

The “Revival” of Abram Leon: The “Jewish Question” and the American New Left

Tal Elmaliach, University of Wisconsin

Abram Leon’s book *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* is considered by scholars to be the most systematic attack ever made on the Zionist idea.¹ The book was first published in 1946 in French, and in the following years was translated into Portuguese (1949), English (1950), and Spanish (1953).² For two decades following its first publication, the book did not receive public attention, no new editions were printed, and it remained relatively unknown. However, during the second half of the 1960s, Leon’s book began to arouse significant interest, which led to its reprinting in several languages. It was published in new editions in Spanish (1965), French (1968), and Arabic (1969). In March 1971, a new English edition was printed, and its 3,000 copies sold out almost immediately. The next English edition also sold out quickly, and a third was published in 1974, followed by eleven more in later years. During the same period, the book was also published in Swedish (1970), German (1971), and Japanese (1973). In the early 1970s, *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* became, therefore, a bestseller in terms of theoretical Marxist literature, and a necessary item on the bookshelves of many radicals around the world.³ What was the reason for this sudden “revival” of Abram Leon?

While *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* has so far been discussed mainly from a theoretical perspective, there has been very little examination of its political and social role, which changed dramatically between its first publication and the time it became a classic text.⁴ Any attempt to analyze this role—which constitutes the background for Leon’s revival—through existing research on related subjects meets several difficulties. Various scholars have dealt with the role of Jews in the 1960s New Left, the New Left’s hostile attitude toward Israel, and the reaction of pro-Zionist Jews to this hostility.⁵ However, other aspects of this background remain undeveloped: the relation between the crisis of the global Left in the 1950s and the demise of the discussion of the “Jewish Question,” as well as its revival during the New Left era; the unique role of radical Jews (especially those who were tied to the Trotskyist movement, of which Leon was a member) in the anti-Zionist campaign of the late 1960s and the 1970s; the connections between the old and the New Left, linked by Leon’s book; the internal dissent among pro- and anti-Zionists in the New Left (from which arose the need for a book like Leon’s, which dealt with Jewish history); and more. These gaps in the research leave unanswered the question of why *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* transformed, almost overnight, from an unknown text

to such a popular book. In this article I intend to answer that question.

Methodologically, I will explain Leon's "revival" by examining the attitude of the global Left, and especially its Jewish supporters, to the "Jewish Question" between the era of the writing of *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* and the time it became a classic text. The article focuses in this case on the United States, but it describes a phenomenon which also took place in other Jewish diasporic centres, such as Latin America and Western Europe.⁶ My main argument is that the popularity of the text was influenced by social and political changes and, at their centre, the rise of the struggle between pro- and anti-Zionist Jews under the framework of the New Left. As I will show, between the end of the Second World War and the mid-1960s, the global Left's interest in anti-Zionist ideology decreased, and this explains the lack of interest in Leon's book in the first two decades after its publication. However, from the mid-1960s onward, the "Jewish Question" arose again, especially as a result of the New Left's interest in the Arab-Israeli conflict, which increased significantly after the Six-Day War. During those years, the Jewish young generation in the diaspora developed strong ties with the New Left, although a big part of it disagreed with the New Left's hostility towards Israel. The tension between the affiliation with the New Left and the support of Israel, the struggle over the hearts of Jewish youth and the prominent role of Jewish radicals in leading the attacks on Israel constitutes, therefore, the framework for the discussion of the relevance of *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* which led to its re-publication. I will open with presenting the first wave of publication of the book and explaining its "anonymous" phase; then I will describe its re-publication and how it was integrated in the ideological discourse about the "Jewish Question" in the American New Left. In summary, I will explain the "revival" of Leon and also discuss the contribution of this story to research of the New Left in general.

The Dark Ages of the "Jewish Question"

The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation was written by Leon in the beginning of the 1940s, and marked the end of a long period of Marxist writing about the "Jewish Question."⁷ Leon became part of this historiographical endeavour while embracing the ideas of other scholars who dealt with the subject prior to him, such as Karl Marx, Karl Kautsky, and Otto Heller. He integrated them with non-Marxist ideas about the history of the Jewish people (such as the writing of Max Weber) and anchored them in the historical research of his time. The outcome was a clear and updated thesis built upon an established narrative—albeit not lacking dogmatic elements and empiric weaknesses, which were mainly a result of Leon's poor writing conditions in the underground under Nazi occupation.⁸ Rather than deal primarily with the question of Palestine, Leon turned to Jewish economic history to undermine Zionism as a solution to the "Jewish Question" in the 1940s. He described the causes for the emergence of the "Jewish Ques-

tion," meaning Jews' inability to become part of the modern social and economic life of Europe: this was an outcome of the rise of commercial and industrial capitalism, and the decline of the economic function which the Jews fulfilled in ancient and early medieval times, as a social class of merchants. Based on this analysis, Leon developed a discussion about relevant answers to the "Jewish Question." Zionism, he claimed, was not a proper solution since it relied on two elements which were already undergoing a process of demise: the petite bourgeoisie as a social group and the idea of the nation state. This combination, Leon wrote, could not offer the Jews any better future, and would only duplicate the "Jewish Question." He did not argue that Jews do not have the right to a national existence, but that the only way to fulfill this is with the complete abolition of capitalism. He also did not reject the gathering of Jews in one territory, but conditioned it on not doing so at the expense of another people, i.e. the Palestinians.

Beyond his theoretical contribution to discussion of the development of the "Jewish Question," and its potential answers, Leon's book was also important politically, since he disconnected the seemingly natural and logical relation between the troubles of the Jewish people throughout history (which he did not doubt) and the Zionist idea. The book's profundity made it a valuable polemic asset for opponents of Zionism. However, the book's power also derived from the fact that it was written from the perspective of many of Leon's generational peers among the Jewish people. Along with the book's scholarly character, it contained an autobiographical element. It was born directly out of the way that Leon experienced reality in the age of constant global instability, as a young Jewish radical socialist. In the 1930s, he was a prominent leader of the Zionist-Socialist movement Hashomer Hatzair in Belgium, when he began to feel that Zionism could not provide satisfying answers regarding the universal aspects of the "Jewish Question." He was mostly concerned that Jews would still be exposed to the two main problems of the era: capitalism and fascism. After a long period of doubts and parallel activity in both Zionist and non-Zionist frameworks, he consolidated his idea that Zionism was not the answer to the Jewish people's troubles. His book emerged from this process, and through it he explained why he had abandoned Zionist activity and joined the Trotskyist movement in Belgium.

Leon's movement from Zionism to universal revolution signified a broader trend among radical socialist Jews of the inter-war era. Jews had developed clear affiliations with revolutionary movements since the emergence of the political Left in the mid-nineteenth century; however, converting from Zionism to revolutionary socialism was a different phenomenon. During the 1920s and the 1930s, this turn was evident both in Europe and in the developing Israeli labour movement in Palestine.⁹ First, signs of the collapse of the post-First World War order created a general leaning to the left, and also a radicalization within the Left itself. Second, the answer to the "Jewish Question" was seemingly embodied by the Soviet Union, under which there was a flourishing Jewish cul-

ture at that time. Third, the Zionist project was suffering some great difficulties, as a result of frequent economic crises in the Yishuv (the pre-state Jewish settlement in Palestine), the bitter struggle between Labour and the revisionist Zionists, the struggle against the British authorities, and the violent clashes between Jews and Arabs, which reached a new peak during the years 1936–1939. In addition, supporting Labour Zionism became much more difficult for radical Socialists, who saw how the pragmatic character of the pioneers in Palestine conflicted with socialist elements; for example, through cooperation with capitalist forces in the Zionist movement and struggles with Arab workers. The criticism over the implementation of Socialist-Zionism and the rise of global revolutionary socialism created a constant stream of young Jewish radicals who did as Leon had done in the 1930s. *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* was, therefore, a very relevant text at the time Leon made up his mind about Zionism, on the eve of the Second World War.

However, during and after the war, there was a dramatic turn in the reality from which Leon's book emerged. First, the Holocaust made every discussion of the "Jewish Question" from a Marxist point of view problematic. The definition of the Jews as "people class" (meaning a group organized by social-economic function rather than common ethnic origins) which was the base for the Leon thesis, seemed inappropriate, considering the fact that the Nazi "final solution" was based on the ethnic origins of the Jews. Second, the direct encounter of many radical Jews with the Soviet Union during the war (especially with anti-Semitism among the Soviets) led some to disappointment with "the world of tomorrow." Third, Jews' motivation to be part of the non-Jewish world—in the hope that a socialist revolution would arrive someday—suffered a severe blow. Fourth, Zionism—which was a main political rival of the Jewish universalistic Left—became a broad convention, and it seemed that although it could not completely solve the "Jewish Question," it still constituted a safe haven for survivors and other parts of the Jewish world. Indeed, the establishment of the state of Israel in May 1948, and the absorption of more than 600,000 Jewish immigrants in its first three years (doubling the number of Jews in Israel), made many of the accusations of the anti-Zionist Left irrelevant. Moreover, two other developments even led to a positive attitude toward the new born state. The first was the establishment of the state through a struggle against an imperial force (the British Mandate for Palestine); the second was the Soviet Union providing help to Israel.¹⁰ Thus, during the late 1940s, the young Jewish radicals who formed the potential audience for Leon's book experienced a watershed. It turned out that from a political and social perspective, *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* was actually written for an era that had passed and a public that no longer existed.¹¹

In the 1950s, the situation worsened, as the lack of relevancy of the Marxist claims against Zionism combined with the general crisis of the global Left. From the beginning of this decade, a plethora of evidence revealed that

Joseph Stalin had created a tyrannical regime from which the Jews especially were suffering. The Soviets also turned against Israel, providing military support to the Arab countries calling for its extermination. The 1953 appointment of Nikita Khrushchev as Stalin’s successor did not change this situation, the 1956 Soviet invasion of Hungary disappointed Western supporters of the revolutionary Left. Indeed, any criticism of the Soviet Regime from the Left seemingly strengthened the Trotskyist movement—a traditional rival of Stalin—but the overall crisis of the global Left affected the Trotskyists as well. The historical affiliation of Jews with the revolutionary Left seemed to belong to the past.¹² In the United States, this trend occurred during the era of McCarthyism and was exacerbated by the general weakness of leftist organizations.¹³ During this conjuncture, there was no demand for a Marxist interpretation of the “Jewish Question.” Therefore, when the Second World War ended, and Leon’s friends from the Trotskyist movement were preparing the manuscript of *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation*, they assumed that it would be received enthusiastically; but this hope was false.¹⁴ The book remained an internal text of the declining Trotskyist movement, sinking into oblivion soon after publication.

The New Left and the “Jewish Question”

In the mid-1960s, a new era began for the global Left, reviving young Jews’ interest in the radical Left’s interpretation of the “Jewish Question.” This “New” Left emerged as a result of disillusionment with the Soviet Union and with the Western social democratic welfare state.¹⁵ The trend contained two main innovations that distinguish it from the old Left: one was a reorganization of the leftist ideology, which now emphasized anti-colonialism, criticism of the capitalist culture, and resistance to state authority; the other was the sociological base of the Left, which now contained a new generation—the “baby boomers”—led mostly by the children of the white-collar middle class, who made college campuses their centres of action. Along with these differences, there were also patterns of continuity between the old and the New Left. The Left’s general tendency to provide theoretical explanations of how reality is constructed (in order to change it) remained. Organizationally, the old Left operated a network of political and cultural frameworks (such as seminars, study groups, summer camps, journals, etc.), which also existed in the 1960s, although some underwent changes and modifications.¹⁶ Many leaders of the New Left grew up in those frameworks, where they received their basic training as “professional” revolutionaries. The combination of old and new in the Left, and especially the role that Jews played in shaping this combination, formed the social and ideological background for the revival of Abram Leon’s work.

Jews helped to create continuity between the old and the New Left, as they were important in both movements. This continuation was mainly a result of the Jewish cultural and social surroundings, which preserved the knowledge and

traditions of the radical Left (such as how to operate the seminars, study groups, summer camps, and journals mentioned above).¹⁷ This historic connection was a great asset for the New Left, since it provided teachers and instructors. Jewish activists, thinkers and scholars who were active in the old Left, and were anonymous for more than two decades, suddenly received great interest. Some of them, such as Isaac Deutscher, Ernest Mandel, Hal Draper, Herbert Marcuse and Nathan Weinstock, even became cultural heroes.¹⁸ They dedicated themselves with great enthusiasm to their young followers and became mentors for the leadership of the New Left.

The Frankfurt School and Trotskyism were the most notable theoretical schools of the old Left to be led by Jews and to influence the New Left. While the Frankfurt School focused on criticizing the social-democratic welfare state, consumerist culture, and the socialization mechanisms of modern society, Trotskyism was based mainly on criticism of Stalinist Communism. At the same time, Trotskyism had an impressive interpretation of how world power was divided, and of the political and economic structure of imperialist states in the East and the West. The Trotskyist movement was represented in the United States by the Socialist Workers Party (SWP), whose publishing house produced the most popular books of the radical scene, such as the writings of Malcolm X and Che Guevara, among others.¹⁹ A young generation's thirst for knowledge, ideological instruction, and organizational tools, combined with the intellectual richness and activist heritage that the American Trotskyist movement offered, led to a flourishing connection between the New and the old Left movements. In the 1960s, there was a constant flow of new young members to the SWP. Moreover, the subscriber base of the party's weekly, *The Militant*, doubled between 1962 and 1966, while the sales of party publications quadrupled by the middle of the decade.²⁰

The main aspect of the encounter between the Trotskyist party and the New Left was ideological, and mostly influenced the intellectual segment of the New Left, many of whom were Jewish. Of all the different elements of the Trotskyist thinking, its dominant contribution to the New Left ideology was the anti-colonial struggle. At the centre of the anti-colonial perspective was a new division of the global powers: "North" against "South," instead of the traditional Cold War division "West" and "East." This was a very relevant analysis of colonialism in the 1960s, since it reflected an understanding that the post-World War order had not implemented a just division of resources and power in the world, and that it discriminated against the Third World.²¹ It also expressed the disappointment with the East (Soviet Communism), which was no longer perceived as a force that could counter imperialism since it developed its own kind of "Soviet Colonialism" or "Russian imperialism" in Eastern Europe, the Baltic states, and Central Asia. A significant element of the North-South division was a new definition of who was oppressed. It was no longer the proletariat of the industrial

world (which was now considered to be a reactionary class embracing capitalist culture), but the people of the Third World who suffered from colonial control by the industrial world.²² From the beginning of the 1960s, the New Left's emphasis on Third World anti-colonial struggles became more evident, following a series of events. The most notable of these were the Algerian War of Independence, the Cuban Revolution, the development of the Civil Rights Movement, and the anti-Vietnam War demonstrations in the United States.²³ These events seemingly confirmed the anti-colonial perspective, made it more known to the public, and gathered a new generation of leftists around it.

In the mid-1960s, the Middle East also became part of the New Left's focus. After the Suez Canal Crisis in 1956, internal turmoil emerged amongst Palestinians who were becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the way Arab countries were managing the conflict with Israel. In 1959, Palestinian students founded an independent organization, The Palestinian National Liberation Movement (also known as *al-Fatah*), seeking to establish Palestinian national independence through armed struggle against Israel. In 1964, an umbrella organization called The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was established in order to lead this struggle, containing *al-Fatah* and other groups founded at the same time. In 1965, the PLO began attacking Israel. The Israeli army retaliated by attacking Arab countries that supported the PLO fighters by providing them bases for launching attacks. The situation worsened due to a controversy over the use of water, which originated in these countries and flowed through Israel.²⁴

Those who sympathized with the Palestinians perceived Israel as an aggressive and imperialist state. In January 1966, a convention of Third World countries from Asia, Africa and Latin America gathered in Havana, Cuba, and established The Organization of Solidarity with the People of Asia, Africa and Latin America (OSPAAAL). Delegates from Israel were not permitted to participate in the conference, and OSPAAAL urged its members to cut all ties with Israel.²⁵ In August 1966, an international student conference in Nairobi, Kenya, also accepted a resolution denouncing Israel as an aggressor in the Middle East conflicts.²⁶

As a result of its identification with the Third World, the New Left sought to implement an anti-colonial perspective in the Middle East conflicts. It saw the Palestinian struggle against Israel as a guerilla war for freedom, and the Arab countries' refusal to accept Israel's existence as part of a broader revolution, tied to the fight against the *ancien régime* of imperialist super-powers forcing their will on the region. In the mid-1960s, there was a turn to radicalization in the New Left, especially in the American Civil Rights Movement, which embraced a Pan-African Ideology. This trend, led by the Black Power faction of the movement, put Middle Eastern Arabs and African Americans on the same side against imperialist white aggressors. This shared struggle created a strategic alliance, which helped to further mobilize against Israel.²⁷

The New Left's anti-colonial perspective and focus on the Middle East aroused a new interest in the "Jewish Question" in the mid-1960s. Naturally, most of the discussion about it took place amongst Jews. The internal character of this discussion continued the traditional patterns of the old Left. Unlike the first half of the twentieth century, in the 1960s the Left did not consider any real revolutionary alternative to Zionism, since the Israeli state already existed; instead it mainly dealt with the character of the Israeli state as either a "progressive" or "reactionary" project. While Israel's supporters emphasized the socialist character of the Israeli leadership, the achievements of the pioneers' settlements and the power of the Histadrut (the Israeli workers union), the anti-Zionists focused their propaganda on the suffering of the Palestinians, the collaboration of Israel with the West and the capitalistic elements of the Israeli economy.²⁸

The ability to be part of the debate about the character of the Israeli state and society required detailed study of Jewish history in modern times. Abram Leon's historical perspective in *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* thus contributed to its revival. 1965 saw a Spanish edition of the book printed and circulated in Latin America, with a new introduction.²⁹ The "Jewish Question" continued to be discussed in 1966, when Jean-Paul Sartre organized a special issue of the prestigious magazine *Les Temps Modernes*, on the Arab-Israeli conflict.³⁰ The issue included commentary from both Israeli and Arab thinkers, and came out one day before the Six-Day War. This timing made the special issue extremely relevant—after the war it was translated into many languages and sold tens of thousands of copies. While some writers adhered to a Zionist perspective, the magazine also expressed a Trotskyist anti-Zionist perspective, represented in an article by the Jewish French scholar Maxim Rodinson. Rodinson, who after the Six-Day War wrote the introduction to the new French edition of *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* (published in 1968), described Israel as an imperialistic and aggressive state. His article raised broad interest and was later published in an English translation by the SWP.³¹ Its inclusion in the special issue of *Les Temps Modernes* and the effect it had on its leftist audience indicated that the Trotskyist interpretation of the Zionist project was relevant again. The Six-Day War, which opened with an Israeli attack on Egypt, Syria, and Jordan (following the mobilization of these countries' armies towards Israel's borders and Egypt's closure of the Straits of Tiran) and ended with Israel's occupation of surrounding territories, seemed to legitimize Trotskyists' renditions of the broader conflict, and made their point of view even more relevant.

Young Jewish Radicals between Zionism and the New Left

The circumstances and outcomes of the Six-Day War led to two notable phenomena among the young generation of Jews. The first, resulting from the anxiety that Israel faced before and during the war, was a strong identification of the

world Jewry with Israel; The other—a product of Israel’s surprise attack and its conquest of the Golan Heights, Sinai Peninsula, Gaza Strip, Judea and Samaria—was a dramatic criticism of Israel around the world.³² The New Left, which had been critical of Israel prior to the war, now became the main centre of denunciation against it, even expressing hostility and anti-Semitism. This led many of its Jewish members to take a step back from their involvement, although they still identified with Leftist values and goals.³³ The existence of a broad, confused public among the young generation of Jews was recognized by both pro and anti-Zionist elements around the United States, who instigated a struggle for the hearts and minds of young Jewish radicals. College campuses, where 350,000 Jewish students were exposed to propaganda of all kinds, became an ideological battleground. As we will see, Leon’s book would enter this arena as a prominent weapon.

The first attempt to influence the Jews of the New Left (in the United States and elsewhere) came from the anti-Zionists. A few weeks after the Six-Day War, the British journal *New Left Review* published a long interview with Isaac Deutscher. Deutscher, who belonged to the old Left but influenced the ideologies of the New Left, claimed that the initial Israeli attack had been an extension of American imperialism, and that what stood against it was an “Afro-Asian” counter attack.³⁴ Israel, he argued, was a front fortress of the West in the Middle East, dependent on the superpowers (i.e. the UK, France and the US) for its survival. This dependence, in turn, shaped Israeli policy in its conflict with the Arabs. Although Deutscher did not contest Israel’s right to exist, he conveyed an analysis in which the Palestinians were victims of Zionism and Israel was “Prussia of the Middle-East.”³⁵ The interview concluded with criticism of Pro-Zionist leftists, with Deutscher arguing that the Holocaust should not lead Jews to justify injustice against others. Deutscher passed away soon after publication, and the interview was heralded as the famous thinker’s “last words.”³⁶

Hal Draper echoed Deutscher’s sentiments. Draper was one of the founders of the SWP, but abandoned the organization following an ideological conflict. He managed to establish an independent position as a radical thinker and activist within the global Left, while working with another Trotskyist group (the Independent Socialist Club). In the 1960s, Draper settled in Berkeley, California (one of the main centres of the New Left), and became an influential figure in the Free Speech Movement and a mentor to its leader, Mario Savio. Soon after the Six-Day War, Draper edited a collection of articles under the title *Zionism, Israel, & the Arabs: The Historical Background of the Middle-East Tragedy*.³⁷ The collection included articles (some authored by Draper) written between 1948 and 1967, which critically discussed the establishment of Israel and key elements of its existence. The collection showed that following the Six-Day War, the New Left lacked contemporary and updated arguments on the Arab-Israeli issue, relying instead on already published content. However, it marked the pattern which

new materials would also follow: an attempt to retrospectively de-legitimize the Israeli side by discussing the historic circumstances of its establishment.

Following the Six-Day War, the SWP produced the first updated anti-Zionist materials published in the United States. From June 1967, *The Militant* published articles on the events in the Middle East, and in August, The Young Socialist Alliance (YSA—the youth movement of the SWP), published a collection of articles on Israel under the title *Zionism and the Arab Revolution: The Myth of Progressive Israel*. The introduction to the collection asked: “What attitude should American radicals take toward the Zionist government of Israel?”³⁸ The various articles presented a clear answer: the Israeli-Arab conflict is part of the global struggle between the Third World and imperialism, and the Palestinians are the oppressed in this struggle, while Israel is the oppressor. The collection also advertised the 1950 English edition of Leon’s book. The editor of the collection (and author of most of its articles) was Peter Buch, a prominent Jewish activist in the SWP. Buch was heavily influenced by *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation*.³⁹ He was also a former member of Hashomer Hatzair who, like Leon, developed criticisms of Zionism and moved to Trotskyism. When the “Jewish Question” reemerged in the 1960s, Buch was an asset to the SWP due to his familiarity with Zionist ideology. Naturally, he became the SWP’s spokesperson on the Jewish issue, and actually led the party’s anti-Zionist campaign after the Six-Day War.

Other organizations encouraging the anti-Zionist turn in the New Left were the Organization of Arab Students (OAS) and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). The OAS was established in 1952, and by the 1960s had thousands of registered members across the United States. Following the Six-Day War, OAS formulated a new platform supporting an armed struggle against Israel. It did this while establishing strong ties with *al-Fatah* and collaborating with New Left organizations promoting shared anti-colonial struggle. OAS activities focused on teaching, demonstrations, fund-raising, hosting *al-Fatah* activists lecturing in the United States, and organizing delegations of students to visit *al-Fatah* training camps in the Middle East.⁴⁰

The SNCC was established in 1960 and helped organize groundbreaking civil rights demonstrations in the southern United States: sit-ins, freedom rides, and the March on Washington. In the mid-1960s, the organization began to go through a process of pushing its white activists—most of them Jewish—out of important positions.⁴¹ This was part of the rise of the Black Power Movement, which demanded that black people be self-represented in their struggle for social, economic, and political equality.⁴² At the same time, the organization developed a close affiliation with the anti-colonial trend (by defining African Americans as Africans) and with the Palestinians.⁴³ Both the OAS and the SNCC took an active part in the campaign against Israel, but the theoretical arena of this struggle was mainly occupied by Jewish anti-Zionists, most of whom were active in the SWP.⁴⁴

The alignment between the different parts of the New Left’s anti-Zionist campaign became evident in the first formal gathering of the American New Left: the National Conference for New Politics, held in Chicago at the end of August 1967. During the conference, which sought to include a wide range of topics, black activists claimed that the discussions were not radical enough, and threatened to leave. Although they did not constitute a majority at the conference, they exercised great influence, in an attempt to have them stay, they were allowed to produce a resolution which the conference would vote on.⁴⁵ The resolution included thirteen issues: twelve about domestic American subjects and one about the Middle-East conflict.⁴⁶ At first, there was an attempt to demand that Israel should withdraw from all territories conquered in the Six-Day War. However, after pressure from some pro-Israel participants, this paragraph included only a condemnation of Israel for opening the war.⁴⁷ Although the paragraph was not supported by many of the participants, no one wanted to exacerbate the conflict with the Black activists, and the resolution passed. Among the 3000 participants in the conference were a few hundred Jews—many of whom voted to approve the thirteen-point program. They did not want to be the ones leading the failure of the first attempt to create a shared agenda for the whole American New Left.⁴⁸

The resolution of the New Politics convention was a forewarning for Jews in the diaspora as well as in Israel.⁴⁹ The exclusive focus on the Arab-Israeli conflict, along with one-sided condemnation of Israel that ignored the Arab countries’ role in the emergence of the war, led to anger and disappointment. Pro-Zionist Jewish activists were especially hurt—they had expected their non-Jewish comrades, who had been fighting beside them for several years for peace, equality, and freedom, to stand with them against the anti-Zionist campaign.⁵⁰ Isolation of the pro-Israel Jews in the New Left also became evident to leaders of the Jewish-American and Zionist-Israeli establishments.⁵¹ From the end of 1967, both activists and establishment began to react.

The pro-Zionist counter-attack against the New Left’s propaganda was emerged in two phases. During the first, from 1967 to 1968, it ran without significant collaboration between activists and the establishment; during the second, from 1969 onward, these elements began to cooperate. The first phase included the development (in Israel) of a broad institutional plan to promote Zionist education in the United States; at the same time, spontaneous grass-roots pro-Zionist groups began to organize in campuses across the country.⁵² The institutional plan, called “America Plan,” included doubling the budgets of Zionist educational activity on American campuses. It was operated mainly by Israeli *shlichim* (emissaries) who worked in Zionist youth movements and Jewish communities. It was connected with three Israel-centered bodies: the Kibbutz movements, which provided most of the *shlichim*; World Zionist Organization’s (WZO) department of youth and pioneers; and the Jewish Agency’s department for *hasbara* (propaganda). The WZO and the Jewish Agency both provided the organizational base

for the operation. Grass-roots action included the foundation of discussion groups and publication of ideological materials, and was led mainly by graduates of Zionist youth movements such as Habonim, Hashomer Hatzair, and Camp Ramah. In the spring of 1968, these graduates established the North American branch of the World Union of Jewish Students (WUJS), an umbrella organization of pro-Zionist endeavour on campuses around the world.⁵³ The establishment of the American branch of WUJS created an important arena for collaboration between the different grass-roots groups, and the new organization was therefore named “Network.” Moreover, the connections (under WUJS) between young Jewish-American pro-Zionist radicals and their peers from other countries also helped to realize the transnational patterns of the anti-Zionist campaign and to react to them more efficiently.

From the end of 1968, a connection was also established between the institutional and grass-roots elements of the pro-Zionist campaign. That mainly resulted from changes in the department of youth and pioneers and the department for *hasbara*. The new managers of these departments—Mordechai Bar-On and Abraham Schenkar—understood the potential for field activists to operate as “Trojan Horses” in the New Left, delivering the pro-Zionist messages.⁵⁴ The result of this collaboration was that existing grass-roots groups now received significant budgets, and that new groups were founded by institutional initiative and with institutional support. In 1970, Network activists, with the help of the Israeli and Jewish American establishment, founded an information and press centre that controlled the production and distribution of pro-Zionist ideological materials in the New Left scene.⁵⁵ Although the centre, called “Jewish Students Press Service,” (JSPS) was supervised by the establishment, its character was radical and anti-establishment, following the zeitgeist of the New Left era. At the end of its first year of activity, JSPS represented over 50 newspapers and its audience numbered over 300,000 students.⁵⁶ In 1970, a few of the most prominent left-wing pro-Zionist groups also established a new umbrella organization in order to collaborate more closely. The new organization, called “Radical Zionist Alliance,” (RZA) included more than 70 chapters around the United States, with hundreds of active members.⁵⁷ By 1971, the American pro-Zionist front included almost 200 groups and organizations.

Escalation

In 1969, facing the organized reaction of the pro-Zionist front, the anti-Zionist faction of the New Left also developed significantly. Israel continued to hold the territories conquered in the Six-Day War, and there was no sign of a peace agreement in the future; on the contrary, a new war—the War of Attrition—emerged between Israel and Egypt in March 1969. In February, the first section of a three-part article about the Middle-East was published in the Journal of the SDS.⁵⁸ The

article compared Israel's hold on the occupied territories to the *Lebensraum* idea of Nazi Germany. At the same time, *The Militant* started to publish articles discussing the Israeli occupation, and detailing Israeli abuses of the Arab population.⁵⁹ In 1969, the Jewish activists of SWP prepared more updated propaganda materials about the Israeli-Arab conflict. One publication, by Peter Buch, was called *Burning Issues of the Middle-East Crisis* and another, by George Novack, was called *How Can the Jews Survive? A Socialist Answer to Zionism*.⁶⁰ While the first provided a broad description of the conflict between Israel and its neighbors, the second focused on analyzing the character of Israeli society. Both examined those aspects from an anti-colonial perspective, while leaning on historical background—such as the origins of the Jewish presence in Palestine—that seemingly supported their arguments.

1970 saw the peak of the anti-Zionist campaign in the American New Left. This was a result of two factors: the continuation of the escalation which started in 1969; and the general radicalization of the New Left in 1970, following developments in the Vietnam War which led to severe clashes in the United States. Starting in April 1970, Nathan Weinstock, (who, like Leon and Buch, was also a Hashomer Hatzair graduate who “crossed the lines” to anti-Zionism), published a series of articles in *The Militant* attacking Israel. He focused on defending the anti-Zionist Left against accusations of anti-Semitism, but also explained in detail why Israel is a colonialist state.⁶¹ At the same time, Buch went on a national lecture tour of America's campuses. In September 1970, more attention was given to the Palestinian issue because of conflict between the Jordanian regime of King Hussein and the Palestinian organizations in Jordan—many Palestinians were killed, and Hussein had backing from the United States and Israel. At the end of the year, an 11-part article about the roots of the Middle-East conflict began to be published in *The Militant*. The writers, Gus Horowitz and Barry Sheppard, described the emergence of the Zionist and the Palestinian national movements, while repeating the familiar Trotskyist interpretation.⁶² Another significant step for the anti-Zionist campaign was inviting Arie Bober—one of the leaders of the Israeli anti-Zionist organization Matzpen—to the US for a lecture tour. Bober was hosted by a new organization—a collaboration of Jewish American left-wing activists (such as Noam Chomsky and I.F. Stone) and Jewish SWP members—called “The Committee on New Alternatives in the Middle-East.”⁶³ Bober lectured on dozens of campuses, creating great enthusiasm among his listeners, and his success generated concern in the pro-Zionist front. The Israeli government paid close attention to his lectures, and pro-Zionist field activists were frustrated every time there was no one to answer Bober with the other interpretation of the Middle-East conflict.⁶⁴

Internal arguments

Along with the escalation of the struggle between the pro- and anti-Zionists from 1969 onward, internal arguments also started to occur within each side. On the pro-Zionist front, this was an outcome of two elements: one was the demise of the euphoria that followed the Six-Day War, with the understanding that the Israeli occupation would not end soon. As a result, field activists started seeking more complex answers to the dilemmas they faced, aside from unambiguous support of Israel. The other was a generational gap that corresponded with tension between the institutional and grass-roots parts of this front. While the institutional level of the pro-Zionist front was operated mostly by middle-aged people, the activists were twenty to thirty years old; differences of style and character naturally appeared.⁶⁵ Among anti-Zionists, the internal argument stemmed from accusations of dogmatism and one-sided perspectives about the Zionist project. These internal conflicts affected cohesion on both sides and blurred the differences between them. The leadership of both forces reacted by seeking to unify their groups and prevent a disintegration.

The internal arguments of the pro-Zionists had two main results: the first was an attempt to bridge the ideological tension between universal values and support of Israel, by emphasizing the synthetic character of Socialist Zionism (now called “Radical-Zionism”) or emphasizing Jewish cultural and religious identity as a source of self-determination, instead of support of Israel.⁶⁶ The other result was that these pro-Zionist disagreements were perceived by the anti-Zionists, who sought to use them for their own purposes. For example, an internal SWP communiqué recommended distribution of anti-Zionist writings in the Radical-Zionist centers, since there was a clear ideological weakness among them.⁶⁷ Indeed, the criticism of the Israeli government and the stronger emphasis of the “revolutionary” element in the pro-Zionist front actually made it a target audience for new materials—Leon’s book among them.

Internal debates also became part of the anti-Zionist front, and this also affected the re-publication of Leon’s book. Already in November 1967, the SWP experienced internal opposition to its anti-Israel ideological campaign. A letter sent by Jewish party member Beverly Wise to members of the party National Committee claimed that the one-sided description of Arabs as the representatives of “progress” was inaccurate; she argued that they also showed “reactionary” patterns, such as anti-Semitism. Although it was clear that Zionism was not the answer to the “Jewish Question,” Wise wrote, the establishment of the State of Israel saved lives, and the Six-Day War was an act of self-defense. She argued that the Trotskyist movement should not embrace existing Arab propaganda, and that the Middle-East conflict had its own unique patterns and did not fit any general theoretical frame. She also claimed that there were many like-minded members in the party, who were afraid of expressing their doubts about the party line.⁶⁸ Simi-

lar accusations arose in the SWP in 1968, this time in *The Militant*.⁶⁹ Starting from the end of the year, the readers’ letters section began publishing articles by a young Jewish radical named Yehuda Krantz. Krantz, only seventeen years old, was a Hashomer Hatzair leader who left high school and dedicated his time to fighting the anti-Zionist campaign of the New Left. He became a respected speaker and was invited to debates and panels about Zionism on a regular basis.⁷⁰ He recognized *The Militant* as a central promoter of anti-Zionism and decided to confront it directly—by writing regularly and arguing with readers, he began receiving support from some. Krantz died in 1969 after being struck by a bus, but his tragic death did not end the public debate, and *The Militant* now became a permanent forum for expressing doubts about the SWP party line on the Middle-East conflict.⁷¹ The argument led SWP institutions to develop a formal and binding resolution about the subject; but this attempt almost failed, as an oppositional resolution rose as an alternative to the party line. While the institutional resolution opposed any Jewish national self-determination and supported the establishment of Palestinian nation-state in the Middle East (where the Jews would be an ethnic minority), the oppositional resolution supported national Jewish self-determination under a Socialist Israeli state.⁷² After a short struggle the party line was accepted, expressing condemnation of Israel and support for the Palestinians.⁷³

Throughout the internal debate in the SWP, participants seeking historical references for their many arguments over the characteristics of the Zionist project repeatedly mentioned Abram Leon and his book. In a letter to *The Militant*, for example, reader Jan Garret wanted to show that there were two kinds of nationality—progressive and reactionary—and that the Jewish nationality belonged to the second type. Garret quoted Leon and directed readers to his book, and her diagnosis followed one of Leon’s important theoretical contributions: the claim that the Zionist movement emerged at a late phase of the national phenomenon, when it was actually in demise, and therefore a Jewish nation state could not provide a sustainable answer for the “Jewish Question.”⁷⁴ The reason for this, Garret argued, stemmed from the history of the Jews as an ancient “people class,” which survived as such through constant immigration to pre-capitalized areas.⁷⁵ Another writer, Hana Niel, wrote that she embraced Leon’s perspective of Judaism as a social class and not a religion, but that she did not agree that it could never develop a progressive character as a nation.⁷⁶ This ongoing and vibrant discussion dealt more and more with the core issues of Leon’s book, and made its re-publication clearly necessary. In March 1969, the idea of reprinting a new edition arose, but the resources for doing so were not available. In May of that year, the issue was raised again by the director of the SWP publishing house, George Breitman. Soon, the required funds were found and Nathan Weinstock was asked to write the introduction for the new English edition.⁷⁷ The “revival” of Abram Leon became a reality.

Conclusion

The “revival” of Abram Leon has been explained in this article as a result of three historical developments. The first is the rise of the New Left’s interest in the Middle-East conflict and the character of the Israeli state (this interest emerged prior to the Six-Day War but increased after it). The second is the struggle between anti- and pro-Zionist Jews of the New Left (which began after the Six-Day War). The third is the internal debate within the anti- and pro-Zionist camps (starting mainly from 1969). The New Left tried to implement its anti-colonial perspective on the conflict between Israel and the Arab countries, and the Palestinian struggle against Israel—so it needed a historical narrative that could present the Zionist project as imperialist and reactionary. Moreover, the Zionists’ counter-attack demanded of the anti-Zionists more thorough and comprehensive materials to develop this narrative, and Leon’s book was the best of all existing options. Furthermore, the internal debates among the anti-Zionists required a solid “footnote” for the claims against the Zionist project, to answer the doubts from within. At the same time, ideological weakness among the pro-Zionists created further motivation among the anti-Zionists to republish Leon’s book, since they saw it as an opportunity to penetrate pro-Zionist lines and enlist new members. For all these reasons, in 1969 *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* became an in-demand ideological product, and the idea of republication was fulfilled in a relatively short period of time.

The discussion of Leon’s revival also provides several general insights about the New Left. The republication of *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* constituted a clear example of the ideological, organizational, and social ties between the old and the New Left. The book was part of a whole theoretical curriculum which the SWP, as a senior old Left organization, provided to the American New Left. The anti-Zionist campaign was also led by old Left Jewish activists, who became mentors of the new generation. However, Leon’s revival also reveals theoretical weaknesses of the New Left, when compared to the old Left. The enthusiastic embrace of a book written underground in the early 1940s—almost without access to sources of any kind—as the “bible” of anti-Zionism in the 1960s and 1970s, shows the difficulties of the anti-Zionists in producing their own theoretical materials. In this sense, the fact that *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* became a classic two decades after its first publication emphasizes not its theoretical merits—which carried a stronger validity at the time when it was written—but its social and political importance, which could have been embodied only in the 1960s. This reveals the interaction between ideology and social and political conditions: while ideology has an independent existence, it sometimes has no meaning without the reality that makes it relevant.

NOTES

¹ Stephen H. Norwood, *Antisemitism and the American Far Left* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 200–201; Enzo Traverso, *The Marxists and the Jewish Question: The History of a Debate, 1843–1943* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1994), 221–228; Yair Oron, *Kulanu Yebudim Germanim: Radicalim radicalim Yebudim be-tzarfat be-snot ba-sbshim ve-ha-sbshim* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, the University of Tel Aviv and the University of Ben Gurion, 1999), 207–211; Danny Gutwein, “Bein Tzionut Le-trotskyism: Abram Leon Ve-ha-konceptsia Ha-materialistit Shel Ha-she’ela Ha-yehudit,” *Tura*, 3 (1993): 201–220. Abram Leon was born in Poland in 1918. In the 1920s his family immigrated to Palestine, but returned to Poland after a year and eventually settled in Belgium. Leon was a member of the Zionist-Socialist movement *Hashomer Hatzair* and appointed as its leader in Belgium. During the Second World War he became a Trotskyist and was active in an anti-Nazi underground. He wrote *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* in the early 1940s. Leon was imprisoned in 1944 and died in Auschwitz the same year, at age 26.

² Portions of Leon’s book came out in the American Trotskyist press (*The Militant* and *The Fourth International*) in 1947.

³ Norwood, *Antisemitism*, 207; Colin Shindler, *Israel and the European Left: Between Solidarity and Delegitimization* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2012), 173.

⁴ See note 1.

⁵ Mordechai S. Chertoff, ed., *The New Left and the Jews* (New York: Pitman, 1970); Bill Novak and Robert Goldman, “The Rise of the Jewish Student Press,” *Conservative Judaism* 25, no.2 (Winter 1971): 5–19; Jack Nusan Porter and Peter Dreier, *Jewish Radicalism: A Selected Anthology* (New York: Grove Press, 1973); Sander Gilman, *Jewish Self-Hatred: Anti-Semitism and the Hidden Language of the Jews* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1986); Robert S. Wistrich, ed., *The Left against Zion: Communism, Israel and the Middle-East* (London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1979); Michael E. Staub, *The Jewish 1960s: An American Sourcebook* (Waltham, Mass: Brandeis University Press, 2004); Edward Alexander and Paul Bogdanor, eds., *The Jewish Divide Over Israel: Accusers and Defenders* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2006); Robert S. Wistrich, *From Ambivalence to Betrayal: The Left, the Jews, and Israel* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2012); Arthur Liebman, *Jews and the Left* (New York: Wiley, 1979), 536–587; David Glanz, “An Interpretation of the Jewish Counterculture,” *Jewish Social Studies* 39, no. 1/2, American Bicentennial: II (Winter–Spring, 1977): 117–128.

⁶ See Shindler, *Israel and the European Left*; Oron, *Kulanu Yebudim*; Beatrice D. Gurwitz, “From the New World to the Third World: Generation, Politics, and the Making of Argentine Jewish Ethnicity (1955–1983),” (PhD diss., University of

California, Berkeley, 2012).

⁷ Traverso, *The Marxists and the Jewish Question*.

⁸ Maxim Rodinson, for example, argued that Leon's claim that Jews were merchants since their early history is not accurate, and that they became a clear example of a "people class" only in the eleventh century, and only in Western Europe. Rodinson also saw the way Leon used the materialistic method as too vulgar. See Maxime Rodinson, *Cult, Ghetto and State: The Persistence of the Jewish Question* (London: Al Saqi Books, 1983) 68–117; For an answer to Rodinson's arguments, see Nathan Weinstock, "Introduction," in Abram Leon, *The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation* (New York: Pathfinder, 1970) 27–63. See also John Rose, "Liberating Jewish History from Its Zionist Stranglehold: Rediscovering Abram Leon," *Holy Land Studies: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 5, no. 1 (2006): 1–20.

⁹ For further discussion of the Elkind group in Gdud Ha-avoda, or Hashomer Hatzair in Poland, see Anita Shapira, *Ha-Halicha al Kav ha-Ofek* (Tel Aviv: Sifriyat Poalim, 1989) 208–257.

¹⁰ The Soviet Union favoured the establishment of Israel in the November 1947 United Nations vote, and also supplied Israel, through Czechoslovakia, with significant military equipment prior to and during the War of Independence.

¹¹ Ezra Mendelsohn, ed., *Essential Papers on Jews and the Left* (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 10–11.

¹² Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 33.

¹³ For further discussion see Aviva Weingarten, *Jewish Organizations' Response to Communism and to Senator McCarthy* (London; Portland, OR: Vallentine Mitchell; 2008).

¹⁴ Correspondence between Ernest Mandel, George Breitman, Morris Stein and others, 1945–1947, copies sent to the author by Steve Clark, editorial director of Pathfinder Press, via e-mail on January 12, 2016.

¹⁵ For further discussion see Seymour Martin Lipset and Philip G. Altbach, eds., *Students in Revolt* (London: Beacon Press, 1970); Jeremi Suri, *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003); Gerd-Rainer Horn, *The Spirit of '68: Rebellion in Western Europe and North America, 1956–1976* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

¹⁶ Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 557–558. For further discussion see Maurice Isserman, *If I Had a Hammer: The Death of the old Left and the Birth of the New Left* (New York: Basic Books, 1987).

¹⁷ Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 440, 542–557; Percy S. Cohen, *Jewish Radicals and Radical Jews* (Cambridge, MA: Academic Press, 1981), 14–84; Judy Kaplan and Linn Shapiro, *Red Diapers: Growing Up in the Communist Left* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press,

1998); Paul C. Mishler, *Raising Reds* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

¹⁸ Isaac Deutscher (1907–1967), was a Jewish Trotskyist and one of the most important figures in the global Left; Ernest Mandel (1923–1990) was a Marxist economist and a Trotskyist activist and theorist; Hal Draper (1914–1990) was a Jewish Trotskyist; Herbert Marcuse (1898–1979) was a German-American philosopher, sociologist, and political theorist, associated with the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory; Nathan Weinstock (1939–) was a senior Jewish Trotskyist leader from Belgium.

¹⁹ A. Belden Fields, *Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the United States* (New York: Praeger, 1988) 131–184. For further discussion see Barry Shepard, *The Party: The Socialist Workers Party, 1960–1988, Volume 1: The Sixties, A Political Memoir* (Sydney: Resistance Books, 2005); The publishing house of the SWP was established in 1930 as “Pioneer,” and changed its name to “Merit” in 1965 and “Pathfinder” in 1970.

²⁰ Between 1965 and 1967 the average age of SWP council representatives decreased from 33.5 to 29.5 and the median age decreased from 30 to 25. At the same time the average number of years of membership in the party decreased from 10.5 to 7.3. See Minutes of the 22nd National Conference of the Socialist Workers Party, New York City, October 26–29, 1967, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Micro 596, Reel 13, P93–3914; Additional analysis for the Militant, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Micro 596, Reel 13, P93–3914; Publications report October 1967, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Micro 596, Reel 13, P93–3914.

²¹ The term “Third World” refers to the economically underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa, Oceania, and Latin America, which have been considered an entity with common characteristics, such as poverty, high birthrates, and economic dependence on more advanced countries.

²² Jeremy Prestholdt, “Resurrecting Che: Radicalism, the Transnational Imagination, and the Politics of Heroes,” *Journal of Global History* 7, no. 3 (November 2012): 506–526.

²³ Other anti-colonial struggles took place in Angola, Guiné-Bissau, and Mozambique (against Portugal). The “Prague Spring” in 1968 was also perceived as anti-colonial struggle. For further discussion see Cynthia A. Young, *Soul Power: Culture, Radicalism, and the Making of a U.S. Third World Left* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); Max Elbaum, *Revolution in the Air: Sixties Radicals Turn to Lenin, Mao and Che* (London: Verso Press, 2002).

²⁴ See: George De Carvalho, “An Ancient Hatred Builds toward War,” *Life*, June 18, 1965. <http://bit.ly/2GnlsbH> (Accessed January 24, 2018).

²⁵ See “The First Afro-Asian-Latin American Peoples’ Solidarity Conference,”

Peking Review 4 (Jan. 21, 1966): 19–25,
<http://www.massline.org/PekingReview/PR1966/PR1966-04h.htm> (Accessed March 7, 2017).

²⁶ Matthew Kalman, *The Kids Are Alright: Chapters in the History of the World Union of Jewish Students* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Students, 1986), 51.

²⁷ Liebman, *Jews and the Left*, 586; Pamela Pennock, “Third World Alliance: Arab-American Activists in American Universities, 1967–1973,” *Mashriq & Mahjar* 2, no. 2 (2014): 55–78; Prestholdt, “Resurrecting Che,” 506–526.

²⁸ See for example: T.T., “Israel’s ‘Socialism,’” *The Militant* 31.1 (1969); M.R., “On Arab ‘genocide’ and Israeli ‘Socialism,’” *The Militant*, February 2, 1969; “The problem of ethnic discrimination between oriental and Western Jews takes crisis proportion in Israel,” *Fateh*, April 12, 1971; Isaac Deutscher, “On discrimination,” *Fateh*, April 12, 1971, Hoover Institute Archive, New Left Collection, Box 1, Folder 1.

²⁹ Avraham Leon, “La concepción materialista de la cuestión judía: Bases para un estudio científico de la historia judía,” in *El Marxismo y la cuestión judía* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Plus Ultra, 1965).

³⁰ “Le conflit israélo-arabe,” *Les Temps Modernes*, June, 1967.

³¹ Maxime Rodinson, *Israel: A Colonial-Settler State?* (New York: Mound Press, Pathfinder Press, 1973).

³² See Eli Lederhendler, ed., *The Six-Day War and World Jewry* (Bethesda, MD: University Press of Maryland, 2000).

³³ See note 5.

³⁴ Isaac Deutscher, “On the Israeli-Arab war,” *New Left Review* 1/44 (July–August 1967).

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ “The Six-Day War: The Last Words of Deutscher,” *Matzpen* 39 (1967). Available at <http://bit.ly/2ocV3Gd> (Accessed May 7, 2017).

³⁷ Hal Draper, *Zionism, Israel, & the Arabs: The Historical Background of the Middle-East Tragedy* (Independent Socialist Clippingbooks, 1967).

³⁸ *Zionism and the Arab Revolution: The Myth of Progressive Israel* (New York: The Young Socialist Alliance, 1967), 3.

³⁹ Interview with Peter Buch, Tamiment Library & Wagner Labor Archives, Oral History of the American Left Collection, New York University, OH.002, Box 7, Folder 8.

⁴⁰ Pennock, “Third World Alliance”, 55–78.

⁴¹ *American Jewish Year Book* Vol. 68 (1967), 63–96.

⁴² In the words of one of the movement’s prominent leaders, Stokely Carmichael (1941–1998), Black Power was “the ability of black people to politically get together and organize themselves so that they can speak from a position of strength rather than a position of weakness.” Quoted in Joyce Ladner, “What ‘Black Power’ Means to Negroes in Mississippi,” *Transaction* (November 1967): 7–15. For further discussion see: Jeffrey O. G. Ogbar, *Black Power: Radical Politics and African American Identity* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

⁴³ Pennock, “Third World Alliance”, 55–78.

⁴⁴ In regard to the theoretical writings in the SNCC about Zionism, it was Stokely Carmichael himself who stated that “We found, to my surprise, that a great deal of the most incisive and persuasive critical writing was by Jewish writers.” See Stokely Carmichael with Ekwueme Michael Thelwell, *Ready for Revolution: The Life and Struggles of Stokely Carmichael (Kwame Ture)* (Scribner: New York, 2003), 557. In regard to the Arab writings see Pennock, “Third World Alliance,” 55–78. See also materials in Hoover Institute Archive, New Left Collection, Box 36, Folder 2.

⁴⁵ “New Politics Gathering Divides on 3rd Ticket,” *The Militant*, September 11, 1967; Harry Ring, “The white-black issue,” *The Militant*, October 2, 1967.

⁴⁶ Text of the “Black Caucus” resolution adopted by the National Convention for New Politics, Chicago, September 1967, Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University, New Left Collection, Box 36, Folder 2.

⁴⁷ “‘New Politics’ Convention Modifies Its Indictment of Israel,” *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, September 6, 1967.

⁴⁸ Cohen, *Jewish Radicals*, 27; Norwood, *Anti-Semitism*, 198–199.

⁴⁹ “Ha-Kongress Ha-Yehudi Nozef Be-SNCC,” *Al Hamishmar*, September 10, 1967; see also Michael E. Staub, *Torn at the Roots: The Crisis of Jewish Liberalism in Postwar America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 208.

⁵⁰ Rafael Medoff, *Jewish Americans and Political Participation: A Reference Handbook* (Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2002), 97.

⁵¹ See for example “Meeting of the Israeli government,” July 2, 1967, 2943(2)35.1, Hashomer Hatzair Archive, Givaat Haviva.

⁵² Israel Pinchasi letter to emissaries in North America, December 2, 1967, 2943(2)35.1, Hashomer Hatzair Archive, Givaat Haviva; Glanz, “the Jewish Counterculture”, 167–187.

⁵³ Kalman, *the Kids Are Alright*, 46–100.

⁵⁴ Author interview with Mordechai Bar-On, Jerusalem, December 29, 2016; Abraham Schenkar in a discussion of API administrative committee, December 2, 1968, Hashomer Hatzair Archive, Givat Haviva, 94.3(1)3886.

-
- ⁵⁵ Novak and Goldman, "The rise of the Jewish student press", 5–19.
- ⁵⁶ McCandlish Philips, "Jewish Student Press Seeing Swift Growth," *The New York Times*, March 13, 1971.
- ⁵⁷ Mordechai Bar-On, unpublished memories (available at Yad Ben Zvi, Jerusalem), 65; Porter and Dreier, *Jewish Radicalism*, xxxi.
- ⁵⁸ Susan Eanst, "History of Middle-East Liberation Struggle," *New Left Notes*, February 28, 1969. Available at Wisconsin Historical Society Library, Microfilm P76-4828 4 2n.
- ⁵⁹ Joel Aber, "Israeli regime seeks to hold annexed land," *The Militant*, June 13, 1969; Joel Aber, "Israel gives master plan for Arab lands," *The Militant*, August 15, 1969; Joel Aber, "Israel admits napalming Lebanese," *The Militant*, September 5, 1969.
- ⁶⁰ Peter Buch, *Burning Issues of the Mideast Crisis* (New York : Merit, 1968); George Novack, *How Can the Jews Survive? A Socialist Answer to Zionism* (Toronto: Pathfinder, 1969).
- ⁶¹ Nathan Weinstock, "Anti-Zionism: why it is not anti-Semitism," *The Militant*, April 10, 1970; Nathan Weinstock, "How the state of Israel was really established," *The Militant*, April 17, 1970; Nathan Weinstock, "Is Israel a peaceable prosperous nation?," *The Militant*, April 24, 1970; Nathan Weinstock, "Israel's development as a colonial power," *The Militant*, May 1, 1970.
- ⁶² Guy Horowitz and Barry Sheppard, "Roots of the Mideast Conflict," *The Militant*, first part published November 6, 1970.
- ⁶³ Robert Lengstone, "Israeli anti-Tzioni Be-Aetzot Ha-brit," *Matzpen*, 55, September 10, 1970; Joel Britton, National office to all organizers and political committee members, February 17, 1970, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Micro 596, Reel 14, P96-2467.
- ⁶⁴ Semiannual national council meeting of API, November 13–14, 1970, Hashomer Hatzair Archive, Givaat Haviva, 3899(3)107.93.
- ⁶⁵ Kalman, *The Kids are Alright*, 46–100.
- ⁶⁶ Israel Neeman, "From the New Left to the Jewish Left: Zionist Student Activism in America from 1967–73," (MA thesis, University of Haifa, 2007), 68–70.
- ⁶⁷ Pathfinder Press Newsletter, May 1973, Tamiment Library & Wagner Labor Archives, New York University, 169, box 27, folder 1.
- ⁶⁸ Beverly Wise to members of the party National Committee, November 22, 1967, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Micro 596, Reel 13, P93-3914.
- ⁶⁹ For example: "Zionist stand refuted by Arab student," *The Militant*, November 15, 1968.

⁷⁰ Author interview with Ariel Hurwitz, Kibbutz Gal On, November 10, 2014.

⁷¹ For examples, see Yehuda Krantz, “Arab Israel conflict—a different view,” *The Militant*, December 13, 1968; Yehuda Krantz, “Finds Israel less tied to big powers,” *The Militant*, January 17, 1969; Joel Beinin, “Struggle against Zionism same as genocide?” *The Militant* January 3, 1969; A.K. “Finds in the Kibbutz ideal form of Socialism,” *The Militant*, January 17, 1969.

⁷² SWP discussion bulletin, Vol. 29, No. 27, August 1971, <https://www.marxists.org/history/etol/document/swp-us/idb/swp-1970-76-db/v29n27-aug-1971-disc-bul.pdf> (Accessed January 31, 2018).

⁷³ Gus Horowitz, *Israel and the Arab Revolution: Fundamental Principles of Revolutionary Marxism* (New York: SWP, 1973); Werner Cohn, “From Victim to Shylock and Oppressor: The New Image of the Jew in the Trotskyist Movement,” *Journal of Communist Studies* 7, no. 1 (March 1991): 46–68.

⁷⁴ See the eighth chapter in Leon’s book, titled “Toward a solution of the Jewish question,” <https://www.marxists.org/subject/jewish/leon/ch8.htm> (Accessed January 31, 2018).

⁷⁵ Jan Garret, “DeZionize Israel,” *The Militant*, January 10, 1969.

⁷⁶ Hana Niel, “A ‘Proletarian Jewish Nationalism?’,” *The Militant*, August 8, 1969.

⁷⁷ Minutes, Publishing Committee, May 19, 1969, July 21, 1969, State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison, The Socialist Workers Party, Micro 2050, Reel 87, P02-3159.