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In These Words a Congressman Described What happened in the House on Aug. 17: "**You Could Almost Reach Out and Feel The Atmosphere of Fear in the Chamber**" As the CP-Outlawing Bill Passed Amid an Orgy of Hysteria Led by Yellow-Liberals

**By PHILIP COHEN**

Literally and physically, on August 12 the U. S. Senate acted out the wild witchhunting hysteria which engulfs the United States. On August 17 it was followed by the House in a similar orgiastic saturnalia in which the most "liberal" Democrats bought out the McCarthyites in drawing all sense of democracy into the ring.

The orgy was launched by the Senate leader of Americans for Democratic Action, Senator Humphrey of Minnesota.

Every senator down to Lehman of New York, who held back the most, crumbled before the pa.rad of fear that swept over the House, and voted for the measure which only a handful are really for: the bill to outlaw the Communist Party.

Everyone of them—against the known views of even Eisenhowcr, Brownell and J. Edgar Hoover—disintegrated like yellow dogs at the sight of a spectacle which, in his opinion his committee is carrying out its statutory tasks.

There is a very strong hint here that even though it may be true that his economic advisers with no eyes to men who could make the economic analysis wrong, he has a bit too much academic integrity to be willing to subscribe to this "bill to nullify the propaganda of a scientific estimate of the people's needs." (H.R.)

In a word, the president says that things are just Jim-dandy, and will be getting better as the year rolls along.

True, he indicates there is quite a bit more unemployment here than there was a year ago at this time; and business conditions generally are not fairly so good; production of steel, coal, oil, autos, electrical appliances and the like is down; but then that was the top of the boom, and this is near the bottom of the recession, and one can't expect things to keep going at boom levels all the time. Anyway, there are more jobs and more wages being earned than there was during the first half of 1937, when the Depression was in power.

The president said further, that the non Cotton quarter of 1934 found things a bit better than the first. From this he drew the conclusion that the recession has jumped bottom, and the economy is on the way up. Things will be definitely better in the fall, is the word.

**FONY FIGURES**

Now, there is an interesting fact about this second-quarter improvement.

As noted in these columns before, the issue of factory production over a couple of points during the first week of April from the low it had hit at the end of March, then remained steady through the second week in May, then rose fairly steadily till the end of June. Thus April, (Continued on page 11).

**The Studebaker Wage-Cut: Discussion of the UAW's Policy**

---

**War on Israel? The Mistakes of the Arab Socialists**

---

**Eisenhower's Farm Program Suits the Big Business Farmers**

---

**An Indictment**

In an unusual "letter to the editor" printed in the N.Y. Times (Aug. 18), the Times' own dramatic critic, Brooks Atkinson, drew up and presented a pithy indictment of the "internationalist attitude and practices" in the U.S.A. The text of the letter follows.

---

**Record will not be able to reflect the entire history.**

---

All this in order to fire black-army bombers against a Communist Party of perhaps some 20,000 members—discredited, weakened, impotent—in a country which is not demanding such an army.

The orgy began with the calling-up of the Internal Revenue Service. This was a witchhunting bill to smash unions and the organized labor movement. The picture is well-nigh incredible, and yet we are quite well aware of what has been going on in these United States. The scene in the Senate particularly was that of a stampede of cattle, led by the "liberal" Democrats.

For hours no one knew what was happening on the Senate floor as the cattle milled about, and to this day a straight account has to be pieced together. The press has opting that even the Congressional

---

**Record will not be able to record the entire history.**

---

In a BLUE FUNK

On Wednesday evening, however, Sen. Humphrey got the ringing jitters. This miserable ADA leader decided that the Magnon Substitutes was going to be defeated, and that something else had to be done. He finally proposed, obviously, be freged on outlookening the GOP red-hunting stractgy by proving that the Democratic Liber- als were as good McCarthyites as any other.

Therefore this scummy "liberal" thought up and introduced his bill to outlaw the (To be continued on next page)
Should the UAW Have Yielded to the Company's Ultimatum?

**Discussion: The Studebaker Wage-Cut**

By BEN HALL

In South Bend, at the main plant of the Studebaker Corporation, workers have yielded to company demands for wage cuts. It is an ominous sign for the whole labor movement, as similar (although generally smaller) unionizations or the United Auto Workers (CIO), one of the most powerful in the country.

If these men in union are forced to retreat, what about the rest of organized labor?

Anyone who has been to South Bend or has read the reports of the smaller companies to fight over a remaining two or three percent.

Pressed to the wall, the individual independent auto manufacturers have become critical in the last year. The Big Three (Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler) have been waging an ever-increasing proportion in the struggles of the smaller companies to fight over a remaining two or three percent.

Thus, in the area of automobilists, the Wall Street Journal has been asking whether it is going to be by merger: Kaiser merged with Willys; Hudson merged with Nash; and Packard merged with Ford. Each combination tries to hold on by organizing and reorganizing to cut-cut and plant concentration.

Studebaker sales have dropped from 1939 in the first six months of 1939 to 48,000 in the same period in 1944. The company claims to be selling its cars at a loss, reporting a net loss of $8,000,000 in the first six months of the year.

Wage rates at the Studebaker plant with the wage cuts did not remain entirely higher than in the Big Three. The change in the company's demand.

(1) Absolute and relative payments by hourly rates equivalent to those paid by the Big Three. This meant that the individual合作社s were forced to accept the Big Three's demands.

(2) Reduction of holiday pay, wash-up time, and sick pay.

(3) Reduction of night-shift premium on the same basis.

**WITHOUT A FIGHT**

The negotiations committee and leadership of UAW Local 5 accepted these demands without a fight, but a number of independent observers reported a major protest by a large majority to reject them. This was followed by an ultimatum that announced cancellation of a contract extension.

The leadership of the United Auto Workers is considerably the new threat, the membership reveres its position and to the company.

Bluntly put, the union retreated without a fight. But that fact alone is not enough to explain what happened. There is an even more important force - the rate of costs of the fight too high.

In this case, the workers were faced by a prolonged struggle with the company. Studebaker is a very large company and with a large force in the plant.

FOOLISH CONCESSIONS

What has happened to the UAW in the past? How has the company succeeded in getting concessions from the union without a fight? How has the company succeeded in getting concessions from the union by a small force in the plant? How has the company succeeded in getting concessions from the union by a small force in the plant?

The answer to both these questions is different. The company wants its workers to work in the plant. The company wants its workers to work in the plant. The company wants its workers to work in the plant.

The company wants its workers to work in the plant. The company wants its workers to work in the plant. The company wants its workers to work in the plant.

WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

Whether it was right or wrong in its large scale of the balance of power, such a leadership would be fulfilling its responsibilities to the worker by explaining the present and preparing for the future. And it would point the way to men in other shops and other industries who might be better able to resist a big push over into the UAW.

How the UAW leadership, local and international, prepared for the consequences of the strike, we do not yet know.

It might be argued that Studebaker has succeeded in establishing a precedent - a precedent that all automobile workers will have to fight if there is any chance of winning a fight. It might be that the company will be able to make things a little tougher for us in the future, in any case, a bitter fight will be stronger opponents against attempting the same.

Unequivocally, leadership in the UAW which claims to be representing its members must be able to anticipate the future. It must face the issues. It must face the issues.
Eisenhower Farm Plan Suits

The Big Business Farmers Fine

BY SAM TAYLOR

In an election year the rush of legislation in the closing days of Congress is a common experience. This year, however, the scene for the November election. The administration goes heavy on the whip to push through "vital" legislation. The same sort of legislation that comes down where it believes it can argue with most effectiveness in the campaign season, and not necessarily in the public's interest.

Says one man who sat through two years of more or less anaesthetic sessions with the Farm Bureau Federation, and is encountering with the falling of the leaves that they have differences, almost irreconcilable ones. The easygoing backslapping will get your back if you will scratch mine," is the prognosis for the week in November.

The present wrangle over the passage of the Eisenhower farm program takes place in such a pre-election atmosphere. The public in Washington believes the administration is fighting hard to pass a fundamentally new farm bill is in the process of enactment. Nevertheless the legislation that will emerge and its effect on the consumer at work in an important area of American politics.

The economy at present is going through economic uncertainties in the short run, small and marginal producers. A market in which short-term prices are being rampant and a merger and consolidation of many of the largest producers. This is also the occasion on which the market is bearing the brunt of the present recession. In automobile, the trend of prices, but one merger in the last year or so and many more mergers in the coal and even in the steel industry.

SHAKEOUT in agriculture, this shakeout of the industry, is to a large extent been held back by the existing laws providing protection for agricultural and dairy products. One of the most important reasons for the shakeout is the highly protective flexible farm-partry program of the Eisenhower administration is to accomplish this long-drawn-out thinking of the prospects of the products and services are by the parity program—cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, rice, tobacco and dairy products.

The rise and fall of flexible price-support policies, the increasing threat of the tremendous "surpluses" of agricultural goods, plus the uncertainty over the end of the present war. The recent time, it is estimated that the United States is spending $6 billion worth of these "surpluses," and with the end of the war next year that amount will go even higher. The problems of the shakeout and the future of agriculture have been one of the trickiest problems for the administration. What it is that there is no end in sight, and it is inapplicable of utilizing the great progress of the American economy for the benefit of the people throughout the world. The first step of the need for the need of the American people.

The high-parity support for farm

"90% COMMUNIST"

The course of the debate over the Eisenhower farm bill became so colored at one point that it has become difficult to tell the players apart without some reference to the Farm Bureau publicity, an opposition to a "new" publication called "The Farmer's Casebook." Senator Young of North Dakota, an opponent of the new farm bill, referred to the report to members of Congress with the words: "The farmers are a dangerous and are in favor of 90-10 percent support,"" he said.

The next day the Farm Bureau of the Senate's floor, the special called today to get an appointment that he was for flexible-supports between 90 and 100-12 percent of parity. It seems like a clear case of McCarthyism in farm policy, the present plan that is the parity program is to grow wheat in the farms of the South and East, where wheat production isn't carried on. The farmers in the South and East, where wheat production isn't occurred, are penalized the more.

The effect of this plan would not necessarily be to drive South and East and be harmful to farmers everywhere. This is why it is important to keep clear the effect of the price support and that the Big Business farmers in this country are often run by corporate cartels and the sale, which are different from in retail but not from the local area, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the spokesmen of the large agricultural interests, is hot for the flexible program.

The FORCES BEHIND

The Bill incorporating a flexible price range of 85 to 90 percent of parity is only a compromise. The Benson-Farm proposals were for 75 to 75 percent parity, which would have driven a further toward getting out the small producer. It is as Rep. Hope of Eastern Kansas said, the Bill would be better and it could be worse.

It is not that, the large agricultural capitalists are opposing to receiving high price support for corn, wheat, soybeans, cotton, and so forth. It is that they will be able to raise or lower production. This has been affected by the opposition of the livestock industry and doesn't mean for the time being nothing to cry over. It is not the case that the large agricultural capitalists are opposing to receiving high price support for corn, wheat, soybeans, cotton, and so forth. It is that they will be able to raise or lower production. This has been affected by the opposition of the livestock industry and doesn't mean for the time being nothing to cry over.

If one looks at the arguments of the parity program—cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, rice, tobacco and dairy products. One of the most important reasons for the shakeout is the highly protective flexible farm-partry program of the Eisenhower administration is to accomplish this long-drawn-out thinking of the prospects of the products and services are by the parity program—cotton, corn, wheat, peanuts, rice, tobacco and dairy products.

The rise and fall of flexible price-support policies, the increasing threat of the tremendous "surpluses" of agricultural goods, plus the uncertainty over the end of the present war. The recent time, it is estimated that the United States is spending $6 billion worth of these "surpluses," and with the end of the war next year that amount will go even higher. The problems of the shakeout and the future of agriculture have been one of the trickiest problems for the administration. What it is that there is no end in sight, and it is inapplicable of utilizing the great progress of the American economy for the benefit of the people throughout the world. The first step of the need for the need of the American people.

The high-parity support for farm

The key one is going to be the Wall. But then, remember that things under capi-

Inke Fakes a Report

(Continued from page 7)

May and June showed definitely better things are going as good as they were in the rest of the country. In other words, no one quite figures out how to get to the bottom of the problem.

SECTIONAL ANGLE

However, these arguments for the Benson plan are not the real basis of its existence. The Benson plan aims at increasing the domestic "surpluses" in the expectation that at lower prices will drive some producers of the "basic" crops either out of business or to the extent of 10 percent less. If they go into other crops, the likelihood is that the surplus of basic crops will be still another, and the problem would be back where it started.

This fact behind the Benson plan is the problem of the "surplus" crops. While all people will "worry," said Mr. "point out that "surplus" is a relative term. "In Eastern Kansas, a diversified area [of farming], high prices for some crops are more prevalent in Western Kansas, where wheat is the main crop, and they will be pushed into raising other crops.

The saddest (Kansas) Journal is quoted in the report that the Benson plan is that the government, farmers to grow

"In other words, no one quite figures out how to get to the bottom of the problem. Unemployment has not been treated as a menace, and it is not the same problem as the depression from Hoover on..."
Hooliganism on Both Sides in N.Y.C.

New York City is seeing a routine police-roundup campaign turning typically into an explosion of violence, with many violations of constitutional rights.

Recently the city Police Commissioner Adair has been campaigning for more police action, but the result has been a police round-up of «smells». The police, instead of a careful, methodical analysis of the real reasons for the "success" of the campaign, have treated to a tribute to all the "great statesmen" who made possible the campaign of Irishmen by their tact, desire for compromise and diplomatic skill—i.e., Anthony Eden, Mendez-Franco, Molotov and Chou En-lai.

And this is written by the best (I') of the Tribune crowd—Michael Fox.

The "peaceful coexistence" theory has now established for itself firm roots, not only among the sober, but among the CP leaders. The CP leaders, of course, do not grow itself, but its influence over important sections and fields of left Labour thinking will be considerably augmented.

It is obvious that the Tribune wants American policy to be a balance of power, and from the columns of this paper, from the junctures of Anthony Eden and Mendez-Franco, there seems to be no opposition to Eden as Labor's foreign policy candidate.

Tribune is quite happy with Mendez-Franco policy. Here is a passage from a Tribune editorial: The fact that the only obvious candidate for the role of a new conservative Ben- barker (several or semi-collie) is a Mendez-Franco—this is a candidate who has been supporting in Madrid to the end of a broken street (that 's what the Tribune's been saying about Mendez-Franco for the last two years). For sure, Mendez-Franco may well be part of the Spanish people in slavery for the last fifteen years.

All in the name of the defense of freedom.

The Spanish-American agreements followed close upon the heels of the communals—"free Spain": "Cuba" and "free Spain," "free Spain": "do not attack Cuba." The agreements are in the tradition of the "Spanish" and "American" freedom. The agreements are in the tradition of the "Spanish" and "American" foreign policy.

The determining factor in the present of economic aid (to Spain) will be the recognition of the "Spanish" and "American" freedom. When the text of the agreements is published, it will show that the Spanish press was worried about the conditions imposed on Spain and the prerogatives granted to the United States.

The latter will have the right to impose "Spanish" and "American" conditions on Spain, and in the "Spanish" and "American" freedom, there will be no talks of compensation. Whether the military agreement is reached or not, it is clear that the American policy will be to impose "materials", goods, and equipment, and to obtain from America a "Spanish" and "American" freedom.

The Carter government, in its joint statement with the United States, has made it clear that the military agreement will be implemented, and that the military agreement is not a "Spanish" and "American" freedom. The military agreement will be implemented, and the military agreement is not a "Spanish" and "American" freedom. The military agreement will be implemented, and the military agreement is not a "Spanish" and "American" freedom.

There is no indication of the number of American troops or animals that the United States has promised to send to Spain. All we know is that the United States has promised to send to Spain, and the United States has promised to send to Spain, and the United States has promised to send to Spain, and the United States has promised to send to Spain, and the United States has promised to send to Spain.

A man who despairs of freedom in Spain, in the American context, is well advised to keep his eyes open. And the American people, who have the power to decide the fate of Spain, should be well advised to keep their eyes open.

The significance of the Spanish-American agreements, both for Spain and for the United States, is that they show America's distrust of the possibility of defending the countries of the world, the Elbe, and the Orient, and it is necessary to have an adverse effect on the future of these countries.

A recent statement by the Spanish Foreign Minister Ardavina said that the Carter government is 

"Our alliance with the U. S. A. serves yet another aim—a defense of Europe. But Europe is not the only place in the world where the Carter government is interested in freedom and democracy. We must be clear that our primary interest is to protect the freedom and democracy of all countries, not just those that are members of NATO, but all countries that are threatened by Communist aggression."

And the Spanish people—what about them? They have not been consulted, and they have no voice. But I am sure that they will not be satisfied with the miserable agreements that were negotiated for the sake of the peace. 

The "peaceful coexistence" theory is not a theory of genuine and lasting peace. The "peaceful coexistence" theory is a theory of the temporary truce between the classes, a truce which will be broken when the people of Spain rise up against the dictatorship, and when the people of Spain rise up against the dictatorship, and when the people of Spain rise up against the dictatorship, and when the people of Spain rise up against the dictatorship.
You Still Can Register for 

THE Y.S.L. CAMP-AND-SCHOOL

The first national Summer Camp of the Young Socialist League will take place at Mountain Spring Camp, Rt. 1, Washington, New Jersey, from the supper meal on Friday, August 3 to the supper meal on Saturday, August 11.

The rates for the camp are remarkably low in this period of high vacation prices. The cost is $25 per room or $3 per person per week; for downtown, $25 for the full week. For the weekend, the rate is $12 for a cabin, $7 for dorms. Dormitories can be accommodated by a deposit, $5 for a full week, $3 per day. Send reservations to the YSL, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

The camp will feature socialist education, socialist socializing, and the traditional forms of camping, baseball, volleyball, badminton, etc.

On the educational side, Hal Draper, editor of LABOR ACTION, will give one lecture entitled "Socialistic Views of American History." Gerald McDermott, noted socialist scholar, will give three sessions "A Socialist View of American History." And Dan Reider, writer for the New Masses, will lecture on "Socialism and the Middle Class". A millenial of the Peacekeepers group, will speak, although his topic has not been announced yet.

For all the information and help needed, write to the Young Socialist League, 114 West 14 Street, New York City.

The camp starts on August 27.

Youth-Camp Registration Form

Youth Socialist League

114 West 14 Street, New York City

I would like to make the following camp reservation:

A. single B. full week C. cabin D. encl.

people family (how many)...

encl. deposit...

encl. (Deposit per person; full week $5; weekend $3.
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ZIP

Address

[Form to be filled out]
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A REPLY TO CLOVIS MAKSOUK ON THE ISSUE OF ISRAEL AND ZIONISM

MAKING THE MISTAKES OF THE ARAB SOCIALISTS

By Hal Draper

In the last two issues of LABOR ACTION we have devoted pages to the activities of European socialists. As an Arab socialist, I recently wrote an article in which I had accused Comrade Clovis Maksoud, giving the Arab socialist position on Jerusalem and on Zionism in general, a thorough discussion, written at our invitation. And we welcome this opportunity for such an exchange of views.

The fact that we disagree quite sharply with its central thesis on Israel does not, to us, lessen the value of bringing such a discussion out into the open.

In the course of Comrade Maksoud's recent treatment of the question by most European socialists, especially those who are not simply anti-Zionists, last month his views were presented in a short but comprehensive article. In this article, Comrade Maksoud makes a clear case that he has been virtually impossible for the Arab socialist viewpoint to get heard within that quarter. Theirs has refused to print any articles by him or his comrades, or to allow discussion on the subject of simple suppression. This applies to the British Labour party as well.

It is not surprising to us that the press and leadership of the socialist movement behave this way, for all their talk of being "tolerant" "democratic socialists" who have a very special hatred for "Bolshevism" suppression of opinion. On the contrary, it is typical. They will often give space to minority points of view when these express views that are not simply anti-Zionist, or do not make any use of the "Bolshevik" method of supression of opinion. As far as we are concerned, therefore, we will only allow our points to be put to the test. We are not prepared to put our own opinions against these; and we always will, because we are not a "closed" "open" forum but a socialist movement, but the openness of our columns to political dispute and disagreement of an educational nature is a near useless one.

In view of the Arab socialists' experiences with the European socialist-social democrats and liberals of the Socialist International, we make the above clear in order to bring an accurate picture of how we have given their position so much space, and also why we believe it necessary to criticise it.

Our Alternative to Chauvinism

In far-staged passages throughout his article Comrade Maksoud felt it necessary to devote a good deal of attention to presenting an "anti-chauvinist" interpretation of Arab socialism. He seems to have found them, even though these remarks did not bear directly on the most important issue of Israel and the Arabs. His sympathies with his feeling that the Socialist International is shot through with opportunism, confusion, and unscientific policies and practices. In our resolutions, we have always expressed the hope that the International will have for the further progress of socialist development of the Asian socialists, the destitute, the Arab liberals, and in colonial expansion, at least a certain amount of sympathy with their "practicability" (when he persisted against the "anti-chauvinism" of the Arab socialist, and he is absolutely sound and indeed elementary precepts of genuine socialism.

In Britain, where he is now studying, Comrade Maksoud has clearly shown a heavy dose of that thoroughly chauvinist attitude toward other peoples (including the socialists of other peoples) which is so heavy an anachronism with the British Labourism as it is with the socialist movements and in other types of social democrats, who have always been alien to the real internationalism.

We draw a firm line between (1) fighting Zionism, its ideology and politics; fighting against the Zionist policies which are the only way to achieve the solution, and against the Zionist leadership which is the official government of the state of Israel and its policies to oppress and overthrow the state of Israel as such. Now, this distinction is absolutely clear. It may be very much in Maksoud's eyes; it may be a mistake in his opinion. He has a right to argue that we should be exploited by the leadership of the state of Israel itself. But he should not close his eyes to the fact that this distinction must be made.

Yet he does not insist on it. On June 7 last, we had explained the difference between the two positions of the British Socialists and with Stalinist Russia. We stressed that there was a big difference between the two socialist states, the Jewish and the Russian. (Or being anti-Nazi and anti-German). So also, we said, one must distinguish between anti-Zionist and anti-Israel, in exactly the same way.

In each case, it is plain, you have a political movement (with all its accomplishments and failures) with a particular state that is not the same as the state of the socialist revolutionaries. Everybody knows how easy it has been for the Russian revolutionaries to make a tragic error into anti-Russian falsifications. It was easy for anti-Nazism to make a mistake into anti-Communism. And it goes to this day over all Britain and Europe, it was easy for the British Labour party. It was easy for renunciation, in the U.S. & after Pearl Harbor, to whip up a state against all Japanese peoples, even against Japan

A Basic Distinction

Maksoud rejects the comparison. I confess that I cannot even follow him with any respect re. regard to Communism (Stalinists), he agrees that—

... the opponents of this system must distinguish between the abysmal, ideational and methodological features of the Communist party, and the state, against which any other system, and the people who live under it.

But it is "different" for Zionism, he argues—

"Zionism is not an institutional organization. It is not a theory of a state sought to be or the state of the socialist revolutionaries in order to create a state for a Jewish nation."

But Stalinism is not an "institutional or organization" in the sense of a state sought to be or the state of the socialist revolutionaries in order to create a state for a Jewish nation. It is possible to be anti-Zionism without being anti-Jewish. It is possible to be anti-Zionism without being anti-Israel.

But if he denies that it is even possible to be anti-Zionist without being for the overthrow of the state and not even main, it has its characteristic "institutional" (like the NVD) and its characteristic "organizational" functions, which Zionism has its characteristic institutions, etc., also.

Above all, Stalinism goes as a political movement, with a certain people, to build a state;.Maksoud has not yet reached a state. It proceeded to "create" a new state in its own image and likeness.

Of course, there are several thousand differences between the two states which could be mentioned to confuse the analogy, the very, very simple point is that Stalinism exists without being anti-Jewish. It is possible to be anti-Zionism without being anti-Israel.

When Comrade Maksoud denies this, then we feel that we are partly dealing with a very problem, let alone the correct socialist solution is the correct one.

If he denies that it is even possible to be anti-Zionist without being for the overthrow of the state and not even main, it is indeed difficult for him to grapple with the issue as they present themselves. That is, we have not only these, but also the anti-national, anti-socialists, and not only those with a pro-Zionist bias.

"In fact, one could raise a question about what Maksoud means by Zionism. In his article in LA for June 7, he states that it is the Jewish self-determination. It seeks to make religion the rallying factor of a nation, which is self-determination, many other religions, and other religious or races (et al. of the treatment of Arab minorities) in the Jewish state. It is just not true that Zionism makes religion the major issue.

"Surely he must acknowledge that full and complete equality between Jewish and Arab citizens has ever been fully achieved, or even approached. The strong state which is in the midst of the whole problem, the Arab problem, is the Zionism which is in the very heart of the Jewish problem. And this could lead us to look at whether the Zionists are being united not by their religion, (if any) but by their political and social pressures.

And Zionism is necessarily intolerant of "other religious races."

One other point: The religious discrimination against Christians, for example, The use regulatory measures which are not religious (such as the Jumma, and not Ismail) and that but hardly for reasons of the question of the relation of the Jews to the Arab or other religious persecution of the Arab minority is based on political reasons; in a political and social pressure, not a religious persecution.

Maksoud here as he does not think the Zionists are religious fanaticism or fanaticism. Nothing could be further from the truth. The real issue is what the state's role is.
Their Call for War on Israel is a Grievous Error

go on to discuss Carmed Makkabes' positive reasons for opposing the U.S. as a Jewish state. But first of these is bound up with his argument that Israel had a major responsibility to avoid war.

At this point Carmed Makkabes' article's presentation was a gradual decline. We have sent him a letter, expressing our appreciation and taking a more serious note of his argument. The article was marred by inaccuracies and inadequate, in which we do not believe that this will be the case.

During most of the history of Zionism, it has sought to become the enrolling roll of some imperialist explorer who would found the Zionist aim upon Palestine for its own imperial interests. We say this not in terms of any personal advantages, but as an attempt to present this idea to the world, bar none.

We believe that no argument proves that the influx of such immigration might harm the standards or otherwise improve the situation of native labor. The function of the immigrant is to be the target of the immigrant (mentioned above) and they were right up to a certain point. They were right up to a certain point. They were right up to a certain point.

The truth, then, that Carmed Makkabes now understated what we (at least) mean by the right of the Jews to go to the "country of their choice." It is a right we hold dear, for it is the right of all nations. How much more, in view of the explosive situation we have barely sketched, the extermination of g people?

The Post-War Dynamic

In this writer's opinion (though it can be notioned) by far the greatest portion of Europe's persecuted Jews would have preferred to come to the U.S. and not to Palestine, given free choice. The influx of Jews to Palestine was not unexpected; it was the sudden change in the anti-Zionist sentiments of Jews, of love for Zionists. But the U. S. has Appointed its doors shut, while pretending to express its horror at the anti-Jewish crimes of others. Other countries banged up the doors. A steel ring of national boundaries encircled the Jews, while, in fact, many displaced persons faced survival, forced them to flee or forced them onward.

Something had to give. The European political reaction forced the Jews into the bag set up by the Zionists. Here was one direction that things could go, without much outside help—"the door is open", and machinery shifted up by the Zionist movement. It was the path least resistant for them, and the pressure ratcheted up to the breaking point in this direction.

What we set up as the dynamic push behind the post-war dynamic of Jewish life in Europe.

Our comrade Makkabes sees not the impact of Zionism. We would like to call his attention to this other explosive development.

This was the exterminationist fate which loomed before a whole people in Europe, the Jewish people.

The Fate of a People

First, there was the wholesale persecution of the Jews before the war. During the war there took place an industrial and psychical reorganization of Jewish life in our civilised age—the unprecedented physical extermination of the Jews. We are left with the Nazi "solution" of the Jewish problem. Not only Germany became un-english to the Jews, but they were expelled to Italy and France under the Nazi occupation. Then after the war, a new wave of anti-Jewish persecution arose in the United States, with the Nazi states and some within Russia itself.

A whole people was being murdered and driven out of Europe. Drives—where? Where could they go? Even Soviet Russia—"Where would they go?"

Why Palestine? asks Carmed Makkabes in effect. This is a problem for the whole world, not just the republicans. We feel that we have to bear the burden of the whole world.

"Absolutely correct."

The one country that was in the first place as a haven was not Palestine but the United States; not because it is a better place or a better place. It is the decent democracy, the real Jew, who lived to cry out—"Open the doors of the Jews to all the Jews in Europe."

For Arab-Jewish Unity

Our view, in as much as Makkabes', was a mistake that the Jewish exodus was channelled into Palestine. The truth is that it was. That is one of the crimes of the whole-Jewish imperialism and imperialism ought to end the same day. But it was a fact, and not a Jewish plot.

The Zionists were able to take advantage of this anti-Semitic windfall of the Jewish exodus to feed on anti-Semitism—but the problem that was created had to be faced up to by all the Jewish people. It could not be faced merely by catering to Zionism. The problem of the Jewish people is a general political problem; it is not a Jewish problem. And so for a whole new political situation. It was what we counterposed to the Zionist solution, on the one hand, and to the Arab states' on the other.

As concisely summarized in our resolution (directly following the last paragraph given) it was:

"The Marxist, firmly opposed to both, advocated a policy which would bring together the Arab and Jewish peoples in a joint fight against British imperialism. In the first place, and, secondly bound with us, this third, Jewish For their independence, for a Palestine free from all foreign rule and governed by a democratic Communist party of the Jewish and Arab nationalities."

"Such a fight was desired least of all by the Jewish and Arab masses. In the course of the joint struggle from below, cemented by common national and economic interests and common anti-colonial and anti-imperialist interests, Masons aimed for a free and independent state of Palestine, based on the existence of two people of equal status, equal social and cultural conditions, and cosmopolitanism and safety assured for both. This was the only program of the Zionist opposition. It looked not only to revolutionary struggles in Palestine and in the Jewish home of anti-imperialist and revolutionary strivings in the whole Near East, on the same footing as a Near East Federation of socialist republics."

This is highly compressed, and we shall have to come to some points, but certain things should be immediate.

Against a "Jewish State"

In the first place, it should be plain that we oppose all, the idea of a Jewish state. The idea, the concept of a "Jewish state" is not the same as any idea for the elimination of the Jewish people. As long as the people and government of Israel, follow-
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The ISL Program in Brief

The Independent Socialist League stands for socialist democracy and against the two systems of class rule which now divide the world: capitalism and Stalinism. We stand for an irreconcilable, by any Fair Deal or other deal, so-called reform, or appeasement, abroad or at home. Our fight is for the destruction of both systems, democratically controlling their own economic and political destinies.

Stalinism, in Russia and wherever it holds power, is a brutal totalitarianism — an exploitation of the working class in every country, the Communist Parties, are manipulating masses of socialism and there is nothing common with socialism — which cannot exist without effective democratic control by the people.

These two camps of capitalism and Stalinism are today of each other’s threats a worldwide imperialist rivalry for domination. This struggle can only lead to the most frightful war in history so long as the people leave the capitalist and Stalinist rulers in power, independent Socialist stands for building the ISL as the Third Camp of the people against both blocs.

The ISL as a Marxist movement, looks to the working class and its ever-present struggle for freedom as the revolutionary force in society. The ISL is organized to spread the ideas of Marxism-Leninism among all the workers, and among all other sections of the people.

At the same time, Independent Socialist demands on the part of the people for better the present-day many-country, for the growth of the world-wide movement from all over the world, the demands for a left move- ment, we seek to join the International Movement of Labor as a movement to join the Independent Socialist League as an independent labor party and other pro- grams.

The fight for democracy and the fight for socialism. Both are for the people. If we are to be no longer and genuine democracy within socialism, we can be no social- ism without democracy. To enroll under this banner, join the Independent Socialist League!
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