

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

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

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

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

* * *

COMMUNICATIONS

BLINDED BY NATIONAL CHAUVINISM

By David Fried

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

* * *

EVENTS AND VIEWS

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

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

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

*

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

* * *

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