FACT AND OPINION

by SAMUEL SPIEGLER

ARAB-JEWISH PEACE— IN SOUTH AMERICA

JEWS and Arabs are talking peace together—in Sao Paulo, Brazil.

The signatures of more than 3,000 Arabs and Jews, members of the Arab-Jewish Union of Sao Paulo, were affixed to a touching appeal for peace in the Middle East submitted to Brazilian President Artur Costa y Silva.

Similar moves were registered in the state of Parana and the city of Belo Horizonte, "where both communities are linked by traditional bonds of friendship," according to a report by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith based on a survey of Latin-American reaction to the Middle East crisis of May-June 1967.

The survey found Latin American public opinion "decidedly in favor of Israel." Most Latin American countries remained officially neutral, Cuba alone backing the Arab states.

Israeli embassies throughout Central and South America received many offers of material aid and pledges of solidarity, the report continued, and Jews and non-Jews alike enlisted as volunteers. At the Israeli consulates in Brazil, more than 3,000 volunteers turned out, prompting the Brazilian Government to warn against possible loss of Brazilian nationality.

In Argentina—which has some 450,000 Jews and 700,000 Arabs—a Committee of Support for Beleaguered Israel, composed of Argentinian intellectuals, priests and other distinguished personalities, expressed solidarity with "Israel's just fight" to the Israeli ambassador. Blood donors flocked to the Jewish Hospital, and all sectors of the Jewish community began to organize help for Israel, collecting donations, merchandise and medical supplies.

The Argentine military, caught between its hatred of Moscow and its traditional antipathy toward Jews, called Israel's military success the "most astonishing, unparalleled military victory in history," and praised Israel's army, its officers, its pilots and its intelligence organization, "the best in the Middle East."

A few minor incidents were reported, including anti-Zionist leaflets distributed by Tacuara, the long-time anti-Semitic organization, whose head, Patricio Errecalde Pueyrredon, volunteered to fight for the Arabs. Israel and Arab embassies and consulates were heavily guarded, as were synagogues, Jewish schools and other centers.

Brazilian Jewry collected more than \$3 million in a short emergency drive for Israel. A public meeting of the Brazilian Jewish Confederation was well attended by Jews and non-Jews alike. Editorials in the *Jornal de Brasil* compared Nasser's policy to Hitler's, called upon the conscience of the world, and said that Israel's use of force had been justified in the face of a dictator's madness and the weakness of the U.N.

In Chile, the press was unanimously on Israel's side; a typical editorial blamed the crisis on Nasser's intransigence.

The Guatemalan Senate and Congress condemned the "illegitimate" blockade of the Tiran Strait as an act of aggression and a violation of human rights.

In Uruguay, three congressmen from the Government Party offered to volunteer for Israel.

ANTI-SEMITISM SURMOUNTS POLITICAL BARRIERS

ANTI-SEMITISM makes a malignant bond among its devotees, though they be the deepest political enemies.

A survey of statements on the Middle East issue, compiled by Milton Ellerin, Director of the Trends Analyses Division of the American Jewish Committee, showed that hate publications, traditionally anti-Communist, had been trapped by their fierce anti-Semitism and hatred of Israel into denying Russian support of the Arabs; while the Communists, long self-styled champions of progress, support regressive Arab countries against the moderate social democracy of Israel.

The anti-Semitic hate publications have always denounced Communism and pictured themselves as its unrelenting opponents; but they refuse to recognize that Communist Russia has been supporting the Arabs. This is a "giant hoax," they proclaim, being perpetrated upon the American people as part of a Zionist-Communist conspiracy.

A typical example of the mendacity of the far right extremists is to be found in the comment of Edward Fields, in The Thunderbolt, that the American people are "being fooled into believing that Communist Russia is supporting the Arabs in their confrontation with Israel." Fields "assumes" that the Soviet government is aiding Israel, and that "the clever trick that they have perpetrated is to make it appear as if by fighting for Israel, Americans are fighting against Communism. Just the opposite is true."

Another right-wing publication, The New York Independent, repeats the charge of Israeli-Soviet collusion with the comment that Israeli leaders have "bound themselves to Moscow philosophically and politically."

This kind of simple disregard of fact, logic and credibility is a little too much for the pro-Communist propagandists, who must try to reconcile dialectically the intrinsically irreconcilable. semantic contortions are exemplified by Deirdre Griswold, a leader of Youth Against War and Fascism, who declared that "Israel in fact is acting as a pawn of Western interests. Our people with their sympathies are for the Arab revolution." Herbert Aptheker, the leading theoretician of the U.S. Communist Party, has been critical of Israeli action in the current crisis in similar terms.

The radical right press has exploited the Middle East situation primarily to attack American foreign policy. In support of the view that American policy in the area has been "catastrophic," the John Birch Society publication, Review of the News, notes that the entire Arab world has been alienated, and that what the United States has lost, "the Soviet Union and its Communist allies within the Arab world have gained."

SPEAKING OF RESPONSA . . .

THE response of NCJCS's new President, Sidney Z. Vincent (Executive Director, Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland) to Mrs. Zena Harman at the Annual Meeting at which she substituted for her husband, the Israeli Ambassador, should not go unrecorded. Following are excerpts:

The past eight days [this was on May 27] have been an agony. And the future is full of deadly menace. But we can take joy and courage from how the American Jewish community has acted . . . the *entire* Jewish community.

We have had our doubters and our cynics about the Jewish community, and some of their doubts and some of their cynicism have been legitimate and useful. But tonight I reject their doubts and their cynicism and say for American Jewry as for Israeli Jewry in the most literal sense, without sloganeering; Am Yisroel Chai.

The people of Israel lives, as all dynamic organisms live . . . rising to the challenge of those who would destroy it and drawing profound new sources of strength hitherto unsuspected, pouring out a spiritual adrenalin that will energize us for whatever lies ahead.

I bless the national agencies whose day and night efforts have provided leadership for all of us, putting aside all organizational pride. I bless the communities, large and small, who have put aside the hesitations and restrictions of business as usual to respond creatively and imaginatively to the great challenge overseas. This community and this generation that have so generously helped provide for the ingathering of our remnants from all over the world will not fail the Yishuv in its great hour of need.

Here is the roll call as of this moment of what has been taking place all over America, in Los Angeles and New York, in Portland and in Toledo . . . a program dictated by both head and heart . . . of courage and of saichel, rooted in the conviction that we are performing in the best traditions of Americanism and Judaism.

We reject the counsel of those timid ones who wish only an "American" program, as if the Jewish community did not have a special stake and a special obligation. It has.

We reject the counsel of those strident ones who wish only a "Jewish" program and who make irresponsible and sometimes parochial demands. That way lies disaster, and a denial of the crucial American stake in the Mid-East.

Here then is a most partial listing of what our communities are doing, each in its own way, and what we will be doing. . . .

- 1. We have expressed ourselves as Jews and as Americans to our President and to our Department of State through more than a quarter of a million wires that have inundated Western Union. We will continue to make our position unmistakably clear, as the situation develops, in concert with our national leaders.
- 2. We are by call, by personal visit and by wire advising with our Senators and our Congressmen, because we understand the crucial role played by the legislative branch of our government.
- 3. We have turned to our friends in the business community, in labor, among religious groups, among civic groups of all kinds, to say publicly that Israel's territorial integrity must be preserved.
- 4. We have arranged services of concern in our synagogues, that have been overwhelmed by thousands turning, as Jews always have turned, to the Bas Haknesses—the religious meeting place, for rededication.
- 5. We have used our religious schools, our many organizations; we have called

meetings of presidents and meetings for members of the entire community so that we might interpret to our own community what the situation is, and where our responsibilities lie. We have prepared detailed fact sheets and will print them in our papers and other organs of communication, so that we can know as well as feel, the better to act

- 6. We are in daily conference with the editors of our papers of general circulation and our radio and TV stations, so that the entire community of which we are a part can have access to accurate information. "Give light and the people will find their own way" is a principle we totally accept.
- 7. We are calling upon our Mayors, our City Councils, our Governors, our State Assemblies to voice their concern that America be America. We urge them to speak out clearly, in complete confidence that they are serving our deepest American interests.
- 8. We are responding with joy to the great financial needs of the emergency. We know that Israel can at this moment no longer support the lifegiving social services in which we too are so deeply involved. Israel needs open hearts and open pocketbooks, and we will not fail her in this most elementary and vital responsibility.

We shall waste no time on internal bickering or jurisdictional disputes. All of us are enlisted . . . Orthodox, Conservative, Reform, secularist, rabbi and layman, the oncoming generation and the veteran, national agency and local community, federations and agencies, Zionists and unaffiliated. All are servants of the Jewish community. All are bound together by ties with Israel and ties with history. In our veins as in yours runs the blood of Ezra and Nehemiah . . . of the Maccabees . . . of the prophets and sages. In our ears as in yours echo the ancient words:

Chazak, Chazak, V'amatz. Be strong and of good cheer.

NOTES FROM ISRAEL

Dedication of New Building of Baerwald School

ON April 19, 1967, the Paul Baerwald School of Social Work of the Hebrew University at Jerusalem formally dedicated its new building in the presence of President Shazar and the participation of Supreme Court Justice Haim Cohen, representatives of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee and members of the family of the late Paul Baerwald. The building was constructed with funds provided by the JDC which had financed the operations of the School during the first five years.

The dedication climaxed a four-day colloquium organized by the School on the subject, "The University and Social Welfare." Fifteen faculty members of the Hebrew University were joined by twelve social work leaders and educators from England, United States and Yugoslavia, as speakers and discussants. The Americans participating were: Eileen Blackey, Joseph W. Eaton, Mitchell I. Ginsberg, Charles H. Jordan, Elizabeth K. Radinsky, Irving Sarnoff, Charles I. Schottland and Herman D. Stein.

The proceedings will be published in English and Hebrew.

Government's Participation in Local Welfare Budgets

The law places responsibility for conducting welfare services on the local authorities. But from the beginning of the State the central government, through the Ministry of Social Welfare, has contributed substantial amounts to the welfare budgets of the localities. The basis of calculating welfare expenditures and the percentages contributed

by the Ministry had been the result of precedent, negotiations and compromise, and varied from one place to another.

Following lengthy discussions between the ministries of Finance and Social Welfare, on the one hand, and the Union of Local Authorities, on the other, a unified plan of defining welfare expenditures, including personnel costs, has been introduced beginning April 1967. The plan likewise introduced three objective criteria for determining the government's share in the costs. These criteria are: size of case load in relation to total population; per capita income from taxes; and the proportion of the civilian labor force in the locality.

Second Generation Welfare Dependents

(Source: Student thesis at the Paul Baerwald School of Social Work, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, June, 1966)

Heads of thirty families receiving public assistance, whose parents were also dependent on welfare, were interviewed. A control group of thirty other families not in receipt of assistance, but whose parents were dependent on welfare, were also interviewed.

An examination of objective factors disclosed that large family size, non-service in the Army and lack of skill were associated with dependency status.

The two groups were compared on six personality factors: fatalism, feeling of being discriminated against, self-valuation, optimism, attitude toward education and work, and use of indirect (illegal) means to reach a goal. Contrary to expectations there were but insignificant differences in the responses of the two groups. The conclusion drawn is that there is no dependency "type," and that the objective factors, like unemployment and illness, are of much greater weight in creating a condition of social backwardness.

LETTER

TO THE EDITOR:

I write this letter as a reaction to two articles published in the Fall, 1966 issue of the Journal. I do not know if you purposely published the articles together in the same issue, but they definitely complemented each other. I refer to "Jewish Rationale and Sectarianism," by Isidore Sobeloff, and "The New Thrust of the Community Social Work Curriculum," by Frank Zweig.

Mr. Zweig's article showed us why many social work students feel they cannot do their field work or commit themselves to Jewish C.O. agencies and in this instance, particularly Jewish Welfare Federations. Although I personally feel that some of the premises of the current philosophies in C.O. are still being debated and might be questioned on one ground or other, any of those questions take a back seat when one compares Frank Zweig's article to Sobeloff's article.

If any C.O. student, and for that matter any group work student, were to read Mr. Sobeloff's article, he would have even more reason to decide not to go into Jewish C.O. work. Mr. Sobeloff's article in a sense was almost tangible proof backing up Frank Zweig's statements.

At least the article by Arnold Gurin which discussed the same topic Sobeloff discussed gave us some hard-headed things to think about. What I gather bothers the students is just that which Mr. Sobeloff discusses. Yes, we have problems, but the building of a viable Federation will solve them, according to Mr. Sobeloff. The article glosses over any of the real problems facing the Jewish community and the Federation's role in the community.

No one can be against motherhood and certainly no one cannot be against the platitudes Mr. Sobeloff uses in his

Journal of Jewish Communal Service

article. But his platitudes hide real problems and his desire for the professional's function to "keep the movement flexible and congenial" (p. 54) tends to obscure these problems. If congeniality is a goal, then no problem will ever be solved.

In my humble opinion, the Jewish Federations of this country had better start focusing on their social planning functions as much as they focus on their fund-raising functions. They should be the ideal agency to help other

Jewish agencies to focus on the real problems facing the American Jewish community. If Mr. Sobeloff's article is any indication of the thinking of the majority of Federation people, I don't blame students for not wanting to commit themselves to working for such agencies.

Sincerely yours,

EARL YAILLEN, ACSW

Director, Staff Development

YM & WHA, Pittsburgh, Pa.