

Jewish **Frontier**

Summer/Fall 2001

Ophir Pines-Paz, MK, with LZA and Habonim Dror Leadership:



From August 10-16, 2001, Member of Knesset Ophir Pines-Paz addressed LZA leadership and members in Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit and New York City. Pines-Paz is a rising leader in the Labor Party, as well as Chairman of the Knesset Law Committee.

SINCE 1934 A LABOR ZIONIST JOURNAL

CHRISTIAN PROTO-ZIONISM
Egal Friedman pp. 10

THE ROOTS OF HOLOCAUST DENIAL
Henry Feingold pp. 8

Jewish Frontier

SINCE 1934

A LABOR ZIONIST JOURNAL

Founders

Hayim Greenberg
Marie Syrkin

Editorial Board

Henry Feingold, *Chairman*
Saul B. Cohen
Jonathan J. Goldberg
Emanuel S. Goldsmith
Jerry Goodman
Rabbi Mark W. Kiel
Chava Lapin
Judy Loeb
Jeffry V. Mallow
Daniel Mann
Mordecai Newman
Samuel Norich
Michael S. Perry
Mark Raider
Eduardo Rauch
Ezra Spicehandler
Phyllis Sutker
David Twersky

Nahum Guttman
Editor
GB Tran
Layout/Design

Cover photography by Dayna Frank

NOTE TO SUBSCRIBERS
If you plan to move, please notify
us six weeks in advance.

JEWISH FRONTIER

275 Seventh Avenue
17th Floor
New York, NY 10001

(212) 229-2280
(212) 366-1194

CONTENTS

Vol. LXVIII, No. 4

Summer/Fall 2001

TRIBUTE TO BEN COHEN 1
AND IRVING WISHNIA *Jeffry V. Mallow*

REMEMBERING DANIEL 5
(DANNY) GREENBERG *Daniel Mann*

Holocaust 8
THE ROOTS AND MEANING
OF HOLOCAUST DENIAL *Henry L. Feingold*

Americana 10
AN IMPORTANT SOURCE OF
AMERICAN SUPPORT FOR
ISRAEL: THE CHRISTIAN
COMMUNITY *Egal Friedman*

THE LINDBERGHs 12
AND THE JEWS *Hal Derner*

International Labor Movement 14
THE SITUATION OF WORKERS IN
THE OCCUPIED ARAB
TERRITORIES *Jerry Goodman, James
Foley, Jay Mazur, and
Amir Peretz, MK*

Books 17
IDEAS FOR AN AGE
OF CONFUSION *Emanuel S. Goldsmith*

WORLD ZIONIST 21
CONGRESS ELECTION
REGISTRATION FORM

JEWISH FRONTIER (ISSN-0021-6453) is published quarterly by Labor Zionist Letters, Inc. Editorial and advertising offices at 275 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY, 1001. Periodicals postage paid at New York, NY POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Circulation, Jewish Frontier, 275 Seventh Avenue, 17th Floor, New York, NY, 10001.

Subscription rates for U.S. and possessions, \$15.00 per year for 4 issues, \$25.00 for two years, 8 issues. Add \$2.50 for Canada. All other countries- \$20.00 per year; All foreign subscribers— remit in U.S. dollars drawn on a U.S. bank. Back issues payable in advance at \$7.00 each.

Editorial/article contributions should be sent to the editorial office and be accompanied by return postage and contact information. Editorial and advertising rates are available on request.

All material (unless otherwise noted) Copyright©2001 Jewish Frontier. Signed articles do not necessarily reflected the official position of JEWISH FRONTIER.

JEWISH FRONTIER is available on microfilm from: University of Microfilm, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Tribute to Ben Cohen and Irving Wishnia

Jeffry V. Mallow

I am delighted and honored to be able to pay tribute to Ben Cohen and Irving Wishnia, two chaverim who have served our movement for longer than I have been on this earth, and whose commitment and dedication have indeed shaped the Labor Zionist Alliance. I think there is no more fitting way to highlight what people like Ben and Irving have accomplished, than by reading poems of Eretz Yisrael in the period just before and during the days of their youth. Now I know that “their youth” is a little vague: Ben and Irving are not exactly the same age. Irving is after all celebrating –biz hundert tsvantzik– his 90th birthday, while Ben is...not. But in any case, I believe I am a bit more accurate than our young chaverim of Habonim Dror, who have been known to refer to LZA members ranging in age from 35 to 90 as “your generation.” In any case I have selected excerpts from two *Yiddish* poets—so I guess these are poems of Eretz YisROYL, not YisraEL. And these are poets usually, and incorrectly, associated more with Labor than Zionism: Peretz Markish and Morris Rosenfeld. Markish actually visited Eretz Yisroyl from Russia in the 1920’s. Rosenfeld, from a somewhat earlier epoch, in America, was writing from imagination rather than direct witness. Nevertheless, both of them speak with the inspiration and clarity of great poets. Here they are in translation*:

Peretz Markish: Jerusalem

Barefoot sit your hills, swollen humps, Jerusalem.
Lamenting, with ancient camel hoof their age
And leprous, they cry out to travelers -
“Jerusalem!” They cry and mutter...

Fiery days crawl on them like blackened bugs,
While on them chokes the hidden haunted border
And their leprous body, and their dead lineage
To black god-merchants and hangmen they are selling
Your holy earth is worthy, Jerusalem,
Together with the slaves, the sheep, the dowry
And with the vessels that brought sacred flame

When the sickly step is forged with crosses

But out of caves come barefoot shepherds
To beg the Dead Sea for a storm.

Morris Rosenfeld: Jerusalem

Oh no, I can in strangers’ lands
No longer beg a home with shame
While yet the ancient loving bands
Bind me to my beloved land

My tired eyes still fill with tears
When I recall what was before
When I could rest in slumber sweet
And never hear oppressors’ shout

When I could tend my flock of sheep
And close to me in piety
And fervent love there shiver still
The blossoms of Jerusalem

I think I hear familiar voices
They call to me, “Come home, come home.”
And in my heart begins to wake
A hope for happiness renewed

I think I see Carmel again
The Sharon blooming as before
The air is sweet with gentle songs
Reminding me of my first spring

Oh no, I can in strangers’ lands
No longer seek a dwelling place
While yet the ancient loving bands
Bind me to my beloved land

That was the reality and the dream of the Eretz Yisroyl of Ben and Irving’s youth. The Medinat Yisrael of today is the product of their toil. One is tempted to say the “culmination of their toil,” but that would be doubly incorrect; first, because the task of building an Israel which embodies the ideals of Labor Zionism is far from over; second, because Irving and Ben are not finished with their many contributions.

The diplomatic way to say this is, “May you go from strength to strength.” We Labor Zionists are not so diplomatic, so let me be clear: “Irving and Ben, you’re not off the hook. You have too much yet to share with us.”

It is virtually impossible in these difficult times for Israel to give a talk that is reflective rather than advocacy, or even polemical. How can you, when each week brings more reports of suicide bombings by Palestinians willing to die as long as they can kill as many Jews as possible, when young Russian Jews, newly arrived out of bondage, are murdered by their “neighbors”? Cool detachment is hardly a virtue when people are locked in violent confrontation. And our people are locked in such a confrontation with another people— a tragic confrontation, because it did not have to be. It has taken LZA some time after the outbreak of violence— sorry, that’s too passive: after Yasir Arafat decided to start a war— for us to regain our equilibrium and bring our ideological and intellectual resources to bear. The shock of Arafat’s rejection of Ehud Barak’s offer was not easy to absorb. The fall of Barak and the election of Ariel Sharon followed fast on the heels of the renewed fighting. Our colleagues on the right could hardly contain their glee at what they saw as a vindication of their world-view, that the PA was a dishonest partner from the start, that you just can’t negotiate with Arabs. On the left, Europeans and some American Jews and Israelis developed an amazing case of amnesia: you would never know from their words and actions that Barak’s offer had ever existed. Or, it was his so called “arrogance” that drove Arafat away from the peace table. Or, the Israelis have been reaping all of the benefits of the Oslo process, while the Palestinians have gained nothing. Let us examine each of these claims.

In answering demands from the Jewish right that Labor Zionism repudiate Oslo and confess its errors, we should follow the lead of our friend Transportation Minister Ephraim Sneh, and remind our interlocutors that the level of violence decreased markedly since Oslo, that the PA worked with Israel to prevent terror attacks from Hamas so that dozens of potential suicide bombings were foiled, that Oslo led to diplomatic relations with numerous states including Jordan and the Vatican, that economic investment soared. We must also remind them that violations of Oslo were hardly one sided, that the Wye agreements

were abrogated by the Netanyahu government almost before the ink was dry, and that those violations were either ignored or applauded by these very Jews who excoriate others for their perfidy.

To our colleagues on the left, we say, why do you, while expressing sympathy for the Palestinians’ plight, and decrying the occupation, neglect to acknowledge that it was Arafat who rejected the end of that occupation? Why do you refuse to hold him accountable? Since when is the putative “arrogance” of an Israeli Prime Minister a reason to reject an offer of permanent peace, of the end of the occupation, of the dismantling of settlements, of the return of 95% of the land and a piece of Israel proper for the other 5%, of a shared Jerusalem, of a solution to the refugee problem? Not generous enough? Make a counter offer, not a war.

As for the claims that Israel got everything and the Palestinians nothing: 45% of Palestinian lands and most of the Palestinian population are now under Palestinian control. Enough? No. But a test of Israel’s bonafides? You bet. In the meantime, despite the decrease in violence since 1993, there was violence aplenty. That eight year Paradise that Israel gained from the Oslo accords included: bombings, shootings, the release of Hamas prisoners by the P.A., the teaching of hatred in Palestinian schools and media, the continual stoning and firebombing of Jews from the Temple Mount to the Western Wall below. And for those who think that stones are not much of a weapon, I did the calculation: a stone *dropped*, not even thrown, from the Mount, hits a Jew below at 42 miles per hour. In this so-called David vs. Goliath struggle, let us remember that David killed Goliath— with a stone. From the signing of the Oslo Declaration of Principles between Israel and the PLO in September 1993, until September 2000, before the latest “intifada,” 256 Israelis were killed in terrorist attacks. And yet, the majority of Israelis, in poll after poll, stayed the course, and reaffirmed their readiness to make sacrifices for peace. A test of *their* bonafides? You bet.

We wish for the occupation to end. We called for this even before Oslo, and we have supported the peace process from the beginning, endorsing the efforts of prime ministers from Yitzhak Rabin z”l to Ehud Barak. We will support the unity government under Prime Minister Ariel Sharon in its efforts to obtain a secure and enduring peace. At the same time,

it is appropriate for us to criticize actions by Israel that we consider excessive, such as the killing of 13 Israeli Arabs at the start of the current violence. We also urge that Israel delay no further in dealing with the socioeconomic disparities and discrimination against its Arab citizens.

We are of course concerned about the high death rate of Palestinians, especially children. How can one not be, even in the face of the appalling Palestinian abuse of their own children: putting them in the front lines? At the same time, we recognize the predicament of a few Israeli soldiers facing a mob of hundreds armed with rocks, slingshots, firebombs, and guns. We are also concerned that innocent Palestinians have become the victims of their leaders' folly. It is impossible to eliminate civilian suffering in wartime; nevertheless, it is important to minimize it, while responding with appropriate force to those who have chosen force. Even that is not simple. What shall we do to deter suicide bombers? Bomb a few villages in retaliation? Kill a few dozen or hundred Palestinian civilians? This we do not do. There is no magic plan. Sharon is faced with precisely the same dilemmas as was Barak.

And we have a crucial difference with the policies of Prime Minister Sharon. We oppose the continued establishment or expansion of settlements. We opposed it under Labor, we continue to oppose it. It is a major obstacle to peace. It does not have the support of the majority of the Israeli population, it has led to despair among the Palestinians, and it has provided fertile soil for Palestinian rejectionists. It is simply wrong. Even my *mekhutn* Mort, a retired dentist and no Labor Zionist, is asking, "How can we steal other peoples' land?" Does this mean that Jews should not have the right to live anywhere in the Land of Israel? Of course they should. Just as those Palestinian refugees who did not actually participate in the 1948 war *should* have the right of return, with all of their descendants, to their original homes in Israel. Two splendid abstractions, invoked regularly by those who desire victory, not peace. Peace will come when absolute rights are compromised, when self-righteousness gives way to *seykhl*. The settlements are not the only obstacle to peace, but they are a major one. That having been said: if Arafat had not rejected Barak's offer, that problem would be disappearing even as we speak.

We must, however, acknowledge just how far we have come since Oslo: the positions we Labor Zionists have espoused, including land for peace, and Palestinian statehood, have now become the normative positions of the Jewish community in Israel and in the world, and are endorsed by Ariel Sharon himself. They are also the positions of the American government. The clear consensus among responsible Jews and among responsible Arabs is that there is no going back. Unfortunately, the rubric "responsible Arabs" does not at this moment include Arafat and the PA. We Labor Zionists are not naive: we are well aware that perhaps, as my mother (of blessed memory) would say, "nishtu mit vemen tsu geyn tsum tish": there's no one with whom to go to the table. Nevertheless, we have rededicated ourselves to seeking ways of going forward, to a secure and lasting peace. How to do this? We don't know; no one knows. But we do know how *not* to do it: keep beating the Palestinians bloody and taking their land until they stop hating us. So we soldier on. There is no alternative.

But Labor Zionism is not a single issue movement. As we love Israel, so do we love the Jewish people, and so do we love social democracy. Download our ideology statement: laborzionist.org, and you will see these multiple commitments and agendas. As we rededicate ourselves to the search for peace between Israel and its neighbors, so too do we rededicate ourselves to peace between Jew and Jew. This is no easy task. In Shmaryahu Levin's famous epigram, "Yidn zaynen a kleyn folk ober a paskudnye." Jews are a small people, but ornery. We see this today in the continuing struggle for pluralism. Fifty years ago, a Jewish world traumatized by its horrific losses welcomed those who wished to identify as Jews. Great leaders of the religious movements sat with each other and with great leaders of secular Judaism, and worked together for the good of the Jewish people. Where has that gone? Why has our relative safety produced exclusionary fanaticism? The torching of synagogues was always a hallmark of rabid anti-Semitism. What are we to make of the torching of a Conservative synagogue in Jerusalem by Orthodox Jews? Swiss insurance companies were excoriated for demanding birth and death certificates as proof of identity from descendants of Holocaust victims, or from Holocaust survivors themselves. What are we to make of the Chief Rabbi of Denmark

making precisely that demand, in order to “permit” immigrant Polish Jews to join the Danish Jewish community? There’s an old Jewish riddle: “What’s the difference between an apikoyres and a khnyuk: a heretic and a fanatic? An apikoyres is someone who does one less mitzvah than you; a khnyuk is someone who does one more.” The joke is losing its charm.

We in LZA have set ourselves the task of establishing a forum where all branches of the Jewish people, religious and secular, can seek common ground. We have begun with Jewish leaders in Chicago, including the rabbi who heads the Conservative Movement’s Rabbinical Assembly, a Reform rabbi who is a member of the national boards of both the UAHC and ARZA, and leaders of Naamat and LZA. Such a forum will, for example, consider the question of what our Israeli chaverim call “The Fourth Way”: non-religious, but firmly tradition-based Judaism, such as is currently practiced on many Labor kibbutzim. Where does this fit in the spectrum of Jewish practice? We are also asking, in what way have synagogues evolved, from “houses of worship,” an American Christian concept, to centers of learning and communal activity—which they were in the Old Country? In fact, Labor Zionism itself has long provided a paradigm for the synthesis of Jewish tradition and commitment to ethical action. Here, again translated from the Yiddish, is an excerpt from Nachman Syrkin’s 1917 essay entitled “Thoughts About Socialist Zionism.”

...as longing and as hope, as mystical belief and inner faith, the complex of thoughts and feelings which is contained in Socialist Zionism is rooted in all of Jewish history. The struggle against the world, out of the recognition of one’s own originality and mission, for the higher ideals of culture and humanity, for the spiritualization and moralization of life, is the basic theme of Jewish history. The transformation of each natural and historical reality, in order to bring down the Shkhinah and the Malkhes haRuakh, and actualize the ideal Shabbes Shabbaton of history, runs like a scarlet thread through the thousands of years of Jewish historical existence. In the ideas of Shivas Tsion, Byas ha Moshiakh, Geulah, Atid Lavo, Ketz ha Yomim, Akhris ha Yomim, and even the mystical hope of Tkhyas haMeysim resounds and is expressed this historical originality of Judaism.

This interweaving of traditional, even religious imagery with social action was truly revolutionary in

those revolutionary times. We Labor Zionists, some of us now members of synagogues, have evolved, as have the synagogues themselves. We have placed ourselves in the forefront of the struggle to make the definition of “Who is a Jew” as broad and inclusive as possible.

Syrkin’s essay reminds us of the third pillar of Labor Zionism: what we now call social democracy, the struggle for tikkun olam in the socioeconomic sphere. Here is an excerpt from the LZA ideology statement:

We are committed to fight for human rights, social and economic justice, equal education, civil liberties and religious freedom. We oppose all forms of persecution, including those based on race, religion, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, and sexual orientation.

Brave words. How do we actualize them? Our most recent initiative is the struggle against what I have termed “the global sweatshop.” There is no movement more resonant with American Jewish history, nor dearer to the Jewish heart. The Frankenstein we thought our grandparents and great-grandparents had slain has risen from the ashes. Guest workers, undocumented aliens, citizens of poor third world nations—all of these are reaping the benefits of globalization: sub-subsistence wages, appalling and dangerous working conditions, brutalization by managers, child labor, to name a few. You may recall that Harvard students staged a sit-in last spring. They wanted Harvard to adopt a policy, similar to one passed by the Cambridge City Council, establishing a “living wage” of \$10.25 an hour as the minimum that could be paid to employees. From the April 30 *New York Times*:

More than 1,000 workers at Harvard earn less than \$10.25 an hour. Porfirio Figueroa is one of them. He explained through an interpreter that he has to work two jobs ‘just to survive a little bit.’ But he doesn’t get to see much of his kids. ‘I only see my son on weekends and at night when he is sleeping,’ he said.

I only see my son on weekends and at night when he is sleeping...

I have a little boy, a fine little son. When I see him, it feels as if the world is mine. But I seldom see him awake. When I see him, he’s asleep. I see him only at night.

(Continued on page 18)

Remembering Daniel (Danny) Greenberg z"l

Daniel Mann

In the passing this summer of Daniel Greenberg, known to everyone as Danny, the Labor Zionist movement has lost one of its most beloved members and effective leaders. Some idea of this unique personality can be gained from the opening sentences of his obituary in the July 16 edition of the *Chicago Tribune*:

Daniel N. Greenberg was only 19 when he served as a gunner on a U.S. tank that barreled across Germany during World War II and was nearly destroyed by a bazooka shell. Severely injured, the Chicago native returned home with a Silver Star, a Purple Heart, and a newfound wisdom he used to help others in years to come.

Additional testimony can be found in the eulogy his son Aaron delivered at the funeral:

My father devoted his professional career to trying to ease the suffering of a group of people who are among the most helpless, powerless, and downtrodden in our world, the mentally ill. He was both a therapist and an administrator, eventually becoming the superintendent of the largest state mental facility in Illinois. I walked the wards of his hospital with him once or twice, and it was obvious to me that he felt great respect and affection for the people he was serving, as they did for him. I can attest from personal experience, as I know my sister and brother Ruth and Joe can as well, to his uncanny ability to calm you when you were troubled and help you put your problems in perspective.

Danny Greenberg's roots were to be found in a vibrant Jewish and Labor Zionist home. His father, a Hebrew teacher, was secretary of Branch 1 of Chicago Poale Zion (a predecessor of the Labor Zionist Alliance), and his mother was a founder of the West Side Pioneer Women (now Na'amat USA). His late sister, Ruth (Kohansky), was a delegate from Chicago to the founding convention of Habonim in

1935 (as recorded by Ben Cohen in the foreword to *Builders and Dreamers*). At Danny's funeral, his other sister, Jennie Gordon, recalled the following:

Danny, our sister Ruthie, and I grew up in a home that was always filled with a great deal of love, warmth, and laughter. My father had a great sense of humor, which Danny inherited, and my mother could always come up with some choice sayings which would make us smile. It was a home with a great deal of music, mostly operatic arias and "chazonish" (cantorial) music, which was played on a Victrola which had to be wound by hand.

At the center of Danny's life for almost a half-century was his wife, Chaikay. I was a college student and a Habonim leader in Chicago when they got married, on an evening coinciding with a public meeting sponsored by the Poale Zion Party in support of the candidacy of Adlai Stevenson for president. I recall the chair of the program apologizing to the then young Jewish congressman, Sidney Yates, for the small attendance "because of the marriage of two prominent families of our movement." It sounded like the Cabots and the Lodges, but it was actually the Greenbergs and the Pomerantzses.

Chaikay was a full partner with Danny not only in the raising of their children but also in their many movement and other communal endeavors, and these worlds coincided when their children went to Habonim camp and one of them, Joe, to the Habonim Workshop in Israel. All of this and more was reflected in the eulogy delivered by Danny's longtime friend, Ben Sosewitz, who likewise has served in a range of leadership roles in Labor Zionism and elsewhere, most notably as a recent national president of the American Society for Technion. After recalling their shared childhood and teen years, all connected to the movement because of the influence of their parents and siblings, Ben stated the following:

Danny came home from the war with a broken body. He started a long arduous road to recovery, which he accomplished with reasonable success but not without a lot of difficulty. He was able to continue his education, and later, with Chaikay at his side, to reach professional status at the University of Chicago. He and Chaikay established a family life and Danny achieved a noteworthy career. He loved all kinds of music, the Chicago Cubs, a hot dog with all the works, and once in a while a vodka on the rocks. How unfair it seems that a lifetime of struggle, achievement, contentment, and gratification are described in a few short sentences.

But perhaps, as we look around and take note of those who came here to honor Danny's life, we have a better sense of what that life was all about. Danny reveled in his life as husband, parent, and grandparent. Throughout his life he was a leader, quiet, thoughtful, and modest. Those in his company valued his views and opinions. Much of his energy, outside of family and work, was dedicated to the Labor Zionist movement. Later, he included responsibilities in YIVO because of his love for and interest in the perpetuation of the Yiddish language and its culture. He also became involved in the Chicago Jewish Historical Society in order to assure the retention of our rich local Jewish communal history. Throughout, he never let up in his devotion to the youth of Habonim and their programs. He, together, with Chaikay, were to be honored in August for their lifelong commitment to the Labor Zionist family and its work. He also talked about continuing to help plan additional reunions of his Manley High School classmates, and was planning his regular trek to his summer home, where he shared so much with children, grandchildren, and friends.

Only a few months ago, Danny was getting ready to make his regular two-month visit with Chaikay to the Israel he loved, and to which he gave so much, there to visit with family and a wide circle of friends. Danny surfed the Internet regularly, focusing on the Israeli press and the sense it portrayed of the mood and frustrations of the Israeli public both during the peace process and after its collapse. He voiced his own frustrations because he believed in the need for arriving at a peaceful conclusion of the conflict. Danny was not ready to quit. He was active, responsible, vibrant, understanding, and vital until illness struck him down.

To these excerpts from Ben Sosewitz's moving eulogy, allow me to add some personal notes of my own. Though Danny Greenberg and I were several years apart, we shared a background in Habonim in the Midwest, and later, many overlapping tasks and positions in Poale Zion and then LZA. But it was during the past decade that we became particularly close. Our association began with the effort to publish *Builders and Dreamers* and to provide the seed money for what has now blossomed into a major agency of the movement, the Habonim Dror Foundation. There followed seven years of collaboration in the national, regional, and local work of the Labor Zionist Alliance.

When I became national president, Danny offered to be my agent, my advocate, even my spy (his words) — anything I would ask of him just so he didn't have to attend meetings. Of course that was too high a price for LZA to pay for his leadership, so both Chaikay and he faithfully attended national meetings in New York and elsewhere, and Elaine and I always enjoyed their visits to Washington.

But our most memorable — and productive — contacts were our many phone calls (I called them our Shabbes shmoozes) in which we would catch up on so many topics of mutual interest — families and friends, the movement, Jewish cultural activities and communal history, our congregations — until Danny would say “uh-oh,” knowing that I had yet another request of him, often in the form of some kind of very informal, discreet, and behind-the-scenes intercession to get some program or project started or back on track. The same kind of personal engagement would take place around the dining-room table the many times I stayed at the Greenberg home in Chicago. And we'd compare notes regularly on our respective trips to Israel, though there Danny got his wish: He and Chaikay managed to get there annually, as Ben Sosewitz noted, but without having to attend meetings.

The obituary in the *Tribune* said that Danny's “offbeat sense of humor balanced a more serious side of his personality that came from the harsh lessons of war.” And Aaron spoke of his father's “sharper, more idiosyncratic side. He was a master of sarcasm and loved dirty jokes. He created

a complex hierarchy of insulting names to call people who deserved it (though never to their faces), most of those terms involving various Yiddish names for certain parts of the body.” I was witness to this capacity in more public settings. At most meetings in Chicago, all the veteran members had known Danny since birth, and he in turn knew all the younger people since **their** birth (or their arrival in the community). He had a way of listening quietly through a long discussion and then generating the desired conclusion by saying simply, “Do we have a choice?” Sometimes he would sit on the sidelines and gently tease or almost (but not quite) insult everyone there. Not only did he get away with that, but once again the result was the right decision.

It would have been my privilege to address the tribute to Danny and Chaikey that Ben Sosewitz mentioned, and Elaine was looking forward to joining the festivities. Instead, we now mourn Danny’s passing, but his memory is a multiple blessing: the glow of the memories themselves; the remarkable relationship of Chaikey and Danny and of both of them with their family and friends; the long list of activities and responsibilities that he carried out so skillfully, some of which will now be further enhanced by a fund in his name; and the knowledge that we will honor his memory by continuing to advance his commitments. May we do so with the heart, the hope, the humor, and the humanity that pervaded and indeed personified Daniel Greenberg’s full and special life. □

Labor Zionist Alliance of Chicago

Deeply mourns the loss

Of our Chaver and Leader

Daniel (Danny) Greenberg

And extends heartfelt condolences

To Chaikey and family.

The Roots and Meaning of Holocaust Denial

Henry L. Feingold

The *American Jewish Yearbook*, which is the American Jewish Committee's indispensable collector of relevant data on American Jewry, groups Holocaust denial together with several forms of contemporary antisemitism. The recent libel trial of Professor Lipstadt in London bears out the validity of that classification but it somehow misses the fact that there is something unique about the way this type of antisemitism seeks to hit at Jews. It wants nothing less than to erase even the memory of European Jews murdered in the Holocaust. It is horrendous because, following upon the physical destruction of European Jewry, it now aspires to deny the very Jewish presence in history. It aims its weapons at the inner secret of millennial Jewish survival, historic memory.

While Nazi propaganda spoke endlessly about the Jewish threat, Allied archival documents rarely mentioned Jews. During the refugee stage the preferred term was "political refugee" although they were in fact overwhelmingly central European Jews extruded from German-held territory. The three agencies that the Roosevelt administration helped create to deal with the problem, the Intergovernmental Committee on Political Refugees, the Presidential Advisory Committee on Political Refugees, and the War Refugee Board, avoid the term "Jews." While Berlin was converting Roosevelt to the Jewish faith, his State Department was converting Jews to the neutral refugee category which it was hoped would help solve the refugee crisis by underplaying its Jewish character. When information of the actual plans for a "final solution" was given to Gerhard Riegner, the agent of the World Jewish Congress in Switzerland, the State Department tried desperately to suppress the news which was transmitted by diplomatic pouch. None of the wartime Allied Conferences, Teheran, Moscow, Yalta, Potsdam, that discussed the war crimes question ever placed the mass murder of the Jews on their agenda. It was as if this greatest crime of all wasn't happening. When the Polish Government in Exile requested retaliatory bombing of German cities for what was being done in Poland the request was denied, as was a later request to

bomb the gas chambers and crematoria in the death camps. (There was no specific reference to Jews in these requests.) The cattle cars rolled to the death camps amidst an eerie silence. Nothing was said that might have informed Germans that their loved ones were giving up their lives in enormous numbers on the eastern front to implement an ideological goal driven by an obsession of the Fuehrer that had nothing to do with winning the war. Though Soviet POWs were the first victims of the Auschwitz murder process, the silence of the Kremlin on the genocide was even more profound than that of the United States and Britain. The Kremlin was intent on concealing the linkage that German propaganda sought to make between communism and the world Jewish enterprise which they called "Judeobolshevism." Stalin continued the total denial policy well after the war. At Babi Yar and the sight of other mass burial grounds, Jews as specific victims are not mentioned. Instead we are informed that citizens of the Soviet Union who lie buried. Jews became in death what they were rarely allowed to be in life, honored citizens of the nation.

The most direct reflection of the strategy of denial can be seen in the troubled history of the UN War Crimes Commission (UNWCC). Founded in 1943 when it became apparent that Berlin was waging a new kind of war especially in the east, the UNWCC experienced enormous difficulties in even discussing what was easily the most atrocious of the many war crimes being committed by a criminal state. Since major war criminals would be tried by tribunals in the countries where their crimes had been committed, it was argued the consideration of crimes against the Jewish people were not needed since such crimes fell under the jurisdiction of each state. Thus statements of warning and retribution rarely mentioned the crimes against the Jews. Concealment preceded denial. Not until a political crony from his days at Harvard, Robert (Birdie) Pell, whom Roosevelt appointed to the UNWCC, tried desperately to extend international law so that the genocide of the Jewish people could be

considered, was the Holocaust even contemplated as a war crime. Pell fought valiantly but in the end was too weak to break the opposition which was even stronger in the British Foreign Office than the State Department. He was maneuvered out of his position in January 1945. The Charter of the IMT (International Military Tribunal) under which the Nuremberg war crimes trials were conducted in 1946 made no specific mention of the crimes against Jews. They had to be handled under other classifications such as “waging aggressive war” or “crimes against humanity” or “belonging to a criminal organization.”

As the full extent of the Nazi depredations became known in the immediate postwar years, the concealment of the specific crime against the Jews continued. There are some readers who undoubtedly recall the rage in the American Jewish community when they learned that the handful of Jewish survivors housed in DP camps were often forced to share the same barracks with their tormentors. Only with the establishment of the state of Israel in May 1948 did some recognition of what had happened to European Jewry enter public consciousness. There are some who maintain that the very recognition of the Jewish state was based on a rare feeling of contrition in the international community for what had befallen European Jewry. It created a needed “window of opportunity” for the recognition of a Jewish state. It was that state that became the instrument for breaking through the denial and concealment of what had happened during the war.

It was in fact not until the capture of Adolf Eichmann and his trial that a full recognition and acknowledgment of what had happened in the death camps was made. Eichmann was tried on the specific charge of “crimes against the Jewish people” which gave the world a needed historical corrective. Predictably the cry of illegality soon arose. “How could Israel try Eichmann if the Jewish state did not exist at the time?” The Nuremberg charter called for major war criminals to be tried in the country where the crime was committed. That is why Rudolf Hoess, the Commandant of Auschwitz, was tried and executed in Poland. That meant of course that the hundreds of war criminals who dealt exclusively with the murder of Jews like the commanders of the *Einsatzgruppen* and the *Ordnungspolizei* who wandered behind the *Wehrmacht* from place to place doing their murderous work would escape punishment entirely. Israel argued that she was a successor agent to the Jews of Europe, a principal

which had already been accepted by Konrad Adenauer, the Chancellor of the *Bundesrepublik*, in Israel’s reparations agreement with Germany. Moreover, the “Crimes Against Humanity” category allowed any member of the family of nations to apprehend and try war criminals. Nevertheless there was resistance to the Eichmann trial in the Allied camp. It was couched in legal terms but beneath one could sense that the reluctance to recognize the “final solution” as a separate and unique crime continued well beyond the war years.

Let the impression is given that Allied Holocaust denial is in the same category as that of David Irving’s, we need to add that its relationship to antisemitism is quite different. Allied concealment was based partly on the fear that to make the war one to save the Jews would have interfered with the effort to mobilize a reluctant people to make the sacrifices required to win the war. Jews were after all not winning medals for popularity in the thirties and forties. The connection to antisemitism was indirect based as it is on the antisemitism which is believed to be latent in public consciousness in the Christian world. Contemporary holocaust denial, on the other hand, is a direct instrument of antisemitism seeking to delegitimize the Jewish people now returned to history. It seeks to deny Jews their history which for Jews especially serves as a building block for communal identity.

History is a battleground, a loss here can push Jewry off the historical canvas and into oblivion. So Professor Lipstadt’s courtroom victory against David Irving, a holocaust denier who conceals his obsessive antisemitism, is an important one. There is a struggle not only for the continued existence of the Jewish state but also for a Jewish place in history. It is an existential struggle. That is also the reason why the increase of Holocaust denial in the Arab world is so disturbing. It was the creation of the Jewish state that allowed Jews to regain control of their history. When Arafat declares that there was no Jewish temple in Jerusalem, when his supporters claim that there was no Holocaust and that it is touted to garner the benefits a caring world reserves for those it has victimized, there can be no other answer than for Jews to continue to control the writing of their history. No people has better reason to know that it is better to be the masters of history than its victims. That truth, learned at a dear price, is what gives the Zionist movement its ability to sustain Jews wherever they are. □

An Important Source of American Support for Israel: The Christian Community

Egal Friedman

In its relatively short history, Israel has known no real peace. Arabs have waged constant war against it, either openly or by terror. Given Israel's protracted crises, the low-grade war waged by the Palestinians who surround it, and the groups of fundamentalists who vow to obliterate it, what can American Jews do? There is no certainty that the American government or American public opinion will continue to view the Jewish State with affection into the distant future. A rearrangement of world alliances, for whatever reason, could generate a change in political mood that would work against the vital needs of the Jewish State. Add to this the possibility of a decreasing influence of the Jewish community due to a reduced population because of a declining birth rate, intermarriage and assimilation, and it is conceivable that in a few generations, removed from the birth pangs of Israel's early history, American Jews will perceive a threat to Israel's existence with indifference. Their desire to influence American lawmakers to bolster Israel's defenses could wane. There is no easy solution to this problem. But perhaps a dedicated segment of America's Jewry could launch a program of educational renewal with respect to Israel and the Jewish people, a program designed to permeate American society.

Actually, Jews are not amateurs in educating Americans about their past and are forever alerting the public's attention to the Jewish experience. In this case, the most striking example concerns the destruction of Europe's Jews during the Second World War. A generation ago, the term "Holocaust" was rarely mentioned or discussed publicly in the United States. Since that time, the term has come to stand for the horrors that Jews sustained while most gentiles stood by in silence. Today public school teachers talk about it to their students. Colleges and universities

offer courses and sponsor programs of remembrance about the Holocaust; while survivors, who had for years remained silent about their experiences, are now beseeched to speak about their dark past. Holocaust museums, which are found in many major cities, are crowned by the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, endorsed and partially supported by the Federal government as a national institution in Washington, D.C., a must for visitors to the nation's capital city. Most significant is the religious impact of the Holocaust on the nation's churches. Catholics and Protestants of numerous denominations, like Jews, pause each year to commemorate *Yom Hashoah*. They see it as a tragedy committed against the Jewish people by the Christian world, a blot upon humanity. It was a catastrophe that might have been prevented, if not for the absence of Christian values and behavior.

American Jews should not overlook the potential support available to them from the Christian community, especially from evangelical Protestant denominations and the Roman Catholic Church. Through dialogue and informal discussions, Jews should make every effort to nurture these pro-Israel sentiments.

Evangelical Protestants, those who are generally characterized as biblical literalists or fundamentalists and who classify themselves as "born again" include among them friends of Israel. Indeed, by the late nineteenth century, evangelical Protestants, driven by their peculiar eschatology, displayed a passionate Zionism equal but for different reasons to the fervor of the Lovers of Zion; and it persists to this day. They continue to yearn for an end to the dispersion of the Jewish people. They find Arab demands upon the State of Israel unreasonable and

highly distasteful. Together their numbers are large — recent polls count almost 40 million “born again” Christians — and cross denominational lines. Among them are included many of the most influential Americans. They sit in the halls of Congress and Senate and vote consistently for bills in support of the Jewish State. They pilgrimage frequently to the Holy Land and fill its best hotels to capacity, while Jews stay home. For the sake of Israel, American Jews should welcome the commitment to Israel extended by many fundamentalists.

To be sure, American Jews should also remain suspicious of the evangelical caress of Zionism. Protestant evangelical hope for a Jewish return is intimately linked at times — but not at all times — with the hope for a Jewish conversion to Christianity. In fact, many see the return as a signal for the second advent of the Christian savior and the beginning of world redemption. However, Jewish concern for their safety and their children’s safety is exaggerated. Neither should American evangelicals’ stress on public prayers and Bible reading or even a silent prayer in schools cause a permanent alienation between Protestant faithful and American Jews. Most important is that many evangelicals are eager to learn from Jews of their views and anxieties about Israel. The first time priority of American Jews is to strengthen public support for the Jewish State.

The Roman Catholic Church moved more slowly than did evangelical Protestantism in its recognition of the Jewish State. It was not until 1985 that the Holy See admitted with caution that the existence of the State of Israel held great religious and political importance for the Jewish people. The Church’s eagerness to dialogue with Jews and learn more about them did not at first include the issue of Zionism. The omission was not an oversight. It was deliberate. Strong Arab objection to any favorable mention of Zionism was an inhibiting factor. Also, the Church found it hard to acknowledge that Providence would approve a Jewish return to the Holy Land. Church doctrine had not yet caught up with the reality of Jewish sovereignty. What is more, the Holy See was deeply concerned about its own role and the security of its religious sites in the Jewish State. Perhaps most important was the absence of instruction on all levels of Catholic education about the roots of Zionism and the centrality of the Land.

It was the Church’s revelation of the depth of American Jewish anxiety for Israel’s safety during the

crisis of the Six Day War that jolted the American hierarchy into the realization of the importance that the Land held for the Jews. American bishops urged their faithful followers to treat Jewish love of Israel with greater sensitivity and understanding. Actually, it was because of this realization that the subject of Israel’s centrality for Judaism became an integral part of the dialogue between Jews and the Catholics. The subject of the land constituted a new plank in the strengthening structure of Jewish-Catholic relations. The trend was capped by the formal recognition of the State of Israel by the Holy See in 1993. That was a move long awaited by American Jewry and the Catholic hierarchy.

Jews should not take the Catholic change of heart towards Israel lightly. It represented a profound theological reversal: the acceptance of Israel as a sovereign State of the Jewish people. Moreover, it was an indication of the Church’s wish to learn more about Judaism and to understand its deepest hopes.

Yet it would be foolish to believe that the Catholic Church’s alteration of its sentiments with respect to Israel was absolute. Despite all of its sympathetic utterances, Rome, as is also true of a segment of liberal Protestantism, has kept one of its eyes focused on the hostile complaints about the Jewish State from Christian and Muslim Arabs. Arab gripes have engendered a note of ambivalence about Israel’s place in the Middle East. American prelates have tried to walk a thin line between Israel’s needs and Arabs’ desires. Some Christian groups have counseled Israel to exchange strategic land for peace, to show more trust in its Palestinian neighbors. But none of these criticisms ever call into question the need of a Jewish State. On the contrary, in the wake of the Shoah, its existence has been viewed by the Catholic Church as imperative: it realizes that any attempt to define Judaism without Israel would constitute a gross distortion. A number of prelates have defined anti-Zionism as a new version of antisemitism. Such growing sympathetic gestures have tightened the bonds between American Catholics and Jews. Leading American Catholics hope that normalization of the Church’s relationship with the Jewish State will intensify and improve the dialogue between the two faith communities.

It is imperative that, for the sake of America’s future relationship with Israel, Jews seize the opportunity to engage in dialogue with Roman Catholics. With about

(Continued on page 19)

The Lindberghs and the Jews

Hal Derner

It was hardly with a moment of shock or dismay that I reacted to the response of a forty-something colleague when I mentioned to her the recent passing of Anne Morrow Lindbergh “Who is she?” she asked. Figures.

Of course Anne and her illustrious but controversial husband Charles, were of a different time – a different generation. With almost seventy four years of “Lucky Linda’s” history-shattering trans-Atlantic flight having elapsed, small wonder that primarily octogenarians and trivia buffs remain among the few who remember the May 20, 1927 event.

Fitting firmly into the former category and marginally into the Jeopardy set permits a bit of nostalgia to emerge — that fourth-grade teacher exuberantly informed us of Lindbergh’s heroic feat — my first in the “where were you when?” department. As a rather precocious 16 year-old high schooler in winter 1935, I devoured the *New York Daily Mirror’s* day-by-day transcripts of the trial of Bruno Hauptmann for his 1932 kidnapping and murder of the Lindbergh’s first-born twenty-month-old Charles Jr. — a horrific event that the American press dubbed “The Crime of the Century.” It would alter the lives of the famous couple forever.

American Jewry, particularly of the pre-World War II generation, also remembers the Lindberghs, especially husband Charles, for his pro-Isolationist, Nazi, anti-Semitic stance that irreparably diminished and tarnished his reputation as well as his wife’s.

Anne Morrow Lindbergh, who died on February 7 at age 94 merited a full page obituary in the *New York Times* and one of equivalent length in the *Los Angeles Times* - a rare honor indeed.

Both newspapers, to their credit, did not minimize the controversial aspects of the lives of both

the Lindberghs. *The Los Angeles Times* writes that “at various times... (Mrs.) Lindbergh was the most envied, pitied and hated woman in America” and goes on to say that in her 1940 book *The Wave of the Future* (she wrote more than two dozen), which argued against American involvement in World War II, she mirrored her husband’s isolationist views and also “was condemned as a pro-Nazi traitor, a reputation that took years to fade.” Her tome was reviled as the “most despised book of the day.” She did later recant much of the work.

In 1938, Charles, who had made favorable public statements about German air power, accepted a swastika-adorned medal from its government. For the next three years he made speeches about American involvement in the war in Europe, culminating in an autumn 1941 rally in Des Moines, Iowa, organized by the isolationist America First Committee. There he alleged that three groups were pressing the country toward war: the Roosevelt administration, the British and the Jews. Scott Berg, in his 1998 best-selling biography *Lindbergh*, quotes “leaders of the Jewish race are not American in interests and viewpoints” and refers to American Jews as “other people.” Berg continues, “the day after the speech he awoke... to a Niagara of invective. Few men in American history had ever been so reviled.” The Roosevelt administration branded him “the No. 1 Nazi fellow-traveler.” Berg says that “in truth Charles Lindbergh, in spite of having made speeches for the aforementioned America First Committee, [he] was never associated with any pro-Nazi or antisemitic organization; he never attended any Bund meetings and since more than four months before the outbreak of war in Europe, he had neither consorted nor consulted with anyone known to have any connections with the Third Reich.”

Berg does devote considerable space to Lindbergh's bizarre fascination with Germany from 1936 to 1939. He (Lindbergh) describes Germany as "the most interesting in the world today. I have come away with a feeling of great admiration for the German people." He lauds Hitler as having "far more character and vision than I thought existed in the German leader who has been painted in so many different ways by the accounts in America and England. He is undoubtedly a great man." In one public pronouncement he stated that "their [the Jews] greatest danger to this country lies in their large ownership and influence in our motion pictures, our press, our radio and our government." Berg carefully refutes all of these allegations.

Of course, Lindbergh, though thoroughly excoriated for his diatribes, continued to make speeches for the America First Committee. Noteworthy was his New York Madison Square Garden address on October 30, 1941. Anne doesn't come across as even remotely unscathed. After the 1936 Berlin Olympics she displayed an effusiveness for Hitler in her writings that even her editor recommended that she temper. In November 1938 she rented a house in the Berlin suburb of Wansee, renown for its infamous conference that yielded "the final solution." A record exists of a letter that Charles wrote to then Ambassador to the Court of St. James, Joseph Kennedy, ironically on November 9, 1938: Kristallnacht, when one hundred synagogues in Germany were destroyed, thousands of Jewish-owned businesses were demolished and thousands of Jews were arrested and imprisoned. The letter continues to evince Lindbergh's interest in Germany as expressed to the elder Kennedy, himself regrettably an admirer of the New Order. The November 26, 1938 issue of *The New Yorker* carried the following "We say Good-Bye to Col. Charles A. Lindbergh who wants to go and live in Berlin, presumably occupying a house that once belonged to Jews."

In 1980, Mrs. Lindbergh told CBS' Morley Safer about her dismay at her husband's anti-Jewish remarks four decades earlier. According to her *New York Times* obituary, she said "it was terribly stupid." She is also quoted as saying that same year in her diary volume that she "experienced a profound feeling of profound grief over what her husband had

said and decided that it was at best a bid for anti-Semitism." In 1977 Lindbergh's *Wartime Journals* were published, for the most part, unedited. "The bulk of the omissions," Berg writes, "centered on one subject: the Jews." He continues "in writing about a single tribe he was segregating them in his mind from the rest of the nation, and to that extent he was like many of his countrymen, anti-Semitic." A journal entry written in 1939 regarding a rough trans-Atlantic crossing refers disparagingly to Jewish passengers on the ship becoming sea-sick. Lindbergh goes on to say that "imagine the United States taking these Jews in addition to those we already have. There are too many in places like New York already. A few Jews add strength and character to a country, but too many create chaos. And we are getting too many..."

Berg cites Lindbergh's 1939 cozy relationships with a former American diplomat, one William Castle, described as a rock-solid conservative with close ties to the Republican National Committee, as well as the arch-conservative Fulton Lewis Jr., a name quite familiar to anyone recalling that sordid era. Lindbergh again wrote in his journal of his pre-occupation with Jewish influences in "press, radio and motion pictures," referring to them as the "Educational agencies in this country." In his concluding chapter "Aloha," Berg relates that "more than thirty years after his isolationist statements, Lindbergh still refused to recant anything."

Without trying to sound like an apologist for Charles Lindbergh, one comes away with the feeling that for all his heroic exploits, and there were many, in addition to his solo flight across the Atlantic, due to ignorance, stupidity or possible arrogance, he had little or no concept of what anti-Semitism was all about. In spite of protestations that he was not a Jew-hater, his record and writings belie that fact. Anne, undoubtedly brighter and more sensitive, appears to have been aware of the long-term implications of her husband's anti-Semitic fervor, although she regrettably never saw fit to repudiate it publicly.

Anne Morrow Lindbergh's recent passing rings down yet another proverbial curtain on a facet of contemporary American history: that men of good will deplore and disdain forever. □

89th International Labor Conference, Special Sitting “The Situation of Workers in the Occupied Arab Territories.”

James Foley, Jay Mazur, and Amir Peretz, MK

At the mid-June International Labor Conference of the ILO in Geneva, a “Special Sitting” was convened on “The Situation of Workers of the Occupied Arab Territories.” The reference is to the West Bank and Gaza, much of whose Arab population is no longer under Israel’s authority.

Previous “special sittings” have been the scene of strong, anti-Israel speeches, led by Arab and non-Arab Muslim delegates. This recent sitting, at the 89th Session of the ILO’s International Labor Conference, was no different. About sixty persons asked to speak, nearly all of whom criticized Israel. Several European delegates, including those from Norway, Sweden and France, and the European Union, joined in the criticism.

Among those seeking a more harmonious and productive role for the ILO was Jay Mazur, president of the National Committee for Labor Israel, in his capacity as president of UNITE and as a workers’ delegate from the AFL-CIO. James Foley, the Government Delegate of the United States, joined him. Histadrut Chair Amir Peretz, MK (Member of Knesset), made a highly effective and emotional presentation. Peretz took the moral high ground, and called for Palestinians to join in a quest for peace. His appeal remains unanswered.

Jerry Goodman
Executive Director, NCLI

Statement of James Foley

Thank you, Madam President. The United States takes the positiontoday, as it has in previous years, that it is inappropriate to hold this special sitting. Not only does this practice single out one member country for treatment different from others,

but it also misuses the ILO as a forum for political discussions and diverts attention from practical measures that can make a real difference in the daily lives of Palestinians.

The United States strongly agrees that the ILO should focus on programs of technical assistance that will improve the situation of workers in the West Bank and Gaza. We commend the Director-General for taking steps to strengthen the ILO’s activities in this area by sending two high-level missions to the region, and by setting up a Task Force on emergency employment creation. The ILO is putting the emphasis on saving existing jobs, creating new ones, and setting up vocational training and rehabilitation programs. In our view, this is the correct approach. Several donors are already contributing to these programs or have pledged to do so, and all who believe the ILO can play a role in bringing peace to the region owe them a debt of gratitude.

The Director-General’s report points out, however, that some donors are wondering whether technical cooperation activities are feasible under existing circumstances. We believe they are, and we offer as evidence the U.S. Agency for International Development’s Community Services Program for the West Bank and Gaza. This five year program, launched in September 1999, will grow to about 90 million dollars by the time it is completed in 2004. It focuses on creating jobs and improving infrastructure and services in communities hard hit by the current crisis, and it is continuing despite daunting operational difficulties related to that crisis. Agricultural roads are being built linking villages that have been largely cut off from the outside world due to closures. Schools are being refurbished, providing jobs to artisans and construction workers shut out of the Israeli labor market. Local communities have

been eager to contribute materials, labor, and even cash toward these projects, demonstrating that technical assistance can continue even in the midst of an uprising.

Madam President, the Director-General's report documents a dramatic decline in the standard of living of Palestinian workers as a result of the tragic violence in the region. It is all the more tragic because it comes at a time when the economic situation in the West Bank and Gaza was improving. In the first three quarters of last year, per capita GDP and GNP were growing impressively. Employment rates were going up and unemployment rates were going down. The violence has taken an enormous toll, wiping out these gains and leading to widespread job insecurity and deepening poverty. And as the Director-General's report makes clear, the Israeli economy has suffered also. A report just released by the Federation of Israeli Chambers of Commerce estimates that the crisis could cost the Israeli economy two billion dollars this year.

The Director-General's report reminds us that this tragic situation is the result of political and military developments outside the ILO's area of competence. Yet it also points out that the ILO can make a genuine contribution to finding a way out of the vicious circle of fear, suspicion, and violence. This is through targeted technical assistance at the local level that will give unemployed Palestinian workers the training they need for future jobs, and through emergency employment generation. These are efforts to which the ILO's government, worker, and employer constituents can each find ways to contribute. If the message that goes out from this special sitting is that we will rededicate ourselves to this task, then our discussion here this afternoon will have served a useful purpose. Thank you, Madam President.

Statement of Jay Mazur

Thank you, Madam President, for giving me the opportunity to speak to what hopefully will be the last special sitting on the issue before us now. As has been the case every time, in 1990 through 1995, 1998, and 1999, and now this year, the ILO conference has held a special sitting on the situation of workers of the occupied Arab territories. The American labor movement, the American Federation

of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), has expressed its deep concern over the sad misuse of the ILO.

It has been the AFL-CIO's consistent view that these special sittings do not contribute any constructive role to help guide the ILO. Simply stated, this is the wrong place to discuss the political and security aspects of a very tense situation.

The conferences of the ILO are not the same as the United Nations General Assembly or the Security Council. The ILO is a unique and specialized international organization, including its tripartite structure, within the U.N. system, and the ILO has a globally respected mandate, responsibility and competence.

These special sittings only serve to politicize and weaken the effectiveness of the ILO and ultimately its credibility. Unfortunately, there are some who, while not openly admitting so, would indeed like to see the ILO's credibility weakened and its organization undermined, or worse. And more disturbingly, there are those who would just as well like to see any progress towards genuine peace, security, democracy and economic and social justice undermined (or worse) in this part of the world.

Madam President. Certainly there is very clearly a constructive and important role for the ILO to contribute that is within its mandate and competence. The vision of decent work, including the strategic objectives and crosscutting issues, all have elements that through technical cooperation can help build essentially needed confidence, dialogue and negotiation within its sphere of competence.

The Appendix to the Director General's report, which is the basis of the discussion in this special sitting, includes a useful summary of the technical assistance program underway within the framework of the 1994 Memorandum of Understanding.

The report specifically mentions the project to assist members of the P.G.F.T.U. (Palestine General Federation of Trade Unions) in the formation, development and implementation of vocational training policies with the help of the ILO workers' activities branch, ACTRAV. Also noted is the establishment of a vocational rehabilitation center for people with disabilities and youth with special needs, as well as the technical support to the employment program through the multidisciplinary team and the regional office.

Madam President. The work of the ILO, including its agenda of decent work, the strategic objectives and, in particular, gaining respect for and implementation of the Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, are now more important than ever around the world and especially in the surrounding wider region that we are addressing today.

The reality continues that there is a gaping absence of fundamental human labor rights in the wider region that has been documented in the ICFTU's (International Confederation of Free Trade Unions) annual survey of the violations of trade union rights and other sources for years. Trade unions are simply banned in some states. In others, no collective bargaining is allowed. Outright government control is the situation in some others, and only a very few states permit trade unions to act, most often under severe limitations.

The fact is, these special sittings do not address the fundamental underlying problems of the massive and appalling social and economic inequalities that are so widespread throughout the greater surrounding region. These injustices are clearly linked to the harsh suppression of democracy and prohibitions against workers being able to freely form their own trade unions. In reality, that is the profound challenge facing the ILO in the wider region today and for the foreseeable future.

Thank you.

Statement of Amir Peretz, MK

Madam President, Ladies and Gentlemen. I had actually hoped to come here and talk about the strengthening of the peace process, but instead I find myself heartbroken, discussing the damage that has been caused by crisis after crisis in the last nine months. I see so many innocent people pay the highest price of all as a result of the ever-more horrific, senseless acts of unbelievable violence. Innocent Israeli citizens are forced to live in fear of terrorist attacks, buses and restaurants being blown up, innocent teenager killed and mutilated while standing in queue for a discotheque on a Friday night.

The Palestinians also pay the price in blood and death and in addition find themselves with no source of income and no way of supporting their families under the closure. These inhuman acts of

violence are carried out by ever growing groups of fanatics. Throughout the history of the entire world, in every conflict between nations, there have been fanatics on both sides, and always the fanatics from one side encourage the other and serve each other in deepening the conflict. We in the Middle East suffer from the same problem.

The question is: who will be the victors? Is it to be the fanatics, or is it to be the moderates who determine the future of the region?

Ladies and Gentlemen, Brothers and Sisters. The Palestinians are not our enemies. Terrorism is. Fanaticism is.

It has been said before, that the worst peace is better than the best war. I believe this to be true. I know this to be true.

Assuring human rights to Palestinians, creating a strong society and a strong economy among the Palestinian population, is of course in the interest of the Palestinians. But it is also an Israeli interest and in the interest of the region as a whole.

However, above all is the most basic human right, the right to life. This, we must protect first. I understand that you expect me to fight against the closure that prevents Palestinian workers from entering Israel to make a living with dignity. Neither I nor any of you sitting here today can take the responsibility that among those thousands of workers is concealed a terrorist fanatic, on a mission of mass murder and destruction.

Madame President, I was born in Morocco. I came to Israel. I grew up in Israel. I served in the Israeli army as an officer. I was severely wounded and spent two years in a hospital. I left the hospital in a wheelchair, and when I first stood on my feet again I swore to myself that the next war I was going to fight was the war for peace.

From the start of my public life, I have always supported peace between Israel and its neighbors. As early as 1984, I believed and openly stated that the Palestinians have the right to a country of their own. Everyone knows I fully support the equal rights of the Palestinian workers. Despite the fact that the situation today is very difficult, I, as a member of the Israeli Parliament and the chairman of the Histadrut, the Israeli Trade Union, gave a very clear instruction to all the Histadrut departments to continue providing support and protection to the Palestinian workers. For example, teams of lawyers from the Histadrut are on

(Continued on page 19)

Ideas For An Age of Confusion: Studies in the Thought of Abraham Y. Kook and Mordecai M. Kaplan

by Jack J. Cohen, Fordham University Press,
New York, 1999, 386 pp.

Reviewed by Emanuel S. Goldsmith

Abraham Yitzhak Kook (1865-1935) and Mordecai Menahem Kaplan (1881-1983) were two of the leading Jewish thinkers of the twentieth century. Kook was the Chief Rabbi of Palestine from 1921 to 1935 and Kaplan the founder of Reconstructionist Judaism in the United States. In this fascinating and groundbreaking study, Jack J. Cohen, Kaplan's leading disciple claims that "by studying the works of Kook and Kaplan, one can clearly see the two main alternatives for preparing the Jewish world for the next two generations." The two thinkers represent the two poles of what Cohen calls "the reasonable spectrum of Judaism" in our day. Both thinkers were responsive to the intellectual and spiritual currents of the modern world. Kook, however, while endorsing the Darwinian theory of evolution, denied the need to alter any of the fundamentals of the theory or practice of Judaism. Kaplan, on the other hand, felt that Jews needed to rely more on reason and on their ability to think than on their confidence in the inherent rightness of their heritage. Kook thus represented a Judaism the prevailing mood of which is love and respect for the tradition, and Kaplan a Judaism based on reason and experience that seeks liberation and enlightenment. As Cohen writes, Kaplan wanted Jews to do more than pass Judaism *on*. He also wanted them to *pass* on it - to evaluate it and change it wherever necessary in order to make it more relevant and dynamic.

Cohen evinces respect, admiration and affection for Kook as well as for Kaplan so that his book serves as a major study of each of the thinkers as well as a comparison of their views on such issues as

rationalism and mysticism, the search for God, Jewish identity and character, Eretz Yisrael and the Diaspora, Jewish education, democracy, prayer and repentance, the role of Halakhah and the role of women in Judaism.

In the course of their careers, Kook and Kaplan were both excommunicated by ultraorthodox elements in Jerusalem or New York. Nevertheless, they have come to be regarded as the outstanding twentieth century representatives of the traditional Halakhic approach to Judaism and the radical modernist approach respectively. They are forever linked by a profound mystical love for God, Israel, Eretz Yisrael and Torah as well as by a profound rationalism that takes feeling, imagination and intuition into account. They shared many traditional Jewish values including the emphasis on justice, love and holiness despite the fact that each interpreted such values in his own unique way. Kook's view of holiness, for example, stressed the authority of the Torah while Kaplan could accept only those aspects of tradition which accord with universal standards of morality and intellect.

Kook saw the *mitzvot* or religious commandments as the categorical laws of an Absolute Deity while for Kaplan they were norms distilled from Jewish experience that can still inspire modern Jews. God, for Kaplan, was essentially the Cosmic Source of trust in life and in the potential for peace between individuals and nations.

The most profound difference between the two thinkers concerns their views of democracy.

Despite his remarkable open-mindedness and tolerance, Kook's notion of freedom of thought was confined to what the Halakhah permits. Kaplan, on the other hand, insisted that democracy had to be incorporated into Judaism's roster of sacred values. He was a philosopher of democracy as well as a philosopher of Judaism. Democracy and faith in a God who makes for human improvement and fulfillment were for him complementary elements of the greater Judaism of the future.

This is a major, thought-provoking analysis of issues confronting humanity in general and the Jewish people in particular at the beginning of the twenty-first century. It needs to be read, studied and discussed by individuals and communities everywhere. □

CONTRIBUTORS

Hal Denner Los Angeles School Administrator, retired

Henry Feingold Professor of History, City University; past President, Labor Zionist Alliance

Egal Feldman Professor of History, University of Wisconsin; well-known for his studies of the American-Jewish cultural scene

James Foley U.S. Delegate to the 89th International Labor Conference

Emmanuel Goldsmith Professor of Yiddish, Hebrew and Jewish Studies at Queens College (CUNY); ordained Rabbi

Jerry Goldman Executive Director, National Committee for Labor Israel

Jeffrey V. Mallow President, Labor Zionist Alliance; Chair, Physics Department, Loyola University Chicago

Daniel Mann Past President, Labor Zionist Alliance

Jay Mazur President, National Committee for Labor Israel; President Emeritus, UNITE!; delegate to the ILO from AFL-CIO

Amir Peretz Chair of Histadrut; Member of Knesset

Tribute

(Continued from page 4)

Morris Rosenfeld's most famous poem, "Mayn Yingele"[My Little Boy], set to music and sung by thousand of Jewish workers. It was with the strains of this song echoing in my head that I read in the New York Times of May 9, at the end of the partially successful sit-in, the smug words of Harvard's spokesperson: "We have not agreed to a living wage." Have they no shame? Have they no shame?

LZA has joined this struggle. Together with our youth movement Habonim Dror and the Jewish Labor Committee, we are developing a curriculum in our summer camps, to educate our youth in the history of the sweatshop, its current incarnation, and methods to combat it, including petitions, pickets, and boycotts. Like the corporations, we too are becoming multinational. The struggle of a Mexican immigrant in Los Angeles, a Pakistani child in Lahor, a Thai guest worker in Tel Aviv, is our struggle. We are the allies of the American Labor Movement, of the Histadrut, of the struggles for social and economic democracy around the world. We won once, and we shall win again.

A talk like this is inevitably something of a deception. One of the perks of the LZA president is to tell an audience of all we are trying to do, and all we hope to do. The reality is somewhat different. The LZA officers, the Executive Director, and I examine our budget, and decide which of those things that we want to do, and that need to be done, we cannot do. Can we afford another press release? Another mailing? Another speaker from Labor Israel? Another dues payment to the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, which would dearly love an excuse to throw us out, so that it can move even further to the right, while claiming that it represents all of American Jewry? Which of these goes by the wayside? Which can we afford *not* to do?

If all it took to accomplish our goals were sweat equity, we would have succeeded many times over. Irving Wishnia and Ben Cohen are the best examples of that. They have sweated for Labor Zionism all their lives. But they have also lent their

names and their prestige to today's occasion because they know that it takes more. It takes contributions and donations and memberships. It has been my task today to explain why LZA is worth it. Your presence and your generosity to the Labor Zionist Education Fund is the best possible tribute to the work of Irving and Ben.

Ben and Irving: Mazal Tov. Kol tuv lekulkhem. Zayt ale gegrist. Thank you. □

Jeffry V. Mallow
President, Labor Zionist Alliance
June 3, 2001

** In the speech, these were interspersed with excerpts from the original Yiddish*

Christian Community

(Continued from page 11)

fifty million adherents to the Church of Rome, this important segment of American society dare not be ignored. Its eagerness to enhance its knowledge about Judaism offers American Jews a golden opening to explain their political and religious thinking about the Middle East. If Jews do not share their heritage and concerns with them, who will?

Strengthening the ongoing dialogue with the Christian Community is a crucial aspect in the battle for public opinion. The responsibility for instructing America will not be easy. There will be setbacks and disappointments. But this is the American Jewish Home Front. This is a role that American Jewry must fill. Current conditions allow us to deal with it successfully. What Israel needs and deserves is an assurance that American public sentiments continue and will continue to support her in her confrontation with those who seek to destroy her. □

Situation of Workers

(Continued from page 16)

the borders and receive complaints from Palestinian workers, which are then placed before the Israeli courts. However, as long as the acts of terror continue, with every new horror I can do less and less.

I call on you, my colleague Shaher Saed, head of the Palestinian trade unions, to fight against terrorism. I also call on you, the trade union leaders from Jordan and Egypt: instead of fighting the Peace Agreement, fight terrorism. As representatives of workers' rights and human rights in the region we should take a much more significant role in helping to change the atmosphere of hate in the Middle East. We are not and should not be swayed by political considerations, but by human ones.

I have always believed that our mission should be to build the infrastructure for peace by creating mutually beneficial activities. It has always been the case that when there are agreements on paper, between politicians, it has been our job, the workers' representatives, to implement those agreements on the ground, between real people, with real everyday problems. Political agreements between governments can stop tanks and missiles, but nothing can stop a hungry man. In a situation as today, our function, our mission, takes on a much greater importance. Of course, I realize that this cannot happen, will not happen, unless we can find the right framework and create the correct atmosphere.

Therefore, I turn to the ILO to sponsor such a framework under its auspices and in this way, perhaps, finally start talking. If by this action we can succeed in getting around the table, if we can show the world that it is possible and through this perhaps pressure the leaders of the region into following our footsteps, then we will have done our job. Then we will have fulfilled our true function. I have been dreaming and hoping for peace all my life. I believe the time has come to take more action towards turning this dream into a reality. I want peace, I support peace and I know that there is no alternative to peace.

Ladies and Gentlemen, when I hear the voices of hate in the debate, I ask myself, "why?" Will these voices strengthen the efforts that are happening now to bring a cease-fire? Will these voices help the efforts of Mr. Koffee Annan and Mr. George Tenet after the Mitchell Report? Can these voices bring us back to the situation we were at nine months ago? My answer to this is very clear. No! If we really want to help the peace process, let's find the words that can change this atmosphere. Let's find the words with which we can, with pride, educate our children to love one another for their future and the future of peace. □

Register Now To Vote in the 34th World Zionist Congress.

LZA Needs Your Vote!

The World Zionist Congress elections will soon be upon us in February, 2002. Since the Congress four years earlier, our movement is stronger, alumni have been mobilized, and Labor has demonstrated its leadership for peace. LZA, Na'amat and Habonim Dror, together as the Labor Zionist slate, will lead the way in shaping the future of Zionism. We need your vote.

The Labor Zionist Alliance is in the forefront of advancing the critical issues facing world Jewry today: peace, pluralism and progress. We will continue to work for peace in the Middle East. We will continue to fight for pluralism and egalitarianism throughout the Jewish community. And we will continue to struggle for progress on the social front—organizing against sweatshops, opposing the exploitation of workers, advocating on behalf of Ethiopian Jewry and other immigrants to Israel, and democratizing the Jewish community.

Labor Zionists support our youth movement, Habonim Dror, at the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency. We fight to ensure that *shlichim* continue to educate our children and that critical funding continues to support all Zionist youth movements. Indeed, we have experienced great success: in the last sixty-five years, Habonim Dror has been the springboard for Labor Zionist ideology and activism. With twenty one local branches, seven summer camps and numerous pioneering programs in Israel, Habonim Dror cultivates a progressive, deep-rooted Jewish and Zionist identity in our youth. In the

past year, Habonim Dror members established an urban kibbutz in Jerusalem. This past summer, Habonim's *Machaneh Bonim in Israel* program had the best participation of any summer Israel program from North America.

The upcoming elections will determine how many delegates LZA will have at the next World Zionist Congress in June, 2002. We must vote for representation to the Congress so that our vision—peace, pluralism, progress, the education of our youth—is actualized.

On the following page is a registration form. Registration, which is required for all voters, costs \$4.00. A couple may send their separate registration forms in the same envelope with a single personal check covering both. Adult children living at home should send in their own checks with their registration forms. The closing date for registration is December 14, 2001, and your ballot will arrive in the mail at the beginning of February, 2002. For your convenience, you can also **register online at www.azm.org**. Also, check out our website for the Labor Zionist Slate at: www.labor-zionist-movement.org. Finally, be sure to encourage your friends and family to register and vote as well.

Shanah Tovah,

Jeffrey V. Mallow
President, LZA

Voter Registration Form

American Elections to the 34th World Zionist Congress

Every item must be completed in full and printed legibly. Please use **BLOCK LETTERS**.

By signing below, I affirm the accuracy of the registration information I have provided.

Furthermore, I confirm that the following statements are true:

- a. I accept the Jerusalem Program.
- b. I am Jewish.
- c. I was born on or before June 30, 1984.
- d. I reside permanently in the United States.

X

Signature

If you are signed in register with a valid card, the signature will be used to verify the signature.

Last six digits of your social security number:

00-0000

First Name

M.I.

Last Name

Home Address (Please do not use a business address. Address must be a permanent US address. Do not use a PO Box address)

City

State

Zip Code

E-mail address (optional)

Providing your e-mail address enables processing of requests administered to which you are eligible to receive up to date.

Method of Payment:

- ☐ American Express
- ☐ Personal Check (enclosed)
- ☐ MasterCard
- ☐ Visa

Credit Card Number

Exp. Date

If you belong to any of the organizations listed below, check the appropriate boxes.

I am affiliated with the organization

- American Friends of the Jewish People
- Americans for Israel
- ARZA/World Jewish Congress
- Bnei Zion/American Zionists
- Labor Zionist
- MERCAZ USA
- Moretz USA
- Religious Zionist Movement
- American Zionist Movement - The umbrella organization for the Zionist Movement in the United States

Registration form FPO

check the appropriate boxes.

I do not share my e-mail address with any organization.

By signing this form, you are giving permission for your e-mail address to be shared with those organizations that you have selected.

How to Register

Please read and complete the form. Sign your name where indicated. Every item in the required section must be completed in full and legibly printed.

- 1) Registrant's signature on the form confirms all four of the following statements:
 - a. I accept the Jerusalem Program.
 - b. I am Jewish.
 - c. I was born on or before June 30, 1984.
 - d. I reside permanently in the United States.
- 2) Each individual must complete his/her own form, which may be photocopied, but an individual may register only once. Duplicates will be invalidated. Registrations must be postmarked no later than December 14, 2001.
- 3) Enclose a \$4.00 payment. Payment can be made with registrant's personal check for \$4.00, payable to the American Zionist Movement, or by credit card. (The credit card must be in the name of the registrant and must be a personal, not corporate or institutional, credit card.) Neither cash nor money orders will be accepted. No ballot will be sent if the registration fee is not paid. Should the election be deferred or cancelled, refunds cannot be made. You may also go on-line to register. Go to www.azm.org to find the link to the secured registration site. You may only use a credit card for on-line registration.
- 4) Mail to: (insert address here)

Please note that you will receive only one ballot package. Requests for replacement packages will require a payment of \$10.00 per replacement. If your mailing address changes any time after you register, please contact AZM at info@azm.org or visit our website at www.azm.org.

The Jerusalem Program THE AIMS OF ZIONISM ARE:

- The unity of the Jewish people and the centrality of Israel in Jewish life.
- The ingathering of the Jewish people in its historic homeland, Eretz Israel, through aliyah from all countries;
- The strengthening of the State of Israel, which is based on the prophetic vision of justice and peace;
- The preservation of the identity of the Jewish people through the fostering of Jewish, Hebrew and Zionist education and of Jewish spiritual and cultural values;
- The protection of Jewish rights everywhere.

Jewish
Frontier

Summer/Fall 2001