

Published by the
Communist Party,
U.S.A.

JEWISH AFFAIRS

Jan.-Feb. 1974

Price 35¢



PEACE—A Picasso reproduction

IN THIS ISSUE

Zionist Enemies of Detente

Editorial

Some Questions and Answers

Herbert Aptheker

A New Balance of Forces

Hyman Lumer

Which Way to Middle East Peace?

James West

**HENRY WINSTON — AGAINST APOLOGISTS FOR
IMPERIALISM, ZIONISM, RACISM**

JEWISH AFFAIRS

Vol. 4, No. 1

January-February, 1974

Editor: Hyman Lumer

Editorial Committee: David Fried, Jack Kling, Alex Kolkin

CONTENTS

Editorials

<u>Zionist Enemies of Detente</u>	1
<u>Arrogance and Ignorance</u>	2
<u>Coming: An Important New Publication</u>	4
<u>The Second Jewish Affairs Dinner</u>	5
Ted Bassett, <u>Greetings from the Daily World</u>	6
Herbert Aptheker, <u>Some Questions and Answers</u>	8
Hyman Lumer, <u>A New Balance of Forces</u>	12
Henry Winston, <u>Against Apologists for Imperialism, Zionism, Racism</u>	17
James West, <u>Which Way to Middle East Peace?</u>	24
Klaus J. Hermann, <u>The Jewish Community in the GDR</u>	31

Communications

Meyer Bellit, <u>Who Attacked Whom?</u>	34
The Editors, <u>Who Were the Aggressors?</u>	34
Morris Kamiel, <u>Good Wishes from a Canadian Friend</u>	35
E. G., <u>The Yevseev Pamphlet</u>	36
<u>Greetings</u>	37

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

Zionist Enemies of Detente

The Zionist Organization of America is the second-largest Zionist body in the United States, exceeded in membership only by Hadassah. It has established for itself an unbroken record of support to reaction and of the most rabid anti-Sovietism. It supported the U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam, and it called on Jews not to take part in the peace movement lest the U.S. government cease giving aid to Israel. Now it comes out flatfootedly against any improvement in relations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

An editorial in its official organ (The American Zionist, October-November, 1973) states that

... there was an Israeli victory and the conspirators shall yet have to atone for their infamous deed on Yom Kippur. The war ended with Israeli forces 40 miles from Cairo and 20 miles from Damascus. A death blow was about to be delivered to the attackers, who were saved only by the Soviet Union's ability to gain American acquiescence to the imposition of a cease-fire at the decisive moment.

The inference is clear. The Nixon Administration has, it seems, permitted the Soviet leaders to hoodwink it into letting the alleged aggressors, bent on destroying Israel, to escape their just deserts. The editorial adds that "the Soviet Union, by going to the brink of confrontation with the U.S. to get a cease-fire precisely on the Arabs' terms, has helped to bring home to the American public the folly of a detente whereby the U.S. would provide the means enabling the Russians to devote more of their resources to a global competition aimed at the strategic discomfiture of the U.S."

This is only the beginning. The full venom of the ZOA toward the Soviet Union is expressed in the following paragraph:

Only those who believed you could do business with Hitler can doubt that the Soviet rulers have inherited the Nazi mantle and constitute today the same kind of threat to freedom--now in a "distant place" (that is how Chamberlain described Czechoslovakia in 1938), but ultimately we ourselves will be the target.

The utter falsity of this foul slander of the Soviet Union hardly needs to be demonstrated. Let us look rather at the logic of this total confusion of friends

and enemies of the Jewish people--for the Israeli people first of all, and for the world as a whole.

What the editorial says is, first, that "you can't do business with the Arabs," that the only basis for Israel's security is military superiority and the delivery of a "death blow" to the armed forces of any Arab state which dares to challenge its aggressive actions. But has not the October war demonstrated the complete bankruptcy of such a policy? Has it not demonstrated that reliance on military force and the expansionist concept of "secure borders" can lead the Israeli people only to disaster? How many more Arab and Jewish youth must be slaughtered in wars before the ZOA and its counterparts in Israel learn that lesson?

Second, the editorial maintains that "you can't do business with the Soviet Union," that detente can lead only to our becoming victims of "Soviet aggression." In clinging to this discredited cold-war canard, the ZOA's leaders are saying that peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union is impossible, that the security of the United States can be assured only by military means--by nuclear confrontation and war. But is it not clear that this is the path not to security but toward annihilation, and not only for the people of our country but for those of the entire world?

These Zionist leaders, it seems, have learned nothing from experience. Their adherence to these policies is leading them into ever closer association with the most reactionary class forces in our country and ever more deeply into the bog of anti-Sovietism and war. Into this bog they seek to plunge the Jewish people. In the light of this the struggle against such Zionist poison must be greatly stepped up.

* * *

Arrogance and Ignorance

Sid Resnick, who poses as an authority on Middle East affairs, writes in the Morning Freiheit of January 27 that "one of the pleasant surprises of the election in Israel" was the fact that the newly-elected mayor of Nazareth was a member of the Communist Party of Israel. He goes on to say:

We almost flipped when we read this news. The supporters of the Rakach Communists must be surely hard put to explain this victory. For years they have been telling everyone that Israel is a "racist" state, an undemocratic state, almost a fascist state. To listen to their dismal descriptions of Israeli society one would think that all the Rakach Communists were in jail and all the Arabs in concentration camps.

Resnick's chutzpah is matched only by his ignorance. The election of a Communist mayor of Nazareth came as no great surprise to the Communist Party of Israel; on the contrary it was pretty much anticipated. The Communist Party has long enjoyed considerable support among Israeli Arabs, receiving from 35 to 50 per cent of the Arab vote. And the population of Nazareth is almost entirely Arab. When I visited Nazareth in 1966, 7 of its 15 City Council members were Communists. In the recent elections the Communist Party's vote among the Arabs increased by 35 per cent. This, together with a 7 per cent increase among Jewish voters, won it a fourth seat in the Knesset, in which it previously held three seats.

All this is a tribute to the steadfast, principled stand of the Communist Party. But it is no proof of the absence of racial oppression of Arabs in Israel or of persecution of Arab Communists, any more than the election of Black mayors in a growing number of U.S. cities demonstrates the absence of racial oppression of Black people here.

The fact is that Arab Communists in Israel have been subjected to special persecution. From the time of the 1967 war on, they have been subjected to imprisonment, beatings, house arrest or confinement to the particular locality in which they lived. In the 1969 elections the Communist Party also stood a good chance of electing four deputies, but this was prevented by the simple device of arresting several hundred Arabs in Nazareth before election day and releasing them shortly afterward. These and similar acts have been vigorously protested by the Communist Party of Israel and by Communists elsewhere. We do not recall any such protests on the part of Mr. Resnick. The simple fact is that Israel is a racist state, no less than the United States, even though both are bourgeois democracies. In the name of "objectivity" he seeks to gloss over this all too obvious fact.

But Mr. Resnick's display of ignorance does not end with this. He writes that

... despite all the "progressive" developments in the Arab nations, the Communists in these countries, except for Lebanon, are either completely illegal and underground, or if they are permitted above ground they may not publicly identify themselves as Communists in these one-party states. It is unheard of that Arab Communists can run for political office in the Arab countries.

The best answer to this rubbish is contained in a summary of a declaration issued by a meeting of Communist and Workers' parties of the Arab countries held last September. It says:

The declaration deals with the evolution of political democracy in Arab countries. In recent years a number of Communist and national patriotic parties were enabled to operate legally. Progressive national fronts were

established in Syria and Iraq. In Lebanon, progressive parties and organizations cooperate ever more closely in defense of democracy, the interests of the masses and the Palestinian resistance movement. In the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen there is cooperation between national democratic forces. In a number of Arab countries the Communist parties are participating in government and cooperate on a growing scale with other progressive parties and forces on the basis of common objectives. (Information Bulletin, World Marxist Review Publishers, No. 20, 1973.)

The Syrian cabinet has two Communist ministers and so does that of Iraq. In Egypt, where the Communist Party dissolved itself with the idea of working within the Arab Socialist Union, there are known Communist groups and Communists participate as such in the leading bodies of the Arab Socialist Union. Even in Jordan, where the Communist Party is formally illegal, part of it operates openly. It is, in fact, the only political party in Jordan.

We could go on. But the point is clear. There are to be sure, countries like Saudi Arabia with extremely reactionary governments and no democratic rights whatever. But to lump these together with countries with progressive governments simply demonstrates that Mr. Resnick does not know what he is talking about. Or else he is so blinded by Jewish nationalism and pro-Zionism that he does not wish to know.

Mr. Resnick sings the praises of bourgeois democracy. But it is necessary also to recognize its class character and its limitations. In the elections in Israel, despite the multiplicity of parties and coalitions, it was glaringly evident that the masses of Israeli people who reject the policies of the Meir government had no way of giving effective expression to their feelings. The same Zionist clique which has ruled Israel since 1948 remains in power. And it has as yet given no indication of any significant change in policy. Furthermore, those Arab countries which are taking the non-capitalist path of development, a path leading toward socialism, are moving toward a far higher form of democracy than is possible in a capitalist country like Israel.

* * *

Coming: An Important New Publication

The Black Liberation Commission of the CPUSA has undertaken to launch a Party magazine in its field--a sister publication to Jewish Affairs. This will be the first Party publication in the field of Black liberation. There is no question that it is vitally needed and can exert great influence not only in the sphere of the Black liberation struggle but in the fight for peace, freedom and progress generally. It will, among other things, be of great service, together with Jewish Affairs, in fostering Jewish-Black unity.

(continued on p. 36)

The Second Jewish Affairs Dinner

It was a superb affair. Such was the enthusiastic judgment of the more than 400 people who attended the second annual Jewish Affairs dinner. The attendance and the warm response of the audience to the speakers were a demonstration of the growing support which Jewish Affairs enjoys within the progressive Jewish movement.

The main theme expressed at the gathering was the demand for a just and durable peace in the Middle East based on carrying out fully the terms of the UN Security Council cease-fire resolutions, including in particular the implementation of Security Council Resolution 242. This was clearly reflected in the main speeches, presented by Henry Winston, national chairman of the Communist Party USA, Dr. Hyman Lumer, editor of Jewish Affairs, and Dr. Herbert Aptheker, head of the American Institute of Marxist Studies. All were very warmly applauded. The texts of these speeches are published in this issue.

In addition, greetings were brought by Judy Edelman of the Young Workers Liberation League, Leon Tolopko of the Ukrainian News and Ted Bassett of the Daily World. A very enthusiastic reception was given to Wilfried Matthews, baritone, whose program included "Sunrise-Sunset" from "Fiddler on the Roof" and such Paul Robeson favorites as "Waterboy" and "Old Man River."

The greetings by Comrade Bassett and the texts of the speeches are published in this issue in the order of their presentation.

More than \$1,400 was raised in the collection.

Great thanks are due to the arrangements committee, whose diligent labors made the affair such a highly successful one. Appreciation is due especially to the very efficient work of Florence Pasternack, who devoted her full time to the preparations, and to Alex Kolkin, head of the National Jewish Commission of the Communist Party, for an outstanding job of organization.

The editors of Jewish Affairs are highly gratified at the turnout of its readers and supporters for the dinner. We are equally gratified at the multitude of greetings which were received. Many of these appeared in our last issue and many more appear in this one.

We look forward to the next annual dinner in the hope and anticipation that it will be marked by a greatly improved Jewish Affairs, both in quality and in circulation.

Greetings From the Daily World

By Ted Bassett

Dear Comrades, allow me on this occasion of your second annual dinner to tender you the warmest greetings on behalf of the staff of the Daily World, which takes this occasion to hail the important contributions of Jewish Affairs not only to the struggle of the Jewish people for peace, democracy and socialism but also to the struggle of the entire American people. I refer particularly to the role of Jewish Affairs on the ideological front in the fight against white supremacist ideas, anti-Semitism, Zionism and Jewish bourgeois nationalism.

Two events in the past period have lent particular importance to the ideological struggle. U.S. monopoly capitalism has tremendously stepped up its ideological offensive in response to the advances of the socialist camp, the revolutionary working-class movement in the developed capitalist countries and the forces of national liberation.

Secondly, against this background, the 1967 Israeli annexationist war against the Arab peoples spurred a nationalist hysteria among sections of the Jewish community in our country, a hysteria which has mounted during the current war. This has added to the tasks confronting Communists and all progressives on the ideological front.

In this regard, Lenin, in his celebrated work, What Is to Be Done, called for a three-sided struggle--"the theoretical, the political and the practical economic."

He notes that "Engels recognizes not two forms of the great struggle of Social Democracy (political and economic)... but three, placing the theoretical struggle on a par with the first two."

During the decade of the sixties as well as historically, liberal Jewish organizations and leaders played a prominent role in the freedom and equality struggle of the Afro-American people. This has been seriously disrupted by the influence of Zionism and Jewish nationalism and the accompanying rise of white chauvinism in the Jewish community.

The nationalist hysteria which developed among sections of the Jewish community spurred white chauvinism which was glaringly expressed in New York City in the racist strike in 1968 against the Ocean-Hill-Brownsville experimental district in Brooklyn, led by Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers. It was further expressed in the fight in 1972-73 against an integrated

housing project in Forest Hills, Queens and against integrated schooling in Canarsie, Brooklyn.

White chauvinism must be fought as the chief strategic weapon of the white monopoly ruling class designed to maintain and perpetuate the division of the American working people. Anti-Semitism is a significant current in the racist ideology of U.S. monopoly capital and must be untiringly combatted. It is the duty of all Communists and progressives to lead in the struggle against both white chauvinism and anti-Semitism.

The American bourgeoisie foments reactionary nationalism among the Afro-American people.

It is the special duty of Black Communists and progressives to combat Afro-American bourgeois nationalism, as exemplified in the brilliant work of Henry Winston in Strategy for a Black Agenda, directed against the Ima mu Barakas and Stokely Carmichaels. It is likewise the special duty of Jewish Affairs to combat Zionism and Jewish bourgeois nationalism.

Jewish Affairs has played this role. It can serve to mobilize progressives and the entire Jewish community in these ideological struggles essential to achieving working class and people's unity and the building of the anti-monopoly front. May the circulation of Jewish Affairs grow.

* * *

SUBSCRIBE TO JEWISH AFFAIRS

Subscription rate: \$3.50 for 12 issues
\$1.75 for 6 issues

Special introductory offer:

12 issues plus a copy of the book Zionism:
Its Role in World Affairs (price \$2.45) for
\$5.00.

.....
Please check one of the following:

12 issues at \$3.75 6 issues at \$1.75 Special offer at \$5.00

Name _____ Address _____ Zip _____

Send to: Jewish Affairs
23 West 26th St.,
New York, N.Y. 10010

Some Questions and Answers

By Herbert Aptheker

I wish to direct my remarks to a consideration of the four or five most commonly asked questions concerning the Mid-East, so far as my own recent experiences go.

Aggressors and Victims

Frequently one hears and reads that Israel was the victim of aggression in the 1973 war. The war, however, was fought only within lands belonging—as everyone affirms—to the alleged "aggressors" while the "victims" battled only upon the lands of the "aggressors." Is this not strange? Can one point to another example of such a situation in the very long history of humanity?

Having such a definition of "aggressor" and "victim," would not one have to revise the common estimate of Kossuth's efforts to drive the Austrians out of Hungary, of Garibaldi's efforts to drive the Austrians and French out of Italy, of Juarez's efforts to drive the French out of Mexico, and of the Vietnamese people's just efforts to drive Mr. Nixon back to his tax shelters?

How is it possible for otherwise rational people to seriously offer such estimates of the Mid-East situation? I think the answer is that otherwise rational people, when infected with the virus of bourgeois nationalism, lose their rationality and permit their prejudices to dominate their thinking.

Secure Borders and "Extermination"

One hears, also, that Israel is a very small state and that therefore it requires, as a matter of military necessity, to extend its borders in order to assure its security and survival.

Of course, one might note that there have been other small states—England, for instance, which similarly affirmed the need to extend its borders and so set out to conquer Scotland and Wales and Ireland and then as much of the world as she could. One hesitates to think that "little Israel" apologists have this in mind—yet this precedent does exist and it is likely that it has occurred to people in Egypt, Jamaica, India and Nigeria, for example, who have reason to remember this history quite vividly.

At any rate in today's world, with its technology and weaponry and means of locomotion, the logic which in past centuries may have had some weight on this "border" question surely has infinitely less today. Furthermore, the only secure borders for Israel are borders of friendship and not of hostility and such borders cannot appear if within them are the occupied lands of ravished neighbors.

Further, in practice, has Israel gained for itself security by expanding its borders? Has it not rather gained repeated war and perpetual mobilization? Did not Israel suffer—according to official figures—2,500 killed in 1973? This is a figure which in relative terms would mean 175,000 U.S. men dead—or over three times the losses sustained by the United States in its ten-year war to stop "aggression" in Indochina. At this rate, Israel will never have secure borders and will be inviting, indeed, extermination.

As to the latter, it is frequently insisted that Israel fights against those who would end its very existence. This is quite false. The UN Resolution 242 of 1967 distinctly affirms the right of all states in the Mid-East to exist and the Arab countries have adopted this Resolution as their position. The Soviet Union, of course, has ardently supported that Resolution and the cease-fire agreement of October, 1973 reiterates the support of the 1967 Resolution on the part of all its signatories—including the United States as well as the Soviet Union.

It might be added that the Soviet Union opposes any effort at the extermination of any state; it opposed proposals—including some made by U.S. Cabinet members during World War II—for the extermination of Germany. The USSR opposed fascism in Germany and contributed decisively to its extermination; it fought not against the German people and their right to nationhood but rather against Nazism.

Exactly so here. The USSR has affirmed a hundred times that it in no way challenges the right of Israel to exist; on the contrary, the Soviet Union was decisive in helping to bring about the Israel envisioned by the UN and has always insisted that the right of Israel to exist is no more in question than the right of any other state. The opposition here is not against Israel but against Zionism—that is, against an aggressive, racist, pro-imperialist ideology now dominating Israel's ruling circles.

What threatens the extermination of Israel is the Meir—Dayan government's policy of aggression and pro-imperialism; in the present relationship of world forces such a policy has no future and will mean, as it has meant, one disaster after another for Israel.

Democracy: Truth and Myth

One is told a hundred times that in the Mid-East only one democracy exists, namely, Israel; and it exists, one is assured, in the midst of an "Arab world" characterized by feudalistic tyranny and general despotism. Surely, then, in a conflict involving Israel and the Arab states a progressive-minded person must support the former. Let us see.

It is true that in terms of bourgeois democracy and western parliamentary government, Israel is different from--ahead of, if you wish--the Arab states. But a progressive-minded person--let alone one who is a Marxist-Leninist--understands the limitations of bourgeois-democracy, at its best, and with the racism so dominant in Israel and with Israel as an occupying power, surely that "democracy" is not at its best! With the majority of the Jewish population in Israel being Sephardic and discriminated against in economic, social and political terms very much as Black people are now in the United States; and with about 12 per cent of the total population of Israel being Arabic and being discriminated against in ways similar to those practiced against Black people in the United States some ninety years ago, surely one must pause before siding with it in a war upon neighbors whose lands it occupies!

Furthermore, the depiction of the Arabic world as a monolithic one--as is so often done with Africa--or as Mr. Agnew did with the Black population in the United States--is itself reflective of racism. The Arabic world is multi-class, of course, and its states vary from fearfully regressive, such as Saudi Arabia (Washington's favorite among Arabic states), to significantly progressive, such as Syria. But the basic point is that there is an Arab people's liberation movement, which transcends class and which reflects the fact that for over a century these people have been subjected to colonial, racist indignity and domination and that they are in the midst of a process of throwing off this yoke. To throw off this yoke means not only to free their states politically and to be able to advance their people socially; it means also to have the capacity to recapture the resources of their lands and above all the oil in the Mid-East, today dominated by an international cartel which in turn is overwhelmingly controlled by U.S. corporations.

This is at the heart of the wars in the Mid-East since the end of World War II: colonial-imperialism versus national liberation and in so far as the government of Israel has served the cause of the former it hinders the latter and is an enemy of human liberation.

Furthermore, on this question of "democracy": in World War I were not the Allies--especially after the February, 1917 revolution in Russia--more "democratic" than the Central Powers? Does this mean that Woodrow Wilson was right and that Lenin was wrong? Does it mean that the "socialists" from Briand to Berger were correct in supporting the Allies and that Lenin was really, perhaps, a "German agent"? When Albert Shanker and his cohorts scream today about the "democracy" in the Mid-East, they are following the example of their ideological forebears who betrayed the socialist movement in 1914-1917. Were their forebears right? If not, why is Mr. Shanker right today?

Finally, on this question of "democracy," one should note that Israel is quite isolated in the world community of nations and has as so-called allies only the United States, Portugal, Iran and South Africa. Now there is a democratic coalition, if I ever saw one!

Africa and Israel

Not infrequently, one meets a question as to why it is that practically all African states have expressed support for the Arab cause and have, indeed, severed diplomatic relations with Israel. One individual even said to me that when she had seen some Black people picketing, with others, in protest against Israeli occupation and aggression, she was tempted to approach them and explain to them--in case they did not "understand"--how involved Arabs had been in the African slave trade.

Well, of course, the slave trade was not confined to Arabs. Europeans--and Africans, too, for that matter--engaged in it and it was the Europeans who were most "successful." And, of course, slavery and the slave trade was a matter of business, of money-making, of class, of socio-economic order and not a matter of this or that particular people or nation. (One recalls that the Secretary of the Treasury for the Confederate States of America was Jewish; and that August Bondi, who fought with John Brown, was also Jewish.)

The peoples and states of Africa overwhelmingly oppose the policy and practices of the Israeli government because in the first place, Egypt is in Africa. Our high school textbooks may have given us an opposite impression, but the fact is that Egypt is African and when Israel bombs Egypt and rapes Egypt she is bombing and ravishing a part of Africa--and that is a continent whose peoples have had their fill of aggression and ravishment!

Moreover, Africa and its peoples are basic to the process of national liberation; hence, the struggle of the Arab peoples for national liberation is quite naturally and properly viewed by the peoples of Africa as a fraternal effort, as part of a worldwide effort having a common foe--imperialism--and common friends--all nationally oppressed peoples, all democratic-minded peoples, all peoples and states within the socialist community and especially the Soviet Union.

*

It is because the present policy of Israel is a policy subservient to imperialism that Israel has become a parish among the nations of the earth. It is because such a policy ties Israel to a diminishing force in today's world and to one already subordinate in terms of the global relationship of forces that the policy is doomed to failure.

The power of peaceful coexistence has forced the United States to accept a cease-fire and a peace conference to be held under UN auspices and chaired by the UN secretary-general. Despite resistance, it appears altogether likely that the conference will occur and that it will mark the beginning of a real agreement providing for a reversal in U.S.-Israeli policy in the Mid-East, the liquidation of the aggression, the return of the occupied lands, justice to the Palestinian people and peace in that critical and tormented part of the earth.

Not least among the forces making such prospects realistic are those

represented by Jewish Affairs, whose second annual dinner we here celebrate, and the leadership and staunchness of its editor, Dr. Hyman Lumer. Encompassing the magazine and its possibility for service was, of course, the guidance and inspiration of the Communist Party of the United States, the best of which is epitomized in the presence among us today of its chairman, Comrade Henry Winston.

The Communist Party has held firm the banner of international working-class solidarity here in the bastion of imperialism and in the face of the hysteria induced by the Mid-East events and by the propaganda forces of Zionism.

This firmness and the work of Jewish Affairs have served the cause of national liberation, of the continued existence of what must become a truly democratic, anti-racist and anti-colonial Israel, of the cause of world peace and the cause of socialism. The magazine has earned the ardent support of all who value these purposes.

* * *

A New Balance of Forces

By Hyman Lumer

This is for me a very happy occasion. Having been absent for a considerable period of time, mainly for reasons of health, it is good to be back and to participate in this important event. It is good to be back among friends and comrades in struggle, and to see so many of you here.

Under the best of circumstances an editor's job is not an easy one, as I am sure my fellow editors, past and present, who are here today, will readily agree. But neither is the life of an editor's wife an easy one, as I am sure my wife Dorothy, here beside me, will testify. If Nobel prizes were given to those who deserve them, surely she would be the recipient of one, if for no other reason than because she puts up with me. But her contribution goes far beyond that. She is one of my severest critics, and among other things she is critical of me for working too hard—that is, when she can take time out to do so from her own endless round of work and political activity. For her appreciation and help I am grateful. Her contribution toward the success of Jewish Affairs, in addition to her many other contributions, is deserving of recognition on this occasion.

*

As we meet, the center of the international stage is once again occupied by the Middle East crisis. Once again there has been an outbreak of full-scale

warfare and once again it is followed by an uneasy cease-fire. But this war has radically altered the picture in the Middle East. The balance of forces in that region has been irrevocably changed and the policy of aggression and annexation pursued by the Israeli ruling circles has now been shown to be totally bankrupt. Within Israel, as even the brief visit I was able to make was sufficient to show, this policy is being rejected by growing numbers of the Israeli people.

On the one hand the idea that security and peace could be assured by annexation of Arab territory has been proven false; on the other hand the myth of Israeli military invincibility has been shattered. To growing numbers of Israelis it is becoming evident that the present policies of the Israeli government lead only to disaster.

On all sides these policies are being subjected to ever greater questioning and opposition. To be sure, Israeli military superiority may still exist and with it the ability to win further military victories over the Arabs. But at what cost? Already, according to the official figures, some 2,500 Israeli soldiers have been killed, nearly four times the number of Israeli lives lost in the 1967 war. Many Israelis, it should be noted, consider this figure an underestimation. And had it not been for the cease-fire the number would be much greater.

On all sides the government policies are being challenged. The Israeli people were told that the new borders would provide security and minimize the danger of war. Now they have learned that this was not so, that the location of a border is no guarantee of peace. This is expressed in a petition being circulated in Israel by an organization called "Peace Initiative Now," which says: "The Yom Kippur War exposed the illusion and errors of the politics of stalemate and creeping annexation which did not lead to peace and did not prevent war. In the wake of the cease-fire, a historical opportunity for peace has arisen. In the absence of peace, further wars are to be expected.... Israel's security will not be achieved by annexation and/or occupation...."

An even greater shock was the smashing of the myth of Israeli military invincibility—the discovery that the Arab states not only possessed the most modern weapons but were no less capable of waging modern warfare than the Israeli military forces themselves. This is reflected in the staggering total of Israeli casualties which reach into many Israeli families.

The Israeli government, it has now become crystal-clear, can continue its present policies only at an intolerable cost in lives and property, at the cost of wrecking its economy through endless military mobilization of its manpower, at the cost of total disaster.

Israeli foreign policy has been based on the racist concept of Arab inferiority. Like all such policies it was doomed to defeat, for in reality there are no superior and inferior peoples. This realization was strikingly brought home to the Israeli people—and especially to the Israeli soldiers—by the war. The racist ruling circles are being compelled to learn this lesson the hard way.

Growing masses in Israel have become disillusioned with the Zionist-inspired policy of aggression and annexation. They have come to see it as a policy which leads only to endless war and destruction for Israel. They no longer believe what the government tells them, and there is a rising, highly vocal opposition to the present leaders, especially to Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan. Like Nixon, they have forfeited the confidence of many who formerly supported them.

Even more significant is the fact that the basic precepts of Zionism are being challenged, especially among the youth. The Ministry of Education complains that students are asking questions such as "is there something wrong with us that the world is always against us?" and "what are we fighting for and is it worth dying for?" They are rejecting the concept of Israel as the state of all Jews and of Jews as a "chosen people." A growing sentiment is developing for doing away with the Zionist concept of an exclusively Jewish state, for making Israel a country based on Jewish-Arab equality and friendship. And this begins with mounting demands for return of the occupied territories as the only real basis for peace. As the workers in one shop put it, "Let us pay for Sinai oil with money, not with blood."

A basic change has occurred in the thinking of the Israeli working people, a change whose significance should not be underestimated. There is a widespread rejection of force and expansionism as the foundation of Israel's future.

But there is still far to go. Much confusion exists. Some attribute the crisis not to a wrong policy but the ineptness of the present government leaders. Anti-Sovietism is widespread. Anti-Arab chauvinism remains rampant and the falsehood that the aim of the Arab states is to destroy Israel is still all too widely accepted. But the change is there and the basis exists for conducting the fight for a durable peace on a new plane, with much greater assurance of victory.

*

Of course, a long and difficult struggle still lies ahead. Despite the popular opposition, and despite opposition within its own ranks, Israel's ruling class doggedly clings to its bankrupt, suicidal policies. It is already quite clear that it intends to utilize the cease-fire agreement only as a base for maneuvering and stalling, and least of all does it have any intention of living up to Security Council Resolution 242 and withdrawing from the occupied territories. Nor is it prepared to recognize the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs; indeed, it is vigorously opposed to allowing the Arab refugees to return to their homes and to the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state of any kind.

These things are evident in the platform adopted by the Labor Party--the dominant party in Israel--for the coming elections on December 31. It has responded to the popular opposition, and to an opposition movement in its own ranks, led by such individuals as Yitzhak Ben Aharon, former head of the Histadrut, and Lyova Eliav, the party's former general secretary, by the adoption of a highly demagogic 14-point platform which offers no basic change in policy.

It omits the notorious "Galili Plan" which presents a four-year program of annexation and which the Central Committee had previously adopted. But it does not abandon the policy of annexation itself. And it is this party which, it appears, will dominate the new Parliament.

The Israeli voters will undoubtedly seek to express their opposition to the present leadership in the elections. But unfortunately they have no effective instrument for replacing it. If they do not vote for the candidates of the Alignment (the Labor Party plus Mapam), the only other large electoral bloc on the scene is Likud, a coalition of ultra-Right, fascist groupings led by Menachem Begin and supported by such elements as the hoodlum Meir Kahane, himself a candidate. And it should be borne in mind that these two groups do not differ fundamentally on the question of expansionism. The only alternative left as M. Poles, editor of the newspaper Ha'aretz notes (November 30, 1973), is to vote for the Communist Party of Israel or for one of the other small Left groupings presenting slates of candidates.

Undoubtedly the Alignment will lose votes, some going to Likud and others to the parties on the Left, and especially to the Communist Party. This party has continued heroically to defend its principled Marxist-Leninist position in the face of great difficulties and dangers, including the physical attack on Meir Vilner by fascist elements in the Knesset. But now history is proving it correct in the eyes of a growing number of Israelis, who are coming to recognize it as the only true party of peace. People are beginning to listen to the Communist Party. As a soldier on leave, a member of the Young Communist league, told me, soldiers from other units come around and ask: "Where are the Communists? We want to talk to them." All this will unquestionably be reflected in its vote.

However, while there may be some changes in the cabinet which emerges, the elections are not expected to produce any major changes by themselves. The necessity grows for mass struggle of all kinds as the means of forcing basic changes in policy, and there is no doubt that such struggles will continue to mount.

*

What is happening in Israel is beginning to find its reflections in this country, even within the Zionist movement. Thus, Israel Horizons, organ of the Americans for Progressive Israel, editorially recognizes the fact that military victories are no guarantee of peace, that territorial security can never be absolute, that the era of Arab military impotence may well be past, and hence that it is necessary to rethink many past axioms.

Others, too, are beginning, after the first emotional reactions to the war, to re-examine their previous ideas and to arrive at new conclusions. But this in itself is no guarantee that the new conclusions will be correct. And this is where we come in. We have a big job ahead of us.

For a number of years our Party, Jewish Affairs and its readers, the Committee for a Just Peace in the Middle East and others have fought unceasingly for the implementation of Security Council Resolution 242 as the only real guarantee of durable peace in the Middle East and the security of Israel. For some time, we have conducted this struggle almost alone. But now the prospects exist of making this a much broader struggle, involving many who would not previously accept our views.

The struggle now takes place under new conditions. It takes place within the framework of growing U.S.-Soviet detente, of the cease-fire resolutions jointly introduced by these two countries in the Security Council, which explicitly embody the implementation of Resolution 242. It takes place at a time when growing numbers are prepared to listen to us, to recognize that it is our policy which truly serves the interests of the Israeli people and of the Jewish people generally.

It is our responsibility to take up the call of the World Congress of Peace Forces for full implementation of the cease-fire resolutions of October 22 and 23 and to work to build a mass movement behind it. This task is of exceptional importance in the United States, both because of the special role played by U.S. imperialism in supporting and financing the aggressive policies of the Israeli government and because of the support to these policies by the powerful Zionist movement in this country.

It is our responsibility to reach out to the mounting numbers who are ready to listen, who are rethinking their positions, to move them into action. In this, Jewish Affairs can and must play a leading part.

To those who have worked with me in its publication, to those who have worked so hard to bring about this magnificent gathering, to those who have fought with us for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East I offer my own thanks and encouragement. May this affair be not only the celebration of past accomplishments of Jewish Affairs but the starting point of a new struggle for a just and durable peace in the Middle East, for an end to a situation which has for so many years threatened to become a source of nuclear confrontation.

Peace between Jews and Arabs can be won, peace based on the safeguarding of the rights of all states in the Middle East and on the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs to self-determination. To these goals Jewish Affairs dedicates itself.

* * *

Greetings from a Jewish Friend from Alma Ata
to a fighting magazine.

Contribution: \$15.00

Against Apologists for Imperialism, Zionism, Racism

By Henry Winston

To our chairman, to our honored guests and to all our comrades and friends present--warmest greetings!

Even though the introduction of our chairman was overstated, I was moved by the spirit of his remarks and by your inspiring response to them.

Esther Carroll, with her usual warmth and humanism even makes me a "doctor." It is known that this is not my status, yet I applaud the beautiful sentiments and hopes expressed in the remarks of Esther Carroll, for they are truly reflective of the democratic, anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist unity that is growing between Jew and gentile, Black and white, and all oppressed minorities whose interests are as one in a common struggle against monopoly, against imperialism.

The strengthening of unity and its further development is largely dependent upon the quality and quantity of the struggle against the main weapons of a decadent, dying system which is consciously fanning racism in general and anti-Semitism in particular.

It is indeed a pleasure to find here a conscious understanding that anti-Communism, racism and anti-Semitism are needed by the reactionary, militarist, ultra-Right and fascist forces not only to undermine the struggle for detente and peaceful coexistence, not only to place obstacles in the way of the fight of labor and the people to defend their living standards against the monopolies, but also to establish a safe rear for the monopolists by crushing the liberties of the people, and making possible a more aggressive military policy in the international arena.

Implicit in all the speeches from this platform is the simple truth that the realization of the cause of democracy and peace makes mandatory a vigorous struggle against anti-Communism, racism and anti-Semitism.

Jewish Affairs has played and is playing a very fine role in helping to bring

that kind of clarity to our class and our people, and is at the same time actively giving leadership to larger and larger numbers of Jewish masses seeking answers, at a time when the ideologists of imperialism in general and Zionism in particular have pulled out all stops in their barrage within the Jewish community.

What is the aim of this barrage? It is a conscious effort to spread that kind of confusion which would make it appear as if the Zionist-directed policies of the Israeli government are identical with the healthy national aspirations of the Jewish masses. The Zionists receive the unstinting support of finance capital as a whole in the U.S. Without such support the barbaric racist and militarist occupation of Arab lands could never take place.

The defense of the vital interests of the Jewish masses is identical with the needs and aspirations of all lovers of democracy, equality and peace. The realization of these goals by forward-looking humanity necessitates an understanding of the conscious efforts of imperialism to muddy the waters. With that it is necessary to rapidly make a break with the misleading ideologies of imperialism and to take the path of practical organization to advance programs of struggle corresponding to the needs of the working class and all democratic strata against monopoly. Jewish Affairs is playing an important role in helping to bring about this kind of understanding. Hyman Lumer, the editor of Jewish Affairs, is playing a splendid role in this respect.

I am very proud to have been given the honor of representing the Political Committee of the Communist Party of the United States and to convey its warmest greetings to Jewish Affairs and to its editor, Hyman Lumer, for its contributions in bringing the science of Marxism-Leninism to ever greater numbers of people who are playing a growing role in the sharpening struggles within the country. The Communist Party fully supports Jewish Affairs because it is an active fighter for the unity of Jewish masses with all democratic forces, especially labor, with a conscious outlook of an anti-monopoly character. Such an outlook necessarily means vigorous struggle against anti-Semitism in all its forms. Anti-Semitism is a conscious weapon of the forces of reaction in this country. The struggle against anti-Semitism is part of the struggle for democracy, for peace, for the strengthening of solidarity within the ranks of the working class, for unity between Black and white, for unity of all forces seeking social progress. Anti-Semitism is a crime against all that is decent, a crime against everything the people of the U.S. hold dear. Anti-Semitism must be outlawed. This is the position of the Communist Party of the United States.

*

I recently spoke at an All-People's Rally in Chicago at the National Anti-Imperialist Conference in Support of African Liberation Movements. Among other things, I said the following:

My dear friends--if we wish to achieve this objective we must learn what Africans have already learned: that if you're going to defeat the man, you cannot play the man's game. And the man's game is anti-Communism--and he who practices anti-Communism is playing the man's

game. The road to victory is to take away from him his two main weapons. What are these weapons? They are anti-Communism and racism. Wherever you find an anti-Communist you will find a racist. And wherever you find a racist you will find an anti-Communist.

That is why, together with South Africa you will find U.S. imperialism supporting Israeli aggression. What is their weapon? It is anti-Communism, it is Zionism. And Zionism is imperialism; it is racism.

That is why you can have a barbarous assault upon the Arab lands. The struggle of the Arab peoples for the mastery of their land and for driving out the aggressors is a just fight and Communists in the U.S. fully support that fight. Therefore to the Zionist occupiers we say--get out and stay out of Arab lands. The struggle of the Arab people is a struggle which is serving the interests of all humanity. That is why today, within Israel itself, among the Jewish masses there is a growing groundswell against the Zionist leadership of Golda Meir. Moshe Dayan and Abba Eban. The struggle of the Jewish people, if supported by us, will grow and the true national spirit among the Jewish masses in Israel will assert itself.

The Anti-Defamation League is disturbed by this. I pick up the New York Times and find it taking exception to the thought that "Zionism is imperialism" or "Zionism is racism." I cannot say that I am surprised. The rebuff given by the Arab peoples, more united than ever and supported by all peace-loving people throughout the world, among them the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, helped smash the myth of Israeli military invincibility and also revealed to the bulk of the world's peoples the imperialist essence of Israeli aggression.

I am not surprised at the conscious effort of the Anti-Defamation League to conceal the simple truth that Israel is a capitalist country and that Zionism is a political movement which directs the affairs of the entire state. I am not surprised that the Anti-Defamation League deliberately covers up the false concept of a "chosen people." In point of fact, failure to distinguish between Zionism and Judaism is not accidental at all. Perhaps the Anti-Defamation League, performing the role of all apologists of imperialism, would assert that the racist practices against the Arab peoples in general and the Palestinian Arab people in particular accompanied by the discrimination against the Sephardic Jews, should be regarded as a "civilizing" mission. Is this not a justification of Israeli aggression and a defense of racism?

*

In point of fact an axis exists between Pretoria and Tel-Aviv in which there is full cooperation on the political, economic and military level. This unity of the white fascist apartheid regime in South Africa with Zionism is explained by Prime Minister Vorster, who said in a speech in Ketmaskhan, Namibia ... "We are in solidarity with Israel in its war...." The South African newspaper Die Burger was even more precise. It said outright that "from the point of

view of South Africa, Israel was guarding the northern gates to Africa, while from the point of view of Israel, South Africa was guarding the continent's southern gates, and so it is in the interests of both that the other side survives."

I do not think that any sincere person should dismiss the meaning of such relationships. Some people have the mission in life of helping to make things palatable to the imperialists, and cannot be bothered by such facts. Naturally they do not agree with me. But in their haste they are tripped by the cleverly peddled falsehoods. Mr. Max Lerner is such a person. For example, in the New York Post of December 21, 1973, he writes: "The old Lenin-Hobson theory of imperialism died with the twilight of the imperialism of the 'haves' after world war I" and "In the 1930's and 1940's it was the 'have-not' nations -- Italy, Germany, Japan -- who turned the tables and had their own imperialist adventure."

It is very easy to see through this deliberate confusion. Present-day events are daily and hourly revealing the profundity and truth of Lenin's teachings on imperialism. Lessons from these teachings are the basis of study and action guiding hundreds of millions of oppressed people on to the highway of struggle which will achieve political and economic independence. These developments are irreversible.

For example, Mr. Lerner does not tell us the simple truth revealed by Lenin that imperialism is capitalism in its highest phase of development. To Mr. Lerner imperialism becomes simply the difference between "have" nations and "have-not" nations, and regards the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo axis as being only "an imperialist adventure."

Let us take Germany alone. Germany was a major imperialist power with colonies, and, locked in battle with other imperialist states during world war I, was stripped of its colonies. The German state never ceased to be an imperialist state even though its struggles with rival imperialist powers resulted in the loss of its colonies. But Mr. Lerner sees Germany only as a "have-not" nation between the first and second world wars.

Why does not Mr. Lerner tell us that behind anti-Communism in general and anti-Sovietism in particular, and more specifically anti-Semitism, was the drive of the German monopolies for "lebensraum"? Why does he not tell us that it was the imperialist policies of the Krupps and Thysons which brought us Hitler fascism that outlawed democracy and destroyed all political opposition and the trade union movement, that developed the idea of Nordic superiority to the extreme, that gave us concentration camps and crematoria which took the lives of many millions, including six million Jewish people, and that engulfed the entire world in the second world war. This was a titanic struggle against Hitler's efforts to establish German imperialist dominance and a "thousand-year regime" of Aryan terror.

Mr. Lerner fails to tell us that the most significant event in human history occurred when, in October, 1917, the working class and peasantry of Russia, led by the Bolshevik Party under Lenin achieved power and detached from the system of imperialism 160 million people. Nor does he tell us that in 1922 this victory

of the Russian working class and its allies was followed by the founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics--an expression in life of the equality of formerly oppressed nations and peoples.

Thus, when the Nazis launched war against the Soviet Union there emerged a courage, heroism and fighting spirit unequalled in all human history. This role played by the Soviet people was an integral part of the struggle of democratic and peace loving peoples in all lands and of bourgeois-democratic governments opposed to fascism.

The lives of some 20 million Soviet people were lost in this struggle. If democracy is still alive in many lands, if the struggles for national independence in Africa, Asia and Latin America are advancing, this is primarily due to the decisive role played by the Soviet Union in this epic struggle against imperialism. This is a lesson which should never be forgotten. I say that not only because I feel that world humanity owes a debt to the Soviet Union which can never be fully repaid, but also because of the urgent requirements of the moment in helping to build a movement for detente and peaceful coexistence, and for support to all movements of national liberation. Such a cause is not helped when it is declared that the teaching of Lenin on imperialism is "dead."

*

Mr. Lerner's notion about imperialism being a matter of "have" and "have-not" nations makes it possible for him to write this nonsense: "With the ending of World War II it was the Russians who spread their wings and became the imperialist power in the whole of Eastern Europe, and then with Vietnam it was the U.S. which tried the role." Mr. Lerner is developing notions exactly like those of the CIA, the ultra-Right and all forces of imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, which is the top dog in the system of world imperialism. He erases with a stroke of the pen the tremendous contributions of the Soviet Union, an achievement made possible by the Soviet people under the leadership of the CPSU and based on the teachings of the great Lenin.

Mr. Lerner is a learned man, and the fact that he writes about "Russia" is not accidental. Thereby he does two things at once. On the one hand he conceals the splendid achievement in the sphere of equality among peoples magnificently growing and developing in a period of Communist construction. On the other hand he conceals the contribution of this great union of peoples to the liberating underground democratic, anti-fascist struggles in such countries as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Yugoslavia and Albania. These struggles successfully put an end to fascist dictatorship in these countries, making it possible for them, for the first time in their history, to have stable borders and a full national development of their economic, social and cultural life.

Everyone is acquainted with Mr. Lerner's anti-Communism. But new millions will quickly become acquainted with his falsification of the role of the Soviet Union, and will understand that he needs such falsification to justify his apologies for imperialism.

He would have us believe, for example, that the defeat delivered to U.S. imperialism in Vietnam, first of all by the courageous and heroic people of Vietnam, together with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, as well as the peace-loving people throughout the world, including the people of the U.S., has put an end to what he calls "the adventure" of these imperialists who, in Vietnam, "tried the role."

Mr. Lerner needs this manipulation of logic in order to make it difficult to notice an unpardonable racist sin. His "have" and "have-not" concepts are used to sustain the specious thesis which states: "It is the Arabs who are the "haves," when it comes to their rich crucial oil supply, and it is the Western states which are the "have-nots." Mr. Lerner goes on to say that "the true imperialism today no longer Western capitalist imperialism, but Arab oil imperialism."

To Mr. Lerner, U.S. imperialism is no longer imperialism. It is simply a democracy. The class nature of this democracy, the existence of state monopoly capitalism, the existence of brutal class, national and racial oppression, the economic controls of U.S. imperialism in Arab lands and their unity with reactionary capitalists and landowners--all this is not even mentioned. Nor is the just struggle of the Arab peoples for control of their own resources and the use of oil to advance the fight for their national rights--the rights to determine their own lives and the nature of their relations with other states, and to stop the flow of their riches to foreign banks. It is a struggle in which victory can come about only on the basis of the ousting of foreign imperialism. The Arab states will become "have" states only when they become the masters of their lands in all aspects of life. This is the nature of the struggle now. Mr. Lerner, turning logic upside down, calls this "Arab oil imperialism."

Mr. Lerner is angered at such a just struggle. After all this kind of struggle is injurious to his imperialist masters.

That is why it is difficult for Mr. Lerner to restrain himself. He issues a warning to these people fighting imperialism. He writes: "But let them too beware. For they are compelling the disunited West to close ranks in order to meet the threat. The Kissinger idea of a joint crash program of America and Europe, to develop new oil and energy resources, is a handwriting the Arabs should heed. If pre-industrial nations start playing with technology as a political weapon, it is not they but the technological countries who will end the game."

This voice reflects the iron-fist policy of U.S. imperialism and Zionism in support of Israeli aggression. This policy has the aim of strengthening and extending U.S. imperialist influence in the Middle East, establishing military bases there to dominate this area, including the whole of the Mediterranean. This policy also has as its aim slowing down and undermining, with the hope of ultimately destroying the movement for national independence and ouster of imperialism. At the same time, the aim is to create bases of operation directed against the Soviet Union.

Mr. Lerner's "have" and "have-not" concepts are related to these imperialist

objectives. It must be made plain that great dangers are involved in the continued occupation of Arab lands. The implementation of UN Resolution 242 must be speeded.

The millions of Jewish masses must come to understand that such concepts as those of Mr. Lerner are knocking at the door of war, not peace. Let us not forget Charles A. Lindberg's propaganda about the so-called "Asiatic hordes" during the second world war. This does not differ in essence from Max Lerner's propaganda about so-called "Arab blackmail" and "Arab oil imperialism," in relation to the dangers of a third world war.

The magazine Jewish Affairs is making a very fine contribution to an understanding of this question. It must be built--it must constantly grow--and it must help to bring light to Jewish masses in these troubled times.

So I wish to greet this magazine once more, and to wish it new and greater successes.

* * *

(continued from p. 33)

undiminished, he loyally participates in all of the activities of the Magdeburg Jewish community.

The same does not hold true for the large number of "GDR citizens of Jewish antecedent," who are in leadership positions in the Politbureau and Central Committee of the State Socialist Unity Party. These are notable personalities such as Professor Albert Norden, son of the eminent radical-liberal rabbi of Elberfeld and Hamburg, Dr. Joseph Norden who died in Theresienstadt; Chief Commentator Hans Jacobus and Arno Friedmann of television fame, Professor Lea Grundig of Dresden, State Bank president Else Wittkowsky, cultural "pope" and member of the Politbureau Kurt Hager, the director general of the State Radio, Singer; Goldstein of equal stature and a host of others seemingly have severed their ties to their erstwhile coreligionists. This, of course, is their privilege; just as no Jew is in any manner whatever disadvantaged for belonging to the Jewish community, no one is penalized for leaving either.

The one over-riding worry is that of old age eliminating the communities. No remedy has as yet been invented against the normal course of human departure from this earth. Predicated, however, on the small number of younger members, on renewed "recruits" of these alienated from Judaism and immigrants to the GDR, I foresee hope and future for Judaism in the German Democratic Republic.

* * *

Which Way to Middle East Peace?

By James West

(The following is based on a speech presented at a forum held by the Jewish Painters Club in Cleveland, Ohio on December 19, 1973.)

Today we deal with a problem which is, at one and the same time, explosive with the danger of a world nuclear war and pregnant with the possibilities of a peaceful settlement that can bring justice and secure borders for all nations and peoples in the Middle East.

What happens in the Middle East is no purely local problem. The differences which exist there can be settled neither by emotionalism nor by yesterday's methods, let alone the ways of antiquity when conflicts between hostile tribes were settled by combat between the leaders of those tribes. It is easier to see that this ancient method won't solve the problems between Israel and the Arab countries. I know of no one who has suggested that Golda Meir and Anwar Sadat should meet on the field of personal combat and settle matters that way. That idea may be laughable, but the idea that you can take more land with the use of modern weapons as the means of insuring secure borders and national sovereignty is a tragic and suicidal one today. It, too, is an idea which belongs in the museum of antiquities. That idea has been outlawed by the Charter of the United Nations which lays down the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by means of war.

The only way to a just and lasting peace in the Middle East is through peaceful negotiations based on this principle of the UN Charter, and on the UN resolutions. These include specifically Security Council Resolution 242, which provides for the return of the conquered lands, for the recognition of the right of all states to live in peace and security, and for talks to work out peacefully the solution to the Palestinian Arab question. They include also the UN's cease-fire resolutions of October 22 and 23. These resolutions were adopted by countries inhabited by the overwhelming majority of mankind, including the Soviet Union and the United States.

Today, the possibility of enforcing the UN Charter and resolutions as the basis for settlement in the Middle East is meaningful and real, perhaps for the first time.

Today, the conditions exist that can prevent the Middle East from being the

fuse that ignites World War III. The possibility exists for bringing stable peace, security and inviolability of borders to all states and peoples of the Middle East. Today, the possibility for a sober, reasoned approach to solving these problems, instead of hysteria and emotionalism, exists as never before.

We speak of possibilities instead of guarantees, because a few more changes are needed to secure guarantees; some obstacles have yet to be removed. It is necessary to know what the remaining obstacles are so that the forces for peace and justice in our country and in the world can fight to remove them.

None the less, it is possible to approach these problems with optimism because the forces which brought about the changes we already see are fully capable of removing the obstacles. Even more, when it is recognized that the true interests of the people of Israel as well as of the Arab countries rest on the removal of these obstacles, new forces will be added to the mighty legions which stand for peace and justice in the Middle East and around the world.

What are the changes which make the situation today different from the time of the "six day" war? Recognition of these changes, of the new world and regional reality, is vital to Israel's continued existence as an independent, sovereign state, to the people of Israel as well as to the Arab peoples and states and to all Americans who want both Israel and the Arab states to exist and to prosper.

Today, we are in the initial stages of a new chapter known as detente--a detente between the socialist and capitalist countries in general and between the United States and the Soviet Union in particular. The fullest development of the detente is the essential condition for preventing world war, for realizing the principle of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems, for erecting the framework for the peaceful resolution of differences between nations, small or large.

*

It is now generally recognized that the Middle East situation was a test for the new-born detente; that the detente has created the possibility for a peaceful solution in addition to the cease-fire. It is the key factor in restoring the effectiveness of the UN to act in the situation. This does not mean that everything has gone smoothly or that peace is automatically guaranteed. A full, peaceful settlement will not come quickly or easily because there are conflicting interests and cross-currents at work which are trying to undermine detente and go back to the cold war.

The chief reason for the detente is the fact that U.S. imperialism can no longer get away with acting the role of world policeman. It has been compelled to face up to new realities, to add up the score of a series of defeats and setbacks and draw some lessons. It long ago lost the monopoly on atomic weaponry, a monopoly it used to browbeat and blackmail weaker nations and to try to intimidate the socialist nations. The trail of defeats and setbacks for dollar imperialism leads from Korea through Cuba, through Bangladesh, to the tremendous defeat in Vietnam, from the Asian through the African to the South American continents.

On the European continent and in the Far East, its imperialist allies began to kick up their heels and assert their independence. NATO, CENTO and SEATO began to crumble. The other major capitalist powers began to come to terms with the socialist countries against the wishes of the U.S. monopolists. They began to invade U.S.-dominated markets in the so-called free world and made big inroads in U.S. imperialism's home market itself.

Confronted by the fact of Soviet military might which had achieved parity with U.S. military strength, if not actually surpassing it, and faced with a tremendous loss of prestige around the world, U.S. imperialism also found its external and internal economic, financial, monetary and political positions deteriorating. With some exceptions, such as the temporary defeat of the people of Chile, dollar imperialism was increasingly frustrated and blocked, no matter which way it turned.

Faced with the danger of isolation and ostracism in the world family of nations, it had to make some big policy changes. A period of retreat and maneuver, of regrouping, was forced on imperialism. The Kissinger policy is one that says in effect: "Instead of being forced to yield one position after another, we must try to regain some initiative in order to be in a position to restore our ability to determine the course of events to some extent at least. Therefore we must maneuver and retreat to get solid ground under our feet once again and prevent an utter rout from taking place."

This is what created the possibility for detente. It was the timely, bold peace offensive of the Soviet Union, personified in the visit of Leonid Brezhnev to the United States and the accords signed by the two countries, which made that possibility a reality—a reality which must still be fought for as there are still powerful forces in the United States opposed to it.

In addition to the new balance of forces between socialism and capitalism, there is a new balance between the developing, formerly colonial countries and imperialism. Thanks to the powerful support of the socialist countries, to their own resolute anti-imperialism and the support of the world peace forces, the so-called underdeveloped countries have proven their capacity to stand up to and defeat imperialism. We saw this in Vietnam. We see it more and more on the African continent. We see it now in the Middle East.

There is a new relationship of forces in the Middle East. The Egyptian Arab Republic is no longer the pushover of the 1967 war which brought national humiliation to the Egyptian people. The Arab countries have achieved a degree of unity they were not able to achieve before. They have learned not only how to use modern weapons, but also how to fight on the diplomatic, economic and political fronts to redress the wrongs in the Middle East.

Because their self-confidence and national dignity have been restored, because of a proven strength and unity as the new element in the picture, the majority of the Arab countries now feel they are in a position to help implement the UN

Charter and resolutions on the Middle East. It is most significant that Sadat's speech to the EAR parliament right after the war began recognized Israel's right to exist, as well as calling for a return of the conquered lands and recognition of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. More recently, the summit meeting of Arab leaders affirmed the same position. Especially significant is that every Arab nation on Israel's borders has recognized Israel's right to exist and is prepared to work for a peaceful settlement.

The position of most Arab leaders is similar to that which Leonid Brezhnev put forward as the Soviet position at the world peace congress last month, when he said: "Our policy is that all states and peoples in the Middle East--I repeat, all of them--will be assured of peace, security and inviolability of borders." And he added: "The Soviet Union is prepared to take part in the relevant guarantees."

What is there about this position which is bad for Israel? Nothing at all!

What about the guarantees for secure borders for Israel? It is already clear that taking more and more land is not the guarantee. All this does is sow the seeds for new wars. The Soviet Union has expressed its readiness to assume obligations to stand by agreed-upon, secure borders. Most Arab leaders have expressed their readiness to have both the United States and the Soviet Union underwrite and guarantee secure borders. Kissinger has expressed a preference for the United Nations to guarantee secure borders and a reluctance for the United States to do it, but has not shut the door entirely on this. Whichever way it is worked out, it is clear that in today's world the fires of war in such an area as the Middle East can quickly ignite a world war and therefore the world community has a stake in guaranteeing secure borders as a result of a peaceful settlement, and that such a problem cannot be solved by a policy of military conquest.

But to bring this about, it is necessary for Israel to renounce its military conquests, to acknowledge that the lands she took by force belong to the Arabs. After all, it is not Egypt, Syria or any other Arab country which occupies Israeli land, but Israel which occupies Arab lands.

*

What about the Palestinian Arabs? Let us examine this question even briefly. The UN decision which established Israel as an independent, sovereign state provided also for an independent, sovereign Palestinian Arab state. Had this been carried out, there would have been no Palestinian problem. But it was not carried out.

Instead, Zionist influence became predominant in Israel. Israel developed as a capitalist country with classes, class struggle and national oppression; as a religious state. It even laid claim to sovereignty over Jews the world over, which could only be on a religious basis. All this could only lead to the exclusion of Arabs in Israel from any sharing in power, in decisive policy making, in the decisive areas of the life of the country. The extension of this policy to the

Palestinian Arabs denies the existence of a Palestinian Arab people, denies to them their right to self-determination.

The recognition of the right of self-determination, of the right of the Palestinian Arabs to an independent state, is a crucial change that is needed in the policy of Israel before we can speak of the guarantee of a just and durable peace based on secure borders in the Middle East.

The real issue, then is self-determination for both the Israeli and Palestinian Arab peoples. The leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization has moved a long way toward this position. If this can be matched by Israel then, indeed, is there great hope for a successful Geneva Peace Conference.

Here, then, is the basis for principled compromise and peaceful solution. To create an independent Palestinian state, some lands will have to be ceded from here and there, borders would have to be adjusted accordingly. This is not the kind of question that can be worked out by war. It can only be resolved by peaceful negotiation. And you can have peaceful negotiation and solution only by recognizing the rights of all peoples and states in the Middle East, and that includes the Palestinian Arabs.

*

What are the obstacles that stand in the way of such a settlement? What are the changes necessary to bring about such a settlement?

We know that there are forces in the U.S. that want to use Israel as a policeman over the oil-rich Arab countries. This, in fact, has been the policy of U.S. imperialism toward Israel from the beginning. These oil interests care nothing at all about the people of Israel. They are ready to fight to the last Israeli to protect their investments. At the same time, they are prepared to sacrifice Israel at the drop of a hat if they thought that would make their investments in the Middle East more secure. To them, Israel is only a pawn that is expendable.

But what about the government of Israel and its policies? It has made a serious miscalculation. It built its whole foreign policy on the assumption that it had the unshakable backing of U.S. imperialism. The U.S. imperialism it had in mind was the one that played a world policeman role. So the ruling circles in Israel supported the United States in Vietnam, developed close relations with apartheid South Africa and racist Rhodesia and rushed to recognize the fascist junta in Chile. They even tried to play a role in subversive activities against the socialist countries in keeping with the anti-Soviet, cold-war policies of the U.S. monopolists. Israel hitched its wagon to the star of U.S. imperialism.

It was a loyal little helpmate to Big Brother Wall Street and echoed support for its every move. But the results have been disastrous for Israel. Just as U.S. imperialism was faced with the danger of complete isolation in the world, so Israel, too, began to feel the cold winds of ostracism and isolation. African nations one after another broke relations with Israel; boycotts of Israeli goods

were started in numerous countries. Disaster began to stare Israel in the face.

The biggest blow of all for Israel is that it has not only lost the support of Japan and West European capitalist countries, but has suddenly awakened to the fact that it can't count on Big Brother. The U.S. monopolists will not jeopardize their oil interests in the Middle East by going to war for Israel. The time and place are just not right for U.S. imperialism.

The truth is that the biggest threat to Israel's existence comes from the continuation of the old policies by its own government and from the cold-war forces in the United States who would like to use Israel as an expendable pawn in the struggle against the forces of socialism and national liberation.

Within Israel there is a growing awareness of this new world and Middle East relationship of forces. Differences have broken out even within the ruling party. The opposition to the old policies is gaining strength from day to day. The cost of maintaining Israel on a war-footing is causing tremendous economic dislocations and inflation. The class struggle is sharpening and strikes are growing. The movement for peace, for good relations with the Arab neighbors based on the UN decisions, has become the movement of the true patriots, just as the U.S. peace movement became when it fought the barbaric policies of our government in Vietnam.

*

Clinging stubbornly to the old policies can only bring ruin and suicide for Israel. But there is also a growing danger here in the United States. Everyone recognizes that the people of our country are opposed to any U.S. military involvement in the Middle East. Reactionaries, aware of this sentiment, have begun a vicious, demagogic campaign of anti-Semitism, blaming Jews for the monopoly-rigged energy crisis. Should the oil monopolists decide to drop Israel like a hot potato, we will see a campaign of anti-Semitism, the likes of which we have not seen in over a quarter-century.

Israel does not have to hang on to the old, bankrupt policies. It has no contract with U.S. imperialism which says it must jeopardize its own existence in order to defend oil imperialism. And if it has such a contract, it had better break it in a hurry to save itself, for U.S. imperialism will have not the least bit of hesitation of scratching Israel off as a bad investment if it will protect its bigger interests in the Middle East.

The Soviet Union was the first country in the world to recognize Israel. When all the smoke has cleared away, it will be found that the Soviet Union's policies in regard to the Middle East will have been the biggest factor enabling Israel to exist and continue on into the indefinite future. It has been a powerful influence among Arab countries for peace and justice in the Middle East, and that includes Israel. It has opposed a military solution, and because of this its relations with one or another Arab country became strained at times. But throughout, it remained firm and strong in defense of the Israeli peoples' right to national existence even as it polemized against Zionism; and it remained firm and strong throughout in defense of the rights of all the Arab peoples.

The support of the Soviet Union for the anti-imperialist goals of the Arab countries never meant that it endorsed their specific state forms or internal set-ups. The question of what kind of government and economic and social structure each country shall have is determined by the people of the given country.

In conditions of peace, of secure and inviolable borders, the people of each country in the Middle East will have the best, most favorable conditions and circumstances in which to settle their internal problems, contradictions and conflicts. The working class and its allies will have the final say.

The sooner the present differences and conflicts between Israel and its Arab neighbors are peacefully settled, the sooner can each people move on to the solution of its internal conflicts, including the class conflict.

In the last analysis, the Arab workers and peasants, the Israeli workers and farmers will be the ones who will establish and cement a firm and durable friendship between both Semitic peoples, as existed in the ancient times, and as will surely re-emerge in the future.

That future can be hastened by the people of the United States--our workers, Black liberation fighters, peace movements, youth, women, oppressed Chicano and Puerto Rican peoples--joining forces now to demand fulfillment of the UN Charter, of Resolution 242 and the cease-fire resolutions, and for all-out support for peaceful solutions to come out of the Geneva peace conference; for co-operation with the USSR in the spirit of detente to bring a peaceful solution in the Middle East.

A special responsibility falls on U.S. Jews. It is time for other voices, other than Zionist, other than militarist, other than blind nationalist, to be heard in the Jewish communities. It is time for U.S. Jewish voices to be heard speaking up for the UN decisions, against any threat of US military involvement in the Middle East, for a peaceful settlement of all differences.

The true interests of the people of Israel and the future existence of Israel as an independent state are not championed by the bellicose, emotional hysterics of Zionism and extreme nationalism. To the contrary, as we have seen, these are the forces bringing Israel to ruin. Those who would defend Israel as an independent nation, who would safeguard the best interests of the people of Israel must speak up now for an end to military aggression policies, for return of the conquered lands, for a peaceful solution to the Palestinian Arab question as the basis for building a lasting peace with secure borders for all the nations and peoples in the Middle East.

* * *

The Jewish Community in the GDR

By Klaus J. Herrman

(Klaus J. Herrman, Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at Sir George Williams University, Montreal, Canada, visited the GDR this year to investigate the position of the Jewish community. He reported on his findings in an article in the October 1973 issue of The Chronicle Review which describes itself as "Canadian Jewry's National Magazine." A similar article by Mr. Herrman was published in the November 1973 issue of Reform Judaism, the official publication of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. We reprint below from the Democratic German Report a slightly condensed version of Mr. Herrman's article in The Chronicle Review.)

"We are a small and overaged community, but the German Democratic Republic is our homeland and we are proud to do all in our power to strengthen the all-around position of our country. Our government does all it can to assist in the maintenance of our Jewish community. Judaism will continue here." This is essentially the characteristic point of view which I learned from the Jews in the GDR (East Germany) and I found that it truly reflected their outlook on life.

Increased interest is being shown as regards the situation of Jews in the GDR and voices of concern have been heard. In actual fact, the Jewish communities of East Germany are superbly organized. Well financed by the government of the GDR and notwithstanding their extremely small registered membership, these Jewish communities mount an amazingly impressive annual program of religious services and instruction, social gatherings, cultural events and public appearances.

Some background to this: those Jews in the GDR who profess the religion of Judaism are organized in the "Union of Jewish Communities in the German Democratic Republic."

The GDR government, through its Ministry of Church Affairs subvents the "Verband" to the annual amount of two hundred thousand Marks and the Jewish Community of Greater-Berlin (East) receives an additional 170,000 Marks, not counting special subsidies which are provided for visiting rabbis, synagogal renovations and emergencies. That the actual membership of all Jewish communities is currently only around 750, of whom some 420 live in (East) Berlin, continues to be a source of great concern both to the parassim and to the government of the GDR which is most desirous to see the continuance and the growth of the organized Jewish community.

Estimated at between three and seven thousand though, there exists a reservoir of Jews in the GDR who are not officially associated with the communities, because they view them as exclusively religion-centered and therefore not in consonance with their personal Marxist attitude towards organized religion. There is some hope, that out of this reservoir new membership will nevertheless accrue to the communities; indeed, a number of the younger generation has returned to the ancestral faith. There are also prospects of increased Jewish immigration into the German Democratic Republic.

Religious life is maintained at a surprisingly high and admirable level, even though the communities have been without a rabbi since late 1969. Until his death in 1965, Rabbi Martin Riesenburger exercised spiritual leadership, his successor Rabbi Odon Singer returned to his native Budapest in the winter of 1969. Presently, Oljean Ingster of Berlin-GDR serves as principal religious functionary, that is to say as cantor and teacher of religion. In the other communities, religious services of worship are conducted by the parnassim and other laymen.

For the High Holy Days rabbis and cantors are provided by the Jewish Community of Budapest. For funeral services, Chanuka or Purim events and the like, the two professional cantors of the Jewish Community of West Berlin provide their services. Services of divine worship are conducted according to the ritual of German Liberal Judaism, that is to say in the traditional manner with organ accompaniment.

The East-Berlin community operates a flourishing kosher butchery and sausage shop, a shochet is flown in from Hungary at stated intervals. Among the principal customers of this excellent kosher meat market are a congregation of kashruth observant Seventh Day Adventists. A Jewish Old Peoples' Home and ritualarium, the latter not very frequently utilized for obvious reasons, as well as a host of cemeteries are maintained by the Jewish communities.

Nearly all of the members of the communities receive monthly payments of 950 Marks per person as recognized "victims of fascism."

Those Jews who reject membership in the communities because they no longer deem themselves adherents of Judaism, still refer to themselves as "citizens of Jewish antecedent" (Herkunft), thus evincing some degree of loyalty to their descent.

Helmut Aris, president of the "Verband," is a 65-year old native of Dresden who somehow succeeded in surviving Nazi persecution. A former director of an electrical appliance plant, Mr. Aris is well schooled in the Jewish religion and customs. He is a member of the National Council and the Peace Council of the GDR and active in a variety of other organizations. His views on the relationship between the GDR Jewish communities and the Republic of Israel, I found - with one exception - shared by other Jews. In substance, there is the attitude that the State of Israel is a foreign state and that as a Jewish community relations can only be to co-religionists there, but not to the state.

"We are not positively inclined to Zionism, neither is it our concern to take official stands against the policies of the Israeli Republic," said Helmut Aris. Nevertheless, there is considerable irritation among GDR Jews at the stance taken by the Israeli government with respect to opposing GDR admission to the United Nations.

This anger is also shared by the president of the Leipzig community, Eugen Gollomb (formerly of Lodz) who freely and openly dissents from the overall position of the "Verband". He avows his loyalty to the concept of a Jewish nation and peoplehood with its center in the State of Israel, but he is fiercely proud of the GDR and its achievements. He deeply deplores Israeli foreign policy with respect to the GDR, which he feels has been predicated on false assumptions holding sway in Jerusalem. There is the issue of restitution of Jewish property, of course, which has given rise to significant controversy. In point of fact, the Jewish communities of the GDR have been restored to the property of the old communities, so that restitution was accomplished long ago.

Neither the Jewish communities nor the government of the GDR regard the State of Israel or the "Claims Conference" as legitimate successors to the old German Jewish communities. In so far as personal property is concerned, such could have been reclaimed by the former owners or their heirs had they returned to what became the GDR. Failing that, such property is administered in custodianship. Such implies again, that back taxes and maintenance costs for the past twenty-eight years have for all intents and purposes made ownership pointless.

The dynamic 37-year old president of the (East) Berlin Jewish community is neurologist Dr. Peter Kirchner. He impresses as one of those rare types who out of a sense of profound personal responsibility assumed the burdens of office. His predecessor, Heinz Schenk, until his death for over twenty years held sway as executive director and then president of the Community. When Schenk died in 1971, prophets of doom proclaimed the end of the community but they were proved very wrong. Another leader is Dr. Kurt Cohn, retired chief judge of the GDR supreme court, Dr. Cohn until 1938 served as president of the "Central-Verein" for Saxony, then emigrated to England. He returned to the then Soviet Zone of Occupation in 1947 and became an active member of the Liberal Democratic Party and the German Culture Association, in whose governing bodies he occupies a respected position. His profound Jewish loyalty and knowledge has proved invaluable to the Jewish community. Another distinguished namesake is Abraham Glanz, the 77-year old president of the Jewish community of Magdeburg and Saxony-Anhalt.

But there are also a number of "GDR citizens of Jewish antecedent," who enrich communal life, though not registered members. All of them survivors of Nazi oppression, they are proud to live in a state in which anti-Semitism and nazism were extirpated root and branch as is fiercely and honestly proclaimed. There is chief surgeon Dr. Rieger of Stassfurt, for instance. Nephew of a distinguished rabbi of Stuttgart, he left Judaism in 1933 in order to convert to Lutheranism. But his love for Judaism and Jewish affairs has apparently remained

(continued on p. 23)

Communications

Who Attacked Whom?

By Meyer Bellit

I received the special issue of Jewish Affairs of December 1973 and, as always, I found it very interesting, very educational, politically correct and factual. However, in the editorial on the first page there is one sentence which speaks of "the October war of Israel against Egypt and Syria."

Who started this war, the so-called Yom Kippur War? No matter what opinion one holds about the entire Middle East problem, no one in his right mind can honestly say that the recent war was started by the Israeli army. I consider this phrase absolutely wrong, a phrase that will discredit Jewish Affairs, a phrase that will only play into the hands of the Jewish chauvinists who are using all kinds of falsehoods to discredit anyone who does not agree with the reactionary and dangerous policies of the Israeli ruling circles.

I feel very strongly about it, because this is a very serious situation and one must be very careful about what he says and how he says it. I consider Jewish Affairs very important in the work it is doing to bring some sanity to the Jewish masses who are victims of false and reactionary propaganda from Zionist sources.

Having said this, I am enclosing a check for \$3.50 for a year's subscription. Hoping that my remarks will be considered in the right manner, I wish you great success in the highly important and timely task you are performing.

* * *

Who Were the Aggressors?

By the Editors

The sentence to which Mr. Bellit refers was not intended as an assessment of who "started the war" but only as a description of the war as one between

Israel on one side and Egypt and Syria on the other. But at the same time it must be clearly understood that the aggressor was Israel.

The character of a war is not determined by who struck the first blow. Rather, it must be judged on the basis of the famous maxim of Clausewitz that "war is a continuation of politics by other means"—that is, by violent means. Said Lenin: "The policy which a given state, a given class within that state, pursued for a long time before the war is inevitably continued by that same class during the war, the form of action alone being changed." (Collected Works, Vol. 24, p. 400.)

The policy pursued by the Israeli ruling circles, virtually since 1948, has been one of aggression and expansion at the expense of the Arab peoples. The 1967 war was an expression of that policy. In that war Israel invaded Egypt, Jordan and Syria and seized parts of their territories. These territories it has refused to return, in defiance of the UN and of world public opinion, but has proceeded to incorporate, step by step, into the State of Israel.

In the war of October 1973, the Israeli forces fought to retain and to expand its conquests, while the Egyptian and Syrian forces fought to regain the territories taken from them by force. This they have every right to do, by whatever means are required. The cause of the war is the refusal of the Israeli government to abide by UN Security Council Resolution 242, which calls for withdrawal from the occupied territories—territories to which they have no legal or moral right.

Thus the war waged by the Israeli government was a continuation of a policy of aggression. It was an unjust war, which must be condemned. On the other hand, the war waged by Egypt and Syria was a war against aggression, against the forcible occupation of their lands. It was a just war, one which must be wholeheartedly supported. This is the real essence of the matter, and any charges that Egypt and Syria were guilty of attacking Israel must be firmly rejected.

* * *

Good Wishes From a Canadian Friend

By Morris Kamiel

I wish to express my enjoyment at being present at the Jewish Affairs dinner. I was amazed at the number of people present who support the position on the Middle East problem presented in your magazine. I wish we could achieve the same thing in Canada. For sure you have the basis now to win over

the Jewish people in the U.S. in the future to see the truth about Israel and the Middle East and the USSR.

I am enclosing a check for \$35.00 to cover the cost of the dinner I had and a donation to the magazine. I hope you have many more victories and anniversaries.

* * *

The Yevseev Pamphlet

By E. G.

The article by Aaron Vergelis, "The Fight against Zionism from a Realistic Point of View," is an excellent documentation of the meaning of Zionism and sets the record straight that while Zionists are Jews, not all Jews are Zionists, as is witnessed in our country and others.

My reason for addressing this letter to you is as follows. Aaron Vergelis, in examining this question, quotes passages from a pamphlet written by Y. Yevseev under the title Fascism under the Blue Star. My question is: who is this Yevseev and where was this pamphlet published? Was it published in the USSR? I think many readers like myself would like an answer to these questions.

(Yevseev is a Soviet writer who has produced several writings in this vein. The pamphlet was published in the Soviet Union. We neglected to mention, however, that in addition to the publication of Vergelis's criticism, the pamphlet was withdrawn from circulation.)

* * *

(continued from p. 4)

Currently the Commission is engaged in raising a fund of several thousand dollars, sufficient to see it through the first year of publication. The National Jewish Commission, as a demonstration of solidarity, has contributed \$100 to the fund and calls on other Jewish organizations and Party groups to follow suit. Jewish Affairs wholeheartedly joins in this campaign and calls on its readers to contribute generously. Contributions should be sent to Roscoe Proctor, Chairman of the Black Liberation Commission, CPUSA, 23 West 26th Street, New York, N.Y. 10010.

* * *

GREETINGS

FROM

JOHN and JESSICA ABT

[][][]

GREETINGS

[][][]

- FROM -

CONEY ISLAND CLUB

[][][]

GREETINGS

FROM

MANHATTAN COUNTY PRESS
COMMITTEE

GREETINGS

ANGELO D'ANGELO
RUTH CALLENDAR
FANNIE HECHTMAN
ARTHUR KNIGHT

[][][]

GREETINGS

ROSE JONES
LEAH LAWENTMAN
PEARL ALBERT
ANITA GARDELLA
MARIAN WALLACE
MIRIAM CHAMBERLAIN
BELLE HEYMAN
MRS. MARY COURMAND
DR. & MRS. CAMENIR

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

Jene Carroll

John Sagretch

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

from

from

J. Gelfand

Abe Stapinsky

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

Rose Thaler

Anna Lebowitz

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

A. Chorover

Celia Garment

BOSTON FRIENDS

MEYER KLARFIELD

GREETINGS

NATHAN GINSBERG

ROBERT POLLOCK

WINTHROP CULTURAL
CLUB

FRIEND FROM MASS.

Mass.

BEST WISHES

□ □ □ □

for a steady growth of this
important publication

HEARTIEST GREETINGS AND WISHES

to a very important publication

DIANA & SAM KUGLER
Los AngelesPAT & LEO KOSKI
Los Angeles

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

to a publication which deserves
all the support.

from

RUTH & JOE MORTKOFF
Los Angeles

DORETTA TARMON

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

from

from

TOM CUCA

IRENE MACK

JEWISH AFFAIRS

WITH BEST WISHES

The Best Voice Against
Anti-Semitism

FROM

MARION and MAX MILLER
Los Angeles

FANNY and SAM ARONOFF
Los Angeles

GREETINGS

BEST WISHES

TO

TO

JEWISH AFFAIRSJEWISH AFFAIRS

ESTHER CICCONI
Los Angeles

HARRIETT LIPTZIN
Los Angeles

A Much Needed Voice
for the Jewish People.

Jewish Affairs should be
in every Jewish home.

ESTHER CICCONI
Los Angeles

WANDA and ROY ALARIO
Los Angeles

LOS ANGELES FRIENDS

ESTHER BECKER
RICHARD PELL
ERNIE and TASSIA FREED
DORA H. SHAPIRO
TESSIE BERLAND
SONIA AIROFF
ANNA SHIFFER
ESTHER SAZER
IDA GEFFIN

FANNY NEMSON
ESTHER MILLER
FREIDA KING
ABE & GITA GALINSKY
ABE & LENA KENDZER
SARAH GILBERT
ROSE GLORING
BERTHA TABACHNICK
J. and E.

GREETINGS

to a publication which is like a beacon in the darkness that is spread by most media with their false and confusing information. May it get the support it deserves.

PAULA MOLDOFSKY
Los Angeles

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.

- - [] [] [] - -
[] [] []

ORESKE'S WOMENS CLUB
Los Angeles

GREETINGS AND GOOD WISHES

for the speedy growth of such a worthwhile publication which brings clarity and truth in this period of confusion on the problems of the Middle East.

PHIL & FANNY SASLOVSKY
Los Angeles

Several Members
of the
San Francisco Club
of the
Emma Lazarus Federation

GREETINGS

Wishing you success.

Fraternally,
ZENA DRUCKMAN

I. M. RAPAPORT
Petaluma, Calif.

GREETINGS

Be well and continue with your work,
which is so very important.

RALPH LEFSKY
MAX ZADKIN
Miami Beach, Fla.

FLA. FRIENDS FROM MIAMI AND
MIAMI BEACH

LAKE STANDER
ABE KANTOR
MARIAN LERNER
SHIMKE CHYATTE
ANN WUNTHAL

LILY BYDERIAN
LILLIAN HERSKOWITZ
RACHEL STONE
EVA PIETKOWSKY

NEW YORK FRIENDS

IZZY ZUCKERMAN
TEDDY GOLOMBECH
SAMUEL UTIN
D. DUBNAU
TED REICH

SANDRA D'ANGELO
A FRIEND IN BROOKLYN
MR. & MRS. P. J. BRUNS.
BINDER
NATHAN WITT

□ □ □ □

GREETINGS

□ □ □ □

- FROM -

□ □ □ □

GENE

GREETINGS

0000

0000

LENA LEVINE

GREETINGS

□-□-□-□

from

□-□-□-□

JACOB EPSTEIN

GREETINGS

FROM

SCHACHT

Lots of progress for
Jewish Affairs and
continue work for
peace and socialism.

□□□
GREETINGS

- FROM -

Sonia Kolkin

□□□

ABE MORRISON

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

from

[]

FROM

[]

Bessie Mitchell

M. TUBMAN

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

BEN & SONIA ITZKOWITZ

MAY,
MARGARET
& IDA

GREETINGS

GREETINGS

from

E. S. BROOK

Leah Taradesh

□ □ □

- [][] -

SOME GREETINGS
AT OUR
SECOND ANNUAL DINNER

MOLLIE SALTZMAN
MAX GUNDY
GOLDIE WEINTRAUB
ROSE MAYERS
ANNE FRIEDLANDER
IDA I. LEON
ROSE SOBELL
AURORA ZONA
SAMUEL WEISSMAN
J. ARONOW
ANTONOFF
MORRIS DAVIS
SONYA C. TUCHNER
VINCENT & MADELINE PROVENZANO
SAM LIPT'S
SONIA WOLF
MR. AND MRS. JACK FRIEDMAN
BERTHA GREENSTEIN
ANNE YELLIN
A&E FRIEDHEIM

ROSE & GEORGE BARKOW
PAULINE ROSEN
BEN LUBEROFF
LOTTIE SHAPIRO
HELEN M. RUEBEN
GERTRUDE WOLKOFF
DEBBY FULIT
J. BIALER
SARAH WEISS
AL & CEL PAULA
NINA PERRIN
MAX SCHNAPP
S. D. LEVINE
SHEILA ELIASLOW
SARAH BEACH

□ □ □ □ □

□ □ □

□ □ □ □ □

GREETINGS

from

NETTIE J. ZIMMERMAN
and ELLA ZIMMERMAN

- 0 -0- 0 -

GREETINGS

from

LENA LEVINE

- 0 -0- 0 -

GREETINGS
AT
SECOND ANNUAL DINNER

□ □ □

ABE STAFINSKY

ABRAHAM ZITRON

ABE & EVA WISE

PAUL STEVENS

T. ROSENBERG

MAX MANES

M. HELLER

RUTH & GEORGE SHERRY

A NON-JEWISH FRIEND

MARY FLEISCHMAN

ETHEL RICHTMAN

CARRIE & PAUL SCHREIBER

MR. & MRS. ISRAEL KUSHNER

GERTRUDE & ROBERT DECKER

□ □ □

ISRAEL: IMAGE AND REALITY

A Journalist's First-Hand Report

by Carl Bloice

Based on a visit in June 1972. Extensive factual material on the brutal, racist oppression of Arabs in Israel and the occupied territories, aggressive colonial policy of the Meir-Dayan government, discrimination against Sephardic Jews, use of immigrants as pawns for conquest. Appeals to American friends of Israel to fight for a change in policy as the only way to bring peace.

48 pages--65¢

NEW OUTLOOK PUBLISHERS
205 West 19th Street, 9th Floor
New York, N.Y. 10011
