

communist party of israel
central committee · tel aviv

August 1970

P. O. B. 1843

6

IN THIS ISSUE:

START THE NEGOCIATIONS! ★ S. MIKUNIS:
ON THE CROSSROADS ★ M. SNEH: MILITARY
CONFRONTATION AND POLITICAL CONFRON-
TATION ★ PALESTINIAN ARABS FOR PEACE ★
B. BALTI: THE PALESTINIAN ELEMENT ★ Y.
SILBER: TACTICS AND PRINCIPLES ★ SOLIDARY
WITH INDOCHINA'S PEOPLES ★★★

HX
632
A1
W9
NO. 1112

MAIN



CONTENTS

DOCUMENTS

Start the Negotiations!	3
-------------------------------	---

EVENTS OF THE MONTH

S. Mikunis: On the Crossroads	5
M. Sneh: Military Confrontation and Political Confrontation ...	7
Big Power Manoeuvres	11
Peace initiative will Prevent Imposed Settlement	13
On Three Blunders of the G. Meir Government	13
MAKI Criticizes Knesset Debate on Soviet Jewry	16
Emergency Regulations Must Be Discontinued	16

PALESTINIAN ARABS FOR PEACE

Anwar Nusseiba in an Interview with KOL HAAM	18
Sheikh Ali Ja'abari writes to MAKI's Arabic Monthly	21

COMMENTS

S. Mikunis: Encouraging the Capitalists and attacking the Workers - even in War-Time?	22
R. Teitelbaum: The Agreement with the European Common Market	26
B. Balti: The Palestinian Element - and Israeli Inactivity	27

ISRAEL - AND ABROAD

French Leftists Visit Israel	31
Lebanese Communist Leader Denies Israel's Right to Exist	32
Y. Silber: Tactics - and Principles	35
Solidary with the Peoples on Indochina	39
The Romanian Communist Party Thanks MAKI	39

Please, dear readers, ensure our work to arouse world public opinion for a genuine peace in the Middle East, and ensure regular receipt of your copy -

BY FORWARDING TO US YOUR SUBSCRIPTION FEES!

Regular mail	\$ 4. -
Air mail to Europe	\$ 6. -
Air mail to U. S. A. , Canada	\$ 8. -
Air mail to Latin America, Australia	\$ 9. -

DOCUMENTS

START THE NEGOTIATIONS!

C. P. I. BUREAU COMMUNIQUE

The government of Israel should immediately respond affirmatively to the new American proposals for a political solution of the Middle East crisis, especially after the consent of the Soviet Union, Egypt and Jordan.

The government of Israel is bound and entitled to add to its consent the following demands:

- a) During the cease-fire period, however long it last, effective control must be maintained to prevent changes in the existing military positions. It must also be guaranteed that the cease fire equally bind the Palestinian sabotage organisations operating from the territories of the Arab countries,
- b) At the end of the negotiations to be held under the auspices of Dr. G. Jarring, it is imperative to achieve a peace agreement between the parties.
- c) The "secure, recognised borders" to which Israel is required to withdraw from the cease fire lines - as all other provisions of the Security Council resolution - shall be determined by an agreement between the parties, in accordance with paragraph No. 3 of the said resolution.

In the fourth year of the war, it has become clear beyond all doubt, that the war of attrition and the bloodshed did not and will not lead to the subjugation of one party by the other, and that the solution of the tragic situation can be only to establish a just, lasting peace between the belligerent parties, based on the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, that is to take into account the guaranty of the legitimate rights of Israel and the Arab countries alike.

The trends in the "Unity" government for territorial annexations are the reason why Israel is today forced to respond to the proposals drafted by others instead of compelling others to respond to the Israeli peace initiatives. However, even after a delay, the government of Israel must respond quickly to these latest American proposals. "Herut"'s quitting the cabinet will only facilitate the execution of the initiated, consistent policy of peace.

The assessment of the C. P. I. Bureau is that despite the importance of the above reservations, the decisive importance lies in the very change

that has occurred in the situation, in the start of negotiations and the cessation of fighting, in the change opened for the achievement of peace.

The government of Israel is required to give preference to peace and security, to mutual recognition of sovereignty and territorial integrity, to a withdrawal to secure, recognised, agreed boundaries, rather than to an adventurous territorial expansion that endangers our security and our national future.

An Israeli recognition of the right to self-determination of the Palestinian Arab people will further the understanding and the peace between the peoples and will limit the influence of the Palestinian sabotage organisations that deny any political settlement and peace agreement with Israel.

Tel Aviv, 30.7.70



IN SHORT

- ★ A Summer Camp - the first ever established in the Israeli occupied areas since the Six Day War - was opened at the end of July by the Ministry of Social Welfare, financed by a Swedish welfare organisation. One hundred and fifty boys, age 10-15, were among the campers, most of them from poor families and others orphans from Gaza.
- ★ The First Strike Against the Local Authorities in Gaza since the Six Day War, was held at the end of July 1970. Following a two-day strike by some 300 municipal daily workers, the Municipality agreed to nearly double their wages. The workers, who were earning about IL. 1.80 per day, demanded parity with wages paid by the Military Government - between IL. 3 to IL. 5 per day. All the strikes in the Gaza Strip up to now have been directed against the Israeli authorities.
- ★ At the Conference of the Union of Arab Cooperatives in Israel that took place in Haifa at the beginning of July, it was reported that 16 co-operative societies have joined the Arab cooperative movement in the past two years and there are now 141 Arab cooperatives with a membership of 14,000.
- ★ Recognition of a Palestinian Nation is included in the summary adopted by the group for social and political activities of the young kibbutz members affiliated to the Israel Labour Party. The conference held at the beginning of July, expressed the view that disregarding the Palestinian Arab population does not remove the roots of the Israel-Arab conflict, and that the Israel government must develop political initiatives to promote peace.

ON THE CROSSROADS

By S. Mikunis

The events of the past three years have proved very clearly, that the Soviet Union cannot identify itself with the extremist anti-Israeli Arab aspirations. Such complete self-identification does not conform with the Soviet interests, nor with the Soviet experience in our region, as in other regions, such as Indonesia. The Soviets undertook the task of helping the Arab side to liquidate the results of the Six Day War, to assist them in standing on their own feet, to reach a political solution of the problem which would be the most convenient for them, but not to strangle Israel.

On the other hand, the same events have proved that the interests of the United States are not identical with the extremist anti-Arab Israeli aspirations, with the annexationist trends. Simultaneously with the interest of preserving Israel's existence, the Americans want to preserve their own economic and political interests in the Arab countries. Just as the Soviets are not completely with the Arabs, the Americans are not completely with Israel, in spite of the advice and exaggerated love declarations on the part of Israeli statement. That is why the Americans want to reach a "reasonable" political solution of the present crisis.

It is obvious that the two big powers, quarrelling among themselves on numerous problems throughout the world, and taking into account People's China and its increasing influence among the extremist Arab circles, want to prevent a military confrontation between them in the Middle East. Such a situation induces them to seek common formulas. In the meantime they are blackmailing each other, and blackmailing mainly the Israeli and Arab sides, by various acts and declarations. As yesterday, today also, the big powers are conducting the controversies between themselves at the expense of both Israel and the Arabs.



The increased Soviet assistance to Egypt, and the growing involvement in the conflict, have created, without doubt, a difficult situation for Israel. Nobody can guarantee that aside from the internal defence of Egypt, no Soviet pilots will appear also over the cease-fire lines on the Suez Canal. Nor can anyone guarantee that they will confine themselves to the internal protection of the Egyptian skies.

In fact, considering the matter deeply and objectively, there are obviously no basic contradictions of interests between Israel and the Soviet Union. Were it not for the one-sided behaviour of the Soviet Union in our region, at Israel's expense, were it not for Soviet actions in the past and in the present at the expense of our country, Israel could live in peace and in friendship with the Soviet Union.

It is for this reason that Israel must do everything in its power to prevent a confrontation with the Soviet pilots. It is for this reason that the provocative anti-Soviet declarations of irresponsible statesmen must be stopped. We do not think that one must faint and become frightened in view of the situation that has arisen - but greater seriousness and responsibility of the government is needed.

Under the present circumstances, it is obvious that we have to defend the cease-fire lines till there is peace. Especially in this tense situation, it is necessary that the government dare to declare overtly and clearly, that it is prepared to withdraw the Israeli forces from the cease-fire lines to "agreed, secure" borders to be fixed in a peace agreement between the parties, based on the Security Council resolution of 1967. The time has definitely come that the government declare overtly and clearly, that Israel seek peace, not territorial annexation.

One must not put up today with a wait and see policy, waiting a decision from Moscow or Washington. The government of Israel should show its political independence and suggest principles for a peaceful solution with the Arabs, without attempting to evade reality, such as the issue of the Palestinian Arab people and its right to self-determination. One should never be content with bombardments on our part, however successful they be. After all, this is a political problem, and our right to exist can be defended not only by military initiative, but mainly by serious, just political initiative.

Israel must do everything to assure its contribution, its maximum contribution to peace, when approaching the crossroads. For this purpose, it is essential to dismantle the "National Unity" government that is cracking anyhow. The participation of Gahal in the government has not helped the victory in the Six Day War - but has been harming unto this day the cause of peace. It is impossible to pursue a line of peace, while a substantial part of the government prefers a "Greater Israel" without peace rather than a smaller Israel with peace.

The dismantling of the present government and establishment of a peace government, without the enthusiastic supporters of territorial annexation - is the order of the day. Changes should be made, must be made - and better now than later.

(Kol Ha'am, 25.6.70)



MILITARY CONFRONTATION AND POLITICAL CONFRONTATION

by Moshe Sneh

Three years after the Six Day War we are facing two grave problems: there is a possibility of a military confrontation with active Soviet intervention against us, and there is a possibility of a political confrontation with big power plans for the Middle East.

During the past three years we have suffered heavy casualties, we have lost dear brothers and sons. We have also lost a considerable part of the sympathy we enjoyed in the international arena before we broke through the siege. Not only abroad, but at home as well there are many who find it difficult to understand that in June 1967 we only broke through the siege, but did not remove it; we enlarged its perimeter, but it is an optical error to think that we have come out into the open space; as long as the near and remote Arab neighbourhood does not put up with us, we are under a siege. And the past three years were for us years of war - waged by political means and military means alternately - to remove the siege, to have our neighbours put up with the State of Israel, to have peace.

It is evident that all attempts to force us to retreat without peace have failed. In the beginning, immediately after the fighting had ended, an attempt was made through a special United Nations assembly to condemn us as an "aggressor" and to order us to retreat unconditionally; afterwards the attempt was repeated in the Security Council, until a resolution was adopted that does not impose any dictate on Israel and links a withdrawal with peace and secure, recognised borders, and with an agreement between the parties on every issue. When the attempt to give the resolution and the Jarring mission a false interpretation had failed, the same attempt was repeated within the framework of the talks between the two powers and the four powers. Parallel to these political measures, military measures were also adopted against us, and they, too, failed. The sabotage organisations were forced to give up the general trend to act inside Israeli territory. They

adopted a line of infiltration, and from this line, too, they were forced to retreat to the bombing of our border settlements and border roads from far away, as their main method. The regular Arab armies proceeded from isolated violations of the cease-fire to an attack aimed at destroying our positions along the cease-fire lines and at preparing the invasion of our territory, after Nasser's declaration that the cease-fire is null and void as far as he is concerned, and after he proclaimed a "war of attrition" as a stage toward a "war of liberation" (i. e. : a war of revenge). This attack ended again in shameful failure, the Israeli air-force destroyed completely the Egyptian air defence network that was built on SA. 2 missiles, and the scheme of attrition turned against the schemer. As a result of these failures, Egypt was forced to take advantage of the growing Soviet involvement (the establishment of SA. 3 missiles inside Egypt and the manning of a number of Mig-21 planes with Soviet pilots) as well as an effort to activate the "Eastern front" - the Jordanian-Iraqi and the Syrian-Lebanese front. The new difficulties and risks facing us are, therefore, only an outcome of our success in overcoming previous difficulties and in repelling previous threats.

The main danger is now that the Soviet involvement might be extended to the banks of the Suez Canal, that we might be forced to defend the cease-fire lines - the sole legitimate lines by international law that separate Israel from her neighbours till peace comes - against an attack in which Soviet soldiers will take part. I am sure that Israel will also do in the future everything to prevent such a tragic clash, and will not do anything that might be used as a pretext by the opposite side for such a purpose. Between the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and the national interests of Israel there is no such contradiction that could not be settled by way of coordination and agreement. But the command of defending the cease-fire lines is for us an international right as well as a national duty and a vital necessity of a self-defence, because a forcible breakthrough of these lines would open the way before those who are scheming Israel's subjugation and the annihilation of the Jewish State. Therefore let us defend the cease-fire lines against every attack, whoever the attacker may be. There is nothing new in this attitude of ours. As early as October 30, 1968, at the opening session of the last C. P. I. Congress we said;

"We have not wanted a rift with the Soviet Union, and we have not caused it. The whole people of Israel is interested in restoring the friendship with the great Soviet people... Therefore, we take the liberty of addressing to Moscow from this Israeli Communist platform the call: Do not lift up your hand against this bereaved people! Do not hit our little home that is gathering the displaced of a persecuted people! Do not intervene against us - and prevent a total disaster!

This people has a vehement desire for peace and does not seek annexations, but it has no choice but to defend its life, and it will do so under all circumstances. "

Today we have but to repeat word for word what we foresaw and fore-told almost two years ago.

There is reason to presume that an Israel-Soviet military confrontation will be prevented. The American intervention in Vietnam was an ill-fated affair and it serves as a lesson for every big power that it is better not to start a campaign against a small people that strains every nerve to survive, because nobody knows if the super-power will succeed in coming out of the campaign unshamed. It may be presumed that this universal lesson that was learned by the Americans is known in Moscow, and it will surely be included in the textbooks of military history. It may be presumed that they weigh there also the risk involved in an American-Soviet confrontation after the battle on the Suez Canal: it is not a matter of the Israeli self-defence relying on American intervention, unless the American counter-intervention would be a function of the Israeli stand in repelling the onslaught. Let us, Israelis, beware of inviting an American counter-intervention or relying on it, but this possibility is without any doubt the subject of deliberations of the Soviet leadership that is striving for talks, and not for a military confrontation with the United States.

The position of our Party: to prevent a military confrontation with the Soviets, to face it and not to invite American intervention. It includes our permanent principles: a desire for peace, a preparedness for national defence, not to succumb to any imperialism.

On the basis of the above considerations, we may hope that we shall be saved a military confrontation with a Soviet force, and if it is nevertheless forced upon us, we shall be able to withstand it, i. e. to defeat the attempt to dislodge us by force from the cease-fire lines and again we shall succeed in a war of defence.

If - as we do hope - the Israeli-Soviet confrontation will be avoided, the danger of a political confrontation with the United States will become more acute. Because one of the methods, and perhaps the chief method that the U.S. government is expected to employ in order to prevent a further Soviet intervention in Egypt, is to offer the Soviet Union political settlement of the Middle East crisis agreed upon between them as a kind of another Rogers Plan. For the peoples it would be better if they were left alone to settle their affairs by themselves, without the interference of the big powers and without a globalisation of the conflict. We shall be compelled,

now, to enter an argument with the United States on the political plan it proposes. Therefore, it is important for us to determine in advance on what we shall insist, fight, be obdurate. Our answer is: not on territorial profits, but on a just, lasting peace; not on a substitute for peace, such as "a cessation of belligerency" which is nothing but a synonym for an "armistice" and for a "cease-fire", but for a peace that provides an agreed solution of all the problems in dispute; a "peace" that leaves the Palestine issue open (for another war) is nothing but a fraud; let us not insist on the form of the negotiations, but on the negotiations themselves; and let us also insist on secure, recognised borders that will be drawn by a reciprocal agreement, and not by a dictate that one side imposes on the other. Whoever declares his approval of the Security Council resolution, and demands that Israel withdraw exactly to the lines that existed before June 5, 1967, evidently says two contradictory things: the resolution has expressly demanded an agreement between the parties on the borders, on demilitarisation, on the refugees, on navigation, on everything.

Disbelievers doubt if it is possible at all to achieve peace with the Arabs. Our answer is: it certainly is, but for this purpose it is necessary that several conditions be fulfilled. One of the conditions is that the Arab rulers must be dissuaded of the illusion that they alone, or with the help of the Soviet Union, will subdue Israel by war. Another condition is, that the trend of a Soviet-American accord prevails upon the trend of a confrontation in the Middle East. Lately, the conception is gaining support in the Arab capitals (Khadafi, and not only him), that to get rid of Israel, it is not worthwhile that the Arab countries subjugate themselves to a foreign power. In Egypt, there are signs of disappointment in the pan-Arab, that is, the Asian, orientation, and a trend towards African orientation in the direction of the Maghreb. This is the background of Nasser's contradictory declarations, and though he must be suspected of hypocrisy, it is to be seen if there isn't anything real in his linguistic acrobacy. And last, but not least - Israeli initiatives for the promotion of peace may make it easier to overcome obstacles on the way to peace raised by the Arab states and their supporters, may encourage the trends of peace that are hidden in the Arab camp, and bring Israel sympathy and friendship in the international arena. Out of a list of ten initiatives that we have suggested in the Knesset, the Prime Minister accepted only the first three, and with much delay, which was enough to create a crack in the wall of the "national unity" government. Hence it can be seen, how heavy is the hindrance and obstruction on the part of Gahal preventing the government from pursuing an active policy of peace initiatives. That is why we demand the disbanding of the unity government with "Herut" and the establishment of a government that will seek peace, not territorial annexations.

Just as a dividing line exists in the public between the advocates of peace and the advocates of annexations, another dividing line exists between those who are prepared to persist in Israel's political-military campaign and those who are inclined to surrender, i. e. to give up, in fact, the right to self-defence, or to put up with a real peace, or to give up even the sovereignty of the state or its link with the Jewish people. And our position is clear in respect of these two dividing lines, just as it is clear in the line that divides between the classes, between the interest of the exploiting, parasitical big capital and the interest of the workers, the overwhelming majority of the people. The C. P. I. will not stay forever alone. A differentiation has already started inside the government, a trend to the left has also started inside the Alignment. Our chief expectation is to rally with Left elements in the Israel labour movement on the basis of national responsibility and class loyalty. Under complicated and difficult circumstances we are fighting for another government - under the banner of peace and social justice; for a change in the alignment of the workers parties - under the banner of socialism; for the immunisation of the youth and intelligentsia against the bacilli of national nihilism, national self-denial and self-annihilation - under the banner of national responsibility for Israel's fate.

(Kol Ha'am, 18.6.70)



BIG POWER MANOEUVRES

It is very difficult to discern the hidden threads of the complex diplomatic game, but generally it may be said that each of the two world powers seeks to achieve its own goals, and its allies or protégés are considered by the powers in the first instance as pawns for reaching their objectives. We certainly do not err much if we presume that the Americans are primarily interested in removing the Soviet Union's physical presence from Egypt, and from their point of view it will be worthwhile if the Soviet Union rescinds its involvement in exchange for U.S. pressure for an Israeli withdrawal. This is not so from Israel's point of view. For her it is an absolutely unprofitable deal, and these differences determine the limits of the partnership between the U. S. A. and Israel.

Regarding the Soviet Union - her central objective is surely to increase her foothold in the Middle East, or, in the language of the Soviet press - "in the Arab East". The Soviet plan for a settlement, as it was published in the bulletin of the Soviet Embassy in London, conforms this basic aim. On one hand, it is adapted to the "no's" of the Khartoum conference (no peace, no recognition, no negotiations with Israel) and therefore it is apt to strengthen the Soviet position in the Arab countries, even if the extremists in the Arab camp - the Palestinian organisations, Syria - can and surely will find short-comings in the Soviet plan.

On the other hand, the Soviet plan is in accord with the intention of the Soviet Union to separate the conflict of 1967 (and to resolve it by way of "liquidating the Israeli aggression" and restoring the situation of June 4, 1967) from the original conflict of 1948. The paragraph in the Soviet plan that demands to resolve the refugee problem after the Israeli withdrawal, and the cessation of Arab belligerency, is destined to leave open the Palestinian problem and to enable the Soviet Union to strengthen her position by stirring it up. As long as the solution of the refugee problem does not satisfy the Palestinian organisations, they can renew the fighting under the pretext that Israel has violated the provisions of the settlement, and the Arab states, (as well as the Soviet Union), will back the Palestinians and render every support. Then events like the shelling of Nahariya will re-occur day by day - but the launching positions of the katyusha missiles will be much more convenient for the attackers.

While the powers are pursuing a strategical policy that takes into account primarily their own selfish interests, the absence of the strategical conception in the Israeli policy is most evident. It is true that Foreign Minister Abba Eban presented in his Knesset speech an attractive procedural proposal on preparations for official Arab-Israeli negotiations, but he was criticised even by government circles because he suggested merely general principles, while a concrete peace programme is needed. Not only the left wing opposition, but a spokesman of the Labour Party, MK. A. Ofer, considers Abba Eban's impractical approach to the Security Council resolution as a retreat, compared with Golda Meir's speech in the end of May.

(Kol Ha'am, 16.7.70)

★

THE MOVEMENT FOR PEACE AND SECURITY: ONLY AN ISRAELI PEACE INITIATIVE WILL PREVENT AN IMPOSED SETTLEMENT

The Movement for Peace and Security published a communique at the end of June 1970 saying:

"Two possibilities of development in the near future are emerging on the horizon of the Israel-Arab conflict: political settlement between the super-powers, to be imposed on the countries involved in the conflict (Israel and the Arab states), or, if such a coercion is unfeasible: an intensification of the battle for the domination of the Suez Canal, accompanied by a growing danger of a military confrontation between Israel and the Soviet Union. The two possibilities carry with them many dangers for Israel which the government must try to prevent. This can be done in one way only: The government must immediately launch a large-scale peace initiative.

a) It is not enough to reject proposals that we cannot accept; clear counter-proposals must be formulated, based on the Security Council resolution of November 1967 which the Prime Minister re-affirmed recently by announcing Israel's acceptance of the resolution.

b) An effort must be made to renew the mediation of Dr. Gunnar Jarring and to make possible its implementation by consenting to a limited, well-controlled cease-fire that must not be misused by the Egyptians.



ON THREE BLUNDERS OF THE G. MEIR GOVERNMENT

Prime Minister Golda Meir, delivered a political statement in the Knesset on July 1, 1970, in the wake of the declaration of the U. S. Foreign Secretary Rogers on the Israel-Arab conflict.

The Israeli Premier rejected the proposal regarding a limited cease-fire saying that Israel favours a general cease-fire without firm limit as was decided by the Security Council already in June 1967, and which was meant to serve as a transitory stage from war to peace.

Short statements were made by the representatives of the opposition factions after the Premier's statement.

In a statement on behalf of Maki, MK M. Sneh said:

"It is our stand in the national defence front that obliges and entitles me to expose the blunders and the grave negligence in the conduct of the campaign by the self-styled National Unity Government." M. Sneh specified three fundamental mistakes of the cabinet:

★ Seeing the United States and the Soviet Union only as two opposite poles and disregarding the trend for an accord existing in both of them; and subsequently trusting that the U. S. A. would back Israel just as the Soviet Union is backing the Arab countries. This was a most dangerous illusion that brought bitter disappointments. The erroneous outlook on the Soviet-American relations has also caused a neglect in the Israeli political thought about an Israeli peace plan vis-a-vis the plan that is taking shape between the powers.

★ The government did not do what is necessary in order to explain to all the international factors that Israel does not seek territorial expansion but agreed security borders of good neighbourhood. On the contrary, endless declarations by various cabinet ministers have created an opposite impression all over the political world and have not increased but rather affected the sympathy and support for Israel which we need now if we have to stand up against the U. S. policy.

★ The government has disregarded the problem of the Palestinian Arab people; without its positive solution no peace is possible. Three years ago, there was, and to a large extent there still exists, a great historical opportunity to extend a hand to a million Palestinians in the areas and to enable them to establish a national representative body of their own that will seek peace with Israel, against the sabotage organisations that bring upon their people a further disaster. But the government did the opposite. It rejected the initiative of citizens in the West Bank to organise, which could have led to an advance of both people on the basis of self-determination and peaceful coexistence. The refugees living in the Israel-held territories have been terribly neglected.

Were it not for these blunders, Israel's situation would be entirely different today.

In the beginning of his speech, M. Sneh pointed out, that it seems that a plot is under way against us between the super-powers. The one is threatening us with talks and actions, directly and indirectly, and the other

is attempting to weaken our alertness and to mislead us. And under these circumstances he would advise Israeli policy to behave according to Lenin's slogan: You shall not frighten us, you shall not deceive us.

Which are the chief criteria by which we should test every plan that is submitted by one of the international factors? asked the C.P.I. representative and answered: The first is if the plan intends to bring a peace agreement between the Arab peoples and Israel and not a substitute for peace, such as a declaration on the cessation of belligerency which is nothing but a new version of an armistice or a cease fire. The second is, if the future borders between Israel and its neighbours are to be fixed by a mutual agreement between the parties concerned and Israel withdraw to these borders from the cease-fire lines, or that the borders are stabilised by a dictate from a third party or from one party vis-à-vis the other.

The Rogers Plan, too, must be examined according to these two touchstones. Any solution that is contrary to one of these two criteria must be rejected.

And finally, when we jointly rejected the first Rogers plan eight months ago, we demanded that the Prime Minister present an Israeli peace plan. Today, too, in view of the fact of another Rogers Plan, the Premier has not announced any positive Israeli counter-plan, and this was an exceptional opportunity not to take a position towards their plan and to say what our own plan is. Therefore, the representative of Maki demanded that the government's reaction on the new Rogers plan should be evenly balanced and to the point, but at the same time the government should publish the Israeli plan that will lead to a just, lasting peace based on mutual recognition of the legitimate rights of all concerned.

★

★★ "Israel's Economic Resources are nearly equal to those of Egypt, with 32 million inhabitants, or of Iraq, Syria, Lebanon and Jordan, with a combined population of 20 million", Israeli Finance Minister Pinhas Sapir said addressing the 400 graduates at the Faculty of Social Sciences at Tel Aviv University on June 1970.

★★ Tourist Traffic to Israel has increased by eight percent in the last year, despite the grim Middle East situation, - Tourism Minister Moshe Kol said in Jerusalem on 17.6.70.

★

MAKI CRITICIZES KNESSET DEBATE ON SOVIET JEWRY

On 1.7.70 the Knesset passed to the Committee for Foreign Affairs and Security the motion of six factions demanding a debate on the situation of the Jews in the Soviet Union. The representative of Maki, M. Sneh, abstained from the voting. Explaining his abstention, M. Sneh said:

"Maki regards the historical campaign for the national rights of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union, for the democratic liberties of the public and the individual there, for the protection of man from false accusations, from violations of the Soviet law by the Soviet security services, - as the noblest human, Jewish, socialist duty. At the same time, we consider as our supreme national interest the prevention of a military intervention against us and the renewal of the normal, and even friendly relations between us and the Soviet Union. The issue is, therefore, most complicated, very delicate, very sensitive. Consequently, I do not believe that the numerous discussions on the Jewish-Soviet subject in the Knesset serve their purpose. I do not think that there could be a worse timing than now to debate the six motions."

The faction of Rakach boycotted the session in protest at "the very staging of the anti-Soviet debate which is a harmful step for the State of Israel, because it serves the purposes of the warmongers promoting the cold war in the world and kindles the fire of war in the region" (Quoted from the statement issued by the Rakach faction in the Knesset).



EMERGENCY REGULATIONS MUST BE DISCONTINUED

During the debate on the Ministry of Justice in June 1970, MK M. Sneh demanded the abolishment of the Defence (Emergency) Regulations of 1945 that serve as the judicial basis of the administrative arrests. The Communist deputy quoted from the Knesset protocol, Vol. 9, p. 1828, the resolution adopted by the Israeli parliament on May 22nd, 1951, reading: "The Knesset resolves that the Defence Regulations (Emergency) 1945 still existing in Israel since the British administration, contradict the foundations of a democratic state, and hereby instructs the Constitutional and Legal Affairs Committee to bring before the Knesset within two weeks a draft law for the abrogation

of the above regulations." This resolution has existed for nineteen years and has not been implemented till this day. I trust that the Minister of Justice will obey this resolution of the Knesset as soon as possible and will bring us Israeli regulations instead these regulations of 1945. Their contents are to be discussed by the Knesset. If regulations are necessary, they should be drafted by the government of Israel and confirmed by the Knesset after the normal legislative procedures.

I think it is a duty to honour the resolution that was once adopted almost unanimously by the Knesset, by a majority of 53 against 1 - said M. Sneh.



THE FACTORY WAS CLOSED DOWN BUT THE WORKERS CONTINUED WORKING

The Jerusalem Yarn Mill was closed down on July 1st, 1970, by a decision of the management. Nevertheless the workers came to operate the machinery as usual.

The factory managers claim that the enterprise is not profitable enough. 220 workers are threatened with dismissals.

The workers announced that they are acting in accordance with a recommendation of the economic ministerial committee and the Knesset Committee for Economic Affairs that the factory be operated for another two months until a committee of experts determines whether production can be made profitable.

The C. P. I. branch committee in Jerusalem published a leaflet expressing solidarity with the just struggle of the factory workers. It may be noted that this is the first case in Israel that workers did not allow to close down a factory and resisted their dismissals by continuing production on their own responsibility:



PALESTINIAN ARABS FOR PEACE

ANWAR NUSSEIBA, EAST JERUSALEM PALESTINIAN POLITICIAN, IN AN INTERVIEW WITH "KOL HA'AM": "U. N. RESOLUTIONS ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ISRAEL AND THE REFUGEES QUESTION MUST BE RESPECTED"

"It is a fact that Israel was established as a result of the U. N. resolution, by an agreement between the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world assembled at the United Nations. I feel that the decision of the world organisation was an important fact regarding the establishment of the State of Israel, and I do not think that it should be under-estimated. It would be a good deed if we respected more strictly the U. N. O. decisions in connection with Israel: The establishment of the State, the issue of the refugees, etc." - declared Anwar Nusseiba, an important Arab personality of East Jerusalem, who had been Minister of Defence in the Kingdom of Jordan, in an interview published in "Kol Ha'am".

The Security Council resolutions - a good foundation

In reply to the questions posed by the interviewers, Com. Ya'aqov Silber and Raoul Teitelbaum, Anwar Nusseiba explained his view that "the Security Council resolution of November 1967 is a very important, a very good resolution and a good start. If both sides accept it, the future can be built on it."

It is true, the Security Council resolution does not expressly mention the Palestinian Arab people, but it is included in it. The problem affects it in the first instance. It is true that Nasser cannot decide in the matters of the Palestinian Arab people, but it is possible and necessary that its representatives, too, participate in the discussions on a "package deal".

There are also moderate Palestinians

Question: Obviously the Palestinian organisations are against any political solution. How is this compatible with your view?

Answer: And what choice have they when the government of Israel is not prepared to propose anything to them and years are passing by? But besides the "liberation organisations" there are also others whose voice is not heard, and within the framework of discussions between Israel and the Arab countries and the Palestinians, they too, should have their say.

Question: Our Party, the Communist Party of Israel - Maki - has demanded, ever since the fighting ended, to enable the Arab population in the Israel-held areas to set up a democratic representative body and to give them self-rule with the aim of discussing with these representatives, the demands of the Palestinians, and to make possible, when peace comes, the full implementation of their right to self-determination. What is your opinion about that?

Answer: Democracy is in my opinion an important tool, but a tool only - the principal thing is the content, and when it has no content it can serve, what is its usefulness, what is the purpose of creating the tool? People in the occupied areas are living in conditions of occupation, how can elections be held there? Evidently, even if your intentions are the best, the holding of elections will be regarded as a fraud and the elected - as collaborators.

The problem of Jerusalem, too, can be solved by a compromise

Asked by the interviewers how, in his opinion, the problem of Jerusalem can be resolved without re-dividing the city, without restoring the concrete wall, Anwar Nusseiba replied:

What applies to the whole country, applies also to Jerusalem. If we achieve a peaceful settlement, we definitely shall not want a concrete wall between our Jerusalem and your Jerusalem. I shall certainly not like barbed wire fence between us; I like to meet friends on your side and to have them as guests here in my house. But, as we recognise two different entities, we have to recognise accordingly two sovereignties and their own administrations in Jerusalem, guaranteeing a free approach of each to the other side. Thus, by observing our entities, our sovereignties and our administrations, we can perhaps cooperate in the future for something we have in common.

But to start on your side annexing Arab Jerusalem and to say: this is ours, - this would, I think, exclude the possibility of any settlement. Therefore, let us look at Arab Jerusalem the same way as at all the territories: As an occupied area till a settlement is reached, and then our Arab sovereignty will be recognised - and, if you want, by reciprocally guaranteeing a free approach. "

Cease-fire - yes; accomplished facts - no!

Question: We wish to raise now the question of cease-fire. Maki insists on the demand to respect the Security Council resolution on a cease-fire, promoting of course at the same time a peace-settlement, for instance by Rhodes-type talks. What has to be done, in your opinion, to achieve this?

Answer: I have no special opinion, because I agree to the cease-fire; I do not think that war solves anything and that an escalation will help. Just as they did not help in the past, they won't help in the future. Naturally, a cease fire must be connected with the solution of the problem on the basis of the elementary resolution. One must not use the cease-fire in order to create a new "accomplished fact" - as Israel did de facto in Jerusalem, in the Jordan Valley, in the Golan. Obviously, this is not the intention of the cease-fire. Therefore, I should say that it is meant for a process of resolving the problem and not for a process of its complication.

Question: Arab leaders have argued that Israel's "recognised" borders to which the Security Council resolution refers are the borders of the 1947 partition. How do you see it?

Answer: Indeed, these things have a significance. I do not deny it. The significance is, simply, that the only internationally recognised borders of the State of Israel, are those decided upon in 1947. Juridically (Dr. Nusseiba is also a lawyer) this is, I think, the truth. The Israelis could create new borders as a result of battles. It may be true from the de facto point of view, that it is impossible to amend the new borders without causing new suffering, but I don't see anything wrong in noting the fact that Israel's recognised borders are those decided upon by the international commonwealth in 1947.

The borders of 1967 with reciprocal amendments

Question: But this rouses a hard problem, because one must ask what will be the basis of the peace agreements: the borders of the armistice agreement or the borders of 1947. If the basis should be 1947, it is obvious that this will make it still more difficult, because then there is, in fact, no chance for an agreement. That is so because the State has absorbed mass immigration from socialist and Arab countries of which nobody was thinking in 1947. Neither was the friendly Arab state established that would have made possible complicated border lines as were drawn in the original resolution. Don't you, too, think that these facts logically exclude the demand for the borders of 1947?

Answer: I think you are right, and the Arab countries have also admitted it. When they accepted the Security Council resolution of 1967, they were thinking mainly of the armistice lines. But it must be remembered that these borders were never confirmed as permanent borders. They were imposed only by military force, were recognised as a military necessity. I assume that they are a subject for negotiations, to be finally determined

according to the principles of justice for both parties. The deliberations must take into account issues of democracy, economy, communications, an outlet to the sea; all these must be discussed.

But fundamentally, if the Arab countries say they accept the resolution, it means they accept the situation as it has developed till 1967, excluding those amendments that will be necessary because of the reasons I have mentioned here.



THE MAYOR OF HEBRON: BETTER ONE HOUR OF PEACE THAN A
THOUSAND HOURS OF WAR

Sheikh Muhammed Ali Ja'abari, the Mayor of Hebron, is much alert to the views aired in Israel, and naturally he appreciates the democratic public opposition in the country against acts of injustice or discrimination of the Arab population and of the inhabitants of the Israel-held territories. This alertness of Mr. Ja'abari is also reflected in the letter he sent to the editor of "Saut Al-Sha'ab", the Arabic language C. P. I. organ.

The editorial article of its issue No. 9 dealt with the opposition against the building of a Jewish quarter in Hebron. The same issue published details on the action taken by the C. P. I. faction in the Knesset against the sequestration of lands near Hebron and an interpellation to the Ministry of Security as well as a report stressing that the establishment of a Jewish quarter in Hebron under the present circumstances does not improve but is detrimental to security.

Sheikh Ja'abari writes in his letter of 6.6.70 to the editor of "Saut Al-Sha'ab":

"Considering that the attention to these issues was correct, to the benefit of the public and of the preservation of general security, which we need most, - I thank you for your appreciable attention and hope it will enlighten the people of Israel and bring the maximum benefit, because one hour of security and peace is better than a thousand hours of war and ruin."



COMMENTS

ENCOURAGING THE CAPITALISTS AND ATTACKING THE WORKERS - EVEN IN WAR-TIME?

by S. Mikunis

This is the fourth year that the people and the State of Israel have been holding out in a heavy military campaign on the cease-fire lines. Special, vital weight is added today to the most difficult political campaign that seeks officially to find a political solution for the Israel-Arab crisis. This is a most difficult campaign for Israel, because the political equipment of the "unity government" for the purpose of this campaign is very poor; because for three consecutive years, since the Six Day War, the cabinet, in its present composition, was unable to combine a just military defence with a just peace policy, with peace initiatives in general; because the trends of territorial expansion inside the government have constantly outweighed the trends of readiness to prefer peace to areas. Political omissions in the issue of a peace, that should be based on the principles of safeguarding Israel's rights and security without infringing upon the rights of the Arab side, including the Palestinian Arab people and, furthermore - acts of colonization of an annexationist nature in the Israel-held areas have not prepared Israel adequately to stand in the serious political campaign evolving presently, and in which the big powers that are friendly between themselves are those that intend to play the leading role.

Our campaign is composed of several important "items" in which the social situation and the social morality play a very important part. This was always true and is still more so in times of war when the sensitivity of the public is most developed. Everybody knows that a juster society is stronger, and this strength is most vital for our people and our country to let us overcome the Israel-Arab crisis unscarred, to guarantee our right to exist and our national security.

However, to our regret, it is also the domestic policy of the unity government, and perhaps in the first instance this policy, that is in striking contradiction to the war-time requirements. This domestic policy, and mainly the economic-social policy, which has always been anti-popular, has worsened in recent years. While the government fosters a policy encouraging the capitalists, costing the treasury hundreds of millions pounds and upsetting the development of the national economy, it increasingly disowns the vital interests of the working people compelling them to fight for every

penny under grievances and defamations in the well-known style of employers who are not concerned with the national interests but with their profits.

Even the official balance sheets of the foreign and local capitalist corporations; even the statistics of the capitalists' profits that are "modified" for the purpose of concealing income from the income tax authorities - even they point to growing enrichment of the rich, despite the war and the state of emergency. And on the other hand, the "average" figures of the employees' income point to a further pauperisation. When we are talking about the working people, we mean the overwhelming majority of the wage-earners in Israel.

The "package deal" has grown a beard, but the stability of prices and taxes which was its original purpose, while rejecting the just demands of the workers, is far off. Still before this unhappy deal was concluded, the prices of the mass consumer goods were already soaring. In the course of time, an indirect rise of municipal taxes has taken place, as well as a rise of the costs of various municipal services. According to The Histadruth Institute of Economic and Social Research, the cost-of-living index in January-May has increased by 3%. (When and how will the wage-earners be compensated, if at all?) The Finance Ministry is planning a new rise of taxes. Indeed, many are the requirements of the security services, but the Manufacturers Association, the Coordinating Committee of the Economic organisations, demand a raise in indirect taxes, which fall heavily on the shoulders of the popular masses and create an "equality" between the poor and rich; while others, including the Histadruth leaders, demand a rise in direct taxes which is a more just measure, but - again - it will be paid chiefly by the workers, as usual, and they will not have the full freedom to fight for wage increases and improvement of social conditions.

"The workers of Israel", - says the Histadruth Secretary-General (in Ashdod) "are ready to spend their blood and money without reservation for the State of Israel, but not for the Israeli contractors." These words are as true as daylight, but the truth is that the workers of Israel are forced to contribute too much "for the Israeli contractors" as well, as a result of the government policy that is encouraging the capitalists and curbing the class struggle, also as a result of the policy of the majority in the Histadruth leadership which has "succeeded" in systematically gaining the antipathy of the working class, as Golda Meir stated after the last elections to the Histadruth Congress.

According to Ben-Aharon's statement in "Davar", "80% of Israel's workers are already living today in a regime of war" (as far as sacrifices are concerned - S. M.) and he demands equal sacrifices from the others, too.

The Secretary-General warned of any initiative to give up Histadruth assets at a time when "the banks, the contractors and the importers continue making profits in war time. It is impermissible that the rich get richer and the poor - poorer... as long as there is no control of profits, prosperity and luxuries, we shall not accept a state control of wages and social conditions". This is a correct description of the situation, though a little "smoothed down", but the main thing is the gap existing between true words and acts. "For the time being" we are thankful to the Histadruth Secretary General for the right words. In any case, the workers of Israel will not object to pass from words to actions, if the majority in the Histadruth leadership changes its way and supports the Histadruth members in their just struggles.

The situation, "for the time being", is not splendid in this respect. Strikes break out one after the other in various sectors of production and services, after negotiations have been dragged on for years. Workers are being faced with dismissals in the Jerusalem Yarn Mills, in "Wooltex" Afula, in Beisan and other places. Learned and honourable professors who do not know the secret that "a just society is stronger" and that this is an important condition for the success of our security and political campaigns, are favouring a "devaluation" and a "recess" which must cause more unemployment, bitterness and despair among the workers, while they are making an effort to defend Israel without saying a word. And if these suggestions are not yet accepted officially, the authorities are taking the side-road of "slowing down the economic activities" involving all the destructive results with regard to unemployment as well as with regard to the interest of exports. This, too, is clearly indicated in Ben-Aharon's Ashdod speech, stating rightly, that "unemployed cannot build a homeland and cannot fight with devotion" (quoted from "Davar").

Unemployment started throwing its shadow upon the working people, on the State of Israel in general. It injures not only the unemployed, the lowest paid sections, but it is exploited and will be still more exploited by the employers of all kinds in order to hold down the workers' wages and their social conditions, in order to carry on a regime in which the rich get richer and the poor - poorer. It is not accidental that the coordinating committee of the economic organisations hurried to condemn Ben Aharon's statement in Ashdod. It is not accidental that the big bourgeoisie is roaring against the "heretic words" of the Histadruth Secretary-General and others who take a stand at the side of the workers be it only verbally, because they are really afraid that these words, too, might strengthen the working class in its just demands.

The sale of 26% of the shares in the profitable Haifa oil refineries to the "Israel Corporation", a foster-child of the Millionaires Conference that took place in Jerusalem after the Six Day War, is a further scandal in the series of extraditions of state enterprises into the hands of the big foreign capitalists. The scandal transcends by far all other scandals of this kind, because the "Corporation" was destined, as was enthusiastically proclaimed at the Millionaires' Conference, to establish new enterprises, to mobilise large funds for the substantial expansion of the Israeli economy and to guarantee its steadfastness also for the sake of the country's security. It turned out that "the mountain gave birth to a rat". The capital mobilised by the "Corporation" reached less than 20 million dollars and the "Corporation" infiltrated, like a parasite, existing profitable enterprises, as it was unwilling to risk the establishment of new ventures.

It takes too long to specify the economic failures and the social and moral injuries inflicted upon the national economy and the working people by the government policy of encouraging the capitalists. It is high time that the Labour Party cease learning the doctrine of labour from "Herut" and social relations from the big bourgeoisie - even if preached by educated professors. It is just the state of emergency that compels the government and Histadruth to adopt a policy of hegemony of the labour movement and not of the big capitalists. Not an enrichment of the millionaires at the expense of the nation's funds and the expansion of the social inequality, not an encouragement of the capitalists, but a policy of encouraging the creative toil - manual and spiritual alike - will strengthen the morale and the unity of the Israeli society that are so badly needed for our successful stand in the national and class campaigns, - that is to say, for the whole of Israel.

These vital changes will not come by themselves. For their realisation the workers must rally, must not be afraid of boycotts and defamations by the employers and their executives in the government and in the Histadruth, and fight for their humane existence. The fate of the working people, the fate of all Israel lies in the hands of the manual and spiritual toilers who have always displayed more than ever their national and class loyalties.

(Kol Ha'am, 2.7.70)



THE AGREEMENT WITH THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

by Raul Teitelbaum

After many years of contacts, talks and wide-spread diplomatic activity, the preference agreement between Israel and the countries of the European Common Market was signed this week in Brussels. Although this agreement may be considered, under prevailing circumstances, as a minor political success for Israel, it indicates the striking failure of the European orientation advocated by Ben Gurion and his close associates in the fifties and early sixties. Economically, this preference agreement does not contain any special economic advantages for Israel, though it grants, in the long run, a certain stability of our international trade relations and removes the threat that was facing our exports to the six countries of the Market, in particular the danger to the export of citrus fruit.

It is significant that last Monday, when Foreign Minister Abba Eban signed the agreement, the Market signed a similar agreement with Spain. But Madrid achieved from the economic point of view better conditions than those granted to Israel. The agreements that were signed some time ago between the Market countries and Morocco and Algeria were far more advantageous for the Maghreb countries. Before the agreement with Madrid, an agreement was signed between the countries of the Market and Yugoslavia. Compared with this agreement, we are a little better off. Subsequently, Israel is between Spain and Yugoslavia regarding relations with the Common Market. Truly, in Jerusalem the hope was expressed that in another three and a half years, when talks start, to draft a new agreement with the Common Market, political circumstances may be different, and the European Market countries may show a more sympathetic approach to Israel's basic demands for a status of a Common Market associate, a status that was granted to Greece and Turkey. But this is a distant hope, and the future will tell if it becomes true.

Meanwhile there is a preference agreement, in which Israel has undertaken to grant 30% lower customs rates on various transmitting equipment imported from the Market countries. But these reductions do not include imported consumer goods, such as radios, television sets, or passenger cars. On the other hand a 15% duty reduction will be allowed on imported washing machines, newspaper stock, leather and shoes, raw materials for the plastic industries, various kinds of threads, etc. Our correspondent was told that generally there will be no customs reductions on goods imported from the Common Market, the customs duties on which exceed 60%, in order to keep the income of the Treasury unchanged.

Despite the efforts on the part of the Israeli representatives, a number of Israeli industrial products were not allowed any customs reductions in the Common Market countries. Other industrial products were granted a 50% reduction. Customs duties on citrus fruit will be reduced by 40%. Our export of fresh fruit and vegetables will not be allowed any duty reduction.

The mutual reductions will come into force within 5 years. The scope of the customs reductions that Israel will enjoy in the beginning of 1974 in the Common Market countries will total about 15 million Israel pounds. Parallel to these reductions, Israel will grant the Market countries customs reductions totalling more than 10 million IL. This is, for the time being, the practical profit of the agreement.



THE PALESTINIAN ELEMENT - AND THE ISRAELI INACTIVITY

B. Balti

The agreement signed on July 10, 1970 in Amman between the government of Jordan and the central committee of the Palestinian sabotage organizations contains 16 paragraphs, and was reached by the mediation of a four-member "reconciliation commission" - including representatives of Egypt, Algeria, Libya and Sudan. This new agreement extends the rule of the sabotage organisations compared with the cease fire agreement concluded between the King and the saboteurs on June 10, and limits the authority of the King and his government considerably.

The agreement of July 10 reflects the process of the King's diminishing rule and the strengthening of the Palestinian element in Jordan, but none of the two parties is yet strong enough to enforce a final decision. Hussein is unable to subdue Yasser Arafat, while the terror organisations are for the time being unable and unwilling to take the full power into their hands. They prefer, at this stage, to act behind the king's emblem.

This is clear from one of the 16 paragraphs of the agreement. This paragraph promises the sabotage organisations freedom of action along the Israeli border, naturally within the framework of Jordanian sovereignty. It is true that the same paragraph speaks of a coordination between the Palestinian organisations and the forces of the Arab Legion (the Jordanian army), but it is doubtful if Arafat's command will really be willing to limit, even slightly, the terrorists' freedom of action.

According to the agreement of July 10, Amman becomes practically a neutral capital. The forces of the Arab Legion as well as the armed Palestinian forces will be evacuated from Amman where only a militia under strong Palestinian influence is to remain.

Israel cannot be indifferent to what is happening in Jordan. The terrorist organisations have once more declared that they reject every political solution of the Israel-Arab conflict and the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, and they will continue their struggle until the establishment of a "democratic, secular, unitarian Palestine" on the ruins of Israel. The actual partnership of these organisations in the Jordanian administration makes the achievement of a political, peaceful solution to the conflict, based on the recognition of the just rights of both parties, a most difficult venture. Nor must it be ignored that the July agreement caused an intensification of the terrorist activities against the border settlements. When the Palestinian sabotage organisations reached the agreement with King Hussein, they extended the shelling of the Israeli settlements. Even a region that was peaceful for decades, the summer resort of Nahariya, has become a target of attacks by katyushas. Dozens of peaceful Israeli villages are the targets of the "popular war of liberation" waged by Yasser Arafat's "Palestinian revolution". The terrorist organisations have transferred their activities to Jordanian and Lebanese territories because they are unsuccessful in infiltrating Israel and the Israel-held areas. It is true that despite their recently intensified activities the sabotage organisations are unable to mark great successes on the battlefield. On the contrary, in the final balance they have suffered a crushing defeat, but this is outweighed by their substantial doubtless achievements in Jordan and Lebanon where they have become real partners in exerting power over wide areas. And what is Israel's political answer to these developments? Israel has the indisputable right to defend herself against the sabotage organisations that are sowing ruin and death in our territory. But we must not content ourselves with this defence.

King Hussein has never been king of the Palestinians. He has never represented their aspirations, nor their national will. Yasser Arafat and his companions, on the other hand, represent a small section of Palestinian politicians who do not recognise the Jewish people's right to self-determination and who want to liquidate our sovereign state. Neither King Hussein nor Yasser Arafat represents the majority of the Palestinian Arab people. The political involvement demands that the government of Israel enable the Arab population in the administered areas to establish a democratic, peaceful national representative body, that it recognise the Palestinian Arab people's right to self-determination. This right will be implemented when peace comes, on the bases of reciprocal recognition, mutual agreement and peace-

ful co-existence. Until peace comes, home-rule must be guaranteed to the population in the Israel-held areas and the rehabilitation of the refugees must start immediately in these areas.

The G. Meir government has acted in the opposite direction. A few months ago, for instance, a serious attempt was made by the Mayor of Hebron, Sheikh Muhammed Ali Al-Ja'abari, to convene the notables from the West Bank for a political consultation. In February, Ja'abari approached the military governor with the request to make this conference possible, but this appeal was not complied with. The answer of the Minister of Security was formalistic: "The Mayor was told that his request for convening a conference for the purpose of political organisation depends on a political affirmation of the Israel government and he has to approach the Prime Minister in this matter". The Mayor of Hebron did approach the Prime Minister, as told, but in vain. Instead, the cabinet decided on the sequestration of land in the Hebron area and on the settling of 250 Jewish families in this city. To all these we must add a declaration by the Premier, that "there is no Palestinian Arab people" and similar statements, just at a time when all the international factors, including U.S. Secretary of State W. Rogers, recognise its existence.

The Israeli answer to the agreement between King Hussein and the sabotage organisations cannot and must not be limited to the military sphere alone. A political answer, too, must be forthcoming. In this connection we may point out that important personalities inside the Labour Party, such as the Party Secretary-General L. Eliav, as well as Mapam, recognise the existence of the Palestinian Arab people and demand to acknowledge its rights. A certain advance in this direction was also discernible in the speech of Foreign Minister Abba Eban on the 22nd Independence anniversary, when he addressed the Palestinian Arabs as a body with a separate national identity. But in this case we must not be content with the proverb "better late than never", because time is pressing and the official Israeli policy disregarding the Palestinian element, depriving it of the possibility of establishing an Arab national representative body in the administered areas, assists in fact Yasser Arafat and increases his influence. The time has come to put an end to this inactivity of official Israeli policy.

The Arab terrorist organisations operating from the territory of the Arab states, with their blessing and consent, systematically violate the cease-fire agreements, perpetrate acts of aggression against Israel and disregard international law. The aim of these organisations is to abrogate the right of the Israeli people to national independence and they do not deserve the name of freedom fighters and most certainly not the material and moral support on the part of the forces of progress and peace.

The experience of the past three years has proved that the way of collective punishment such as the demolition of houses, creates an atmosphere of sympathy with the terror organisations instead of isolating them from the peaceful Arab population. And above all, experience has proved that without opening a political perspective of resolving the Palestinian problem it is impossible to beat decisively the sabotage organisations that pretend to speak in the name of the Palestinian people without being authorised to do so.

(Kol Ha'am, 16.7.70)



ISRAELI NAVAL PATROL SAVED LEBANESE FISHERMEN

A patrol-boat of the Israel Navy coast guard saved four Lebanese fishermen whose boat was swept away into the Israeli territorial waters. The rescue operation took place in the Bay of Haifa. The Lebanese fishing boat was drifting as a result of a motor defect and by the time the Navy patrol reached it, the Lebanese vessel was already filled with water. Thanks to the quick rescue action of the Israeli Navy, the fishermen were brought safely ashore, where they were fed, clothed and afterwards returned to the Lebanon.

FRENCH LEFTISTS VISIT ISRAEL

"Seeing is believing" - said the members of the delegation of the French Left who recently visited Israel. Upon concluding their visit, they could render an objective summary denying many of the prejudices that are circulated against us by sworn anti-Israeli circles. The members of the delegation are activists of the "International Left Committee for Peace Negotiations in the Middle East" that has its main office in Paris, with branches in France and in various countries of Europe and America. The Committee maintains relations with personalities in different countries, including Yugoslavia and Rumania. The members of the delegation were: The writer, Lacoutier, who is well acquainted with Egypt and has published biographies of Nasser, and other Arab leaders; the well-known writer and journalist, Claude Roy, correspondent of "Nouvel Observateur"; Michel-Antoine-Burnier, one of the prominent figures of the "New Left" in France; Jean Pierre Faix, a writer of the "Nouvel Roman" in France; and the journalist and writer, Clara Halter, editor-in-chief of the periodical "Eléments" who is very active in promoting the understanding between Israel and the Arabs. The delegation was invited by the Histadruth. During its stay in Israel it met personalities of the Left in this country, opponents of annexation, leaders of political parties, and members of Parliament, including MK Moshe Sneh, representatives of Mapam, David Ben Gurion, the Histadruth Secretary-General Yitzhak Ben Aharon, Professors Talmon, Arieli and Arye Sachs, MK Avneri, writers, journalists, and many others. The members of the delegation had instructive talks with Premier Golda Meir, with the Minister of Security, Moshe Dayan, Minister Peres and other politicians - talks that enabled them to gather direct impressions of the moods prevailing among government circles, talks with MK Abdul Aziz Zouabi as well as meetings with personalities in the West Bank (Abdul Salah, Mayor of Al-Bireh and Adv. Shahade of Ramallah). A visit in the administered territories enabled them to become acquainted with the state of affairs on the spot, and to distinguish at sight between truth and lies.

The many conversations, the visits in the cities and kibbutzim, revealed to the guests the true Israel. The existence of Left forces in Israel and of opponents of annexation was known to the members of the delegation before, but the face-to-face contacts strengthened them in their view that "the best way is talks between the progressive people of both sides". Therefore, they were not surprised, but "the positive things were even more positive than we had thought" - as Claude Roy put it. "The heads of the

State are sensitive to the public protest, and the impression is that they are inclined to take this protest into account." Lacoutier said: "They do not pay sufficient attention to the opposite side. Maybe in this respect things are hidden from the public." But this is the trouble with the Arab side, too, "because there, too, the moderates are afraid to speak out." "In Paris, when they hear the word 'occupation', they are thinking at once of an association with the afflictions of the occupation that is still fresh in the Frenchmen's memory... That is why the members of the delegation were favourably surprised when they did not see any soldiers in the Israel-held areas," said Clara Halter.

The members of the Left delegation from France hope to visit Cairo and Amman as well some day. "And if they receive us there as we were received in Israel, it will be a sign of their interest in us, and this will be a very good omen for peace."

(Kol Ha'am, 25.6.70)



LEBANESE COMMUNIST LEADER DENIES ISRAEL'S RIGHT TO EXIST

"It is not a matter of accepting or not accepting the Jews' right to self-determination in Palestine, but the that solution of the 'Jewish question', created by imperialist capital, must not be at the expence of the Palestinian and the entire Arab people, or in a way that would impair the Arab revolutionary movement... The main factor here is that the existence of Israel is closely and organically linked with world imperialism."

This is a quotation from an article by Nicolas Shawi, the Secretary-General of the Lebanese Communist Party, published in the May issue of the international Communist monthly "Problems of Peace and Socialism".

It seems that this is the first time that a stand expressly denying the right of the State of Israel to exist have been overtly adopted from an international Communist platform. According to the best of "dialectical" acrobacy, even this denial of a people's elementary rights relies on... Lenin's authority. In the opinion of the learned Lebanese Marxist, "Lenin has never presented the peoples' right to self-determination abstractly, disconnected from the historical circumstances, the circumstances of the class struggle, and from the interests of the revolutionary Communist movement."

As if this were not enough, the leader of the Lebanese Communist Party also makes an effort to erase the distinction between the people of Israel and the government of Israel: "This close link with aggressive imperialism is not limited to the Israeli ruling circles: each successful aggression produces more chauvinist, racialist and anti-Arab hysteria". In the same article, N. Shawi announces that his Party has decided to take part in the activities of the "Partisan Forces" that were established as "one of the detachments of the Arab Resistance Movement".

All this is called, by the Lebanese Communist leader, "a final solution to the Palestine problem on a principled basis". So the "principled basis" is the denial of the rights of the Israeli people and an armed struggle against Israel. It is worth noting, that in September 1964 the Arab Communist Parties published a joint communique in "Problems of Peace and Socialism" that adopted a stand on an entirely different basis. It said: "The Chinese leaders are trying to exploit the Palestine problem for their aims, and to encourage certain adventurous elements to provocative acts of aggression. They pretend to be friends of the Arabs and try to impose on them the idea that it is possible to solve the Palestine problem only by means of war, and by throwing Israel into the sea. Of course, this is no principled approach. The Arab bourgeoisie and the Arab nationalists adopt basically the same approach. They do not propose any practical solution that would satisfy the Arab peoples and the people of Israel alike. Every armed conflict in this region is apt to endanger the achievements of the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples that support a peaceful solution of this problem."

Even Rakach members were not pleased with Nicolas Shawi's article and in the same issue of the "Problems of Peace and Socialism", M. Vilner has a polemical argument with the Lebanese Communist leader without mentioning his name. The Rakach leader writes: "In our day, any objection to Israel's right as a state to exist is contrary to Leninism, to the proletarian class approach to the national question, to the right of the people of Israel to self-determination, and to the real state of affairs in the Middle East and in the World." "There are class divisions and a class struggle in Israel itself."

The contents of this polemical discussion published in the international monthly, was concealed from the readers of the Rakach press in Israel. In Israel, Rakach continues to assert that the Arab leaders are prepared to recognise Israel - while even the Arab Communist leaders are denying the right of the State of Israel to exist.

It may be mentioned that, less than five years ago, on January 13, 1966, Emile Habibi, another Rakach leader, wrote: "It is not right to add to

the class and democratic duties of the Communist Party in Israel the duty to stand up against the danger of the Communist movement and the world anti-imperialistic movement infected by the bacillus of Arab chauvinism."

This controversy was one of the causes of the splitting of Rakach from Maki. At that time we were talking about the "danger of the Communist movement becoming infected" with the bacilli of Arab chauvinism. In the meantime, these bacilli have become enrooted in not a few Communist parties. Now even Rakach is forced to speak out against those who deny Israel's right to exist. For if the concept that denies Israel's existence takes hold of the whole Communist movement, the activity of Rakach in Israel will be deprived of its minimal basis. After six years' delay, with hesitations, and as if pressed by a demon, Rakach is now forced to half-heartedly sound complaints for which Rakach has split from Maki in order to prevent their being told aloud.

(Kol Ha'am, 25.6.70)



MOST ISRAELIS ARE FOR SOCIALISM

About two thirds of Israel's inhabitants favour a socialist economic-social approach rather than a capitalist economic-social approach. This appears from the results of a poll carried out in early 1970 by the Institute of Practical Social Research.

Only 12% of the people today support an absolute capitalist approach, and if we add those who favour a more capitalist than a socialist approach - it turns out that only one third of the population believe that capitalism is better than socialism for Israel. On the other hand, 24% side with an absolute socialist approach to which we may add 40% who favour a socialist rather than a capitalist approach.

Further findings of the poll: 57% of the interviewed expressed their opinion in favour of a separation of the state from religion.



TACTICS - AND PRINCIPLES

by Ya'aqov Silber

A Yugoslav Weekly Against Israel's Right to Exist

Since the escalation of anti-Israeli articles started in the left-wing press, we have ceased quoting false arguments and slanders, because - according to a definition of a news item - "a dog that bites a man is not news".

If we are quoting this item today, it is not because a "man has bitten a dog", but because of the peculiar originality of the anti-Israeli "argument" and the place where it has been published.

In Farid Kamil's article "Arabs and Israelis" we find the following pearl: "By the IVth century, they (the Hebrews) had all switched to other religions and ceased to be Jews. Until the XIX century when Europe's Jews, escaping from persecution, found refuge in Palestine..."

But not the disappearance of the Jews and their sudden reappearance after 1600 years are the "pearl", but the following sentence: "Israel's 'devine' claim to it (Palestine) as a 'promised land' has been forfeited by its rejection of Christ as the Missiah of the Jewish people, theologians agree." And, as we said, the "theological argument" against Israel's right to exist is not yet the complete "pearl", because it was published in an official organ of a socialist state that, as is well-known, is not affiliated to the Vatikan. We found it in the "Review of International Affairs", a Yugoslav periodical which, similar to the Soviet "New Times", serves as the mouth-piece of the Yugoslav Foreign Ministry, although it is officially called the organ of the journalists' association. This statement was published on 20.6.70 in its six editions in Serbo-Croat, English, French, Spanish, German and Russian, (Issue No. 485) in a long article on the Middle East.

Which should teach us that even Yugoslavia, that emphasises her anti-Stalinist approach, determines her relation to Israel according to what serves her best as a power.

(Kol Ha'am, 9.7.70)



"L'Humanité" and "Daily World"

"L'Humanité", the organ of the French Communist Party, attacked in its issue of 22. 5. 70 Willi Brandt's proposal at Kassel to sign "contractual settlements" between the two German states. The West German chancellor suggested that both states demand jointly to be admitted to the U. N. O. in accordance with international law, but at the same time he pointed out that the relations between them should be based on "our efforts for a gradual improvement" by "an agreement or agreements that may be only signed on the basis of equal rights and non-discrimination".

"Only a recognition of the DDR in accordance with international law, not less!" demands "L'Humanité" together with "Pravda" and others. " The refusal to sign such a document of recognition proves of aggressive intentions" - says "L'Humanité". And it is very difficult to discard associations with the situation in the Middle East and with the approach of these newspapers to the parties to this dispute.

At the other end of the globe, "Daily World", the organ of the Communist Party of the U. S. A. , wrote on the same day that "Castro says Cuba can hit exile bases". The newspaper quotes from a speech on May 10, in which the Cuban Premier declared that he is capable of retaliating against the bases of the emigrants in the South of the U. S. A. where the infiltrators into Cuba come from. He also told Britain that if she cannot prevent attacks on Cuban fishermen from the Bahama Islands "then let her. . . allow us to watch over them at least against counter-revolutionary forces. "

The same newspaper condemned Israel because she attacked bases of saboteurs in Southern Lebanon, from where murderous attacks are launched on Israeli settlements.

(Kol Ha'am, 4.6.70)



The Dybbuk of Zionism has Entered the "Panthers", too

"The seven accused in the Chicago trial were Zionists and only the Negro Bobby Seale is a real revolutionary". - This astonishing accusation is included in an article published recently in the U. S. periodical "Black Panther".

It may be mentioned that only two of the seven - Abbie Hoffmann and Danny Rubin - are in fact of Jewish descent, and they, too, are far from Zionism. The oldest of the peace partisans, David Dallinger, was always a pacifist. But all this did not save the militants of the "New Left" from the guilt of Zionism - because the violent Negro movement is in despair at its growing isolation in the extremist circles of America and Europe, and is trying to explain this isolation by the argument that "all whites are racists".

Connie Matthews, who is in charge of foreign relations of the Black Panther Party, writes:

"The White Left in the U. S. A. is comprised of a large percentage of the Jewish population. Before the Black Panther Party took its stand in the Palestinian people's struggle, there were problems, but the support of the White Left for the Black Panther Party was concrete. However, since our stand, the White Left started floundering and became undecided. This leaves us with no alternative than to believe that a large portion of these people are Zionists, and therefore racists."

In a further passage of the article, it appears that not only the two members of the "New Left" who are of Jewish descent and not only five non-Jewish comrades of the Black Panther leader have suddenly become "Zionists", but also the whole "New Left" in America and Europe.

"Where does the European Left stand?" - the writer asks desparately. "The time is now for you to show by your actions whether you, too, will flounder when we need your help." "We do not want a race war - but we have lost too many lives in order to keep the stand we truly believe in."

The article reflects bitter despair. Perhaps this bitter experience will make the supporters of the violent struggle for a "black force" and an "Arab Palestine" understand, that not the denial of the other people's rights, nor the preaching of hatred against it, will bring their salvation, but the joint struggle for the right of all. The spokesman of the Panthers admits herself: The masses of American Jews have backed the demand for the liberation and equality of the Negroes as long as their extremist spokesmen had not denied Israel's right to exist. It appears that the European Left, too, does not agree to the new slogan "all are racists".

(Kol Ha'am, 18.6.70)

On the Independent Approach of the Australian Communist Party

"The editors have pleasure in announcing that Roger Garoudy, eminent French marxist, has accepted an invitation by the Australian Left Review to make a lecture tour of Australia in September this year" - reported the theoretical monthly of the Australian Communist Party in its April-May issue.

This is a daring statement for everyone who knows the international campaign waged by the supporters of the "Brezhnev Doctrine" against the former member of the French Communist Party Politbureau, who declared: "One cannot keep silent any more". But no one who is acquainted with the Australian Communist Party, especially with the resolutions of its last Congress, be surprised. We reported on the courageous attitude of renovation adopted by this Party. Recently the C. P. I. Central Committee was informed by the Australian fraternal Party about the subservise attempts of a handful of Brezhnevists there (E. Ross is the Australian "Wilner"). The letter expresses hope that certain parties will not support the attempt to cause a split.

The Australian fraternal Party has also revealed an independent, courageous stand by reading the message of congratulations of Maki from the rostrum of its Congress in February 1970. This attitude is followed by the Jewish Communists who are active in the "Jewish Progressive Group for Peace in the Middle East" that published Com. Moshe Sneh's article "The Venerated Arafat... and the Forgotten Lenin". 1000 copies of this article have already been distributed in circles of left-wing Labour, Communists and trade-unions.

It is worth mentioning that this article was also published by a group of Jewish progressives in Belgium in hundreds of copies - besides its distribution in five languages by the Foreign Relations Department of Maki. Recently it has been also published in "Search", England, by Left wing students, and in France, in the July-August issue of "Politique aujourd'hui", a left-wing revue with wide circulation.

(Kol Ha'am, 16.7.70)



SOLIDARY WITH THE PEOPLES OF INDO-CHINA

The Israeli Peace Committee, in a special communiqué, marked the 16th anniversary of the Geneva agreements on Vietnam.

The Geneva agreements - recalls the communiqué - provided for the evacuation of the foreign armed forces and free elections that were to determine the fate of the country. But the agreements were not kept by the United States, and ever since the world has witnessed the tragical, blood-drenched drama of the war in Vietnam and the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people for self-determination and liberty. Recently, the American intervention even expanded into Cambodia and Laos, and the whole Indochina is now wrecked by the flames of war.

The peace-loving people in Israel, who are fighting against grave dangers and for a peaceful solution of the Israel-Arab conflict that must guarantee the rights of all peoples and a stable, lasting peace, appreciate the sufferings and hopes of another heroic and tormented fighting people - the communiqué stresses. They feel that the end of the war in Vietnam will ease the tension and promote peace in our region, too.

The Peace Committee appeals to the Israeli public to support the appeal of the Stockholm Congress for peace in Vietnam, and demands the immediate, complete and unconditional evacuation of the U.S. forces and of their allies from Indochina.



THE ROMANIAN COMMUNIST PARTY THANKS MAKI

The C. P. I. Central Committee received the following cable from the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party:

"We express our deep gratitude for your cable in which you expressed regret and solidarity in connection with the disaster that befell our country and our people."

★★ The chairman of the Rumanian trade union federation conveyed a letter to the Secretary General of the Israel Federation of Labour thanking the Histadruth for its solidarity with the Rumanian flood victims and the relief extended to them by the Israel labour movement.

★★ The Israeli Government has offered Romania \$ 7 million worth of goods on credit to help the country over the difficulties caused by recent floods. Israel was one of the first countries to offer aid to Romania when the full extent of the flood damage became known.

THE HISTORY OF THE

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..

... ..