the Arabs have ever used this expression against those who have pushed them around.

Nor do we know if the Arabs have referred to the Israelis who chased about 900,000 of them from their pitiful holdings and refuse to aid them in any way as anti-semites.** Although races and even distinct groupings within the same race have been pretty well broken down over the years, we believe that the Arabs would have more justification in branding as anti-semitic the Europeanized and Americanized Israelis who crossed the Jordanian border recently and perpetrated a Lidice***, even if on a small scale, of their own against the Arab village of Kibyah. As was the case in the justification for Lidice by the Nazis, the wiping out of the 56 inhabitants of Kibyah was explained by the Israeli government as a "retaliatory" act against the slaying of Israeli citizens by Arab raiders.

There is of course the Arab answer that the terrorism was started by the Israelis against them and that the Arabs who raided and attacked Israeli farms and individuals were some of those who had been hounded from their homes by the Jews. To the socialist who sees cause and effect as inter-related rather than distinctly separate parts of a question, the quarrel over who started it all becomes just so much sound.

Even a cursory examination shows that the Arab nations, although divided among themselves to a much greater extent than what is popularly imagined, not to mention being also split into mutually hostile economic classes, prefer to maintain the armed truce with Israel until such time as they are better able to prosecute all-out war. On the other hand, the fact that Israel would like to divert water from Syria and annex land from her other neighbors would not make for friendly feeling toward her by the Arab rulers. To the Israeli government and the Jordanian rulers the extermination of Kibyah might have been "caused" by the previous Arab terrorism which was "caused" by the previous Jewish terrorism which was "caused" by the previous Arab terrorism, and so on, but the serious student of modern society finds the cause in the class, commodity nature of the world in which we live and seeks the answer in a revolutionary new society.

According to **U. S. News & World Report for Nov. 6, 1953, "Many U. S. officials believe . . . that only resettlement in other Arab countries can end their miserable plight." But it appears that the other Arab countries do not want this problem dumped in their laps.

***A town in Czechoslovakia wiped out by the Nazis in World War II.

ANOTHER COUNTRY HEARD FROM

Regardless of the question as to who caused what, however, the situation in the Near East is anything but pleasant for the Arab nations, the Jewish State or for that matter for the United States or Great Britain who would like to keep both sides quiet while they reap the profits from the oil industry in that part of the world. And now, to make matters still worse for these nations, *U. S. News & World Report* in its issue for Oct. 30, '53 informs us that West Germany has made a phenomenal come-back in world trade and particularly in the Middle East. The U. S. and Britain, the article states are "losing out from Cairo to Tehran."

It seems that in Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Israel, Egypt, and Yemen, Germany has either already out-stripped her two western conquerors in trade, or is paving the way for control of the area by advising on finance and training armies as in the case with Syria, and Egypt, replacing British engineers, railway technicians, and oil men with her own.

Fantastic as this swift come-back by a thoroughly defeated nation may seem, the concluding paragraph of the above mentioned article which sets forth the reason for this come-back is even more fantastic. Believe it or not, here it is:

"The German challenge shows no signs of a letup. American and British competitors are howling for help from their governments. But, until West Germany's industrial plant is required to fill its share of Europe's arms orders, until West Germany gets an Army of its own, the Germans in the Middle East are likely to cling to the business and the jobs they have won and keep pressing for more."

Once upon a time we were informed that Germany had become a great trading nation and a great threat to the interests of "freedom" and "democracy" because she, being military-minded, had built up a frightful army and had forced her trade on the world. Now, we learn that Germany is once more becoming a nation to contend with and worry over because she *does not have* an army to maintain and that this situation must be remedied forthwith by forcing her to once more assume her militaristic "nature."!**** How ridiculous can the apologists for capitalist wars of "freedom" get before the working class wises up to the hopelessness of the economic system they suffer under?

We do not expect much in the way of understanding from the miserably poor Arab peasant. The majority of the Israeli workers, coming as they do from Europe and America might be expected to show a somewhat higher degree of solidarity at least among themselves and an inclination to look a little askance at the myth of a common bond between them and their own capitalists, even if they do not appreciate the common interests with their fellow non-Jewish workers throughout the world. Upon examination, however, we find that such is not the case and the same sort of superficial and artificial differences as to economic "rank," country of origin, etc. exists among themselves that we find throughout the capitalist world in general.

****The same process is taking place in Japan where we observe Vice-Pres. Nixon insisting on Japanese rearmament and admitting the U. S. A. "erred" in disarming the Japanese in the first place.

We can only hope that the rapidly worsening world situation together with the slackening in the economic boom will have some effect in creating this feeling of solidarity among the workers in all countries that is so sorely needed. An understanding of their class position, a knowledge of the rudiments of socialism and a desire to institute a sane system of society are the requisites for an assured future.

HARMO

THE FLAVOR LASTS

QUESTION: Do the ethics of the opposing groups in the world today differ much from each other?

ANSWER: Not that you can notice. The ethics adopted by all of them indicate that they are out to grab all that is grabable. They are much the same ethics as warlike tribes made use of in their jungle haunts. The only difference is to be found in the involved, circumlocutory methods in vogue today. The jungle folk were direct actionists. The modern campaigners skip, slide, twist, and sashay in moving toward their goal.

The nature of the capitalist ethical code is well exemplified by an international trading deal following World War II. The United States having on hand a large fleet of ships that were of no immediate use, and having temporary allies in Europe that might be organized to protect American interests, distributed the ships to the worthy allies at nominal prices and on a credit basis.

The recipients of the Liberty fleet were quick to sense that something known as profits could be made by engaging in trade in the world market. This was soon extended, in the quest for larger profits, to trading with "enemy" nations, strategic war materials to Russia and China.

The ethical code of the joint partners, in their search for profits, smells like a stuffy pool room with overtones of second hand garlic.

J. A. M.