

from the left end of the political spectrum and from independents who *in toto* represent a small component of Israeli society. The content of these statements has nonetheless been important. Tel Aviv University Professor of History Benjamin Cohen, for example, has accused Begin and Sharon of "Goebbels-like lies" and of bringing about the "dejudaization of the Jews" through their "veritable blitzkrieg" in Lebanon, in a letter appearing as a full-page advertisement in France's *Le Monde* on June 19. Cohen has formed a "Committee Against the War in Lebanon," and has appealed to American Jews to take a stand against Sharon's genocide, in an interview with *EIR*.

Alluding to Begin's frequent references to Hitler and the holocaust, Cohen told *EIR*: "Who is *now* committing the crime? Begin makes the comparison with a certain person. If you compare, Begin is more and more resembling someone whom I don't care to mention." Cohen made the same point even more forcefully about Ariel Sharon: "In an interview Sharon told it openly, that he had prepared the whole thing before he was brought into the government! . . . in terms of the PLO he used the Hebrew word *hashmada*, which means extermination; this is identical to the words used by the Nazis. . . ."

Six hundred and fifty representatives of Israeli universities, the military, and other institutions have signed a public petition against the war. In a press conference announcing this initiative, Hebrew University Professor Yoshayahu Leibowitz accused the government of "fabricating a pack of lies" and using "Orwellian" language in labeling the blitzkrieg action "Peace in Galilee." He called for immediate Israeli negotiations with the PLO.

During a trip to Paris, peace advocate Gen. Matti Peled charged that Israel's most recent actions were making of the country "the Mongols of the Middle East, spreading destruction and misery" throughout the region. His colleague, Uri Avneri, stated that the absence of a constitution in Israel gave Sharon a green light, since there were no constraints on his actions. Avneri's statement echoed this writer's prior call for the creation of an Israeli constitution as a necessary instrument to reverse the moral and political degeneration Israel has been undergoing.

However, Sharon's critics have not pinpointed the role of Great Britain in having set up this crisis, through allowing the "triggering" assassination attempt on Israeli Ambassador Argov in London. The critics have thus left untouched Britain's filthy role in manipulating Middle East factions toward war, and have not identified Sharon's real pedigree as a brutish agent of the Crown's neocolonialist wars of population-reduction in the developing sector. A constructive opposition to "Israel's Vietnam" will require pinpointing British responsibility for arranging the entire despicable affair.

---

## European Jews are torn by Lebanon war

by Thierry Lalevée, from Wiesbaden

Relations between the state of Israel and the Jewish communities of Europe are being transformed as a result of Israel's invasion of Lebanon. What Israeli Prime Minister Begin and Defense Minister Sharon have done to Lebanon under the Hebrew code name of "Operation Purification" divided and traumatized European Jews, particularly those in France.

The fact that French Jews are leading the criticism of Israel has its own irony. Only a few years ago, the Begin government, finding French Jewry too passive, sought to mobilize them on Israel's behalf, directly financing new organizations such as "Jewish Renewal." A "radicalization" occurred, but not that sought by the Likud government.

Soon after the invasion began, Radio Jerusalem lambasted French Jewry not only for insufficient support of the invasion, but for showing active disapproval. Radio Jerusalem stated, "numerous cases have been noted where traditional supporters of Israel have been seen refusing to donate to Israel after prayers at the synagogue."

Eyewitnesses reported that fights broke out between the unconditional supporters of Israel and the "refuseniks." The occurrences were hushed up to avoid publicity, but the crisis was out in the open. Fights among Jews, an unprecedented phenomenon, grew to dramatic proportions. On June 15, several Jewish organizations, some of them known for their association with the Israeli peace movement, organized a demonstration of 500 in front of the Israeli embassy in Paris where Israeli Foreign Minister Shamir was speaking to the press.

The demonstration was assaulted by the "Jewish Renewal" group and the hardcore youth group of the Likud, the Betar, known for its thuggery. Demonstrators and attackers exchanged epithets of "anti-Semite" and "shameful Jew." Similar demonstrations were organized in front of the Israeli embassies in Bonn, West Germany and Vienna. On June 22 the Israeli ambassador to Bonn was prevented from speaking at a public event by a group of demonstrators composed primarily of German Jews. That this could happen at all was a sign, said German representatives, of a sweeping change in attitude toward Israel.

Most of the mainstream Jewish communities have

stayed out of these demonstrations, due to an inability to resolve the "moral dilemma," as a French Jewish leader expressed it, "between our support for Israel and the revulsion against its actions in Lebanon." The same strata did not hesitate to contribute financially to the campaign of those who did decide to go public. Hundreds of paid advertisements were published by various professional, political, and religious groups willing to express their opposition to Israel. These included a letter published by Pierre Vidal Naquet in France, from his Israeli friend, Professor Benjamin Cohen, denouncing the "Goebbels-type lies" of the Likud government to its own population. Others were calls to members of "the three religions of Abraham" to join to end the fighting.

Then there were the activities of the peace movement as such. On June 17, a press conference in Paris organized by the Orientalist Maxime Rodinson featured Israeli peaceniks General Peled and Uri Avneri, who had recently participated at the founding conference of the "International Jewish Peace Union" sponsored by the Paris-based magazine *Israel and Palestine*. The conference's final communiqué had called for an "immediate Israeli withdrawal to the international border" and upheld "the right to national self-determination of the Palestinian and Israeli peoples within the framework of the two states."

### The case of Nahum Goldmann

Summing up the statements of the peace movement and the sentiments of those who had decided to remain silent was a series in the French dailies *Le Monde* and *Liberation* by Nahum Goldmann, founder of the World Jewish Congress. The views of this once-isolated figure are finding wide echoes.

In one article in *Liberation*, Goldmann raised the courage and determination of the Israeli people, but warned against "transform[ing] Israel in certain ways into a protectorate of the United States that would contradict the meaning of Zionism itself: Jews could not have suffered through two millennia only to see their ancestral fatherland being dependent on the good will of a superpower.

"The only hope for a peaceful solution lies in a change of policy of the superpowers, which up to now have contented themselves with making platonic declarations. Concerning the United States, they tried to eliminate the Soviet Union from any agreement in the Middle East, something which is impossible. . . . The joint pressures of the superpowers could bring Israel and the Arab states to recognize each other and to establish relations—initially of cooperation, later of friendship, [announcing] a new era of political, economic, and cultural development for Israel as well as for the other countries of this region. . . ."

---

## Latin America

---

# Which policies for post-war Argentina?

by Mark Sonnenblick

Argentina's top military leadership still has not come to grips with the fact that Britain's war against it was not for mere possession of some God-forsaken islands, but was for the larger "principles" which have always motivated England's imperial system. London's *Daily Telegraph* contemptuously enunciated those principles in a June 21 editorial message to a rudderless Argentina: "Whoever leads Argentina next will have to gain acceptance for a degree of austerity which its hedonistic society has never known."

Important sectors of the army appear to be taking economic marching orders directly from Argentina's enemy, as per the *Daily Telegraph* dictum. The army high command has unilaterally appointed retired General Reynaldo Bignone as President, effective July 1. Bignone is a committed advocate of the British-inspired monetarist policies which, since 1976, have ravaged not only Argentine industry and society, but also its war-winning capabilities.

The navy and air force—cognizant that the continuation of such policies would sink Argentina into civil war—withdrew from the government. The army is thus presented with the problem of ruling a three-legged junta with one leg, a sure recipe for instability. It hopes that British and American backing for such an arrangement will enable it to consolidate its power.

The other two services have pulled their officers out of all government positions and reportedly opened contact with dissident generals, colonels, and other army officers, and with civilian forces from the "Multipartidaria" umbrella group of opposition political parties, who also want an end to monetarism. The Buenos Aires daily *Clarín* revealed June 20 that a 35-point ultimatum presented by Navy Commander Anaya in April to then-president Galtieri included a demand that Friedmanite Economics Minister Roberto Alemann be fired and his monetarist policies reversed. The air force has also drafted an economic program for Argentina's post-war recuperation, which includes salvaging Argentine industry and restoring workers' incomes stolen by Alemann's wage freeze.

What's at stake is Argentina's foreign debt of nearly \$40 billion. Everybody recognizes that even with the