

Jewish Life

Issued Monthly by the Morning Freiheit Association

15c

HONOR IS DEPARTED FROM THY GATES

An Editorial

Proclaim These Truths!

An Editorial

ONE hundred and seventy-two years ago, the subversives of America, who included the overwhelming majority of our colonial ancestors, determined to smash the grip of tyranny held over them by a predatory force from across the sea. Since then, our country has more than once had to renew the battle against domestic and foreign tyranny, against reactionary resistance to progress whether organized by southern slave-owners or nazi imperialists.

Today, as we approach the celebration of the anniversary of our revolutionary struggle that set us free, the American people are again faced with a fateful decision. Shall we take the path of the German people that led to fascist enslavement? Or shall we continue on the democratic road that leads to progressive advance? Do we submit to American fascism, or do we fight to crush this un-American, anti-democratic offensive against the rights of the American people?

Increasing numbers are beginning to realize that bills like the Mundt-Nixon Bill are aimed not alone at communists and the Communist Party, but at all progressive, liberal, labor and peace forces, and at all other human beings who possess a grain of human decency. In the June issue we had already commented on the meaning of such bills to the Jewish people. This understanding of the all-inclusive nature of the fascist attack is all to the good, and should be used to rally the broadest sections of the people to resist the offensive of the bi-partisan trusters, for whom Mundt and Rankin speak.

But there is one gap in the understanding that creates

(Continued on page 5)

RECOGNITION MUST BE IMPLEMENTED

By Sen. Glen H. Taylor

WHERE ARE YOUR GUNS?

A Short Story

By Howard Fast

PROBLEMS FACING JEWISH AMERICAN NOVELISTS

By Ben Field

UN AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

By Andrei Gromyko

JULY 1948

From the Four Corners

AT HOME

Among those who condemned the Mundt Subversive Activities Control Bill and called for its defeat by press time were: the Queens and Kings (N.Y.) Councils and the Newark City Council of the Jewish War Veterans; the Bronx County (N.Y.) and Connecticut annual conventions of the JWW; the American Jewish Congress; the National Council of Jewish Women; the Anti-Defamation League; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise; Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver and Rabbi Joshua Trachtenberg. During the House debate on the bill, Rep. John Rankin indulged in Jew-baiting when he retorted to Rep. Leo Isacson's charge that champions of Palestine might be called "communist fronts" under the bill: "Let them all go to Palestine with one-way passports."

☆

Anti-Semitic epithets were used by Catholic War Veterans hoodlums during demonstrations against the warmongering film, *The Iron Curtain*, at New York's Roxy Theater. Response of "Rabbi" Benjamin Schultz, director of the Jewish League Against Communism, was to suggest that Jewish organizations join the Jew-baiting CWV pickets supporting the film. Schultz admitted that he could not persuade any Jewish organizations to picket with the CWV.

☆

Catholic War Veterans distributes literature at its meetings defending Robert Best, convicted traitor who broadcast for the nazis during the war. It has also distributed literature calling for appointment of Merwin K. Hart, leading pro-fascist, as U. S. attorney general.

☆

A special air mail service to Israel has been organized by the Palestine Emergency Deliveries, set up by a group of Zionist organizations. The service will provide postal service, at the sender's risk, to Israel under the following conditions: sealed letters addressed to individuals residing in Israel must be affixed with the necessary U. S. postage. An additional charge of 25 cents per half ounce must be paid in coin or postal money order. The sealed letter, plus the service charge, should be addressed in another envelope to Palestine Emergency Deliveries, 60 East 66th Street, New York City 21. All mail will be flown to Israel by chartered plane. Regular air mail service with the Jewish community of Israel has been unavailable since May 1.

☆

The American Council of Judaism has declared its independence of the Jewish state of Israel. The Council statement said that "at this time we Americans of Jewish faith wish to declare our complete independence and separation from any state that is, or may be established (in Palestine). . . . We speak out and declare once more our unalterable opposition to the establishment anywhere of any Jewish nationalist political entity."

☆

According to *Tide*, the advertising executive's magazine, Philip Morris cigarettes will soon make a change in its packaging "for a highly interesting, if subtle, reason: it will drop the phrase 'English Blend' and replace it with 'Special Blend.' The company found that, because of the British handling of the Palestine issues, sales of the brand tended to slump in a certain predominantly Jewish section. Incidentally you probably will see similar changes in other branded products before long," *Tide* concludes.

☆

Following the annual meeting of the National Jewish Welfare Board, a Statement of Principles



VOL II, No. 9 (21)

JULY, 1948

EDITORIAL BOARD

ALEXANDER BITTELMAN

ALBERT E. KAHN

MOSES MILLER

PAUL NOVICK

SAM PEVZNER

MORRIS U. SCHAPPES

SAMUEL BARRON, *Managing Editor*

LOUIS HARAP, *Editorial Associate*

JEWISH LIFE is devoted to the scientific study of the political, economic, cultural and social development of the Jewish people, and to the militant struggle for equality and democracy. It carries on a consistent struggle against anti-Semitism and all other forms of discrimination in the United States. It fights for the building up of a progressive Jewish life in our country and throughout the world. It gives maximum support to the development of Jewish communities where they exist. It recognizes that the chief strength of the Jewish people lies in an alliance with the progressive forces of the world particularly labor, and with the masses of the oppressed peoples.

THE EDITORS.

CONTENTS

PROCLAIM THESE TRUTHS! <i>an Editorial</i>	1
FROM MONTH TO MONTH	
HONOR IS DEPARTED FROM THY GATES	3
RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS	4
SICKENING SYNCOPHANCY	5
RECOGNITION MUST BE IMPLEMENTED <i>by Sen. Glen H. Taylor</i>	7
CAN WE BE NEUTRAL? <i>by M. Mirsky</i>	8
PROBLEMS FACING THE JEWISH AMERICAN NOVELIST <i>by Ben Field</i>	10
JEW IN COLONIAL AMERICA, <i>a review by Morris U. Schappes</i>	13
DUBINSKY TAKES A POSITION ON PALESTINE, <i>a cartoon by "Chips" Wilson</i>	14
WHERE ARE YOUR GUNS? <i>a short story by Howard Fast</i>	15
HAGANAH, <i>a poem by A. M. Krich</i>	17
"ANGLO-SAXON" AIRWAVES <i>by Bob Lauter</i>	18
THE DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH CULTURE IN AMERICA <i>by Moise Katz</i>	19
A JEWISH OFFICER'S STORY <i>by Col. David Dragunsky</i>	22
AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE AND FOREIGN POLICY <i>by Louis Harap</i>	23
DOCUMENTS	
UN AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL <i>by Andrei Gromyko</i>	27
ISRAELI COMMUNISTS HAIL "GREAT DAY"	28
LETTER FROM ABROAD	
WARSAW GHETTO MEMORIAL DEMONSTRATION (Warsaw) <i>by Joel Lazebnick</i>	28
REVIEWS	
PORTRAIT OF AN AMERICAN DIPLOMAT <i>by Paul Novick</i>	29
ON UPPER CLASS ASSIMILATIONISM <i>by Ben Levine</i>	31
LETTERS FROM OUR READERS	31
FROM THE FOUR CORNERS	2

JEWISH LIFE, July, 1948, Vol. II, No. 9 (21). Published monthly by the Morning Freiheit Association, Inc., 35 East 12th St., New York 3, N. Y., ALgonquin 4-9480. Single copies 15 cents. Subscription \$1.50 a year in U.S. and possessions. Canadian and foreign \$2.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter October 15, 1946, at the post office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1948.

for the programs of Jewish community centers throughout the U. S. and Canada was announced. The Statement held that the individual American Jew is identified with every phase of American life and is "part and parcel" of it, politically, culturally, economically and intellectually. At the same time he recognizes certain aspects of life which concern him uniquely as a Jew. The Jewish center should function to help integrate Jews as individuals and as a group into American life, but Jewish content should also be fundamental to its program. No Jew should be excluded from center membership for reasons of Jewish doctrine or ritual or because of political or social views. Although the Jewish center should fulfill its Jewish purpose, participation in the center should be open to all inhabitants of the community.

Dr. Abram Sachar, Jewish scholar and chairman of the national Hillel Foundations, has been appointed president of Brandeis University, the Jewish-sponsored secular institution that will open in September near Waltham, Mass. First year registrations will be kept to a "modest" figure and an attempt will be made to keep faculty-student ratio down to one to ten or twelve.

☆

The rate of natural increase of Jews in the United States lags behind the general population and American-born Jews tend to have smaller families than Jewish immigrants or other native Americans, it was revealed in *Population*

(Continued on page 32)

FROM MONTH TO MONTH

HONOR IS DEPARTED FROM THY GATES

"BRITISH and American imperialism," said Dr. Moshe Sneh, former head of the Haganah, recently, "are like the two edges of a scissors. Sometimes they work together; sometimes apart. But their point is directed at us."

How this scissors operates was clearly illustrated at the recent UN Security Council meetings. The Soviet delegation proposed that a cease fire order become effective within 36 hours of its proclamation and that the Security Council be empowered to declare as an aggressor any party refusing to obey the order and to impose all necessary economic and military sanctions.

The American delegation declared its support of the Soviet proposal and voted for it. However, the resolution failed to get the necessary seven votes and was defeated. It is no secret that the American delegation could have secured the passage of the Soviet proposal if it had wanted to. For it would be the height of naivete to believe that countries like China and Belgium would incur American displeasure by voting against a resolution which America wanted passed. How long would Chiang Kai-shek and his reactionary Kuomintang stay in power without American dollars and arms? And how many Marshall Plan dollars would Belgium receive if it incurred the wrath of American officialdom?

Equally revealing was the American delegation's indecent haste to support the British resolution, once the Soviet resolution had been defeated. For an analysis of the British resolution shows complete disregard for the UN decision of November 29 and for the fact that a Jewish state now exists. The resolution has not a word to say about the fact that it is the Arabs who invaded Israel and consequently are the aggressors.

The British resolution calls for the halting of all immigration to Israel of men of military age, thereby giving the Arab states fresh opportunity to recruit further manpower while keeping Israel down to its present manpower. The British resolution would also halt all shipment of arms to the Middle East, another treacherous maneuver which would work against Israel alone. For this would establish a world-wide boycott against Israel while the Arab states would continue to receive military supplies from Britain under the pretext that they were for other purposes.

Such is the truce which America and Britain are seeking to put across. As Richard Crossman declared, this is a "peace offensive against the Jews . . . even more dangerous

than the Arab invasion." And while this truce is in effect, Anglo-American imperialism hopes to put the finishing touches on a plan which will insure their continued domination of Palestine, as of the Middle East generally, and that Israel shall become an Anglo-American puppet state.

What are the general outlines of the Anglo-American plan? Numerous British and American spokesmen as well as many correspondents have hinted at it. Walter Lippmann put it plainly in the *Herald-Tribune* on June 3:

"To achieve an armistice and then peace in Palestine is a matter primarily of imposing an armistice and negotiating a treaty between Transjordan and Israel. . . . There is now in sight the main outline of an honorable settlement which will fit the vital interests of all concerned, namely the expansion of Abdullah's kingdom up to the partition line, except for an international enclave of Jerusalem; a treaty of peace and alliance between the enlarged Transjordan and the State of Israel; and then a confederation with economic union between them. This would bring into existence a Middle Eastern Commonwealth which would be under the joint protection of Great Britain and the United States."

The dangers to Israel inherent in this plan are not too hard to make out. The negotiation of a treaty between Israel and Transjordan is an invitation to Britain to resume control over Palestine. For it is no secret that Abdullah is a hired man who does Britain's bidding for a cool eight million dollars a year. Nor will American imperialism be a minor partner. For while the press and even some Jewish leaders try to give the impression that America is an innocent dupe, the facts show otherwise. Even a superficial survey of the Middle East will readily indicate the extent to which American imperialism has forced concession after concession from Britain to the point where American economic interests now surpass those of Britain.

What are the consequences of such a plan for Israel? After having fought heroically for its independence and for the abrogation of the mandate, it will find itself once more under the yoke of imperialism. But this time there will be two imperialisms to which tribute must be paid.

It is now becoming increasingly clear to many who had previously ignored the question, that the future of Israel depends upon the fulfilment of the *entire* UN decision, which means the struggle for the establishment of an independent Arab state as well as of the State of Israel. Both American and British imperialism have very con-

veniently forgotten about this part of the UN decision. And with good reason. For the imperialists' hope of reducing Israel to a vassal rests on their ability to frustrate the establishment of a free and independent neighbor state on Israel's borders, on their ability to extend the domain of a puppet state into Palestine proper and thus regain entrance and a renewed hold over all of Palestine.

In a speech at the Salute to the Jewish State at the Polo Grounds on May 15, Jacob Riftin, leader of the United Workers Party in Palestine, declared: "The British mandate over Palestine ended yesterday. We Jews of Eretz Ysroel can repeat the words of the poet: 'There was no joy in our cohabitation, there is no pain in our separation.' And yet there is no certainty that Britain really means to leave. For Britain has perfected the art of 'leaving' while laying the basis for 'remaining.' As you know the appetite not only of British imperialism but of imperialism generally is voracious in its desire to swallow up the Near East. I believe that I speak not only for the United Workers Party but for the majority of the Yishuv when I declare that we do not want our future to be built on the basis of fictitious independence as is the case, for example, with Abdullah's state. We want real political, economic and military independence."

American Jewry, like the democratic forces of America generally, have a major role to play in the struggle of Israel for independence. The American Jewish community must give unceasingly and unsparingly to help Israel in its present war for survival. Equally important is the political struggle to lift the embargo. Though hypocritical promises have been forthcoming from the White House and the administration, real recognition for Israel remains to be won. Funds to Britain from our government must be stopped and effective sanctions must be applied against the Arab aggressors.

This battle will not be won if illusions are fostered that the bipartisan architects of American policy can be relied upon. Certainly it was disturbing to hear Emanuel Neumann, president of the Zionist Organization of America, introduce Senator Robert A. Taft to the Madison Square Garden audience celebrating the proclamation of the Jewish state, as the one diplomat who never wavered in his loyalty to the cause of the Jewish state. Nor was it edifying to find a United Jewish Appeal advertisement featuring a letter of Mr. Forrestal endorsing the United Jewish Appeal.

The interests of Israel are not served by such tactics. American Jewry can carry out obligations to Israel only by a clear-cut anti-imperialist fight.

RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS

ON May 3 of this year, The United States Supreme Court rendered a 6-0 decision ruling restrictive covenants not enforceable in the courts.

The restrictive covenant is a major instrument of the racists for the maintenance of ghettos. These covenants

are agreements among real estate owners of a specific area barring the sale or rental of real estate property to Negroes, Jews or other oppressed minorities, thereby keeping the area restricted.

The Supreme Court has now ruled that the courts cannot be used to enforce such an agreement should a party to it decide not to comply. The Supreme Court's action overruled Missouri and Michigan Supreme Courts and the Federal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia which recognized the validity of the restrictive covenant and sought to compel compliance with its terms. As a result several Negro families who had been stopped by the lower courts from doing so, can now complete the purchases of homes in such formerly restricted areas, or enjoy the fruits of purchases already made.

In a limited sort of way, this is a victory for democracy in our country. But the extent of the victory is only relative to the temper of the times. Anything that to any extent sets back the offensive of reaction is that much to the good.

In our jubilation, however, we must not overlook one important fact. The restrictive covenant itself was not invalidated by the U. S. Supreme Court, nor did it bar real estate owners from entering into such agreements. Any racist mind that can project restrictive covenants, can also work out, if necessary, extra-legal means to compel enforcement. In fact, within 24 hours after the decision was read, property owners and neighborhood citizens' association in Washington, D. C. announced plans to establish voluntary covenant organizations that would operate through "community conservation agreements." One character, Gilbert C. Vincent, president of the National Gateway Citizens Association, declared "the white race today is the victim of partisan politics. I'm confident, however, that we'll find ways and means to throw it back into the Supreme Court and they will reverse their decision. There will once again be white supremacy."

The result of half-hearted court decisions in upholding the rights of Americans can be nothing but the encrustment of segregation on a quasi-legal base guarded by a bigoted and intimidated community. The court may have its own opinion as to what it meant to achieve by barring court enforcement while leaving untouched the validity of the agreements. What it actually succeeded in doing was to transfer the restrictive covenant from the embarrassing precincts of a court to the elusive area of the "gentleman's agreement."

A commentary on the court decision is the fact that barely a quorum participated in the case. Justices Jackson, Reed and Rutledge disqualified themselves. "The assumption around the court," the *New York Times* of May 4 reported, "was that one or more of them might have owned, or were interested in, property restricted by covenants."

Today decisive action is required to defeat the efforts of reaction to deepen national oppression of all kinds. What is unfit for the courts to enforce, is unfit for human relations. The restrictive covenant must go. It must be banned as an illegal infringement on the rights of fellow Americans.

SICKENING SYCOPHANCY

IT must be a tremendous sense of achievement for some Jews to hear an anti-Semite drool, "Now, don't get me wrong, some of my best friends are Jews." It must be proof to them of being on the in to hear a Jew-baiter slobber, "Present company excluded." For this privilege some Jews are willing to sacrifice much—even to the point of endangering the security of our people.

And it isn't just "little" Jews who have a weakness for social acceptance with no questions asked from the merchants of stolen Anglo-Saxonism. The "big shots" do it even bigger, as befits their more exalted positions. There is Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, head of the American Jewish Committee, who in 1946 acted as a character witness for George A. Timone, an appointee to the New York Board of Education, who was charged with pro-fascist sympathies on the basis of having publicly sponsored Christian Front meetings and admitted sympathy for Franco. And there was Leo Butzel, legal counsel for General Motors and member of the national executive of the American Jewish Committee, who had endeared himself so much to Gerald L. K. Smith with monetary contributions that the fascist *Fuehrer* was "glad to have any judgment concerning my patriotism confirmed by Mr. Butzel."

Now we have two more examples of mud-crawling that are worth noting.

Exhibit A: The National Conference of Christians and Jews has awarded a citation for "superior assistance in the promotion of American brotherhood" to *The Tablet*.

The Tablet, in case you do not know, is a Brooklyn paper and is generally known to be the voice of Father Edward Lodge Curran. Curran, "the Father Coughlin of the East," was a supporter of the fascist, anti-Semitic Detroit priest. He was a supporter of the Christian Front and of Gerald L. K. Smith. His articles and speeches were frequently reprinted in *Social Justice*, Coughlin's rag. This is the spiritual aura around *The Tablet*.

It is difficult enough to understand how Christians can think of awarding such a paper for its "contributions" to brotherhood. But how Jews can manage to permit themselves to be a party to this macabre jest, after all the suffering they have experienced, is explicable only by a careful study of Exhibit B.

Exhibit B: We present another "spiritual" character, one S. Andhil Fineberg, director of the Community Service Department of the American Jewish Committee.

In a document which came to us via California, Mr. Fineberg tells followers of the AJC that *A Mask For Privilege*, an outstanding work on anti-Semitism by Carey McWilliams, is not recommended because in it "big industry is made the *bête noire*, the spear-head of American anti-Semitism." And then S. Andhil Fineberg proceeds to pile rascality on top of sycophancy. He refuses to differentiate between cause and effect, and puts trade union discrimination in the same category with big business racism. He claims

McWilliams' concentration on Loomis is a distortion that helps "maintain the impression that American big-business is the chief instigator of anti-Semitism," as though American big business had not previously supported the German-American Bund and Hitler's nazis, or had not S. Andhil Fineberg ever heard of American participation in the I G Farben cartel? The AJC boy scout objects to McWilliams' criticism of the "quarantine treatment" of anti-Semites, when he could have read even sharper, on-the-spot criticism in the Anti-Defamation League report on anti-Semitism in 1947. It was *not* "a Republican Governor of New York State whose support and even insistence brought the first state Fair Employment Practice laws," as he says, but such a *mass* delegation that its sheer size almost pushed the Republican governor out of Albany. This may break S. Andhil Fineberg's bi-partisan heart, but knowledge of this fact may save the Jews of America heartache after this coming election.

When we hear an S. Andhil Fineberg sing hosannas for the Fords and the Charles E. Wilsons while he disparages the Theodore Dreisers; when we hear him sneer at "preconceived economic-political theories" in order to safeguard the interests of big industry, we have witnessed a sycophant who borders on the lap dog. Such an individual, even if his name is S. Andhil Fineberg, and if he works for the AJC, is not sufficiently experienced in spiritual matters to know what he is talking about when he says that "some of us are concerned about (the) spiritual security" of the Soviet Jews.

Red-baiting does not add either to the spiritual or social stature of a back-bending sycophant, even if it does help temporarily in an economic way.

PROCLAIM THESE TRUTHS!

(Continued from page 1)

a basic weakness in the resistance, and makes possible a breakthrough for the fascist panzers of the trusts. Inadvertently those who display this weakness feed the enemy and encourage him, and thereby let down their guard.

There are some who see and oppose the broad sweep of the attack on democracy involved in the Mundt Bill, but are absolutely neutral toward the Communist Party. They treat it as an unmentionable pariah whose non-existence can be achieved through silence. But the Communist Party *is* a fact and one cannot be neutral to facts. Least of all can one be neutral to communists as referred to in the Mundt Bill. The authors of the bill deliberately linked all progressive forces to the Communist Party on the plausible basis of partial or total concurrence of program.

There are others even among liberals who are in complete agreement with the bill's attack on the Communist Party, and object only to the "mistaken judgment" of the Un-American Committee in including other groups in the bill. If the bill were rewritten to hit only the Communist Party, they would be thoroughly satisfied. They are hurt that the

red-baiting paradise they had sought, and that some of them like Morris Ernst had helped to build, had turned out to be something of a slum.

What both groups overlook—what the American people may overlook only at the risk of their liberty—is that it is no accident that an attack on the Communist Party cannot be isolated from an attack on democracy in general, no matter how skilful the legal brain engaged to perform the operation. The lessons of nazi Germany, of fascist Italy, of Vichy France, of Franco Spain verify this truism.

The inseparable connection between the rights of the Communist Party and the rights of all the people does not rest on abstract principle. Voltaire's famous dictum, "I disagree with what you say, but I will defend with my life your right to say it," requires serious revision today. Not every attack on a section of the people endangers all the people. To attack fascists and their supporters, or anti-Semites, or Negro baiters, even to the point of their complete removal from American life, does not endanger the people, but strengthens them. For it removes elements whose objective is the destruction of democracy.

The Communist Party, on the other hand, plays a positive role as a democratic force, and any attack on it, is an attack on the democratic camp as a whole. For whether or not one agrees with the principles or practices of the Communist Party, one must admit that at all critical moments it has been found an invaluable ally in the democratic camp.

Labor found the Communist Party on the picket lines while the forces behind the Mundt Bill forced through the fascist Taft-Hartley law. Humanity found the Communist Party at Stalingrad while the forces behind the Mundt Bill prayed that the nazis and the Soviets bleed each other. The Negro people found the Communist Party battling southern "justice" while the forces behind the Mundt Bill whitewashed lynchers. Israel found the Communist Party-led Soviet Union consistently supporting Israeli national aspirations, while the forces behind the Mundt Bill intrigued and betrayed UN decisions. The Jews found the Communist Party using its influence in the eastern European democracies to declare anti-Semitism a crime against the respective states, while the forces behind the Mundt Bill are themselves the anti-Semites.

In every instance cited, the Communist Party strengthened democracy, while the forces behind the Mundt Bill tried to weaken and undermine democracy. Nor can one cite an instance where at a critical moment at home or abroad the Communist Party was not found fighting at the side of the democratic forces.

The current publication by the Communist Party of a draft resolution as a basis for pre-convention discussions by its membership is an act to be noted. Of course, there will be Max Lerner of *PM* who will now don pontifical robes, lower his voice to a basso profundo and issue a pipsqueak about the fact that what is written in black and white is not there at all, simply because what is there does not correspond to the nonsense he thinks the Communist Party should say. But except to one who has Lerner

Tremens simple English is simple English. And there will be those who will speak about bringing the communists into the open. But do these people know of any other party in America that will publish in the public press two months before its convention, a draft resolution to be discussed by the membership in public in the press, in open meetings before they elect instructed delegates to the convention? It is much less than two months before the conventions of the Republican and Democratic parties, and does Lerner have any official document or program of these parties to discuss, and do those who would drive the communists into the open know what is going on now in smoke-filled private offices of the bi-partisan politicoes?

The draft resolution requires such discussion, and *JEWISH LIFE* in the course of its study of the programs of all the parties will undertake an analysis of it. But even a first reading of the draft resolution makes clear that it deals with the every-day realities of the life of the masses of people, that it is deeply concerned with the maintenance of peace, with the economic security of the people, with the safeguarding of the democratic rights of all the people. It does not deal in pious phrases and cheap sentiment. It presents sober facts and figures of events, actions and statements. What is more, it gives an all-round picture, so that each particular problem falls into its proper relationship to all other problems. The draft resolution therefore invites confidence because of its very thoroughgoing analysis, its rejection of the eclectic. Jews, for instance, can see their vital concern in each of the problems raised, and can see their solution, offered by the Communist Party, emanating from the total program, from the total objectives enunciated by the party. They are not simply a sliver of words to catch the "Jewish vote." And what is this total program it offers? It is a program of struggle for peace, for democracy, for security in all phases and aspects of American life.

This explains why an attack on the Communist Party is inseparable from an attack on the people as a whole. In the face of this one cannot be neutral, but one must take a positive position of support for the rights of communists. If anything, history should teach us that the Communist Party is a scapegoat that boomerangs. Anti-communist hysteria comes first in the calendar of oppression because the Communist Party is a powerful force against reactionary trusts, and stands in the way of their carrying out imperialist plans of fascization, of war, of world enslavement.

We make this statement because the Mundt-Nixon Bill raises profound dangers to the continued democratic existence of our country. The forces behind this bill are powerful and ruthless, as ruthless as their nazi forerunners, and as desperate. It will take the utmost effort to defeat and crush and eliminate totally this fascist menace in our country. And for this the fullest unity of all democratic forces is a first requirement. It is the greatest source of strength for the people, the greatest source of faith in its inevitable triumph.

RECOGNITION MUST BE IMPLEMENTED

By Senator Glen H. Taylor

TONIGHT there is a new birth of freedom in the world. As we meet here in this first great gathering of Americans of all races to celebrate the birth of the new Jewish state, our prayers are for peace, peace for the new Republic of Israel and peace in the world.

For the first time since the legions of imperial Rome entered Galilee, and Jerusalem was sacked by Titus almost 2,000 years ago, the Jews have a single and united state. That state is the work of many brave and selfless men and women; in celebrating its birth all who love freedom pay them tribute. But it is also a living monument to the unquenchable will to freedom of a people who have endured centuries of suffering, of persecution, of wandering to and fro over the face of the earth, that reached its tragic climax in the inhuman ferocity of the nazi will to conquer the world.

The fixed resolve to establish a sanctuary of their own, inspired by an unconquerable piety, kept alive the spirit of freedom in the hundreds of thousands who fled before the nazi terror and escaped the butchers of a master race. Israel was destroyed by a Roman ancient imperialism only to be born again in the death throes of a nazi imperialism.

Out of the terrors of the concentration camps, out of the death chambers, out of the endless flights to escape the Warsaw of Europe, out of the appalling hatred that seared them wherever they sought refuge, the Jews of Europe saved this one great hope that is now being realized in their ancient home on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean. I rejoice in American recognition of the living realization of this hope.

However, my rejoicing is restrained. American recognition of Palestine does not mean that the battle is won. Recognition is but a manifestation. I cannot banish from my consciousness the memory of my own gladness and the joy of my Jewish friends when our government, in the comparatively recent past, came out so bravely for partition. I cannot forget my own chagrin and the disillusionment and despair of those most active in this great fight when partition was forsaken.

I am constrained at this moment to recall that Republican Spain was left to the mercy of fascist aggressors while yet enjoying this very same recognition that is now bestowed upon this new and infant nation whose birth we celebrate.

I must warn that this is no time for complacency. In view of the recent history of our unpredictable maneuvers in the field of foreign policy I believe a note of caution is advisable here.

SENATOR GLEN H. TAYLOR, vice-presidential candidate on the third party ticket, delivered the above address at the great Salute to the Jewish State meeting at Polo Grounds on May 15, 1948.

The *New York Herald-Tribune* in reporting the events of the past 48 hours says that other nations were "irritated at the United States for what they called a double-dealing and melodramatic flip flop."

Perhaps I am overly suspicious of the bipartisan architects of our foreign policy but my common sense leads me to say to you that yesterday's melodramatic flip may be tomorrow's double-dealing flop.

Recognition without implementation can only be a hollow mockery.

Break the Oil Conspiracy

Recognition must be made a fact and translated into action. It cannot remain a piece of paper and a slogan. Americans must unite to force the lifting of the embargo against the new state of Israel. If we deprive the Jews of their means of self-defense, we shall be recognizing a dead people, not a live freedom. We must not have another Spain. We must act for peace through the United Nations—but we must also assume our responsibility for bringing that peace into being by our own actions.

We cannot achieve peace as long as the conspiracy of oil imperialism dominates our policies. Recognition does not blur the sharp outlines of that oil imperialism which makes pawns of the Arab states. We cannot tender recognition with one hand to the people of Israel, and arm the sons of Ishmael with the other. Recognition must be made the gateway to peace, not the burial ground of the hope for freedom.

The future of Israel and the fate of its people revolve around oil. The voice of the American oil cartel is still the dominant voice in our State Department and our Department of Defense. The withdrawal of British oil imperialism from the Middle East is not complete—and every gap it leaves is filled by a stronger American oil imperialism. The Marshall Plan still insures the profits of American oil trusts, an insurance scheme whose premium is being paid by the people of America and the world.

We must see to it that oil imperialism does not drown the aspirations of Israel in blood. We must see to it that the men of war and profits in the State Department and the Department of Defense do not make of recognition the empty scrap of paper their British counterparts made of the Balfour Declaration. We must see to it that freedom and progress triumph in Israel and throughout the Middle East, not oppression and feudal reaction.

The Declaration of Independence of Israel is a great step toward that ultimate triumph.

But we cannot relax our efforts. Today the new member of the society of nations needs help. Arab legions are mov-

ing from all sides to crush the new state. They are the modern successors of the Canaanites, the Philistines, the Chaldeans, the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Egyptians, and the Hittites come to smite the Jewish state. But they come with cavalry equipped by the British, their infantry armed by American lend lease and trained by the British, their ancient chariots replaced by British and American tanks and planes.

The great nations of the world cannot stand by and talk while innocent pioneers are slaughtered. America must not only speak but act. The only important military force in the Arab lands is the force of King Abdullah of Transjordan. Transjordan could not exist except for British support. Britain is the instigator and supporter of the Arab League. Neither the legions of Transjordan nor the Arab League could move without British support.

But British support today means American support. America has the power to act—it cannot shift the blame to Britain or the United Nations. America could stop the invasion of Galilee with swift action. Three days ago, Paul Hoffman, the chief of the European Recovery Program, warned that American aid would be withdrawn from any nation that directly or indirectly supplied so-called war material to the Soviet government. I demand that that same

prohibition be applied immediately to Britain. If aid is withdrawn from Britain, aid will be withdrawn from the Arab states—and war will stop.

Secondly, America must stop payments of oil royalties to Arab nations. This is a real embargo.

Finally, America must summon the Arab nations before the bar of the United Nations for their outright acts of aggression.

Support of this program will bring peace to Palestine and prevent the spread of war in the world.

The Bible has it that "a remnant shall return" to Israel. That remnant has returned and has accomplished miracles in the desert. We must help them grow strong—we must help them build their cities in peace—we must help them plant their vineyards and make their gardens—as the Bible says.

The Jewish people have returned after 2,000 years of wandering over the face of the earth. That is past. We must here resolve that this people shall be able to plan for 2,000 years of security, dignity, peace and plenty in their gloriously resurrected homeland as a fitting reward for their magnificent and unparalleled scientific, cultural and spiritual contributions to all mankind in all the countries of the world through all recorded history. *Mazel Tov!*

CAN WE BE NEUTRAL?

By M. Mirsky

WE recently received and have studied carefully the message of Dr. Nahum Goldmann, chairman of the executive of the World Jewish Congress and member of the executive of the Jewish Agency, on "Several Problems of Today and Tomorrow." It reads like an introduction to the more inclusive report which will be made at the meeting of the World Jewish Congress scheduled for May of this year.¹

The message poses a series of questions. They are presented like a thesis that is not completely formulated. Dr. Goldmann's remarks deserve comment but we do not feel, however, that we can enter into a discussion at this time of all questions raised. We also feel that some crucial problems of the Jewish people on a world scale were not touched upon in his message. Generally speaking, we are in agreement with his presentation of a number of the problems with which he dealt. Among these are the questions of Jewish unity, trends in Jewish life, shortcomings of the

¹ The World Jewish Congress meeting scheduled for May has been postponed to June 27.—*Editors.*

M. MIRSKY is a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Jews of Poland and chairman of the Jewish Committee of the city of Lodz.

World Jewish Congress and a dozen more. We also believe that our friend Dr. Goldmann has made very fine observations of the role of the Jewish state and the relationship of Palestine with all other Jewish communities in the world. These views can serve as a basis for reducing the area of ideological differences.

On one problem, however, we can agree with neither the formulation nor the substance. We refer to his thesis of "The Two Camps." The honored Dr. Nahum Goldmann has erected a very shaky structure, especially when he passes from doctrines to practical Jewish politics. At the outset Dr. Goldmann says, "The second session (of the World Jewish Congress) must devote a great deal of attention to those problems which result from the terrible tendency to split the modern world into two camps. I have already pointed out the dangers in such a development for the very existence of the Jewish people."

True, it is a danger to the very existence of the Jewish people. But whence comes this danger? The honored Dr. Goldmann does not take the trouble to ascertain the source of these terrible tendencies to split the world. These difficulties do not drop from the sky. Someone is responsible for these tendencies. Why, then, restrict oneself to generalities? To do so means to minimize the danger and to mask

the source of these tendencies. Is the security of our people strengthened by putting the question in this way?

The United Nations made a decision to recognize a Jewish state in Palestine. We were happy about this majority decision. But who is creating the "terrible tendency" to betray this decision?² Who encourages splits and refuses to honor the decision adopted by 33 nations? Why keep that country's identity anonymous, my dear Dr. Goldmann, when the government in question is itself not ashamed, but speaks openly, cynically, arrogantly? And then again, who takes the position that the decision should be respected? Once again, no anonymity. Why speak in general terms when the forces are specific? America and Britain are breaking decisions, are splitting the world; the Soviet Union and the people's democracies are striving for international collaboration.

Origins of the "Terrible Tendency"

The "terrible tendency" does not, after all, begin with the Palestine problem, which is merely one link in the chain of policy that is dividing the world and violating the decisions of Yalta, Potsdam, etc.

Can we be in a position to resist when we do not know who the enemy is and where he comes from? Why do you make such an unclear recommendation to the second session of the World Jewish Congress, which is meeting at a fateful moment in Jewish history, when its very existence is menaced?

But this is not all. The esteemed Dr. Goldmann goes further. He says, "There is a natural tendency among Jewish groups in these two spheres (that is, the Anglo-Saxon bloc and the Soviet Union—M.M.) to drag the World Jewish Congress into this struggle. This must not be permitted, this must not happen. The World Jewish Congress, as the representative of the Jewish people, must be kept outside these conflicts. At the same time it must be clearly understood that the task of the World Jewish Congress is to fight with every means against reactionary and anti-Semitic tendencies, such as those, for instance, involved in the German problem. . . ."

Although we have great respect for the personal wisdom of the esteemed Dr. Nahum Goldmann, it is hard for us to understand how he intends to fight against "reactionary and anti-Semitic tendencies" without opposing the reactionaries and anti-Semites who are the driving force behind these tendencies. It is an open secret that "the German problem" is part of the Marshall Plan. The German problem, Dr. Goldmann confesses, is bound up with "reactionary and anti-Semitic tendencies." How, then, does Dr. Goldmann plan to separate the result from the cause? Marshall has set about to reestablish a militaristic Germany which menaces the existence of many peoples, and certainly the Jewish people. How then can Dr. Goldmann stand by and say nothing, how can he avoid taking a position toward the

Marshall Plan, which is the cause of everything that is evil? Can we Jews, as a people, be neutral toward the Marshall Plan, and assert that it does not concern us, if the success of its German phase is bound up with the annihilation of the Jewish people? We must fight against the Plan. And if other peoples are also menaced by the Marshall Plan, they can be our allies in the struggle for our security. What is the meaning of standing apart, of being neutral?

That means neutrality toward our fate!

Esteemed Dr. Goldmann, let us not repeat the mistakes of World War II. The first time a wrong move is made, it might be considered a mistake; if it is repeated, however, it becomes a system directed against the interests of the Jewish people.

Our friend Dr. Goldmann speaks in his message about the positive meaning of the UN. Good. If there are forces that work to undermine the prestige of the UN, to nullify its decisions, will you do nothing, will you recommend neutrality while international organizations, which try to help us, are everywhere destroyed? And even if the attempts to smash the UN and betray its decision, even if the rebuilding of Germany or helping the Arab bands, etc., did not concern us directly, would you still question whether we can afford to stand aside from world struggle for peace and freedom? All the more, when developments of vital concern to us and involving our fate are at issue, how can we possibly stand aside?

Jews Have No Choice

The good Dr. Goldmann oversimplifies the matter. According to him there are apparently two groups of Jews—one that goes along with Russia, the other with America and England. He concludes, therefore, that it is better to stand aside. But no, my dear doctor! You can't pose the question in that way. We are not being given a choice. The second world war taught us that Hitler did not give the Jews a choice.

The Jews of Europe, who thought they could stand aside without fighting against Hitler, that they could wait out the struggle and survive it, also became victims of Hitler. But we have no choice! When Jews face the alternative of anti-Semitism and friendship for the Jews, between building Jewish communities and destroying them, between building a Jewish state and destroying it, we Jews have no choice but to struggle against the enemy.

The esteemed Dr. Goldmann oversimplifies the matter when he thinks that "the political battles" toward which he advocates neutrality on the part of the Jewish people and the World Jewish Congress, can be ranged along geographic lines between Anglo-America and the Soviet Union. The line of demarkation is socio-political.

Arrayed against us we have the America of Taft and Truman; fighting on our side is the America of Wallace, Taylor and Foster. Against us is the Britain of Churchill-Attlee-Bevin; with us is the Britain of Zilliacus and Pollitt. Against us is the France of De Gaulle, Schumann and

² This article was written before May 15.—Ed.

Blum (in spite of the fact that the last-named is a Jew); with us is the France of Cachin, Joliot-Curie and Duclos. With us is the Soviet Union, with us are the democracies of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, etc. Against us are the rotten remnants of these countries—the Anders, Mikolajczyks, the various species of Chetniks and similar blackguards.

Can we reject our natural allies? Are not the allies of the fighting Jewish *Yishuv* in Palestine also not the allies of fighting Greece and China? Must we reject them, refuse to unite with them?

We are not to blame for the betrayal of the Jewish people by official America and England. They are betraying their own nations in the first place. These nations will not remain neutral toward their internal enemies, toward their be-

trayers. Shall we remain neutral towards those who would tighten a noose around our neck?

No, my dear Dr. Goldmann. Your concept is false and dangerous. Think further before advocating it, for it may bring misfortune and destruction. Our path must lead to an alliance with the democratic section of all peoples who will not permit themselves to be burdened with "Plans," and will not permit themselves to be whipped into paradise. We don't want war, and Wall Street is feverishly preparing war. Therefore we must find our natural partners in the struggle against the war danger. We cannot be neutral. We have no choice if we have concern for the security of our people.

Ours is the heroic tradition of the ghetto fighters. This will inspire us, and not any false doctrines of "neutrality."

PROBLEMS FACING THE JEWISH AMERICAN NOVELIST

By Ben Field

The article by Ben Field below and Arthur Miller's "Concerning Jews Who Write" in the March issue together present imminent problems facing the creative writer on Jewish themes. We have invited a number of writers to comment on these two articles and will publish their replies in forthcoming issues. We also invite comment from readers.—Editors

I HAD several choices before me for the theme of my third novel before finally selecting *The Last Freshet* which is the story of the logger, Virge Doggity, and the love for him of his daughter-in-law. Virge works in the woods in upstate New York, and like the other major characters in the novel is a Gentile. Had I taken up the other themes, I would have had city novels with Jewish American characters. One would have been the study of a young woman, slim and beautiful as a Lombardy Poplar, whose tragedy is that she cannot adapt herself to the rapid-fire changes of our postwar life. The other would have been a long novel about a rabbi, a chaplain, and his congregation in a suburban community.

The novelist is not like a carefree child at a party plunging his fists gleefully into a grabbag for his subject matter. His materials are found around the pools of his experience, and it is there that he hunts for plots and characters. There was a conflict between my recognition that the woods theme was closest to me and was creating in my mind the most vivid images and my feeling that it was high time

I returned to the city for my work and to the people with whom I grew up, driven as I was toward them by the crisis facing the Jew. I do not regret choosing the country story. But in reviewing the resolution of the conflict, I must confess that I acted with timidity and with unwarranted and unfruitful humility before the "big book" which either one of the others might have turned out to be.

The Last Freshet is not a complete turning of the back to the city or to the Jew. As in my other novels it does not ignore anti-Semitism in the country. True, this is not one of the major wheels in the book; nevertheless, it is dealt with in several of the important episodes and it helps characterize and give body to some of the more significant figures. To put it crudely, the more "decent" people in this novel in general are immune to the virus of race hatred. This is true of the New Deal Democrat, Dr. Ormsby, as well as of his friend, Doggity, whose prejudices against "foreigners" have been knocked out of him by years of working in various parts of the country when he rubbed shoulders with all kinds of men and women. On the other hand, the lumberman for whom Virge works, the big shot in the community, is a Jew-baiter of the worst kind, uses the Jew as a whipping boy to add to his holdings, to fight his Jewish competitor, and to throw dust into the eyes of his employees. And the lumberman's son-in-law is the one person in the book who definitely shows the making of the storm trooper.

The Last Freshet, therefore, has a value in that it illuminates the poisonous stream in the rural areas in which reaction fishes. And my experiences in upstate New York bear that out.

For a number of years I have had communication lines with a village on the Delaware River on the road between

BEN FIELD is a novelist and short story writer. He is the author of *The Cock's Funeral*, a collection of short stories, and the novels, *Piper Tompkins* and *The Last Freshet*. He has published numerous short stories and is at work on a new novel.

Port Jervis and Binghamton. I established residence, got tangled up in local politics, and worked on a farm and in the woods. I came to know many of the farmers, loggers, and villagers. There were some Jews among them. The first Jewish settler in the community had to withstand terrific pressure before he could grow roots in it, and I know that a delegation of villagers came to the city to get him to withdraw his deposit on the property he had bought, threatening him, but being a man of courage, he refused to be bullied.

I found anti-Semitism on the farm and in the woods. A farmer with whom I spent a winter took a personal liking to me and in talking about the Jews would always make me the exception to prove the rule. The loggers in the woods made the Jew their scapegoat for the misery of their lives, and I recall how we sat in the laurel one day on a hill overlooking the river and had it out. They were impressed with the vigor of my counterattack, but it takes more than one talk and one experience to alter the deep grain of men's prejudices. This is illustrated by a row-I had with a friend whose family were among the first raftsmen on the river. One day while harnessing the skidding horse together, he complained about the doctor who had taken care of a child of his and launched into a bitter denunciation of the "damn Jew doctors." When I whipped back at him, calling his attention to a doctor in the next village whose progressive political views he admired, the logger's answer was that this one was a "white Jew."

What complicated our problem in the Delaware Valley village was the outrageous behavior of some of the Jewish merchants who had an ill-concealed contempt for the poorest loggers and skinned them whenever they got the chance. That some of the other merchants were no better than their Jewish competitors cut no ice with the loggers. The more decent Jews in the area did very little to take the problem by the horns and beat it down. One of them confessed to me that he feared that this rich "black" Republican landowner and that lumberman would no longer do business with him if he openly contributed to a cause which defended the Jew as well as other oppressed minorities. Slurs against the Jew in the central school remained unanswered even after the children of several of the hotel owners reported them to their parents.

What makes the novelist's task doubly difficult in portraying such a state of affairs is the outraged reaction of some of us to the description of weaknesses in the Jew, to the portrayal of the so-called objectionable types among the Jews. This was a point which was made with such telling effect by Arthur Miller in the March issue of *JEWISH LIFE*. I recall how I was denounced for daring to include among my characters a Jewish tobacco grower who exploited his help. The label of anti-Semitism was slapped on me at the very moment that the *Freiheit* was preparing to serialize that novel in its pages. And the criticism hurled at me then was neither the first nor the last I was belabored with for daring to write about Jews objectively, with vigor and with what I conceived to be honesty.

I must say that critics who heap such charges on the writer muddy the pool at which he captures reality. The result of such criticism may be a complete clamming up of the writer and his unwillingness to deal with Jewish themes out of fright and disgust. Or if he accepts such pressure, he may very well romanticize and canonize his people, and by trying to make them more than human, may end in making them less so. One can see in Ludwig Lewisohn how distorted and wooden are his conceptions of men and women because of this drive to idealize a certain type of Jew; that type becomes a stake to drive home the point of Lewisohn's return to the fold as well as a tree on which to hang his feverish consecration to Judaism. With such figures as his you get a snobbishness, reactionary political and religious views, and a belief that the Jew is the good man and the saintly one and the rest of humanity, at best, *shabbas goyim*.¹

The Jewish American writer then has often stood in double jeopardy. In flight from the Jewish community whose bourgeois leaders ape so often the worst aspects of American life, the writer found himself in his new progressive surroundings in an atmosphere almost as stifling as the one he had fled. This may sound shocking. It has been acknowledged, however, that the intellectual atmosphere of the Left at least until recently hasn't been the most helpful toward that free play which is needed for the development of the creative artist. And I do not believe that the air has been thoroughly cleared as yet. There is still Philistinism in our approach to the problems of the writer and a desire to favor the Jewish character, to shield him from the rigors and the penetrating and ruthless objectivity of the honest novelist. We still approach men and women like a bunch of idealists, seminary students, afraid of the thick coarse thumb of life, desirous of cutting men and women according to patterns which spring from the desires of our hearts and not from the hard-hitting realities around us. We act as though the world were a simple mechanical toy, an erector set, and not a grand, complex, awe-inspiring structure, the top crown of which is man.

Healthy Atmosphere for Creation

The remarks of Arthur Miller indicate that some writers are well aware of these problems, are thinking them through, so that their work will help in their solution. Such writers are taking a forthright stand, and it is a stand on the side of their people. The ferment among these writers, however, goes beyond turning out novels against anti-Semitism, important as they may be; for it must be added here that certain writers see anti-Semitism as an opportunity to hit the jackpot, and their treatment of it is shallow and focussed softly. Works in progress of some of the more serious novelists now do indicate a growing interest in all the sides of Jewish American life. In my own case, for my next novel I shall get at one of the themes

¹ Non-Jews who perform acts for Jews on the sabbath that are forbidden to Jews, such as striking a light.

I mentioned earlier in this article, and at present I am revising a group of stories about Jews in New York, and I intend to explore the dark pockets whether others follow me or not.

To have important books one must have receptive audiences. The reader, especially if he is a spokesman for the progressive circles in American life, must give the lead in approaching the writer with understanding and an open mind. Pronunciamentos from the mountaintop and self-righteous indignation at the waywardness of the writer, as if he were the prodigal son, will not create a healthy atmosphere and lay the ground for that respect and collaboration without which there can be no genuine art. We must encourage writers to tackle all aspects of our life, the most unsavory segments of it, to show all the contradictory

elements in the Jew. We must demand honest portraits of people.

The writer is a man with a mission. He is in the best sense of the word, a spy sent out by the people. Spying out the land is not a Sunday School picnic with white gloves on in a pleasant grove with nice people. We must disabuse our minds of that notion. In the Bible the spies sent out by the Israelites spent the night in the whore's house, letting themselves out of the window with purple cords. Nothing in that wonderful story in our history makes it so believable and so human as that episode. So with the honest writer. For no matter what stops he makes on the way he is bound to return to us with visions, reports, and stories which will enable us to see that the people's will is done, the battle won, and the land finally ours.

JEWES IN COLONIAL AMERICA

A Book Review

By Morris U. Schappes

FROM the colonial cradle there finally emerged the young American republic, at that time the most socially and politically advanced state in the world. In that state then more people had more rights and better opportunities than anywhere else. Approximately a thousand of these people in this new democracy were Jews. They were then the freest Jews in the wide world. Complete equality they had not yet attained (and to this day we do not have it in our country), but they had a greater degree of it than any other Jewish community.

They won their freedoms by fighting for them. The New World, it is sometimes forgotten, was settled by people from the Old World. The colonists were themselves the products of the social systems from which they came. Among the baggage they brought over were certain ideas about, and attitudes toward, Jews. Many of these were hostile. Jews had to face this opposition as they asserted their right to stay in the colonies and began the long struggle for economic, legal, political, religious and social equality. They began it in 1654 in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam, governed by the despotic Peter Stuyvesant. They were Dutch Jews. In old Amsterdam and in Holland as a whole, the Jews then had fewer restrictions and more rights and opportunities than any of the Jewries of Europe. The Dutch needed their Jews and found them useful. Holland was then the leading mercantile capitalist country in Europe. Both in its basic struggle against feudal Spain and Portugal, and in its competition with the emerging capitalism of England, Holland found its Jews very helpful. It was the influential Jews in Holland who made it possible for the

shipful of penniless Jews of New Amsterdam to obtain, during three years of struggle, most of the rights the Dutch Jews had, despite the economic fears and religious antipathy of Stuyvesant. Rights won in New Amsterdam, of course, later helped in the process of winning similar rights in other colonies.

A part of this exciting story is told with skill and vitality by Rabbi Abram Vossen Goodman.¹ Without apprehending or revealing the fundamental uneven development of European capitalism that is the background for the growth of the American colonies, Rabbi Goodman chronicles in lively manner the still too little known incidents of Jewish colonization, the process of taking root, the thrills of democratic victory, the mortification of temporary defeats. What others have already presented in books or in scholarly publications, Rabbi Goodman can retell with freshness. But since he is resourceful and persistent in research, he also corrects old, oft-repeated errors, and, more important, adds new facts and details to the still small and inadequate store of our knowledge of the life and work of America's colonial Jews. He has the rewarding habit of going to original sources even when others have already investigated them, and he frequently returns with data overlooked or ignored by his predecessors. He also has the patience and ingenuity to dig into unexplored areas before which others have stopped short.

It has been known, for instance, that in 1747 in the city of New York the right of Jews to vote in elections to the colonial Assembly was challenged by a defeated candidate. What Rabbi Goodman now reveals is that William Smith, who represented the complaining loser at the Assembly

MORRIS U. SCHAPPES is a scholar of American Jewish history and a new edition of his *Emma Lazarus: Selections from Her Poetry and Prose* was brought out recently.

¹ *American Overture: Jewish Rights in Colonial Times*, by Rabbi Abram Vossen Goodman. Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, 1947. \$3.00.

hearing on the subject, "insisted that Jews had no right to vote—first, because they were disfranchised in England, and, second, because of the responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus of which he accused them. As he delivered his fiery harangue, declaring that the curse of blood guilt still rested upon Jews, making them unworthy of political rights, we are told that the assemblymen wept and the rabble was ready to engage in a pogrom. No disorders occurred, but the Assembly did its duty." It disfranchised the Jews, for a time.

Rabbi Goodman is also too mature to attempt to force saintliness upon a Jew who does not merit it. Thus Jacob Lucena, who was heavily fined and banished from Connecticut in 1670, was reported by Leon Huhner in 1900 to have been guilty probably of Sabbath-breaking. By examining the manuscript court record that Mr. Huhner cited, Rabbi Goodman, however, discovered, and discloses with good cheer, that Lucena had been convicted of having been "frequent & notorious in his lascivious dalliance & wanton carriage & profers to severall women." On the rogue and villain, Jacob Lumbrozo, the "Jew doctor" who was charged in Maryland with the capital crime of blasphemy in 1658-59, Rabbi Goodman lavishes perhaps too much attention in such a small volume, especially since the details of his roguery were set forth 20 years ago by B. H. Hartogensis (with whose work Rabbi Goodman does not seem to be acquainted). Of a different order of interest is the fact, freshly recorded, I believe, that in 1718 a Jew joined in a petition to the King to overrule the Governor of New Jersey "who had allowed Quakers to assume office by making a solemn affirmation instead of taking oath." Rabbi Goodman notes the significance of the fact that "when his rights were not circumscribed, he (this Jew) sought to limit the amount of religious liberty enjoyed by others." Where nationalistic Jewish historians blink such facts, Rabbi Goodman has the objectivity to note them.

Defects in Approach

Yet the reader, no matter how many interesting facts he may learn, will find that his understanding has not been correspondingly deepened. The fault is partially a matter of arrangement. For a reason I cannot fathom, Rabbi Goodman has avoided the chronological arrangement that would begin with New Amsterdam in 1654 and then go on in sequence to the Jewish group settlement of other colonies. Instead, he has a geographical arrangement, by which he takes up the colonies going from Massachusetts and Rhode Island in the North down along the coast to Georgia in the South! Such a pattern, instead of clarifying the history, scrambles it. Perhaps because he is a native Bostonian, Rabbi Goodman also sets out to prove that the Puritans of Massachusetts (and Connecticut) have a record of treatment of the Jews which is "without a black mark." To do so he has to strain his interpretation of many facts, but he succeeds only in evoking the more important question: why, if the Puritans were so generous to Jews as Rabbi Goodman

would have us think, did the colonial Jews persistently avoid settling in these colonies?

Deeper than the problem of sequence and arrangement is a basic weakness in Rabbi Goodman's approach to history. He is indifferent to economic history. Except for a bow in the direction of English mercantilist theory, he virtually avoids the examination of the economic and material conditions of life in Europe and in the colonies. Of the "Jewish Rights in Colonial Times" that Rabbi Goodman sets out to treat, he does not recognize that the basic right was the right to make a living without the kind of restrictions that feudalism in Europe had imposed on the Jews and that capitalism had not yet entirely abolished. Jews in the colonies fought for and won the right to own land and houses, to sell by retail and wholesale, to trade, to sign petitions with other merchants, as well as for legal, political, and religious rights. Together with non-Jews, they worked to establish a system of capitalist relationships, within which they expected to achieve full democratic equality.

Avoids Material Forces

There are certain areas that Rabbi Goodman does not even touch. The American overture was an overture to revolution, independence and democracy. What were the Jewish themes in that grand overture? Colonial resistance to English mercantile policy grew rapidly in the eighteenth century. The Jews played an interesting role in the non-importation struggles that dealt such a severe blow to British domination. Rabbi Goodman makes no mention even of what is known, much less investigate the matter still further. The basis for the degree of national unity that made a successful struggle for independence possible was a rudimentary economic unity brought about by intercolonial trade that England vainly tried to stop and disrupt. The Jews, by family and other ties, were in an unusual position to encourage and develop this intercolonial trade and unity. Rabbi Goodman ignores this factor, although it contributed to the independence and democracy that tended to fortify those political and religious rights that the Jewish colonial groups had won.

His avoidance of material and economic factors is so pervasive that it leads him even to the impoverishing of his sources. Checking the implications of some kind of religious revival in Rabbi Goodman's remark that in 1655 "a group of London Marranos reverted to Judaism," I found his source, Cecil Roth, very illuminating: England being at war with Spain, the property of the Spanish Marranos was seized by the British government; the Marrano promptly proclaimed his Judaism because "As a Spanish Catholic his position had been open to question. As a refugee Jew he was safe." In other instances, Rabbi Goodman misses the point of a clash between Gentiles and Jews because, despite the clear statement in his source that it was a matter of Gentile *planters* fighting Jewish *merchants*, or of Gentile merchants opposing Jewish merchants, he contents himself with reporting the clash of Jew and Gentile without the economic foundation for it.

In his two chapters on Georgia, Rabbi Goodman has included valuable new material. But he fails to explore an interesting problem about the Jews in Georgia because of this allergy to economic factors. In a Columbia doctoral dissertation, *Religion and the State in Georgia in the Eighteenth Century*, Reba Carolyn Strickland defines the motivation for the colony thus: "Four types of reasons appear to have motivated the undertaking: imperialistic, mercantile, humanitarian, and evangelical. The first two motives probably carried most weight with Parliament, which was induced to grant financial aid. The English government had for some time been aware of the necessity of protecting the other colonies against the Spanish and French [in Florida and Louisiana Territory] and Georgia was intended as a buffer colony." Compare with this Rabbi Goodman's opening: "The founding of Georgia was a characteristic expression of the surgent humanitarianism which marked the eighteenth century." Dr. Strickland goes on to surmise that as war with Florida Spaniards came near, Jews in Georgia left the colony for fear it would be conquered by the traditional enemy of the Jews, but Rabbi Goodman, ignoring the fact that Georgia was a buffer colony (although he cites Dr. Strickland's book in his bibliography), is indifferent to this issue.

Similarly, by ignoring the economics of slavery, Rabbi Goodman flounders in embarrassment when he has to record that Jews as well as Christians in Newport "pursued the infamous triangular route" of the slave trade. To exculpate these Jews, Rabbi Goodman declares: "That was before the sufferings of the unhappy black had excited compassion." To Rabbi Goodman's credit it should be noted that he did not, as did Rabbi Morris A. Gutstein in his *The Story of the Jews of Newport*, flatly and righteously deny that Newport Jews dealt in slaves. As for exciting "compassion," however, Rabbi Goodman is wrong: as far back as 1624, protests against slavery were voiced in the colonies. Nor did Christians and Jews ultimately abolish slavery out of compassion or out of loyalty to the teachings of the Old or New Testaments. It was only when slavery had outlived its usefulness as a productive system that it was replaced by a system of wage-labor. We would be spared shame-faced denials and apologetics if the abomination of slavery were approached with the method of social science instead of compassion. Then it would be understood that morality cannot rise higher than the economic system that underlies it.

A Useful Book

Weak as he is in these major respects, Rabbi Goodman, with occasional exceptions, is pleasingly accurate in his statements of fact, citations of sources, and transcription of quotations. He tries to be rigorous in his examination of evidence, but he is not consistent. He will severely brand as a hoax a document bearing upon the existence of Jews in Rhode Island in 1658, although two historians accept it for what seem to me sound reasons, but he will swallow

gullibly the very flimsily substantiated theory of Mr. Huhner that the David Emanuel who was governor of Georgia in 1801 was a Jew or the son of Jews. He will dismiss as "legend" the report that a Jew was one of the founders of the Union Society in Georgia in 1750 because the story is first mentioned in 1933; yet he will say, "we may assume" that a practice in New York of allowing Jews to omit Christological phrases from an oath of office also obtained in Georgia, although there is no evidence for the assumption. Like his predecessors, he will assume that a challenge made in 1703 against the fact that Jews and Negroes voted in South Carolina establishes that they had a right to vote. This petition of the dissenters charges that the triumphant Anglican party accepted the votes illegally in order to stuff the boxes. Does Rabbi Goodman really believe the petition demonstrated that Negroes had the right to vote in South Carolina in 1703? Yet there is no more evidence that Jews had the right to vote. Incidentally, Rabbi Goodman errs when he declares that Joseph Salvador of South Carolina "was the first Jew in America history, and probably the first Jew in the modern world, to serve in an elective office" (in 1774). In the City of New York, between 1725 and 1754, some ten Jews were elected to the post of constables. Salvador was the first Jewish legislator to be elected, and even then it has not been proved that he did not take office on the oath of a Christian.

Rich in detail, this book will be most useful to those who already understand the basic social forces in history, American and Jewish.



By "Chips" Wilson

While keeping his medal from the Bevin government, David Dubinsky takes a position on Palestine.

WHERE ARE YOUR GUNS?

A Short Story
By Howard Fast

IN the land of the *goyim*, my father traded with the Indians. We traded for beaver, and my father's word was as good as his bond, and we never carried a weapon except for our knives. From the lakes in the north to the canebrake in the south and as far west as the great river—there we traded and we never carried a weapon, never a musket or a rifle or a pistol, for these are weapons of death; and if you deal with death, what else can you expect in return? Is it not said in the Book, "Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart"? And is it not also said, "I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles"?

Among the Mingoes, we dwelt and traded, and among the Delawares, too, and among the Wyandottes and the Shawnees and the Eries and the Miamis and the Kickapoos, and even among the Menomini, where only the French have been, and never did we carry a weapon. "Men do not kill for the sake of killing," my father answered once to a hunter who could not understand why we didn't walk in fear of the red savage. "My people walked in fear for too long," my father said. "I don't fear what is different."

The hunter was one who slew his meat and ate it, even as the red men do, but our law is different. We kept the *law*. Would you understand if I told you how we suffered to keep the *law*? The *law* says that when a beast is slain, it must be with the hand of a holy man, so that the life blood will run out as an offering to God rather than as a wanton slaughter of one of His creatures—with God's will and God's blessing.

Long, long ago, when I was only nine, my father said, "The high holy days are coming, and we have not sat down with our own people since your mother's death three years ago," speaking in the old tongue, which he taught me so carefully, being a man of learning. "I would have you pray for your mother's soul, and I would be with my own people for a little while, there is such a hunger in me." So we saddled our horses and made the long journey eastward to Philadelphia, where were a handful of our own people. Not that they welcomed us so well, we were two such wild buckskin folk, my father's great black beard falling to his waist; but we prayed with them and we ate meat with them.

You would have thought that we were unclean, they were such fine people there in Philadelphia, and when they talked about certain things, politics and who ruled over whom, indeed we sat as silent as the red men in their own

HOWARD FAST is the well-known anti-fascist novelist who is probably the most widely read contemporary American novelist. His last book was *Clarkton* and he has recently finished a new novel on an historical Jewish theme.

woods. What does a man who trades with the Indians know of politics, my father thought? And what is it to a Jew who rules over a land? A Jew is a Jew, whether it be the old world or this new world, where the forest rolls like the sea. But when they talked of the *law* and of holy things, then it was different, for my father was a man of learning, and when he lifted the meat to his mouth, he pointed out that this was the first meat he or I had eaten in years—and even since that day in Philadelphia, no unclean meat passed our lips.

I speak of this because I must make you understand my father, the man who traded with the Indians, so you will not judge me too harshly. I am not my father. My father fared forth to a wild land from far-off Poland, and of Poland I know no more than a dream and a legend, nor do I care. With his own hands he buried his wife in the wilderness, and he was mother and father to me, even though he left me with the Indians when I was small, and I lived in their lodges and learned their tongue. I am not like my father. He had a dream, which was to trade with the Indians until there was enough money to buy freedom, peace, security—all those things which, so it goes, only money can buy for a Jew; and because he had that dream, he never knew any comfort and the taste of meat was a strange thing to him. A stream of beaver skins went back to the *company* on the donkeys and the flat-boats that were owned by the *company*, and all of it went to a place called London, and in this place there was a thing called an *account*.

Those were names and words and without meaning to me. I cared nothing of the beaver skins and nothing of the account, but if my father said that these things were of such importance, then indeed they were, even as the *law* was. I knew other things; I knew the talk of the Shawnees and Algonquin talk, and I could make palaver with the men of the Six Nations too, if need be. I knew Yankee talk, the talk of those long-boned hunters of the East, and I knew the French talk and the high-pitched nasal talk of the British, who claimed to own the land, but knew nothing of it and stayed huddled in their outposts and stockades. I spoke the old language of the book and I knew the *law*, and I could catch trout with my bare hands and steal the eggs from under the nesting bird never disturbing it. I knew the step and the stride of nineteen moccasins, and where the wild parsnip grows and the wild turnip too, and with only a knife I could live the year round in the dark woods, where never the sky is seen. By heart in the old Hebrew, I knew the Song of Songs, which is Solomon's, and I knew 40 psalms. And from the time I was 13, I prayed twice a day.

I ALSO KNEW WHAT IT IS TO BE A JEW.

But not like my father, whom you would have remembered, had you seen him come into Fort Pitt on that day. My father was six feet and two inches tall; 15 stone he scaled, and never an ounce of fat, but hard as rock, with a black beard that fell to his waist. All through the woods, in those times, which are the old times now, the half-forgotten times, were Jews who traded with the Indians and went where no other white man had ever trod, but there was no one like my father, you may believe me. No one so tall or so wide or so heavy—or so sweet of speech and gentle of mien, yet I remember so well a cart and horse mired belly-deep, and my father heaved the horse out and the cart too. Or the time a year ago at the company post of Elizabeth, where two Delawares were crazed with drink; they would have been slain, for what is better sport for a redcoat than to slay a drunken Indian? But my father lifted them from the ground like puppies and shook them until the drink went out of them, and instead of going to their deaths they went home to their lodges and were grateful.

I am not like my father, believe me. No man touches my forehead, unless he kill me first; but when a hunter met my father and saw that he was a Jew and begged to feel for the two horns nestling in his hair, my father would smile and agree, and then kindly commiserate with the man when he discovered that the old wives' tale was no more than that. Nor did my father sign for surety—ever, be it old MacTavish, who fended for the company in the north, or Ben Zion, who provided trade goods in Philadelphia, or Pontiac, whom my father told me to look at and heed, so I would know what was best in my own people in the ancient time when they followed the way of war and not of peace.

That was my father, who bound the phylacteries on his head faithfully every morning, and kept the *law*, and did justice to all who knew him. That was my father who came into Fort Pitt with me on this day. We drove seven donkeys and they carried eleven hundred skins, and for a month I had listened to my father plan how now we would go to New York and demand an accounting from the company, and there we would live with our own people and roam the woods no more. He was filled with it. A mile from the fort, we had stopped to drink water at the outhouse and mill of MacIntyre, and my father told him.

"No more this way, Angus" my father said "but eastward and the boy will wear woven cloth on his back."

"Ye been a woodsey man these twenty year," MacIntyre said somberly.

"I'll be woodsey no more. And young Reuben here will make a company of his own, the good Lord willing."

"Heed the new commandant. He has no love for Jews, or for Scots either. I am glad to see you safe, because there is war with the Mingoes."

My father laughed because we had bought 200 skins from the Mingoes, and there was no war talk in their cities. But

when we came to the fort, there was a new guard at the gate. The doors were closed, and the men on the walls wore yellow facings and shakos I had not seen before. It was a new regiment for the woods.

"Who goes there?" a sergeant called.

"Two traders with skins."

"And where are your guns?"

"We bear no guns," my father said. "We are Jews who trade with the Indians."

Then the doors opened, and we entered with our donkeys, but there was never a smile or a nod. I looked at my father and he looked at me, but there was nothing to make out of his face; and when we looked around us, we saw that these were new men. Their cloth clothes were still fresh with the east, and they stared at us as if we were creatures; were we not Jews, they would have stared at us too, but there was that in their eyes—that was singular for Jews.

WHERE, I WONDERED, WERE THE YANKEE FOLK, BENSON, the smith, Bryan, the cooper, Wheelbury, the harness maker? Where were the Indians, who were always a crowd in the fort? Where were the woodsey folk, the hunters, the French, in their green buckskin and red hats? Where were Stuart and Stevenson, the storekeepers? That too was in my father's mind, as I could see, but his broad face was calm, and he smiled at me as we prodded our donkeys into the low town. As if this were the first time we had come to old Duquesne, soldiers barred our way and a British subaltern demanded of us:

"Who are you and what are your names?"

"We are Jews who trade with the Indians," my father said. "My name is David, and this is my son, Reuben. Twelve years I have been in and out of this place, even when it was Duquesne, and I am known in the forest country."

"I don't know you," the young man said, as if we were dirt and less than dirt.

"Then I be sorry," my father said. "Stevenson knows me, for I have always traded with him and paid my loanings. Benson knows we, for he shod my beasts, and Bryan knows me, for he boxed my goods. I am not a stranger here."

"You are a Jew and damned insolent," the young man replied. "As for the scum of this place, they know the dregs of the woods. Where are your arms?"

"We bear no arms but our knives."

"And how did you come through the Mingoes? There is war with the Mingoes."

A mass of soldiers were around us now, and now I could see Benson and some of the others, but keeping off. I am not like my father. I would have made a story then, but it was not in him to speak anything but the truth. He was going to New York, but I knew of a sudden that he would be lonely and forsaken in such a place. The green woods was his home, and it was not in him to speak anything but the truth.

"There is no war with the Mingoes," he said slowly. "I

traded 200 skins with the Mingoes, and I lay in their lodges this fortnight past. There is no war with the Mingoes."

The young officer said, "You're a damned liar, a filthy Jew, and a spy as well."

My father's face was sad and hard and woeful. I moved, but he moved quicker, and he struck the officer a blow that would fell an ox. Then we fought a little, but there were too many of them.

They put us in a cell and they gave us no food and no water. We were bleeding and bruised, but it was not hard to go without food. It was hard for my father to go without his phylacteries, but after the second day I didn't care. They came every few hours and asked us to tell what we knew of the Mingoes, but what we knew was of no interest to them.

The colonel came finally. It is so different now that you cannot know what a colonel was in those days in a place like Fort Pitt. He was an English gentleman and he was God too, and he prodded us with his stick.

"How old are you?" he asked me.

"I am 15," I croaked.

"You are large for 15," he lisped, holding a lace handkerchief over his nose. "The Yankees come large, but I should not think it would be so with a Jew. I shall hang your father tomorrow, but if you will tell me what you know of the Mingoes, you may go free and take your seven beasts with the skins."

"I know nothing of the Mingoes."

"And how do you travel in the woods without guns? I am very curious."

"That you could never know," my father said, almost sadly.

EVEN THESE DAYS YOU WILL HEAR THINGS SAID OF JEWS; IT IS that way; but once my father found a robin with a broken wing, and made splints for the wing and a sling, so that we would carry the bird with us, and he nursed it until it flew away. So I will remember until I die how the British drums rolled as they hanged my father, who traded with the Indians in the land of the *goyim*, and whose word was as good as his bond. And then they gave me 30 lashes until

I bled like a pig, and drove me from the fort to die in the forest.

A Jew dies hard, they say. I crawled a mile to Angus MacIntyre's mill, and he washed my back and cared for me until I returned to my senses and could walk again.

"Weep for your father," he said, "for you are only a laddie, and he was much of a man."

"I weep no more and pray no more. My father is dead, and I am not like him."

"You will be like him, lad."

"I will never be like him, Angus, but I will make my word like my bond. I give you my word I will bring you 40 beaver skins if you give me a musket and powder and shot."

A long time the old Scot looked at me, measuring me and weighing me. "Go to the land of the Yankees, lad," he said, "and wear woven clothes on your back."

"The Yankees stood by while my father was hanged. When that redcoat filth drove the Mingoes from the fort, the Yankees stood by. When two Mingoes came back for the little they left behind and were slain at the gate, the Yankees said nothing."

"How many of them were there?" the Scot said quietly. "They are a strange folk, dirty and bragging and mean and sometimes, in a most curious way, a little noble. Will they be silent forever?"

"Will you give me the gun?"

"You are one of them," the Scot said.

"When they are no longer silent—I will be one of them. When they strike, I will strike with them."

"And your father traded in the woods with never more than a knife. For the company. Are you for the company?"

"I am against any man in a uniform."

"I will give you the gun, lad," the Scot said sadly, "and you will slay your meat and eat it."

"And other things."

"Then put no price on it, for what you seek has no price but a man's blood. You are one of them."

He gave me the gun, and I left him and walked eastward.

HAGANAH

By A. M. Krich

Let your guns speak for us;
Erase the immigrant's accent,
And second generation's stutter
Before the old families.
(Once they valued the flint-lock
Above the tea-cup!)

Fill in the odious spaces on questionnaires

A. M. KRICH has published poetry in several magazines. His poetry has appeared in earlier issues of JEWISH LIFE.

With a round of fire.
Answer for us, who, with politeness
Bear the lighter insult,
Or, bitter, press against their lips
The taste of rage.
Defend your garden earth;
And for all whose native land
Became a charnel-house,
Attack.

"ANGLO-SAXON" AIRWAVES

By Bob Lauter

*You can get good milk from a brown-skinned cow,
The color of his skin doesn't matter no how—
Ho ho ho, haw haw haw—
You can learn common sense at the grocery store.*

SO goes a stanza from one of radio station WNEW's transcribed tolerance jingles. But even as the record turns, America's major radio networks spread racist concepts as vicious as those of Joseph Goebbels. The tolerance jingles, or even the excellent WMCA anti-prejudice dramas, *New World A-Coming*, do not (and can not) change the fundamental character of American radio.

The economic and political concepts of the Marshall Plan inevitably breed theories of "Anglo-Saxon" superiority, of America's "moral" leadership. Wall Street defines "American" to mean "white and native born." Radio dramatizes these concepts against a background of anti-communist hysteria in which the Big Lie has been presented as an ethical standard.

The monopolists of the airwaves are not afraid of "tolerance" messages. They use "tolerance" as the sheep's clothing in which they conceal radio's racist wolves. It is essentially a liberal and petty bourgeois concept. Translated, "tolerance" can mean simply "Live and let live"—the slogan which the white supremacist often uses to justify jimcrow. Tolerance of minorities is no substitute for the working class concept of equality.

While the tolerance jingle tells us that "Nature has no favorite nation, color, creed, or occupation," a network is broadcasting *Beulah*, a program which caricatures and slanders the Negro people against the background of "Anglo-Saxon" middle-class mores. *Can You Top This?* offers jokes in which all minorities are made the butt of dialect humor. Until recently, Eddie Cantor offered us the Greek whose accent, conduct, and general personality were that of a stupid buffoon. And while Cantor presented this caricature, Fred Allen gave us his basically humorless *Allen's Alley*, a catalog of prejudice, complete with comic Jew, and the stereotype Irishman who needs only television to bring us the red nose and green attire. We have our "mad Russians"; Chinese who are ridiculed because of their difficulties in pronouncing certain English consonantal sounds (as though we were so adapt in speaking Chinese!); our Mexican who is always taking a nap or making love, but never functioning like a complete human being.

What radio offers us is essentially a fascist picture of nations and minorities ("Anglo-Saxons" excluded). This

propaganda is degrading the American people mentally and morally, just as the propaganda of Goebbels degraded the German people. Americans have to fight against this insidious poison. It creeps in on all of us. How often have we gone through the experience of smiling at some such characterization while saying to ourselves, "We shouldn't find this funny!" When we do find it funny, it is because we are not ourselves immune from the propaganda of imperialism.

Tolerance jingles and messages tell the audience what they *ought* to do. But the network programs, with their "Beulahs," Allens, Jack Bennys, show us what *is* done. Since radio will not take its own tolerance messages seriously, why should the audience? Can a jingle, with an exhortative appeal, replace F.E.P.C., anti-lynch legislation, the demand to end the quota system in colleges?

Radio has carried the attack on minorities to another front with its systematic curtailment of foreign language programs. WNJR, New Jersey, (formerly WBYN, Brooklyn), has cancelled many foreign language broadcasts. WBNX, of the Bronx, has announced a similar policy. WJBK of Detroit cancelled many language programs in 1947, and attempted to cancel approximately 50 more in 1948. A court order restrained the station from going through with these cancellations until the termination of contracts in October 1948. Although language programs contributed materially to the war effort, the trend to drive them off the air continues unabated. Eugene Konecky, secretary of the Peoples Radio Foundation, has said:

"The blackout of foreign language radio programs threatens to undermine democracy in the United States and to erect barriers which prevent the free flow of ideas and the promotion of friendship with democratic European nations. In American homes one out of every five persons speaks a foreign language. More than ten million radio listeners depend upon foreign language programs. Unless we halt this trend toward eliminating foreign language programs, millions of Americans will be deprived of the cultural and informational sources which these programs provide. Is it not significant that at the very time when we are stepping up American shortwave propaganda to Italy, Czechoslovakia, the U.S.S.R., Poland and Yugoslavia, we are lowering an electronic curtain on domestic foreign-language broadcasts? If the radio monopolists get away with this attack on free speech and civil rights, the foreign language press will be next in line for a similar attack, along with the labor press and labor broadcasting programs and stations." (*The American Communications Conspiracy*.)

Radio's approach to minorities in its programs is reflected in its employment policies. Of the 4,000 radio engineers

BOB LAUTER is radio columnist for the *Daily Worker*.

in the United States, not one is a Negro. No New York network or station employs a Negro writer. The 200 Negroes whom the industry employs nationally are mainly manual and custodial workers.

Mr. Leon D. Schooler of Roosevelt College, Chicago, an institution with an enrollment of some 4,000 students of whom 20 percent are Negroes, reported that only one Negro signed up for work in the Radio Workshop. Mr. Schooler queried other Negro students to ask why this was so. The answer was simple and obvious. Negro students pointed out that there was little use in acquiring skills which they would not be permitted to use after graduation.

In the light of these facts, consider a recently concluded series of programs aimed against group prejudice. The sponsor was none other than the Advertising Council of America. The hypocrisy of this is astounding. Will the members of the Council submit to the public a list of Negroes employed by firms whom they represent? Will the Council tell the public how many advertising agencies are automatically closed to Jews?

The networks might also tell us why Negroes are not allowed to play straight roles in radio dramas. The excuse for jimcrow on the stage—that the color difference would appear incongruous—can not be applied to radio. Why can't a Negro play the role of a Mr. or a Mrs. in a soap opera, of George Washington as well as George Washington Carver, of Jefferson as well as Douglass?

Consider these top radio shows: Jack Benny, Fred Allen,

Eddie Cantor, Danny Thomas, *Beulah*, *Amos 'n' Andy*, *Can You Top This?*, *Stop Me If You've Heard This One*. Everyone of these, and more, offers the propaganda of racism disguised as humor. The serious commentators, and such pseudo discussion programs as *America's Town Meeting*, round out the attack by presenting the outright program of Wall Street imperialism which is becoming increasingly indistinguishable from fascism.

Unfortunately, the listening audience has not been vocal enough in challenging radio's attempt to degrade the American people with the racial philosophy of fascism. Such an organization as the *Voice of Freedom Committee*, whose chairman is Dorothy Parker, needs more active support. Listeners, as well as the economic organizations of radio workers, must insist that characterizations which insult minorities and entire nations be swept off the air.

Small stations which have shown a willingness to fight for genuine equality would do well to scrap the tolerance program in favor of jingles or spot announcements that urge the passage of such legislation as F.E.P.C., anti-lynching bills and the end of tax exemption for schools applying the quota system. Appeals for action must take the place of appeals to conscience.

The airwaves are public domain. If we fail to express our fighting opposition to the caricatures by which radio insults millions of Americans, we must bear the responsibility for our own silence. Otherwise Wall Street will continue to misuse the very air we breathe.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JEWISH CULTURE IN AMERICA

By Moise Katz

JEWISH culture can be defined as the sum total of spiritual values, such as speech, literature, art, scholarship, religion, customs, ways of life, that the Jewish masses create in the course of their lives. Obviously, just as the Jews are not separated by an iron wall from the non-Jewish neighbors with whom they live and work, so Jewish culture is not cut off from relations with and influences from the surrounding non-Jewish cultures to which Jews make rich individual and collective contributions.

Jewish culture, like all others, has progressive and reactionary elements. The first helps our people to move forward, hand in hand with the progressive elements of the non-Jewish people, toward a better and finer life. The second pulls our people back to the past and at best congeals our people into the obsolete forms of life and ideals of the past.

Modern, progressive, secular Jewish culture is the culture of the Jewish toiling masses, through which they compre-

MOISE KATZ is an outstanding Yiddish journalist and cultural figure. He is a member of the editorial staff of the *Morning Freiheit*.

hend the world around them, and make their contribution to it. This culture is liberated from religious concepts and is based on a scientific social outlook. It is Jewish because it is being expressed in forms and ideas of Jewish life.

In the last 50 to 75 years, progressive secular Jewish culture was expressed primarily in Yiddish. Most of the Jewish masses of the world, who had lived until World War I in eastern Europe, or had emigrated from that part of the world and had created new and compact Jewish communities outside of Europe, used Yiddish in daily life and creative work. For the last-half century Yiddish has also been the main language of the Jewish revolutionary masses, of their press, organized labor movement and intellectuals. They continued to use Yiddish from the first socialist meetings in the "old country" up to the barricades of the Warsaw ghetto and to the most recent concentration camps in Germany and to the Soviets of Birobidjan.

Our Jewish culture in America is bound by a thousand threads to the culture of the east-European Jews, especially of the Russian-Polish, Galician and Rumanian Jews, who comprised the largest part of the wave of Jewish immigra-

tion to America since the 70's of the last century. But in its essence the Jewish culture in America is primarily an American product, the fruit of the whole stormy development of the Jewish masses in America. It would therefore be a great mistake to consider American Jewish culture as a fragment of the "old-world" culture, as something imported unchanged from Europe, as a culture without its local roots, and therefore able to persist only as long as it is nourished by the "old country."

The opposite is nearer to the truth. The five million strong American Jewish community, historically still quite young, is already large and deeply rooted. It is capable of creating its own cultural values. The halting of Jewish mass immigration 25 years ago stabilized and accentuated the local character of American Jewish culture, just as, for example, the ending of mass British immigration helped to crystallize the American, Canadian and Australian cultures, without completely tearing them away from their English roots.

Three Waves of Immigration

But Jewish life in America did not begin with the Russian-Polish immigration. The American Jewish community was built by three waves of immigration: the Sephardic Jews who came here 300 years ago; the German Jews who arrived here in the second and third quarters of the 19th century; and the Eastern European Jews (Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, and partly also Rumanian and Hungarian) who came to America during the great mass migrations in the 50 years between the seventies of the last century and the first world war. Although Portuguese-Jewish immigration can not be compared in numbers with the German-Jewish, which in its turn was much smaller than the later Russian-Polish wave, all three waves struck deep roots in America. Each wave influenced the American Jewish community in its own way with its contributions and cultural heritage.

The Portuguese Jews were small in number and represented a mercantile group, which rapidly came into the closest cultural contact with the wealthier American bourgeoisie. They founded the first organized Jewish communities in America, and gave to communal Jewish life an unmistakable religious coloring which it maintains to this day.

The German Jewish mass immigration, which began in the twenties of the nineteenth century, brought to America an element which had lost touch with the old Jewish culture, but which was not integrated in German culture except in language. These German Jews, among whom were relatively few workers or handicraftsmen, fitted quickly into the American middle class group and advanced to middle and big business. They were assimilationist in tendency and mode of life. If they did not quickly melt into the surrounding population, it was because their path was blocked by religious traditions and perhaps even more

by the fact that the German Jewish immigrant masses were already too large for the American bourgeoisie to be absorbed without noticing or resisting them. As a result the German-Jewish immigration was compelled to evolve a Jewish communal life, built formally around the synagogue, but practically around philanthropy and initial forms of defense of Jewish rights and interests. The German-Jewish immigrants showed much energy and ability in communal and philanthropic organization. This organization was already in existence at the beginning of the mass immigration of east European, Yiddish-speaking Jews. It therefore had a strong influence on the communal cultural life of the broad Jewish masses.

The East European Flood

The third, the east-European flood of Jewish immigration to the United States took on a mass character in the middle of the seventies, increased during the eighties and the first half of the nineties. It became even broader between 1903 and 1917 (and for a few years after the first world war). It differed from the Portuguese-Jewish and German-Jewish waves in several important respects. First of all, its mass character quickly enlarged the Jewish community in the United States to the millions and raised national group problems even before the newcomers could fit into their new conditions. Secondly, it brought here hundreds of thousands of Jewish workers and handicraftsmen, many with a militant past, who had to find work in American industry. Third, east-European Jews brought with them a ramified, although somewhat provincial Jewish culture which they soon began to develop on the new basis. Fourth, the fully developed Yiddish language that the east-European Jews brought along with them helped to bind them into their own Jewish community while maintaining close cultural ties with the countries from which they came.

The great east-European Jewish migration for some time brought over quite a number of intellectuals, old and young, who began to create new forms of Jewish cultural life. They used both their heritage from the old country and the new elements they found here.

It was not surprising that immigrants and the second generation of the east-European Jews who became bourgeois in America, should at first try to identify themselves with the old bourgeois German Jews who had done well in the United States. They adopted from the German Jews vulgar bourgeois assimilationism, formal temple-Judaism, and underestimation of Yiddish language and culture. It is indisputable that the influence of this new Jewish bourgeoisie—the *allrightniks*—had an anti-national, anti-progressive, generally reactionary effect on Jewish American life.

But the large masses of Jewish toilers, especially in the shops, tried from the very start to identify themselves with the American working class, with its intellectuals, with the progressive forms of American culture. Because of their

pressing daily problems they tried to create their own Jewish American cultural forms and values. The achievements of the Jewish working masses in America in this respect cannot be overestimated. In the course of some three or four decades the Jewish workers in America created a progressive Yiddish press, a modern Yiddish literature, a Yiddish theater, large Jewish cultural organizations, mighty unions and fraternal organizations that devoted much of their energies to the spread of culture in Yiddish, and at last to the first children's schools in Yiddish. Many Yiddish poets, novelists, journalists, scholars, popularizers of social and natural sciences, dramatists, actors, painters and other artists appear and develop in American soil. A bright constellation arose of early Yiddish proletarian poets like Morris Winchevsky, Joseph Bovshover, David Edelshtadt, Morris Rosenfeld, Yehoash, A. Liessin, A. Gordin and Leon Kobrin; thinkers and writers like Jacob Milch, Dr. Hyman Zhitlowsky and Moissaye Olgin find a field for their activity in the United States. Literary schools and tendencies arise among "youth" like Moshe Leib Halpern, Isaac Raboy and others, a movement of proletarian writers and many other artists who lived among us, and whose number, unfortunately, is too great to list here. There are the writers transplanted in America like Sholom Aleichem, Sholom Asch, Abraham Reisin, David Pinski. In fact, every immigrant Jewish writer, poet, actor, musician, painter and scholar entered into a flourishing American Jewish cultural scene.

The first great Jewish artists, who were also idealists, socialist dreamers, propagandists and organizers, personally organized or through their writing helped to organize the Jewish workers for a better life and to spread enlightenment among them. They stimulated culture and the feeling of solidarity with the whole Jewish people and with the entire working class. These artists left their ineradicable stamp on the development of our younger modern Jewish culture and gave it the progressive character that it now has.

The "Allrightnik" Influence

Naturally the Jewish labor movement and its intellectuals were not made of one cloth. Significant sections of the Jewish intellectuals and workers fell under the influence of the bourgeoisie, of the *allrightniks*. Through the American Jewish press and theater they spread the vulgar and anti-cultural *shund* (hokum) which destroys the institutions that it infects. Out of the American Jewish labor movement the Jewish daily *Forward* grew like a cancer. This paper has become the backbone, preacher, defender and disseminator of everything reactionary in Jewish life.

Together with the *Forward*, the nationalist elements of the Jewish bourgeoisie fight progressive Jewish culture by promoting the use of Hebrew as against Yiddish. There are also elements who glorify Yiddish and make it an end in itself, regardless of content. These people actually turn Yiddish into a weapon of reaction. They seek not only

to split the ranks of the Yiddish-speaking cultural masses, but also consciously to ignore the actual bi-lingualism of the Jewish national group in America. They thereby help to deepen the harmful cleavage between Yiddish and English speaking Jews.

The approach of these groups to Jewish culture and to Yiddish inhibited the building of Jewish culture in America. The Jewish immigrant masses systematically lost most of their creative and professional intellectuals, who tried to integrate themselves with Anglo-American culture. The "Americanized" Jewish intellectuals became spiritually impoverished because they severed not only their natural bonds with the masses from whom they sprang and whom they had the responsibility of leading. They lost continuity with their Jewish cultural heritage, and thus weakened their creativity.

The cultural impoverishment of the Jewish masses in America that followed desertion by their intellectuals, increasingly limited Yiddish literature to the song and the short story despite the available talent; translations practically disappeared from Jewish publication lists and the Yiddish speaking audience was thus isolated from the broad stream of American and world literature. The old forms of the Yiddish theater froze, and its content was even less lively than that of this theater 30 and 40 years ago. With few exceptions, this theater almost completely lost its progressive social content and the function of a progressive institution in Jewish life that it filled at the beginning of the century. The Jewish private publishing business has practically died, Yiddish radio programs and Yiddish phonograph recordings are with few exceptions on a horribly low level; the Yiddish press has ceased to grow and periodicals have shrunk miserably; the progressive Yiddish children's schools suffer from a shortage of qualified teachers even more than from a shortage of pupils.

Torn from sources of Jewish creation and from our great cultural heritage, the English speaking Jewish youth and intellectuals were content with a sort of *ersatz* Jewishness, when they thought of their Jewishness at all. They acquired this weak substitute in religious and semi-religious institutions although they themselves were not religious, and in the various nationalist (often extreme chauvinistic) organizations, though they were not themselves nationalists.

Signs of change for the better have appeared. The great catastrophe in Jewish life since the appearance of fascism and nazism; the anti-fascist struggle and the fight against anti-Semitism into which the best elements of American Jewish youth were drawn (recall the Lincoln Battalion in Spain!); the recent world war and the bestial extermination of a third of the Jewish people through bloody nazi barbarism; the growing wave of anti-Semitism in the United States—all these profoundly touched the broadest Jewish masses, both Yiddish speaking and English speaking, and compelled them to take stock of their prospects for the future and their responsibilities to their own people.

The dramatic struggle for Jewish statehood and for the organization of a modern Jewish nation in Palestine, and

the building of the Birobidjan Jewish Autonomous Region under Soviet power, have created a great and growing unity between hitherto sharply divided Jewish cultural elements. This unity was based on material and political aid for the Jewish masses abroad, on united Jewish defense against the attack of reaction in America, and also on mutual cultural interests and cooperation between the Yiddish speaking and English speaking Jews in America. The increasing interest of Anglo-Jewish writers and readers in Jewish themes, the new interest of the Jewish Welfare

Board in Jewish cultural activity, the growing popularity of the tri-lingual (English, Yiddish, Hebrew) Book Month, the rapid growth of the English speaking membership in the Jewish People's Fraternal Order, the warmer interest which American-born English speaking Jewish mothers are beginning to display in the organization of progressive children's schools in Yiddish—all these are important signs of the times. These are signs of rapprochement between the two main groups of the American Jewish people that should in time contribute much to Jewish cultural life.

A JEWISH OFFICER'S STORY

By Colonel David Dragunsky

MR. Drew Middleton, the American newspaperman, is not a novice at anti-Soviet fabrications. He displayed no passion for the truth when he was a correspondent in Moscow. But his latest anti-Soviet effusion certainly takes the cake.

Middleton insinuates that there exists national discrimination in Russia; he says that Jews are kept out of universities and colleges, that demobilized Jewish officers are given worse jobs than those they held before the war, etc.

One can only wonder where Mr. Middleton got the idea for these flimsy fabrications. He certainly cannot claim to have witnessed any manifestations of anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. Honest Americans who have visited our country know the truth. They can see for themselves that in the Soviet Union there is no trace of, and no room for, national or racial discrimination, anti-Semitism and other vices inherent in bourgeois society.

My own experiences—the experiences of a Jewish officer of the Soviet Army—give the lie to Mr. Middleton's assertions.

I am 38 years of age. I was born in the town of Svyatsk, Bryansk Region. My father was a tailor. There were nine of us in the family, and before the Revolution of 1917 we lived in poverty and could not dream of an education.

It was the Soviet system that enabled our family and hundreds of thousands of other poverty-stricken families to start life anew.

All my brothers and one sister were graduated from high school and some of them received a college education. My brother Zelig attended the Moscow Chemical Machinery Institute; my sister Haya was graduated from a teachers' college in Novozybkov; my brother Mikhail studied at a Textile Institute, and Shevel was graduated from a tank school and became an army officer. I also joined the army.

The war brought the Soviet people countless sufferings. The German barbarians shot my father and mother, a grandfather who was 79 years old, my grandmother, 75 years of age, and my sisters and their children. Altogether

they murdered 74 of my relatives. My brothers died fighting for their country. Lieutenant Mikhail Dragunsky, a tankman, was 22 years old when he was killed in the battle of Kharkov. My brother Zelig, a sergeant major, fell near Lvov. My brother Shevel died while fighting for the liberation of Poland.

I myself was severely wounded five times. I began the war in the rank of senior lieutenant. My unit fought all the way from Moscow to Prague. All my comrades fought bravely. There were among them Russians, Uzbeks, Turkmenians, Georgians, Jews, Armenians, Ukrainians, Kazakhs, Kirghiz and representatives of other Soviet nationalities. We fought in the battles for the liberation of the Ukraine and Poland, stormed Berlin, and liberated the Czechoslovak capital, Prague.

We were all fired by a passionate love for our country, we all felt ourselves sons of one great Motherland.

By 1943 I had been promoted to the rank of lieutenant colonel and was put in command of a tank brigade. In a battle west of Kiev my tank was hit and I was gravely wounded. The tank caught fire and it seemed that I was doomed. But my comrades, Sergeant Georgi Gazoshvili, a Georgian, and the tank driver Ibrahim Mingalejev, a Tatar, came to my rescue and saved me at the risk of their own lives.

The Soviet Government decorated me with 17 Orders and medals. The title Hero of the Soviet Union was conferred on me twice, and this year a bronze bust of me is to be put up in my home town, Svyatsk. In 1945 I was invited, along with other officers, generals, soldiers and marshals of the Soviet Army, to attend a celebration in the Kremlin in honor of victory.

At present I attend a military academy. Among my fellow students at the Academy are a number of other Jewish war veterans: Ruvim Lapp, Wolfman, Berlin, to name but a few.

What do these facts leave of Mr. Middleton's allegations? Nothing. They show that Middleton's assertions are all pure fabrications. Their purpose is to poison the minds of people in preparation for a new war. But the Middletons will not succeed in sowing enmity among the peoples.

This article is reprinted from *USSR Information Bulletin* for April 28, 1948.

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE AND FOREIGN POLICY

Last of a Series

By Louis Harap

WE have traced the pattern of American Jewish Committee activity on the domestic scene and have found it to be dominated by big business interests in the Jewish community. How does the pattern work out in relation to foreign affairs?

In the past few years the AJC has attempted to function like a division of international Jewish affairs of our State Department. The intimate relations of the two can be judged from the following statement of Dr. John Slawson, AJC executive vice-president, made in 1947: "We (that is, the AJC—L.H.) are intensifying our contacts with the State Department on the various levels of professional service rendered by that Department. We feel it important that the Committee have contacts not only with the Secretary of State and the Undersecretary of State, but also with the heads of various divisions such as the Near Eastern Division, Western European Division, etc."

AJC foreign policy has been guided by its big business objectives as these apply in the area of Jewish world affairs. This policy has had to be accommodated to the enormous groundswell of national feeling that has moved American Jewry in the past decade. The AJC has acted as a faithful apologist for the State Department, but in such demagogic fashion as to avoid isolating itself from the Jewish masses. The AJC has tried not to depart too far—verbally, at least—from the positive position on Jewish issues taken by the mass of Jewry. At the same time, the AJC has cleverly not lost sight of its class interests and anti-communist, anti-Soviet aims.

Post-war activities of the AJC have fallen in with the imperialist, anti-democratic drive of the bipartisan administration. At the Paris Peace Conference in 1946 the AJC led other Jewish organizations in supporting the adoption of clauses in the treaties with Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria of guarantees of Jewish rights in those countries. In the actual circumstances, however, this admirable objective tended to defeat its purpose by working in with anti-democratic forces at the conference. It was a fact that in these ex-nazi satellite countries broad democratic regimes had been set up. Furthermore, in these countries anti-Semitism had been outlawed—which was not true even of the allied victors, except the Soviet Union. The AJC was not perturbed by support of its proposals by that great "defender" of Jewish rights, Great Britain. The French Jewish journalist, A. Raisky, characterized the inclusion of such points in the treaty as "degrading" to these central European countries and as "an instrument for reactionary intervention" supported by "anti-democratic (conference) delegates who were concerned not with the Jewish people but with their

own imperialist interests." The past few years have shown who were the friends of the Jewish people—the United States and Britain, or the Soviet Union and the eastern democracies.

Soldiers in the Cold War

The AJC has allied itself with the State Department in the cold war. For about six months in 1947 David Bernstein toured Europe to survey the field and establish contacts for the AJC. "For most Europeans," said Bernstein on his return in July, 1947, "Secretary Marshall's recent speech at Harvard (announcing the Marshall Plan—L.H.) was a shot in the arm. It was interpreted as a dramatic, and perhaps a decisive, challenge to European vision and initiative. Out of it can come, if Europe's leaders have the courage to accept the challenge, a real program of reconstruction and stabilization, and incidentally a lessening of the tensions which produce anti-Semitism." How a program that attempts to rebuild a reactionary Germany and involves strengthening reactionary and fascist forces in Europe can help to "lessen the tensions which produce anti-Semitism," the AJC has not explained to this day.

About the same time Dr. John Slawson returned from Europe and reported that anti-Semitism was increasing in Germany and that the occupation authorities were failing to democratize the American zone. "If we build up Germany materially at the present time without doing a complete spiritual and educational and reorganization job, we are building a Frankenstein monster who will infect and menace the world." But while Slawson charged that our military government was "re-nazifying" Germany, he whitewashed the administration by charging that the cut in the military government budget by Congress was responsible for the failure. He further placed responsibility for the situation in the laps of the American people for not insisting on a larger budget. In other words, while Slawson could not ignore the dangers of the German situation, he took pains to absolve officialdom of responsibility.

But it is in the AJC's position on Palestine in the past few years that the AJC alliance with the imperialists and reactionaries has emerged most clearly.

The AJC has tended to identify all Jewish national aspirations with aggressive nationalistic action. While it has refrained from fighting against British and American oil imperialism and Truman doctrinism in Palestine, the AJC has condemned Jewish "nationalism" there. AJC "theoretician" Dr. John Slawson recently wrote: "Someone asked me once how much of our budget is spent on fighting Jew-

ish nationalism. I answered: '100 per cent of our budget is spent on fighting all nationalism and a goodly portion of it in fighting Jewish nationalism.' Everything we do is anti-nationalist. . . . Every one of our publications is, in effect, a statement against Jewish nationalism." This statement is a mixture of foggy, unscientific thinking about the legitimacy of Jewish democratic-national aspirations and is a manifestation of AJC assimilationism.

Specter of "Dual Allegiance"

For the big business minds of the AJC have been haunted by the specter that support of a Jewish state in Palestine involves them in the charge of reactionaries that this signifies a "dual allegiance" of Jews to the United States and Palestine. Before 1943, when the whole line of the AJC received a new coat of varnish, the AJC made no bones about its non-support of a Jewish state on this ground. This "double loyalty" argument stems from an assimilationist attitude. Other national groups in the United States who maintained their interest in and aid to the liberation struggles of their land of origin—the Irish, for instance—did not have to apologize for this attitude or contend with a "double loyalty" charge. No one seriously challenges Irish-Americans' pride in their heritage of centuries of the fight for freedom in their land of origin and their fervent support of this struggle. However, in the case of American Jews, anti-Semitism and the disabilities consequent upon identification with the Jewish people in our dominantly Anglo-Saxon culture, led many Jews to reject their Jewish origin. Many Jews protested that interest in the building of a Jewish state interfered with their effort to identify themselves with non-Jews in order to escape these disabilities. These Jews tried to obliterate every difference with non-Jews except the religious difference. This position has been maintained in organized form in the past few years by the American Council for Judaism, offshoot of the AJC¹ which the parent organization now verbally rejects for the purpose of retaining a hold on the Jewish community. The Council is today the foremost organized exponent of the "double loyalty" argument against the Jewish state.

Since 1943, when the AJC discarded the "dual allegiance" argument against a Jewish state in Palestine, its spokesmen have included the denial of "double allegiance" in policy statements on Palestine. There is, of course, nothing wrong with denying dual allegiance. What is objectionable, is the assimilationist use to which it is put, namely, to frighten Jews away from support of Jewish national aspirations. In Judge Joseph M. Proskauer's presidential address at the 41st annual meeting in January 1948, he once more reaffirmed the 1943 statement that "there can be no political identification of Jews outside Palestine with whatever

government may there be instituted."² . . . We have not, we cannot have and will not have any political fealty except to our own America." Methinks the gentleman doth protest too much. This defensive attitude shows that the AJC position has not basically changed. And after the State of Israel was proclaimed, both the AJC and the Council for Judaism hastened to disclaim "double loyalty."

Let us examine AJC policy during the last few turbulent years of the Palestine problem. Despite the fact that the role of imperialism in Palestine has been made plain to any child in the past year, the AJC has largely ignored this fact. Instead of putting the major blame on British and American imperialism for the difficulties of Arab-Jewish rapprochement in Palestine, the AJC throws the burden on Jewish "nationalism." Britain has encouraged the most reactionary trends among the Arab and Jewish peoples in Palestine to the point where reconciliation has become extremely hard. But it is not enough to express pious, vague generalities about Arab rights in Palestine as can be found in AJC statements: it is necessary to fight against the imperialist inspirers of disunity. In 1947, for instance, the AJC affirmed that "there is no irreconcilable conflict between the interests of Arabs and Jews in Palestine." The "ultimate solution" to the problem requires "complete fairness to Arabs and Jews alike, which will guarantee to every Palestinian complete political equality." And how did the AJC propose to bring this about? By an appeal to the *mandatory* power, which has for nearly 30 years deliberately fomented Jewish-Arab antagonism. No other alternative was offered.

No Criticism

Judge Proskauer testified on behalf of the AJC before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine in Washington in January 1946. He there advocated a trusteeship under UN auspices, as well as immediate entry of displaced persons into Palestine and other countries. But Proskauer sycophantically disclaimed criticism of Britain. Although he appealed to Britain to "modify that White Paper (of 1939)," he added, "I am not one of those who speak in this connection of 'perfidious Albion.'" Proskauer quoted a statement by Henrietta Szold to the effect that Britain had thwarted all attempts at cooperation between Arab and Jew, but he thought this was "immaterial" in the present situation. British Commissioner Justice Singleton later referred to this allusion by saying that if a case of a Briton stifling cooperation were brought to light, the offender would not remain in British service. Proskauer thought this a "very heartening assurance," although he affirmed that he "had not the slightest knowledge or infor-

¹ President and moving spirit of the American Council for Judaism is Lessing J. Rosenwald, who is also a member of the administrative committee of the AJC. Publicity man for the Council is Sidney Wallach, an AJC staff executive for many years, who sketched pretty completely the Council program in a secret official AJC memorandum in 1941, while he was still employed by the AJC.

² In a letter to the *New York Times* dated January 23, 1948, Lessing J. Rosenwald wrote, "In the main, I write to support the central theme" of the above quotation from Proskauer. Rosenwald then goes on to criticize the consistency of Proskauer's whole policy statement with the sentence quoted. Actually, the difference between Proskauer and Rosenwald is that the latter represents the extreme right which is far away from the Jewish people as a whole, while Proskauer represents the right which is realistic enough not to isolate itself from the Jewish people. But in essence their position is the same. The difference is one of tactic only.

mation" about such attempts. If this profession of ignorance is genuine, Proskauer's competence to direct policy of an important Jewish organization is open to grave doubt. In any case, this ignorance falls in suspiciously with AJC policy of cooperation with imperialism.

Obedient Servants

Let us follow the AJC reactions to the UN handling of the Palestine problem during the Special UN Assembly Session that began on April 15, 1947. The AJC followed State Department policy slavishly. The AJC agreed that the session should limit itself to procedural questions, as the United States and Britain insisted. Neither did the AJC join the protest against these delegations' reluctance to allow the Jewish Agency to act as spokesman for the Jewish people. The wave of popular indignation forced the Assembly by May 5 to allow the Agency to speak for the Jews at the Political and Security Committee. In reply to sharp criticism of the American position at the UN proceedings, Judge Proskauer on May 2 issued a statement defending the State Department. With colossal impudence he said that the AJC "is confident that it voices the almost unanimous opinion of all American Jews, Zionists and non-Zionists alike" in dissenting from this criticism. Proskauer added that "the action of the American representatives gives no basis for such criticism. On the contrary . . . thus far our representatives have tactfully and efficiently handled a delicate situation."

A revealing AJC action occurred on the eve of the historic partition recommendation of the UN Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP). In a memorandum submitted to UNSCOP the AJC strongly urged that no "ultimate" solution for the Palestine problem be projected. The AJC advocated trusteeship for Palestine under the UN, a plan strikingly similar to that advanced by U. S. delegate Warren Austin, to the dismay and disgust of all, after the U. S. renounced partition in March 1948. And as the power to be responsible for the administration of Palestine under the suggested trusteeship, the AJC nominated Britain.

If UNSCOP thought an "ultimate" solution immediately necessary, the AJC statement said reluctantly, partition seemed the best arrangement. But the AJC vastly preferred a scheme which would keep the *Yishuv* and all of Palestine tightly clutched in the imperialist hands of Britain, behind the whitewashed mummery of a UN trusteeship.

When UNSCOP submitted its reports, the AJC telegraphed State Secretary George C. Marshall on September 11, 1947 its approval of the Majority Report. During the ensuing debate in the UN Assembly the AJC continued to curry favor with the State Department. On October 21, while the United States position on partition was still far from unequivocal, Proskauer expressed "full confidence in the intention of the United States Government to obtain a practical form of implementing the partition plan" (*New York Times*, October 22, 1948). He approved the U.S. proposal for an international constabulary to police Pales-

tine—an evasive proposal that was quickly dropped by the UN. After the partition decision was reached, the AJC issued a statement on December 1, 1947 hailing the decision and calling it a "vindication of the wisdom, skill and energy of the American delegation and of our State Department." The statement also thanked by name President Truman, Secretary Marshall, Undersecretary Robert A. Lovett and others for this. There was not one word of the decisive part played by the Soviet Union and the new democracies in making the decision possible.

Marshall Plan Above All

By now the cold war against world democracy and the Soviet Union had become warmer. As might be expected, the AJC swallowed the Marshall Plan whole. The 41st annual meeting of the AJC in January 1948 was one continuous eulogy of the Marshall Plan. The meeting brought up the big guns of General Omar N. Bradley, who advocated the "European Recovery Program" without naming it, and James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, who hypocritically urged the implementation of the Marshall Plan "without political strings." Dr. John Slawson said that the success of the Marshall Plan was "basic to the preservation of civil rights in western Europe." Full approval of ERP was expressed by former Governor Herbert H. Lehman, speaking before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 24, 1948 on behalf of the AJC. ERP, said Lehman, was needed to avert the rise "of police states whether of the right or of the left," which represent "a threat to our national interest as Americans."

What the Marshall Plan meant for Palestine was soon to become only too obvious. The honeymoon of the partition decision was short-lived. The decision was torpedoed by the Forrestals and the State Department Marshall Planners and the tell-tale film of oil began to appear on the surface for all to see. The tie of the Marshall Plan and aid to the nazi-linked Arab feudalists in the Middle East became ever more embarrassingly apparent. Secretary Marshall himself affirmed the connection between the Plan and denial of a Jewish state in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 24, 1948. The *New York Times* reported that he justified the betrayal of the partition decision by maintaining that "success of the whole vast program for aiding Europe was a compelling factor in the turnabout of the United States on Palestine" (March 25, 1948). As usual the AJC, as a big business organ should be, was indifferent to the sinister implications of the plan not only for the Jews of Palestine, but also for Jews all over the world.

In March 1948, as the world will never forget, the United States delegation to the UN betrayed the Jews and the UN by its proposal to scrap partition in favor of a "trusteeship." On March 28 the AJC issued a formidable statement in its usual pompous and highly diplomatic language deploring the reversal of the U.S. position. But several revealing elements appeared in the statement. The AJC put the burden

of blame for the crisis on Arab warfare and called on the UN to suppress "Arab violence and aggression." Nowhere a word about British or American complicity in this violence, as indeed the AJC has never recognized the existence of imperialistic action in Palestine or elsewhere. Not a word about the brutal influence of American oil interests, which was now transparent. The AJC called for the "exercise of reason and restraint." Although the AJC favored the carrying out of partition, it left the door open to acquiescence to the changed position by its emphasis on Arab violence alone. This emphasis allied the AJC with the U.S. attempt to scrap partition in favor of a "truce" proposal that would prevent the proclamation of a Jewish state.

However, one new element turned up in this statement. So far as I know, the AJC has never once in a public statement on Palestine even mentioned the Soviet Union and the new democracies. The AJC was applying the "silent treatment" to the central role these countries were playing in the drama of Palestine. But the statement of March 28 broke the silence, though in negative fashion, by urging the need for Palestine to be oriented on the west. The AJC posed the "danger" that the failure of United States leadership in the UN to stop "Arab violence and aggression" would persuade the Jews in Palestine that they "have been deserted by the democratic nations. The consequences of that, we submit, would be injurious to the national interests of the United States, to the United Nations and to the peace of the world. It is vital that the governments which will arise in Palestine should be favorable to the democratic nations." No mention of the naughty words "Soviet Union," "eastern democracies" or "communism."

The AJC position was therefore in essence no different from that of Secretaries Marshall and Forrestal, who insisted on reversal of partition on the grounds of our "national interests." A few days before the proclamation of the State of Israel, Joseph Brainin wrote in a widely-syndicated column what was common knowledge of any student of the AJC. "Strenuous efforts are being made," he wrote, "by leaders of the American Jewish Committee to get the Jewish Agency to play ball with the U.S. government on the new formula of temporary trusteeship. Notwithstanding the 'major statement on Palestine' issued by the American Jewish Committee several weeks ago, the

AJC leaders are terribly worried about the possibility of the Jewish Agency definitively rejecting the U.S. Palestine solution. We are informed that the key figure in the present political moves of the U.S. on the Palestine question is Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, president of the American Jewish Committee. Our State Department and our delegation to the UN find it easiest to talk with him." The State of Israel came into being in spite of the attempted bipartisan betrayal and the readiness of the AJC to abet the betrayal at the end.

Thus we have seen how AJC policy on international issues in the past few years has consistently, though deviously, supported bipartisan imperialistic objectives. The AJC has done its utmost to make this anti-democratic world policy palatable to the Jewish community. The AJC was obliged to make certain concessions to the overwhelming mass Jewish sentiment for a Jewish state in Palestine, so as to carry out its main reason for being, namely, to act as a brake on democratic expression in Jewish life and to aspire to direct Jewish life along AJC big business class interests. The AJC therefore approved the UN partition decision, which really went against its grain.

While events of the past year have pitilessly exposed the imperialist nature of our bipartisan foreign policy, most obviously in the case of Palestine, the AJC has given fullest support to this dangerous policy which threatens the Jewish people with a repetition of the Hitler era. The AJC has tailed after the State Department, giving way only where the State Department itself has been unable to resist mass pressure, as in the cases of the UN partition decision and recognition of the State of Israel.

Thus we have shown in this series the pervasive AJC pattern. In its all-embracing activity at home and abroad, the AJC has set itself up as a barrier to the democratic development of the Jewish people. We have seen how the AJC has tried to capture oligarchic control of Jewish life; how it has advanced ineffectual plans for fighting anti-Semitism by advocating the hush-hush approach and its disguised variants; how it has tried to smear progressives who are among the most effective fighters for the security of the Jewish people and for democracy itself; and finally, how it has thrown its influence, such as it is, in the direction of putting the Jews in the hands of reactionary forces on the international scene and with respect to Palestine.

The Editors of Jewish Life

take great pleasure in announcing the annual

CULTURAL SUPPLEMENT

to appear in the

Second Anniversary Issue, November 1948

The Editors invite manuscripts of short stories, poetry, drama, criticism and scholarship, and reproductions of works of art. All contributions must be based on Jewish themes. Manuscripts must be limited to a maximum of 2500 words. All contributions must be submitted by August 1.

DOCUMENTS

UN AND THE STATE OF ISRAEL

By Andrei Gromyko

Following is a speech made to the UN General Assembly on May 14, 1948.—Eds.

WHAT is the status of the Palestine question now? We know that the special session is considering this question and has been doing so for four weeks. We know that new proposals were submitted by the Government of the United States in connection with this question, and that these proposals differed from the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 29 November 1947. We know that these novel proposals were subjected to rather careful consideration in the appropriate committee of the General Assembly. We also know that the United States proposals for the establishment of trusteeship over all of Palestine failed of adoption and failed to receive the support upon which the Government of the United States apparently counted when it submitted those proposals. Lastly, we are aware of the fact that the Government of the United States, through its delegation at the General Assembly, at least no longer presses for its original proposals.

That is a positive fact. It proves that the step which was taken, because of certain considerations, by the Government of the United States of America has failed. It may be said that the United States proposals on trusteeship were actually rejected by the overwhelming majority of the members of the General Assembly. Novel proposals were also submitted by the delegation of the United Kingdom—I am referring to the proposal for the establishment of some kind of emergency or temporary regime in Palestine—but I think that many delegations will agree with me when I say that even these proposals of the United Kingdom failed to muster general support in the General Assembly, and it may be considered that these proposals as well have been rejected by the General Assembly.

By virtue of this situation, some days ago the United States of America, with the support of the representatives of some other states, submitted another and still newer proposal for the creation in Palestine of some kind of regime, which cannot be described as the regime contemplated by the United Kingdom proposals and which at the same time cannot be called a trusteeship regime. It is now being called the establishment in Palestine of a medi-

ator, with the appropriate appurtenances and machinery.

However, the USSR delegation wishes to ask this question: Are there any reasons for setting up in Palestine this post of mediator appointed by the United Nations? It is the profound conviction of my delegation that there is no reason to do so if we take into account the present *de facto* situation in Palestine, which is as follows: In Palestine there exists one of the two states contemplated in the decision of the United Nations rendered last November. The Jewish state is in fact in existence. The delegation of the United States has not confirmed for our benefit whether the United States Government has in fact recognized Israel, but even if this is not so, a fact remains a fact. One of the two states provided for in the resolution of the General Assembly of 29 November is in existence in Palestine.

Under these circumstances, the imposition of some kind of temporary regime upon Palestine—a regime which the Government of the United States may consider some kind of vague trusteeship—is unfounded, to say the least, and such a step on the part of the General Assembly would even be insufficiently serious if the members were to take a look at the actual situation in Palestine.

Even if the resolution submitted by the Sub-Committee were to be adopted, everyone would understand that this would not jeopardize the existing decision for the partition of Palestine into two independent states which is still in force. Nevertheless, the delegation of the USSR objects to the adoption of this new resolution because it would merely confuse the situation which prevails at the present time. The adoption of such a resolution would be utilized by the enemies of the United Nations decision for the partition of Palestine with a view to confounding the confusion which already prevails.

For these reasons my delegation cannot accept these novel proposals and will vote against the draft resolution. I should like to call the attention of delegations to the fact that in my opinion we have, in the course of our discussion, lost sight of several aspects of the question. In the first place, we have lost sight of the fact that so far in Palestine there is one state, the Jewish state, but no other state, whereas there was a decision for the establishment of two states. For some reasons which are, may I say, peculiar, the delegations of the Arab states do not consider it possible to

endorse the creation of the new Arab state. Owing to circumstances which are no less peculiar, the Governments of the United States and of the United Kingdom do not consider it proper to support the creation of a new Arab state in Palestine.

After all, however, the United Nations must base itself, first of all, on the interests of Palestine and its people. This was the consideration which was taken into account by the General Assembly when it adopted its decision on 29 November 1947. We are told that the United States and the United Kingdom are greatly concerned to see to it that the struggle between Arabs and Jews in Palestine should come to an end. The delegation of the USSR, however, cannot accept this. The United States and the United Kingdom have done their best to wreck any and all proposals designed to put an end to the struggle between the Arabs and Jews in Palestine. Not a single one of the proposals which were least significant but a little bit effective enjoyed the support of the United States or of the United Kingdom. As a result of this also, Palestine is the scene of carnage. The Arabs and the Jews are paying with their heads and their blood for this situation, the responsibility for which weighs heavily on the shoulders, first of all, of the United States, which undertook this political game directed not only against the interests of the local population of Palestine but also against the interests of the United Nations, because the United States has placed this organization as a whole in a situation which is embarrassing, a situation which, more than that, is ludicrous.

If the information which we have received to the effect that the United States has recognized the Jewish state is correct, what is the situation? With one hand, in the Political Committee and in the General Assembly, the United States is dragging through certain proposals, while with the other hand it is endorsing other plans. This, I submit, is a policy devoid of principle, and one which is directed not only against the interests of the people of Palestine but against those of the United Nations as a whole.

In this respect, the USSR pursued a consistent policy. It based itself, in the first instance, on the interests of the peoples of Palestine. The USSR has no reason to blush for its behavior in the consideration of this question—in contradistinction to the Governments of some other states.

CAMP KINDERLAND

on SYLVAN LAKE
HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.
Modern Progressive Children's Camp of the
Jewish Peoples Fraternal Order
SPORTS — EDUCATION
Registrations Accepted Now
1 Union Square, N. Y. GR. 7-8659

ISRAELI COMMUNISTS HAIL "GREAT DAY"

Following is the statement issued by the central committee of the Communist Party of Israel on the day the Jewish state was proclaimed.—Eds.

THIS is a great day for us. The British mandate, covered with blood, is dead. The Jewish state arises. The British mandate has been annulled by the struggle of the *Yishuv* and with the help of the Soviet Union and the progressive forces of the world. But the fight for independence is not yet finished. There are still the British armies on our soil.

The British sent Abdullah's Arab Legion into action, who are now attacking savagely.

Just as we achieved liquidation of the mandate by a struggle for liberation of

the *Yishuv*, so we will achieve full independence by the mobilization of all the forces of the *Yishuv* for the fight for our freedom.

On our side stands the whole Jewish people. On our side stand all progressive forces. We will fight and we will win.

The proclamation by the government of the Jewish state means a change in the tradition of getting instructions from Washington and London. On this great day, we state we will never accept foreign domination and we will fight for the full evacuation of the British army. As we succeeded in destroying the British mandate, so we will oppose every new attempt at Anglo-American suppression. On this great day we declare we will fight for the freedom of the Arab population and

cooperation with them in our state. We stretch out our hands for agreement with neighboring Arab countries, for their independence means our independence, and we want to stand with them against the common imperialist enemy.

May the Jewish state be the free homeland for all its inhabitants. May the Jewish state be the homeland for working people. Let us build a fighting democratic unity for full independence of our state.

In these fateful days and amid dangers which threaten us, may the *Yishuv* be ready for the defense of our state. Our enemies won't conquer us. The whole *Yishuv* must be united to fight for freedom. Every attack will meet opposition of the whole people.

Long live the Jewish state! Long live our independent democratic state! Glory to the defenders and fighters for independence! Justice is with us. Victory will be ours.

LETTER FROM ABROAD

WARSAW GHETTO MEMORIAL DEMONSTRATION

THE fifth anniversary celebration of the Warsaw ghetto uprising and the unveiling of the great monument in the area of the former ghetto were transformed into a mighty demonstration of the entire Jewish people against the crimes of fascism, against the evil forces of yesterday and today, for peace and friendly collaboration of all freedom-loving peoples.

The ceremonies in Warsaw attracted the attention of all the Jewish communities in the world, especially those of the people's democracies, and of progressive people everywhere. Participating in the ceremonies were 124 delegates of Jewish communities and organizations from the following 21 countries: America, Palestine, Argentina, Uruguay, England, Hungary, Australia, France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, Austria, Italy, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway and China. Representatives of the World Jewish Congress, the Joint Distribution Committee and ORT were present. More than 20,000 Jews from all the cities of Poland also participated.

The scope and character of the demonstration surpassed all expectations. What was demonstrated before the world was the historic continuity of Polish Jewry, its rebirth on a truly democratic basis, the living strength of the creative spirit of the Jewish community of 100,000 in the Poland of the people's democracy, and its bonds with the Jewish people in the whole world.

Especially important is the fact that the demonstration and the unveiling of the memorial were under state sponsorship, and that the Polish democratic government, representatives of the army and Polish political and social organizations participated in the event. Throughout Poland commemoration meetings of Polish people were simultaneously held at which the meaning of the fifth anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising was seen as part of the struggle and resistance against the Hitlerite genocide. It was also emphasized that the ghetto uprising had been the blood contribution of the many-millioned Polish Jewry to Polish freedom and independence, achieved by the victory over fascism of the freedom-loving nations, led by the great Soviet Union.

The Jewish people's demonstration in connection with the ghetto ceremonies at the same time gave foreign visitors the opportunity to compare the false reports, being spread by certain elements in the foreign general and Jewish press about Poland and Jewish life in Poland, with the true facts. For many of the delegates acquaintance with the actual state of the country and of the life of the Jewish people, came as a pleasant surprise. Their own observation convinced them of the tendentious prejudice of the anti-Polish and anti-Jewish propaganda in their countries.

The demonstration and unveiling of the memorial showed them the tie of the Jewish people with the camp of peace and progress, with the people's democratic

states and with the Soviet Union, which will not permit the rebirth of fascism, German imperialist aggression or the enslavement of nations.

The celebration also provided another occasion to demonstrate the fraternal sympathy of the Jewish community in Poland with the bloody, self-sacrificing struggle of the fighting Jewish community in Palestine against imperialist forces and for the realization of the UN decision for an independent, democratic Jewish state in Palestine.

The Jews of Poland, as proud and free citizens of the Polish People's Democratic Republic, understand the importance of this struggle against the imperialist warmongers.

The demonstration was a warning to all Jews and freedom-loving peoples that a new war means our physical annihilation. The Jewish people therefore have a vital concern to strengthen the forces of peace and democracy in all countries.

The Warsaw ceremonies lifted the prestige of the Jewish community in Poland in the eyes of the entire outside world.

At the conclusion of the celebrations a great conference of outstanding Jewish workers in coal mines and in heavy industry—shock-brigaders who had distinguished themselves by achieving production goals—was held. This conference was also a demonstration of the creative character of the Jewish community, of the bonds of the Jewish workers with the finest ideals of the Polish working class, with the Polish people's democracy.

The Jewish workers in Lower Silesia, as in the whole country, played an important part in putting the Jewish community on a productive basis in a democratic Poland.

Their day-to-day work in Lower Silesia, as in Lodz, Krakow, Szczecin and in other cities, which began under the most difficult conditions on the morrow of liberation, made it possible in a comparatively short time for the Jews of Poland to erect a monument which commemorates the millions of victims, and embodies the heroism that has no equal in the history of our people. The great demonstration at the unveiling of the memorial has significantly shown the world that the path taken by the Jewish community in democratic Poland was and remains the only correct one and has gained the best results.

It is especially pleasant to record that the conference in Wroclaw will stimulate the peopling and economic conquest and development of Poland's western provinces. This area is organically united with the whole country and its development provides one of the most important guarantees against the rebirth of German imperialist aggression, for the strengthening of Poland's independence, for peace, freedom and progress.

The first conference of Jewish shock-brigaders in Lower Silesia will help broaden the movement for increased production and will contribute to the inclusion of all Jewish workers in heavy industry and production cooperatives.

The conference was a great demonstration of the growth of class consciousness among the Jewish workers, of their patriotic feeling and organic connection with the Polish working class and the people's democratic state.

The conference was also an expression of greater internal strength, of the belief in the solidarity of the Polish Jewish community, and of its readiness to defeat every effort, wherever it may come, to weaken this community.

The Central Committee of the Jews of Poland expresses hearty thanks to all Jewish organizations and delegations from the aforementioned countries, for participating in the building of the great monument of martyrs and heroes for posterity.

Warsaw

JOEL LAZEBNICK
General Secretary,
Central Committee of
the Jews of Poland

FOR AN IDEAL VACATION CAMP LAKE LAND

HOPEWELL JUNCTION, N. Y.

Phone Hopewell 85

Modern conveniences: Topnotch entertainment • Cultural activities in English and Yiddish • All sports, including swimming and boating • Excellent meals.

Make your reservations now
Moderate rates

Transportation: Frequent trains from Grand Central to Pawling, N. Y.; also by bus from Dixie Terminal.
City Office:

1 UNION SQ., Rm. 408 • GRamercy 7-8659

REVIEWS

PORTRAIT OF AN AMERICAN DIPLOMAT

By Paul Novick

HOW many Polish government leaders are Jews? The former American ambassador in Warsaw, Arthur Bliss Lane, in his book¹ on Poland, is anxious to name them: "Minc, Berman, . . . Radkiewicz, Spychalski" (p. 250).

It so happens that Spychalski, aide to the commander-in-chief of the Polish army, and Radkiewicz, Minister of Security, are not Jews. Either Mr. Lane does not know what he is talking about, or he is fabricating. In any case it is clear that he offers Jewish, or apparently Jewish, names for sinister purposes. And this gives us a key to his book.

Mr. Lane points at this or that person: he's a Jew. The security police, he says, "had . . . many Jews of Russian origin" (p. 251). "The Jews (of Poland) could no longer be considered an economic menace" (p. 251). Apparently in pre-war Poland they were a "menace." He intimates that the pogrom in Krakow in August 1945, was "Soviet-inspired" (p. 252) and then he promptly seeks to whitewash the pogrom by claiming that it was an isolated instance started by "the irresponsible acts of young hoodlums" (p. 252).

Lane uses the same technique in discussing the horrible Kielce pogrom in early July 1946. First he participates in the contemptible frame-up—quoting "independent sources"—that "the pogrom was prepared by the government to provoke difficulties for the opposition, especially among Jewish circles in the United States" (p. 249). Then he offers the theory that the Kielce Jews alone were to blame for the pogrom. According to "Gentile sources" the Jews had arms and, "terrified by the presence of the militia and the gathering of the crowd, had lost their heads and fired in self-defense" (pp. 247-8). Then Lane says that the pogrom was due to the fact that the mob was infuriated by the "falsification of the referendum results," until he offers the final "reasons": there were too many Jews in the government (and he lists the names mentioned above) and there are "Jews of Russian origin" in the security police.

Lane complains against the government for trying the murderers of 40 Kielce Jews by court martial. He stresses that they were civilians—and his demand for justice

for the pogromists becomes somewhat suspicious. But among the indicted were two militiamen, Stefan Masur and Wladislaw Blaczut. Does he not know about this? Why does he complain before he investigates? And how is it possible that he does not know? His representatives, who attended the Kielce trial, reported to him in detail. I myself was present at one such report in Mr. Lane's office in the Polonia Hotel, together with other American correspondents.

These calumnies and falsifications in Mr. Lane's book reveal the character of the man who represented our country in Warsaw—much to our loss and shame.

I emphasize the "Jewish"—more correctly, anti-Semitic—wrinkle in Mr. Lane's book not only because other reviewers have failed to note it, but also because I have a "personal" interest in it, since I was in Warsaw during the Kielce pogrom and several times came into contact with Mr. Lane. His view of the Jewish aspect of the situation in Poland is a key to his attitude in general.

The theme running through the entire book is quite naturally that Roosevelt betrayed Poland. Poland was "sold down the river at Tehran and Yalta," says Lane (p. 219). One chapter is entitled "Yalta—Deathblow to Poland's Hopes." Yet Lane kept struggling with the Polish government supposedly for the fulfillment of the Yalta agreement.

Lane was designated as ambassador to the Polish government-in-exile in London in July 1944, when he was ambassador to Colombia. The Red Army was still on the east bank of the Vistula. But in the American colony of Bogota, Colombia, he informs us, he had received his first lesson on Soviet "imperialism." We shall see that Lane did not need any training in Soviet-baiting.

He left for Washington immediately to receive his instructions. Months passed before Roosevelt met with him. In the meantime he got his cue—from the reactionary leader of the Polish-American Congress, Charles Rozmarek of Chicago. After the elections, on November 20, 1944, Roosevelt saw him.

Lane began with the point that since we now have "the largest army, navy and air force," we should be firm with the Soviet government. In other words, "Get tough." Roosevelt stopped him with, "Do you want me to go to war with Russia?" (p. 66.)

"Mr. Roosevelt," Lane relates, "said that

¹ *I Saw Poland Betrayed*, by Arthur Bliss Lane. Bobbs Merrill, New York, 1948. \$3.50.

he thought Stalin's idea of having a *cordon sanitaire*, in the shape of a Poland under Russian influence, as a bulwark to protect the Soviet Union against further aggression was understandable; Stalin himself had pointed out to the President that after World War I the Allies had formed a *cordon sanitaire* to the east to protect them from the threat of Bolshevism and now he claimed a corresponding right to protect himself from the west" (p. 67).

From Lane's report of what Roosevelt had said, one can imagine what the late president had actually told him about the justice of the Soviet position.

Roosevelt went to Yalta and Lane gave way to despair. When Lane discovered that the Yalta agreement provided that the Curzon Line should become Poland's new eastern border, he burned up. He refused to recognize the agreement. He persists in using the phrase "Molotov-Ribbentrop Line," instead of Curzon Line, in order to obscure the fact that the Allies themselves, after World War I, had established the borders which were "yielded" to the Soviet Union at Yalta.

Roosevelt died several weeks after his return from Yalta. Lane remained ambassador to Poland. But he was so embittered against Yalta and against the Polish government set up in Warsaw, that he could not bear the thought of going to the Polish capitol. He finally went only because "someone" in the State Department warned him that a more friendly person might be appointed in his place (p. 119).

Lane's work in Poland ran somewhat as follows:

1. He constantly advised the State Department not to give Poland loans or aid or even surplus goods that were rotting away. In several instances, even Truman's State Department showed greater consideration for the destroyed country of our Polish ally. Lane was deeply pained over this. He intrigued against UNRRA aid to Poland. When the former chief commissioner of UNRRA, Herbert H. Lehman, refused to pay any attention to Lane, the ambassador was hurt again.

2. He constantly badgered the Polish government about arrested "Americans"—that is, Poles who tried to squirm out of punishment for various misdeeds, both during and after the war, by claiming to be Americans. Lane reports "dreadful" things about arrests and "persecutions," but we have already seen how reliable Lane is. I know personally of one arrest, and this supplies a key to all his tales. An employee of Lane's embassy, Irena A. Dmochowska, was arrested. Lane insists she was innocent. But in August 1946, I was present with other correspondents in the office of the foreign ministry when

Dmochowska's implication in the smuggling of arms to the terrorist gangs was announced. So much for Lane's complaint. In fact, Lane admits that Dmochowska confessed at a public trial, but this really makes no difference to him.

3. Lane himself was on the side of the gangs in Poland through Mikolajczyk, his best friend. (Lane says that Mikolajczyk, who came to Warsaw supposedly to carry out the Yalta decisions as vice-premier of the government, was also opposed to Yalta.) Lane is full of praise of Mikolajczyk, Witos and other leaders of pre-war Poland. Lane calls the former Premier Witos, who was anti-Semitic, "the famed leader," "the revolutionary firebrand." Former Education Minister Grabski, leader of the Polish Democratic (that is, ultra-reactionary) Party, who instituted ghetto benches in the universities, is called "venerable."

All this explains the outlook of Lane. He was a career diplomat for 30 years, beginning after World War I in Poland as secretary of the embassy. How he delights in Pilsudski's Poland! He was little concerned about the condition of the peasant, the worker, the Jew in feudal Poland. After that, Lane represented America in the Baltic states where he apparently completed the anti-Soviet development he had begun with Pilsudski. How could he possibly be pleased with a Poland without the nobility, big industrialists, bankers? Yes—and without opportunities for foreign investments?

We are dealing with an individual who has not begun to understand the popular upsurge of the present period, the social needs of the masses, the situation of the Jews. He was not moved by the extreme suffering of the Polish people after the war. He was undisturbed at the figures that I saw in Warsaw—15,000 democrats murdered by the bands in a single year. The Jewish victims left him unmoved. To him the gangs in the forests were fighters for democracy! Hence his evasiveness in dealing with the Kielce pogrom. I talked to Lane in his office in the Polonia Hotel on July 8, 1946, after I returned from the mass funeral in Kielce. I showed him photographs of the victims of this horrible pogrom—trampled, battered. And what did Lane say about it? "There are a lot of Russians in the security police."

What had that to do with the pogrom? The bands committed the murders "because" there are Jews in the security police. Lane knew that he was speaking to the representative of a Jewish newspaper, therefore he called them "Russians." Now, in his book he repeats the statement of the pogromists, as we have seen.

The "terrible" security police. It does not occur to Lane that in Poland, the regimes of Pilsudski, Witos, Grabski left

REVIEWERS

PAUL NOVICK is the editor of the *Morning Freiheit*. He spent several months in Poland about a year ago.

BEN LEVINE is a member of the staff of the *New York Daily Worker*.

such a heritage of reaction and anti-Semitism that Hitler found it convenient to establish the mass slaughter camps of Treblinka, Maidanek, Oswiecim and many others in Poland involving thousands of reactionary Poles in the slaughter of millions of Jews—as well as many anti-fascist Poles. This reactionary heritage in Poland made a security police imperative in the new country! The pogroms in Krakow and Kielce, the wave of murders of Polish democrats bore testimony to that.

The book gives a portrait of an American diplomat. These are the kind of people being sent abroad to represent our country.

A few more "gems" will complete the portrait. The masses in Warsaw demonstrated on May 1, he says, because there was a check up of participants at the beginning and end of the demonstration. Washington, Lane insists, never uses food as a political weapon. The leader of the communists, vice-premier Gomulka-Vieslav, Lane suggests, did not know that American planes took part in the war in Europe.

The former eastern part of Poland that is now part of the Soviet Union, he declares, is economically more important than lower Silesia, which was ceded to Poland after the war.

In 1946, Lane says (p. 209), Oswiecim was a concentration camp for opponents of the government. I visited Oswiecim at that time—and there's nothing to the tale. The government, he says, announced that 80 per cent had voted for it in the referendum. Actually it had announced 67 per cent. On the one hand, Lane implies that Poland had a government led by Jews, on the other hand, he says, that government permitted Jews to leave because it wanted to get rid of them.

This book, which Lane put together with the aid of the State Department, was published in the interests of "understanding." And this piece of hysterical and anti-Semitic twaddle, full of calumnies and provocations, is being widely circulated!

Subscribe today to JEWISH LIFE

Rates: \$1.50 a year in U.S. and possessions. \$2.00 elsewhere.

ON UPPER CLASS ASSIMILATIONISM

By Ben Levine

LUDWIG LEWISOHN has brought together a story and a play by British writers and a story by a French writer, dealing with anti-Semitism in the upper classes. To this he has added a section from Thomas Mann's tetralogy, *Joseph and His Brothers*. The purpose in bringing these literary works together in one volume¹ is, as Lewisohn intimates in his introduction, to prove that assimilation can't work.

The first story, "The Alien Corn" by Somerset Maugham, tells of a fabulously wealthy Jewish family in England that has Anglicized its name and has become thoroughly upper-class English in its manners and devoted to the snobbishness of the British landed aristocracy. Their son is brought up like an English gentleman. He rides the hounds, he wears his clothes perfectly. But a visit to an uncle reveals his Jewish ancestry. The shock causes him to try his hand at becoming a concert musician. He fails at that, and commits suicide. It's a well-told story, and it would be excellent entertainment, if it were not for Maugham's snobbishness, and his subtle anti-Semitic undertones.

The sin of this Jewish family, according to Lewisohn, is that they have "abandoned folk and faith and God." That is true. But a point Lewisohn ignores is that the Jews in this story are trying to ape the manners of a dying, parasitic British aristocracy, geared to keep out all intruders, be they Jewish or American or British. One lesson in this story is that the path of social climbing is not the path for any self-respecting person, Jew or Gentile.

The same thing can be said for the French story, "Silbermann," by Jacques de Lacretelle. This is a more moving story of the persecution of a Jewish boy in a private Catholic school in France. But here again, it is about wealthy people, and the Jewish boy in the story vainly thinks his brilliance and his patriotism will win him acclaim in the ranks of a bourgeoisie that later sold out to Hitler and is now selling out to the Wall Street trusts. So it's not only a case of assimilation, but also of a foolish confidence in the virtue of the French upper classes.

The same point can be made about John Galsworthy's play "Loyalties." Here again, a wealthy Jew is victimized by his wealthy Gentile friends, who have a common "loyalty" against him. Again one might ask

who, whether Jew or Gentile, would want to be "assimilated" into this world of rotten British snobs.

The Thomas Mann section was added to round out the volume with a description of the Jewish culture of Old Testa-

ment days. Lewisohn evidently wants to underscore the splendid, vital culture that these rich Jewish "assimilationists" are deserting.

We Jews, it is true, have a splendid history and family traditions and customs that are surely worth preserving. But Jewish culture, like all cultures, can be preserved by getting together with all others who seek to guard the treasures of the past and the life of the future from the menace of fascism and war.

LETTERS FROM OUR READERS

My People, My "Landmanshaft"

Editors, JEWISH LIFE:

Four of us sat down to a cup of tea after a meeting. The conversation somehow drifted over to our Russian and Polish background. The other three spoke of their antecedents. The father of one was a storekeeper, of the second a lumber dealer, of the third a rabbi.

"I come from the lowest class," I added my two bits. There was felt a second's embarrassment and that chat veered off to other more innocent subjects.

When I tell my friends and comrades that my main work and interest lie in the *landmanshaften*, there usually occurs a similar pause. Everybody knows and professes that the duty of a true progressive is to enlighten the masses, but too many shirk the personal contact with these masses. Lenin said that in order to teach the workers you have to learn from them. You can neither teach them nor learn from them without close contact with them. You can not do it by literature only. Our movement can not base itself on the correspondence school method.

The *landmanshaften* constitute the biggest organized force among the American Jews. Here in Chicago there are four hundred of them. Their membership probably reaches the 40,000 mark. Their names read like a post office guide of Eastern Europe. We have here two only from Western Europe. The British and the Irish Jewish *landmanshaften* are the exceptions.

The *landmanshaft* members are Jews without old country pedigrees. The rich don't belong, because their money meets with scant respect from the healthy proletarian sceptics. The rabbis and professional people feel that their dignity will suffer from associating with the *am hooretz*, or the Yiddish speaking worker and small storekeeper. The progressive and radical would rather work in organizations of other progressives, this "work" consisting of taking in each other's washing ideologically. I don't wonder then why there are so many progressives who are sectarian. It is really very comfortable to meet like-minded people. You don't have to fight for your ideas as among the great masses, in whose name you speak.

The *landmanshaften* are fortresses of democracy. Anybody can join them, anybody can express his opinions, fight for his ideas, if he does not do it by disrupting the organization. What is required of him is work. He is judged by his deeds, not his words.

A teacher of a progressive Yiddish school expressed to me his desire to join a *landmanshaft*. There is a fine organization here built by his townsmen. When I told him about it, he asked me:

"What can I do there, lecture on different subjects?"

"First you will help washing the dishes after the meetings." That kind of a democracy was too much for him. He never joined the *landmanshaft*. However, he does lecture—in JPFO lodges.

Chicago

BERISH K.

Anti-Communist or Red-Baiter

Editors, JEWISH LIFE:

In Ruth Simon's article, "Fifth Column in the Jewish Community," in the March issue, page 12, she says about Mr. James Lawrence Fly, that he is "an anti-communist who is not, however, a red-baiter." In all my experience in the labor movement, in fraternal organizations, in cultural and social activities, I have never met an "anti-communist" who was not a red-baiter. The anti-communist title in itself implies red-baiting. . . . Millions of people are not communists and have a right not to be communists, but they are not anti-communists. When one is "anti" anything, he is active about it and an active anti-communist is a red-baiter. Trying to be kind to Mr. Fly is no excuse for presenting false interpretations to the readers of JEWISH LIFE.

A group of readers of JEWISH LIFE in a discussion of this article could not find one example of an anti-communist who was not a red-baiter as soon as he got into a discussion of either local, national or international affairs. Mr. Fly is evidently a nice guy who is not a communist but deserves a better association than Gerald L. K. Smith and John Rankin.

Los Angeles

N. A. G.

The indignation of our correspondent indicates that the term "anti-communist" is ambiguous, and therefore should not have been used in order to avoid misunderstanding. It is of course possible for someone not to believe in communism, and even to oppose its principles, without being a red-baiter. Such an individual usually supports progressive measures in order to try to prove the advantages of the capitalist system. The red-baiter, on the other hand, does not face issues but appeals to prejudice by smearing and calling names. Mr. Fly, for instance, opposes communist principles, but has the intellectual integrity and respect for democracy to nail the bigoted character of red-baiting, which he did in his opinion as arbitrator. Surely such opposition to communism cannot be compared to the red-baiting of John Rankin, whose greatest characteristics are intellectual dishonesty and hatred for democracy.—Editors.

¹ Among the Nations: Three Tales and a Play About Jews, edited by Ludwig Lewisohn. Farrar, Straus & Co., New York, 1948. \$3.00.

FROM THE FOUR CORNERS

(Continued from page 2)

Trends Among American Jews, a study published by the American Jewish Congress. The study also reveals that in several Connecticut cities the rate of intermarriage has risen from slightly above one per cent at the turn of the century to over six and seven per cent at present.

Negro dancer Claude Marchant, who was excluded from use of elevators in Tudor City, a Fred F. French housing development in New York City, brought the case to jury trial. An all-white jury awarded Marchant \$1,000 damages under the N. Y. State Civil Rights Law.

The Philadelphia City Council unanimously has passed an ordinance authorizing a Fair Employment Practices Commission with the right to investigate all complaints of unfair employment practices and the obligation to formulate an educational program. Violators of the ordinance are liable to fines up to \$100 or jail up to 30 days.

Paul P. Rao, attorney whose law firm acted as counsel for the Nazi German-American Bund, who acted as attorney for the pre-war pro-Nazi German-American Front, Inc., and was declared in 1941 by the Manhattan and Bronx Bar Associations unfit to hold public office, has been nominated by President Truman for a life-time post of judge of the U. S. Customs Court.

An attempt to prevent the showing of *Gentleman's Agreement* in Tulsa, Oklahoma, by Gerald L. K. Smith, was defeated early in May when Judge Eben L. Taylor of that city denied a motion for an injunction against the film. Smith's name is mentioned in one sequence. It was revealed that box office receipts for the film in southern cities are matching those of the north.

Louis B. Mayer, production chief at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, has announced that he will not make a film on anti-Semitism this year. "Two films on anti-Semitism are sufficient," said Mayer, referring to *Gentleman's Agreement* and *Crossfire*.

EUROPE

The second session of the World Jewish Congress will open on June 27 in Montreux, Switzerland, with delegates from 64 countries expected to attend. Topics to be discussed include the Palestine question, rehabilitation and reconstruction problems of Jews in various countries, cultural problems, as well as problems of the organization and future structure of Congress.

On May 1, 300 British fascists led by Oswald Mosley marched through six miles of London streets, five of them under police escort. As they marched one mile through streets largely populated by Jews they shouted anti-Jewish slogans. At one point the fascists beat up a Jewish photographer who was taking pictures of the parade. In the first few days of May, 31 persons were arrested during clashes between Mosleyites and anti-fascists, 15 of them Jews.

A resolution urging the British government to enact legislation against fascism and racism in Britain was referred to the national executive committee of the Labor Party after the measure was considered by delegates to the Party's annual conference in May.

The World Jewish Congress on May 9 protested to the U. S. State and War Departments against the action of the American head of the extradition section of military government in Germany who allegedly refused to extradite war criminals because the Jewish witnesses against them "cannot be considered objective and impartial." The accused Poles were said by Jews to have been "intimate collaborators with the German Gestapo and responsible for mass murders of Jews."

The majority of medical personnel fired from Eppendorf-Hamburg Hospital in Germany after the end of the war as major Nazis, are being re-engaged for their former posts while anti-fascists are being dismissed.

News from Rumania. . . . Simon Zeigher, a Jew, has been appointed deputy minister in the prime minister's office. Zeigher, whose duties will be to "coordinate the activities of the Cabinet commission for economic recovery and monetary stabilization," is the second Jew in the cabinet, the first being Foreign Minister Anna Pauker. . . . Rumanian Yiddish writers will hereafter be eligible for literary awards, which have hitherto been awarded to writers in Rumanian and Hungarian, the Society of Writers of Rumania announced. . . . The Rumanian government has allocated nearly \$250,000 this year for the country's Jewish hospitals.

A 26-member consistory, made up of 13 communists and 13 Zionists, was elected in Sofia in May at the close of a two-day conference of the Bulgarian Jewish Communities. The conference decided to withdraw all financial support from Bulgarian synagogues, leaving religious Jews in the community solely responsible for their maintenance.

The first Yiddish movie produced in Poland since the end of the war had its premiere in Warsaw in May. The movie, *We Remained Alive*, depicts the life of Poland's Jews during the war in the Warsaw ghetto, Maidanek death camp and other places. . . . The first postwar exhibition of Jewish painters and sculptors in Poland opened in Lodz on February 11, with the exhibition of 157 works.

The insignificant role played by the U. S. in admitting European displaced persons was emphasized at the May meeting of the 14-nation preparatory commission of the International Refugee Organization. A report pointed out that during the past eight months more refugees were admitted to Britain, France and Belgium than to the U. S. The U. S. admitted 12,200 while Canada admitted 11,500 and Britain admitted 45,000 during this period.

ISRAEL

Refugee Jews are entering Israel at the rate of 15,000 a month and before the end of 1948 the total number of immigrants will exceed 120,000 said Mrs. Goldie Meirson, member of Israel's Provisional Council of Government.

Israel is planning to float an internal loan of \$20,000,000. Postage stamps printed in Hebrew have been issued for domestic use. A Jewish police force is being formed and price control has been imposed. The import-export license office has already granted licenses for \$25,000,000 worth

of imports and exports to and from 36 countries, including 12 from the sterling bloc.

United May Day celebrations organized by the Histadruth were held in Palestine in which the three workers' parties, the Labor Party, the United Workers Party and the Communist Party participated. This marks the first time that the CP was officially represented in the Histadruth May Day meetings.

The people of Israel are being warned by *Kol Haam*, communist daily, and *Al Hamishmar*, United Workers Party daily, that chauvinistic anti-Arab practices either tolerated or ignored by the new government endanger the successful prosecution of Israel's war of liberation and the democratic future of the state. *Kol Haam* stated editorially that Arabs should be provided with homes, food and jobs and that they be protected against looting, and urges close cooperation with Arab democratic forces. The progressive Arab League of National Liberation has issued an appeal to Arabs urging them not to follow reactionary Arab leaders who play the imperialist game. Attempts being made by certain Zionist leaders to eliminate militant left-wingers from the top Haganah command are causing tension.

Samuel Mikunis, general secretary of the Israel's CP and communist member of the State Council, has criticized unprogressive tax provisions and demanded separation of church and state in the constitution together with guarantees of religious freedom. He also demanded the voiding of foreign concessions given to the former mandatory power. Representatives of the United Workers Party urged that "the new state shall not be dependent economically, militarily, and politically on the imperialist powers and will oppose every attempt to use it for interventionist aims."

The government of Israel is considering the filing of formal charges of war crimes against Brigadier John B. Glubb, British commander of the Transjordan Arab Legion. A Haganah communique stated that all the inhabitants of Kfar Etzion, men, women and children, were killed after the Legion occupied the settlement after a three-day battle.

The government of Israel charged in a message to the UN in May that Britain supplied the Arab countries with guns and ammunition with full knowledge of Arab intentions to invade Israel. Said the message: "From documentary evidence received by us it appears that arrangements were made by British authorities to ship a considerable quantity of military equipment to the Arab Legion, timed so as to reach Transjordan on May 14 and May 15 coincident with the termination of the Mandate. Transported on three vessels from Suez to Akaba, the shipment comprises petrol, and more than 255 tons of guns and other ammunition and was carried out with the full knowledge of British intelligence and of the activities and intentions of the Arab Legion."

A cable to the N. Y. *Daily Worker* from correspondent Derek Kartun dated May 21 charges that a British brigadier is leading Syrian troops fighting against Israel in the Jordan Valley. Israel radio operators near the town of Samakh overheard instructions being given to Syrian troops in English over the field radio from brigade headquarters. The same correspondent reports that he was given eye-witness accounts of how on April 16 the British turned over the town of Safad, which is inside the boundaries assigned to the Jewish state, to an Arab force. The eye-witness reported that the British commander scolded the Arab commander for being late for the appointment.

