

JEWISH AFFAIRS

25¢

Vol. 3, Nos. 4-5

April-May 1972

CONTENTS

Editorial

<u>Zionism and Racism</u>	2
Hyman Lumer, <u>The Middle East and World Peace</u>	5
Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East <u>Stop the Bombing! End the War!</u>	11
William L. Patterson <u>How Should Black America View Israel?</u>	12
Sol Flapan, <u>29th Anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising - its Observance in Warsaw</u>	15
Editors of <u>Sovetish Heimland</u> <u>What is Happening in the Morning Freiheit?</u>	19
Nikolai Petrov (Yakov Shtein) <u>Ma'ariv's Lies</u>	23
<u>Events and Views</u>	24

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

EDITORIALZIONISM AND RACISM

In our issue of January 1971 we published an article by Lee Carr, entitled "The Jewish People and the Fight to Free Angela Davis." The article dealt with the disturbing rise of racism within the Jewish community and its expression in the almost total boycott of the Angela Davis case. Months later, the October 1971 issue of Israel Horizons reacted editorially to the article. This is the organ of Americans for Progressive Israel-Hashomer Hatzair--the "socialist" wing of the Zionist movement. The editorial took Lee Carr severely to task, asking why he singled out only the Jews for criticism. It stated: "This, to us, smacks of primitive anti-Semitism in which Jews are singled out for blame in situations not of their own making." And finally, it protested the magazine's devotion to the freedom of Angela Davis.

Our reply noted, among other things, that "there is a special problem in the Jewish community, namely, the pernicious influence of the racist concepts of Zionism. This leads to equating the anti-Zionism which is widespread among Black Americans with anti-Semitism and the launching of a campaign against so-called 'Black anti-Semitism' as the main threat to the Jewish people..." Now, along comes Israel Horizons itself (March-April 1972) to prove the point.

A regular column, whose author signs himself Y'rachmiel, is devoted to the content of a column in the Amsterdam News, New York's leading Black weekly, by its executive editor Bryant Rollins. Mr. Rollins writes that he had recently received from Morton Yarmon, Director of Public Relations of the American Jewish Committee, a letter inviting him to lunch. He replied that he could not accept the invitation until the American Jewish Committee could answer some perplexing questions for him on the following points:

- "1. The Forest Hills housing project.
- "2. The attempt by city officials to obtain a racial census in order that it might begin to attack the problems of Blacks and other minorities being systematically excluded from city jobs.
- "3. A vicious press release, distributed on January 30, 1972, in which the American Jewish Committee delivers an underhanded and unprincipled attack on the Black Muslim movement in America."

Y'rachmiel then proceeds to express some thoughts of his own on these questions. On the first, he states: "I will not go into the Forest Hills mess since it cannot be discussed adequately in the confines of this column." On the second he has much more to say and we quote him at some length. He is

against a racial census, he says,

...and precisely for the reason at which Mr. Rollins hints but does not state in a question he asks concerning a proposed census by the City University of New York, and which ten Jewish organizations, including the AJC, have been fighting: "What group will be most severely threatened by the revelation that few Blacks hold upper level and mid-level positions within the university system?" He goes on to reply: "You can answer that one, can't you?"

Certainly we can, even if Mr. Rollins is delicately reluctant to do so. The Jews. And if Mr. Rollins thinks the Jews are fighting the questionnaire because they are afraid for their jobs and livelihood, he is exactly right. I don't find it written in any law, religious or secular, that it must be the Jews, and the Jews alone, who are to make way for the upward mobility of the Blacks. If Mr. Rollins is looking for whipping boys, I would ask him to look elsewhere. We Jews have played that role much too long--longer by millenia than have the Blacks.

With regard to the AJC release, Y'rachmiel notes only that Rollins does not deny its charges of anti-Semitism and hostility to Israel on the part of the Black Muslims but charges that the release ignores their positive role in the Black community. He says: "The AJC attack, according to Mr. Rollins, "is an outrageous, machinegun attack on brothers and sisters who are part of our community and with whom we, not the AJC, must learn to live and work."

*

We think Y'rachmiel's observations speak for themselves. Certainly his reference to the "Forest Hills mess" is eloquent indeed. The basic issue in Forest Hills is simple enough: a group of Jewish bigots is fighting to keep Black people from coming into the community. Such racist exclusionism must be condemned and fought, and a number of Jewish and other organizations have taken such a stand. For Y'rachmiel to say so hardly requires a whole column. If to him it is a "mess" requiring a lengthy discourse, it is evidently because he does not accept this view. It is such failure to take a forthright stand on so clear-cut a case of racism that incurs the distrust and hostility of Black people, including Mr. Rollins.

Y'rachmiel's reaction to the question of a racial census is an especially outrageous exhibition of racism. He directly pits Jew against Black and says in effect: "We Jews have been scapegoats long enough. We have overcome anti-Semitic discrimination and have made a place for ourselves in the New York educational system, and no one will take it from us, including you. If you seek to rectify the injustices inflicted on you, go look somewhere else. It is not our concern." Where else they are to look, he does not say.

Such total callousness to discrimination against Black people grows out of the type of thinking which is characteristic of Jewish nationalism and Zionism, as it is of narrow nationalism generally. It dictates that each oppressed people must concern itself solely with combatting its own oppression, if need be at the expense of other peoples.

Y'rachmiel sees the threat to the jobs of Jews in the university system as emanating from the Black academics with their demands for minimum quotas and preferential hiring, just as in the Middle East Zionism sees the threat to Jewish existence as emanating from the Arabs. What the Y'rachmiels fail completely to see is that both Jews and Blacks are victims of a common enemy--monopoly capital, which is the fountain-head of both Black oppression and anti-Semitism. What they fail to see is that the best interests of Jews in the educational system (and for that matter of all whites) are served not by contesting with Blacks for jobs but by uniting with them against the real enemy of both.

Today the growing retrenchments in an already grossly inadequate educational system, while military expenditures continue to rise, pose a threat to the jobs of teachers and administrators generally. What is called for is a united struggle against retrenchment and for the much-needed enlargement and improvement of educational facilities at all levels. Within the framework of the expanding employment that this would create the upgrading of Black teachers and administrators could be jointly fought for.

But Zionist ideology builds walls between Jews and others, and leads to such crass racism as is displayed by a Y'rachmiel, albeit he regards himself as a "socialist" Zionist. This is reflected also in his response to the question of the Black Muslims. Apart from the general Zionist tendency to equate anti-Zionism and opposition to Israeli foreign policy with anti-Semitism, he shows gross insensitivity to the problems of the Black community and the role which the Muslims and other groups play within it.

Y'rachmiel ends by saying: "I shudder to think of the future of Jewish-Black relations when there are molders of Black opinion such as the Executive Editor of the Amsterdam News. I know there must be more responsible minds among his people." One can only say that if he is looking for Black leaders who are amenable to his racist views he is in for a rough time. And it is they who may well say: "We hope there are less chauvinist minds among his people."

* * *

THE MIDDLE EAST AND WORLD PEACE

By Hyman Lumer

(The following is the text of a speech, somewhat abridged, which was presented at a meeting held by the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East on April 21, 1972, and attended by some 400 people.)

Overshadowing all else today is Nixon's new, unparalleled escalation of mass slaughter in Vietnam, with the raining of thousands of tons of bombs on civilian populations in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. This criminal act of desperation not only carries the brutal aggression to new depths of barbarism but vastly increases the threat of a world nuclear war.

At this moment there is no more vital, no more life-and-death task before us than compelling Nixon to put an end to the bombing and withdraw all U.S. military forces from Indochina. The course of events everywhere depends on the outcome of this crucial struggle, not excluding the Middle East. Here, too, U.S. imperialism pursues a policy of aggression, directed against the forces of national liberation, a policy which greatly aggravates the danger of war.

*

On the surface, the situation in the Middle East is comparatively quiet. Events there receive few front-page headlines. There is a continued stalemate with regard to negotiations, which has lasted for well over a year. Israel continues to occupy the conquered territories; the Arab states continue to maintain an uneasy cease-fire. But the calm is deceptive. The longer the present impasse continues, the greater is the danger of the outbreak of large-scale warfare in the Middle East with all its possible consequences.

The source of the deadlock remains what it has been from the beginning: the Israeli refusal to give up the occupied territories. Israel's rulers say they are for the UN Security Council resolution, but they offer a strange interpretation of its meaning. The resolution calls, they say, for the negotiation of secure and recognized borders. Therefore, let us proceed to negotiate these borders; then we can discuss withdrawal. In an interview in January of this year, Golda Meir spells it out in these words: "There must be changes in borders, on all our borders, for security's sake. So our policy is, we want to negotiate peace treaties with our neighbors on secure, agreed and recognized borders." (New York Times, January 30, 1972.)

What are the changes in borders of which the Israeli Prime Minister

speaks? In the same interview she states: "We must have full control of Sharm el-Sheikh. There must be a territorial connection between Sharm el-Sheikh and Israel proper, which means there must be changes in the Israeli-Egyptian border." The rest of the Sinai peninsula must be demilitarized: "...the Sinai cannot again be filled with the Egyptian army."

To this she adds that "Israel has taken a definite position that Jerusalem will not be divided again and is a part of Israel and the capital of Israel." But it does not end with this. As she and other members of the government have declared, to be secure, Israel must retain the Golan Heights and the Gaza strip. And she must have the right to maintain troops and settlements along the Jordan River, even if the West Bank is returned to Jordan.

What the Israeli leaders are saying is this: "We hold these territories and we will no longer accept the borders that existed before June 1967. Whenever the Arab states agree to the new borders that we consider secure, we will graciously consider giving up the remainder of the occupied territories. Until then we will hold on to all of them." Yet they have the effrontery to say: "We want to enter negotiations without any preconditions." And Abba Eban declares in the UN that Israel seeks no annexations!

More than that, if the Arab states reject these demands, it is because they don't want peace with Israel. "When they reach the point that they desire true peace," says Golda Meir, "they will understand that we do not have to give back all the territories." (New York Times, April 30, 1972.)

But this is an outright repudiation of the UN resolution, which starts out by "emphasizing the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war." This principle, moreover, is not merely part of the resolution; it is contained in the Charter of the United Nations, to which Israel, as a UN member, presumably subscribes. What it means is that the conquered territories do not belong to Israel, that the Israeli government has no right to use them as bargaining pawns in negotiations, and above all that it has no right to annex them.

The argument that these territories are necessary to the security of Israel is entirely without merit. In this day of jet planes and guided missiles (not to speak of nuclear weapons) the shifting of borders a dozen miles, fifty miles or a hundred miles makes little difference. Security does not lie in geography. There are no impregnable borders. And no one knows this better than Israel's rulers, who are militarily very astute.

What they are seeking is not security from invasion, of which Israel is in no real danger, but territorial expansion, which is what motivated the conquest of these territories in the first place. As far as they are concerned the stalemate can last forever; meanwhile they continue to implement their policy of de facto annexation through a succession of accom-

plished facts. Thus, an article in the Israeli newspaper Ha'aretz last November stated: "Without much publicity, in the past four years important changes have been made in the Jordan Valley. . . . I am referring to the establishment of a series of closely located settlements along the border from south of Beit Shean to the Dead Sea and along its western shore to Ein Gedi. . . . Politically, the establishment of these settlements is very important. It is, in effect, the annexation of the Jordan Valley by Israel." (Ze'ev Shif, "New Map in the Jordan Valley," November 4, 1971.)

Evacuation of Arabs in the Gaza Strip to make way for Israeli settlements continues. Only recently, according to the Israeli press, the Secretariat of Mapam voted to protest against the policy of "depriving the Arab inhabitants in the Gaza Strip and Pithat Rafiach of their land and against the plans for permanent Jewish civilian settlement in the Strip and North Sinai." (Al Hamishmar, March 16, 1972.)

This refers to the growing practice of closing off areas of land belonging to the Arabs on the excuse of "security," thus clearing these areas for future Israeli inhabitants. And this follows upon the wholesale razing of houses in the Gaza Strip town of Jabaliya last July and the forcible removal of some 2,000 families--also in the name of "security." What the Israeli occupiers are seeking is the step-by-step clearing out of Arabs in order to populate the occupied territories with Jews. In pursuit of this same aim, the Israeli government has spearheaded the slanderous anti-Soviet campaign whose purpose is to bring Soviet Jews to Israel.

Similarly, the integration of the occupied territories into the Israeli economy goes on without interruption. These are being developed as a colonial hinterland, providing profitable markets for Israeli goods and a source of cheap Arab labor. The Egyptian oil wells in the Sinai Peninsula are being operated at full capacity, providing Israel with its total oil requirements and more.

Here lies the nub of the question. While the Zionists accepted the UN partition of Palestine in 1947, they have always conceived of the Jewish state as embracing all of Palestine, and their policies since that time have been designed to bring this about. The Right wing, headed by Menachem Begin, makes no bones about it. They call for the outright annexation of all the occupied territories--and more. Those in the Meir government are not so crude about it, but they, too, stand for annexation of all or most of the conquered territories.

An attempt was initiated by Egypt in February 1971 to find a way out of the deadlock by opening negotiations for opening the Suez Canal. But this, too, has been stymied by Israel's refusal to yield an inch.

Egyptian proposals called for Israeli withdrawal to a specified dis-

tance, reopening the Canal with the stationing of Egyptian troops on both banks, extension of the cease-fire for a period of six months to a year, and recognition that these acts would constitute the first steps in a process of withdrawal.

But virtually all of this was rejected by Israel, which proposed withdrawal to only a short distance from the Canal, no Egyptian troops--not even token forces--on the East Bank, an unlimited cease-fire, and recognition of the withdrawal as a closed act with no commitment to accept further withdrawals.

In short, Israel proposed to allow the Canal to be reopened only if the Egyptians would accept this as the totality and would renounce all rights to take action to regain its territories--that is, if the occupation of the Sinai Peninsula were made permanent.

*

In pursuit of this policy of annexation, the Israeli rulers do everything to make it appear that no understanding with the Arabs is possible, that they are determined to destroy Israel. Thus they have continued the practice of reacting to raids by Arab guerrillas with massive attacks on Arab territory, attacks in which the casualties and property damage are entirely out of proportion to any damage done by the raiders. Only last month we witnessed a series of such invasions of the territory of Lebanon and Syria. Once again these actions were condemned in the UN Security Council. And once again the condemnation was ignored.

The Israeli ruling circles evidently consider that time is on their side, that the longer the present state of affairs continues the greater will be the pressure on the Arab states to agree to negotiations on Israel's terms. But this is an illusion. In reality their situation grows worse with time. For one thing their policies are progressively isolating Israel among the nations of the world. The UN General Assembly in December, after its discussion of the Middle East situation, adopted a resolution, sponsored by Egypt, reaffirming the November 1967 resolution of the Security Council as the basis for negotiations and calling on Israel to respond favorably to the memorandum issued by Gunnar Jarring in February 1971. That memorandum, we may recall, asked the governments of Egypt and Israel to state their positions on the provisions of the 1967 resolution. The Egyptian government replied, accepting all the provisions of the resolution and offering to sign a peace treaty with Israel in return for her withdrawal from the occupied territories. The Israeli government has never replied and it is clear that it has no intention of doing so.

The General Assembly resolution was adopted by a margin of 79 to 7, with 36 abstentions. Who were the six nations that supported Israel? Haiti, Salvador, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, Uruguay and Costa

Rica. Even the United States could do no more than abstain. Condemnation of the Israeli annexation of East Jerusalem, of the treatment of the Arab population in the occupied territories, of the repeated attacks on neighboring Arab countries, has been almost universal. In fact, today the only country which Israel's leaders look upon as an unshakeable friend is Iran.

Furthermore, the policy of pinning Israel's security on military strength is leading to greater and greater military budgets, to a skyrocketing foreign debt, owed mostly to the United States, to mounting inflation and worsening conditions for Israeli working people, and to a growing threat of economic bankruptcy. Meanwhile a handful of war profiteers and corrupt officeholders wax rich on the huge military bonanza.

Third, this policy carries with it the ever-present threat of war. It is sheer self-delusion to think that the Arab states will ever give up their efforts to recover the territories taken from them by Israel, or that the Palestinians will cease fighting for their right to self-determination. Nor will Israel's present military superiority last forever, despite all the planes and other equipment obtained from the United States. And the Soviet Union has made it clear that just as in the case of Vietnam, so too in the case of countries like Egypt and Syria, it will provide them with all the assistance they need to defend themselves. With every new incident, with every Israeli attack on Arab territory there goes the danger of a renewed flareup of large-scale warfare which can all too easily escalate to nuclear war. The Middle East, thanks to the aggressive, expansionist policies of Israel's Zionist rulers, is a tinder box, an area which holds the gravest of threats to world peace. This is the reality of the situation and we must never allow the present superficial calm to make us forget it.

The Zionist rulers of Israel are able to maintain their policy of aggression and annexation only by virtue of one thing--the support and assistance of U.S. imperialism. Without this they could never have launched their attack in June 1967. Without it they could not continue to defy the UN and world opinion as they do. Without it they cannot carry on their present policies for a single day. It is because of the United States' opposition that the Security Council has never been able to do more than condemn Israel's violations and has been prevented from more effective action such as calling for sanctions against Israel.

U.S. policy in the Middle East is dictated basically by the interests of the oil monopolies. Its aim is to undermine and destroy the Arab liberation movements and the anti-imperialist governments in Egypt, Syria and other Arab countries. U.S. imperialism gives all-out military assistance to Israel and strives to assure Israeli military superiority in the name of supposedly maintaining the "balance of power," because Israel's ruling class has made of Israel an instrument for these ends.

But at the same time Washington tries to create the impression that it is impartial, that it seeks to serve the interests of both sides. Toward this end both Secretary of State Rogers and Assistant Secretary of State Sisco made well-publicized tours of the Middle East during the past year. On these trips they offered the services of the United States as an "honest broker," as a "middleman" to bring the two sides together. They have also tried to make it appear that they are pressing the Israeli government to commit itself to at least partial withdrawal. And to give this an air of reality they held back the delivery of Phantom jets to Israel for a time.

All this, however, is a fraud. It is an attempt to substitute the State Department for Gunnar Jarring and to replace the terms of the UN Security Council resolution with a much more limited basis of negotiations, centered around the reopening of the Suez Canal and absolving the Israeli government of any serious commitment to withdrawal. The Israeli government agreed to participate only after the Nixon Administration agreed to resume the sale of Phantom jets. The Egyptian government, however, has flatly turned down the whole scheme, pointing to the increased arming of Israel and calling it a trap. And so it is.

The United States is also undoubtedly involved in the recent proposal of King Hussein for the establishment of a semi-autonomous West Bank, federated with Jordan. This, perhaps together with the Gaza Strip, would constitute the territory of the Palestinian Arabs. The idea is not new; similar proposals have come from Israeli sources, such as the Allon plan.

This proposal is offered in the name of assuring the Palestinian Arabs their national rights. But it does no such thing. Self-determination for the Palestinian Arabs means that they themselves decide their status, not Hussein and not the Israeli leaders. However, no such decision can be made as long as the bulk of the Palestinian Arabs live either under Israeli occupation or in the status of refugees. The prerequisites for genuine self-determination are withdrawal from these territories and resolution of the refugee question.

Without this, Hussein's proposal is no more than a maneuver, designed to foster the U.S. -Israeli aims as well as to sustain his own rule. Its real meaning is shown by the strong opposition of the Arab states, with Egypt going so far as to break off diplomatic relations.

*

The fight for a change in policy on the part of both the United States and Israel must be stepped up. In particular, the demand for Israeli commitment to withdrawal takes on growing urgency.

In Israel the opposition to the Meir regime's policies is growing. Recently a group of 46 scholars and public figures addressed an open

letter to Golda Meir urging the need to re-examine present policies. Student groups have accused the government of delaying a settlement, and there have been refusals to serve in the armed forces in the occupied territories. The Movement for Peace and Security calls for commitment to withdrawal--for "saying yes to Jarring."

We must build support here to this opposition. Our chief responsibility, however, is to fight for a change in U.S. Middle East policies. We must demand an end to the arming of Israel for aggression. And we must demand that the U.S. government genuinely press for withdrawal from the occupied territories as the only real road to peace.

Finally, the struggle for peace in the Middle East must be fought in the context of the struggle to end the U.S. aggression in Indochina. Our demand must be to end aggression everywhere.

* * *

STOP THE BOMBING! END THE WAR!

(The following letter was sent to all Presidential candidates.)

We, 500 people assembled in the Marc Ballroom in New York City on April 21, 1972, call upon the Presidential candidates and all others to strongly condemn the mad and insane decision to bomb the cities of Hanoi and Haiphong and the dangerous escalation of the Vietnam war.

The reckless adventurism of Nixon and his Pentagon militarists places the struggle to end the Vietnam war as the most immediate question confronting our nation now and during the 1972 elections.

This rally, called by the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East, therefore resolves to organize the widest protest against the bombings and for complete withdrawal of all American forces from Indochina.

The struggle to end the Vietnam war and the fight for peace in the Middle East are indivisible parts of one battle. The same aggressive imperialist forces dropping death on the peoples of Indochina are also those who help Israel continue her occupation of Arab lands - and for the same purpose: that of keeping South East Asia and the Middle East as areas for exploitation and profit.

We are confident that the majority of the Jewish people will join with their fellow Americans in the condemnation of the bombings, for an end to the Vietnam war, and for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East.

All Presidential candidates have a great responsibility in this election campaign to publicly speak out and to take an active part in organizing the

people to halt the bombings and to fight for the complete withdrawal of all American forces from Indochina.

All Presidential candidates must also speak out for a peaceful political settlement of the conflict in the Middle East based on the complete withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab lands so that the Middle East does not become another Vietnam.

Very truly yours,

COMMITTEE FOR A JUST PEACE
IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Alex Kolkin, Chairman
Sam Weintraub, Co-Chairman

* * *

HOW SHOULD BLACK AMERICA VIEW ISRAEL?

By William L. Patterson

Bayard Rustin, an ideologist in the Black Liberation Movement, a disciple of A. Philip Randolph, leading Black social democrat of the U. S. A., and executive director of the A. Philip Randolph Institute in New York, has an article in the Congress Bi-Weekly, organ of the American Jewish Congress, entitled "Black Links to Israel," that is of political significance not only to Black liberation fighters and progressives, but to all progressives regardless of creed or color.

Rustin starts off with a series of political questions. They demand, however, considerably more attention than Mr. Rustin cares, or has the opportunity, to give them.

The first is: "How should Black Americans view Israel?" It is answered in the last lines of Mr. Rustin's statement. There we find a far-reaching Rustin admonition: ". . . Black people all over the world should take an active interest in securing Israel's survival."

Nowhere are we informed as to who or what threatens that survival, or why or how Blacks should fight that unknown entity, or of Israel's designs on the young African states seeking economic freedom.

The second question is: "Is she the Republic of Israel as some Black nationalists assert, an uninvited imperialist threatening African solidarity?"

The third is: "Do her minorities suffer discrimination in law and

custom similar to those with which Negroes here are so familiar?"

The second question is answered in the negative. Under Mr. Rustin's examination the plunderers of Black Africa are the "Moslem kingdoms" that robbed the Black Continent of its wealth "and enslaved and murdered its inhabitants well in advance of the European colonial expeditions." Such an assertion can only throw one off the track as Blacks search for allies in today's struggles. That is not only a distortion of yesterday's history, but besides we are discussing today's situation.

Addressing himself to the third question, Mr. Rustin considers that: "There is no denying that the problems facing those Arabs displaced when Israel was formed some 25 years ago are still severe." He says nothing about the recent seizure of Arab lands nor of the Zionist sneers leveled at the United Nations resolution calling for their return to the Arab states.

Mr. Rustin oversimplifies his answers. Perhaps he did not have time nor space in which to elaborate upon the problems he has posed. It is all very well to tell 25 millions of oppressed and exploited Blacks living and struggling in the racist citadel, the financial and military arsenal of world reaction, how they should view Israel. But the question is not alone how Israel should be viewed by Blacks, but how the world should today be viewed by those Blacks who are seeking release from racism in all its malignant and murderous forms and equality of opportunity and rights for themselves and for all mankind. Israel falls within that orbit. How does Israel view racism in the U. S. A. ? That's a vital question.

The answer can only be found in the position and attitude taken by the countries of the world, Israel included, toward neo-colonialism and racism U. S. A. More particularly, it can be found in their attitude toward the national liberation struggles of oppressed people toward the fierce African, Asian and Latin American liberation conflicts and Black, Brown, Red and Yellow liberation struggles in the U. S. A. That tells the story. How does the country under analysis stand on the question of world peace? How does it stand in relation to trade union unity and democracy on an international as well as a national scale? This is the essence of the problems posed by Bayard Rustin and ignored by him.

The struggle being waged in the country for equality of opportunity, for the inalienable rights of man, and against racism as an export commodity as well as a racist policy of the cities, states and federal government of the U. S. A. , can no longer be viewed as a domestic affair. Nor is it the concern of Blacks alone. It is an international matter. Racist preachment and practices now adversely affect imperialist foreign relations as well as all domestic affairs. Racism in the U. S. A. is in direct violation of U. S. commitments to the rest of the world under the Charter of the United Nations. It is in violation of the decision handed down by

the Nuremberg Trial Court in the case of the Nazi war makers and terrorists. It is in defiance of international law. What is Israel's attitude toward that segment of the U.S.A. that launched a murderous criminal war against the heroic peoples of Vietnam? Rustin doesn't tell us, but history does. The answer is not difficult to find.

There are two Israels. There is the state of Israel now in the hands of the Zionists. They raped the lands of the Arab peasantry. They have aided Rhodesia, South Africa and the fascists of Portugal who with force and violence have robbed millions of Africans of their national heritage. They have subjected the Arabs living in Israel to the most brutal oppression - an oppression which Mr. Rustin seeks to gloss over and conceal, as he does also the severe discrimination against the darker-skinned Sephardic Jews. That these marauders are Jews is an accident of birth. That they are imperialist bandits to be hated and opposed by all progressive mankind is due to their class nature--the class nature of imperialism. Blacks have no link with them.

Then there are the Jewish masses for whom the myths of the superiority of the Jews are as dangerous as are the myths of white superiority loosed on the United States to the masses of its white working class. The link of Black America to the Jewish masses is determined by the mutual enemy and the role they play in the liberation struggles of progressive mankind.

A Zionist World Congress took place in Jerusalem in the latter part of January of this year. It was a monstrous demonstration against the liberation struggles of the Arab peoples and all others fighting for peace and freedom. American imperialism, the arch foe of Black liberation everywhere, together with the big Jewish bourgeoisie, sponsored that demonstration. The site chosen was an insult to the Arabs.

Blacks everywhere must make a clear and distinct differentiation between that segment of world imperialism which is by accident Jewish and by class inseparably related to world reaction, and the heroic Jewish people who are part and parcel of national liberation struggles wherever they reside. There is no homogeneous Israel. International Zionism has a State in Israel. It is a racist state, a supporter of racism the world over. Blacks do not seek the destruction of Israel. But for the benefit of the national liberation movements of the world, their own included, they should seek the smashing of Zionism as well as all other segments of the imperialist world.

Blacks seek the support of progressive mankind in their liberation struggles. They are an inseparable part of that mankind. They must tighten the ties that bind. There is a link that binds the Black and the Jewish peoples fighting for peace and liberation from imperialism. It is not with the State of Israel.

No force seeks the destruction of Israel. Those who oppose Zionist aggression are the friends of the Black liberation movement. Those whom Zionists support are its enemies. This is part of the policy of the national liberation movements of the world that links them together.

Bayard Rustin states that Israel "has established ambitious programs of cooperation with and aid to Asian and African nations. Part of this help comes in the form of economic and military aid." It is better to be more specific. The military training is in preparation to fight guerrillas and is more helpful to Portugal and the neo-colonialists of the West than to the African liberation movement. The unity of the Arab countries and Black Africa is historically necessary for the defeat of neo-colonialism. One must ask: What price economic aid from Israel? Israel is giving Black Africa anti-Arab and particularly anti-Soviet ideological indoctrination. It acts as the agent of the imperialist forces that established it-- the major cost of which is paid by world Zionist agencies and U.S. imperialism. One can only say of the Afro-Asian Institute of which Rustin glowingly speaks that it was set up with money from the AFL-CIO and the training is of the Meany-Lovestone variety which has kept the unions of the U.S.A. split along the color line.

Africa is a market for goods from Israel but the conditions do not favor the industrialization of any African country. The rulers of Israel are aligned with the worst enemies of Black Africa. This is especially true of its relations with the government of South Africa. The Organization of African Unity has by resolution denounced Israel's aggression in the Middle East. There is no threat to the survival of Israel. Black people the world over should take an active interest in the smashing of Zionism, an arm of world reaction in the Middle East and for unity with the progressive Jewish masses at home and abroad.

* * *

29th ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW GHETTO UPRISING -

ITS OBSERVANCE IN WARSAW

By Sol Flapan

WARSAW, April 26 - "Dying, they became immortal," declared the president of the Social and Cultural Society of Jews in Poland. Thus Edward Rajber concluded his impassioned memorial day address marking the 29th anniversary of the outbreak of the Warsaw Ghetto uprising.

In a voice choked with emotion, Rajber recalled the heroism of the Jewish freedom fighters inside the Ghetto under the command of the 23-year-old Mordechaj Anielewicz. And he paid the highest tribute to their Polish comrades-in-arms who rushed to their assistance in, and outside

the Ghetto, like Jozef Lewartowski who was sent behind The Wall by the underground Polish Workers' Party with the idea of creating an antifascist bloc.

Speaking in Yiddish, and translating some of his key passages into Polish, Rajber told the overflow mixed audience in the Jewish State Theater on April 19 that "the Ghetto insurrection was no isolated armed action. Nor was it divorced from the nationwide armed struggle on Polish soil, or from the efforts of all the nations which were being bled white under the fascist yoke."

The historic truth of the uprising in the Warsaw Ghetto, he stressed, is that it was a planned operation, prepared by an antifascist coalition and carried out by the Jewish Combat Organization.

That idea found fertile ground in the hearts and minds of militants in the Ghetto, and the April 19 to May 8 armed struggle (with isolated pockets of resistance holding out till mid-July) is but one of the more generally known and dramatic examples of long-standing Polish-Jewish working class solidarity.

This thought, said Rajber, aroused among the Ghetto Jews the awareness that precisely such an effort was the path for a life-and-death struggle in the united antifascist front together with the Polish people, together with the heroic Soviet Army, with all of the world's peaceloving nations against the hated enemy--Hitlerism.

The memorial meeting was opened by Witold Sikorski, vice president of the Warsaw area branch of the Union of Fighters for Peace and Democracy (ZBOWID). This is an organization of armed forces veterans, concentration camp survivors, soldiers of the anti-Franco International Brigade in Spain and other antifascist struggles.

Sikorski hailed the gallant struggle of the Jews who transformed the Ghetto into a "battlefield" which was incinerated by flame-throwing Nazi infantrymen, gutted by field artillery, overrun by tanks and pounded by dive-bombers.

As Rajber, Sikorski recalled the active support to the Ghetto freedom fighters by the whole spectrum of the Polish resistance movement from Gwardia Ludowa (People's Guard - the armed wing of the Polish Workers' Party) to the Armia Krajowa (Home Army - the forces of the emigre government in London).

With the final strangulation of the Ghetto, there began a new operation - to get as many of the Jewish compatriots as possible out of the smoldering ruins of what once was the Ghetto. Many of those who were thus saved, noted Sikorski, were whisked off to partisan units. There,

together with their Polish comrades, many Jews took part in the Warsaw Uprising of 1944. Still others fought their way to Berlin to deliver the death blow to the Nazi beast in his own lair.

The ZBOWID official said that the Nazi murder of Poles and Jews here comprised the greater part of Nazi Germany's wartime crimes.

Six million Polish people were killed from September 1939 when the Nazis attacked Poland to the liberation of the country in 1945. Every fifth citizen was such a victim, declared Sikorski.

It is generally accepted that of the 6,000,000 Jews the Nazis murdered, 3,000,000 were Polish citizens.

This joint martyrdom and militancy were then dramatized by the artists of the Jewish State Theater. Their vehicle was a triptych of screened scenes of the Ghetto and concentration camps while the artists glided in and out from the darkened wings "explaining" the scenes by singing appropriate songs and reciting fragments of evidence at trials of Nazi war criminals or wartime reminiscences of Poles and Jews. The tragedy and the glory of the Ghetto was thus reenacted from its early moments of bewilderment, self-delusion and apathy to the maturing will to resist as described in one of the final songs that "there's a difference when you know what you are dying for."

Interesting was the fact that the Yiddish words to this call to battle were put to a famous German antifascist song of the 1930s (Hans Eisler's "So left, two, three/So left, two, three/To the work that we must do/March on in the workers' united front/For you are a worker too").

One of the reminiscences recited verbatim stems from the 460 page album "Poles/Jews 1939-45." It's by Helena Jasinska of Warsaw who describes being rescued by Jozef Piwarski at the risk of his own life and that of his family. He brought her to the home of Aleksandra Habrowska-Chojnacka near Warsaw.

"In moments of raging terror," recalls Jasinska, "I wanted to leave so as not to jeopardize the Habrowska family... on my account."

But her Polish guardian stopped her, saying, "My child, your fate is intertwined with mine. You shall not leave this place."

The evening was brought to a dramatic climax as the entire cast sang as a finale the Jewish partisan song with its challenging "We are here" refrain. The audience rose as when an anthem is sung.

At 11 a.m. on that same day, the traditional wreath-laying ceremony was held at the Monument to the Warsaw Ghetto Heroes. Leading off the delegations were those of ZBOWID and the Social and Cultural Society of Jews in Poland, the cosponsors of the Ghetto memorial day celebrations.

Another wreath-bearing group represented the National Unity Front, an umbrella-like public organization embracing the nation's political parties, organized labor, the women's and youth organizations and other civic groups.

The Warsaw garrison was represented by three officers.

There were delegations from the different sectors of the Jewish community: the Social and Cultural Society and the editorial board of Folks-Shtime, its Yiddish-language weekly, the Jewish Theater, and the religious congregation.

A delegation from the "Tabor" Gypsy Folk Ensemble also paid their respects. The Gypsies, too, were earmarked for total annihilation in the Nazis' "New Order."

Evidence that the Ghetto struggle and what it entailed will be remembered and honored by tomorrow's generations was provided by the groups of school children who participated in the ceremony. There were youngsters from the orphanage named after the famous prewar Jewish pedagogue and children's story writer Janusz Korczak (Henryk Goldszmit) who refused to abandon his charges and voluntarily accompanied them to the Treblinka death camp.

Also present were the pupils of public school 32 who are the caretakers of the Ghetto monument and the surrounding park grounds.

These youngsters are living proof of the hope raised by Edward Rajber in his memorial meeting speech that "... new generations will be developed and brought up in the spirit of international brotherhood in our homeland, People's Poland..."

* * *

It has been charged that the May Day rally in Union Square was misused for the distribution of a leaflet issued by Jewish Affairs attacking the Morning Freiheit. The facts are as follows: Jewish Affairs has reprinted an editorial in Sovetish Heimland, critical of certain policies of the Morning Freiheit, for the benefit of its Yiddish-speaking readers and friends. It appears in English translation in this issue. There was no organized distribution of this reprint at the May Day rally. One or two individuals, however, distributed copies on their own initiative.

WHAT IS HAPPENING IN THE MORNING FREIHEIT?

Editors of Sovetish Heimland

(Note: The following is a translation, somewhat abridged, of an editorial published in the March 1972 (No. 3) issue of the Soviet Yiddish monthly Sovetish Heimland.)

In contrast to the chauvinistic and militaristic atmosphere that has been predominant in Israel for some time, a convention of the Israeli-Soviet Friendship Movement was held last January in Tel Aviv, with the participation of close to 200 delegates from all over the country. The speakers represented a broad spectrum of Israeli public opinion. They included the well-known Hebrew author Mordechai Avi-Shaul; Yaakov Rifkin, leader of the Socialist-Zionist Association of Israel; a representative of the City Council of Nazareth, Chalil Shuri; two distinguished attorneys, Abraham Melamed and Jachia Gusi; the journalist and noted public figure, Nathan Yalin-Mor; a veteran leader of the Israeli-Soviet Friendship Movement, Misha Eidelberg; and the Communist activist, Ruth Lubitch. A delegation of the Soviet Association for Friendship with Foreign Nations greeted this assembly in the name of the people of the U. S. S. R.

Could anyone, who is a true friend of Israel and the Soviet Union, have any doubts about the importance of this significant event?

In one newspaper, however, which enjoys the confidence of its readers because of its progressive traditions, we read the following report on this convention:

A Soviet delegation came to Israel to attend a conference on Israeli-Soviet Friendship. This event ought to be welcomed in spite of the fact that the gathering has been regrettably restricted only to the followers and sympathizers of Rakach (the Communist Party of Meir Vilner and Taufiq Toubi) and does not have the support of the Israeli public... This conference, which was obviously organized by pre-arrangement with Moscow (?--Editors SH), is one of the steps for an understanding between the two countries, as weak as it is for the time being. (Our emphasis--Editors SH.)

It is interesting to know: Which newspaper was it that has expressed so much reservation in its report on the Soviet-Israeli Friendship Conference? Why did this newspaper have to resort to a lie, stating that the participation in the conference was restricted "only to followers and some sympathizers" of Rakach and did not receive the support of the Israeli public? Isn't it evident that this friendship convention introduced a new factor in the public life of Israel, at a time when the 28th Zionist Congress was held in Tel Aviv, in a frenzy of anti-Soviet hysteria? Isn't it a fact that the conference, which was convened in spite of the Begins,

Meirs, and Dayans, represented the forces that are for friendship with the U.S.S.R., who will in the near future indubitably become the majority in Israel, and are at present expressing the awakened conscience of that country?

We must state with deep regret that the quotation cited above has been taken from an editorial published by the Morning Freiheit (January 30, 1972).

We are getting letters from many Sovetish Heimland readers who are asking: "What has happened to the Morning Freiheit?" On what important ideological questions have the MF leaders deviated from the fundamental precepts of proletarian internationalism? One of the basic deviations is to be found in their position with regard to the U.S.S.R. The prevailing tendency in the material on the U.S.S.R. published by the Morning Freiheit in the last few years is as follows: In its general approach the line of the paper is against anti-Soviet propaganda; on concrete issues, however, the MF actually joins the anti-Soviet campaign under the guise of "constructive criticism." To cite an example, the MF has joined the noisy "protests" that were whipped up at the time when the Warsaw Pact countries fulfilled their international obligations, assisting the people of Czechoslovakia who were defending themselves against the counter-revolutionary attacks from within and without their country.

When the editor of Undser Freint, a progressive Yiddish newspaper published in Uruguay, pointed this out in a polemic with the Morning Freiheit, the MF editors answered that they are not bringing up this question any more since it became evident, from a discussion conducted by the paper, that the majority of its readers supported the measures taken by the socialist countries, and also because they had particularly in view that the agreement concluded between the Moscow Pact leaders and the Czechoslovakian leaders should be carried out in life." Commenting on this statement, the editor of Undser Freint correctly noted:

But this is not enough. In a truly sincere, self-critical analysis, the Morning Freiheit would have to admit publicly its ideological errors in the evaluation of the Czechoslovak crisis... In our modest opinion these errors stem from the fact that at certain times the MF has dropped its compass (an expression used by the first MF leader, Moishe Olgin, at previous occasions when anti-Soviet hysteria was rampant in the American Jewish community. --Editors SH)-- the compass of internationalism; of solidarity with the U.S.S.R. (Undser Freint, April 27, 1969.)

The Morning Freiheit leadership has never made a sincere self-critical analysis of its errors.

The spokesman of the MF did not heed the advice of those readers, who called, in their letters to the editor for a class approach and consid-

eration of the interests of the USSR in regard to the Leningrad trial. Meir Silves wrote (January 6, 1971): "Analyzing carefully the trial of the eleven (in Leningrad), it becomes evident that they have committed a horrible crime. The verdicts were rendered not on Jews but on criminals. Is this the time for an attack on the Soviet Union?" Anna Dubinsky stated in her letter (February 2, 1971): "It seems that the whole world is against the pirates who have endangered human lives hijacking airplanes. . . . I believe that an alarm is being sounded not so much in the defense of those convicted, but more in order to spread hatred against the USSR, which is engaged in building a new, Socialist life. . . ." A. Kenzer, from Los Angeles, rightly remarked in a subsequent letter (August 5, 1971): "Concerning transgressions or crimes in the Soviet Union, the Morning Freiheit always puts a particular emphasis on the Jewish element. When a crime or transgression is committed in the United States, it is usually reported that the people involved are Italians, Irishmen or Jews. In the Soviet Union, as we well know, everyone is recognized as a Soviet citizen. In the MF, however, it is constantly stressed that Jews are the ones who are being brought to trial. Other Soviet citizens are also punished but they are not mentioned in the MF, which creates an impression of Soviet anti-Semitism. Why such an approach?"

In its report on the trial of the airplane hijackers, the MF relied on very questionable sources. It was shameful to read in the year-end 1970 issue of the paper a "special report" on an anti-Soviet demonstration in New York, "organized by a number of Jewish organizations." This meeting was chaired by a Rabbi named Klapperman. A greeting was sent by the reactionary Republican Senator Jacob Javits. The MF praised this demonstration as an expression "of deep concern for the convicted in Leningrad. . . ."

The second major question on which the Morning Freiheit has digressed from the principles of Marxism-Leninism involves its approach to Zionism, its evaluation of the Israeli-Arab war.

According to the theory that the editor-in-chief of the MF, P. Novick, constantly preaches, there are "bad" Zionists and "good" Zionists. According to him it is necessary to collaborate with the "good" Zionists. Hardly anyone will be taken in by the formula, "It is necessary to collaborate with good Zionists" for peace, which P. Novick uses as a cover-up. For this approach Novick's recommendations are, of course, unnecessary. The world peace movement is based upon the principle of broad collaboration with all shades of public opinion. Even multimillionaires (Cyrus Eaton) and presidents of bourgeois republics (the president of Finland, Kekkonen), even monarchs (Haile Selassie, emperor of Ethiopia), oftentimes declare themselves as peace-advocates, and join in efforts for peace. What P. Novick, Chaim Suller and the others have in mind is collaboration with the "good" Zionists on a broad political basis, otherwise they wouldn't be forever watchful that the "good" and "bad" Zionists "should not be thrown in

one pot (God forbid)," and that the honor of the "good" Zionists should not be slighted. Such is their position at a time when Zionism as a whole, as a political trend, is engaged in an unworthy fight with unworthy means, against the progressive Jewish ranks and the Soviet Union. . . . Those who are for progress and social justice can find nothing acceptable in the ideology of Zionism, which is against the people, against progress, and anti-Soviet.

Of course it is a good thing for the American Zionist rabbi, Arthur Lelyveld, to whom the Morning Freiheit leaders constantly allude, to join the struggle against the war in Vietnam. This, however, cannot, and must not lead to ideological co-existence with Zionism, as was pointed out by an MF reader, Hershel, from Miami Beach, in a letter to the editor (February 24, 1971). He stated:

As far as I am concerned all Zionists are ideologically the same. They are all adversaries of socialism. I remember that in the years 1904-05 we had to fight Zionists because they were the enemies of the Jewish workers, they opposed the class struggle against the Jewish bosses. . . .

To summarize, the leaders of the Morning Freiheit say that they have adopted a platform of collaboration with certain shades of Zionism. That is what they say, but we believe that on the fundamental question which has a bearing on the present political situation -- on the evaluation of the character of the Israeli-Arab war -- the Morning Freiheit has taken an unequivocal Zionist position, in complete conformity with the Zionist line adhered to by the Sneh-Mikunis group in Israel. (Incidentally, this is the reason why the Morning Freiheit proclaims this renegade group as the "Communist Party of Israel"). . . .

It is interesting to note that in the polemic with Undser Freint, the editors of the Morning Freiheit began to feel that their position on the character of the six-day war is a slippery one, to put it mildly. They therefore proposed that this question, as well as the Czechoslovak question, "should be put aside." The response of the editor of Undser Freint to this was: "Why should it be necessary to put aside the question of the character of the six-day war? A correct evaluation of this question will enable the Jewish masses better to understand the dangerous political line that the Dayans and Begins are preaching. . . ."

There are other questions with regard to the present situation in the Morning Freiheit on which we will comment at a future date, if we will find it necessary to do so. In April of this year the MF will celebrate its 50th anniversary. The heart of every progressive Jewish leader grieves at the ideological degredation that now permeates a newspaper which was so beloved by the Jewish masses of the United States and other countries.

There is, however, reason to believe that the Morning Freiheit will find the strength to overcome this difficult period and will again take the position of a crusading organ of the progressive Jewish community in the United States.

Translated by PH

* * *

MA'ARIV'S LIES

(How Mania, immigrant from the Soviet Union, was "absorbed" in the cemetery. . . . and how "Ma'ariv tries to revive her with its lies.)

By Nikolai Petrov (Yakov Shtein)

(Abridged from a Reader's Letter published in Zo Haderekh, February 16, 1972.)

Some time ago a press conference was held by three Soviet journalists in Vienna with the express purpose of effecting a confrontation between the local and foreign press and ex-Soviet Jews who had been enticed by Zionist propaganda to come to Israel, had there had their keen disappointments and were now in Vienna trying to attain repatriation to the Soviet Union. In this press conference the tragic fate of Mania Spector was told by some of the returning immigrants. She was the mother of two, who had in April 1971 come to Israel from Moscow, together with her husband Itzhak Kaplan, while their two children remained in Moscow. Mania Spector had been a merry woman, full of zest for life. However, after three months in Israel she changed completely. In her despair she committed suicide, and when her husband returned from his work on July 9, 1971, he found her lifeless, hanging from a pipe in the lavatory of their home.

The Dead Do Not Complain. . . .

The story of Mania Spector's tragic death aroused echoes in the world press. In order to "mitigate" the detrimental impression, the Israeli noon paper Ma'ariv employed a dirty trick: Six months after Mania's interment, Ma'ariv dared to publish, on January 21, 1972, the headline "The Suicide Is Alive and Well." And under this caption the paper said cynically: "It has turned out that Mrs. Kaplan, about whom it was reported that she had committed suicide, is alive and well, and earns well for her livelihood. Her husband is a cutter, who has recently started to work in self-employ, and she herself works, too. In the past she had complained with respect to her work."

Well, first of all: The surname of Mania is not Kaplan, but Spector (Soviet women have the right to maintain their maiden name after marriage - IB). Secondly: Her husband Itzhak Kaplan had worked in Moscow as com-

mercial manager of an enterprise producing armored concrete. He had never been a cutter or tailor. In Israel he worked as a warehouseman in a building materials warehouse in Ramat-Gan.

In respect to one matter Ma'ariy was correct: Mania does not complain any more. . . . And here is her precise address: Holon, Municipal Cemetery, Place number 7, block number 3, row number 19. By following this information the editor or correspondent of Ma'ariy will easily find the woman about whom that paper said that "she lives, is well and earns well for her livelihood. . . ."

This is the story of Mania. If the "most authoritative and objective paper of Israel" was capable of such a shocking falsification, one can easily make assumptions about the falsification of other matters by this paper, and by others which resemble it.

* * *

EVENTS AND VIEWS

A Committee of Concerned Jewish Students at City College of New York has recently issued a leaflet protesting the hoodlumism of the JDL on the City College campus. The leaflet followed a JDL attack with clubs and brass knuckles on a group of Jewish students. It calls attention to the JDL's history of gangsterism and violence as well as its association with notorious Right-wing anti-Semites and racists. It condemns Kahane's separatism, which seeks to isolate the Jews from other people, and concludes on the following note:

"We say that, despite all their shouting, the JDL has already forgotten the lesson of the six million killed by Hitler. We say never again, but by this we mean never again must Jews be separated from other peoples whose interests are the same as theirs. Never again must the Jews be separated from the fight for freedom of all people. It was only by isolating the Jews from the rest of the people that Hitler was able to slaughter the six million. It was only by preaching exactly what Kahane preaches--that the interests of Jews were different from other working peoples--that Hitler could turn the rest of the Germans against the Jews. Now Kahane would have the Jews voluntarily isolate themselves.

"WE SAY: THE JDL DOES NOT SPEAK FOR US!"

* * *

JEWISH AFFAIRS is published monthly by the Communist Party, U. S. A. Price per copy 25¢. Subscriptions: one year \$2.50, six months \$1.25. Canada and Foreign: \$3.50. Address all correspondence to JEWISH AFFAIRS, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010.