

NEWSLETTER

#4

**Anti-semitism
& Zionism**

Fighting Racism

Workplace

Editors' Introduction

This is the fourth issue of the tendency newsletter.

We particularly wish to draw your attention to the conference call in the first pages of this issue. While a number of details remain to be worked out (though it seems fairly certain that the conference will be held at a single site in Brooklyn on Easter weekend - April 1,2,3,1983), several meetings have already been held and workgroups assigned to the various tasks, ranging from funding to childcare to speakers arrangements. Participation at all levels is still welcome, anyone with a desire to either come to the conference or work on its preparation should contact either this newsletter or one of the individuals or groups listed as sponsors.

It is our opinion that the success of this project will be dependent in large measure on the preparation of the participants. To aid that preparation, future issues of this newsletters or special editions will likely concentrate on readings for background and papers to be debated and discussed at the conference. Those who have suggestions within the areas outlined should immediately contact us.

For those reading this generic newsletter the first time, we repeat from a previous issue: we want to circulate material that is of direct interest and use to the political trend to which we belong. In part this will be descriptions and analyses of work area; in part it will be treatment of various strategic and theoretical questions and the debates around them... Our hope is to gradually overcome various questions of security and political diplomacy to the point where major areas of work can be analysed with sufficient detail and candor so that a clear picture of various forces and programs will emerge. Similarly, on the theoretical and strategic questions our goal is to be able to present issues and question in a way that a more general participation in discussions will be possible before lines become fixed and public stances are assumed.

Other notes:

- as always, publishing or reprinting of an article here should not be taken to mean that the writer is a member of the tendency.
- the anti-war newsletter Battlecry, which was combined with this newsletter for the previous issue, will begin publication shortly under a new name. Notes and debate should be sent to it c/o this address.
- Technical notes: send camera-ready copy (carbon ribbon, 1/2" margins all around, 8 1/2" by 11" paper) to us. In the case of posters, leaflets and the like, send the original or a good PMT. We have facilities for reduction and other layout changes, but discourage this unless checked beforehand.

This newsletter is on permanent file at the Chicago Historical Society

Circulation this issue: 500. Let us know if you need more.

Tendency Newsletter
c/o STO
P.O. Box 8493
Chicago, IL. 60680

Conference Called

A theoretical/political conference is being planned for Easter weekend, 1983, to be held in New York City. It will be on the interrelated themes of new trends in capital and the implications of those trends for both state and society. Our emphasis will be on the particularities of the U.S. situation with an eye to providing a context for future discussions of questions of strategic importance for left work in various movements and sectors. Within this framework, we intend to incorporate a consideration of developments in other developed countries as possible indicators of the direction of the movements spawned by the present crisis.

The conference is conceived by its initiators as part of a process already underway to consolidate a political tendency on the left--one that is existent in elements but not self-conscious nor effectively organized. Generally this tendency is characterized by activism, internationalism, a recognition that struggles waged by oppressed groups (Black, latin, women, etc.) are central to the revolutionary process and a conviction that those struggles must develop autonomously, an open and critical approach to major questions before the left, a willingness to draw from various currents in left thought, an appreciation for the importance of theory, and a critical attitude towards the traditional party building movement but still understanding the need for revolutionary organization.

Besides preparations for this first of what may be a series of conferences, co-operation on joint political projects are going ahead amongst people in this tendency and communication is being promoted through this generic newsletter.

The planners of the conference hope to attract activists who generally fit within the characteristics stated above. Identification with the tendency building process is not a prerequisite to participation. The conference is not intended to develop formal organizational structure or to serve as a recruitment device. Rather, it is meant to be an opportunity for much-needed serious, strategically-oriented discussion amongst revolutionaries who do share a certain common perspective.

At the end of this report you will find a description of the thematic divisions we have arrived at and the breadth of consideration they are meant to encompass. There is obvious overlap between the various segments and final clarification of the exact limits between each topic will be determined in consultation with the principal speakers.

The format consists of a panel of two or three speakers on each topic followed by small discussions involving the panelists and perhaps other speakers. Participants would reassemble for a plenary discussion before proceeding to the next topic. There will be no votes or resolutions. Participants will be expected to do extensive advance preparation.

With the wide scope and complexity of the topics, we can only expect issues to be clarified, questions asked, and debate to begin. It is hoped that debate will continue through this newsletter, other appropriate media, and possibly other conferences.

The conference planning committee has thus far included the following individuals and groups: Red Balloon Collective, South African Military Refugee Aid Fund, Sojourner Truth Organization, Tuesday Marxist Group, Saralee Hamilton, and John Garvey.

Letters to prospective participants will be mailed soon. Readers of this newsletter who are interested in the conference should correspond with the conference planning committee care of this newsletter: PO Box 8493, Chicago, IL, 60680.

CONFERENCE TOPICS AND QUESTIONS

I What is happening to the U.S. economy? The microprocessor revolution--what is the future of the auto and other industries which up to now have been basic to the economy? Will there be a shift in relative importance of heavy industry, military, clerical, communications and service sectors? What is the aim of capital--to restructure or to reindustrialize?--and to what extent can it realize that aim? To what extent are these developments caused and shaped by the various mass struggles? What will be the impact of these changes on the size, and on the racial, sexual, age and skill composition of the working class? What are the likely changes in the sexual division of labor and in the family? Is there a tendency towards the emergence of Third World characteristics (i.e. extremes of poverty and wealth with little in between) in the U.S. and other industrial countries?

II Changing conditions in the periphery The effect of uneven development of the periphery. The character of the "economic Miracle" in Taiwan, South Korea, etc. Multi-national corporations and multinational imperialism. The degree to which capital remains "nationalistic"--questions of domestic stability versus foreign investment. The role of the IMF and AID policies. The "new international economic order" and the international division of labor. Dependency theory, unequal exchange and other theories of imperialism. How developments in the periphery place limitations or present options for capital.

III The impact of the changes on the character of the popular struggles in the U.S. Three models of struggle in a developed country--Gdansk, Brixton, Miami. What are the distinguishing features of each and the relation between them? What is the role of immigrant workers, undocumented workers, "guest workers"? The struggle of women against their exclusion from social labor. Youth and the struggle in the social sphere. The skinhead phenomenon and fascist potentials. New forms of divisions within the working class and potentials for a unified class movement. Unemployment and the refusal of work. The currently existing movements and their likely prospects.

IV The drift towards militarism and repression Is there a new basis in structural change for a turn towards militarism and repression in the U.S.? What are the limits of bourgeois democracy? Is the state a terrain of struggle or simply the instrument of the ruling class? The tendency towards the "strong state" and its relation to mass autonomous fascist movements. "Extermination" and the development of an autonomous military. The armed clandestine movements in the developed countries.

Anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism

For too long, a critique of the role of zionism and how it impacts on left and mass organizing has been largely ignored by both progressive and left forces. Let me start by saying I am speaking here only for myself as a Jew, an anti-imperialist, and an anti-zionist.

As Jews who are opposed to zionism, we tend not to have a voice. For many progressive and even anti-imperialist Jews, the questions of Palestine and Israel, and of zionism and Palestinian nationalism are areas that are avoided for a number of reasons. Some are emotional, since we (as Jews) are socialized to believe we are traitors to Jewish people if we oppose or even question zionism. Some of the political reasons have been the fear of the unpopularity of the Palestinian cause in this country and the fear of losing even liberal support. Despite the fact that Israel's "socialist" facade has to a considerable extent been discarded, that tendency known as Labor Zionism or Socialist Zionism, still provides a kind of "progressive" justification for many people.

As a Jew, I do care about Israeli Jews, I want them to live peacefully with their neighbors. I don't want them wiped out or expelled. But for them to live peacefully in Palestine, with the original inhabitants, zionist ideology and institutions which cannot be reconciled with this goal will have to be supplanted. I am frightened by what will happen if the current trends of xenophobia, religious nationalism and chauvinism continue to deepen.

It is for these reasons that the role of zionism on organizing must be addressed. Events have stripped away some of the old arguments. Israel's open expansionism has embarrassed even some of Israel's strongest supporters, racism and class distinctions have been revealed where once the claims of 'zionist' liberation stood uncontested; and the Palestinian Resistance has raised the challenge of Palestinian self-determination.

It is important to understand that being anti-zionist is not the same as being anti-semitic and that anti-semitism is recognized as a very real phenomenon which must be countered. It is equally important not to discount the persecution of Jews, including in the U.S. The events in WWII and past history did occur and the rise of the New Right and its push towards fascism coupled with increased anti-semitism cannot be ignored. As I stated earlier, but will restate because of its importance, it needs to be realized that zionism does not help, but rather fosters anti-semitism. Zionists have used anti-semitic racism as an 'objective, immutable inherent characteristic of non-Jewish human nature. It was the zionist acceptance of the racist and anti-semitic characterization of Jews that encouraged the creation of the Jewish state, and conversely the disintegration of Jewish cultural life in Eastern Europe.

Zionist racism and anti-Palestinian sentiments perpetuation among many Jews in Palestine by virtue of their role as colonial settlers (and the Sephardic past experience in reactionary Arab countries) feeds on and in turn nourishes the reactionary notion that Jews can never enjoy partnership with other people. This notion must be opposed carefully, however.

I will briefly focus on how the issue of zionism confronts us in the feminist and anti-war organizing arenas. The impact of zionism and anti-semitism on the anti-racist movement would take a whole other paper, so it won't be dealt with explicitly here.

In the feminist arena, this issue has probably received the most attention recently with articles appearing in Ms. magazine and Off Our Backs, along with countless letters. The clear line in this area revolves around the misconception put forth by zionist "feminists" that to be anti-zionist automatically means one is anti-semitic. The internal conflict seems to be between the Jewish feminist discovery of themselves as Jews and the confusion

over the question of Israel. Jewish lesbians and other feminists are celebrating their cultural and religious identities, and, of course, that needs to be supported. They aren't however, differentiating between politics and religion. They are equating their Jewishness with zionism and ultimately support for the State of Israel. They concentrate on Israeli feminists while making Palestinian women nearly invisible. It is important to clarify that Judaism is a religion, with all the culture, literature and art that are associated with it and that zionism is a political movement. The question that is brought into mind is "how is the State of Israel, itself a reactionary regime, going to further that celebration of feminist discovery?"

In the anti-war movement, the question doesn't seem to be addressed in the same way as the feminist arena. The role of the US--playing a central part in this area does not get addressed in the anti-draft, Freeze, or anti-intervention movements. The anti-war movement remains silent when tens of thousands of "peacekeeping" troops are sent to Lebanon to support the Phalangist government, while loudly protesting when advisors are sent to El Salvador. The Freeze movement doesn't address Palestine at all (since there is a clear pattern of not dealing with Third World issues) while the US is providing Israel with cluster bombs. The anti-war movement seems to get caught on Israel. While supporting the FMLN/FDR in El Salvador, or the rights of Blacks in South Africa to struggle for self-determination and liberation, there is hesitation in supporting the PLO.

The PLO is portrayed as a terrorist organization in media and buys into the anti-Arab and pro-Israeli propaganda. As long as the anti-war movement echoes successive Administrations and asserts that the Mideast conflict hinges on "Jewish survival", "Israeli self-defense" and "democracy", it will be unable to understand that the theft of land from Arab people is inseparable from exploitation, oppression and racism. Often the radical elements in the anti-war movement defer to zionist liberal politicians. The mideast liberation struggle has not been seen as an anti-war issue--and as the left has consistently excluded the question of Black self-determination, the left has failed to expose the nature of class society and its roles in the Mideast.

There is a trend in Jewish politics that is increasingly critical of Israel, a trend which increasingly feels the need to distance itself from official Zionism and the State of Israel. It is, therefore, important to assert that there is, within Jewish culture, an anti-zionist and internationalist tradition.

Anti-zionist Jews have ranged in a spectrum of belief from the extreme orthodoxy of the thousands of followers of the Hassidic Satmar Rov, who refuse to recognize Israel on religious grounds through reform Jews of the now-defunct American Council on Judaism to the revolutionary movements of Jewish workers and poor in Eastern Europe. Historically, one organization stood out in the period of the Russian Revolution and before World War II--the General Jewish Workers Union of Lithuania, Poland and Russia, more commonly known as the Bund. The Bund was a mass socialist organization of Jewish workers. It was resolutely anti-zionist and struggled to define and understand the national and social contradictions confronting the oppressed Jewish masses in Eastern Europe. The Bund fought Labor Zionism as reactionary nationalism in a 'socialist' garb and conducted its agitation in the despised 'jargon' of the Jewish masses--Yiddish.

The Bund, in its day was substantially more influential than was zionism. (For example, in the communal elections to the Polish Kehillah (the common council), the Bund won a majority of the votes, defeating the zionist parties in 1939.)

The Bund demanded what they called 'national cultural autonomy' in the lands of their birth, in opposition to the zionist conception that Jews are eternal strangers and aliens in gentile countries. A fundamental tenet of zionism is the 'indigestibility' and eternal 'foreignness' of Jews in the Diaspora--an assumption that unites with the basic assumption of anti-semitism. (Note Herzl's famous meeting with the Tsarist Minister of Interior, von Plehve which occurred shortly after the vicious anti-semitic pogroms at Kishinev in which

von Plehve and the Tsarist state were implicated)) The Zionist denigration of the Jewish internationalist is the equation of self-hatred and Jewish nationalism.

History tends to ignore events like the first armed defense by Jews against pogroms organized by Jews after Kishinev. These anti-Zionist socialist revolutionaries in Gomel in 1903 defeated the pogromists. The Zionist-inspired historiography ignores the strong anti-fascist tradition of the Jewish people, of the internationalist fighters of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. Jews participated in every national resistance against fascism, some consciously as Jews, some as French men or women, Poles or Russians.

The struggle against Zionism and anti-Semitism must be indissolubly linked. The Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai Brith Society issued a report on the rise of anti-Semitism in which they concentrated almost exclusively on criticism or opposition to the State of Israel, which is the given definition of anti-Semitism. B'nai Brith is also known as an organization that upholds white (including white Jewish) supremacy in the US.

The Zionist movement accepted uncritically the racist and anti-Semitic characterization of Jewish life and Jews in the Diaspora. This acceptance was also predicated on the anti-Semitic contention that Jews have no place in non-Jewish societies. The only possible solution could be the concentration of Jews as proud citizens of a Jewish nation-state. During World War II, the emphasis of Zionists was on the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine, instead of the rescue of Jews from concentration camps.

It would follow that if the creation of a Jewish state (as a solution to the Jewish problem) was to be at all possible, it could only happen if a dedicated minority established the civil administration, state machinery and political sovereignty for the Jewish masses.

The Zionist movement did not originally base its efforts on colonization of native land by exploitation, but by systematically following the patterns of colonization by dispossession. The Zionist leaders and founders had no intention of sharing the country equally with its original inhabitants, or of joining together in common struggle against common exploitation and oppression. They came to establish Israel and solve the Jewish problem by setting up a state as an a priori position and state monopoly for Jews which consequently meant the dispossession and expulsion of the native population. "Socialist Zionists" have claimed that Jews can oppose Begin and the war in Lebanon without calling into question the nature of the Zionist state. They claim that U.S. leftists opposed Nixon and the war in Vietnam without calling for a redrawing of the borders of the U.S. This essentially reformist view, usually backs the return of the Labor Party to power, or supports the 'Peace Now' groups' vision of limited Palestinian autonomy. It is important to pose the question to these "socialist Zionists": "Don't the massacres in Beirut point to something basically wrong with the Zionist state, much as the massacres at Wounded Knee and My Lai were not mistakes, but pointed to the basic genocidal nature of the U.S.?"

The Zionist movement rooted its existence in a number of assumptions: the definition of Palestine as an empty land--a land without people for a people without land-- and after 1948, the misconception that the native Palestinian Arab population voluntarily left their villages and towns at the explicit request of their leaders in order to return as conquerors. (All parties of the Zionist movement; labor Zionism, religious Zionism, and revisionism share the common goal of establishing and consolidating in Palestine a Jewish state for Jewish people, above and beyond the very real policy differences and political ideologies. 'Peace Now' has supported the Camp David accords and the invasion of Lebanon up to the Litani River and has denounced army reservists who refused to serve in the post-1967 occupied territories.

The plight of the Palestinian people in their occupied homeland is not dissimilar from that of Black people in South Africa. The racist policies in both countries, are perpetuated with the full complicity of imperialist powers. This dispossession of the Palestinians and the continuing expansion of Israel have occurred under the active sponsorship of

the US, not simply because of support for white supremacy, but because of the economic and strategic ends served by those policies. When Americans speak of the "rights of Palestinians" it has no meaning because they are speaking of a group of refugees and not a nation.

Palestinians place their emphasis on the difference between the Zionist state and Jewish people in Palestine. However, some progressives fail to understand the distinction and call for the eternality of the Israeli state. The Palestinian struggle has given rise to defeatism, and antizionism in Israel has begun to drive a wedge between the Zionist state and its people. Some anti-Zionists demonstrate a misunderstanding of the complete process when they oppose the military action of the Palestinian movement, demanding it wait for Israeli workers themselves to overthrow the Zionist state. The question is vaguely similar to the question of white skin privilege in the US---to what extent will Jewish workers identify with Palestinians? What will a democratic secular state look like if Jewish workers do not renounce their privileges? The Jewish communist anti-Zionist group in Israel, Matzpan, has addressed these questions of Jewish privilege and Palestinian nationalism.

Chauvinism (nationalism of oppressors) is the tool which is used to keep Israeli workers from turning against the ruling class which exploits them and the state which uses them. The Israeli workers have had increasingly to face the contradiction between their 'national interest' (and their role of beneficiaries of Zionism) and their real class interest.

Although the US support has created conditions which divided the Ashkenazi and Sephardic workers among themselves and from the Palestinians, it at the same time created a basis for anti-imperialist unity. Israeli rulers, determined to uphold the garrison role which protects their own privileges have not hesitated to strengthen themselves by establishing good relations with the widest variety of fascist supporters--(although in the long run this will undermine their hold over the Israeli masses).

Thus, in the anti-war movement, support for the Zionist state, which must inevitably have imperialist military backing, is in direct contradiction to anti-militarism. In the feminist movement, support for the Zionist state negates the identity of Palestinian women. One Israeli woman's comment summarized the Zionist position: "Palestinian women are not oppressed by Israelis, they are being oppressed by Palestinian men." Translated into the U.S. context, white women would never be oppressors of black women. Within both the anti-war and feminist movements, questions of Zionism bring out not only positions on Judaism and Israel and Lebanon, they bring out basic political positions and world views beyond the Mideast.

The underlying premise here is "How do we approach or handle Zionism, knowing its emotional impact?" There are two courses to take, one is to ignore the issue entirely, and to not bring it up, as chances are quite high that it will split the movement. The other choice (albeit the more difficult one) is to confront the issue and have open discussions. Granted, it may polarize the group, but a recognition of polarization is often more healthy than perpetuating a tense 'harmony'.

--A. Brule and friends.

discussing the

Dear Sisters,

middle east

This open letter is addressed to organizers and supporters of an International Women's Day event held in Madison, Wisconsin this year and to organizers of similar events elsewhere in the country. We are a group of women active in the Ann Arbor and Chicago chapters of New Jewish Agenda, the Chutzpah Women's Group, Chicago Friends of (Israeli) Peace Now, and a vital Jewish lesbian community in Chicago.

We commend the organizers of the International Women's Day event in Madison for attempting to include the Middle East on their agenda this year. For too long, the women's community has termed the Middle East "a male issue," while the male-dominated left has reduced it to "the good guys versus the bad guys." Both views are used to mask sentiments that "the Middle East is too complicated or too emotionally charged an issue to put our necks on the line."

Women make up half of those who suffer the most direct consequences of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and it is often women who suffer disproportionately the effects of this conflict. For example, military expenditures in the Middle East region (including Israel and the Arab states where most Palestinian women are concentrated) are the highest in the world relative to expenditures on social services which women are often forced to rely on. Similarly, women in the United States who rely in disproportionate numbers on government social services felt the effects of increasing U.S. militarism in the Middle East Region.

While the Madison IWD organizers' attempt to contradict these views prevalent in the women's movement and the male-dominated left is welcome and in fact long overdue, the manner in which a workshop on the Middle East was planned and problems which arose from it were "resolved" cannot go unchallenged. It is our understanding that an Israeli woman and a Palestinian woman were asked to lead the workshop. At least one of them did not know that she was to share the platform with the other, and the organizers of the event seemed to know little of the political perspective of either woman. Two days before the event, the Palestinian woman refused to speak if the Israeli woman was present. While the organizers had the option to encourage both women to speak or to cancel the workshop altogether, they voted to have only the Palestinian woman speak, and dis-invited the Israeli woman. It appears that this decision was made because the organizers did not want to be perceived as racist. After a demonstration was called to protest this decision, the organizers withdrew their sponsorship of the workshop but allowed it to take place anyway. In sum, the manner in which the workshop was planned was naive and irresponsible.

The decision to dis-invite the Israeli woman from the workshop can only be motivated by ignorance and guilt. Implicit in this decision was an assumption that Jewish oppression (commonly known as anti-semitism) is not a form

of racism. We fail to see any excuse for ignorance of the fact that Jewish oppression is indeed a form of racism. It is sad to see the women's movement mimic the male-dominated left in denying that Jews are an oppressed people who have rights to national liberation just like any other people.

Gentiles, when acting out of guilt, pit Jews and Arabs against each other by trying to rank our oppression. They give uncritical support to one or the other of these groups, depending on which they view as having endured the greatest amount of suffering. A veteran Middle East activist recently wrote that "Little effort is made (by Gentiles) to approach Jews and Arabs as equals to search for dialogue and understanding." It is obvious that the decision of the Madison IWD organizers to dis-invite the Israeli woman was not motivated by constructive, hopeful thinking on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Instead, it seems to be based on guilt and internalized oppression.

We offer the following suggestions to organizers of the Madison IWD event and to organizers of similar events in the future: 1) Familiarize yourselves with Jewish oppression (anti-semitism) and anti-Arab racism. Do not wait for protest or letters such as this one to spell it out for you. Organize study sessions and workshops on Jewish oppression and anti-Arab racism at conferences, teach-ins, etc. 2) Do not type-cast Jews and Arabs. This is one of the most racist things you can do. Vital and serious debate exists within the American Jewish and Arab-American communities, as well as within Israel and the Palestinian nationalist movement. The bottom line for all of this debate is survival and liberation. Take some time to familiarize yourselves with this debate (as some of the Madison IWD organizers are currently doing), and to determine which perspectives offer the best hope for the future of both peoples. Do not offer anything less than this.

For liberation (yours and ours),
Christie Balka
Arden Handler
Claudia Kraus
Janet Tobacman
Sherry Weingart
Debbie Zucker

another view on the middle east from the midwest

Dear Sisters,

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to respond to the letter from the Chicago women. I want to clarify the facts. First, the Israeli and Palestinian women were asked to participate on a panel about women in the Middle East and Asia with women from Sri Lanka, Malaysia and India, they were not asked to "lead the workshop". The Israeli woman described herself to the coalition as a "left-progressive" and a "feminist", and

was tentatively placed on the panel. From the beginning, the Palestinian woman said she could not sit on the same panel with this woman, whom she believed was a Zionist, because Zionism negates the struggle for Palestinian liberation. The workshop organizer tried to resolve the conflict through a series of meetings with the other tentative panel members, but was unsuccessful because the Israeli woman did not attend. It was decided, when she did not attend the meetings, she was not to be on the final panel. It was not until the day of the workshop that the Israeli woman admitted she was a Zionist. We never wanted to exclude her from the dialogue, and asked her to share her information from the audience, about women's lives in Israel. The Madison Zionists weren't satisfied with audience participation, if she couldn't speak as a panelist, they did not intend to let anyone speak. They physically attacked the workshop. They outnumbered the Arabs and Palestinians five to one. They threw objects at the Palestinian woman and verbally insulted her. In the following days, anonymous Zionists made harassing phone calls to anti-Zionist Jewish feminists in the coalition, calling them "self-hating Jews".

The issue of Zionism and Palestinian liberation is an emotional question since we (as Jews) are socialized to believe that we are traitors if we oppose or even question Zionism, the collective consciousness of the genocide carried out against European Jews and the way this has legitimized the State of Israel. Zionism still has a kind of intellectual hegemony. Because of the "guilt" one feels when criticizing Zionism, it is important to assert that there is an anti-Zionist tradition within Jewish culture--historically, the Bund. The Bund was a mass socialist organization of Jewish workers that was resolutely anti-Zionist. They demanded "national-cultural autonomy" in the lands of their birth. These anti-Zionist revolutionaries defeated the pogromists, while never giving up the political line that gentile and Jewish victims of oppression must unite in a common struggle for a more just society. There is also a strong anti-fascist tradition of Jewish people. It was not Zionism that saved the Jews from Nazism, it was Hitler's defeats at El Alamein, Stalingrad and elsewhere.

The State of Israel, as the embodiment of Zionism is a reactionary regime opposed to the interests of Jewish people as well as Palestinians. Zionism and Israeli policy increasingly contradict the real interests of Jewish people, which are for a democracy and an end to cultural and national oppression. Jewish people need to unite with other minorities and forces capable of fighting racism and to link the fight against racism and anti-Semitism.

Zionism has not delivered on its claims for Jewish people. It is not a "normal" state, but a state claiming to derive its sovereignty from a mythical national entity, the majority of whose members do not reside within its borders or inhabit the country. It is a

mendicant state, dependent militarily and financially on the U.S.. It is a garrison state that openly plans the confiscation and annexation of Arab land. It is a kind of ghetto writ large where the national oppression of Jews experienced in the outside world is inverted and reproduced. It is a regime that sells arms to every repulsive, torturing and right-wing dictatorship you can think of (Somalia, South Africa, and even Argentina, where Nazi war criminals have been able to find a safe refuge.)

The Zionist conception is that Jews are eternal foreigners and aliens in gentile countries, and that Israel is their homeland. Zionism regards anti-Semitism to be an eternal feeling inherent in the human consciousness rather than regarding it as a sociological phenomenon dependent on the consideration of time and place. It demands loyalty to the State of Israel by the virtue of being Jewish. What Zionism does as an ideology is to particularize anti-Semitism, to separate it historically from other forms of racism and to concede the basic assumptions of anti-Semitism, that Jews are a foreign element.

This approach is the antithesis of national liberation. As feminists, (Jewish, Arab, and gentile), we have a political responsibility to analyze the role of imperialist, racist and fascist regimes on the lives of women and other oppressed people, to act on the analysis, and begin to end oppression. The oppression of women will not end as long as people are oppressed on the basis of race, class, religion and national origin. Those systems which maintain this oppression (capitalism and imperialism) must be opposed.

In solidarity,
Leslie Byster,
for the International Women's
Day Coalition, Madison

anti-zionist jewish women

Dear Evi Beck,

Thank you for your bibliography by and out Jewish women, but I think it is important for you to recognize the differences among Jewish women.

I protest the listing of Lilith as "an essential magazine" and one that "has a feminist perspective." As far as I can see, and please correct me if I'm wrong, Lilith is strictly a Zionist magazine with little criticism of Israel. I recently read an article in their latest issue which described the strength of Israeli Jewish women in the army and as fighters, but with no mention of who they are fighting--our Palestinian sisters and brothers.

To me a feminist perspective has got to be an anti-imperialist perspective. In this anti-semitic Christian land, we are grasping for our identities as Jews. As feminists we must always be critical and not simply accept the definitions already given to Jews, especially as blind supporters of Israel.

Chaya,
Brooklyn

Historical Aspects

- A. Role of imperialism & colonialism*
 - 1. economic & strategic role ME plays in Germany, France, USSR, England & US
 - 2. use US imperialism made of State of Israel
 - 3. conditions in US & Europe that made colonialism possible (was it necessary)
 - 4. arab & jewish capitalism
 - 5. role of classes

- B. Origins of zionism
 - 1. Herzl
 - 2. immigration, bourgeoisie resistance to early zionism, settlements
 - 3. history of jewish persecution/justification of Israeli state
 - 4. role of anti-semitism on jewish people
 - 5. cooperation with Hitler
 - role of german fascism
 - class alliance

- C. Origins of Israeli state, Jewish nationalism, & division of ME into nation-states
 - 1. role of Arab revolt (1936-1939), role of British
 - 2. role of labor wing of zionist party & bourgeoisie elements of zionist movement
 - 3. World Zionist Organization
 - role of Western middle bourgeoisie & Eastern petty bourgeoisie
 - role of other western Jewish classes
 - 4. approaches
 - demographic v. territorial
 - philanthropic

*should be seen as three different time periods

- 1859 to 1925 (post WWI)
- 1925 to end of WWII
- 1948 (creation of State of Israel)

Current political situation

- A. Origins of PLO
 - who wanted and why
 - when and how it gained legitimacy

- B. lines w/in PLO and who supports each (also class relations)
 - PFLP
 - Fateh
 - role of bedouin & fedayeen
 - Muslim Brotherhood
 - others

- C. Relationship of PLO to surrounding regimes & different liberation movements therein (also class relations)
 - Iraq (Baath party)
 - Iran
 - Syria (Baath party)

- Lebanon ('78) Progressive Soc. Party, Independent Nasserite Movt., Lebanese Nat'l. Movt., Lebanese phalangist forces, Organization for Communist Action, Democratic Front for Liberation of Palestine, Syrian Soc. Nat'l. Party
- Egypt('78) right-Liberal Soc. Organ., Satdat-Nat'l. Democratic Party, center-Arab Soc., Party, Wanti Party, pro-soviet-Egyptian Communist Party, Egyptian Communist Workers Party, Tagamoo (official party), Organization of Progressive Unionists
- alliance with Syria & Egypt and why it fell apart
- Saudia Arabia & other conservative regimes
- Jordan
- (Yemen -- arab nationalism)

D. Current political trends in Israel, parties in power, their class interests and relationship to imperialism

- Likud (Begin's party)
- Labor party
- Mapai
- Peace Now forces
- Israel Communist Party (anti-zionist faction, Maki)
- Mapam (zionist)
- Movt. for Israeli-Palestine Federation (non-zionist)
- Herut (extreme right wing party)
- Israeli Socialist Organization
- Movt. for Greater Israel (A'hdut Avoda)
- other anti-Arab and pro-imperialist forces

E. Relation of each ME state to imperialism

F. Role of USSR

- support of partition
- w/drawal of support & subsequent support of arab nation
- relation to PLO

G. Trends in Arab world

- role of religion
- role of western imperialism
- Arab & Islamic nationalism, their responses/reactions to imperialism
- pro-USSR
- pro-US

H. Relationship of class forces in Israel

- Ashkanazies v. Sephardic (tribes or classes)
- relation of urban bourgeoisie to rural settlements
- class composition of Kibbutz (etc.)
- presence of racism in Israel (Black & Oriental Jews)
- class composition of these 'non-white' Jews--is it a skin color or class question?
- compare this to Israeli treatment of Palestinians as 2nd class citizens, forced refugees, etc.)
- population control practices

I. Miscellaneous

- role of zionism on arab & islamic nationalism
- role of arab and islamic nationalism on zionism
- trends of arab & islamic nationalism, do they represent the same interests,... what interests
- the political, economic * social factors that brought Israel into being...those that worked against it

- land claim issue similarities (if they exist, similar to others, Indians, etc.)
- was creation of Jewish nation in Palestine a response to or aim of imperialism? what about a zionist state? can a jewish nation be separated from zionism? does existence of 'jewish' nation justify existence of 'christian' nation or 'islamic' nation?

AND NOW, AT LAST THE QUESTIONS.....

1. Is the Jewish struggle in Israel and in the diaspora one of national liberation? What about the zionist struggle? Are Jews a race, people, religion?
2. How is anti-semitism (dis)similar to racism?
3. What is the nature of the current Israeli state? Settler colonial? Fascist? Socialist? Potentially democratic? Can a zionist state exist without expansionism? Is it a war economy?
4. What are the historical links between South Africa and Israel? How is zionism (dis)similar to apartheid? What conclusions can be drawn from Israel's relationships with South Africa and Argentina?
5. What are the arguments for and against the democratic-secular state line? Who in the US holds them? If you advocate this line, how would you say it is different from others who do (particularly May 19/John Brown)?
6. What are the arguments for and against a 2 state position. Who holds these estimations and why?
7. What about the role of 'terrorism' in the Middle East. Ho do you define it and support it or not? How is it different from, say, revolutionary violence?
8. To date, why haven't Arab governments publicly and militarily aided the PLO in Lebanon--why the silence and inaction? (bring in class alliances)
9. What is Israel's role of foreign policy on US imperialism? Does George Schultz represent a change? Have the interests of the ruling class changed?



We're just looking for a little corner to settle in

(Israel)

A PARTIAL BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR ANTIZIONIST JEWS AND OTHERS
by Wej Nacinema

The Jewish Question, by Abram Leon, Pathfinder Books. A first attempt at a marxist interpretation of Jewish history by a Belgian Jew, a Trotskyist and former Socialist-Zionist who died in Auschwitz. The book tends somewhat towards an economic reductionism, but is extremely useful as a starting point.

Israel: A Settler-Colonial State?, By Maxime Rodison, Pathfinder. Analysis of the colonial nature of Israel by a French Mid East scholar with a radical Jewish background.

The Arab World and Israel, by Ahmad El Kosy and Eli Lobel, MR Press. Two essays, one by an Egyptian and one by an Israeli exile, from a Marxist point of view.

Zionism: False Messiah, by Nathan Winstock, Ink Links, (London). Excellent, well-documented study and critique of zionism, arab reaction and imperialism. The author is a former member of Hashomer Hatzair and writes from a kind of sophisticated trotskyist point of view.

The Other Israel, ed. by Arie Rober, Anchor/Doubleday. Israeli anti-zionists of the Matzpen (Israeli Socialist Organization) write on history of zionism, etc. Puts forward the thesis of a "Hebrew nation", among other things and calls for a socialist federation in the mid-east.

The Fall of Jerusalem, Abdullah Schleiber, MR Press.

Our Roots Are Still Alive, Palestine Book Project of People's Press. 'The story of the Palestinian People.' Tends to be somewhat propaganistic, and one-sided, in my opinion, but well worth reading. Everything they left out of the movie Exodus.

This Passover or Next I Will Never Be in Jerusalem, by Hilton Obensinger, Momo' Press, San Francisco. Contemporary American Jew, anti-zionist and poet, socialist organizer and anti-zionist activist.

Eichman in Jerusalem, by Hannah Arendt. Fascinating study of the Eichman trial. Includes some of the ways the trial was used by the Israeli state to legitimize itself; and interesting things on Eichman's attitude towards zionism in the middle and late thirties; his visit to Palestine then.

The Arab Awakening, by George Antonius, Capricorn. The classic account of the origins of Arab nationalism.

While Six Million Died, by Arthur Morse, Randon House/ Ace. How the USA refused to admit Jewish victims of persecution in Europe. There are several more scholarly books out now on the same subject, but this was the first. Western anti-semitism documented by the same countries that later supported a zionist state. Some coincidence.

Zionism Reconsidered, ed. by Michael Selzer. Macmillan. 'The Rejection of Jewish Normalcy' anthology of non-marxist philosophical and religious thoughts on the subject.

The Non-Jewish Jew, MR Press. An interesting perspective on Jewish identity and history by the Socialist historian Issac Deutscher, who incidentally came from a Hasidic Background.

The Arabs in Israel, Sabri Jirvis, MR Press. by an "Israeli Arab" from Haifa, now in exile.

A History of Zionism, by Walter Laquer. An 'objective' Zionist history. The standard Zionist account. You have to read the other side, plus there's useful information.

World of Our Fathers, Irving Howe. The author is an anti-communist, social democrat, but this is nonetheless a great book on the history of immigrant Jews, the socialist and labor culture in New York, Yiddish, etc.

The Jewish Bund in Russia: From Its Origins to 1905, Tobias, Stanford University Press. Scholarly, fascinating history of the socialist and anti-Zionist workers movement known as the Bund and their assessment of the 'national question' and how it evolved.

Jews Against Hitler, Lucian Steinberg, Gordon and Gremonesi, London.

Khamsin---Journal of Revolutionary Socialists of the Middle East. available through MERIP. (First four issues in French) High quality Marxist analysis of various aspects of the Mid-east situation.

Israel: Utopia Incorporated, Zed Press

The Palestine Problem: An annotated bibliography, 1967-1980. edited by H.I. Hussaini, Palestine Information Office. An annotated bibliography on the Palestine problem which attempts to provide the American reader with Arab and non-Zionist perspectives. Included are publications from Palestinian Arabs, western scholars, journalists, non-Zionist Jews and Israelis.

Zionism and its scarecrows *Moshe Machover and Mario Offenberg*

More than ten years have passed since the beginning of the occupation of the areas conquered by Israel in the June War of 1967. The Palestinian liberation movement has become a factor that can no longer be disregarded in any discussion on the perspectives of the Palestinian question and the Middle East conflict. The relative victories of the Arab armies over Israel in the October War of 1973, the economic and ideological fragility of the Israeli state and finally the new attitude of the US and the West European states towards the Arab states - along with the resulting inevitable readjustment of the nuances regarding the question of Israel-Arab confrontation - these things reveal all too clearly the political weakening of Israel's position both at home and abroad. Viewed internationally, the isolation of Israel occurred not only in the countries of the Third World and Eastern Europe but to a certain extent also in the West.

While the bourgeois mass media in the West express 'solidarity' and 'anxiety' for 'threatened' Israel but also for the first time report - cautiously and distortedly - on the Palestinians' struggle for national self-determination, the Western left assesses the Middle East conflict in terms of its anti-imperialist policy. The left attributes the causes of the Middle East conflict to the fact that Zionism - a reactionary, colonising movement associated with imperialism - realised its intention of creating the Zionist state of Israel at the expense of another people. After its establishment, Israel assumed the role of 'watch-dog' for imperialist interests in the Arab East.

However, it is clear that Zionism and its propagandists abroad, using both 'historically based' accounts and appeals to the emotions, do their utmost to prevent and reverse the discrediting of Zionist policy and positions. These propagandists no longer project the traditional image of the 'brave little pioneer who is 150 per cent right', nor do they come out openly with crude, arrogant nationalism in support of Greater-Israel and the expulsion of the Arabs. It's all handled more subtly and modestly today - and for a good reason: whenever the Zionist nature of the Israeli state is seriously challenged - whether by actual political and military developments, or by ideas calling for a multinational Palestine or a supra-national socialist union of the whole region, the pro-Zionist side tries to present the Palestine conflict in terms of a 'tragic confrontation between two equally justified national aspirations' which can be settled on the basis of freezing the

zionist acquisitions of 1949 (with 'corrections').

This article aims to show how the objective and subjective henchmen of zionism in the West, in their attempt to fluster the critics of zionism, present 'leftist'-tinged arguments in support of the Israeli state, but especially directed *against* its Jewish opponents of the anti-zionist socialist movement inside Israel.

Some time ago the West German magazine *links* published in serialised form the paper *The Class Nature of Israeli Society*, which was written in 1970 by Haim Hanegbi, Moshè Machover and Akiva Orr, members of the Israeli Socialist Organisation *Matzpen*¹. A reader of *links*, Alfred Moos, in a critique, objected both to the *Matzpen* article and the anti-zionist position in general.²

We consider Alfred Moos's article typical of the arguments of the so-called 'left-wing' zionists. Therefore, besides dealing with the central points of the argument in his article, we also want to try to use this example to explain the position of 'left-wing' zionists generally, to criticise it and to show how this position is very similar to that of the official zionist propaganda, despite all the nuances.

Firstly, however, a preliminary remark: The attack on the *Matzpen* article takes advantage of the fact that it does not contain a historical analysis of zionism: neither as to the relation of zionism to the Jewish question in Europe, nor as to the relation of the zionist enterprise to the majority of the indigenous population of Palestine (the Palestinian Arab people) and to the various imperialist powers which have dominated the region since the beginning of the zionist colonisation to this day.

The reason why there is no such historical analysis in that article is simple: the article did not intend to present a comprehensive historical reckoning with zionism but more particularly to point out the basic structure of Israeli class society today.³

Zionism and Anti-semitism

It is indicative that 'left-wing zionists' always start their attacks on Israeli anti-zionists with the remark that the Jewish immigrants to Palestine – who provided the human raw material for the zionist enterprise – 'fled all too frequently from physical extermination and from antisemitic humiliation and the loss of their means of livelihood at the very least'. The threat the propagandists of zionism like so much to use is concealed behind this introduction: whoever denounces zionism, whoever rejects the Israeli state, whoever puts up a fight against the zionist nature of Israel and zionist policy – is an ally of antisemitism.

The threat is expressed even more bluntly: for example, that the present struggle against zionism 'is decorated with crumbs from the national-socialist kitchen.' Still more: 'Sometimes one almost has the

impression that zionists are the newly costumed "Elders of Zion" for many leftists.' Words of warning and threats are also aimed directly at anti-zionist Israelis: 'Young Israelis, who are calling upon people to participate in the struggle against zionism, shouldn't forget that their parents or grandparents in most cases were persecuted people for whom Palestine/Israel was the only refuge and that they would hardly have the right today to close Israel's borders if sometime in the future Jews should be forced to flee to Israel in the face of antisemitic persecution. The old Jewish self-hatred sometimes gives rise to queer practices.'

Such libellous statements are nothing new. They were already directed against the Jewish communists in Russia who denounced zionism at the second World Congress of the Communist International:

'We are concerned with the zionists in Palestine, who, under the pretext of founding an independent Jewish state, oppress the working population and force the Arabs living in Palestine under the yoke of the English, whereas the Jews are only a minority there. This matchless lie must be stamped out and indeed most vigorously, as the zionists are working in every country, approaching all the backward Jewish working masses and trying to create groups of workers with zionist tendencies (Poalei Zion), who have recently been endeavouring to adopt a communist phraseology. (. . .) The Communist International must oppose this movement most vehemently'. 'One of the most well-known representatives of zionism made no secret of his opinion of the anti-zionist communists: 'These psychopaths and sadists, full of hatred for everything Jewish, shall rot in their own depravity and hideousness and suffocate in their own filth.' 'The way the zionists treat their (Jewish) critics, who oppose them on the basis of the principles of internationalism, has not changed. The co-founder of the pre-communist group in Palestine was labelled a 'traitor' and 'enemy of the Jewish people' in 1920,⁶ because he dared to say abroad that the expulsion of the Arab fellahin by the zionist movement was a challenge for the entire Arab world to make a stand against the Jews of Palestine.⁷ Even the 'doves' of zionism show no mercy; for them, the anti-zionists from the 'Holy Land' are suffering from a 'pathological feeling of enmity towards the Jewish national creation', as they are propagating the 'belief in inciting a war of genocide against the Jewish community of the country'.⁸

Israeli revolutionary socialists have been accustomed to the reproach of 'self-hatred' all along and have been well armed against it. However, from their own experience they know that the defamatory scarecrow of equating anti-zionism with anti-semitism still succeeds in intimidating a considerable part of the left (not to mention the democratic non-leftists) outside Israel. It is therefore essential that the left in Western Europe also learn to see through this false and defamatory equation and to recognise it as a propagandist scarecrow on the part of zionist policy.

There is no doubt that the modern zionist movement arose as a reaction to anti-semitism and the plight of the Jews in Eastern and Central Europe at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of this century. But it is not enough merely to point out that zionism constitutes a reaction to anti-semitism; we must determine *what kind of reaction it is*. In principle there can be two opposing attitudes towards anti-semitism as towards other similar phenomena of discrimination and oppression for racial, ethnic, religious and similar reasons.

The first attitude is common not only to socialists but also to all those who have a progressive outlook (radical liberals, radical democrats etc). The way they see things, discrimination and oppression of minorities do not originate in human nature but are rather the result of certain conditions - namely, social, economic and political conditions, which are *historical* and consequently *changeable*.

According to this view, only the struggle to change the prevailing social, economic and political conditions is the politically correct reaction to anti-semitism and other similar phenomena, this change being an organic component part of the general struggle for 'a better world'. Of course the various progressive tendencies (revolutionary socialists, social reformists, radicals) considerably differ from one another both in their conceptions of the new world they are striving for and also in the means necessary to wage the struggle. All, however, share one common assumption: the struggle against the roots of anti-semitism and similar phenomena is not futile and (as a part of the general struggle for a better society) is the only correct political answer.

On the other hand, in the case of those who hold reactionary and racist views, we generally find an opposing attitude: the antagonism and conflict between the majority of a population and racial, ethnic and religious minorities are rooted in 'human nature' itself; a struggle against anti-semitism (or against similar phenomena) is pointless because anti-semitism is a necessary, normal, indeed even healthy phenomenon. The only way to solve the problem once and for all is to destroy its alleged roots: it is imperative to change the situation where Jews live as a minority among non-Jews. It will not be difficult for the reader to see that this second attitude is the one characteristic of anti-semites. However, the truth is that this attitude constitutes the fundamental premise and the point of departure for *both anti-semitism and zionism*. The only difference is that zionism appeals to the Jews to leave the 'non-Jewish' peoples *of their own free will*, whereas anti-semitism simply demands that *they be thrown out*.

One can show that many anti-semites are aware of the elements that anti-semitism and zionism have in common. For example, the British colonel, R. Meinertzhagen (who was political officer on the staff of the conqueror of Palestine in the first world war, General Allenby)

confides to us: 'My inclination towards Jews in general is governed by an anti-semitic instinct which is invariably modified by personal contact. My views on zionism are those of an ardent zionist'.⁹

To the anti-semite's friendly wave the zionist responds with an elegant bow. In his diary, the founder of zionism, Theodor Herzl, tells how he was influenced by the Dreyfuss trial, on which he, Herzl, reported for an anti-semitic Vienna newspaper:

'In Paris (. . .) I achieved a freer attitude towards anti-semitism, which I now began to understand historically and to pardon. Above all, I recognised the emptiness and futility of trying to "combat" anti-semitism.'¹⁰

The ideology of zionism, as conceived by its founder, Theodor Herzl, is based on earlier studies done by other 'race theoreticians'. For one of them, anti-semitism is subject to a biological law: 'Jewbaiting is a kind of demonopathy with a difference: it is not a quality of a particular race but common to all mankind . . . Like a psychic affliction, it is hereditary, and as a disease has been incurable for two thousand years.'

Another 'theoretician in things Jewish' says: 'Jewish noses can't be re-shaped and black, curly Jewish hair can't be changed into blond hair or combed straight by christening. The Jewish race is a basic one and reproduces itself in its integrity despite climatic influences. The Jewish type has itself always remained the same throughout the course of the centuries. (. . .) It's no use Jews and Jewesses denying their origin by being christened and disappearing into the great sea of Indogermanic and Mongol tribes. The Jewish type cannot be exterminated.' Although these statements could well have come from the Alfred Rosenberg Nazi school, we must name the actual authors: the first is the zionist thinker Leo Pinsker, the second is Moses Hess.¹¹

It is not difficult to cite many further quotations from zionist sources, from the beginnings of zionism to the present day, which show the common theoretical point of departure of zionism and anti-semitism. We shall spare the reader these quotes and make do with the analysis of a young contemporary Israeli historian, Yigal Elam:

'Zionism assumed anti-semitism to be a natural state of affairs as far as the attitude of the world towards the Jews was concerned. (. . .) zionism did not consider anti-semitism an abnormal, absurd, perverse or marginal phenomenon. Zionism considered anti-semitism a fact of nature, a standard constant, the norm in the relationship of the non-Jews to the presence of Jews in their midst (. . .), zionism considered anti-semitism a normal, almost rational reaction of the gentiles to the abnormal, absurd and perverse situation of the Jewish people in the Diaspora.'¹²

Revealing and illuminating is the almost apologetic understanding a prominent zionist leader shows for Nazism in 1934:

'(The Jews) have been drawn out of the last secret recesses of christening and mixed marriages. We are not unhappy about it. In

their being forced to declare themselves, to show real determined courage, to stand by their community, we see at the same time the fulfilment of our desires. (. . .) The theory of assimilation has collapsed. We are no longer hidden in secret recesses. We want to replace assimilation by something new: *the declaration of belonging to the Jewish nation and the Jewish race*. A state, built according to the principle of purity of the nation and race (ie the Third Reich – *editor's note*), can only be honoured and respected by a Jew who *declares* his belonging to his own kind.¹³

The far-reaching harmony between zionism and anti-semitism, caused by the common ideological point of departure, goes even further than could be assumed . . .

The introduction to the infamous racist Nuremberg Laws of 15 September 1935 says among other things: 'If the Jews had a state of their own in which the bulk of their people were at home, the Jewish question could already be considered solved today, even for the Jews themselves. *The ardent zionists of all people have objected least of all to the basic ideas of the Nuremberg Laws*, because they know that these laws are the only correct solution for the Jewish people too (. . .).'¹⁴

Such implicit harmony between zionism and anti-semitism must have been a dreadful blow for those Jews and non-Jews who saw the solution of the issue in waging a political struggle to 'democratise' their societies. Isaac Deutscher reports that in Eastern Europe, and especially in Poland, the Yiddish-speaking workers who considered themselves Jews without reservation were the most resolute enemies of zionism. They were determined opponents of emigration to Palestine. These anti-zionists thought the idea of an evacuation, an exodus from the countries they called home, where their ancestors had lived for centuries, amounted to abdicating their rights, yielding to hostile pressure, betraying their struggle and surrendering to anti-semitism. For them, zionism seemed to be the triumph of anti-semitism, legitimising and validating the old cry 'Jews out'. The zionists accepted it, they wanted 'out'.¹⁵

Zionism was indeed *a reaction* to anti-semitism; the *basic assumption*, however, on which zionist ideology is based *agrees with that of anti-semitism*.

Zionism and the rights of the Jews

From what has been explained above, it becomes clear why zionism was so often indifferent to the struggle against anti-semitism and for equality for the Jews; as it disputes from the very outset the possibility and usefulness of a struggle against anti-semitism. The situation of Jews living outside Palestine interest zionism only in so far as they are moved by their situation to emigrate to Palestine or at least to support

zionism. This is expressed by the Israeli historian Y. Elam, whom we have already quoted above, as follows: 'From the very first moment it (zionism) gave up all considerations connected with the situation of the Jewish people in the Diaspora, except in so far as they contributed to the zionist enterprise.' And so it came about that in the years after the Nazi takeover in Germany, 'when the demonstrations and protest actions against the Nazi regime of terror reached their climax, the voice of zionism was not to be heard.'¹⁶

The zionists in their entirety rejected the continued existence of the 'Diaspora'. According to this view, the life of Jews outside Palestine/Israel is reprehensible, whereas only emigration to Palestine, the active participation in the zionist enterprise, is considered desirable. Regarding the attitude of zionists towards the Jews living in the Diaspora, the Israeli professor of history and zionist functionary of many years standing, Arieh Tartakower, says: 'They (the majority within zionism) considered every attempt to protect Jewish rights in the Diaspora to be a complete waste of energy.'¹⁷ Even if zionism's contempt for the Diaspora was an apparent contradiction – for selfish reasons zionism could not be indifferent to what became of the reservoir of immigrants – it seems that the zionists (like Herzl originally) considered anti-semitic intrigues, which might drive the Jews to Palestine, to be more important, up to a certain point, than the struggle against anti-semitism. Without doubt, this way of reasoning implies to a degree an element of discipline, but also self-justification and most certainly a deep contempt for humanity, and infinite hypocrisy.

Before and during the second world war, individual zionists like Nahum Goldmann and Yitzhak Grienbaum, demanded participation in the struggle for the rights of the Jews. However, all trends and all important leaders of zionism refused this demand. In 1935 the board of the Jewish Agency, the institution which ran zionist activities in Palestine, appointed a special commission to look into the problems of the Jews in Germany. So it came about that during the board meeting of the Jewish Agency on 31 December 1935, David Ben-Gurion, in answer to the demand of Y. Grienbaum that the zionist movement should take part in the struggle for the rights of the Jews in Germany, stated that 'Even according to Grienbaum, the job of the commission appointed by the board was not to deal with the rights of the Jews in Germany. This commission's job was to discuss the question of the Jews in Germany only from the aspect of their immigration to Palestine, and its report is not at all inconsistent with any measures which might be taken in support of the rights of the Jews in Germany. The commission's job was to discuss the zionist aspect of the question and not to deliberate on measures to be taken in support of the rights of the Jews in the Diaspora.'¹⁸

Even if we accept the idea that the report of this commission was 'not inconsistent' with the struggle for the rights of the German Jews

(and this is by no means sure!), the fact still remains that the commission was by no means willing to pay any attention to this struggle. Indeed, it was the main job of this commission to organise the famous 'transfer' deal, the trade contract between the Zionist movement and the Hitler government, according to which the money and property of German Jews were transferred to Palestine in the form of German goods, thus breaking an anti-Nazi economic boycott organised by anti-fascist forces. Here too (as Y. Elam rightly points out) it was 'not the attempt to save Jewish property in the Diaspora which was behind the deal, but the attempt to increase the economic strength of the Jewish "Yishuv" in Palestine.'¹⁹

This indifference on the part of Zionism towards the struggle for the rights of the Jews has existed all along. It continues even today, for example, in the case of the Soviet Jews. It must be pointed out that the vociferous campaign of the Zionist movement in this matter does not aim to help the Jews in the Soviet Union as such but is only directed at securing *one single privilege* – namely, the right to emigrate to Israel. The struggle for the rights of the Jews which, like any other struggle to secure equal rights for a national or ethnic minority, deserves the support of every progressive person, is hardly of interest to Zionism. Moreover, as we shall see later, it is certain that if, for whatever reason, there is a decline in the propensity of Soviet Jews to emigrate, this will cause many Zionist leaders disappointment and regret. This has become especially evident since 1967.

Every attempt to present the 'Jewish problem' in the Soviet Union in an ahistorical 'eternal dimension' – which is typical of idealism generally and Zionism in particular – is from the outset manipulatory and misleading, and mainly based on exploiting the emotions and the ignorance of the observer. The 'Jewish problem' in the Soviet Union is *one* of the national problems there – not the only one, not even the most important one; it does not exist 'autonomously' (according to the false slogan: 'even socialism can't solve the problem of the Jews . . .'), separately or independently of the other inner social processes of the Soviet Union.

It would definitely be very presumptuous to attribute the Soviet Jews' willingness to emigrate only to their desire to gratify Jewish religious and cultural needs to a greater extent than is possible in the Soviet Union, or to their wish to strengthen Zionism politically, economically and militarily in Israel. For some of them that may be true. For many, however, the simple wish to live outside the Soviet Union is the main drive. Over half of the Jews allowed out of the Soviet Union, ostensibly as going to Israel, never arrive there. They 'drop out' during the stopover in Vienna or Rome and that's the end of their 'journey to Jerusalem'.²⁰ The Russian Zionist activist, Dr Viktor Polski, who left Moscow in 1974 and emigrated to Israel, laments: 'Should exit conditions be relaxed and fewer refusals be issued by the Soviet government, I have no doubt that the emigration

flow will increase considerably. However, I greatly fear that the flow of those arriving in Israel will not increase proportionately. If the Soviet Jews' image of Israel and the actual conditions behind it don't change, the proportion of those who drop out in transit will be greater than those arriving in Israel.'²¹

Many of the Soviet Jewish emigrants have fallen victim to Israeli propaganda, which by radio and much more subtle and seemingly 'unofficial' means, penetrates into the interior of the Soviet Union. Recently the situation has begun to change: relations and friends already emigrated report in detail on the rude awakening they have undergone in the Zionist state. Instead of a completely harmonious, affluent society without any friction, they found a class society in which they are exposed to the same exploitation, unemployment, inflation, bureaucracy, alienation which make up the day-to-day life of the rest of the working population of Israel – in spite of the great financial benefits they enjoy as privileged immigrants. In addition, there is the constant deadly peril of confrontation with the Palestinians and neighbouring Arab states. In 1974 half as many Jews emigrated from the Soviet Union to Israel as in the previous years 1973 and 1972 respectively.²²

With the worsening of the economic crisis in Israel and increasing inflation and unemployment rates, the resentment of the Israeli population at the Soviet Jews, with their special prerogatives as regards housing and jobs and their special tax reductions, is becoming more marked. Any member of the working population can easily realise that the national income cake, in any case inadequate, and the capital collected abroad by the Zionist organisation are being distributed most unfairly.

In the past grievances were voiced quietly and confidentially about the preferential treatment of the immigrants; but they were 'needed'. Today, however, many in Israel express their annoyance openly. The Jews and more specifically the Jewish underprivileged social strata, like the Orientals, sections of the youth and the working class, are venting their protests more blatantly and explicitly against immigration at their own expense. For the most part they are reacting quite spontaneously, generally without realising that thereby they are already assailing one of the basic principles of Zionism. 'Ingathering' of the Jews in Palestine/Israel, demographically outnumbering the Arabs, feeding the insatiable – and in the long run, inadequate – Israeli military machine with human raw material for its fight to the bitter end: this is Zionism, among other things. All immigration to Israel is – today as in the past – motivated, controlled and run by Zionism. The objective contradiction between Zionist immigration and the interests of the working population of Israel cannot be solved. It is an additional source of internal Israeli class conflicts.²³

But what becomes of the Soviet Jewish 'drop-outs'? The Israeli journalist, Abraham Tirosh, reports on Jewish emigrants from the

Soviet Union, who either arrived in Israel and then left the country, or who managed to 'beat it' in Vienna, in transit from Moscow to Tel-Aviv, despite constant Israeli surveillance.²⁴ These Jews, who are in a terrible predicament and urgently need help, are as a rule turned away by the Zionist 'Jewish Agency' which has offices in all important cities in Western Europe. The European office of the only allegedly independent Jewish refugee organisation, the HIAS, is in Rome. Tirosh continues: Penniless and disoriented, these Jewish refugees trudge to Vienna and Rome. 'The HIAS organisation refuses to take care of the Soviet emigrants who arrive at their offices in Vienna, Rome or in Israel, unless they have received the confirmation and permission of the Jewish Agency, which looks into each case thoroughly. The acting director of the immigration department of the Jewish Agency, Yehuda Dominitz, and leading circles of the HIAS have strongly denied recent news, according to which, contravening the agreement, HIAS has begun to handle Soviet emigrants from Israel to Europe and the USA.'

The issue of the Soviet Jews can be summed up as follows: The Zionist movement is not struggling for the recognition of the right of *every person* to be able to emigrate from one country to another – in itself a progressive demand which every socialist should support – but it demands this right as a special privilege *only for Jews*, and then only on condition that they immigrate to Israel and to no other country.

The basis of the Zionist campaign on Soviet Jews is not the general idea of universal human rights but the Zionist thesis according to which every Jew everywhere in the world has a special right to Palestine. And in the same breath, Zionism denies the political and national rights of the Arabs of Palestine to their homeland.

Indeed, this same Zionist government and this same Zionist view demand the automatic right of a Jew born in Moscow to emigrate from the Soviet Union to Israel and automatically grant him Israeli citizenship. At the same time, the same view and the same government deny the right of an Arab born in Haifa, who today for example is living in the Gaza Strip or in a camp on the outskirts of Beirut, to return to his home town and to receive his civil rights there. Human rights in general and even the rights of the Jews as a whole interest Zionism only in as far as they help to promote Jewish immigration to Israel.

'Cruel Zionism'

We have already mentioned the *transfer*, that morally dubious business deal between the Zionist movement and the Hitler government. When this deal was criticised – at the time progressive forces were calling for an economic boycott of the Third Reich – Moshe Shertok (later known as M. Sharett, a well-known Zionist leader and

Israel's first foreign minister) answered as follows; 'Here there is a conflict between the Diaspora and Eretz-Israel (ie the Zionist enterprise in Palestine – *editor's note*) . . . It is Zionism's lot to have to be cruel to the Diaspora at times, when the development of the country demands it.'²⁵

This cruelty of Zionism towards the Jews of the world is sometimes especially cynical. It often happens that people who belong to an oppressed group but who nevertheless do not want to or cannot participate in the struggle against the cause of their oppression and prefer an individual solution – emigration to another country. Socialists do not propose to rob them of this possibility; on the contrary, they insist on the right of every individual to emigrate freely. They object most strongly however to emigration being presented as a collective political solution, as a substitute for the struggle against oppression. It must be mentioned at this point that in the 1920s, 1930s and also later, many of the East European Jews did in fact choose this individual solution of emigration. Many millions emigrated from countries where they had suffered great hardship, to the US and other countries, and thus found a satisfactory solution to their problem themselves. Zionist emigration to Palestine was negligible in comparison with the flow of Jewish non-Zionist emigration to other countries. The difference however lay in the fact that Zionist propaganda was directed at the more active and also more conscious elements, who were looking for a political and not simply an individual solution; and it offered them the wrong political solution. Moreover, it tried stubbornly to prevent these Jews from joining in the revolutionary struggle in their own countries – this was to a certain extent both the requirement and aim of the Zionist campaign.

There are also exceptional situations in which there is no possibility of a struggle on the part of the oppressed minority at all, and this minority is particularly exposed to great danger. In such cases the only humane solution is the prompt organisation of emigration for those in immediate danger to any countries ready to grant them asylum. (A fairly recent example is that of people of Indian origin in Uganda in 1972.) Such was the situation of the Jews in Germany and other European countries at the end of the 1930s. It was clear that to save the Jews from the danger of extermination, it was necessary to enable them to emigrate to any safe place.

At this historical moment truly cruel Zionism (without inverted commas) showed its absolutely cynical attitude towards the problem of saving the Jews. The leaders of Zionism reacted with indifference and even hostility towards the emigration of Jews from the endangered countries to places other than Palestine. Zionism clearly showed that in principle it is not interested in saving the Jews themselves, but only in saving them by emigration to Palestine. The leader of the Zionist movement, Chaim Weizman, said: 'Zionism is eternal life and, compared with that, saving thousands of Jews is merely

extending their lives on borrowed time.'²⁶

David Ben-Gurion's letter of 17 December 1938 to his colleagues of the Zionist Executives is particularly shocking. In reaction to attempts by the Western powers – under pressure of public opinion – to find various expedients for the problem of the Jews in Germany, Ben-Gurion writes: 'The Jewish problem now is not what it used to be. What is now happening to the Jews in Germany is not the end but the beginning. Other anti-semitic states will learn from Hitler's deed . . . Millions of Jews are now faced with physical extermination. The refugee problem has now become an urgent world-wide issue and England, assisted by anti-zionist Jews, is trying to separate the refugee problem from the Palestine problem. The frightful extent of the refugee problem requires a speedy territorial solution and if Palestine won't absorb any Jews, one would have to look for another territory. Zionism is endangered. All other territorial experiments, which are doomed to failure, will require huge amounts of capital, and if the Jews are faced with a choice between the refugee problem and rescuing Jews from concentration camps on the one hand, and aid for the national museum in Palestine on the other, the Jewish sense of pity will prevail and our people's entire strength will be directed at aid for the refugees in the various countries. Zionism will vanish from the agenda and indeed not only from world public opinion in England and America but also from Jewish public opinion. We are risking zionism's very existence if we allow the refugee problem to be separated from the Palestine problem.'²⁷

It is not just that zionism and saving Jews in danger of extermination are not one and the same thing; at a critical historical moment, zionism took a stand *against* saving the Jews. Here we must add something: it is true that those Jews who before the second world war had participated in the zionist emigration from Central and Eastern Europe thereby escaped annihilation by fascism. The attempt, however, to use this as a 'socialist' justification of zionism is nothing but demagoguery and moral blackmail.

Firstly, many more Jews managed to save themselves without zionism, indeed contrary to zionism, either by emigrating to America or by fleeing to the interior of the Soviet Union. Secondly, the deliverance of the Jews in Palestine was due to the fact that the German army in Africa under Rommel only got as far as El-Alamein, and did not conquer Palestine. Palestine was also on the planned route of the fascist conquerors. If Rommel's army had conquered Palestine and had got as far as Syria, the fate of the Jews in Palestine would undoubtedly have been the same as their brothers' in Poland. No 'magical mystical' power of zionism's would have protected the Jews of the zionist community from the Nazis then.

Only few zionists were ready to recognise the untenability of the zionist axiom, according to which Jews could 'get out of' world history through zionism so that they would then be outside the fascism-anti-

fascism process. This is what the zionist leader Yaakov Zrubavel said in January 1945 in the Congress of the 'World Organisation of Poalei Zion' and thereby gave rise to violent disagreement: 'Is it admissible to build everything on this catastrophe? (the annihilation of the European Jews – *editor's note*) And isn't it pure chance that we have survived in Palestine? Wasn't Hitler at the gates of the country? What would have been our situation and fate here then? Large sections of the population here and certainly those present here could have defended themselves, just as the Jews in Warsaw defended themselves. Hitler didn't only plan to annihilate the Diaspora but *Jewry*, all Jews everywhere. We have saved ourselves *by pure chance*.'²⁸

Those who consider the extermination of the Jews by German fascism to be a 'refutation' of the marxist view of the Jewish problem and its solution by the social struggle and social change, and who invoke this as proof of the 'necessity' of zionism, should be answered in the words of Isaac Deutscher:

'To my mind the tragic events of the Nazi era neither invalidate the classical marxist analysis of the Jewish question nor call for its revision . . . Classical marxism reckoned with a healthier and more normal development of our civilisation in general, with a timely transformation of the capitalist into a socialist society. It did not reckon with the persistent survival of capitalism and its degenerative effects on our civilisation at large. Nevertheless Marx, Engels, Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky repeatedly said that mankind was confronted with the alternative of either international socialism or barbarism – *tertium non datur* . . . European Jewry has paid the price for the survival of capitalism, for the success of capitalism in defending itself against a socialist revolution. This fact surely does not call for a revision of the classical marxists analysis – it rather confirms it.'²⁹

Indeed there was no essential connection between the deliverance of the Jews in the second world war and zionism. What brought about the deliverance of the Jews in Palestine was the fact that Hitler's war machine had been brought to a halt. The Jews were saved wherever nazism could not reach. The historical conclusion to be drawn from this is that only the worldwide struggle against fascism and reaction is an effective answer to anti-semitism. This conclusion is exactly opposed to the one drawn by the so-called 'left-wing' zionists.

Zionist propagandists often point out that the emigrants to Palestine/Israel from Eastern and Western Europe 'and recently from the Arab countries' came because of anti-semitism and lack of a means of livelihood: 'Zionist ideology played in most cases no role at all or at the most a secondary one . . . These people did not need any pressure or zionist propaganda to decide to emigrate to Palestine.'³⁰

The answer to that is: first, no one is trying to deny that zionism used countless thousands of people as human raw material for its own

enterprise, people looking for an escape from destitution and oppression, – many of them were not particularly enthusiastic zionists to begin with. On the other hand, however, the assertion that zionism did not have to exert any particular pressure on these people to get them to emigrate to Palestine/Israel is very far from the truth. Let us recall as an example the emigration of the Jews from Iraq at the beginning of the 1950s. A brief outline of the affair: in 1950 the zionist movement concluded a secret deal with the reactionary government of Iraq, according to which the emigration of the Jews of that country to Israel was to be encouraged. The Iraqi government concluded this deal among other things because it had a financial interest in it: the property of emigrant Jews was to be confiscated and handed over to the government. Both the zionists and the Iraqi government were completely satisfied with this arrangement. The only problem was that the Iraqi Jews themselves did not want to play along. The way they saw things, they had absolutely no reason to emigrate from Iraq to Israel. Their relations with the Islamic and Christian sections of the Iraqi population were in general quite good.

Then something strange happened: bombs exploded in various Jewish establishments and meeting places. Some Jews were killed by the bombs. As a result, the Iraqi Jews panicked and within a short time most of them applied to emigrate to Israel. Some time later it turned out that those who had planted the bombs were without any doubt agents of the zionist movement who were following their movement's instructions. So the leaders of cruel zionism had decided that wherever there is not enough anti-semitism, it must be intentionally created or simulated in order to frighten the Jews and motivate them to implement the zionist solution. All the details of this affair, based on the statements of Iraqi Jews and some of the 'heroes', the names of the bomb-planters, were published only fifteen years later in Israel. Many Jews from Iraq living in Israel today, when asked who planted the bombs admit in private conversations: 'Hatnu'ah' – 'the Movement', which in Hebrew usage means the *zionist movement*. This is not the only affair of this kind. In this case however many of the details became known.³¹

The Problem of Land and Expulsion

We have seen that zionism is not quite the same as the deliverance of Jews from danger and anti-semitism. Moreover, the important thing about zionism is not that it wants to solve the problem of the Jews by emigration generally. The important thing is zionism's insistence that Jewish emigration be directed exclusively at a systematic colonisation of Palestine with the aim of establishing an exclusivist Jewish nation-state. The character traits of the 'zionist enterprise' in Palestine are the inevitable result of this aim. 'Left-wing' zionists often explain that

'the land they immigrated into was already populated by Arabs – that is the tragedy of the Jewish immigration to Palestine, which doubtlessly is frequently unrecognised or suppressed; but then, who can expect an ethnic group – whatever it is and whenever it was – to be prepared to commit collective suicide, when there is the possibility of migrating, even if the country in question is already populated by other people.'³²

There was nothing tragic about the fact that the US was already populated, for those Jews who chose to escape danger and persecution by migrating privately to the US – and there were many many more of them than those who chose the zionist solution. It did not even enter their minds that in order to escape 'collective suicide' they should expel the non-Jews from the US. The 'tragedy' only began when the zionist settlers aimed not only to settle in Palestine but to change it from an Arab country into an exclusivist Jewish nation-state. We put the word tragedy in inverted commas because the 'left-wing' apologists of zionism use it to give the impression that it was a matter of some cruel play of blind fate, not the result of intentional and planned actions on the part of the leaders of the zionist colonisers. Chaim Weizman, the president of the Zionist Organisation, explained the zionists' aim before the Paris Peace Congress in March 1919 as follows:

'With the establishment of a Jewish national home we intend to create such conditions in Palestine as make it possible for us to transport 50,000 to 60,000 Jews yearly, to develop our language, establish our schools, universities and other national institutions and to continue to work in this direction until Palestine is finally just as Jewish as America is American and England is English.'³³ And what was to become of the existing population of Palestine, which was predominantly Arab? Some prominent zionists are much more honest here than many of their apologists; Menachem Ussischkin, member of the Zionist Executive, reports on the zionist solution planned for what was called in the zionist vernacular, the 'Arab question':

'We are condemned to remain a small island in the Arabian ocean for ever; but that does not mean that we should allow ourselves to be humiliated or subjugated. We have to keep silent and go to Palestine. Hard times are ahead. *But if we go to Palestine ten by ten, hundred by hundred, thousand by thousand, hundreds of thousands, the Arab question is solved.*'³⁴

The 'Arab question' was 'solved' satisfactorily for zionism: the Arab people of Palestine were made foreigners in their own country. 'Tragedy'?

The territorial expansion of zionism which can be traced exactly from the already famous maps of Israel (1947, 1949, 1967, 1973) is no coincidence, no historical mishap. It arose from the global matter-of-factness of the zionist movement which on the one hand lays exclusive zionist claim to the whole of Palestine – naturally, only for

Jews – while on the other hand it believes it can counter the objective incompatibility of the Zionist entity with its Arab environment by means of the military, strategic and demographic advantages gained by expanding its borders. The annexation of Arab territories under Zionist rule has both history and method. In 1918 the population of Palestine was made up of 599,000 Arabs and 67,000 Jews, who owned two million hectares and 65,000 hectares of land respectively. In 1970 only 86,000 hectares of Israeli land (ie approximately 4 per cent) were still in Arab hands.³⁵ Until 1948 Zionism had to take over and colonise land ‘step by step’; but after achieving state sovereignty, it was able to take over both the lands and the villages of the Palestinian refugees (in Israeli legal terminology ‘abandoned property’) as well as substantial parts of the lands of those Arabs who stayed in Israel, by their administrative transformation into ‘closed military areas’ and their consequent confiscation. For example, this was how the ‘Judaisation’ of the Galilee was engineered and imposed from the fifties.³⁶

The Zionist policy on land left nothing to chance. The fact that it was connected with iniquities, expulsions and great suffering for the Arabs of Palestine was not a ‘mistake’ but the logical consequence of the policy which Zionism consciously and systematically pursued. Before the terms ‘colonisation’ and ‘colonialism’ generally came to be regarded throughout the world as dirty words, the Zionist movement used them to describe its own pursuits in Palestine. It spoke of ‘*Kolonizatzia*’. The nasty aftertaste of the word later led them to use the Hebrew circumlocution for the same concept. At its foundation congress in Petah-Tikva in 1919, Ben-Gurion’s party Ahdut Ha’avoda (which was to be the leading ‘left-wing’ party in the Zionist movement ever since) proclaimed the aim of the ‘Zionist Workers’ Movement in Palestine’ (sic): ‘The transfer of the land of Palestine, its rivers and its natural resources to the possession of the entire Jewish people.’³⁷ A definite aim without doubt, but the Zionists knew very well that ‘our country (is) not only small but for the most part in the possession of others.’³⁸

A complicated and fateful enterprise in the opinion of both its supporters and opponents who knew one thing very well: *Palestine was already populated, its transformation into a ‘Jewish’ country would have to be at the expense of the indigenous population!* The Zionist economist Alfred Bonnè, says: ‘The problem of land is one of the questions which has become particularly acute and politically significant with the expansion of Jewish colonisation in recent years. If Palestine had been an unpopulated country or if conditions there had been the same as in the colonial territories of Australia, Africa or South America which are hardly populated, the significance of the question would not have gone beyond the bounds of pure economics. *But Palestine was a populated country when the Jewish colonisation movement began and it was even more densely populated on average than the neighbouring countries.*’³⁹ Ya’akov Meiersohn who has

already been quoted says in 1920: ‘In Palestine there is no unsettled land at all; the land of Palestine is settled, but not intensively cultivated. I am stating quite frankly and clearly that up till now not one piece of land has been bought in Palestine which had not been cultivated before by Arabs.’⁴⁰

The Communist Party of Palestine says in this regard: ‘The Zionist movement does not like to buy lands which have to be drained before construction can begin. It prefers land which has been worked for years by the fellahin (. . .) First, it is more economical and in the public good to build kibbutzim on land that has already been cultivated than on uncultivated land; and secondly by doing this one fulfills a (Zionist) duty: the Arabs, the “goyim”, are expelled from the “Holy” Land, now “redeemed” by the hands of Jewish workers.’⁴¹

Today no one can deny that the Zionist Movement of Palestine, which was under the leadership of Ben-Gurion from 1920 until the mid 1960s, intended anything but to have a Jewish majority as great as possible in a territory as big as possible – and for the most part ‘free of Arabs’ . . . Ben-Gurion writes: ‘First and foremost I am a Zionist and strive for the concentration of the Jewish people in its own country. Only after that do I see the Arab question arising.’ And further: ‘If the Zionist idea has any true content, it is the content of the state. Zionism is the desire for a state of the Jews, the yearning for the country of Palestine and for the establishment of a government.’ Four years later, in 1928 he wrote: ‘Palestine for the Jewish people and Palestine for the Arab people is not one and the same thing . . . We would be deceiving ourselves if we said that it were one and the same . . . Palestine is destined for the Jewish people and the Arabs who live there.’⁴² It must be noted here that Ben-Gurion means *all the Jews in the world* and refers to them as a *people*, whereas in Palestine there was not even an Arab people, just ‘the Arabs who live there’. In 1931 he says: ‘I have always only viewed the Arab problem from the Zionist point of view, ie I wanted to solve the problem of the Jewish people in Palestine, concentrate on them in this country in order to make them a free people living in their own country. There isn’t an Arab problem in Palestine, only a Jewish one – like everywhere else, by the way.’⁴³

The fact that the very vociferous Zionist ‘workers’ movement’ practises colonialism under the cloak of socialism may be confusing, but the facts speak for themselves. For those who could not understand how socialism could be consistent with colonialism, internationalism with nationalism, workers’ solidarity with expropriation and repression, the ‘left-wing’ Zionists enacted their verdict in 1921: ‘Whenever we come across a contradiction between national and socialist principles, the contradiction should be resolved by relinquishing the socialist principle in favour of the national activity. We shall not accept the contrary attempt to solve the contradiction by dispensing with the national interests in favour of the

socialist idea.⁴⁴ If one sees through the 'socialist' claims of zionism, its contradictory nature and untenability, the zionist movement loses one of its most important propagandistic hobby-horses which has helped it to rope in and take unfair advantage of socialists, who are subjectively all too sincere but nevertheless confused, in support of an objectively abominable colonial and repressive enterprise.

Indeed, that is what happens, whether it is a 'bourgeois' or 'left-wing' zionism. As far as the practical implementation of the zionist project in Palestine is concerned, the consequences for the Arabs of Palestine, the objective consequence of the zionist enterprise for the country in general are the same, no matter how one subjectively would like 'one's own' zionist activity to be understood – as opposed to that of 'the others'.

This is quite clearly a matter of planned politics. Even the founder of zionism, Theodor Herzl, writes in his diary on 12 June 1895:

'By buying land we are immediately giving material advantages to the country which takes us in. By and by, we have to get the private land in the areas given to us out of the hands of its owners. We want to get the poor inhabitants across the borders without making a stir, by giving them work in the transit countries. But in our country we won't give them any work at all . . . It's good for the landowners to believe they are exploiting us and getting excessive prices for their land. But no land will be sold back to them.'⁴⁵

This was and still is even today zionism's conscious and planned policy: the 'poor population' ie the majority of the Arabs in the Promised Land should be excluded from the country by all ways and means. In 1940 Joseph Weitz, head of the Colonisation Department of the Jewish National Fund in Palestine at the time, and therefore responsible for the practical implementation of zionist colonisation, wrote in his diary: 'Among ourselves it should be clear that in this country there isn't room for both peoples together. With the Arabs we won't achieve our aim of being an independent nation in this small country. The only solution is Palestine, at least a West Palestine (ie the entire area west of the Jordan, as distinct from "East Palestine", which refers to Transjordan – *editor's note.*) without Arabs . . . and there's no other way but to transfer the Arabs from here to the neighbouring countries; to transfer all of them. Not a single village, not one tribe should be left behind . . . For this purpose money, plenty of money will be found. Only after this transfer will this country be able to absorb millions of our brethren.'⁴⁶

In his article in the daily newspaper *Davar* (officially the organ of the *Histadrut* but actually the mouthpiece of the *Mapai*/*Avodah* party) of 29 September 1967, Joseph Weitz himself tells us that this excellent plan, which he had entered into his diary 27 years previously, was not just his own idea. The most important zionist leaders in Palestine gave this plan their support and they started to put out feelers to see how this could be realised in practice. Indeed, a large

part of the programme was realised eight years later in 1947 when 'the UNO passed a resolution to partition the country into two states and to our *gretgreat good fortune* (our italics – *editor's note*) the war of liberation broke out which brought with it a two-fold miracle: a territorial victory and the flight of the Arabs.'

There can be no doubt that the expulsion of the Palestinians from their country was not a 'tragic blow' of blind fate but the result of consciously planned zionist policy. Under these circumstances the question posed naively by 'left-wing' zionists sounds really amazing: 'In the years of the Mandate 1920-1947/48, before the Arabs offered violent resistance to the UN resolution to partition the country, how many Arab peasants actually lost their land, despite the legislation of the Mandate protecting the Arab peasants, and could no longer work in agriculture, and how many Arabs immigrated in this period from the neighbouring countries to Palestine?'⁴⁷

Some indicative characteristics of this argument can be deduced from these questions. First, it follows that the expulsion of the Arab fellahin was warranted after the Arabs had 'offered violent resistance to the UN partition resolution'. Such views should be met with silent scorn. We should remember that in all the hypocritical apologies of colonialism throughout the world it is usual to call mass expulsions of the colonial peoples a just punishment for the fact that these wicked natives dare to offer violent resistance to their mass expulsion. Secondly, it appears that the known intentions of zionism, as expressed in the above quotations and in many other documents and the known historical facts, are supposed to be consciously ignored. Instead one should tell the story that zionism did not expel the Arab fellahin on a large scale until 1948. The truth, however, is quite different.

Examples of mass expulsions of Arab fellahin as a result of zionist colonisation can be cited very easily. Many expulsions took place before the establishment of the zionist state and continued during the entire period of the British Mandate, ie till 1948.

Such questions from 'left-wing' zionists are also intended to lead one to believe that British imperialism – with the Mandatory government – offered some effective protection against expulsion. This is not true either. In this context let us refer to the memoirs of a Jewish English zionist, M. Hyamson, who in the first half of the Mandate period was a high government official in Palestine. M. Hyamson reports on the first attempt, which was made at the beginning of the 1920s to protect Arab tenants from expulsion: The need (for these regulations) became urgent, because Jewish agencies bought relatively large amounts of land from (Arab) landowners who lived in Paris, Beirut or Cairo, whereby the moral – if not the legal – rights of the tenants, who had been resident on that land all along, were ignored. According to the new legislation the transfer of lands was forbidden if the tenant's interests were not ensured by

leaving him enough land to guarantee his own and his family's livelihood. This, however, was contrary to the interests of both sellers and buyers. The buyers were willing to pay prices higher than usual but demanded that the land be available for settlement. The sellers, who had no local interests at all, were of course keen to sell at as high a price as possible.

They very quickly found a way to dodge the law by means of a small payment. They found allies in the money lenders to whom most of the tenants were deeply in debt. In order to get the tenants to abandon the land before it was transferred, they paid them small sums of money with which they could settle some of their debts to the money lenders. Then, when the transfer came, there were no more tenants there to take care of. So everyone was completely satisfied: the sellers, the buyers and understandably the money lenders, but of course the tenants only for a limited time.

The tenants were only satisfied for a short time because the 'damages' they received from the landowner amounted to very little. It was hardly enough to repay their debts to the money lenders. Moreover, Hyamson says the fellahin and tenants who were forced to leave their lands could not obtain employment in most of the newly developed manufacturing plants in the country. These manufacturing plants were Zionist, and Zionism refused in principle to employ Arab workers. Hyamson continues that 'in 1929 a new regulation was passed which gave the tenants still less protection . . . ; it virtually legalised the established practice'.

Two years later the purchase of land began once more on a large scale and the expected problem of the Arabs without land was again at the top of the agenda. This problem caused unrest and forced the Mandatory government to enact new regulations. However the new regulations of 1931 did not offer the tenants any effective protection either, for those landowners who wanted to sell their land at 'acceptable' prices could still dodge the objectives of the law. This state of affairs continued until the end of the Mandate.⁴⁸

We have summarised only a small part of Hyamson's interesting chapter on this topic. It clearly follows from the extracts above and from the entire chapter that the problem of those tenants who lost the basis of their livelihood (ie the land which they and their forefathers had cultivated for generations) because of Zionist colonisation, was an extremely serious one and involved a great number of people. Similarly it is clear that the decrees of the Mandatory government could not protect the tenants effectively from the conspiracy between the Zionist institutions, landowners and moneylenders, serving their common interests. One example only:

The 8,000 fellahin from 22 villages who had lost their land at the beginning of the 1920s when the great landowner family Sursuk sold land to the Zionists, received exactly ten shillings per capita from the Zionist Organisation.⁴⁹

To make Zionist colonisation seem harmless, Zionists often point out that at that time 'a total of only 664 claims for damages' were placed by Arab peasants. Here, besides the fact that the possibility of so-called (and relatively low) damages was publicised as little as possible, nothing is said about the number of dispossessed peasants who from the outset were excluded from the possibility of claiming 'damages':

Peasants who were expelled after their land was sold to non-Jews. (There were many sales to Arab agents and profiteers who then sold the land to the Acquisition of Land Department of the Zionist Organisation)

Peasants who were not classified as tenants; agricultural workers and peasants who only sold part of their land.

Peasants who had no documentary proof of their tenancy rights (very many!)

Peasants who after sale were allocated other land, even if it could not be cultivated.

Peasants who had found other employment after being expelled.

That is how, in the interests of Zionism, they managed to limit the classification 'landless Arab' to a small group.⁵⁰

In the period 1920-36, the time when the foundations of the Zionist enterprise in Palestine were being laid both in the towns and in the country areas, there was an increased 'exodus' of peasants from the country areas - an exodus which must be understood correctly: not 'out of' the country but a migration as a result of the peasants' losing their land. The Arab urban population of Palestine increased from 194,000 in 1922 to 298,000 in 1936.

The landless Arabs met with increasing unemployment in the Zionist-dominated urban economy, caused by the Zionist insistence on 'Hebrew labour' and boycott of Arab labour. But let us get back to the fact that the fellahin were mostly expelled by the sellers before the sale (in deliberate agreement with the buyers). This fact enabled Zionism, like Pontius Pilate, to protest its innocence and to maintain it was not responsible for the expulsion of the fellahin. However, there are also enough examples of cases in which the Zionist colonisers, in collaboration with the British police, actively participated in the expulsion of the indigenous fellahin as in Al Fuk (today Afula) at the end of 1924, or Wadi al-Hawarith (today Emek Hefer) in 1933.

Still today the propagandists of Zionism spread the claim that the Zionist institutions (at least until 1948) in most cases received 'deserted lands' so that Zionism is not responsible for the expulsion of the masses of fellahin. From a technical point of view and applied to the appropriate cases that is not a lie but actually a half-truth - which is worse than a lie. For the Zionist propagandists conceal the fact that, to dodge the laws enacted to protect the fellahin, the Zionist institutions demanded that the sellers expell their tenants themselves, before going through with the sale.

By the way, we can see here how far from the truth is yet another claim of the 'left-wing' zionists: the claim that 'it was not the poor fellahin but the great landowners who, for reasons of class consciousness, rejected Jewish immigration and they consequently feared "infection" of their fellahin with social ideas imported from Europe'. In the first place, the 'social ideas' zionism brought from Europe were intended for exclusively Jewish use. All the institutions of organised work and community life were in no way intended for Arabs. Zionism never propagated any progressive social ideas among the fellahin. On the contrary: zionism was, as we saw above, the objective ally of the great landowners. This was the only social class in Arab society which received any advantages through zionist colonisation – they received for their lands prices which were higher than before colonisation. The fellahin were in fact the victims of an alliance between zionism, the great landowners and the moneylenders. It is true that to veil their real interests and intentions, the great landowners sometimes launched vigorous verbal campaigns against zionism. But it was all talk.

Here we must mention that the method of expulsion (which was usually concealed to evade the law) and the lack of any reliable registration of proprietary and usufructuary rights are the reasons why it is still impossible today to supply exact details as to the extent of the expulsions. There is no doubt that there must have been many thousands. The exact figure, however, would have to be determined through painstaking detailed research. The question how many fellahin lost their land because of zionist colonisation can at present only be answered generally.

In this context, here is an extract from a speech of Moshé Dayan before the students of the Haifa Technical University ('Technion') as quoted by the Israeli daily *Ha'aretz* of 4 April 1968: 'We came to this country, already inhabited by Arabs, and established here a Hebrew, ie a Jewish state. In large areas we bought lands from the Arabs. Jewish villages arose in place of Arab villages. You don't even know the names of these villages and I'm not reproaching you for that, as those geography books no longer exist. Not only do the books no longer exist but the villages don't exist any more either. Nahalal arose in place of Mahlul, Gevat in place of Jibta, Sarid in place of Haneifs and Kefar Yehoshu'a in place of Tel-Shaman. Not one place in this country was built where there hadn't formerly been an Arab population.'

Indeed the professional generals of zionism often speak more clearly and more frankly than many of their 'left-wing' apologists. The colonisation of a country and the resulting expulsion and oppression of its indigenous inhabitants, and all of this with the propagandistic aim of a so-called 'progressive' society in Palestine, as the zionists, disguised as socialists, it, is not only pure hypocrisy but also the theoretic and practical prostitution of revolutionary

theory – a theory advocated only verbally.

The first systematic research into the extent of the destruction which zionism and zionist colonisation caused to the original Palestinian society, compiled by the Palestinian historian 'Aref al-'Aref and presented on 15 February 1973 by the chairman of the Israeli League for Human Rights, Professor Israel Shahak, contains a complete list of those Arab villages in Palestine which existed until 1948 and which today would be sought in vain. They no longer exist. In figures: 385 – in words: three hundred and eight-five.

It follows from some of the quotations above that it was part of the zionist expulsion policy to exert pressure continually on the Arabs by not employing them. 'Left-wing' zionists feel slightly uncomfortable about this point . . . but only for a moment. They concede that the displacement of Arab workers from their jobs is one of those things which 'have a repulsive effect on us Europeans'. However in the same breath they call on their readers to free themselves from such merciful, weak, apparently specifically European 'prejudices'. You must understand, the Arab workers had to go, 'to protect these (Jewish) workers from starvation, as it was just impossible for Jewish workers to live on the same wages as Arab workers'. So, one has to excuse them: the Jewish workers had a European stomach which was bigger than that of the Arab members of the same class.

After such brilliant argument, however, they apparently get an uneasy feeling once more and admit that perhaps 'some kind of solution more favourable to the Arabs could have been found. For example, one need only have somehow institutionalised the actual circumstances – the Arab peasants sold their products unhindered at lower prices even in Jewish towns – and a lot of dirty linen would have been avoided.'

This attempt to excuse, however, is a twofold failure: an untruth and an absurdity at one and the same time. It is untrue that the zionist institutions did not systematically interfere with and hinder the sale of products by the Arab fellahin: this was done not only with propaganda but also with the aid of more effective means of 'persuasion'. (The zionist leader David Hakohen reports for example in the supplement of the newspaper *Ha'aretz* of 15 November 1968 how he and his colleagues poured petroleum over tomatoes being sold by Arabs and broke their eggs.) The attempt at an excuse is fundamentally absurd because the only way of solving the problem which would have avoided 'a lot of dirty linen' would have been for zionism to abandon its main aim.

From the standpoint of the zionist aim – the transformation of Palestine, which was an Arab country, into a 'Jewish' nation-state – the presence of the Arabs was an obstacle which had to be removed. The way to achieve this goal was to refuse the Arabs work, as all zionists since Herzl have realised.

The policy of 'zionising' and at the same time 'de-Arabising'

Palestine has not changed fundamentally. On the contrary: the Arab areas conquered in the 1967 June War gave Israel the opportunity to erect more than 100 additional civilian and military settlements there and to expel many thousands of Arabs, some for the second time in twenty years. The guiding words of Moshé Dayan say it quite clearly: 'In the course of the last hundred years, our people have been undergoing a process of building up the country and the nation of expansion, by increasing the number of Jews and settlements and of colonisation in order to expand the borders. Let there be no Jew who says that this is the end of the process. Let there be no Jew who says that we are near the end of the road.'⁵¹

Israel is as a state a huge *fait accompli*. However, it is not likely that Israel, even within the borders of 4 June 1967 'plus corrections', can look forward to peaceful and harmonious coexistence with its Arab neighbours in the long term. The Middle East conflict is not simply a 'border conflict'. The cause of the historical conflict between the state of Israel in its present Zionist form on the one hand and the Arabs on the other, is the existence and the effects of Zionism. Whoever is sincerely interested in the future of Israelis and Arabs in the Middle East should seriously reflect on this.

References

- 1 First published in English in *New Left Review* 65, Jan-Feb 1971.
 - 2 Cf. Alfred Moos, in: *links* no 33, 1972. A Hebrew translation of Moos's article was immediately published in Israel by the Zionist group which had split from the CP of Israel in 1965, *Maki* (today: *Moked*) in its organ 'Kol Ha'am' no 32 (1972) under the title 'Zionism, the Scarecrow'. This group had taken it upon itself to back the Israeli state by accusing 'from a communist point of view' all opponents of the Zionist policy of anti-socialism and by seizing most gratefully on any political or apologetic contribution from abroad. These people revised socialist positions not only by putting forward the classical Zionist arguments, but by such historicist constructions which use the actual events and negative trends in the international communist movement and in the Soviet Union, to come to the conclusion they desire, i.e. that socialist opposition to Zionism is only one more negative trend, which, like the Stalinisation of the Soviet Union and the Comintern, is to be condemned and repudiated. When in the following the position of 'left-wing' Zionists is quoted, we are referring to this article by A. Moos.
 - 3 The original Hebrew text of the *Matzpen* article mentioned appeared originally in the Tel-Aviv organ 'Matzpen' and the editors presumed that the reader is familiar with the organisation's analysis of the history and nature of Zionism, as put forward in many articles since 1962. It is obvious that these analyses cannot be repeated in detail here. They partly appear in: Arie Bober (ed), *The Other Israel: The Radical Case against Zionism*, New York 1972; Cf also Nathan Weinstock, *Zionism: False Messiah*, Inklinks, London 1978.
- We shall only go into historical questions here as far as it is necessary to disprove the argument of the so-called 'left-wing' Zionist criticism of anti-Zionism.

- 4 Speech by Esther Maria Frumkina in: *Der 2. Kongreß der Kommunistischen Internationale. Prot. der Verhandlungen vom 19.7. in Petrograd und vom 23.7. bis 7.8.1920 in Moskau*, published by Verlag der KI, Hamburg 1921 p198.
- 5 David Ben-Gurion, *Memoirs*, Part 1, Tel-Aviv 1971, p245 (in Hebrew).
- 6 Cf eg in *Kontres*, organ of the Ahduth Ha'avoda, no 47, Tel-Aviv 1920 (in Hebrew).
- 7 'Yaakow Meiersohn, *Nach der 5. Poalei-Zion-Konferenz* - Brief an die Genossen der Sozialistischen Arbeiterpartei in Palästina (in Yiddish), Vienna 1920, reprinted in Mario Offenberg, *Kommunismus in Palästina-Nation und Klasse in der antikolonialen Revolution*, Meisenheim/Glan (BRD) 1975.
- 8 Aharon Cohen: *Israel and the Arab World*, Tel-Aviv 1964, p259 (in Hebrew).
- 9 R. Meinerzhagen, *Middle East Diary*, London 1958 p49.
- 10 *The diaries of Theodore Herzl*, Gollancz, London 1958 p6.
- 11 Leo Pinsker, *Auto-Emancipation*, New York 1948 p33 and M. Hess, *Rome and Jerusalem*, Tel-Aviv 1935 p25/26.
- 12 Cf Y. Elam in an article in 'Ot', organ of the Israeli Labour Party *Ma'arakh* no 2, Tel-Aviv 1967 (in Hebrew).
- 13 This quotation comes from a book which appeared in Berlin in 1934. The author was at that time one of the leading Zionists in Germany and became a leading Zionist in the USA and chairman of the international leadership of the - Zionist controlled - World Jewish Congress. Cf J. Prinz, *Wir Juden*, Berlin 1934 p154 (emphasis in original).
- 14 Cf *Die Nürnberger Gesetze*, 5. Auflage, Berlin 1939 p13/14 (our italics).
- 15 I. Deutscher, *The Non-Jewish Jew*, London 1969 p67.
- 16 Y. Elam, *Introduction to Zionist History*, Tel-Aviv 1972 p113 and p122 (in Hebrew).
- 17 A. Tartakower, *The Jewish Worker's Way to Zionism: Zionism and Socialism*, New York 1954 p63.
- 18 Reprinted from the minutes of the meeting in Y. Elam, *loc cit*, p123.
- 19 Y. Elam, *loc cit*, p122: 'Yishuv' was the term for the Jewish community in Palestine, dominated by the Zionist movement, before 1948. On the 'transfer' deal see Shaul Esh, *'Iunim beheqer ha-sho'ah ve-yahadut zmanenu*, Institute of Contemporary Judaism, the Hebrew University of Jerusalem 1973 p108ff.
- 20 Herberg Lucht from Vienna in: *Der Tagesspiegel* (Berlin) of 1 January 1975; and others.
- 21 Viktor Polski in: Dov Goldstein, Interview of the Week, in *Ma'ariv* of 27 December 1974.
- 22 Cf *Le Monde*, 20 December 1974 and *Der Tagesspiegel* (Berlin), 21 December 1974.
- 23 Cf A. Hoder, 'Russian Jews, Black Jews and Non-Jewish Jews', in *Israca* no 5, London 1973 p 16-25.
- 24 In *Ma'ariv* of 10 January 1973.
- 25 Quoted from Y. Elam, *loc cit*, p122.
- 26 Quoted from Y. Elam, *loc cit*, p111. The Israeli historian S. B. Beit-Zvi shows in his recently published monograph - *Post-Ugandan Zionism in the Crucible of the Holocaust*, Tel-Aviv, 1977 (in Hebrew) - how 'As a result of narrow-mindedness and fear of the danger of territorialism [ie, the "danger" that the Jewish problem might be solved by migration to some territory other than Palestine - editor's note] the Zionist movement in a number of cases

acted against attempts of Jews and non-Jews to save the lives [of Europe's Jews]. As time went on this intervention [against salvation of Jews] grew in scope and energy . . . In fact, the intervention against attempts to save Jews, to the extent that they were not connected with immigration to Palestine, continued up to the end of the [second world] war.' (*ibid*, p458) Even Y. Grienbaum, who in 1935 had demanded that the Zionist movement participate in the struggle for the rights of Europe's Jews, opposed in 1942 demands that Zionist funds (devoted to the colonisation of Palestine) be used to finance projects for saving the lives of Jews. Beit-Zvi quotes Grienbaum as saying 'When I was asked whether the money of the Zionist Construction Fund may not be used for saving Jews, I said "No", and I now repeat, "No". I know that people wonder why I found it necessary to say this. Friends tell me that even if what I say is right, there are things which must not be revealed in a moment of sorrow and anxiety such as this. I cannot agree with this. In my view, the wave which relegates Zionist activities to second place must be resisted.' (*ibid*, p110).

On the same subject see also Ben Hecht, *Perfidy* New York 1961.

27 Quoted from Y. Elam, *loc cit*, p 125-26. The historical background was the revolt of the Arabs of Palestine against British rule, which Great Britain had a hard time putting down. The British government did not want to antagonise the indigenous Arab population too much at that time by allowing a large wave of Zionist colonisation and were supported in this by anti-Zionist Jews.

28 In *Davar*, 5 February 1945, emphasis in the original.

29 I. Deutscher, *loc cit*, p49-50.

30 A. Moos, *loc cit*.

31 Cf the reports in the weekly *Ha'olam Hazeh* 20 April 1966 and 1 June 1966. This operation is of course denied by Zionists. Cf Y. Me'ir, *Children of the Desert*, Underground Organisations in Iraq 1941-1951, Tel Aviv 1973 p 204f (in Hebrew).

32 A. Moos, *loc cit*.

33 Quoted from Y. Elam, *loc cit*, p73/74.

34 Quoted from: *The XII. Zionist Congress in Karlsbad from 1-14 September 1921*, Berlin 1922 p70.

35 L. Gaspar, *Histoire de la Palestine*, Paris 1970 p104 and p119.

36 See Sabri Jeries, *The Arabs in Israel*, Beirut 1969 pp55-90, where there is a fully verified description of this.

37 Ben-Gurion, *loc cit*, p117.

38 Cf the speech of Saskin, member of the subcommittee for colonisation in the Zionist Executive at the XII Zionist Congress, *Minutes*, *loc cit*, p104.

39 A. Bonnè, *Palestine, Country and Economy*, Berlin 1935 p154/55.

40 Y. Meiersohn, *loc cit*.

41 Quoted from the statement of the Union Department of the PCP, October 1924, reprinted in: M. Offenber, *loc cit*, p336-337.

42 D. Ben-Gurion, *loc cit*, p299/300, p275 and p339.

43 D. Ben-Gurion, *We and Our Neighbours*, Jaffa 1931 p81, 82 (in Hebrew).

44 Y. Ben Zvi in: *Achduth* No 16, Tel-Aviv 1912.

45 T. Herzl, *Diaries*, Berlin 1922 (German).

46 J. Weitz, *Diaries*, quoted by the author in *Davar*, 29 September 1967.

47 A. Moos, *loc cit*.

48 M. Hyamson, *Palestine under the Mandate*, London 1950 pp87, 88.

49 Cf C. Sykes, *Crossroads to Israel*, London 1965 p119. Details of the

complicated dodges used by the Zionists to evade government regulations enacted to protect tenants are given by J. Weitz in the preface to his *Diaries*, Israel 1965 (in Hebrew), vol 1, ppxxii-xxviii. Many illustrations can be found throughout these *Diaries*.

50 Cf *A Survey of Palestine*, published by the Palestine government vol I, p296 and *Palestine Royal Commission Report 1937*, p239, 240.

51 General Moshé Dayan, in *Ma'ariv*, Tel-Aviv 7 July 1968.

OPPOSE APARTHEID AND ZIONISM

The University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg was the scene of a clash between Black and white students on August 4th. The issue was the recent Israeli military invasion of Lebanon. Simultaneous lunchtime meetings were called by the Black Students' Society and the South African Union of Jewish Students. About 1,000 pro-Zionist white students surrounded the gathering of Black students and loudly chanted, "No to PLO terrorism." Some Black students left their meeting wearing signs which read "I am a Palestinian, I have nowhere to live." They were reportedly attacked by the whites, fist fights broke out, and university security police intervened. Twelve students were suspended and the university banned all meetings.

A member of the Black Students' Society was quoted as saying, "Some of the Zionist students were threatening us and we have the security police on our backs. We identify with the PLO because we find them in the same position as us - landless, uprooted, and fighting for the simple right to live in peace with natural human rights." He went on to emphasise that one could be against Zionist aggression without being anti-semitic.

We totally agree with these sentiments.

(from SAMRAF news and notes, Sept-Oct, 1982)

The Class In Motion?

In this issue of the newsletter, we publish two stories of labor struggles occurring in the mid-west. One reason for doing so is simply to bring to people's attention incidents of labor militance that are understandably being neglected by the straight media. However, labor militance can be found in almost all times. Under the present conditions of unemployment and generalized attack on labor, most leftists agree that this should increase possibilities for wider (that is, beyond individual plant and/or industry) struggles to develop. Despite these small examples to the contrary, the problem before us now is the relative passivity of the class towards deteriorating conditions. Where militant struggles have developed, in the majority of cases it has not prevented the corporation from implementing its strategy. We hope to stimulate discussion of these and related problems in class organizing.

The third article in this section is the text of a speech delivered to veterans of the Flint sit-down strike. It suggests a particular attitude towards working class organizing in this period.....the editors

FIGHT AGAINST UNION BUSTING IN MINNEAPOLIS

Early this summer a strike occurred in Minneapolis that received a lot of local notice and may be of interest to labor activists.

The Bureau of Engraving, Inc. is a moderate-sized local company which manufactures printed circuit boards. Its 760 shop employees are organized into the Graphics Arts International Union, an AFL craft union which seldom organizes whole plants. There has never been a strike in the 26 years the union has been there. This year, however, when the contract came up the company demanded substantial concessions and when the union negotiators balked the company unilaterally declared a new "labor agreement" which included no union. The union struck in self defense.

From the beginning the strike was emotionally bitter, but it produced little attention until after a couple of weeks the company began hiring scabs. The first day the scabs came to work they were met by a mass picket line and a barrage of rocks and bottles. This brought the strikers local media coverage, some attention from other workers and unions, and an injunction barring mass picketing within 100 feet of the driveway.

Various left and militant activists from other unions began participating in the daily mass picketing, and began discussing with the strikers how to build serious labor support. The strikers were very anxious for any help they could get. In our workplaces we began publicizing as much as possible the strike and the union-busting behind it (which the media ignored). We began urging the state AFL-CIO leadership to call a massive labor support day at the picket line. The AFL-CIO leadership was less than enthusiastic. First they wanted to negotiate more, then they agreed to hold a series of support rallies: one for Teamsters, one for UAW, one for AFL-CIO. However, they set no dates and headed up to a north woods resort for some annual meeting. The strikers, whose morale was beginning to dip, wondered where all the talked about labor support was.

While the AFL-CIO leaders were up north, a large IAM local settled a month-long strike with Northwest Airlines. They settled on a Thursday and weren't going back to work until Saturday, so on the Friday in between they came down to the picket line 200-300 strong. With maybe 400 strikers and a handful of other activists on hand the atmosphere was immediately changed.

The Minneapolis police described the confrontation as a "mini-riot", saying it was the worst crowd control situation they had faced since anti-war riots on the U of M campus a decade earlier. Although we didn't stop the scabs (we had tried to start a sit-down in the driveway but found ourselves insufficiently prepared) we had immeasurably boosted morale, and had set the stage for future larger and more militant labor support.

The leadership of the AFL-CIO and the striking local continued their foot dragging, but activists and leaders of the two largest UAW locals decided to go ahead with a UAW support day. The word was out: this time the scabs would be stopped. The rally never occurred. The threat of it and perhaps more significantly the ambush-shooting of a scab brought the mayor's office into the picture. The strike was settled quickly with the union accepting some concessions but retaining its right to exist. In a limited sense a victory had been won. And notice had been served to local employers that union-busting attempts would be met with some level of militant labor solidarity.

What significance can be found in this small clash? For one thing it appears quite certain that the union-busting scenario is very in style these days and will be repeated in dozens of variations across the country during the current recession/depression/whatever. It appears generally that because of the economic crisis militant labor fights against "concessions" alone are not occurring (yet, at least). The threat of "causing" an employer to shut down completely appears to be perceived as very real. However in the case of open union-busting there's not much left to lose for most workers (granted some would be re-hired) and a no-holds-barred atmosphere quickly develops. And in the case of union-busting, our experience here shows a tremendous receptivity by other unionized workers and other unions to respond seriously. I was amazed by the number in my plant who said they'd be there for sure on the UAW support day. Large numbers of unionized workers perceive the threat of their own union being a future target, and believed the time to stop it is now.

Left activists can play an important role in mobilizing support for union-busting victims and can contest, at least in a limited way, with the more conservative views that frequently characterize labor leadership. The high tension atmosphere that permeates such struggles also allows the left to tie together in some "mass" way the immediate experience of workers and the underpinnings of the economic (and more) crisis. (The author's work in this respect was found quite wanting largely due to inexperience and lack of preparedness to intervene. In fact, the only left intervention in the strike that was "left", other than one-to-one conversations, was the selling of "the Bulletin" by the political group which publishes that newspaper.)

It may be worthwhile for left labor activists to keep an eye out for union-busting situations, and give some thought as to how to intervene in them.

L. Weiss, Minneapolis

Iowa Beef Strike

(As this issue went to press the last word from Dakota City was that the workers at Iowa Beef Pack had returned to work without a contract. The following article, which has been abridged from the original which appeared in the Summer issue of the Missouri Valley Socialist, covers the period up to August 6th. The author, Ted Tuel, is a shop steward at IBP and an editor of MVS. In our next issue we hope to print Tuel's examination of the later events in the strike and some of the divisions, including racism, which became evident during the struggle.

Missouri Valley Socialist/Box 971/ Sioux City, IA 51102)

Dakota City is a small town located in the broad valley of the Missouri River across from Sioux City, Iowa at the point where the states of Iowa, Nebraska, and South Dakota come together. Other than a proud labor history, there is not much to distinguish this urban area of about 85,000 from other blue-collar towns in the Midwest. Nothing, that is, except the Iowa Beef plant which stands in the cornfields just north of Dakota City and the fact that in July this plant became an armed camp, complete with 160 National Guardsmen, armored personnel carriers, military helicopters and one-fourth of the Nebraska State Highway Patrol.

This display of force is not inconsistent with IBP's normal operating procedure during "peacetime". The violence which occurred on July 20 - when TV viewers nationwide watched as union members hurled chunks of concrete through the windows of dozens of cars attempting to enter the plant - did not just happen. It was a reaction to years of hard work for 48 hours per week in an unsafe and unhealthy profession. It was a reaction to the tense and violent atmosphere which has been created by IBP in its drive to take over the meatpacking industry.

I've worked in quite a few places but I have never seen the kind of surveillance and control that IBP maintains over its employees. As each person passes through the guard shack each day one camera takes a frontal view of the person and another takes a profile. Each person is also subject to search in the guard shack. Behind a partition are several TV screens showing views of the parking lot and various hallways, doors and bulletin boards within the plant. There is even a rotating camera in one cafeteria which films the employees as they take their break.

The plant which is said to be the largest packing plant in the country, consists of a slaughter and processing division, as well as a hide plant and areas which deal with various by-products. The processing division consists of three large rooms. They are a little dazzling to enter for the first time. They are brightly lit and filled with stainless steel machinery, a maze of conveyors, and chains on which big chunks of meat swing by at rates of up to six per minute. There are two or three hundred people working with knives at great speed, wearing white frocks and helmets which are stained red by blood. The temperature is between 40 and 50 degrees (in the coolers and freezers it is much colder). As you work the cold blood soaks through your gloves, and you stand in salt which quickly becomes mixed with fat and meat that falls from the table.

The noise level is very high. In most area of the plant you have to shout to be heard by the people around you.

When workers get good at their jobs, they have to pull a piece of meat from a conveyor, bone it out or trim it in 25 seconds or so, throw it back on, and pull another. During periods of full production (which is most of the time) they do this one operation over and over, eight hours per day, six days per week.

Workers get two breaks per day, for 15 and 30 minutes. On many lines a worker has to get permission to go to the bathroom and then the foreman is likely to look at his watch and ask you to wait a half hour, or to accuse you of wasting time of simply deny you permission. With a few exceptions, foremen are white males in a plant with a large percentage of female and non-white employees. Plants stewards are kept busy fighting contract violations on a daily basis. Worse still,

many employees are too timid to assert their rights or are unaware of them, often because of a language barrier. The grievance procedure can be painfully slow and workers have no right to stop work over grievances.

Slaughter employees at IBP rotate shifts - two weeks on days, then two weeks on nights.

Despite intense struggles by Local 222 over the years, contract benefits are still far behind those of most other large packing plants. There is no pension plan whatsoever - a workers who retires after 15 years gets a thank-you dinner and a gold pin. The health insurance plan is not adequate to cover a catastrophic illness such as a major heart attack, and employees get fired if they are sick too often.

Health problems and accidents are frequent results of the tense environment, cold air and repetitive knife work. New employees suffer severe pain in their hands and many don't make it through their 60-day probationary period. Many people have to have surgery to correct tendonitis in their hands. Other frequent problems include "beef itch", bronchitis, pulled muscles, and injured backs.

Some very serious accidents occur. Two Hispanic workers were killed in separate accidents at the plant in 1981. Both worked for a clean-up crew which contracts to clean the plant each day after the two production shifts. Rene Nunez, 18, had both legs amputated and died five weeks later after being caught in a ground beef blender. Juan Hernandez Castro, 23, died at the plant after he got his arm entangled in a conveyor belt. Many people have charged that working conditions are unsafe for the clean-up workers and that proper safety instructions are not given to workers who cannot understand English.

The company denies any responsibility for the deaths since the men were technically in the employ of a private contractor. Workers for the clean-up company, who are paid significantly less than IBP workers, have also complained that they have been harassed for wanting to form a union, according to the Sioux City Journal.

Conditions like these, as well as a wage rate which has generally been far behind that of the industry as a whole, have resulted in a remarkable labor his-

tory at IBP. Since the plant opened in 1966 there have been four strikes, and no contract has ever been settled without a strike.

The 1969-70 strike lasted 7½ months and was marked by the shooting death of a company informer, the shooting of a picket and several bombings. A 1973-4 lockout by the company lasted for 6 months. In 1977-8 union members struck for 14 months, blocked plant entrances, and had many of their number arrested. And on June 6 of this year, union members voted 96% in favor of a motion to strike.

What is it about this union that has made workers this militant? No one would argue the point that members of Local 222 have a hell of a lot of determination and that they are willing to risk everything they have -- repeatedly -- to get a fair wage and decent working conditions. I don't think that they are much different from other workers, however: Most workers will fight when they have been pushed far enough, and these workers have been pushed by a ruthless company that will go to any length to fight a union.

IBP began as a single plant in Denison Iowa, 21 years ago. Today it runs 10 beef plants and one pork plant in seven states, employs over 11,000 people, and is this country's largest boxed beef producer. In 1963, the beef industry was dominated by the "Big Five" - Armour, Wilson, Morrell, Swift, and Cudahy. Today, IBP slaughters more cattle than all five of these corporations together, according to the Des Moines Register.

One factor in IBP's rise to the top of the industry is its successful use of new technology and the innovation of selling cuts of beef packed in boxes instead of whole carcasses (this has contributed to greater centralization of the industry and the elimination of many neighborhood butchers). The company keeps in touch with its cattle buyers through the world's largest privately-owned microwave system, and it is planning to replace it with a satellite communications system.

Shady and aggressive business practices are another factor in the company's growth. Currier Holman, the founder of IBP, was convicted in 1974 in New York City for conspiring with a Mafia front man to bribe union officials so they would allow IBP's products to be sold in

supermarkets in NY. In 1977 the U.S. Department of Agriculture charged IBP and another firm with trying to corner the beef market in the Pacific Northwest.

A third factor in IBP's growth -- perhaps the major factor -- is that they have squeezed the extra profit from the blood and sweat of the worker by keeping wages and benefits down. Many of their plants are non-union, and they have gone to such lengths to keep wages down in their unionized plants that they have broken the master wage rate which once was paid by the Big Five packers. The Dakota City plant has always been the wage pacesetter for the rest of IBP.

Last year IBP merged with Occidental Petroleum, a conglomerate of energy companies (including Hooker Chemical of Love Canal fame) which was the 20th largest corporation in the U.S. before the merger. Occidental's net income for 1981, according to their annual report, was \$722 million. IBP's income in 1981, according to the New York Times, was \$58 million.

There is some confusion about the nature of the present contract proposals, largely due to a misleading media campaign by IBP. The proposals include:

- A 4-year wage freeze and no cost-of-living allowance.

- Re-classified rates of pay which the union says would cause about 700 workers to take a wage reduction.

- The present weekly guarantee of 36 hours over a 5-day period replaced by a worthless guarantee of 38 hours per week averaged over a 6-month period (meaning that an employee could work 60 hours one week and 16 the next.)

- New starting rates of \$2 under the applicable rate for the first two years of employment, \$1.50 under for the third year, and \$1 under for the fourth year. These second-class workers would not be eager to join the union, and combined with the high turnover rate at IBP, the union would soon be destroyed.

- Establishment of an "Extra Gang" of 205 workers who would not get any contract benefits. As in the case of the new starting rates, this is a deliberate attempt to destroy the union.

- A provision which would allow IBP to designate their competition by company and permit IBP to reduce its workers' wages if any of these competing plants

reduce their workers' wages during the term of the agreement.

These proposals, viewed in light of IBP's enormous profits and virtual control of the industry, are clearly an attempt to break the union. It should be noted that the union agreed to some concessions, such as a 2-year wage freeze, in a move which many union members disapproved of.

The union began round-the-clock pickets at every entrance to the plant as soon as the strike vote was taken on June 6. ... On July 19, the company announced that it was opening the plant to scab labor, and on July 20 the scabs were met by a crowd of about 300 union members, some of whom hurled chunks of concrete through windows. Many scabs were turned away, dozens of vehicles were damaged, and several people were injured, including away; dozens of vehicles were damaged, and several people were injured, including some (who) were hospitalized and released.

The first violence may have been committed by strikers, but the Highway Patrol quickly took the initiative. Strikers were tear-gassed and maced on the afternoon of July 20 and again the next day. Incidents of police brutality were clearly visible on footage taken by local TV stations. A letter to the Sioux City Journal charged that "One striker was told to stop, so he stopped and put his hands in the air. Four troopers grabbed him and forced him to the ground in a mud puddle and knocked his glasses off and prodded him with their night sticks before cuffing him." Over 50 members of Local 222 have been arrested on various charges.

On Monday, July 26, a demonstration of about 300 workers, many of them from other unions in the Sioux City area, marched past the front of the plant twice in a peaceful and orderly fashion. On their third trip they were ordered to disperse, however, and were then tear-gassed and 20 were arrested.

On the day after this violence was instigated by the Highway Patrol, Governor Thone called out two units of the National Guard in the first use of the Guard to control strikers in Nebraska since the mid-1930's. A court order handed down by a Dakota County court put an almost total ban on strike activity, including any gathering by strikers within 1200 feet of

the plant, yelling at scabs, or even gesturing at them (the scabs retain these same rights, however). According to Nebraska law, picketers are limited to two persons every 50 feet.

The chain of events leading to this situation is suspicious. Bob Parker, Business Agent of UFCW Local 271 in Omaha, has charged in a televised interview that a conspiracy to break the strike exists between IBP and Governor Thone. It is

remarkable that the violence of July 20 had gone on for about two hours before the Highway Patrol showed up, and that most of the scabs had either been turned away or entered the plant before the riot squad moved in to disperse the crowd.

Union members are expecting a long strike, and they are going to need the active support of many workers in order to win.

You Made Only One Mistake...

Thank you very much, it is a great honor for me to be here. I am just Bob Travis's daughter, I myself have not made history like you people have, at least not yet. It has been a lesson to me to drive around Flint and see just to what extent General Motors dominates the life of this city. You can see it and feel it because of the numbers of enormous factories. I realize the extent to which you must have felt the power of the corporate giant that you took on when you seized General Motors property--and yet you acted anyway. You took destiny into your own hands and you shaped an important part of the world. Your actions not only effected your own lives and the lives of your children, but generations of American labor, for the UAW has been setting a pace for US labor generally and setting a goal for labor throughout the world to strive toward. When you seized General Motors property as if it was your own to seize, you shook the world. You made only one mistake, you gave it back.

You acted boldly, recklessly, you took drastic action--you fought the police, the national guard and General Motors, the captains of industry. It was difficult, dangerous and fearfilled. I heard a story today from Nellie Hendrix, a member of the Women's Emergency Brigade, a small and unfamous story, about a woman with 8 children who had no overcoat, and the only pair of shoes she owned were gym shoes that she had to wrap in newspaper with rubberbands, she came to strike headquarters everyone of the 44 days of the strike, walking 7 miles through that cold Michigan winter to get there and often walking 7 miles home again. So the fight, no matter how hard, was worth it to you. But I am also sure

that the excitement, and the danger sometimes even made it fun. It made your blood run so that you could feel your heart pound, feel yourself; fighting for what is right makes life worth living. It is clear the deep significance of the event for you personally. How many events have so many people come 40-45 years later to commemorate it, some of you coming thousands of miles in sickness and in health. Few of us in the US in my generation have had the opportunity to do anything that significant either personally or historically. That's what's wrong with the world, we cannot control our lives and feel our humanity.

The decisions about who will work, what is produced, when, how, and under what conditions--decisions that are so basic that they effect the entire life of most of the people of the world--yet those decisions are made, not by all of us who are effected, or even in our interests, but for the dollar accumulation of transnational corporate interests. These corporations act as if they own, not only the corporations, but also everything and everybody too--and to some extent they do--to the extent we let them. But when you people sat down at Chevy 4 and fought outside in the streets, you challenged that basic operating premise and joined the resisters of the world, you said, "No, you don't own us, we will not cooperate in our own enslavement, we will decide things for ourselves. We are thinking creatures and we too belong here."

And by challenging a basic operating premise of the world--the right of some people to use or discard other people--you changed the world. Given the mighty impact of your actions, there were really very few

of you. Now my generation must do the same, for the conditions of labor in this country are taking enormous leaps backward and the conditions of labor around the world show just how far back we may all slip. I don't think we are willing to slip so far without a fight. We are not robots, we get sick, tired and fed up. And we have had a taste of 'the good life' and want the time and resources to rest, laugh and love.

I am a laid off General Motors employee. I work for the Electro-Motive Division, we build locomotives. I am a member of UAW Local 719. I had 7-1/2 years seniority when I was laid off and there is a strong possibility that I may never work at GM again. That frightens me. I am 40 years old with apparently no marketable skills. I know that you people from Flint understand my fear. The Wall Street Journal in April, said that Flint was the metropolitan area in the US that had the highest official rate of unemployment, 23%. We know that those statistics do not accurately reflect the number of jobless people. And You know what those numbers mean in human costs. You see people losing everything from their cars to their minds.

These economic inequities will produce more and more outbreaks of drastic and reckless social rebellion, at least I hope it will. Better to fight than quietly starve or commit suicide. We must watch for, support and join each others battles, for many of our enemies' enemies are really our allies. Employed must fight for the unemployed, white people must fight with Black people against the inequities they suffer. Black people as a population are suffering more seriously as a general population as a result of long term systematic discriminatory practices and they have been getting bad press much longer than labor. And we people in the US must support the righteous struggles of the people around the world, from Poland to El Salvador. We must be careful and alert not to let the propaganda and social organization created by and for transnational corporations continue to improperly divide us. And this time, our fight must be final. We must challenge the right of the few to dominate the many.

I am not only optimistic, but I also fear that unless we use our intelligence and face reality that we will lose some of

these crucial battles and lose the war of labor for her full productive and creative place on this earth. Global technology is pitting workers around the world in direct competition with each other and robot technology is drastically reducing the number of available jobs. As we take on international corporations, our fight must be international. That must be more than a slogan. But I am sure there is a basis of unity, for I am sure that there are people in Flint in Chicago, in Lordstown, Ohio, Mississippi, in Quebec, Poland, Italy, Mexico, in South Africa and even Japan who would share the desire to say, "We produce the wealth, we will control it." In united action there is power.

This may all sound impossible, and maybe it is. But it is necessary if we are to beat global giants. And many people before the winter of 1937 would have said that a 44 day strike that seized General Motors property and forced a company-wide contract, that that was impossible.

I know alot of people who want to fight the question is where, how. We need to find our leadership and build the required social alliances and identifications. You people know better than many, what is required can be built, once it is clear what is required. You built the organization that was needed from an idea, your allegiance to it, your willingness to act it out with spirit and guts. You shaped history, it can be done right again.

History is just the recorded deeds of people. I just hope the prejudices and false self-interests don't close our hearts and minds to the ideas and allegiances we require to win. If we fall prey to false divisions and alliances we might be conquered and that would be an earthshaking blow to humanity.

Thank you for having me here to speak I know that my Dad would have been happy that you invited me. And thank you most of all for the fight you fought and having the picnic to remind us that working people once knew how to fight. You give my generation something to aim. We too must now again be reckless, proud and daring and behave as if this planet belongs to us, and then it will

Thank you very very much. This has been a genuine privilege.

Carole Trav

NAKN Conference

Several of us attended the National Anti-Klan Network conference in June. However, these are my own thoughts.

The conference was attended by about 175 people taken all together, which is smaller than NAKN meetings in the past. The plenary sessions took up the bulk of the time and the plenary sessions were mostly speeches. There were two different times for workshops. I felt the bulk of the plenary speeches were educational and not cheerleading. The two times the plenary opened for debate there was some real, though not extensive, friendly debate. The workshops I heard about - women, NEA curriculum, Klan watching, and tactics all had good helpful discussion. The workshop on women scheduled an extra 1 1/2 hour meeting for themselves because they were getting so much done. The small workshop on tactics I went to actually got into some debate.

The cultural program on Saturday was something worth going to - unlike most other conferences when that is the best time to caucus. There were several "testimonies" from people who had been directly attacked by the Klan. They included one of the Black women who had been shot in Chattanooga, Fred Shuttlesworth (with a funny rednering of some experiences of the 50's and 60's), a white woman who the Klan was threatening to kill along with her Black baby, and a retired Black schoolteacher from northern Mississippi who had been shot at by the Klan and had shot back - hitting 4 of them. Eddie Carthan also spoke about the Tchula situation. Interspersed was singing led by Guy Carawan from Highlander School and the Harrambee singers who I believe date back to SNCC with Bernice Regon.

It was a very moving experience for me and the others. Unlike the People United conference's small singing session - it did not seem hoaky and put on. (although I certainly felt hoaky).

The Politics

The political theme of the conference seemed to be "The Second Reconstruction." Many of the speeches, particularly from people in the South, talked

about the general attack on Black political gains from the 60's. The Klan was discussed as the leading, violent cutting edge of that attack. The theme was to defend those gains, beat back the Klan and all racist attacks.

There are several good points about this. It attempts to place the current situation in an historical context. This is a good beginning point for the movement to be conscious of itself. It is my estimate (and I believe KL's also) that debate and discussion around the current historical context will increase rather than decrease in the NAKN. To a certain extent the "Second Reconstruction" is an accurate analysis. (I read in one of the Klan newspapers a reference to the current period as "The Second Reconstruction 1954-?") Sojourner Truth Organization has emphasized the distinction between the institutional racism of the state and the genocidal revolutionary program of the fascists. That is certainly the new element of what is new and growing in the Klan. However, the KKK groups themselves are unevenly united around this revolutionary project, and there are reformist racists among them who would like to seize the machinery of the state rather than smash it. That fact alone, (along with other that are beyond the intention of this report) gives a reality to the "Klan as cutting edge" thesis.

However, there are some major weaknesses in the "Second Reconstruction" analysis so far as it has been taken. As above, it doesn't stress what is new and becoming. It lacks a specific theory of the economic crisis we are in. And most importantly, it could lead to a belief that old strategies of countering the Klan can work in the new situation. This is what worried me about singing, "One more time, One more time, We can do it if we have to, one more time." I know that is a song of spirit and determination. However, I believe there is a sector of the NAKN leadership that believes the a-k movement today can be built on the same basis as the civil rights movement of the 60's.

(A brief note: it is my opinion that more research and analysis has to be done on the various periods of Klan-Fascist ups and downs in order to understand what causes them to fall short. I.E., it is quite conceivable that the Wallace candidacy in 1968 disoriented the rightist movement in the same fashion that the McCarthy and McGovern candidacies did to the Left in 60-72.)

Political Growth in the NAKN

In my opinion the NAKN has grown politically in the last several years of my acquaintance with it. At the Greensboro march in Feb. 80 the crowd was way to the left of the speakers. The podium was dominated by the William Winipisingers of the "Left". The first program of action adopted was a lobbying effort in Washington, D.C. Political discussion was out of order. At this conference, a program of action was adopted which stressed grass roots activism. At this conference a speaker was specifically brought who had engaged in armed resistance to the Klan, and had organized others to do the same. Maybe by accident, but Arthur Kinoy was not there. Instead, a whole panel was presented on the government and the Klan which attacked the justice department et al. Marty Nathan gave her government complicity speech, and the most prominent speaker (a Black lawyer who had worked the Chattanooga case) said the justice dept. never had and never would provide justice. It was a far cry from the caricature that P.U. and others had painted of the NAKN, and a step beyond where they had actually been.

Other noteworthy items were Lynn Wells' speech on the economy in which she said (roughly) that white workers were the main recruiting base of the Klan. And IFCO's newspaper article talking about the inextricability of racism and capitalism in an issue devoted to the Voting Rights Act.

Finally, and most importantly I think, it seemed that people were honestly trying to understand the Klan-Nazi threat and deal with it.

This is something new and different in the anti-fascist movement. P.U. doesn't have it. They have their theory. The

facts that don't fit their theory are ignored. Inside of NAKN many of the groups that have left (Equal Rights Congress/Communist Labor Party, Workers World Party, Socialist Workers Party) didn't have a genuine commitment to the anti-fascist movement. They seem to consider the fight against fascism as a subset of their fight against racism, repression, capitalism, etc. Currently it is NAROC which is prone to this position. In one workshop a NAROC heavy stated that they already had their theory, now they were trying to get the facts.

However, the others were very open. David Edgar's and Ken Lawrence's speeches talking about the autonomous program of the Klan were well received. Ann Braden didn't jump up and scream when Lawrence challenged her theory about the disappearance of the Klan in the 30's by talking about the growth of the fascist movement then. Lawrence's point about the merger of the cross and the swastika into a revolutionary fascist movement was particularly well taken.

The most visible confirmation of this is occurring in NAKN's headquarters state. The National States Rights Party has formed its own Klan - the New Order Knights of the Ku Klux Klan. NSRP has always been openly Nazi. Their Klan is the fastest growing, even recruiting away from other Klans, especially Wilkinson's.

During the course of the conference I saw some of the language change from 'Klan' and 'Klan movement' to 'Klan-Nazi' and 'fascist movement'.

Finally, in part because of NAROC, in part because of Sojourner Truth, in part because of the veteran civil rights activists, and in part because of the task we face - the NAKN is the only place I've seen a debate among Leftists and progressives about white workers and white privilege in a long time. (Headhurting sessions with Prairie Fire and May 19th aside).

The Merger Proposal

At the end of his speech, in a manner similar to his effort at the PU conference in February, Lawrence called for the unity of the anti-fascist movement. Particularly, some of us there argued for the organizational unity of PU and NAKN.

At the PU conference there was an extended debate about this question at a steering committee meeting. PU has characterized itself as the activist alternative to NAKN. In fact, neither the NAKN or PU has come up with a program that could effectively counter the fascist danger. In addition, PU has generated a whole area of work against repressive legislation as a function of two things: the CWP's exclusion from NCARL and the CWP-PU notion of the state as the target of an anti-Klan/Nazi movement. It is mainly from this vantage point that elements inside PU are against organizational consolidation.

The NAKN's attitude was that PU could join as a constituent member. They were in no particular rush to embrace PU, but they were not generally sectarian (NAROC aside). Their view was that the main recruiting effort should be towards the center, and that would force the 'left' to join in on a 'stable' basis.

We argued that there is no difference politically between the two groups and the remnants of an old dispute should be swept aside.

Whatever actually happens between PU and NAKN - the NAKN is currently the more viable of the two.

7/10/82

Anti-Racist Strategy

(Willie Turks, a Black man, was killed in a racist attack by a gang of young whites in the Graves End area of Brooklyn. Racial tensions were already high between the Black residents of the Marlboro Projects and the white working class community right beside the project. The following letter was written to Minister Michael of the Black United Front raising strategic questions about the then approaching demonstration and the general approach that should be adopted in organizing in this period.... the editors)

I am extremely concerned that the demonstration on Sunday, July 18th in Marlboro Projects--but especially the march to Avenue X--will stir up racial resentment instead of alleviating it or effectively challenging it. I propose the formation of a committee initiated by our coalition, that will stay in the community permanently, to organize around the issues that are pressing in both White and Black communities: high unemployment, meaningless jobs, no control of one's life, nothing to do, no sense of Black and White people working together for change, frustration and alienation, torn up schoolyards, basketball courts and parks in constant disrepair, no programs for youth, lack of a more accessible library, horrible conditions and high prices in Coney Island Hospital, transit facilities that are falling apart, tenant rights, etc. Furthermore, this committee should give out leaflets and hold up banners along the march that speak to these conditions that give rise to racist scapegoating; and, the coalition demands, as a whole, should embrace additional slogans as its own, and our speakers should address these concerns.

It is one thing to pull the Black community together, to organize for self-defense, to denounce white supremacy and the murder of Willie Turks, and to assert the right of Black people to walk down any street without fear of being attacked. It is another thing to do all this in a way that is sure to fire up the defenses of the white working class community living there. It is absolutely essential that we raise and permanently organize around additional demands that speak to their class needs as a means to get people fighting together against the state, instead of killing each other while the fat capitalists sit back and laugh, and count their profits.

Have we learned nothing from history, from Nazi Germany, where progressives were unable to successfully organize mass numbers of people away from adopting Nazi ideology? Obviously there was a reason then why the Left failed to plug into the deeply held longings people had, which the Nazis addressed and perverted. One cannot fight racism, or fascism, by simply verbally attacking the racist attitudes in white working class communities, unless one also, at the same time, attacks and systematically organized around the conditions which give rise to racist acts.

People are racist for a reason, although racism (like anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany) is not a rational, logical, or thought-through way of seeing. Exhortations to "end your racism" are as meaningless as shouting to a neurotic patient: "End your neurosis." While it is emotionally and psychologically hard for the victims of racism, sexism, anti-semitism, or any other oppression of this magnitude to care at all about the community and the conditions that created Willie Turks' murderers, nevertheless, this is exactly the task that history has placed upon the victims of oppression, when such acts are committed by other people who are economically oppressed, if we want to win and not just make a fine speech.

People overcome their racism (as with neuroses), when they themselves develop the tools to do so, and when they are no longer susceptible to and dominated by the conditions that gave rise to their neuroses. Yet our march, in the way it is currently conceived, does not help white working class people develop such tools. It does not address the conditions in which white working class people live in a way that they can understand. It does not deal with why they became racist in any way at all. Our march to Avenue X, I fear, doesn't accomplish what we want it to accomplish. Our well-meaning acts can cause or help to bring about the opposite of what we intend, and we are unprepared to deal with such an eventuality. It can become a tragic mistake to go into the white working class community, agitate it, and go home when the rally is over, leaving the Black people who live in the Marlboro Projects to bear the brunt of the defensiveness we've helped stir up in the white community. While we've succeeded in verbally condemning racism and racist assaults, we have provided no alternative formations through which White and Black people can address the needs of their communities and work together. As a result, like the Nazis, the state will be able to play on and pervert the deep-rooted feelings in people and, because we have stirred them all up, this could lead to more Black people being killed.

I know this area very well. I lived in the Marlboro Projects from 1957 to 1967, until I was 18, and I still live but a few blocks away. I have often been down Avenue X, especially since the murder. It is ironic that the victims of racism and fascism are being called upon to organize the community that spawned the murders--but who else is going to do it? Besides, these people are victims too, and the potential is certainly there to strike a significant blow against racism. This, however, will not be accomplished until the white community down Avenue X becomes involved in developing organizations with the largely Black community in Marlboro to fight together for what they need. Unfortunately, if you read the local newspapers and talk to the people living there, people are not owning up to racist attitudes, just as most people don't own up to their sexist or homophobic attitudes. The question for us becomes: How do we get people to change themselves?

Please note: I am NOT saying that Black people, with progressive whites supporting and taking part, would not arm ourselves, defend ourselves, raise the issues of democratic rights, of racism, and all that goes along with that. I am saying that self defense, or "Death to the Klan", are not demands we make but are things we do. To think that we can overcome the conditions that gave rise to Willie Turk's murder by raising such demands is ludicrous. If anything, it will scare the shit out of the white working class people, who will only sink deeper into their racism, form their own "defense" groups, egged on by the state, The young toughs who

killed Willie Turks are but a symptom. And while it is hard for a grieving community to not seek revenge or "justice" (as the state dictates), you can't deal with such deep-rooted ways of seeing and acting like racism symptomatically. Others will simply rise in that same festering swamp to take their racist places, unless we do something to change the nature of that swamp, and not just snare a gator here and there.

The proposals made in the first paragraph of this letter are the first step in accomplishing such a change. Since Black and progressive people will not win in a race war in the United States (regardless of whether such a war is morally desirable or not), purely tactical considerations, if nothing else, should indicate an overwhelming desire to organize the white working class community so that it begins overcoming its racism, and so that Willie Turks will not have died in vain. This will not happen--we will only make matters worse!--unless we speak to and organize around the conditions that gave rise to such racism, and involve white people from that community in this process. And this has to start Sunday, at the march, or people simply will not hear what it is that we have to say. And I, for one, would like people to hear it, since we are talking about what happens to the lives of people after the rally is over.

Signed: In struggle, Mitchell Cohen, for the Red Balloon Collective

Solidarity (continued from page 47)

the KB is relatively strong, it has not proven as effective politically as the minority Leninist faction which broke away (Group Z); it also puts a disproportionate amount of energy into its paper, as opposed to its other organizing work.

With the emergence of Solidarity, the US now has a full-fledged movementist organization on the national level. Cooperation with that organization is important; on the other hand, ideological struggle with it should not be neglected.

children who have computer toys, walkie-talkies, record players, and other implements needed for his transmission to the stars. In fact, if E.T. had undergone his unfortunate space-wreck among impoverished black girls and boys in Brazil, he never would have made it to the movies or *The New York Times* best-seller list and another sort of stardom.

Kotzwinkle's book allows us to see precisely why the extraterrestrial in the film is not repulsive to the audience. Not only because of his infantile resonances, but because he has come straight from *Sesame Street*, a second cousin to Yoda. After melting so many nationalities within its borders, and exporting its mass culture to so many foreign lands, what is one more space critter to America? The audience can adopt him in the same way that so many small orphans from across the world, from multiple other very earthly worlds, have been adopted by foster families. An immigrant from another galaxy who does not have to pass through Ellis Island. But I should not complain.

With wars bursting all over the planet like hellfire, with chemicals tormenting our rivers and our vegetation, with whales hunted down to produce tennis racquets, with famine and dictators and too many speeches and reports on how to deal with

them, we should be glad that a delight like E.T. is around. Such a mild and lenient message, whether in the film or in the book, is encouraging, especially if the alternative is to see *Alien* or *Polltergeist*, or peruse their novelizations. At a time when a lack of trust among nations and human beings is pushing us to disaster, such a message is certainly welcome and it should not surprise us that people, burdened with responsibilities they cannot handle, are thankful for it and ready to shell out some dollars for the quick comfort they derive. At least a million and a half have been so impressed that they have gone out and bought the book.

Even though Kotzwinkle has not given them the childish fun they expected, they will probably not be disappointed. He tells us again, although without engaging us completely and instantaneously as the film does, that just because somebody is different, it does not give us the right to be indifferent to his sorrows. But surely we do not have to wait for a traveler from outer space to teach us this. Surely there are plenty of people who are different and otherly and much nearer by, waiting under our own sun. Surely every stranger does not have to be infantilized and Americanized in order to gain acceptance. ■

ET (continued from page 55)

body, after all) substitutes an orange for the ball. He also eliminates Buck Rogers as a source of inspiration for phoning home.

But Kotzwinkle adds an American trait when he informs us that the spaceship is like a gigantic glowing Christmas tree ornament. Who would guess that intergalactic beings would model their vessels upon the commercialized American model for the Nativity? Or is this a subtle way of saying that the three kids are the Magi who recognize the Child?

E.T. has been lucky enough to get lost in a rather special, privileged place called California. He never would have made it back home if he had not chosen affluent

ANTI-RACISM LITERATURE PROJECT

P.O. box 2902

Brooklyn, New York 11202

PAMPHLETS AVAILABLE FROM THE ANTI-RACISM LITERATURE PROJECT

This catalogue lists the pamphlets and booklets produced and distributed by the Anti-Racism Literature Project. The project was an outgrowth of the N.Y.C.-based People Against White Supremacy. We are working to make available inexpensive, popularly written literature which describes and explains how racism and white supremacy work, and which offers suggestions about how they can be combatted. We also make available material on the activities and thought of third world people's movements and how they can be supported.

Racism & Education In New York City

Annie Stein, the late educator/activist/organizer/researcher discusses how and why the N.Y.C. schools fail third world children and suggests a solution—community control of schools. Never before published. 20 pages

Price: 80c*

Black Worker/White Worker

Discusses why and how to raise the issue of white supremacy among white workers. From Sojourner Truth Organization. 24 pages.

Price: 75c*

Sex, Race and Class

An article by Selma James and responses and contributions from The Black Women's Group, Darcus and Howe and others. Originally published by Race Today in 1974. 36 pages.

Price: \$1.60

Violence Against Women

Lenora Williams discusses a basis upon which feminists and the Black Community can come together to fight violence against women and racism. Reprinted (xeroxed) from The Black Scholar, Jan. 1981.

Price: 65c*

Racism & Nuclear Technology

A paper delivered by Fight Back, a Black workers' organization, to a meeting of the Committee For A Non-Violent World in 1980. Mimeographed.

Price: 5c (by mail free with a stamped envelope.)

Racism And Busing In Boston

The editors of Radical America magazine analyze the roots of racism within the context of the Boston school busing struggle. A case study of how white politicians use white supremacy to build and maintain a powerbase. 32 pages.

Price: 35c

Fighting Racism-An Exchange

Staughton Lynd, Noel Ignatin and Ken Lawrence argue the basis for organizing whites in support of busing—sparked by the Radical America editorial. 16 pages.

Price: 35c

Hell In A Very Small Place

Includes 13 articles describing conditions at Marion Federal Penitentiary, especially the behavior modification "control" unit. Produced by the National Committee To Support the Marion Brothers.

Price: \$1.50

Breaking Mens' Minds-Behavior Control And Human Experimentation At The Federal Prison In Marion, Ill.

Written by a former inmate who describes the conditions in the control unit. 20 pages.

Price: 60c

Native Americans Information Packet

An ideal primer on this subject, the packet includes an historical overview, a speech by the A.I.M. leader John Trudell and an 8-page brochure providing an account of the struggle being waged by the Hopi and Navajo peoples.

Price: \$1.00*

In Total Resistance

Statements and poetry by Leonard Peltier, Standing Bear (two imprisoned Native Americans) and Bobby Garcia (a Chicano who was killed in prison) about conditions in and out of prison. Produced by the Leonard Peltier Support Group . 72 pages.

Price: \$2.00

Azania (South Africa) Information Packet

A good primer on the movement. Includes an overview of the libertarian struggle by Southern Africa magazine and documents from the African National Congress, Pan African 1st Congress and the Black Consciousness Movement.

Price: \$2.00*

Puerto Rico: a United States' colony

Oscar Lopez-Rivera lays out five points as proof of Puerto Rico's colonial status on the occasion of his trial for seditious conspiracy (ie: being a member of the F.A.L.N.) in July, 1981.

Price: 25c*

Illusion of Black Progress

A condensation of a report by Robert Hill for the National Urban League which refutes many widely held misconceptions about the economic condition of Black people in the U.S. Reprinted (xeroxed) from the Black Scholar, October, 1978.

Price: 85c*

From Somewhere In the World-Assata Shakur-Message To The New African Nation

Discusses the conditions which have led to the current national struggle of Black people, the building of a Black Liberation Army and a Black nation. Produced by the New Afrikan Womens' Organization. 16 pages.

Price: \$1.50

The Political Conviction Of R. Dhoruba Moore and the Repression of the Black Liberation Movement

This 8-page tabloid discusses the case of Dhoruba Moore and the government's use of the Counter Intelligence Program (Cointelpro) against him and the entire Black liberation movement.

Free (for mail order send 40¢ in stamps for each copy)

Prisoners Of War-The Case Of The N.Y. Three
Statements from Herman Bell, Anthony (Jah) Muntaqim Bottom and Albert (Nuh) Washington, former Black Panther Party members who joined the Black Liberation Army and who are currently serving time in N.Y. State prisons. 36 pages.

Price: \$1.75

Not For Sale

Michael Manley and C.L.R. James. 48 pages.

Price: \$1.50

Make checks payable to ANTI-RACISM LITERATURE PROJECT. Mail to: ANTI-RACISM LITERATURE PROJECT, P.O. Box 2902, Brooklyn, N.Y. 11202. Please add 50¢ or a 20% of total sale price* to all orders. Allow 3 weeks for delivery.

**a bulk order discount of 20% applies to orders of 10 or more copies of a single item*

People Against White Supremacy-Who We Are
An explanation of the thought behind the formation of the group as well as the points of unity and a short description of their work.
Price: 35¢*

STOP RACIST ATTACKS

3-1/2 by 2-1/2 no lick stickers. White letters on a red, green and black background.
Price: 40/\$1.00

AVAILABLE SOON

Doing Support Work

A discussion of the reasons and principles for white people to support the autonomous struggles of third world people including a critical description of the work of the Black United Front Support Committee in N.Y.C.

PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE FROM THE BLACK AND THIRD WORLD MOVEMENT

The following is an incomplete listing of publications from the Black and third world movements. They can be ordered directly from their publishers.

Black News

Official communications instrument of the East.
\$7/12 issues

East

10 Claver Place
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11238

Arm The Spirit

An independent paper. \$3/yr plus 1 yr. sub for a prisoner.

Arm the Spirit
P.O.Box 5548
Berkeley, CA. 94705

Burning Spear

Newspaper of the African Peoples' Socialist Party.
\$7.50/yr.

Burning Spear
P.O.Box 27205
Oakland, CA. 94705

New Afrikan Freedom Fighters

Official organ of the National Committee To Defend New Afrikan Freedom Fighters. Single issue/50¢

NCDNAFF
P.O.Box 1184
Manhattanville Sta., N.Y. 10027

The Communicator

Newspaper of the Black Veterans
Justice. \$3/yr.
BVFSJ
1119 Fulton Street
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11238

If They Take You In The Morning They Will Be Coming For Us That Night

An independent newsletter from N.Y.C. responding to the governments attempts to disrupt and destroy the Black and Puerto Rican movements. By contribution.

NTCLR
P.O. Box 65
Bronx, N.Y. 10473

The Black Scholar

An independent journal of Black studies and research. \$16/yr.

Black Scholar
P.O. Box 7106
San Francisco, CA. 94966

Freedomways

A quarterly review of the "freedom movement."
\$7.50/yr.

Freedomways Associates Inc.
799 Broadway
N.Y., N.Y. 10003

Akwesasne Notes

Native American news and information.
The Mohawk Nation
via Roosevelttown, N.Y. 13683

Stop Grand Jury Repression Free the Grand Jury Resisters

As of the end of September, eight individuals are currently imprisoned for refusing to cooperate with a federal RICO grand jury that is allegedly investigating the Brinks incident.

Each of the individuals made clear to the grand jury and to the judges that they would not be coerced into cooperating—no matter how long they would be kept in jail. Not surprisingly, the judges dismissed these statements of principle and more or less said, "Well, let's see what happens." Now, a good number of months later, the subpoenaees have remained faithful to their original stands.

A couple of the subpoenaees are about to file "Grumbles" motions which might lead to their release. However, what has always been true is that only popular pressure can speed the release of all those behind bars. Thus far, there has been little enough of that. We believe, however, that the situation can be changed.

The New York Committee to Stop the RICO Grand Jury is attempting to organize support for all those resisting the grand jury. As part of that attempt, we'd like to explain why the government is imprisoning these particular people, why they are refusing to cooperate with the grand jury and why they should be supported.

The eight people in jail have either been activists in the Black liberation movement or white people who are supporters of this movement. What they have in common is not membership in an organization nor even necessarily agreement on all political questions, but instead a conviction that the struggles by Black people are absolutely central ones for the future of the society we live in. They also agree on the need for an absolute refusal to cooperate with a government that has shown time and again the lengths it is prepared to go to defeat those struggles. In the minds of those refusing to cooperate, there can be no presumption of good faith for a government that launched COINTELPRO operations against all segments of the Black movements in the 1960s and 1970s.

A major part of the US government's counter-intelligence strategy in the past has been the use of "criminal" investigations and prosecutions to neutralize leaders of the Black liberation movement. For example, ten years after the convictions of Dhoruba Moore and Geronimo Pratt, two former leaders of the Black Panther Party currently serving life sentences, it was revealed that both were targets of COINTELPRO and subjected to a variety of illegal acts by the government, including systematic fabrication of evidence. These and other disclosures led Amnesty International to issue a report in 1981 calling for new trials for all targets of COINTELPRO who are now in prison.

There is strong evidence that the government is continuing to employ not so different methods today. Specifically, in spite of repeated protestations to the contrary, it has been revealed that the government has been conducting widespread electronic surveillance of many activists in the Black community.

WHY THESE PEOPLE?

Which brings us to the question of why the government has subpoenaed these eight people. Clearly, all of them have had contact with one or another of the people who have been charged or connected in some way with the attempted robbery of a Brink's truck in Nyack on October 20, 1981. The US Attorney may have reasons to believe that those imprisoned can provide him with information to bolster his contention of a wide-ranging conspiracy. But then again, why should we believe anything he says? His record and that of his associates, on every level of the criminal process, has made clear that they will resort to any stratagem to imprison those who they believe to be political threats. They will tap phones; they will use informers; they will use people who wind up in mental institutions; and, when all else fails, they will use their imaginations.

But who is a political threat? We need not think that the US Attorney is an expert on such matters, nor that he is even particularly well informed. His judgment is undoubtedly affected by some rather pervasive racist notions; but it is also informed by a memory of the role that was played by the Black movement of two decades ago in placing fundamental questions about the nature of this society before people in this country and throughout the world. Despite whatever setbacks it may suffer, the Black movement and its activists represent a threat to an "American way of life" that is secured by the oppression of people of color in this country and throughout the world.

The government's preferred method of attacking the movements of those people of color, at this point, is to characterize them as terroristic and criminal. The fact that the government is selective in its attacks and that many people in progressive movements remain unaffected should offer no cause for gratitude. And it should offer no cause for reluctance to rally to the defense of those imprisoned for refusing to cooperate with the grand jury. So long as they remain in jail, all progressive movements suffer. A popular movement can not only speed up their release, it can as well serve to strengthen all our movements—by restoring to its central place the role of principle and our obligation to defend those who uphold it.



WHAT YOU CAN DO

- sign a petition and donate a quarter
- set up a meeting of your organization or with your friends to learn more about grand jury repression. Call the NY Committee if you would like a speaker or would like to show the film "Until She Talks"
- send money to the grand jury resisters
- send money to the NY Committee
- write letters to the US attorney demanding the release of the grand jury resisters

WRITE TO THE GRAND JURY RESISTERS

Yaasmyn Fula, Asha Sundiata/Margaret Thornton,
 Eve Rosahn, Bernardine Dohrn,
 Sha'eam Jabbar/John Crenshaw,
 Alan Berkman, Aisha Deborah Buckner

Metropolitan Correctional Center,
 150 Park Row,
 New York City

New York Committee to Stop the Rico Grand Jury
 c/o The Grand Jury Project, 853 Broadway, Rm. 1116, NYC 10003 (212) 674-6005

Puerto Rican Indictments

The most recent development in the years long legal investigation into so-called "Puerto Rican terrorism" is the indictment for criminal contempt of Julio and Andres Rosado, Ricardo Romero, Maria Cueto, and Stephan Guerra. In themselves these indictments are no great surprise. All five of those indicted have faced similar charges in the past when they refused to accept offers of immunity designed to force them to cooperate with grand jury investigations. All except for Guerra have served substantial jail terms on earlier contempt charges.

What is new and alarming about these indictments is the manner in which the FBI has handled them. The New York FBI director called a press conference, after four of the five had been arrested and two had already been released on bail, to announce that the FALN had been beheaded. "Those who know how to make the bombs and how to store them" were in custody or would soon be. In fact, all five are well known public activists. Four of them are leaders of the MLN (National Liberation Movement), and the fifth, Andres Rosado, is an unaffiliated community health worker. The MLN, a Puerto Rican Chicano Mexicano organization, is widely known for its public support for the strategy of people's war for Puerto Rican liberation. It is not an armed clandestine "terrorist" group, but a political organization that functions openly through a variety of legal institutions.

The manner in which these indictments and arrests were handled indicates a major state move to eliminate the distinction between supporters and defenders of armed struggle and actual combatants. While this is far from unexpected, it could signal a major change in political climate.

The five are scheduled to go on trial in mid-December.

Solidarity and Regroupment

-- A Report on the East Coast Regional Conference of the Socialist-Feminist Network -- Solidarity.

By Phil Hill,
Tuesday Marxist Group
Washington, DC.

This report is unfortunately somewhat late. Nonetheless, I feel that it is important for revolutionaries of the spectrum of opinion from which the readership of this newsletter is largely drawn to be able to evaluate the positions of our comrades who define themselves as "socialist-feminists." I hope that this report can contribute both to concrete cooperation with those comrades and to the development of a productive debate with them.

#####

Over the weekend of Dec. 12, 1981 East Coast chapters of Solidarity gathered at American University in Washington, DC, for a regional conference. Solidarity is the left wing of the old New American Movement -- i.e., the wing that refused to merge with DSOC (now DSA). It sees itself as part of a "socialist-feminist tendency" on the radical left, the only nationwide organization in that tendency.

Reflecting Solidarity's orientation, the "feeling" of the conference was one of extreme decentralization, concern for "process," feminism and consensus-democracy. In regard to the substance of the debate, the conference participants displayed a seriousness and sense of purpose about their political work; on the other hand, they demonstrated that the organization has yet to fully define its political role. National Staffer Peter Drucker told me that "a fair description" of the organization's function would include only (1) pro-

viding a "presence" of organized socialist-feminism within the left; and (2) providing resources for work taken up by the chapters. Thus, the organization's involvement in mass work is determined almost entirely at the local level. When, as is the case with the group's work within the Reproductive Rights National Network (R2N2), this work is sufficiently widespread, it can be said that the group has a national presence in that area. In most other struggles, this is not the case. The Washington conference's vote to endorse the June 12 demo is about as far as the national body can be expected to go on its own initiative. This is, after all, not ongoing mass work, but only a single demo. It should be added that this conference was in a sense comparable to a national convention, although it only brought together East Coast people. The Network has never had a national conference, and its two wings, one on each coast, thus function largely independently. That may change. A national conference is to be held at the end of the Summer; even in Washington, moreover, Drucker was able to provide West Coast input, since he works out of SF.

One of the problems with the loose organizational structure became apparent when recruiting was discussed in a workshop. A number of independent socialist-feminists have apparently declined to join Solidarity because it doesn't provide them with anything that they don't already get through their local collectives or mass organizations. Why pile on more meeting commitments, and pay dues? On the other hand, an opinion was expressed that Solidarity members "are a certain kind of people," and the character of the organization should not be altered by indiscriminate recruiting. In other words, a good part of the commonality that holds the group together is personal affinity with the same "kind of people," rather than a clearly defined political

purpose.

On the second (final) day of the conference, the issue of regroupment brought the membership face-to-face with the contradictions inevitably flowing from such a situation. For Solidarity, regroupment means the possibility of joint work, federation or even merger with groups of historically different political origins. The editors of this newsletter, in calling for the "formation of a tendency," are in effect also pushing for a kind of regroupment. I believe that that fact creates the basis for a dialogue between these two non-dogmatic trends in the revolutionary movement.

The Washington conference was attended by representatives of three organizations with which Solidarity is currently engaged in regroupment-oriented discussions. Two were former Trotskyist organizations, the IS and its break-away, Workers' Power; the third was the Socialist Party. The latter presentation was largely ignored by the delegates in their subsequent discussion of regroupment, possibly because the SP's representative, in spite of an attempt to put as "left" a face as possible on his group, seems to have been unable to overcome the general suspicion that it was a smaller version of DSOC.

The IS's Michael Urquhardt, in response to a question, pointed out that his group rejected the theoretical premise -- common, though not universal within Solidarity -- that capitalism and patriarchy are two separate exploitative structures that simply interact. When discussion of the question opened, Washington chapter leader Dana Naparstack seized on that statement as an illustration of why the regroupment issue need not any longer even continue to waste the time of the conference. Drucker, on the other hand, emerged as an enthusiastic advocate of a process that might lead to a merger of the four (or several of the four) organizations. Between these two positions, a number of opinions which accepted some degree of regroupment existed,

but there was no clear crystallization of factions around opposing positions.

Drucker's conceptual premise was that the socialist-feminist tendency need not have an exclusive organizational base. Rather, he saw the possibility of a regroupment process that brought socialist-feminists into an organizational framework alongside other non-dogmatic revolutionaries; socialist-feminism would then be a tendency within that broader grouping. Naparstack, on the other hand, wanted Solidarity to take the lead in forming and strengthening the socialist-feminist tendency itself, and therefore to retain its ideological self-definition organizationally. The debate between the two protagonists and the other participants culminated in a series of votes in which Naparstack lost by resounding margins in every case -- she was literally alone on one vote -- and yet her concept emerged victorious in the final analysis.

Naparstack exemplified the tendency to see Solidarity's reason for existence in terms of affinity and personal needs rather than goal-oriented politics. Her expression of the fear that "ten years from now, when the movement is big, there won't be any Solidarity" -- if the organization failed to defend its integrity from the creeping danger of regroupment -- showed her orientation. While most participants did not share her extreme position, they harboured enough of the same sentiments to be somewhat wary of the actual organizations with whom regroupment was expected to be undertaken.

Thus, two resolutions on regroupment ended up being "modified" beyond recognition before any votes were taken. One, from Boston, proposed a detailed scheme for close federation with IS and WP. Under pressure from the participants, the proponent of the resolution deleted the names of the partner organizations -- so that the resolution in effect said nothing. It was thereafter ignored. Discussion then centered around the other resolution, this one by Drucker. Although this was a more general

"endorsement-in-principle" type of resolution, it did mention the names of the prospective regroupees, and was therefore sure to "go down in flames," as Drucker ruefully put it. To save the ship, the ballast went overboard again -- not only were the groups' names deleted, but the final resolution called for "regroupment" with "local socialist feminist organizations and [unspecified] national organizations." "Regroupment" with the former was, of course Naparsteck's kind of regroupment: i.e., no regroupment at all. Thus, the subsequent votes merely upheld this watered-down compromise against Naparsteck's attempt to pass her undiluted extremist position.

I would like to conclude by offering several lessons that, in my view, emerge from the debate within Solidarity.

1. Both regroupment concepts are valid models for non-dogmatic revolutionaries to consider, and need not be mutually exclusive.

Naparsteck was defending the need for particular tendencies to maintain their organizational coherence. Even if one doesn't agree with the politics of a certain tendency -- and I don't agree with Naparsteck's politics -- I think that it's important for the development of non-dogmatic - revolutionary politics to have organized forms for various tendencies.

Drucker, on the other hand, was calling for a broader regroupment of non-dogmatic revolutionaries. This, too, is a goal worth working toward, so long as it does not preclude the formation of factions based on a higher level of agreement.

2. There is a fairly basic difference in orientation between the socialist-feminist tendency and the type of tendency that I believe this Newsletter should contribute toward building.

The difference, in my opinion, is one which combines elements of style and substance of the groupings. By "style," I mean the basic psychology of the organization, which, in the case of Solidarity, I have described as "affinity"-oriented, etc. I be-

lieve that a revolutionary political organization should be based primarily on a political self-definition, and have well-defined revolutionary political goals.

By "substance," I refer to Solidarity's relationship to the movements in which it is active. I don't believe that Solidarity is capable of defining for itself and implementing a political role within the movement that sets it apart from the rank-and-file of that movement. Thus, it runs the risk of keeping revolutionary politics as the preserve of the "kind of people" who are in Solidarity, without ever seeking to develop a strategy for creating a mass-based revolutionary movement. I believe that the role of revolutionaries within the mass movements has to be clearly defined -- even if we agree to discard the actual role definitions inherited from the Stalin era.

In evaluating Solidarity, it would be wise to keep in mind recent developments of European groups whose politics are generally in the non-dogmatic revolutionary spectrum. OCT in France, PLS in Belgium and the KB in West Germany have all split in recent years along lines described as Leninist and Movementist (Anderson, Revolutionary Socialism, London, 1980 -- this is Big Flame's journal). The British group is divided into factions over the issue, though it hasn't split (yet?). In short, the "movementist" -- or "libertarian" -- position is comparable to the socialist-feminism of Solidarity, while the Leninist position is more comparable to what I have outlined as being opposed to Solidarity positions. In both France and Belgium, the movementists have ended up doing nothing except publishing newspapers. This is not surprising, since their ideology tends to contradict the concept of an organizing role for a central leadership body. Deprived of such a role, the central body can best serve the movement by putting out a publication. Even in West Germany, where

(continued on page 40)

I gonna tell you a little bit about Berlin politics. First of all the Reagan visit. On June 10th he was in Bonn and there was a huge peaceful demo, almost 500,000 peaceniks were there. But the demo was in the outskirts of Bonn, on the other side of the Rhine, Reagan stayed on the opposite side.

Some people marched only about 500 yards since the organizers were afraid of militancy. As far as I heard the whole thing was a nice sunny boring peace festival nobody was impressed by.

Berlin was very different. From the beginning it was clear that there would be 2 demos, one - the peaceful one - the day before the visit (June 10th) and the real one (June 11th). The weeks before were already very tense: people put out of their windows banners with slogans like Reagan go West/Go Home/fuck off, etc. The police confiscated these banners, painted slogans over, and new slogans appeared. The peak was when the largest German satire magazine included in one of their issues stickers with "Reagan Go Home" and the police confiscated all of the issues from Berlin from every single booth, store where they were sold. The media criminalized those who were willing to go to the June 11th demo already beforehand. Rumors were spread that the police would shoot at people to keep them from demonstrating.

The day of the demo was like this: about 10 AM people were supposed to gather at a certain square. About 3,000 were there in time. About 10:10 AM the police closed off all streets around the square with barbed wire, the subway station and all stores closed. Thousands of policemen surrounded the place with their equipment like high-pressure water-tanks, police tanks, tear-gas guns....We called it the concentration camp at the Wollen dorf-Platz (name of the square). The police told us to stay there till 2 PM, when Reagan would leave. But their plan didn't work. People succeeded in removing the wire, making the police ~~move~~ backwards thru hails of stones, building barricades, even a police van and the Mercedes of an ABC News team burnt out. Police brutality was enormous, hundreds of people got wounded, 16 are still in prison

waiting for their trial. More than 200 people were arrested before the demo, when they wanted to cross the border to Berlin and were released after Reagan had left. The riots spread all over the city and the street fights went on til late at night. At the same time 10,000 Berliners greeted Reagan. It was very hard to get a permission to this show. You had to get a Secret Service check-up, apply a couple of weeks for tickets beforehand. And only 2000 applied. To avoid a disaster, big companies and the government gave a day off to those who were willing to waste their time there. Also, about 10% of the spectators were security people. Reagan left the show an hour early, since the Berliners didn't respond the way there were supposed to, plus the police forces were badly needed at the demo.

Though it was a good day, it deepened the split between the militants and the non-violents. The Alternative list was criminalized in the time after the demo, the press called the demonstrators the legal wing of the RAF, etc. Also, everybody is afraid now that the police uses the next demo for a revenge. This didn't happen so far, but the police force was larger than before at the demos. They also clear two squatted houses since then and search 3-5 houses every day. Last week was the last demo. It was very hot, so people decided to change the route. We went to a lake in Berlin, where people undressed, took a swim, with banners in the lake and then we continued the demo - nude. The motto of the demo was expanded to, "We want the right to have scarves in front of the face and helmets during a demo." We also stopped several times at old water pumps to get some water, took a bath in a fountain and the policemen were sweating in their thick uniforms, with helmets on their heads... Though this was fun, the situation in general is very bad. My impression is that the peak of the squatter-punk-no future movement, the revolt of the last two years is over, and that the movement is going downhill: drugs, alcohol, pills, internal aggression and tension, all this supported by the police, the continuous police raids, more and more people in prison, 4,000 are still waiting for their trial in Berlin, no clear orientation.....

additional notes from late September

The political climate here in Germany is changing, slowly but steadily. The shift to the right might become more obvious when we have the conservative CDU-FDP government, starting next week. Although they won't do much different things from the former government, except they'll act a little bit faster and clearer. It was the Social Democratic government which suggested to cut unemployment benefits by 50%(!), was ready to go ahead with the nuclear program, especially the breeder reactor, introduced new police weapons and laws, built high security prisons, criminalized the left as terrorists, etc....I guess the main difference will be in the social field, probably something like your Reaganomics program.

Right now there is a kind of campaign going on against the legal anti-imperialist left - being labelled as the "legal wing of the RAF", and therefore juridically ready to be prosecuted and sentenced. This, for instance means that they arrested some people who bought a tent the same kind as used during an attack against Krossen,

a US military figure here.

Or a box of chocolate, which was supposedly found in a house where some RAF people stayed. Imagine: You buy something and guerilla group buys the same by chance, you get arrested - because its a good reasons for arrest, because they always wanted to get you for your legal political work. Also, there are NATO manuevers going on till end of Dec. so they are afraid of attacks, therefore they increased surveillance immensely....

At the same time Nazi groups increase.

Just two examples: There were some state elections spring/summer '82 a so-called 'Immigrants-out' party got about 4% of the votes, and this party is clearly a branch of the biggest German Nazi group. Another example: skin-heads (Nazi youth group, right wing punks) attack squattered houses, beat up squatters, punks, left people, stab them, put fire to houses, etc. I was at a Punk concert and about 30 skinheads with helmets, clubs and tear gas attacked the waiting crowd. It's almost for sure that the police collaborated or better allows their attacks. There was also a meeting of top-Nazis in Berlin in the Intercontinental under police protection. I guess that the silent unmoral majority supports them, since unemployment is rising, media pro-paganda against the left is awful. I read

an article a couple of days ago, which compared how unemployment and inflation figures are made in different countries. In this comparison it was shown that both figures are higher in German than in the U.S. And the workers remain quiet, bound by the Unions, by their hope to stay employed or get a new job; they just call for restrictive measures against "lazy people" like us, against aliens.... They are introducing something like your school busing-system for Turkish students here in Berlin: No more than 50% non-Germans in a class. And the secretary of education hired 100 fascist Turkish teachers directly from Turkey to give the right education to Turkish kids. If a Turkish person seeks political asylum here, the government asks the Turkish intelligence for "advise". About 98% of all people who seek asylum are rejected, which means are sent back to their home country and get killed there.

STRUGGLE IS A NAME FOR HOPE



poems by
Renny Golden and Sheila Collins

Profits from the sale of this book will go to the Chicago Religious Task Force on Central America; the National Campaign to Free Mayor Eddie J. Cerhan and the Tehula Seven and to preserve Black political rights.

Send \$3 per book plus \$1 postage and handling for every 1 to 3 books to: West End Press, Box 7232, Minneapolis, MN 55407.

Norteamericanos, Call Home

By Ariel Dorfman

E.T. The Extra-Terrestrial in His Adventures on Earth. By William Kotzwinkle. Berkeley Books, \$2.95 paper.

Most people buy a novel based on a movie in order to duplicate an already pleasurable experience. The written word lets them control the rhythm of the camera and relive the story in comfort, far from the maddening popcorn crowd. My reasons are different. I'm searching for clues to what really happened on the screen, almost hoping that the writer will have excluded something vital, that he will have altered enough so I can emphasize in retrospect the essential, irreplaceable element which cannot be repeated in another medium. Because a book cannot manipulate us as much as anything audiovisual. But generally my hopes are thwarted: we tend to get rehashes performed by hacks.

For once, however, I have been fortunate. William Kotzwinkle's narrative version of *E.T.* has removed the pulsing, dancing core of the movie. It was not his intention, I am sure, but he has smuggled us a blueprint with which to interpret the original. By reading his book, we can come to terms with the real reasons for that film's phenomenal success. Paradoxically, Kotzwinkle's offshoot is interested in adults. Perhaps there was no other way a writer as accomplished as the author of *Doctor Rat* could avoid a dull and parasitical line-by-line repetition of the screenplay. He had to find a universe of his own to play with, and the only direction for independent development and depth was toward the senior characters.

Be that as it may, Kotzwinkle does not care especially for the children, but is fascinated by Mary, the kid's mother, and by the extraterrestrial himself. The mother is growing old and does not like it. *E.T.* is 10 million years old, "older than Methuselah, as old as old," and loves it. He wants to stay that way. He would also like to return to his interstellar routes before Earth's gravity tears him asunder. Although in the book *E.T.* has a childlike, Wordsworthian worship of living beings, it is pervaded by a "terrible and ancient knowledge," communicating with star-energies and other such elevated and inscrutable beings. Mary is worried about more down-to-earth dilemmas: early menopause, late psychiatry, aching feet at work, pornography, calories and beauty cream, suburbia, and recurring visions of devastating males in bed or at the door. She does not know that Kotzwinkle has injected into the space elf a rather improbable crush on her. While she pines away, a three-footer from the stars debates in her son's closet how best to communicate his feelings. To the story of love between children and the visitor that formed the basic plot of the picture has been added an ironic and sad description of unrequited and impossible love, a reverse fairytale in which the frog does not gain admittance to the dormitory and never quite becomes the prince.

It is clear that perspectives such as these, from the mature side of life, would have destroyed the film's charm as well as its box office clout. In the movie, adults are either remote and menacing or close by and ridiculous. They are always useless. They are the real aliens in the camera's laughing lenses, not *E.T.*

So nothing could push the book farther from the movie than classifying its extraterrestrial among the adults or trying to give us a notion, as Kotzwinkle does, of how the world might look through the eyes of a more evolved species stranded on our planet. By doing so, Kotzwinkle has acted like someone who, trying to copy Leonardo's *Mona Lisa*, has left out not only the famous smile, but the mouth itself, the framework for the smile. Children are the smile in *E.T.*, the movie. Spielberg's whole strategy has been to strip the universe down to the visions and

dimensions of the young. He has also, as is wont to happen in fairy tales, dared the spectators to rejuvenate themselves if they care to enjoy the show. This much has been noted by all, movie critics, spectators, and film executives. Yet what seems to have escaped us, and what Kotzwinkle's novelization obliquely reveals, by turning *E.T.* into such a solemn and slow and ponderous old organism, is that the creature from outer space, in the movie, is also a child. His aspect may be ancient and turtlelike, but he is treated like a baby, both by his protectors and his cinematic narrators.

Part of that childishness is, naturally, in the novel as well. It can be attributed to the hostile environment and culture where he has been abandoned. Foreigners always have that air of the newborn about them,

permit him to be dressed up like Miss Piggy. He wants us to feel that we are in the presence of a god from the stars, a nuclear being, and should be properly awed. But not even he can explain why *E.T.* did not simply fly to his spaceship at the beginning instead of letting himself be tripped up by inferior roots and shrubs, turned into a Robinson Crusoe with duck-waddling feet and no Friday to lord it over. Kotzwinkle is trapped in the original plot.

The novel has been derived from Melissa Mathison's screenplay, and not from the finished picture. If Kotzwinkle had seen and been enchanted by the creature in all its magic, he never would have been able to transmogrify it into such a consummate adult, and he certainly would not have underlined and exaggerated its



It is not enough for E.T. to be a child. He must have an air of familiarity, a capacity for cultural assimilation. He is not alien to Americans. This may not seem obvious to people from the States, who tend to view their habits as natural and global. But to someone from the thirdworld, it is clear that E.T. can be sheltered because he is comfortably integrated into American mass culture.

as they try to adjust to a strange land. But *E.T.* is purportedly of superior intelligence, agog with magical powers. In theory, he should be able to cope very well. He has all the wisdom of the celestial spheres at his cosmic fingertips, is proficient in telekinesis and telepathy. But what happens to these diverse talents in the movie is significant. They are, in fact, pseudo-powers, bestowed upon him by the script more than by nature so that he may seem mysterious and preeminent, so that he can play with them and with us, give us a thrill or a laugh. Then they are conveniently forgotten for the purposes of the plot. In fact, he is more like a small savage from the third world or the backlands than a Milky Way wizard. There is no reason why he should be so clumsy, why he should raid the refrigerator and spill everything, why he should get drunk, why he never proceeds beyond a pidgin English ("E.T. phone home") such as Tarzan used in his first film and countless Indians have stuttered in so many others.

Or rather, the reasons have to do with the film's strategy: our boy from out yonder must be vulnerable, an orphan, somebody who provokes our tenderness, with whom we can all identify, full of sitcom gags. The movie does not give us time to ask these questions. We are carried along by the frames, the music, the montage. The book, on the other hand, must try, as literature will do, to deliver a certain logical consistency to the character. So Kotzwinkle makes his space runt more wary of his action. The author will not

deformities: "his hideous shrunken form, his horrible mouth, his long creepy fingers and toes, his grotesque stomach..." This horror is not our adorable *E.T.* It is true that Spielberg has suggested "only his mother could love him," but he forgot to add that the movie's greatest triumph is to turn all of us into mothers. The wondrous mechanical being that Carlo Rambaldi has concocted is strange and bizarre, but not at all threatening. Merely designed to bring out our softest thoughts, to make "everybody love it," as one Hershey executive announced when asked if it was safe to have such a freak promote Reese's Pieces. He could have proved his point with Konrad Lorenz, who noted, in *Studies in Animal and Human Behavior*, that humans feel affection for animals with juvenile features: enormous eyes, bulging craniums, rearing chins. However much *E.T.* is beholden to worms, dragons, and insects for his looks, he is above all an overweight fetus, a wise man from outer space in the garb of an infant. This puerile condition is overwhelmingly visual and spectacular, so maybe it was better for Kotzwinkle not to watch the animated marvel in motion, sucking up our sentiments. He was able to devote himself to more literary whirls of empathy: "His thought patterns were not visible, could not be seen rainbowing above his head in brilliant, subtle waves." In other words, the intellectual glimmerings of a monster are not exactly filmable. His childishness is.

It is this basic puppy-feeding, absent

from the book, which has made the movie *E.T.* (and, of course, the book as well) such an incredible success. And such a relief. *E.T.* is so different from all the other fiends, ectoplasms, and psychopaths who have been howling and devouring their way through walls, bodies, and box offices. I have watched with consternation how the mounting curve of American paranoia in international affairs coincides with the mounting hysteria in horror movies. These pictures are laced with fear, insinuating a mental landscape where neither spectators nor characters feel safe. In *Poltergeist*, a typical case, adults try to save the children. *E.T.*, the film, predates the reverse: it is the children who will save the adults, and they will do it because they can comprehend that an alien is not to be inevitably feared, that we do not need to project our terrors upon him. Both the film and the novel refuse to see the stranger as a metaphor for that which must be eliminated, the stranger as an accusation or a blasphemy that can be stilled only through martyrdom or persecution.

This proposition, that we accept creatures unlike us, no matter how revolting and ugly, that we stand up against intolerance and extermination, is not new to science-fiction literature. Kotzwinkle's book pursues the idea without adding anything to it. He has written about a Close Encounter of the Fourth Kind. By doing so, he throws into relief, once more, the inventiveness and originality of the Spielberg film. The U.S. audience, starved for affection and openness, is given a tale in which Beauty (the child) kisses the Beast (*E.T.*) and resurrects him, in which the tired wayfarer of forbidding demeanor but with a bag full of miracles is given hospitality and a hearth. Kotzwinkle, by making his fallen divinity so overwhelmingly superior, leaves us no alternative than to enter into an alliance with him; Spielberg has made sure of the monster's acceptance by making him a baby.

And of course the extraterrestrial poses no challenge, in the film and in the book, to the society which harbors him. There is no demand in either of them for a real dialogue with the creature or his civilization. In the book, his world is too mysterious and arcane to be understood, except through impalpable, improbable (and tiresome) waves of light and fingertips of fire, whereas in the film *E.T.* has no effective civilization, no distinct symbol-system. Here is another clue to how an alien can convert the audience to the gospel of love. It is not enough for him to be a child. He must also have about him an air of familiarity, he must have within a desire and capacity for cultural assimilation. In the film, he is not alien to Americans at all. This may not seem obvious to people from the States, who tend to view their own habits and images as natural, eternal, and global. But to somebody from the third world, as I am, to people who are real outsiders and misfits, it is clear that the walking vegetable with the valentine beating openly on his chest as a sign of friendliness, can be accepted as somebody to cuddle and protect, can be sheltered and watched over, because he is easily and comfortably integrated into American mass culture. His very semblance has been prepared by the doll industry, by the Muppets, by animated cartoons. That is why, when the mother sees him amid a mountain of stuffed toys, he does not stand out.

Spielberg has made sure that all initial contacts between the alien and Elliot are through objects that any kid from the States would recognize, the symbols of the most popular folklike longings of 20th century America. The space goblin is enticed out of the foliage by a string of Reese's Pieces, almost as if he were a famished waif in an Asian or African alley. And the first rapport depends on baseball—the boy throws a ball into the toolshed, where the invader is hiding, and the ball bounces back. This may have been too much for Kotzwinkle, who in his quest for universality (a god must be everything to every-

(continued on page 40)



Tendency Newsletter
c/o PO BOX 8493
Chicago, Il. 60680