רענד- סקול, וואָס קוקט אַויס ווי דער אַריינגאַנג צו אַ שלאַס און דערוען דעם גרויסן בוך-געשעפט, איז מיר געוואָרן ליכטיק אין די אויגן. איך האָב געפרעגט אויף אַלעקסאַנדער טראַכטנ- בערג, האָט מען מיר אַנגעוויזן אויף אַ סדר מיטן אַיפּשריפט: „דעפּאַרטמענט אָו לעיבאַר ריסורטש“. איך האָב אַנגעקלאַפּט און אַ קרעפטיקע שטימע האָט אַויסגערופן:

— קומט אַריין.

ווען איך בין אַריין אין העל באַלויכטענעם קאַבינעט, האָב איך דערוען פיר ווענט מיט ביכער, אַ גרויסן טיש מיט אַנגעוואַרענע ביכער, זשורנאַלן און פאַפּירן און פון צווישן זיי שיינע אַרויס אַ פאַר שוואַרצע אויגן איבער שוואַרצע וואַנצעלעך.

אַ נידעריק-געפאַקטער ברונעט האָט זיך אַיפּגעהויבן און אַויסגעשטרעקט אַ האַנט:

— דעיוויד?

— יעס, סער.

ער האָט מיר אַנגעקאַפּט די האַנט און קרעפטיק אַ טרייטל געטאַן. ער האָט גלייך גענומען רעדן רוסיש און געפרעגט פון וואַנצען איך שטאַם. ווען ער האָט דערהערט, אז איך קום פון די ברעגן פון דניעסטער האָט ער זיך דערפּרייט:

— נו, און אין אַדעס ביזסטו אַמאַל געווען?

— יא, אין 1914.

— וואו אין אַדעס?

— אויפן קיאָליניצקי לומאַן.

— אויף וועלכער דאַטשע?

— קאַפּישעוסיקי נומער 40.

— כאָ, כאָ, דאָס איז דאָך געווען מיין פעטער אַר-

קאַדיע'ס דאַטשע.

ער האָט מיך אַרומגענומען און אַוועקגעזעצט אויף אַ שטול לעבן זיך. ער האָט געבעטן דערציילן ווי אזוי אַונזער פאַמיליע איז אַנטלאָפן פון אונטערן יאָך פון די רומענישע באַיאָרן און ווי אזוי איך אַרבעט און צי לערן איך זיך ענגליש.

— מיטאַמאַל האָט ער מיך אַ פרעג געטאַן:

— פון וואַסע איז אַלגיניען האַסטו געווערט?

— נין.

— וועלכע אידישע צייטונג ליינעסטו?

— דעם „מאַרגן זשורנאַל“.

— ווייסטו וואו דער „פאַרווערטס“ געפינט זיך?

— יא, אויף ראַטנבערג סקווער.

— איך וועל דיר געבן אַ צעטעלע צום בוך-געשעפט אין

דער „פאַרווערטס“ געביידע, און זיי וועלן דיר געבן אויף

מיין חשבון מאַסיעי אַלגיניס אידישע איבערזעצונג פון דזשאַן

וידוישע ענינים

די „צען טעג“, וואָס האָבן אויפגערוּדערט אַ „גרינעם“ אינגל

קאָפייל פּונעם בוך: „אַמעריקאַנער בילדער און געשטאַלטן“

פון דוד סעלצער

איך פלעג באַקאכטן ווי אזוי די רעדאַקטארן אַרבעטן, ווי אזוי מען קאַרעירט און מען שרייבט איבער מאַנסקריפּטן. ניט איינמאַל האָב איך אַרויסגעראַטעוועט פאַפּירענע שרייב פּון די קערבלעך, וואוּהינ מען פלעגט אַריינזאָרפן גאַנצע בלעטלעך פון באַרימטע שרייבער. אַיי, ווען איך וואַלט דאָן באַהאַלטן יענע שטיקלעך מאַנסקריפּטן, זיי וואַלטן דאָך היינט געווען טייערער ווי גאלד.

איך פלעג זען די באַרימטע ענגלישע שרייבער קומען אין די רעדאַקציעס און דורך מינע הענט זיינען דורכגעגאַנגען גען זייערע מאַנסקריפּטן און קאַרעגירטע אַפּדורקן פון זיי. ערע דערציילונגען, אַרטיקלעך, לידער און רעפּראָדוקציעס פון באַרימטע מאַלער און סקולפּטארן. איבערהויפּט האָט דער זשורנאַל „דאַיעל“ מיך אינטריר גירט מיט די נעמען: וויליאַם באַטלער יעטס, ס. ס. עליאט, שערווד גענדערסאָן, בערטראַנד ראַסעל, פאַבלע פּיקאַסאָ און מאַרק שאַגאַל.

באב האַליוועל און דזשאַן ריד

פון אַלע רעדאַקטארן און פאַרוואַלטער פון די זשורנאַלן בין איך אַמאַנענטסטן געוואָרן מיט'ן פאַרוואַלטונגס־רעדאַקטאָר פון זשורנאַל „ניו רעפּאַבליק“ — דעם מאַלער באב האַליוועל.

ער איז געווען אַ זייער צוגעלאָטער און וואוילער מענטש און זיך אַפט פאַראינטערעסירט מיט מיר, דעם גרינעם בחור'ל, וואָס בלעטערט נייערייך די זשורנאַל און פאַרקעט זיך אין די געבנדענע בינדער אין די בעכער־שראַנקען. מיר איז זייער שטאַרק געפּעלן געוואָרן זיין פּערלדיקע האַנטשריפט — זיין קאַליגראַפּיע. ער האָט קיינמאַל ניט גע' קלאַפט אַויף קיין שרייב־מאַשינקע און קיינמאַל ניט דיקטירט דער שטאַרע זיינע בריוו. אַזער מעמאַס, נאָר שפּוט געמאַלן מיט דער שוואַרצער פעדער געדרוקטן אַדער שרייבנדיקן שריפט. ער האָט אַפט מיר געוויזן ווי גרינג עס איז זיך אויסלערנען שרייבן שיקן, און איך האָב פון אים אַ סך גע'לערנט.

איינמאַל האָב איך זיך שטאַרק פאַרקוקט אויף אַ גע'מאַלענעם פאַרטערע, וואָס האָט געהאַנגען אויף דער וואַנט

אין פאַרבוינדונג מיט דעם פילם „רעזס“ וועגן דזשאַן ריד און זיין בוך „צען טעג וואָס האָבן אויפ' גערווערט די וועלט“, דרוקן מיר דאָ איבער אַ קאָפּי פילם פון דוד סעלצערס בוך: „אַמעריקאַנער בילדער און געשטאַלטן“, וועלכן דער מחבר גרייט צום דרוק.

נאָך שטלעכע חדשים אַרבעט אין דעם פעטער מאַני'ס דרוקעריי, די „פּערעגוט פּרעס“, אויף 7טע עוועניו און 23טע גאַס. מאַנהעטן, בין איך אַוועק אַרבעטן אין דער דרוקעריי פון מיין קאָזין הערשלייב. דאָס איז געווען סוף 1920. הערש לייב'ס דרוקעריי, די „מאַק פּרינטינג אַפּאַנטי“, אויף 25טער גאַס און זעקסטער עוועניו, האָט געטאָן זייער אַ סך פּובליקאַציע־אַרבעט — זשורנאַלן און צייטשריפטן אין ענגליש.

הערש־לייב אַליין איז געווען אַן ערשטקלאַסיקער שריפט־זאַצער פאַכמאַן. אַ געוועזענער פאַרמאַן אין דער באַרימטער דרוקעריי „בלענשאַרד פּרעס“. טאַקע דערפאַר האָט ער אַריינגעקראָגן די אַרבעט פון די זשורנאַלן „די דאַיעל“, „סווירוועי“, „סווירוועי גרעפיק“, די „ניו רעפּאַבליק“ און אַנדערע.

פונקט ווי ביים פעטער מאַני אזוי אויך ביי הערש־לייב'ן בין איך אַ גאַנגע צייט אַרומגעלאָפן ווי אַ שיק־אינגל מיט אַפּדורקן פון קאַרעקטורן, געפירט מאַנסקריפּטן און געשלעפט פּעק אַבער ווייניק וואָס געאַרבעט ביי זעצעריי, די אורזאך פאַרוואַס איך בין אַוועק פונעם פעטערס און געווען טאַקע דערפאַר, וואָס איך האָב געוואַלט וואָס שנעלער ווערן אַן „אַפּרענטיס“ (אַ לערנער) אין דעם פאַך פון שייפטזעצעריי. הערש־לייב האָט מיר צוגעזאָגט, אַז איינליך וועל איך דאָס ווערן. דערווייל אַבער בין איך נאָך אַלץ געלאָפן אַ גאַנג. עס איז אַבער געווען פּיל אינטערעסאַנטער און באַלערנדיקער, ווי איך דער קליינער קאַמעריציעלער דרוקעריי ביים פעטער. אין די רעדאַקציעס פון די דערמאַנטע זשורנאַלן, מיט זייערע רעדאַקציע־קאַבינעטן, שיינע ביבליאָטעקן און אויפ־נאַמט־ציערן, פלעג איך אַפט לאָגן וואַרטן. אַז איך בין שוין געוואָרן דאַרטן אַ היימשיפּער, פלעג איך פּיל אַרומוואַנדערן פון צימער צו צימער און געוואָרן פאַני־בראַט מיט אַלע אַנ'געשטעלטע.