

Published by the

Communist Party,

U.S.A.

JEWISH AFFAIRS

(Double Issue)

September-
December
1974

Price 35¢



IN THIS ISSUE

In the Rabin Camp

Editorial

A Visit to the USSR

Philip Honor

General Brown's Anti-Semitism

Editorial

On the Zionist Ideological Crisis

Emile Touma

Hyman Lumer

THE PALESTINE QUESTION

JEWISH AFFAIRS

Vol. 4, No. 5

Double Issue
September-December, 1974

Editor: Hyman Lumer

Editorial Committee: David Fried, Jack Kling, Alex Kolkin

CONTENTS

Editorials

<u>General Brown's Anti-Semitism</u>	1
<u>In the Rabin Camp</u>	3
Hyman Lumer, <u>The Palestine Question</u>	8
Philip Honor, <u>A Visit to the USSR</u>	15
Israel Shahak, <u>Non-Jews in the Jewish State</u>	19
Emile Touma, <u>On the Zionist Ideological Crisis</u>	21
Yosef Lipsky, <u>From an Interview with Shmuel Mikunis</u>	28
<u>Against Zionist Censorship</u>	31
<u>Communications</u>	
Tom Foley, <u>On the Role of Sadat</u>	34
<u>Events and Views</u>	36
<u>Greetings</u>	38

Cover: Illustration for the book Byelorussian Folk Tales; artist Eliezer Lisitsky

Address: 23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010 Tel. MU 5-5755

Subscription rate: \$3.50 for 12 issues
1.75 for 6 issues
Single copies 35¢

Editorials

General Brown's Anti-Semitism

In our last issue we had occasion to comment on some anti-Semitic remarks by ex-President Nixon. We noted that these remarks were not an isolated phenomenon, that such expressions are prevalent in "respectable" bourgeois circles generally, and that the distinguishing feature in Nixon's case was simply that his remarks were taped and made public. We now have another glaring illustration of this point in the remarks made by General George S. Brown, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, at a Duke University Law School forum on October 10.

In the event of a new war in the Middle East, said the general, Americans would suffer unless they "get tough-minded enough to set down the Jewish influence in this country and break the lobby." And further: "They own, you know, the banks in this country, the newspapers. Just look where the Jewish money is." Brown went on to suggest that the loyalty of U.S. Jews is divided and that this supposed control of banks and newspapers is used to reinforce Israel's sway over Congress.

Such virulent, Nazi-tinged anti-Semitism is, in the words of Stanley Kamow, "an excursion into the kind of mythology that should have died with Goebbels." (New Republic, December 14, 1974.) It is the kind of mythology that leads to gas chambers and it is, to say the least, shocking to hear it given public utterance by an individual in such a top military post. At the very minimum, it called for his dismissal.

But no less disturbing than Brown's anti-Semitic comments is the reaction to them in certain quarters. Within the Administration they appear to have caused much more embarrassment than outrage. President Ford was quick to disassociate himself from them and gave Brown a ten-minute scolding. But then, evidently satisfied that he had done enough, he said he would not fire Brown for "one mistake." Brown himself apologized profusely and it was apparently hoped the matter would be dropped.

There was also embarrassment in certain Zionist circles. Brown, it seems, is regarded as a "friend of Israel," having played an important part in arranging the supply of U.S. arms to that country in the October war and since. Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, in a recent statement, referred to Brown

as "one of Israel's strongest sympathizers" and added that "Israelis must beware of creating a situation in which the anti-Israel, anti-Semitic allegations such as Brown made recently become the rule rather than the exception." (Chicago Sentinel, December 12, 1974.)

In Zionist circles here, this advice has evidently been followed. The Cleveland Jewish News states in an editorial that "the word seems to have gone out from various quarters that the issue of Gen. Brown's virulent anti-Semitic remarks is best left--like old soldiers--to fade away, on the assumption that Brown has learned his lesson and the point of Jewish protest has been made." It adds: "His mistake, he now realizes, was in stating [his views] openly. There is no guarantee that Gen. Brown's replacement would be of any different persuasion, even though he certainly would be careful to keep his feelings to himself." (Quoted in Chicago Sentinel, December 12, 1974.)

In other words, don't "over-react." If we succeed in getting Brown fired, that will only give credence to his assertion that Jews are all-powerful. And besides, whoever replaces him is not likely to be any better. We would only exchange a proven "friend of Israel" for an unknown quantity. Such is the logic of capitulation.

Ford's reaction is not surprising. It is indicative of the racism and chauvinism which permeates government circles and which was further illustrated just recently by Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz's insulting "humor" at the expense of Italians. This racism, whose source is monopoly capital which profits from it, is expressed and fostered by its servants in the state apparatus--Ford as well as Brown. The only caution is not to be too clumsy about it.

In the face of this, the Zionist capitulation is particularly noteworthy. The leading Jewish organizations which devote so much money and effort to crusading against a non-existent "Soviet anti-Semitism" are quite prepared to live with the real anti-Semites here, provided only that they are "friends of Israel." The Zionist establishment boasts many such "friends"--the Buckleyes, the Reaganes and others, who are no less anti-Semitic than General Brown. In both aspects--the anti-Soviet campaign and the failure to fight anti-Semitism in this country--Zionism serves the interests of monopolist reaction.

But the interests of the masses of working people and, in particular, of the Jewish people, it is essential to pursue vigorously the struggle against the real anti-Semites. The monopolist-instigated racism and chauvinism which pervades this country takes its toll of all sections of the people--white as well as Black, Gentile as well as Jew. The case of General Brown, therefore, must not be permitted to rest. The demand for his dismissal must continue and increase in volume until he is fired.

In the Rabin Camp

The lead article in this issue deals with the Palestine question, with particular reference to the recent actions of the UN General Assembly. These developments have done much to bring the issues in the Middle East conflict more sharply into focus. They have served to demarcate more clearly than ever the line of division between those who cling to the bankrupt idea of insuring Israel's security through military force and annexation of territory and those who recognize that the only real road to peace and security lies in negotiations based on withdrawal from the occupied territories and acknowledgment of the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs.

The Palestinian question has been brought dramatically to the fore as the key issue in the conflict, and with this the Palestinian Liberation Organization headed by Yasir Arafat has emerged as the one authentic representative of the Palestinian Arab people. It is accepted as such by the overwhelming majority of the Palestinian Arabs and by the overwhelming majority of states in the world. In this lies the real meaning of the General Assembly's invitation to the PLO. The Palestine question could not properly be discussed without the participation of the Palestinian Arabs themselves, and this could only be effected through participation of the PLO.

Within the UN and throughout most of the world the General Assembly's actions were hailed as an important step forward. In this country, however, the Zionist establishment and its supporters, in league with the Israeli ruling circles and with the blessings of the U.S. government, were able to whip up a storm of opposition, highlighted by the mass demonstration before the UN on November 4. There speakers view with one another in denouncing the PLO and the UN, charging the latter with abandoning its principles by taking to its bosom a gang of "terrorists" and "murderers."

But this was not a demonstration against terrorism or the destruction of Israel. It was in fact a demonstration against the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs, which both the Israeli and the U.S. governments seek to deny to them. It was a vile display of anti-Arab chauvinism.

To its shame, the Morning Freiheit joined in this unholy crusade. An editorial dated November 6, headed "An Historic Demonstration at the UN

against Terror," stated: "It was a demonstration against admitting into the UN the leaders of the PLO headed by Yasir Arafat, which continues its terror against Israeli civilians and is bent on destroying Israel as a Jewish state."

In taking this line the Morning Freiheit goes even beyond such an organization as Breira, with a largely Zionist sponsorship, which distributed a leaflet questioning the demonstration, saying that "it is precisely because of our concern for Israel that we question whether the 'Rally Against Terror'... has reflected a reasoned consideration by American Jews of Israel's best interests." The leaflet adds that "our justified condemnation of the terrorist activities of some Palestinians must not deter us from affirming the legitimate human and national aspirations of the Palestinian people, with whom the Israeli people must eventually find a way to live."

The Morning Freiheit's line is also in sharp contrast to that of the United People's Jewish Order of Canada, a progressive organization, which greeted the UN's invitation to the PLO as a step toward peace. A statement issued by its National Resident Board on October 30 said: "Many available facts demonstrate that the decision... is not a decision directed against Israel. It is in fact in the interest of peace in the Middle East, a peace without which there is no future for Israel." (Canadian Tribune, November 13, 1974.)

The Morning Freiheit carries its assault on Arafat to an irrational extreme. An editorial dated November 15 declares:

...in accordance with his program the State of Israel must be liquidated! From this it follows that whoever supports Arafat is for the destruction of Israel. Those who attempt a double standard, that is, support Arafat and simultaneously create the impression that they are for the existence of Israel, engage in double-talk, seek to deceive.

But it is the editorial which is guilty of double-talk. What does it mean to "support Arafat"? The Soviet Union supports Arafat in the sense of supporting the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination and recognizing in Arafat and the PLO the legitimate representative of this people. At the same time it unequivocally supports the right of existence of the State of Israel.

Thus, Leonid Brezhnev, in his address to the World Congress of Peace Forces in Moscow on October 26, 1973, stated: "Our firm stand is that all the states and peoples in the Middle East--I repeat, all of them--must be assured of peace, security and the inviolability of borders. The Soviet Union is prepared to take part in the relevant guarantees." And Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko, speaking before the current session of the General Assembly, affirmed that "the Soviet Union is in favor of Israel existing and developing as an independent sovereign state. We have declared this many times and reiterate it again." (Pravda, September 25, 1974.)

Does this mean that there is a contradiction in the USSR's position? Does it mean that the Soviet government "seeks to deceive"? Not at all. The Soviet Union recognizes, as do the world Communist, anti-imperialist and progressive forces generally, that a just and durable peace in the Middle East is possible only on the basis of upholding the right of self-determination of both the Israeli and the Palestinian Arab peoples. Accordingly, they reject the PLO proposal for a single Palestinian state since it denies the right of self-determination to the Israeli people.

The fact is that support to the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs and acceptance of the PLO as their representative does not mean acceptance of the entire program of the PLO. It is the Morning Freiheit that confuses the issue by trying to equate the two. And it carries its double-talk further, asserting that Arafat's secular, democratic state is but "a coverup for genocide, the murder of a people, the people of Israel, through an attempt to murder their state. Let it be said categorically: whoever is for genocide is not a revolutionary but a terrorist, a murderer."

The obvious implication is that "support of Arafat" is "support of genocide." The editorial thus sweeps into the category of "supporters of genocide" that vast majority on a world scale which believes that the Rabin government should negotiate with the PLO and respect the right of the Palestinian Arabs to an independent state of their own. And in so doing, the Morning Freiheit places itself squarely in the camp of the Rabin regime, which refuses to have any dealings whatever with the PLO, which continues its policy of annexation and which offers the Israeli people only the outlook of another war.

To be sure, the Morning Freiheit graciously approves negotiating with the PLO if it first renounces terrorism, recognizes Israel's right to exist as a sovereign state, and accepts UN Resolutions 242 and 338 (with, of course, the Morning Freiheit's own interpretation of these resolutions.) Certain Zionist elements, alarmed at Israel's isolation, have similarly called upon the Israeli government to declare its willingness to negotiate, subject to the above conditions. Thus, an editorial in the London Jewish Chronicle of November 8 states: "By rejecting any contact with this organization on any terms Israel is driving herself into a corner in which she is becoming increasingly isolated." And it proposes that the Rabin government should offer to negotiate on the above terms.

But these proposals are not made with the aim of seriously opening the way to negotiations; rather, their intent is to "show up" the PLO. The expectation, according to the Chronicle's editorial, is that the PLO will reject these terms, which would then place the burden of refusing to negotiate on it rather than on the Israeli government. The Morning Freiheit joins uncritically in this kind of clamor.

The Palestine Question

By Hyman Lumer

(Note: This article appears also in the January-February 1975 issue of New World Review.)

The decision of the UN General Assembly to place the Palestine question on its agenda and to invite the Palestine Liberation Organization to attend as the representative of the Palestinian Arab people brought to a climax a process of some years' duration. It thrust the Palestine question into the very center of the stage as the focal issue in the Middle East conflict, an issue without whose solution no durable peace can be achieved. And it gave clear recognition to the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arabs.

The UN action, taken on October 14, was adopted by a vote of 105 to 4, with 20 abstentions. The four opposing votes were those of Israel, the United States, Bolivia and the Dominican Republic. This vote testifies to the almost universal support for the cause of Palestinian Arab liberation and to the almost universal acceptance of the PLO. It demonstrates the virtually total isolation of Israel and the United States on these questions.

A further bombshell was thrown into the situation by the summit conference of the Arab League held in Rabat, Morocco in the closing days of October. With all 20 member states present, the conference acted unanimously to "affirm the rights of the Palestinian people to establish an independent national authority, under Palestine Liberation Organization leadership, as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people on any liberated Palestinian territory." This action, taken with the agreement of King Hussein, strikes a severe blow at the position of the Israeli government.

The Rabin regime has repeatedly declared that it is totally opposed to the establishment of an independent Palestinian Arab state, that it considers Jordan as the state of the Palestinian Arabs, that it will negotiate the return of occupied territories only with Hussein and that under no circumstances will it deal with the PLO, which it brands as a gang of terrorists bent on destroying Israel. Now, with Hussein's recognition of the PLO as the only representative of the Palestinian Arabs, it is confronted with the alternatives of negotiating

with the PLO and accepting the idea of an independent Palestinian state or not negotiating at all.

Secondly, the summit conference also voted unanimously to "invite Jordan, Egypt, Syria and the Palestine Liberation Organization to work out a formula governing their relations in the light of these decisions and in order to implement them." This is a call for concerted action by the four as parties to the Geneva negotiations, in which the PLO has asked to participate. They have agreed to meet on this and may well decide on a joint delegation to Geneva. This counters the Rabin government's strategy of endlessly putting off the Geneva negotiations and dealing with the Arab states one at a time on the basis of negotiating "partial" solutions. It means that negotiations must be conducted with the Arab states jointly and with the inclusion of the PLO. And it means that negotiations must be based not on "partial" settlements but on full implementation of UN Resolution 242 and recognition of the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs.

The Rabat conference, therefore, has placed more sharply than ever before the Israeli ruling circles the alternatives of accepting these conditions for negotiations or opening the door to renewed warfare. And the necessity of such a choice has been rendered still more acute by the outcome of the UN debate, held in mid-November.

*

Highlighting the debate was the opening speech by Yasir Arafat. As expected, it held little comfort for Zionism and its supporters. Arafat castigated Zionism and its aggression, branding it as an instrument of imperialism, of settler colonialism at the expense of the Palestinian Arabs. In the occupation of more than four-fifths of Palestine by the State of Israel in 1948 and the uprooting of more than a million Arabs, he said, lie the roots of the Palestine question. He spoke of the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people to return to their homes and of his own hope and dream "that I should return with my people out of exile, there in Palestine to live in justice, equality and fraternity... in one democratic Jewish state where Christian, Jew and Moslem live in justice and equality." He rejected the label of "terrorist," contending that one who fights in a just cause "cannot possibly be called terrorist." Rather, he maintained, it is the Zionists who are guilty of terrorism, of the killing of untold numbers of Arab civilians over the years of Israel's existence.

Such is the essence of Arafat's plea to the UN. Needless to say, in Israeli government circles and among Zionists and their supporters in this country, his speech evoked only the strongest condemnation. There are, to be sure, points in it with which we must emphatically disagree, and we shall speak of these. But basically it is an appeal for the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs, rights which must be supported without qualification.

The General Assembly concluded its discussion by adopting two resolutions. The first, approved by a vote of 89-8 with 37 abstentions, affirmed the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination, to national independence and sovereignty, also "the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property from which they have been displaced and uprooted." The second, passed by a vote of 95-17 with 19 abstentions, conferred observer status in the General Assembly on the PLO. The appearance of the PLO at the UN and the adoption of these resolutions represent a major victory for the cause of Palestinian Arab liberation and a turning point in the Middle East conflict. They reflect the new character of the UN and its independence from the U.S. domination of the past.

On a world scale the actions of the General Assembly were generally greeted. In this country, however, the Zionist establishment and its supporters were able to whip up a storm of protest. A Zionist-sponsored demonstration took place in New York on November 4, in which Israeli and Zionist leaders, political figures, labor officials and others spared no words in their denunciations of the PLO and the UN, which was accused of abandoning its principles by giving a platform to "terrorists" and "murderers." The attack has continued without letup, focused increasingly on the UN itself. In some instances it descends to the lowest depths of racism, as in the case of the Zionist Organization of America, whose publication, The American Zionist, states editorially: "The UN now belongs to the uncivilized, the brutal, and the mindless. So much so, as to suggest that the organization is located in the wrong place--a more equatorial location seems in order now." (December 1974.)

There are some more sober voices in the Jewish community but these are as yet few in number. In the main, what is expressed is full support to the policy of the Rabin government, which has declared even more emphatically that under no circumstances will it have anything to do with the PLO.

*

This refusal Rabin and others seek to justify on a number of spurious grounds. First, it is argued that the Palestinian Arabs have already exercised the right of self-determination. A Palestinian Arab state already exists, namely Jordan. The partition of Palestine between Jews and Arabs is expressed in the existence of Israel and Jordan and there are no grounds for a "second partition" and the establishment of a "third Palestinian state." But this argument is completely fraudulent. The territory which the UN partitioned into Jewish and Arab states in 1947 did not include Transjordan (later Jordan). It was this partition to which the Jewish Agency agreed at the time, and the Palestinian Arab state which it created has no less legitimacy than the State of Israel.

But this Arab state never saw the light of day; its territories were absorbed by Israel, Jordan and Egypt in the 1948 war. It is on part of these

territories--the West Bank and the Gaza Strip--that it is now proposed to set up a Palestinian state. To deny the Palestinian Arabs this right is to deny them the right of self-determination. Further, self-determination means that their relations with Jordan are to be determined by them, not by Rabin and company.

Secondly, it is alleged that the PLO does not represent the Palestinian Arab people, that it speaks only for itself. But this is clearly belied by the series of demonstrations in support of the PLO which rocked the West Bank during the UN debate, demonstrations which were put down by club-wielding policemen with one killed and scores wounded, with numerous arrests and the deportation of five leading citizens to the East Bank.

Eric Rouleau, Middle East editor of the leading French newspaper Le Monde, writes with reference to the West Bank (March 9, 1974):

The most characteristic development in this area is the nearly unanimous support for the Palestine Liberation Organization. One after the other, the Muslim Council of Jerusalem, the representatives of the established organizations, most of the mayors and "notables" (many of whom were supposed to be loyal partisans of King Hussein) said that from now on they would consider Yasir Arafat's fedayeen movement as "the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people." (Emphasis added.)

Indeed, there can be little doubt as to who speaks for the Palestinian Arabs--in the West Bank, in the Gaza Strip, in Lebanon and elsewhere. And now Hussein himself acknowledges that the PLO speaks for those in the East Bank as well. In fact, it is the PLO alone which represents the Palestinians. There is no other authentic representative--not Hussein and not the handful of collaborators in the West Bank. It is this fact which accounts for the PLO's acceptance by all 20 Arab states, by numerous other countries, and now by the UN General Assembly. And it is this which the Israeli ruling circles seek to obliterate.

Third, it is charged that the central objective of the PLO is the destruction of Israel. This, it is claimed, is the real meaning of Arafat's call for a unitary Palestinian state. It is impossible, therefore, to recognize or negotiate with it.

To be sure, Arafat's proposal must be totally rejected, since it calls for the dissolution of the State of Israel and denies the right of self-determination to the Israeli people. There can be no solution which is not based on safeguarding the rights of all states and peoples in the Middle East, including both the Israeli and Palestinian Arab peoples.

What the Rabin regime fails to recognize, however, is that the position of the PLO leaders is shifting away from this program and toward coexistence

with Israel. The clearest evidence of this is the PLO's request to participate in the peace negotiations with Israel. This is already a de facto acceptance of Israel's right to exist, for one does not negotiate with a state to which one denies that right. Furthermore, what it is proposed to negotiate is the establishment of an independent Palestinian state existing side by side with Israel, and with the course of future relations between the two states subject to further negotiations.

True, Arafat in his speech did not explicitly recognize the right of existence of the State of Israel. True, he renewed the call for a single Palestinian state. But the fact that an unacceptable demand is put forward is not a reason for not negotiating. If it were, Arafat would have at least as much reason for refusing to negotiate as Rabin, for the Israeli government has also laid claim to all of Palestine. A resolution adopted almost unanimously by the Knesset on March 16, 1972 asserts: "The Knesset states that the historical right of the Jewish people to Eretz Israel (that is, all of historical Palestine--H.L.) is indisputable." There are also other expressions of the aim to convert all of Palestine into a Jewish state, thereby liquidating the right of existence of the Palestinian Arab state. It is significant in this connection that it is the PLO which is willing to negotiate and the Israeli government which refuses.

Finally, it is maintained that negotiations are impossible because one cannot deal with a "gang of terrorists and murderers." This reason has as little merit as the preceding one.

Acts of individual terror directed against innocent civilians must of course be emphatically rejected as a method of struggle, whatever their motivation and regardless of who assumes responsibility for them. And they have in fact been repeatedly condemned by the Communist parties of Israel and the Arab countries, as they have by revolutionary forces generally.

However, every hijacking, every murder committed anywhere in the world is attributed to the PLO and specifically to Arafat and Al Fatah, and this without the slightest substantiation and in the face of repeated repudiations of such acts by Arafat. They are also blamed indiscriminately for all attacks on civilians within Israel, although these acts have in the main been committed by extremist groups outside the PLO or on its fringes and although there is good reason to suspect that they are at least in some cases outright provocations.

Moreover, if terrorism can serve as a reason for refusal to negotiate, the Palestinian Arabs have far more reason to refuse than does the Israeli government. That government is guilty of almost daily bombings and shellings of villages and refugee camps in Lebanon with infinitely greater civilian casualties than in all the attacks on Israeli territory taken together. It is guilty of armed incursions into Lebanon with the blowing up of houses and the illegal taking of prisoners. It is guilty of officially ordered assassinations of guerrilla leaders

on Lebanese territory and of the hijacking of a Lebanese plane. It is guilty of using napalm against civilian populations and of bombing factories and schools in Egypt with hundreds of civilian deaths. It has committed all these crimes, moreover, not in the cause of national liberation but for the purpose of annexing Arab territories and wiping out the Palestinian Arab liberation movement.

*

The reasons given by the Rabin government for not negotiating are merely pretexts. The real reason is the aim of the Israeli rulers to annex all or most of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip as well as other occupied territories. Despite the change in government, this expansionist aim has never been given up.

The process of creeping annexation continues without letup. In the Golan Heights five new agricultural settlements and a sizable town are to be constructed within the next ten years. In the West Bank an industrial center is to be built between Jerusalem and Ramallah. And so on.

Rabin speaks not of negotiating peace but of "territorial concessions" in return for declarations of "non-belligerency." What this means is the return of some pieces of Arab territory in exchange for agreement by the Arab states concerned to the permanent retention by Israel of the remaining territories. What is sought is a freezing of the status quo with only minor changes. Toward this end Rabin and his colleagues have maneuvered, with the diligent assistance of Kissinger, to sabotage the Geneva negotiations and to institute separate, "step-by-step" negotiations with each Arab state.

This remains the real roadblock to peace negotiations--not "terrorism," not Arab plans to destroy Israel.

The persistent adherence of the Israeli ruling circles to their policy of aggression and expansion has led to growing dependence on U.S. imperialism and growing subservience to U.S. policy in the Middle East. That policy is one of continued all-out military aid to Israel, combined with pressure on the Israeli government to make some limited concessions to the Arab states. Kissinger's shuttle diplomacy is designed, in keeping with Israeli government policy, to secure partial solutions which will leave the status quo basically unchanged. It scored some initial successes in the form of the disengagement agreements, but these were achieved by ignoring the key issues of Jordan and the Palestinian Arabs, which have now come forward to haunt him. The Rabat conference and the UN actions have delivered a severe setback to his schemes.

The Palestine question can no longer be brushed aside; it must be dealt with now. The Rabin government must negotiate seriously with Egypt, Syria, Jordan and the PLO jointly. The only alternative is to open the door to a new war, and this time one which can swiftly reach catastrophic proportions.

But Rabin is evidently prepared, for the sake of his bankrupt policy, to precipitate such a war. Within Israel the idea has been widely propagated that war is inevitable within the next several months and there is growing talk of pre-emptive war. The same pessimism pervades U.S. government circles, where predictions of imminent war have become nearly universal. The situation is an explosive one.

*

The danger of war does not stem from the Arab states or the PLO. The Arab states have made very clear their readiness to recognize the existence of Israel's sovereignty and to negotiate peace with her if she withdraws from the conquered territories and acknowledges the national rights of the Palestinian Arabs. Nor is the Soviet Union in any way a threat to Israel's existence. While condemning the Israeli government's aggressive policies, the Soviet government has gone out of its way to make it clear that it fully defends Israel's right to exist as a sovereign state.

War is by no means inevitable. There is a sure road to a lasting peace in the Middle East. It lies in the speedy resumption of the Geneva negotiations with the inclusion of the PLO. It lies in the full implementation of the cease-fire resolution and in respecting the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. It lies in the fulfillment by the United States of its responsibility, as one of the sponsors of that resolution, for assuring its implementation and in putting an end to the present maneuvering to prevent it. It lies in the abandonment by the Israeli rulers of their present suicidal path, which can lead only to disaster for the Israeli people.

There are growing voices of sanity both in Israel and in the United States. What is needed is to give organized expression to them, to develop them into effective instruments for compelling a change in U.S. and Israeli policy.

Of key importance is the further development of U.S.-Soviet detente and of coordination of the efforts of the two governments in the Middle East. It was joint action which made the cease-fire possible; it is joint action which will assure its fulfillment. The U.S.-Soviet statement at Vladivostok, in stressing the need of the speediest resumption of the Geneva Conference, contributes to this. But it is here in the United States that the struggle for effective U.S.-Soviet cooperation must be waged.

* * *

A Visit to the USSR

By Philip Honor

My wife and I recently paid a visit to the Soviet Union. On the day of our departure from the Soviet Union for New York, I stopped to eat at a stolovaya (lunch room) on Nevsky Prospekt in Leningrad. My lunch consisted of soup, a generous helping of cabbage salad, two cutlets with sour cream, bread and coffee. For this meal I paid 45 kopecks (about 60¢).

The following day, at the Kennedy Airport I bought a copy of the New York Times at the inflated price of 20¢ (in the USSR a newspaper costs 2 kopecks). The first story to come to my attention was a glaring example of the Times' hard-bitten anti-Sovietism. Appearing on October 6, 1974, it was headed "Russians, Too, Find Costs Rising." This piece of contrived, manipulated reporting, which was given a three-column spread on the first page and most of the second page, was signed by Hedrick Smith.

The article contains such fallacious statements as: "The ordinary Soviet citizens...groan about higher prices on everything..." In painting a picture of alleged inflation in the Soviet Union, Smith's obvious intent was to calm the uproar of the U.S. public against the galloping cost of living here.

Inflation indeed! Here is what we paid, in well-stocked Soviet stores, for some food items and other articles taken at random. A loaf of bread was 15 kopecks (21¢). A kilogram of aged brick cheese cost 2.90 rubles (\$1.50 a pound). A kilogram of grapes was 85 kopecks (51¢ a pound). A well-made house dress, suitable also for street wear, was bought for 5 rubles (\$7.00). We got a three-day supply of the antibiotic tetracyclin for 40 kopecks (56¢). A good-sized extensible dining room table, polished to perfection, cost 50 rubles (\$67.50). I could go on and on.

Smith cannot hide the fact that in the Soviet Union prices of mass-consumption products and services--food, subway fares, rents, etc.--are not only very low but have remained stable for 20 years. He writes that Muscovites "still pay 5 kopecks for a subway ride as they did 20 years ago. Rents in state housing are fixed and held very low--10 to 18 rubles (\$13.30 to \$25.00) monthly. A half liter of milk costs, as it did a decade ago, 16

kopecks. Ordinary potatoes, when available, are fixed at 10 kopecks a kilogram. . . . The beef price ceiling in state stores is nominally unchanged at 2 rubles a kilo."

But Smith faults all this with one stroke of the pen. This has been made possible, he contends, through government subsidies. It is beyond his comprehension that this is what socialism is all about. In socialist countries subsidies are used to assure the people's welfare, while in the United States, billions of dollars in taxes are squandered to swell the profits of big business. It is big business profiteering which is the source of inflation and the diminishing living standard of the working people.

Smith's fabrications suffer from glaring inconsistencies and omissions. On one hand he quotes nameless housewives and others as supposedly complaining that their "cost of living goes up even without changing prices." But later he states that "the supply of any desirable item cannot keep pace with rising demand or the increasing purchasing power of almost all segments of society" (emphasis added). Or he writes that the price of vodka has risen but omits the fact that it was deliberately increased to discourage drinking.

He does not tell his readers that all medical services are free in the USSR. One U.S. tourist who came down with appendicitis in Moscow was amazed to find that it didn't cost him a cent to have his appendix removed.

One of Smith's best kept secrets is that there is no unemployment in the USSR. Many store windows have signs reading: "You are invited to work for us." (Please note: "You are invited"!) Smith also overlooks the rich cultural life that Soviet workers enjoy. Tickets for plays, opera, ballet, concerts, etc., are available at a fraction of what they cost in the United States.

*

We discussed life in the Soviet Union with scores of Soviet citizens in all walks of life. We heard few complaints. We found happy people who abhor war and identify with socialism. They are the first to admit that much remains to be done in providing housing, consumer goods and other needs. But the morbidity and doomsday psychology which pervades the United States and other capitalist countries is absent there. The streets of Soviet cities are full of energetic, purposeful (and often ice cream-eating) people who know where they are going and are in a hurry to get there.

We did meet some "dissidents" who freely expressed their mostly antagonistic views. They are tolerated but generally ignored.

The people's happiness was especially evident in the Black Sea resort city of Sochi. The sanitariums, hotels, beaches and streets are filled with

carefree vacationers, Soviet tourists and patients who come there to recuperate. The vacations are partly paid for by the unions or places of employment, and recently the rates have been reduced to encourage tourism among Soviet citizens.

Smith cunningly writes: "On a smaller scale, Soviet citizens find vacation prices rising. People on the Black Sea used to rent out a bed for a ruble a night a few years ago. Two rubles is common now." To anyone who has seen the gay, carefree life in these resorts it is incomprehensible how he could write such rubbish. He would be laughed at in Sochi.

*

As we left New York the strident din of cold-war demonstrations "to save the Soviet Jews" was still ringing in our ears. But we found no Jewish problem in the USSR. Indeed, Soviet Jews deeply resent these inflammatory demonstrations. The Jews that we met in the USSR--and they were many--were contented with their lives and loved their homeland.

There were some exceptions but they seemed to be alienated from Soviet life and were, in some instances, negative types. Some were influenced by Zionist propaganda. But discrimination against Jews did not seem to be a dominant factor in their considerations.

At a kindergarten and day care center in Rostov we met a piano and dance teacher whose ebullient personality and proficiency attracted our attention. She was introduced to us as Natasha Solomonova. She told us she was Jewish and had been working at the center 25 years. She was 60 years old but had no intention of retiring. Anticipating our question she said: "No, I don't want to go to Israel. I haven't lost my mind yet. You hear many lies in the United States about our country. We are happy here."

We visited a state farm near Rostov. It was an impressive enterprise, covering thousands of acres along the Don River. Our host, the manager of the farm, was a giant of a man, authoritative and self-confident. When the inevitable "Jewish question" came up, he said: "I am half Jewish. Do you think that the government discriminates against me? There are many Jews on our farm, a considerable number in executive positions."

One member of our group was a zealous nationalist. It seemed that the sole purpose of his trip was to hunt for "persecuted" Jews. He wasn't very successful. A Jew whom we met in a park in Rostov remarked that, as he saw it, intermarriage was one of the main causes of assimilation. He asked whether this was the case in U.S. Jewish communities. The nationalist had to concede that his only daughter is married to a non-Jew. "Life seems to be the same everywhere," said the Soviet Jew and departed.

Who are the Jews who want to leave the USSR? In Sochi we met a Jewish couple from Vilna who told us they were waiting for their daughter to graduate from medical school before coming to the United States, "where she expects to make a lot of money." One woman in our group, Mrs. Lina Farber, became very angry. She asked how they could be so callous and ungrateful to the Soviet government which had provided a free education and subsidy for their daughter. Their answer was: "We don't give a hoot for the government."

A sister of Mrs. Farber from Kiev, who visited her and her husband in Sochi, maintained that most of the 200,000 Jews in her city are loyal Soviet citizens. They appreciate the fact that the Soviet government and the army saved many Jews from the Nazis. "Those who want to leave are ingrates," she said.

At the Intourist Hotel in Kiev we encountered a Polish Jew, a would-be emigrant, who was very loud and boisterous. He shouted that he had a message for the U.S. Jewry. "All Soviet Jews need help, a lot of help. They all want to go to Israel," he said. Another Jew who had joined our circle said that this was nonsense. He certainly does not want to leave and he knows few Jews who do.

We met a Jewish chambermaid in the Hotel Ukraine where we stayed. She told us that her family lives very well on an income of 400 rubles a month and is devoted to the USSR. "All my children are professionals," she said. "My father was a tailor and my son is a doctor. Socialism has done this for us."

*

We visited a synagogue, where we found a few minyanim, mostly elderly men (a minyana is a quorum of ten adults, required for religious services). Some of them said they would like to go to Israel for religious reasons. One middle-aged, bearded individual remarked that many shacher-machers (black-market speculators) are leaving the country. "It's not so much their love for Israel; they are afraid of the police. I, too, am religious but I don't like the Zionist propaganda that is going around."

I asked one elderly man whether they know that many emigrants have to endure much hardship in Israel and want to return to the USSR. His answer was: "We know all this. I have advised my son, who also wants to go to the Holy Land, not to apply for a visa. But as for me, I want to die in Jerusalem."

We visited the editorial offices of Sovetish Heimland in Moscow and had a long talk with its editor Aaron Vergelis. He stated that there are

some unsavory types among the Jewish writers, who are going to Israel. Before they leave they usually assert that they will never debase themselves by resorting to anti-Sovietism. But after leaving they invariably join the cold-war pack. He cited the case of one individual who was befriended by the magazine's staff, which looked after his health and his appearance and helped him with his writing. Parting with them, he expressed his appreciation and proclaimed his undying affection for the Soviet Union. But soon afterwards, in the United States, he found a ready market for his scurrilous cold-war pieces and sank to the lowest level of gutter journalism, besmirching Vergelis and other former colleagues.

The Soviet Jews have only contempt for such unprincipled opportunists "who are ready to sell their souls for a dollar," as an elderly Jewish widow in Rostov put it. They deeply resent being used as pawns by the U.S. Zionists, cold warriors and misguided "liberals" in their slanderous attacks on detente and peaceful coexistence.

* * *

Non-Jews in the Jewish State

By Israel Shahak

(The following is reprinted, with permission, from American Report, September 16, 1974.)

The real situation in Israel is very simple. Israel is not an "Israeli" state, nor a state of its citizens; it is a "Jewish state." What does this mean, in practical terms, for those of its inhabitants officially described as "non-Jews"? What does it mean, for example, to be a non-Jew in Jerusalem?

Again the answer is quite simple. The state of Israel builds huge housing projects in Jerusalem. But for whom? Not just for Israeli citizens; only for Jews. An inhabitant of Jerusalem can never be eligible for a flat in these projects if he or she happens to believe in Jesus Christ or in the Prophet Mohammed and acts on this belief--that is, practices the Christian or the Muslim faith.

If you are an atheist? Your right to obtain a flat depends strictly on your ancestry. If you can bring proof that your mother, grandmother, great-grandmother and great-great-grandmother were all Jewish, you are regarded

as a Jew and can obtain a place to live. If one of the links is weak, you cannot.

The situation is the same in most other areas of Israel. More than 90 per cent of the inhabited areas of the state of Israel falls under the regulations of the Jewish National Fund, under which non-Jews cannot rent or buy a house or flat, or open a business. This land is called in Hebrew the "saved" land. Land that belongs to non-Jews is called unsaved or not national (the term "national" in Israel does not mean "Israeli" but "Jewish"). When land is bought or confiscated from a non-Jew by a Jew, the land is said to be "saved."

This is only the beginning. A Jew in Israel, by the mere fact that he is a Jew, will obtain a host of other rights withheld from the non-Jew, some of them honorary, some worth a lot of money. A Jew not only has the right to live on Israeli land that is forbidden to others but he can obtain a mortgage loan. When a new Jewish settlement is being established on "saved" land, all the Jewish inhabitants enter prepared houses, with water and electricity. Most houses in the old non-Jewish villages still have no water or electricity. In some cases, a power line installed to serve a new Jewish settlement passes by the old Arab (or, in official parlance, "non-Jewish") village which is still forbidden to use it, where people sit in darkness in the evening watching the brightly lit Jewish settlement.

In short, to be a Jew in a Jewish state is to be a privileged person, not only in terms of status but also with regard to earning power and other prerequisites. And this is the reason for the furor raised over the question, "Who is a Jew?" It is not a matter of theology, but of money and status.

Suppose that it were possible for a non-Jew to "pass"--for example, by obtaining a certificate from somebody in the U.S. that he is a Jew. Horrible things would happen--non-Jews would be able to live in Ramat-Eshkol. Palestinians from Old Nazareth would be able to obtain flats in Upper Nazareth, which is so far an apartheid city, completely closed to non-Jews. And so on. But no real danger exists: the gate is strongly watched, and only "real" Jews will get subsidized flats in the Jewish state.

If the system were transported to the U.S. it would become very easy to do to Jews in America exactly what is done in Israel to Palestinian Arabs who live there; that is, to degrade them to the level of non-humans, and all in very democratic fashion. It would only be necessary to decide that the term "American" does not apply to Jews, or perhaps to substitute the term "Christians" for the term "Americans," and then to promulgate rules restricting apartments in (say) Manhattan to Christians. It would also be possible, with certain constitutional adjustments, to set up a Christian National Fund which would begin to "save" Jewish places of business by buying or confiscating them and renting them only to Christians. This sort of thing has in fact already been done in America, of course--but not under cover of law.

It is my considered opinion that what is being done to non-Jews in Israel may well be proposed again elsewhere for application to Jews, using the laws and customs of the Jewish state as a model. After all, why not? The principles of justice are the same everywhere, the world is more united than ever before and one cannot really hope to deceive everybody for long.

We do live now under a system of deception, under which some people are against discrimination in New York or Toronto but simultaneously support the same kind of discrimination in Jerusalem. Given the oneness of the world today, such a system cannot prevail much longer.

What this means to Israel, in my opinion, is that either Israel will become a state which treats all her citizens equally, as free human beings, and does not discriminate against those who practice other religions or were born of non-Jewish mothers, or else in other lands the same kind of institutionalized discrimination will be directed against Jews--that is now practiced in Israel.

* * *

On the Zionist Ideological Crisis

By Emile Touma

There are enough indications to substantiate the claim that the October 1973 war accelerated and sharpened an inherent and prolonged crisis in Israel covering the political, economic and ideological sectors.

The political crisis took shape in the mushroom growth of the protest movements directly after the cease fire in October 1973, in the prolonged difficulties of forming a government after the December 31, 1973 parliamentary elections, in the fall of the Meir-Dayan government a month and a half after its establishment, and in the emergence of the I.Rabin government with a majority of one in the Knesset.

The economic crisis expresses itself in a growing trade deficit, in inflation, in soaring prices and a lowering of the standard of living due to the continued expansion of military expenditures which represent over 50% of this year's budget of IL 35 billions (\$8.2 billion).

The new economic policy with its new taxes, cuts in expenditures on social services and compulsory loans bodes ill for the economy of Israel and the well-

being of the working masses, who are made to bear the main burden of the government's failures.

*

No doubt some aspects of the ideological crisis in Israel breed on the soil of capitalism and are common to capitalist societies in the U.S. and Western Europe. Thus when Professor Ya'acov Talmon speaks of a "general depression" in Israel, he does not describe a specific Israeli phenomenon but a general one, characteristic of capitalist societies, and "arising from the impossibility of fulfilling expectations." Talmon implies that the failure of establishing an egalitarian society was emphasized by allowing "slums to fester alongside suburbia." (Jerusalem Post, April 24, 1974.) In other words the deepening social polarization generates this mass feeling of bitterness and class antagonism which Talmon calls general depression.

Another aspect of the crisis common in states following an aggressive foreign policy, in a changing world, is the feeling of alienation from the ruling circles who follow such a policy. This feeling is influenced to a great extent by the general condemnation of world public opinion. Professor Kreitler defined this alienation as a "black public mood" whose source lay in the fact that the "Israeli had lost a sense of being in a state enjoying international prestige plus great security" after the October 1973 war. (Ibid.)

It is interesting in this context to note that Chief of Staff General Mordechai Gur, deploring the present rush of criticism levelled at the army, drew an analogy between Israel and the U.S.A. and contended that if the army is open to public scrutiny at all levels it would make its job very difficult "and we will reach the position of the Americans in Vietnam." (Jerusalem Post, July 2, 1974.)

Though some political analysts tried to accentuate the differences between the protest movements in Israel and similar movements in other capitalist countries by claiming that protesters in Israel were activists who fought in Israel's wars,* the truth is that these movements, in concentrating on the search for new leadership and demanding reactionary electoral changes,** reveal characteristic elements of the capitalist crisis.

* This contention, voiced by Rabbi Dr. J. Vainstein--at one time chairman of the Jerusalem Religious Council--does not hold water, since it was the veterans of the Vietnamese war who gave the protest peace movement in the U.S.A. much of its dimensions and depth.

** These movements call for replacing the more democratic system of proportional representation with the more reactionary constituent system of parliamentary elections.

It is clear that these movements, which claim as their raison d'etre the "failures" of the establishment in the October war, objectively ignore and gloss over the class nature of the political crisis and try to iron it out within the present basic concepts of the Israeli ruling circles.

Obviously the general capitalist ideological crisis, an outcome of the capitalist mode of production, has specific national features in every country, depending on its place in the whole world structure of capitalism. In Israel the capitalist ideological crisis is compounded by the crisis of Zionism, the ideology the Israeli ruling circles adhere to and act in accordance with.

*

In capitalist countries the ruling circles, in contending with working-class ideology, emphasize that their concepts and policies, internally and externally, are motivated by a compassion for the good of their peoples. Even aggressive wars destined to further imperialist expansion are waged under slogans of "national defense," "patriotic honor" and "people's interest."

The Israeli ruling circles resort to these same classical expressions in order to deceive the Israeli people. However it is in the sphere of Zionist ideology that the ideology of the Jewish bourgeoisie unfolds its crisis.

Zionist ideology has been founded on three basic categories: the existence of a Jewish extra-territorial nation, the immortality of anti-Semitism and Jewish concentration in one country as a solution for anti-Jewish persecution and harassment. In the final analysis, therefore, the validity of Zionism has to be judged by its practical ability to provide security for those Jews who accepted its basic platform and settled in this country.

It is precisely here that Zionist ideology faces its toughest challenge. Thus, Rabbi Vainstein, wrestling with this problem, wrote under the headline "Cracks in the Zionist Message:" "The historic Zionist message of the Jewish state as a safe haven for the nation, dispersed for two thousand years, has suddenly been shaken" (after the October 1973 war--E.T.).

How much it has been shaken is relative and differs according to the social strata. But the ex-M.K. and writer-novelist seems to have discovered a common "leitmotif" when he said, commenting on the climate of the post-October period:

"Suddenly everything is under a question mark. Questions that ceased to be asked during other nations' histories never leave us. During the worst days of the blitz no one ever doubted that London would remain England's capital or whether all of England belonged to the English or who is an Englishman...." ("Innocence Lost," Jerusalem Post, April 24, 1974.)

Nathan Rotenstreich, a professor of philosophy in the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, in his article "The Problem behind the Shock" was more definitive and showed an understanding of the interconnection between the ideological and practical crisis of Zionism. He wrote:

"It seems that the idea of a secure refuge, which appears from the Basel Zionist Congress on, and which guided Zionism in one form or another, and its project, the state of Israel, is undermined." And he added: "When the idea of a secure refuge or a refuge guaranteed by public law was raised, its meaning was legal, not physical, not security in the usual sense of the term used today." (Dispersion and Unity, No. 21/22, 1973/74, p. 40.)

Rotenstreich considers further the universal implication of Zionism and concludes, first, that the state of Israel not only did not solve the problem of anti-Semitism, "but even has deepened and reinforced the problem by arousing anger against what the Jews have done," and second, that the collective existence of the Jewish people, which is the goal of Zionism, "is still unsolved and not yet secured against destruction, open or hidden, and at times shocking." (Ibid., pp. 45-46.)

*

Certain Zionists originally emphasized total concentration of the Jews in one territory--Palestine, later Israel. But experience forced upon the leaders a sense of realism and they became reconciled to the idea that only a part of the Jewish communities would settle in Israel.

Moreover, the last decades and especially the period of statehood have proved that Israeli society was in a continual process of fluidity. Emigration from the country reached a high percentage. Up to 1967 about 200,000 left the country. Now authoritative sources report acceleration in this trend; and the Immigrant Absorption Ministry has admitted that "within three years 30 per cent of the immigrants who arrived from the West in 1970 had left the country"--and that 5 per cent of those who came from Eastern Europe, Asia and Africa had departed. (Jerusalem Post, May 17, 1974.)

Under these conditions the Zionist ideologists elaborated the concept of the "centrality of Israel" as the instrument to establish and perpetuate the Jewish collective existence. This is a call upon the Jewish communities to identify with Israel. The idea of identification has been developed to imply allegiance to the policy of the Israeli ruling circles. In addition, infusing the Jewish communities with Judaic education is becoming a means to fight assimilation and maintain the Jewish collective outside Israel. And it is here that the ideological crisis of Zionism is increasingly apparent and is expressed in the spread of alienation among Jews everywhere.

Arnulf M. Pins, director of Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture in the U.S.A., describing the impact of the October war on American Jewry, wrote: "Reaction of American Jewry as a whole to the 'Yom Kippur' war is mixed. One segment of American Jewry is amazingly identified, very involved and totally committed. . .while another part of American Jewry--a relatively large group--is surprisingly ambivalent and/or not committed and seems to be trying to remain uninvolved. Some American Jews have begun to question all over again the viability and advisability of a Jewish state."

The writer, comparing the reaction of American Jews to the last two Arab-Israeli wars of 1967 and 1973, stresses that as a result of the first many Jews "rediscovered their Jewishness" and "turned on" to Israel and adds: "The observers all agree that this did not happen to any large degree in 1973." (Dispersion and Unity, 21/22, 1973/74, pp. 67, 68, 69.)

It is obvious that the writer describes the situation in non-Zionist circles and leaves out the large segment of anti-Zionist Jews in the U.S.A. Thus, the general picture is far from rosy. The vociferous Zionist lobby in the U.S.A. gives the impression of dominance over the U.S. "Jewish scene," but this is due to the collusion between the Zionist leadership (including the Israeli ruling circles) and the U.S. imperialists.

The situation is not different in the other capitalist countries. In France, where the Zionists challenge strenuously the support that many French Jews give to the Communist Party, the process of alienation is accelerating.

The Zionist writer Geoffrey Wigoder, analyzing the results of the French presidential elections noted that in one or two constituencies the Communists succeeded in consolidating the Jewish Left wing behind their party. Moreover, the great hopes over Jewish immigration from the Soviet Union are being dissolved. It is now being admitted openly that there has been a drop of 30% in the number of immigrants from the Soviet Union during the first five months of this year compared with the same period of the preceding year. (Jerusalem Post, June 12, 1974.)* Second, the disappointment of these immigrants drives them out of the country. Professor Yirmiyahu Branover, chairman of Shamir,** was reported "perturbed by the number of Soviet immigrants who arrive in Israel and integrate economically, but then wish to leave (and they do so in increasing numbers--E.T.) as they feel alienated from Israeli society as a

* The actual drop for 1974 is about 50%--Ed.

** An organization set up to help integrate immigrants from the Soviet Union.

whole." (Jerusalem Post, June 18, 1974.)*

The professor noted that many Jews have assimilated in the Soviet Union and added that many others are on the way and lamented that three million Jews in the Soviet Union may disappear in twenty years. The thought nagged P. Sapir, recently elected chairman of both the Jewish Agency and the World Zionist Executive, and he expressed it in these words: "I openly fear the process of degeneration and really wonder what will be left of the Jewish people 50 years from now." (Jewish Observer and Middle East Review, June 28, 1974.)

Arye Dultzin, treasurer of the Jewish Agency speaking in the June 1974 Session of the Zionist General Council "maintained that an entire generation of young Jewish leaders in their thirties and forties were estranged from Zionism because of the movement's political division." (Jewish Observer and Middle East Review, June 28, 1974.) No one will take this claim seriously. Estrangement has deeper roots and the present phase of the Zionist ideological crisis has been precipitated by the acuteness of what Zionists call "The Arab problem."

Tzvi Lamm, Lecturer on Education at the Hebrew University Jerusalem, in an article titled "Zionism's Path from Realism to Autism: The Price of Losing Touch with Reality," negates the concept that Zionism is a national movement for liberation and holds that it is in essence a rescue movement. He insists that it is not the land of Israel that needed to be liberated but the people of Israel. Therefore: "Along with the building of fortifications there was also recognition that without agreement, without talks, without finding a modus vivendi with the Arabs our existence in this land and this region of the world was not assured." (Dispersion and Unity, 21/22, 1973/74, p. 48-50).

However this recognition was shelved and the Zionist leaders of Israel passed from realism to autism, which meant using military power to dictate to the Arab peoples. Lamm notes that to this period belong "the Sinai campaign and the six-day war" and writes significantly that the term "liberated territory" coined to describe the occupied Arab areas "symbolizes the prevailing autism."

Putting his idea in a nutshell, he continued to say that he and others

* An insight into this problem was revealed by a certain Shulamit Atkin who wrote a letter to the Jerusalem Post (July 1, 1974) and described herself as a new immigrant from the U.S. Commenting on P. Sapir's election to the post of Chairman of the Jewish Agency and his desire to bring in 100,000 immigrants a year, she suggested that the first priority should be to keep immigrants in the country and to raise the standard of living of the families of Oriental origin. Then she remarked to emphasize her point: "There must be some reason why 100,000 Israelis live in New York City."

discovered after the six-day war "an enlightening phenomenon; The Zionist ideology, which from the very beginning guided Zionist activity, regressed and was translated into the language of a power ideology."

Nahum Goldman, president of the World Jewish Congress and at one time president of the World Zionist Organization, addressing the Union of Liberal and Progressive Synagogues, accused Ben-Gurion of responsibility for the "deep crisis which Israel is now passing." Israel was paying for twenty years of Bengurionism. He enlarged on the theme: "While he (Ben-Gurion) knew that Israel must make concessions to the Arabs he was stubborn and refused to do as he should. The crisis today is paying for 20 years of delusions of grandeur." (Jewish Observer and Middle East Review, June 1, 1974.)

Zionists admit that their project meant displacing the Arab people of Palestine. They are apt to repeat Weizmann's dictum; The modern conflict between Arabs and Jews is not a case of a conflict between right and wrong but is one of conflicting rights. Weizmann would say, our case is more just because our needs are greater.

But Zionists in periods of success ignore completely the rights of the Palestinian Arab people and the conflict becomes one of right against the Arab wrong. However in periods of rebuff or setback the Zionists go into public soul-searching and begin to speak of compromise. Professor Rotenstreich, learning the lesson of the October 1973 setback, wrote that "since the six-day war we should have been prepared to find a synthesis between our devotion to our goal and the spirit of compromise, between keeping what is necessary for our national existence and a readiness to give up what must be given up." (Dispersion and Unity, 21/22, 1973/74, p. 44.)

The problem naturally is more complex. Zionism's crisis involves strategy not tactics. It is the basic Zionist ideological concepts that are involved, not this tactic or that; and because Zionism, like other capitalist reactionary ideologies, cannot change its nature or characteristics, the present crisis will deepen and envelop Zionism ultimately.

The question differs with Israel. It has reached the stage where a change of strategy can break the magic circle of wrong breeding wrong. In order to do so, Israel has to relinquish Zionist expansionism and recognize the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people. This will mean a break with the policy of collusion with imperialism against the Arab peoples and their struggle for political and social emancipation.

It is in this way that Israel can ensure its security, peaceful existence and acclimatization in the region. When such a stage is reached, Zionist ideology as a determining force in Israel becomes archaic.

From an interview With Shmuel Mikunis

By Yosef Lipsky

Editorial Note: The following is an excerpt from an interview appearing in the Yiddish magazine Our Voice, published in Israel by a group (AKI) led by Esther Vilenska and other former leading members of MAKI (the former Mikunis-Sneh group). These individuals have parted company with that degenerate grouping and have, among other things, joined in a developing united peace front which also includes leaders of the Communist Party of Israel (Rakah). They are among the signers of a declaration in support of a proposed world conference for peace in the Middle East which was published in our last issue.

MAKI, meanwhile, has travelled the path of degeneracy to its end and now formally declared itself to be a Zionist party. Mikunis has resigned from his post as general secretary of MAKI but has so far not left the organization itself. He was among the signers of the above-mentioned declaration.

These developments have brought the former MAKI leaders increasingly into conflict with the line of the Morning Freiheit, which has upheld MAKI as "the Communist Party of Israel." The critics of Mikunis referred to in the excerpt include not only the present leaders of MAKI but also Morning Freiheit editor Paul Novick (see the issue of October 27, 1974). Mikunis's criticism of "certain progressive Jewish circles in other countries" clearly refers, among others, to the Morning Freiheit and those following its line. We present his views because we believe they will be of interest to our readers.

*

Question: What are the tasks of the peace forces at the present time in view of the offensive launched by the Right-wing and annexationist forces to scuttle the Geneva conference?

Answer: It is a fact that "our" (Israeli) Right-wingers and annexationist forces are against the Geneva conference which has the task of implementing UN Resolution 338, based on Resolution 242. It is also true that the Rabin government seeks to escape from the Geneva conference, from a confrontation with the realities facing Israel, preferring secret contacts, from which the

Soviet Union is excluded, in closed chambers in Washington.

The "national" hero of Israeli Right-wing circles is Senator Jackson, the U.S. arch-reactionary. These American "friends" of Israel, the U.S. billionaires, have killed a million Vietnamese. They have drowned Chile in blood and have staged a bloody putsch in Cyprus. Israel was among the few countries which voted in favor of South Africa when a vote was taken to expel that country from the UN. The idea is even being spread that everyone who is Left or progressive is against Israel. Such ideas are outworn. The truth is that those who are Left or progressive are not against Israel but against the policies of the Israeli government. In this respect Israel is isolated even from the Right-wingers, except for the ultra-reactionaries in the United States who dream of getting back the Arab oil sources in our region with the aid of Israel.

The opposition to Geneva is in fact an opposition to the vital interests of our country, of the people, of the workers, of the youth. For it is the masses of the people who bear the burden of the pro-capitalist, adventurist policies of the Israeli government in relation to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

We must make it clear that the Geneva conference is a historic opportunity to solve the problems of the Arab-Israeli conflict, that it is essential for our country and for peace, that we must not wreck such an opportunity if we do not want to be faced with a new catastrophe. We must mobilize our forces and strive to consolidate a democratic front of all who are for preventing another war, for peace without annexation, for democracy and social welfare....

We, who bear responsibility for our country and our people in the aftermath of the great Hitler-slaughter, dare not become weary in the face of rampant reaction. We must mobilize all the broadest circles--regardless of differences of opinion--to assure the success of the Geneva conference.

I believe that certain progressive Jewish circles in other countries have not sufficiently mobilized the more liberal forces in opposition to the Jewish reactionaries and religious extremists. They have not alerted the masses to the dangers which threaten the Israeli people because of the policies of the Israeli government. Thereby they have failed to help the struggle for peace in Israel. A situation has developed in which certain progressive Jewish circles abroad have become infatuated with the Israeli government, closing their eyes to the scope of our struggle for genuine security, for prevention of another war, for a future of peace and good-neighborly relations with the Arab peoples, for democracy and social justice, for freedom from economic and social ills, through the implementation of a policy in the interests of the working people.

There is one thing from which we can take inspiration--the great achievements of the Israeli working class in industry and agriculture. However, we must not forget that the working class does not have power in our country, that this power is in the hands of the speculators and capitalist exploiters.

Question: As is well known, you were criticized for signing the declaration for a just peace in the Middle East. What is your response to this criticism?

Answer: On my return from Romania I learned that I had been criticized in Kol Haam (September 13, 1974) for signing the appeal of the Israeli Committee for Peace and Justice. Everyone has the right to criticize. I do not fall into a faint because of such criticism--I knew very well what I was signing.

The appeal is a very good one. It upholds all the legitimate rights of Israel and of the Arab side. Even if it is not entirely in agreement with my position on this or that point, I consider it an appeal for a united front, that is, for a common denominator--Resolutions 338 and 242, which we can all accept with certain insignificant variations. I believe that every Communist, every democrat, every seeker for peace, can and must sign this document if he means seriously to work for a just peace. It goes without saying that this appeal was not drawn up to please the Israeli, Jewish or Arab reactionaries, but this is what makes it so significant....

I realize that it disturbs some people that the appeal, which was signed by personalities with varied opinions and political views, also bears the signatures of Meir Vilner, Tawfiq Toubi and other Rakah leaders. I want to make it plain that I am not a McCarthyite and do not propose to boycott or exclude anyone....

In my opinion it is the duty of the peace forces in Israel and of all friends of Israel abroad to raise their voices for the renewal and success of the Geneva Conference on the basis of Security Council Resolutions 338 and 242, as well as for upholding the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people. For only in this way is it possible to guarantee peace and the legitimate rights and the future of Israel.

(Translation by Philip Honor)

* * *

<p>Greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>For Unity and Socialism</p> <p>W.E.B. DuBois Club</p> <p>Communist Party of Missouri</p>	<p>Greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>Sadie & Nathan Ginsberg</p> <p>Mishka & Myer Klarfeld</p> <p>A Friend from Massachusetts</p> <p>Winthrop Jewish Cultural Club</p>
---	--

Against Zionist Censorship

(Over a period of time there have been a number of protests from figures prominent in Jewish activities against the censorship wielded by top Zionist circles on the expression of views in opposition to Israeli government policy. Among those who have protested has been J. I. Fishbein, editor of the Chicago Sentinel. More recently he has had occasion to express himself more forcefully on this question. For the benefit of our readers and as a public service, we reprint below an editorial which appeared in the October 3, 1974 issue of the Sentinel, entitled: "Why We Are Withdrawing from the Forum: A Statement of Sentinel Policy." It is the text of an address given at the forum referred to in the title. We are, of course, not in agreement with everything that Mr. Fishbein says, but we believe that his central point is well taken.--The Editors.)

*

This is the last Forum in which the Sentinel will participate as a partner with the Zionist Organization of Chicago. It is important that the reasons for this be clearly understood.

The Chicago Jewish Community Forum was originally established as a means whereby all Jews could come together in a free atmosphere to discuss their common problems--touchy as they might be--and to hear all points of view. It was the feeling of the organizers that this was desperately needed in view of the lack of such a center anywhere else in Jewish life, and because of the difficulty of airing dissenting or unorthodox opinions.

I have repeatedly stated, and I repeat it again, after more than 30 years as a Jewish editor, that I believe there is hardly a group which exercises a greater degree of censorship--self-applied, it is true--than do we Jews. Important decisions affecting our welfare are decided by a few people, usually in New York offices often at the instigation of Israeli officialdom, and supinely accepted without the opportunity on our part to debate them or to disagree. Supposedly, ours is not to question or reason why. Because we dared to break this censorship, we have over the past three years been able to discuss many important issues and achieve something which has been the envy of every Jewish community in the country.

The decision to invite an Arab spokesman for tonight's program was the suggestion of the Zionist Organization, not the Sentinel's. Our only stipulation was that he be an articulate and scholarly representative, having no connection with terrorist groups or connected with any particular ideology. Dr. M. Cherif Bassiouni was suggested, since he had appeared on a number of talk shows, including Kup's, and had spoken in several synagogues. He is a professor of law at DePaul University, one of whose most active trustees and chief fund raiser is Nathan Schwartz, a distinguished Jew and staunch friend of Israel. Schwartz's Bond purchases over the years have probably been greater than those of anyone in this audience; he is not a man who would tolerate an anti-Semitic professor.

All went well until a few days ago, when someone in Chicago intervened. Our understanding is that the New York Israeli Consulate was called and it in turn applied pressure to the national office of the Zionist Organization--which in turn applied pressure to its local group. They were told that under no circumstances was Bassiouni to speak.

What is involved here is something far more important than the mere cancelling of an Arab spokesman. Free speech is not the only issue: It is rather the symbol of a deeper problem. One of the reasons we find ourselves in the very difficult position we are in today in regard to Israel and the disintegration of American Jewish life itself is precisely due to this fossilized kind of thinking. We are afraid to bring our problems into the open and discuss them frankly. We believe instead that if we sweep them under the rug, somehow or other they will disappear. Meanwhile, intermarriages increase, assimilationism grows, our kids run from us in disgust--and we hide it all.

Take the present Israeli crisis, for instance.

Endless wars?

There are not three or four or five answers to the Middle East problem. There are only two. Either we try a dialogue with the Arabs or else we fight. It is that simple. Some day, somehow, we will have to be able to talk to each other as human beings; or we will go on having these endless wars which are denuding Israel of its youth and causing mothers to yearn for daughters instead of sons.

I have never had any fear of facing Dr. Bassiouni or any other spokesman for the Arab viewpoint. I have deep faith in the justice of our cause and the principles for which Israel stands. In 1972 my wife and I spent five weeks in the Middle East, visiting five Arab countries. We never hid the fact that I was a Jewish editor, nor that we disagreed with their policy toward Israel. We had many long arguments and debates with the people we met, including some in high office. Yet we were never molested, but rather

accorded every courtesy possible. We also discovered that the man in the street wanted peace as much as we did, although we differed on how that might be achieved.

In May of this year a group of Jewish editors visited many of these same countries and received the same courteous treatment. However, when we returned two years earlier, we were looked upon as traitors.

What harm is there in hearing the other fellow's point of view? Who would Dr. Bassiouni convert? And what lies could he spread to a Jewish audience that would not easily be refuted by the three Jewish members of the Panel: David Zysman, head of Israel Bonds and certainly one of the most knowledgeable people we have on Israel, Prof. Mark Krug, a past president of the Zionist Organization, and myself?

I was shocked and sickened to learn that at one of the meetings of the Zionist Organization, held last Sunday to discuss the recall of Dr. Bassiouni's invitation to speak here, a spokesman for the Israeli Consulate argued that he was such a persuasive speaker that he might affect some of this audience. How weak and insecure are we that we cannot hear the Arab point of view without questioning our own?

We should have learned by now that we are not going to make a peace unilaterally; we are not going to force the Arabs to their knees. That is wishful thinking of the worst kind and dangerous to Israel. I repeat again: We are going to talk to each other or we are going to fight.

The Sentinel is withdrawing from the Forum because we feel that it is no longer a free and open vehicle for the expression of all ideas, unpopular as some might be. There is no point in talking to ourselves and hearing only what we would like to hear. Tragically, we have enough of such places in Jewish life already. We don't need another.

* * *

(continued from page 7)

Party of Israel," has now travelled the full length of the road of political and ideological degeneration. It has formally declared itself to be a Zionist party and has applied for admission to the World Jewish Congress. Those responsible for the Morning Freiheit, if they do not change their present policies, appear to be only a short step behind.

Many progressive Jewish forces which formerly supported these policies are abandoning them. It is not too late for the Morning Freiheit to do so.

* * *

Communications

On the Role of Sadat

By Tom Foley

If Ellis Goldberg's comments in the last issue of Jewish Affairs on my article on Egypt were to be reprinted today, readers would be able to see that many of the questions he raises have been answered by the simple passage of time. His article therefore would have to be substantially revised; mine, I think, could stand as is.

In general, I am not quite sure of what Goldberg is getting at. I deduce from the tenor of his article however that he doesn't especially like President Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt. This is not an uncommon attitude in the U.S. Left at present. I often run across it among young progressive people who come from a Jewish background.

I stick by my original characterization of Sadat as a "very intelligent Egyptian nationalist." That briefly describes what he is and what can be expected of him; he has never called himself a Marxist and can't be criticized for not acting like one.

I don't see, concretely, what criteria Goldberg is using to place Sadat on the "Right" in the Free Officers group led by Nasser which overthrew King Farouk--it was in 1952, by the way, not in 1953 as Goldberg states. The two people he mentions, Aly Sabry and Khaled Mohieddin, it should be realized, had great difficulties with Nasser, not especially with Sadat. After 1954, Khaled Mohieddin spent years in exile on Nasser's order; he made peace with Nasser, returned to Egypt, and in 1964 became an important figure in the National Assembly, the Arab Socialist Union party, and the Egyptian peace movement--which he remains to this day. Aly Sabry, incorrectly described as a "Communist" by the New York Times, was removed from his government and ASU party posts in 1968 by Nasser, and later was jailed by Sadat.

This brings me to the very important point that nearly all the criticisms of Sadat apply to the late President Nasser too. It was Nasser specifically

who invited the U.S. oil companies to come into Egypt, who guaranteed them against nationalization, etc. It was Nasser who gave the big Egyptian capitalist Osman Ahmed Osman and his construction company the job of helping build the Aswan Dam. Sadat is continuing Nasser's policies in the new circumstances which confront Egypt today.

Nasser all along insisted on a political settlement of the Mideast crisis based on UN Resolution 242. He did so because of Egypt's pressing needs to devote all of its resources to internal economic development. Those pressures have not eased and Sadat's policies are the same as Nasser's in this regard.

Goldberg's criticism of Sadat for withdrawing Sudanese troops from the Suez front in 1971 so they could return to the Sudan to crush the uprising there is factually incorrect. The Sudanese troops, like the Libyans, were volunteers; they could withdraw from Egypt at any time, and there was no way Sadat could have compelled them to remain. The real question here, if there is one, is how quickly the Egyptians enabled them to leave (by air rather than overland, for example). Opinions differ on this point.

On Goldberg's criticism of Sadat for not ordering his troops in Sinai to "move up from the Canal in October after the initial crossing," I can only shake my head in bewilderment and anger. Hasn't Goldberg read any accounts of the Sinai fighting? Doesn't he know the biggest tank battles since World War II were raging there, that thousands of brave Egyptians were being killed or wounded in combat there every day?

On an overall Mideast peace settlement, of course both Goldberg and I agree that it will come at Geneva. Egypt, Syria and the USSR repeatedly have stated that the troop disengagement agreements are military, and cannot substitute for a general political settlement. It is worthwhile noting here that Egypt played a big role in convincing the Palestinians led by Yasser Arafat that such a political approach is realistic, and I think Egypt's commitment to this course is shown by the fact it went to Geneva even though Syria did not at first.

Ever since 1952, there have been Right-Left clashes in the Egyptian ruling group. This was always true under Nasser, and it is still going on under Sadat. In 1958-62, a particularly bad situation existed where members of the Communist Party of Egypt were being imprisoned and tortured; the CPE liquidated itself in April, 1965, so there are no longer any Egyptian Communists. In 1968, right after the war, there was a real Rightist threat in Egypt and it was then that the industrial workers mobilized and demonstrated, strengthening Nasser's position so he could move against Zakaria Mohieddin and other Rightists. In my opinion, no comparable threat has arisen in Egypt since 1968, nor is likely to do so in the near future.

Events and Views

The Israeli newspaper Maariv on July 12 carried a story by Meir Hareuveni entitled "Locating the Golan Center." He writes, in part:

"The final location of the town that will be built in the central Golan Heights will be decided upon by the urban construction company next week....

"Minister of Housing Avraham Ofer, who visited the two possible sites of the future urban industrial center in the Golan yesterday, said that in this year's budget, 18 million Israeli pounds have already been set apart for land preparation and for starting construction in the new town....

"Considering the political aspects of settling the Golan Heights the minister of housing said: 'We know we will not return to the pre-1967 borders and that the extent of our possible concessions in the Golan Heights is much less than in any other area. This is an area that even in the case of peace agreements with our neighbors will remain part of the state of Israel.'"

In short, the policy of "creeping annexation" continues. And it continues to be a policy which can only lead to new wars.

*

According to official Soviet figures, from May 1945 to May 1974 (29 years) migration of Soviet Jews to Palestine and later to Israel totaled about 99,500. In 1973 some 30,000 left the Soviet Union, but during the October war the number of applications fell by one-third and by January 1, 1974 it declined by one-half. In the first five months of 1974 migration was more than one-third less than in the same period in 1973. Of every 100 visa applications, 98 are granted. More than 70 per cent of the emigrants, it is reported, are elderly people, women and children, and only 14 per cent of them have a higher education.

Apparently the wave of emigration which followed on the opening of the doors by the Soviet government has begun to die out. Even Western diplomats in Moscow, according to New York Times correspondent Christopher S. Wren, attribute the drop in emigration mainly to a decline in applications. (October 17, 1974.)

*

The following paragraph appears in an article by the Israeli journalist Y. Lipsky, published in the Canadian Yiddish weekly Vochebnblatt (October 16, 1974) and headed "Sharp Problems Concerning the New Immigrants":

"There recently occurred a very characteristic incident. In Ashdod there was a house-warming celebration for a group of houses built for Soviet immigrants with funds raised for that purpose in the United States. To the celebration came leading government and civic figures, also the U.S. ambassador. In the middle of the ceremonies a group of Georgian Jews raised a banner with the inscription: 'We don't want any propaganda! Send us back to the Soviet Union!' The incident caused much consternation among the immigrants and the invited guests."

It is noteworthy that Lipsky describes the incident as "characteristic."

*

The People's World of November 2, 1974 carries the following story:

"Progressive Jews in Los Angeles held their most successful banquet honoring Jewish Affairs since the periodical's inception in 1970, according to community leaders attending the October 20 celebration at the Yablon Center.

"Over 150 people, including a number of Black and Chicano youth in addition to the largely Jewish crowd, jammed the newly refurbished hall to hear People's World editor Carl Bloice give a first-hand report of repression in Israel and the Palestinian refugee camps in Lebanon....

"Preceding Bloice, an energetic fund-raising pitch was delivered by Sam Aronoff, executive director of the Yablon Center, president of the Jewish American Cultural Clubs, and executive director of the local Jewish Cultural and Fraternal Clubs. About \$400 was raised."

* * *

Subscribe to Jewish Affairs

Subscription rate:

12 issues for \$3.50

12 issues and Hyman Lumer's book

"Zionism: Its Role in World Politics" \$5.50

JEWISH AFFAIRS
23 West 26th Street
New York, N.Y. 10010

<p>Greetings to the 3rd Annual Dinner of <u>Jewish Affairs</u> from</p>	<p>Warmest Greetings Jack and Sylvia Primsak Los Angeles</p>
<p>The Jewish Commission of Southern California District of the Communist Party, Los Angeles</p>	<p>Greetings from Ruth and Joe Morkoff Los Angeles</p>
<p>Comradely Greetings to the <u>Jewish Affairs</u> magazine, fighting consistently and untiringly for peace in the Middle East and the whole world. Beverly Fairfax Club #1, Communist Party, Los Angeles</p>	<p>Greetings Sonia Halpern Los Angeles</p>
	<p>Greetings from Manya Halpern Gersh Los Angeles</p>
<p>Greetings from The Los Angeles Committee of <u>Jewish Affairs</u></p>	<p>The content of <u>Jewish Affairs</u> serves as a guide to action. Jack & Clara Lutz Santa Monica, Calif.</p>
<p>Jewish American Cultural Club of Los Angeles Greetings -- For a Just Peace and Detente Sophie Davidson Rosita Fannie & Sam Aronoff Ida Pasternack Gita and Abe Galinski Esther Becker Esther and Philip Cicconi Sylvia Hill Evelyn Tewkes Morris Dechter</p>	<p>Greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u> from Jack R. Brodsky</p>

Greetings to Jewish Affairs

Best wishes for continuous growth
and influence in the struggle for a
just peace in the Middle East.

From: The C.C. and
Miami Beach supporters

<p>Greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>Best Wishes</p> <p>Raphael Lipsky</p> <p>Miami Beach</p>	<p>Greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>Lily Bydarian</p> <p>Mat Sadkins</p> <p>Hyme Silverblatt</p>
<p>Greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>from</p> <p>C. C. Davis</p> <p>Canada</p>	<p>Greetings to</p> <p><u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>for your wonderful magazine which I read and put to good use.</p> <p>Best wishes.</p> <p>Morris Kamiel</p> <p>Canada</p>
<p>Greetings to</p> <p><u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>John E. Lamb</p> <p>Lawton, Oklahoma</p>	<p>Greetings</p> <p>from Uncle</p> <p>Miami Beach</p>

<p><u>Greetings</u> Walter Lowenfels Jacob Wortsman Willard Uphaus Y. & C. Rothbard Ella Zimmerman</p>	<p>Greetings from Peter V. Cacchione C.P. Club, Flatbush</p>
<p>Greetings from Crown Heights Club</p>	<p>Greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u> 3rd Anniversary and to Jean & Bernard's 1st Anniversary Esther</p>
<p>Greetings from Ralph Glick</p>	<p>Greetings to: Editors, Writers, Readers of Sovetish Heimland and <u>Jewish Affairs</u> Dora Elson</p>
<p>Greetings from Emma & Henry Daniels</p>	<p>Greetings to 3rd Anniversary, <u>Jewish Affairs</u> Continue your valiant fight against racism and anti-Semitism. For Peace and Security for all! Garment Section, Communist Party, New York</p>
<p>Greetings from Aristides Rodas</p>	
<p>Greetings from Jonas & Dorothy Shiffman</p>	
<p>Greetings from Fisher - Mass.</p>	

Greetings

Northern California Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East

P.O. Box 725
Sausalito, Calif. 94965Frieda Canter
Bob Cowan
Hank SeigelBernard Gayman
Michael Zolper
KenGREETINGS and Best Wishes
to Jewish Affairs

from

Mary & Louis Rosenblum

Morris Shamoff
Oakland, Calif.Greetings
Best
Wishes
to Jewish Affairs

from

Dressmakers' Club

Sonia

Greetings and Best Wishes

to Jewish Affairs

from

J. Epstein

Greetings and Best Wishes

to Jewish Affairs

from

Harry & Sonia Epstein

Greetings to Jewish Affairs

In Loving Memory

of Toby and Marian

from Friends

M a z e l t o v !

To Jewish Affairs: May you be a permanent feature in the progressive Jewish community. Your struggle against anti-Semitism, racism and fascism is much appreciated. Forward towards the building of a mass circulation progressive magazine for American Jewry.

Greetings to:

<p>Greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u> for their consistent struggle for peace in the Middle East.</p> <p>Staten Island Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East P.O. Box 509 Staten Island, N.Y. 10314</p>	<p>GREETINGS to <u>Jewish Affairs</u> and to the Jewish people -- for peace, security and socialism.</p> <p>Angelo D'Angelo Staten Island, N.Y.</p>
---	---

In honor of the upcoming 82nd birthday of

Fannie Hechtman

a life-long activist in the struggle for a better world. Many more years of good health and happiness.

Shalom

The D'Angelo Family
Staten Island, N.Y.

O. Cole Chico, Calif.	Greetings from Dr. Sol Lande St. Louis, Mo.	Greetings from Mollie & Sam Gold San Francisco, Calif.
Fred & Nina Firestone Los Angeles	Greetings from M. K. Cleveland, Ohio	Greetings from John J. O'Brien Columbus, Ohio
<u>Greetings to Jewish Affairs</u> for peace and cooperation among mid- east peoples and recognition of the Pales- tinian people's rights. James Sager San Antonio, Texas	Greetings from Morris Sharnoff Oakland, Calif.	<u>Greetings to Jewish Affairs</u> Best Wishes for a very successful New Year from Katharine Senick Sacramento, Calif.
	Greetings from Benjamin DeLeon Springfield, N.J.	
Greetings from Paul Schiff	<p style="text-align: center;">Our warmest comradely greetings to <u>Jewish Affairs</u> on the occasion of its Third Annual Dinner. We wish it all success in its fight for a Marxist-Leninist and inter- nationalist line in our work among the Jewish people.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Southern California District, CPUSA William Taylor, Chairman Arnold Lockshin, Executive Secretary</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Lorenzo Torrez, Chairman National Chicano Commission, CPUSA</p>	
Greetings from Richard Pell L.A.		
Greetings from Sam Davis		
Greetings from Janie and Mark Weiss		

<p><u>Greetings</u></p> <p>Morris Hyman Ida & Nat W. Sceropelli Lenny Hirshman Betty & Sam Anne Binder</p>	<p>With Best Wishes</p> <p>from</p> <p>Harry & Sarah Tobman</p> <p>and</p> <p>J. B. B.</p>
<p>With appreciation for your contribu- tion to our under- standing</p> <p>A Group of Social Workers Mary Russak</p>	<p>Greetings --</p> <p>Best wishes for greater successes in the struggle for peace.</p> <p>Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East</p>
<p>Greetings from James Gilbert</p>	

Travel with
ANNIVERSARY TOURS
... meet our friends around the world

- * GROUP TOURS
USSR, Eastern and Western Europe, Portugal,
Africa, Middle East, Latin America
- * WORKER TO WORKER BUDGET TOURS
- * YOUTH BARGAIN TRAVEL
- * INDIVIDUAL TRAVEL
USA or world-wide
- * AIR TICKETS
Domestic and foreign
- * CRUISES AND TRANSOCEAN SAILINGS
- * HEALTH SPAS/SANITORIA

ANNIVERSARY TOURS

250 West 57th Street	1741 Ivar Avenue
New York, N.Y. 10019	Hollywood, Calif. 90028
(212) 245-7501	(213) 465-6141

<u>Greetings</u>	<u>Greetings and Best Wishes to Jewish Affairs</u>		
Al & Tibby Brooks New York	From Rose and Joe	From Fred Harden	From Jack
Greetings	Brighton Club	Brighton Club	Brighton Club
from Ann Flaurat	<u>Greetings and</u> Best Wishes to <u>Jewish Affairs</u> from Edward Sandler Oakland, Calif.		For a Just Peace in the Middle East S. L. Jackson Kent, Ohio
Greeting for a Better World Jennie & Jacob Bialer Brooklyn			
Sonia Schwartz Brooklyn	Our Greetings and Best Wishes to a publication we heartily support. Your views and analyses of the present day events are always true to facts. May it get the support it deserves. Rae and Morris Baker Miami Beach, Florida		
Greetings Ralph & Helen Kramer Toms River, N.J..			
Jean & Bernard Gittleman Ventnor, N.J.			
Rose Cohen Brooklyn			

<p>We wish you a Happy Birthday</p> <p><u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>Modern Book Store 3230 North Broadway Chicago, Illinois</p> <p>348-2362</p> <p>The center for Marxist books and periodicals in Chicago</p>	<p>Wishing you continued success in the struggle against Anti-Semitism and for Socialism</p> <p>Jack and Sue Kling</p> <p>Chicago</p>	<p>Best Wishes in your ongoing contributions in the struggle for peace and equality of all peoples</p> <p>Frances Gabow Chicago</p>
<p>Under the leadership of Hyman Lumer you help bring clarity in the struggle for internationalism, against all forms of racism and anti-Semitism</p> <p>Wishing you continued success</p> <p>Jewish Commission of the Communist Party</p> <p>Chicago</p>	<p>A Group of Chicago Trade Unionists wishes <u>Jewish Affairs</u> continued success</p> <p>Charles Wilson</p>	
<p>The Illinois-Iowa State Committee of the Communist Party greets</p> <p><u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>and wishes you continued success</p> <p>Ishmael Flory, Chairman Jack Kling, District Secretary</p>	<p>Ohio State Committee, CPUSA greets</p> <p><u>Jewish Affairs</u></p> <p>Champion of Peace and Working Class Internationalism</p>	
<p>From Audrey and James West</p> <p>"Keep up the Good Work!"</p> <p>Cleveland, Ohio</p>	<p>From Ed Chaka</p> <p>"Continue the Good Work"</p> <p>Cleveland, Ohio</p>	

(Further greetings will appear in our next issue)