

7

communist party of israel
central committee · tel aviv

July 1970

P. O. B. 1843

IN THIS ISSUE:

C. P. I. ON ROGERS PLAN ★★★ PREVENT SOVIET
MILITARY INTERVENTION IN THE M. E. ! ★★★
S. MIKUNIS: THE PEOPLE SEEK PEACE, NOT
PERPETUATION OF CONQUESTS ★★★ M. SNEH:
DEFENCE OF CEASE FIRE LINES - AND PEACE
INITIATIVES ★★★ ISOLATE EXTREME RIGHT
WING IN ISRAEL! ★★★ S. MIKUNIS AND
M. SNEH MEET WEST EUROPEAN LEFT ★★★

HX
632
A1
W9
No. 1111

MAIN



CONTENTS

DOCUMENTS

C. P. I. Appeals to the Forces of Peace in the World to Prevent Military Intervention in the M. E.	3
M. Sneh: Defence of the Cease Fire Lines - and Peace Initiatives	7
Communique of the C. P. I. Bureau on the Rogers Plan	11

EVENTS OF THE MONTH

Isolate the Extreme Right Wing in Israel!	13
A Criminal Attack by the Arab Saboteurs	14
Another Important Resolution of the Security Council	15

COMMENTS

S. Mikunis: The People Seek Peace - not the Perpetuation of Conquests	16
E. Vilenska: In the Wake of the Interviews with Nasser and Hussein	19
Y. Lahav: RAKAH in Search of a Redemption Receipt	22
Moshe Dayan's Son against Annexations	26

CLASS STRUGGLE

More Strikes	27
--------------------	----

ECONOMICS

R. Teitelbaum: Implications of the Annual Report of the Bank of Israel	29
--	----

SOLIDARITY

S. Mikunis on His Meetings with the West European Left	31
M. Sneh in Paris	33
Prof. Giulio Mazzon's Visit to Israel	34
Resolution of the F. I. R. Bureau	35
Anti-Nazi Fighters Demand to Free the Political Prisoners in Greece	35
Aid from Israel for the Flood Victims in Romania	36
The Paris Conference of the Israel -Palestine Committees	36
Progressives in Great Britain for Peace in the M. E.	38

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF C. P. I. (MAKI) APPEALS TO THE
FORCES OF PEACE IN THE WORLD TO PREVENT SOVIET MILITARY
INTERVENTION IN OUR REGION

On June 13, 1970, the 10th session of the Communist Party of Israel (Maki) Central Committee took place with the participation of the members of the Central Control Commission. The chairman, M. Sneh, lectured on the political and security situation. The following resolutions were adopted after an extensive discussion:

A.

The C. P. I. Central Committee states with regret and with concern that the increased Soviet involvement in Egypt has aggravated the military tension on the Egyptian-Israeli front and has stressed the danger of a flare-up of war.

It is the unanimous desire of the people of Israel to prevent a Soviet - Israeli military confrontation. There is no contradiction between the legitimate interests of the Soviet Union and the national interests of the State of Israel that cannot be settled by way of mutual agreement. Restoration of the diplomatic relations between the two states would, without any doubt, help the achievement of a reciprocal accord.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel appeals to the Communist and Workers' Parties, to the forces of peace in all countries, to exert their full influence to prevent Soviet military intervention in the Middle East conflict.

The Central Committee is convinced that in the future as well, everything will be done on the part of Israel to avoid a direct clash with the Soviet forces, and nothing will be done that might serve as a pretext for, or cause a Soviet-Israeli military confrontation.

Contrary to the views expressed by certain circles and personalities in Israel, the Central Committee of Maki is of the opinion that it is not in the interest of Israeli policy to invite American counter-intervention nor to rely on it or expect it.

The Central Committee of Maki declares that the people of Israel will independently fulfil its national duty and its international right to self-

defence, and will defend the cease-fire lines until peace comes, against every attack and every attacker.

The Central Committee of Maki sends greetings of encouragement to the soldiers and commanders of the Israel Defence Forces who are standing in the campaign for Israel's survival, security and independence. The Central Committee mourns the heroic defenders who fell in battle, the victims among the citizens - men, women and children - who were murdered in ambushes. The Central Committee expresses sympathy and consolation to the bereaved families, the Central Committee sends get-well wishes to the wounded and to the convalescing.

B.

The Central Committee of Maki sees the correct way out of the Middle-East crisis not in any new military confrontation, but in a political solution that will bring a just, lasting peace between the Arab states and Israel on the basis of an agreed interpretation of all provisions of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

No settlement between the big powers and no political solution imposed or recommended by them can serve as a substitute for a peace agreement between the peoples themselves - and a correct Israeli policy must firmly insist on a conclusion of the conflict by the achievement of an agreed peace based on reciprocal recognition of the just rights of all peoples concerned. A peace agreement will also outline the mutually agreed upon borders of peace that will abrogate the present cease-fire lines. The "secure and recognised" borders of peace, as provided in the Security Council resolution, will be drawn by the way of an accord between the parties, and not by the way of a dictate imposed by one side on the other.

C.

Regarding the No's of Khartoum and the trends of a globalisation of the conflict as the chief obstacles of the conflict, the Central Committee of Maki reiterates its view, that steps for the promotion of the cause of peace, if incessantly initiated, are likely to help the removal of the above obstacles, and it is universally agreed that they are likely to gain understanding, sympathy and support of international factors for Israel's campaigns.

The Central Committee of Maki reaffirms the motion tabled by its faction in the Israel parliament on May 18, 1970 calling for Israeli peace initiatives. (See Information Bulletin No. 6.)

The Central Committee of Maki notes with satisfaction, that the political statement of the Prime Minister in the Knesset on May 26, 1970 includes an express consent to the first three points of the above motion, and calls all forces of peace in Israel to rally and to persist in the struggle until the remaining points of the motion become part of Israel's official policy.

D.

The Central Committee of Maki points out that the said political statement of the Prime Minister in the Knesset must be regarded as a dissociation from the inflexible political line of the "national unity" government, and the abstention of Gahal during the vote on this statement must be regarded as the beginning of a crack in the coalition partnership of the "national unity" government.

Maki will continue its policy that is directed towards isolating the elements in the cabinet that refuse "to budge an inch of land" and towards encouraging those who prefer peace rather than territorial profits, until the present government is disbanded, and a government without the seekers of territorial annexations and social discrimination, represented especially by Gahal, is established.

The Central Committee of Maki states that the government decision concerning the possibility of Dr. Goldmann's invitation to Cairo has severely damaged Israel's image as a peace-loving state, and has thus greatly harmed our national cause. At the same time, the Central Committee stresses the dissociation of Maki from Dr. Goldmann's concepts expressed in his articles in "Foreign Affairs" and "Ha'aretz".

The Central Committee of Maki urges the government to reconsider and to discard the plan of establishing a Jewish quarter in Hebron, thereby contributing to improving the atmosphere among the inhabitants of the administered territories.

In its struggle against the trends preferring annexation to peace, and against the revelations of nationalist chauvinism, Maki will dissociate itself from the circles and from the expressions of national nihilism regarding the campaigns of Israel.



The Central Committee of Maki regards the conversion crisis as an additional stage in the domination of the Chief Rabbinate and its commanding influence over the authorities of the State. The Central Committee points

out that the concessions made by the Labour Party to the Rabbinate in the law that determines "who is a Jew" was followed by further pressure in the issue of conversion to Judaism. The Central Committee of Maki regards the last crisis around the problems of the religious law as proof that the only solution is to separate religion from the state.

E.

The Central Committee warns of the government's economic-social policy discriminating against the working class and the popular sections and enriching the big capitalists and businessmen. The implementation of the "package deal" hits the workers' wages and their living standard, allowing, in fact, a rise in prices, aggravating the burden of taxes, and increasing the profits of banks and capitalist companies. The rise in the interest rates, following the abrogation of the law that has limited interest rates, and the conclusions of the Raveh Committee to raise the rent of flats, also hit hard the masses of toilers. The plans of returning to the "recess" in the economy foreshadow the danger of unemployment for tens of thousands of workers.

The Central Committee calls the working class, the farmers, the working intelligentsia, the tenants of hired flats, to fight for their just rights and demands against the onslaught of the employers and the government, against the unjust division of the national income on the one hand and of the burden of taxes and levies on the other.

The Central Committee of Maki urges the government to take immediate and practical steps to improve the economic and social situation in Beit Shean, Kiryat Shmona and in the development towns and border settlements generally.

The Central Committee of Maki calls the Histadruth leadership to take the lead in the campaigns of the working people for the protection of its rights and living standard, in the struggle against the revelations of social injustice, and for the preservation of the bases of democracy and progress in Israel's society.

The Central Committee of Maki rejects the attack of the right-wing circles on the Secretary-General of the Histadruth, Yitzhak Ben Aharon, because of the steps he is taking to restore the independence and original objectives of the Histadruth.



DEFENCE OF THE CEASE FIRE LINES - AND PEACE INITIATIVES!

by Moshe Sneh

Everyone who intends really and sincerely to promote peace in the Middle East, - be he an Israeli, an Arab, an American or a Russian - must in the first instance think of the prevention of war. The threat of a large-scale military flare-up that is facing our region, is obviously an antidote and an abrogation of the chances for peace in their essence, and preventing a new war is only possible provided that the cease-fire is reciprocally observed, that the cease-fire lines are scrupulously kept intact.

Consequently, every act purporting to dislodge Israel by force from the cease-fire lines is an act of aggression. Nasser's proclamation that the cease fire is null and void, as well as the war of attrition declared by him against Israel, are acts of aggression, and the bombardments, infiltrations, sabotage and laying of mines belong surely to the aggressive plan to destroy the cease-fire lines and to subjugate later the State of Israel. Accordingly, all the Israeli operations that are intended to defend the cease-fire lines or to prevent an attack on them, are in the line of self-defence, that is also the foremost national duty as well as the right guaranteed by international law.

Against this background it is necessary to examine our relation to the Soviet involvement that has been lately intensified, that is meant to assist the Arab attack on the cease-fire lines, the war of attrition, and finally the war of revenge against Israel. In this connection, I wish to say three things that are interrelated and, in my opinion, present a correct Israeli approach:

a) We do not wish relations of hostility between us and the Soviet Union, and we do not rejoice at a Soviet-Israeli military confrontation; we shall do everything to prevent such a confrontation, and we shall not do anything that might serve as a pretext for such a confrontation; we still hope that the Soviet leadership will stop on the threshold of the abyss, if not for principled reasons of morality and ideology, but perhaps after having learned the lesson of the American intervention in Vietnam, because it is easy for a big power to enter, but it is hard for it to leave.

b) Israel is resolved to defend the cease-fire lines, as I said, till peace comes, against any attack from any side whatsoever, whoever be the attacker, indiscriminately and firmly.

c) Let us not put our trust in the rulers of the United States and in an American-Soviet confrontation that will decide the Soviet-Israeli confrontation. If it comes to that, God forbid. We are waging a war of national defence, and we must lead it by the way of an absolutely independent national policy. Surely, we will continue to be assisted by outside factors, but we are not tied to any single super-power, and we shall not be subjugated to any foreign power, even not for the purpose of self-defence.

I have deemed it necessary to bind these three points together, because there were also irresponsible statements made in the Israeli public, such as the call of one of the cabinet ministers - the Minister of Development of the "Herut" faction, of course - that the Israel defence forces should attack the Soviet SA. 3 missile bases deep inside Egypt; such provincial explanations as are given in Hebrew to President Nixon in speeches and in articles, that he must understand that we are fighting here his war against the Soviet expansion. Why are these explanations provincial? Because the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are at present of a complex nature; they are rivals, competitors, clashing one with another - but at the same time they are also talking on with another, dividing up assets and coming to terms one with the other, and discussing the establishment of a cartel between both for the purpose of world domination, for a plot against China which is growing stronger and presents a challenge to both. So, also with regard to the crisis in the Middle East, there exists, beside the American-Soviet rivalry, a trend for an American-Soviet agreement, and it is not impossible that the Soviet military threat on the one hand and the American deferment of the Israel government's requests on the other - are a snuffers' movement to exert political pressure on Israel.

There is no better means against political pressure from outside than independent political initiatives. As we have said all the time, it is necessary to combine with the arm of military defence and preparedness the arm of a political initiative for peace, and the arm extended for a peace initiative must be not less strong than the arm that is prepared for a war of defence.

It was proper that the Prime Minister G. Meir mentioned in her speech Israel's will to maintain the cease-fire and Israel's consent to Rhodes-type talks. However, in order to give this statement its value, it must be underlined by a renewed Israeli proposal through all the international channels and must bear the seal of a resolution adopted by the Knesset at the end of the debate.

It must be pointed out with satisfaction, that after a long period of silence that was not incidental, the Prime Minister recalled explicitly that Israel was the first country that accepted the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, and that till today she is the only state that accepts it in its correct interpretation, i. e. that its aim is a just, lasting peace and not a spoiled substitute for peace, and that the means of reaching the goal of peace is negotiations and agreement on all provisions of the resolution. But if this is the statement of the Prime Minister, why have you any objection, Madam, that the Knesset confirm your statement in detail and absolutely? Who knows better than you how necessary this is for Israel's campaigns?

There are still some points left that require a change in the approach of the Premier and of the entire government, and I shall specify the main points only. Insisting on direct negotiations does not help our political struggle. Surely, this is the most just, the most simple, the customary procedure in the world. But for the achievements of peace we must be prepared for every form of negotiations, and if they only yield desirable results they will get anyway, in the advanced stages, the form of direct negotiations. We must not insist on the form but on the contents.

We all know the comparatively limited value of words. Maybe no great importance should be attributed to the word "withdrawal", too, unless the government had obstinately evaded the use of this word. Hence the word "withdrawal" has received fundamental significance: will the "national unity government" in Israel be prepared for a territorial compromise for the sake of peace, or will it not? Surely, without peace there is no withdrawal; surely, today there is no Arab preparedness to discuss peace, but today the question is presented in the world this way: The Arab rulers are not prepared for peace and the Israeli rulers are not prepared to withdraw. The side that wants peace - despite all the accusations from outside and inside, is Israel - this side must break the vicious circle, must declare and state: On my part there will be no objection. Provided there is peace, there will be a withdrawal to agreed borders of peace. Don't tell me: we shall be asked at once to state to where we shall withdraw. We must say immediately: We shall withdraw only to a mutually agreed border of peace. We shall not accept the dictate to retreat to the lines of June 4, 1967 and we shall not impose the dictate to confirm the lines of June 11, 1967 as permanent borders. Both are military lines that came into being in the course of the fighting of 1948 and of 1967. We seek borders of mutual agreement, of mutual compromise, of security and of good neighbourhood.

Here I must say: The "Herut" faction is opposed to territorial concession in exchange for peace. Therefore, the word "withdrawal" has not been approved either. "Herut" is entitled to such a view, but it received a minority of votes in the elections. Because "Herut" demands "not to budge an inch", this party does not belong in the cabinet, but in the opposition.

Israel needs a government that prefers peace to the annexation of areas. Many acts of omission of the government are a result of straightening the line with this wing, "Herut".

And the last painful issue: We, who have demanded all the time to solve the problem of the Palestinian Arab people on the basis of the right to self-determination and the duty of peaceful co-existence, had a feeling of slight relief when the Foreign Minister addressed the Palestinian Arabs with words of friendship on Independence Day. But besides a holiday there are also week-days. Only yesterday the Minister of Security answered my interpellation and said that the application of the Mayor of Hebron for a licence to hold a conference of dignitaries in the West Bank was rejected with the Prime Minister's knowledge. This is a grave incongruity. The overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of the West Bank are not desirous of returning to King Hussein's rule, and do not accept the criminal adventurism of Arafat and his companions. In our opinion, it is not only a matter of justice but also of wisdom, if the government of Israel gives permission and even assistance to establish a Palestinian Arab national representative body in the Israel-held territories. This body will be the first Arab factor that is prepared to negotiate with the government of Israel, and sees its future in an agreement with Israel.

I am sure that in combining and coordinating the armoured and defensive arm with the political arm that seeks peace - lies the hope of our success in this fateful year. In ten weeks, 1900 years will have passed since the Second Temple was destroyed. The Empire that brought destruction was destroyed, and we have re-established our State, and are standing again in a struggle for our existence and our freedom. We have taken the oath: The year 1970 will not be like the year 70. Judea will not fall again!

(Speech in the Parliament (Knesset) - Kol Ha'am, 28.5.70)

COMMUNIQUE OF THE C. P. I. BUREAU ON THE ROGERS PLAN

The C. P. I. Bureau regards the announcement made by the U. S. Secretary of State, William Rogers, on June 25, 1970 as an attempt to dictate a solution of the Mid-East crisis on behalf of a big power as a substitute for a peace agreement between the peoples of the region. In this announcement, a maximal response to the pressures of Egypt and the Soviet Union is discernible, while it disregards the national interests, the independent deliberations and the security requirements of Israel.

As the U. S. plan for the solution of the Mid-East crisis has not yet been officially published, the C. P. I. Bureau demands that the government of Israel examine carefully and react to the point on the details of the plan, taking into account the following principal criteria:

- a) The starting point and the purpose of every plan for the solution of the crisis in our region must be an agreement for a just, lasting peace between the Arab states and Israel.
- b) The secure, recognised borders, according to the term used in the Security Council resolution, are to be fixed by a reciprocal agreement between the parties concerned, and Israel will withdraw to these borders from the cease-fire lines.

Besides evaluating and reacting to the Rogers Plan, the government of Israel must launch a peace offensive of its own vis-a-vis the Arab people and the nations of the world; this initiative should include the following points:-

- a) Renewed preparedness for an unrestricted, reciprocal cease-fire, making sure that an effective control precludes military alterations in the lines.
- b) Readiness for indirect and direct Rhodes-type talks through the U. N. O. Emissary.
- c) Reaffirming the acceptance of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, including all its provisions, their agreed interpretation to be determined in negotiations between the parties through the U. N. O. Emissary.
- d) Readiness to withdraw from the cease-fire lines within the framework of an established just, lasting peace, to secure, recognised borders, as will be agreed by the parties.

e) Israel's recognition of the Palestinian Arab people's right to self-determination, to be implemented when peace comes, on the basis of a mutual agreement and peaceful co-existence.

The C. P. I. Bureau announces that in the present political situation a clear declaration on behalf of the government of Israel is needed now more than ever, stating that the government prefers peace and security rather than annexations; secure, recognised and agreed borders rather than territorial expansion.

June 28, 1970



PALESTINIAN PEOPLE CONTINUE TO DENOUNCE
"POLITICAL INITIATIVE"

Peking, June 30 (Hsinhua) - - Palestinian guerrilla paper "Fatah", a daily published in Amman, said in an article on June 25 that "any U. S. proposal cannot but be rejected, since the U. S. proposals aim essentially at liquidating the palestinian revolution. "

The article said that the new U. S. "initiative" shows: first, the United States is seeking support for its new "initiative"; second, the U. S. and Soviet standpoints are coming closer together; third, the reactionary forces and conspirators in the Arab Land are being instigated to suppress the Palestinian revolution through the trick of "peaceful solution".

The same paper said in a commentary that the United States insists on trampling the Palestinian people underfoot, enslaving the entire middle east region and keeping Israeli entity like a cancer on the body of the Arab nation.

In another commentary on June 26, the daily "Fateh" said, "when the fate of a small people is being discussed in the halls of the United Nations or among big powers, there starts a rope-dance on a wire made of such phraseology as 'peaceful solution', 'political solution', 'respect for interests', 'respect for sovereignty', etc., and in the end that small people will turn out to be the victim. "

ISOLATE THE EXTREME RIGHT WING IN ISRAEL!

The "Herut" leader, Minister Menahem Begin was furious at the positive mention of the Security Council resolution of November 1967, made in Golda Meir's speech in the Knesset in the second half of May. Begin had succeeded in preventing the cabinet from reaffirming the statement made in favour of the resolution by Y. Tekoa, Israeli ambassador to the United Nations, on May 1, 1968, but now the statement was reaffirmed by the Knesset itself. There will be no government crisis as a result of this Knesset resolution, because the Alignment Labour-Mapam as well as the Gahal block wish to keep intact their partnership in the "national unity" government. But the first gap in the coalition has appeared. With the political-military campaign approaching a point of decision, a political initiative for peace on the part of Israel has become still more necessary and now it has been proved in practice that "Herut" in the government is obstructing this inevitable process; the Alignment has finally shown that the dictate of the Gahal minority has its limits; Gahal has swallowed the bitter pill and remained in the cabinet as if nothing happened. Inasmuch as the future developments will lead not to new military confrontation, but to a real political bargaining, it is inevitable that the gap between the Alignment and Herut will gradually deepen. But the truth must be said that a government freeing itself of the "Herut" partner, would increase the very chance of a development in a political and not a military direction.

The advance and the gap alike serve as proof for the forces of peace in Israel, which line is the correct one. The correct line is directed toward the isolation of the extreme right wing, of the groups that refuse to "budge an inch of land", and not toward self-isolation. The correct policy is that which encourages those groups in the "National unity" government that are prepared for a fair territorial compromise for peace, the policy of criticism that induces them to advance toward consistent and active stand-points of peace, and not a policy of throwing all the parts of the coalition into one bag of "annexationists". The correct policy is that which urges the government to take initiatives for peace and, at the same time, fully support the defence of the cease-fire lines till peace comes, a proper defensive preparedness combined with an energetic political activity to prevent a renewed war, and not a policy separating the aspiration for peace from the concern for security. The correct policy is that of Maki.

("Kol Ha'am", 4.6.70)



ANOTHER CRIMINAL ATTACK BY THE ARAB SABOTEURS

The criminal attack on the school-bus of the cooperative village of Avivim, and its frightful results, have again focused the attention on our northern border. The intensification of the sabotage operations from Southern Lebanon has confronted Israel with new problems that differ in several aspects from those of other frontiers. The main problems emanate not from the direct security aspect - though this aspect in itself involves some problems: (a region that so far has not been prepared for a permanent frontier-war as that waged in the Jordan Valley; various topographic problems, etc.) - but from the political aspect.

It is reasonable to presume that the "method of continuous police patrols" inside the Lebanon, near the border, will ease the pressure and remove the threat from our border settlements in this region. If, in spite of that, the sabotage operations from the Lebanese territory continue, they will take place now, mainly, in the Lebanon itself, while their objective will necessarily be more the police forces of the Israel Defence Army and less the border settlements. (In view of this evaluation, the political and military profitability of the great foray into Southern Lebanon by the Israel defence forces in the first half of May must again be questioned.)

There is no use in hiding the fact that the intensification of the military activities in the northern sector is imposing on Israel additional burdens of security at a time when the Soviet involvement constitutes an important landmark in the process of the intensification of the conflict in general.

The behaviour of the "national unity" government, the absence of a purposeful political initiative on its part and the limitation of its activity in the international arena in reacting on the initiatives of others, do not ease the heavy security pressure and do not contribute to improving the chance of its removal, but cause the opposite effect.

(Kol Ha'am, 28.5.70)



ANOTHER IMPOTENT RESOLUTION OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

The Security Council denounced Israel (with a majority of 11, and 4 absentions) because of her "initiated military action in the Lebanon" (in May 1970), and warned her that, should this action be repeated, the Council would consider "proper, efficient steps to make sure that its decisions are carried out". The representatives who formulated the resolution, refrained from demanding the imposition of sanctions on Israel after it turned out that they could not mobilise the nine votes needed for its approval. A hint as to acts of sabotage against Israel was also included in the proposal.

The supporters of the resolution know that it does not ease the crisis in the Middle East in any way, because obviously Israel cannot put up with acts of sabotage and murder committed by "Al Fatah" from the Lebanese border, while Yasser Arafat intends to continue these activities. That is why the resolution of the Security Council of May 19 must be added to a long series of resolutions that have proved the impotence and inability of this institution to safeguard the security of the peoples in the region.

(Kol Ha'am, 21.5.70)



IN SHORT

- ★★ The 1970 Independence Day Commemorative Coin, issued by the Bank of Israel is dedicated to the centenary of Mikveh Israel, Jewish first agricultural school in Palestine, founded in 1870.
- ★★ The Arava, the first all Israeli-designed and manufactured airplane, made its formal maiden flight on April 10, 1970.
- ★★ Mayor Ja'abari of Hebron, the Arab town in the Western Bank of Jordan, expressed strong opposition to the decision of the Israeli Authorities to close off a 3,000-dunam area east of Hebron for military purposes. He said that for three years he had been trying to bring peace closer, but, in light of the policy of the Government, it was time wasted. He added that he invites "all people of Israel to come and see whether the area is suitable for army training". At a meeting held at the City Hall some 250 leading citizens from Hebron and surrounding villages protested against the decision of the Israeli Authorities.

COMMENTS

THE PEOPLE SEEK PEACE - NOT THE PERPETUATION OF CONQUESTS

by S. Mikunis

The bloodshed along and behind all the "cease-fire" lines increased shortly before the third anniversary of the Six Day War. It makes no difference whether this military escalation was connected with the date of the 5th of June, or whether it was a "natural" result of the deterioration in the Israel-Arab crisis. In either case it is rousing concern and serious fears in the hearts of the masses of people in our country and in the neighbouring countries, in our region and in the whole world. Experience itself provides striking proof that none of the issues in dispute between the Arab countries and Israel, between the Palestinian Arab people and the people of Israel and its state, will be resolved by means of war. The expectations and the hopes of the Arab side for increased Soviet involvement, as well as the expectations and hopes of the rulers in our country for American deeds of kindness, have not led, nor will they lead them or us towards peace. Peace is the interest of the peoples, and its fate is in the hands of the peoples. Even if these sayings are "old", we must repeat them as genuine words of truth. For a just, lasting peace will not be established by way of surrender and by the dictate of one party imposed on the other party, but by way of an agreement, equality and mutual recognition of the legitimate rights of both parties. The supporters of the cessation of war and its replacement by a political solution by peaceful means, have in the present conditions no more adequate and internationally authoritative basis than that of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967. Truly, this resolution does not solve all the problems pending between the parties. Here and there one may even point to contradictions inherent in this resolution. But with good will and the desire to achieve an agreed interpretation, it is possible to derive from it all the most important elements for the establishment of peace between the Arab and the Israeli side.

One of the lessons of the past three years is that the active presence of the big powers on both sides of the cease-fire lines has not contributed to bringing the belligerents nearer to negotiations and peace, but, on the contrary, to the intensification of tension and war between the parties, approaching the danger of an American-Soviet confrontation. An additional lesson learnt by everyone is that by way of aggressiveness and force regular and irregular - the Arab side will not succeed in uprooting Israel from the cease-fire lines without a peace agreement, without recognition of Israel and a readiness to solve jointly the elementary issues facing both parties.

Another lesson learnt by whoever wants to learn it, is that Israel cannot achieve peace and security by territorial annexations, by giving priority to additional areas over peace and good neighbourhood, by disregarding the existence and the right to self-determination of the Palestinian Arab people.

★ ★ ★

Our Party has estimated, since the Six Day War, that our little country can have a great influence on the orientation of the Arab public, and even on the moves of the American and Soviet policy with regard to the Middle East crisis, if we are able to combine an efficient military defence with clever, realistic peace initiatives that would take into account the guarantee of Israel's elementary rights without violating the elementary rights of the Arab side. For this reason we fought the composition of the "national unity" government at the time of the late Premier Eshkol and still more so after the elections to the Seventh Knesset, when the share of Gahal, of the prominent annexationists in the cabinet, was augmented. We have been fighting the composition of a government that imposed a political and diplomatic paralysation on Israel, that put our country in a position of constant political defensive, of inability and isolation vis-a-vis the Arab and Soviet political and diplomatic steps. This situation that has had no objective justification, roused the opposition of many good people in the Alignment itself and in other parts of the ruling coalition, who are opposed to the policy of "wait and see", to the policy of "don't budge an inch of soil", and to the establishment of harmful accomplished facts in the administered areas.

The pressure of this new development, and the pressure of the last steps taken by the big powers, of the intensified, dangerous Soviet involvement on one hand, and of the American "self-control" considering the American interests in the region and in the world, on the other, forced Premier G. Meir to make a certain political move in her statement and her reply to the Knesset debate of May 26-27, 1970. There is some truth in the saying that "this is too late and too little", but as people say: "This, too, is for the better."

The Prime Minister's statement, that Israel wants the cease-fire to be observed, that Israel agrees to Rhodes-type talks, and that Israel was the first state that accepted the Security Council resolution of November 1967, mentioning also the statement of our Ambassador at the U. N. O. of May 1, 1968, was a first attempt after a long period of silence and hush under the pressure of Gahal, a modest attempt to combine the political arm with the

security arm. The first positive echoes in the world press and even the "sceptical" echoes in the Arab press, have proved the correctness of this step.

This statement, that included a correct interpretation of the Security Council resolution, is only a beginning that requires a continuation, if we wish to see Israel as a state taking the initiative for peace, that is capable of hushing our prosecuting enemies who are rather numerous. And the continuation can only be a display of official preparedness to withdraw from the cease-fire lines to recognised, secure borders, agreed on by both parties, without insisting on direct negotiations from the start, recognising the reality involved in the general Israel-Arab problematics that calls for an agreed political solution. There exists the problem of the Palestinian Arab people for whose positive solution only the right to self-determination is a fitting and vital means for the benefit of peace and good Israel-Arab neighbourhood.

★ ★ ★

The decisive link in the struggle of the peace-partisans in our country lies in the rally of the forces against those circles that prefer the annexation of the areas to peace, and who - for this purpose - are fostering the cult of strength, the despair of the chances of peace, and who are putting up with an eternal Israel-Arab war. These annexationist circles are adding fuel to the anti-Israeli Arab chauvinism, are contributing to our isolation even among substantial parts of the Jewish youth in the world and among the world public opinion, are lending support to the extensive propaganda campaign led by the Palestinian sabotage organisations regarding the establishment of a Palestinian state, accompanied by the liquidation of the "expansionist, racial" State of Israel.

This does not mean that we have no argument, or that we should abstain from an argument with those groups - few though they are - which, in the name of peace and democracy, or in the name of peace and socialism, preach that Israel should surrender to the dictate of Arab chauvinism, or to the dictate of the present Soviet leadership, who, contrary to a socialist foreign policy and out of great-power considerations, backs the Arab side against the Israeli side.

But the decisive link in the struggle of the peace-partisans in our country on the basis of mutuality and accord with the Arab side lies in the intensification of the campaign for disbanding the "national unity" govern-

ment and establishing a government of peace that is capable of making a national decision, excluding those who seek territorial conquests that were made in the wake of the just Six Day War of national defence. The justice of the Six Day War must not be distorted.

If we have not succeeded in saving our sons from the fire-lines, let us today do all we can, so that our grandsons shall not have to wear the uniform of war and withstand conditions of blood, fire and pillars of smoke. The situation cries out for a just peace, because if it is not just, it will not be peace, and it will not last. An Israel that defends itself efficiently and has a correct objective, can certainly safeguard its existence and its good future side by side with the existence and good future of our Arab neighbours.

(Kol Ha'am, 9.6.70)



IN THE WAKE OF THE INTERVIEWS WITH NASSER AND HUSSEIN

by Esther Vilenska

Premier Golda Meir's declaration in the Knesset on May 26, 1970, on her support of the Security Council resolution of November 1967, roused favourable echos. This fact stresses the damage that has been caused by Israel because of the Prime Minister's prolonged silence on this issue in the past. But it would be a mistake to think that this declaration is enough to exhaust the Israeli campaign for peace. Its value will have a striking effect, if it serves as a link in a chain of practical political initiatives aimed at stopping a large-scale military flare-up and at bringing us nearer to peace. Some people think that a time of increasing military tension, the increase of fire and numerous battles is not appropriate for additional peace initiatives. I think that the deterioration of the security situation does not justify under any circumstances giving up the hope for peace, but requires the most balanced judgement and a political change in order to prepare on the Israeli side the soil for the start of an Israel-Arab dialogue.

The discussion inside the Alignment itself has become deeper and has reached wider dimensions. Recently, an internal discussion started within the government coalition, in connection with the interview granted by Nasser to the German paper "Die Welt", in which he expressed his readiness to reach peace agreement with Israel, and also with regard to the interview with Hussein who declared his readiness for negotiations with Israel, provided

that Jerusalem, too, be included in the negotiations. Two ex-ministers, members of the Labour Party, Eliahu Sasson and Moshe Carmel, criticised the government during the Knesset debate for refraining from reacting to Nasser's declaration on the possibility of a peace agreement with Israel. A third ex-minister, Mordechai Bentov, wrote a critical article on the government in "Yedioth Aharonot" of 9.6.70, because of its lack of response to these declarations.

Moshe Carmel, former Minister of Transportation, wrote in an article in "Lamerhav" of 29.5.70, as follows: "King Hussein of Jordan said these days to the correspondent of "Stern" that he would be prepared for talks with Israel provided that Jerusalem is one of the subjects in these talks. Nobody has illusions as to Hussein's independence on Nasser in everything concerning negotiations on a peace treaty with us. And still one may ask: Why did our authorities not air their reactions regarding a preparedness for negotiations without preliminary conditions and announce our readiness to discuss with the Kingdom of Jordan every subject that would be brought to the conference table, including the issue of Jerusalem, as the Prime Minister has once announced?" Moshe Carmel writes further: "In the interview in "Die Welt", Nasser says that he supports a peace agreement with Israel in the spirit of the Security Council resolution of November 1967, and that he would recognise Israel's pre-Six Day War borders and her right to free navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba, in exchange for the evacuation of all the occupied territories and the settlement of the Palestinian problem by building new settlements for the refugees, or paying compensation to those who want it". In his opinion, it would be wise on our part to react authoritatively and to declare, in reply to this statement, Israel's readiness to enter into negotiations without preliminary conditions, while the other side would be entitled like us to bring to the conference table every subject it likes, including the Security Council resolution.

Eliahu Sasson, ex-Minister of Posts, wrote on this issue in "Ha'aretz" of 27.5.70: "The very fact, that Nasser is speaking this time about his preparedness for a peace treaty, which is opposed to one of the "no's" of Khartoum, and not about a political solution of the Middle East crisis, obliges our government this time not to dismiss his words without an examination, not to regard them only as Egyptian tactics for outside consumption, to try to test his sincerity not only vis-a-vis ourselves but vis-a-vis the whole world." And E. Sasson says also: "To the best of my knowledge, Nasser is the only leader in the Arab world who can speak without fear about a written, signed peace treaty with Israel without risking his prestige or without provoking a murmur from any side against him."

Eliahu Sasson concludes that if it turns out that a changeover has occurred in President Nasser's policy and he is ready to sign a treaty with us, a peace treaty based on the Security Council resolution, we should do everything that these talks end successfully.

The three ex-ministers who criticised in public the lack of a government reaction on the recent declarations made by the leading personalities in Jordan and Egypt, do not refer to some detail, but to the most central issue. It is unjustifiable that the government is refraining from a reaction on the above declarations by King Hussein and the President of Egypt. Whether it was a tactical step on their part or not, we shall see only after their words are put to test.

The President of Egypt makes one speech after another. Sometimes he mentions the perspective of peace, sometimes he speaks of war to liberate the territories. There are circles in Israel that take advantage of these contradictions in order to dismiss every chance of peace. There are other circles that are, in my opinion, realistic and strongly desirous of peace, and demand to sticking to every chance of peace and to study it in all earnestness. The statement of a "Daily Telegraph" correspondent who returned to London after she had stayed several months in Cairo is also instructive. She says, according to what was published in "Al Hamishmar" of 15.6.70: "There are 'doves' in Egyptian cabinet and also Nasser himself is from time to time a 'dove' because an overt war can only injure himself. Nasser says in every private conversation: Can't you help and explain, that I am extending a hand?"

We must not give in to the fatalism of a fourth war. Daily Israeli peace-initiatives are needed. It must be made clear, that Israel's objective is not territorial expansion, but securing Israel's existence and a just peace. Not once has the Prime Minister declared that, at the moment when somebody among the Arab rulers expresses readiness for peace with Israel, all obstacles will be removed from the way to its implementation. Members of Mrs. Meir's Party are now reproaching her for ignoring voices of peace aired on the other side.

The defence of Israel's existence requires a political action to prevent war and relentless steps to start talks with the neighbouring countries.

(Kol Ha'am, 18.6.1970)



RAKACH IN SEARCH OF A REDEMPTION RECEIPT

by Yehuda Lahav

The British Communist "Labour Monthly" wrote recently that the "Al Fatah" slogan for the establishment of a "secular, democratic Palestine in which Moslems, Christians and Jews will live together" is a generous improvement compared with the former slogan "to throw the Jews into the sea". The Rakach leader Emile Touma - in his article on the slogan of "a democratic Palestine" ("Zu Haderech", March 11, 1970) - followed the footsteps of the writers in the British monthly: "The cry to throw the Jews into the sea has disappeared in the Arab world. The opinion that it is necessary to recognise the Jews in Israel (or "in conquered Palestine" as some Arab circles call it) has penetrated broad circles. This recognition finds expression in new solutions". This means, the programme of establishing a "democratic Palestine". According to Emile Touma's assertion, "the Arab forces that consider themselves as belonging to the anti-imperialistic camp" are divided into two trends. One trend "accepts the existence of the State of Israel in its present or any other form" to which trend belong, i. a. "a number of leaders of progressive Arab states"; the second trend, even though it "totally rejects the existence of the Israeli state", also recognises "the rights of the Israelis". To this trend belong "another part of leaders of progressive Arab states and the Palestinian Arab organisations"

The lie of the "reserved recognition"

We have before us a twofold attempt to purify the wicked scheme of annihilating Israel. First, "the leaders of progressive Arab states", who accept the existence of the State of Israel "in its present or any other form" are the product of E. Touma's delusive imagination. Nasser's most far-reaching declaration, for instance, says, that after the "liquidation of the aggression", Egypt as a state will be ready to put up with the existence of Israel within "secure, recognised" borders that would be congruous with the lines of the 1947 Partition Plan, but even then Egypt would recognise the right of the Palestinians to oppose Israel's existence and would assist them in their struggle.

Second, what is more important: E. Touma presents as "recognition of the Israelis' rights" even the approach of "Al Fatah" that is "totally" opposed - as Touma says - to the existence of the State of Israel, only

because in the future Palestinian state the "Al Fatah" leaders are ready to grant civil and religious rights to the Moslems, the Christians and also to the Jews. But not to all the Jews, because, according to the platform of the Palestine Liberation Organisation, that has been approved in 1968, these rights will be granted only to those Jews who were living in Palestine before the beginning of the "Zionist invasion", i. e. before the Balfour Declaration of 1917. But the people of Israel insists on its right to sovereign, independent national existence. There is not, nor can there be, any "progress", nor a "reserved recognition" when these rights are denied, even if those that deny them were so generous as to grant 5% of the Israelis religious rights in the future Arab state.

"Twenty-five Years of Zionist Practice"

Not only with regard to the present plans, but also with regard to the past, E. Touma cleanses the unclean. Writing about the cries to throw the Jews into the sea, the Rakach publicist asserts that "those hysterical chauvinistic Arab slogans greatly helped the ruling circles in Israel to persuade the masses of Israelis that there exists a threat of real extermination", although "the Israeli rulers were absolutely sure that there is no danger threatening Israel". And the Arab opposition to her existence, too, is in reality Israel's fault: "The Zionist practice during the last 25 years had a decisive influence on several Arab anti-imperialistic circles who oppose the State of Israel". The State of Israel has been existing for less than 22 years, and it is certainly not incidental that E. Touma writes about "25 years of Zionist practice", in order to include in this period, and to discredit, also the struggle against the British as well as the War of Independence.

What "makes it difficult" and what "bars" the way

If this be the approach toward the War of Independence - it is still more so towards the Six Day War and the post-war period.

One cannot accuse Emile Touma of disregarding the subtleties of formulation. In his words, "the (Arab) opposition to the existence of the State of Israel makes it difficult to find the political solution". On the other hand, "the obstinacy of the Israeli rulers and their refusal to retreat bar the way to a political settlement". Note: A political settlement without recognition of Israel's existence is possible, though opposition to Israel's existence makes it difficult to achieve it; but without an Israeli retreat the political settlement is entirely impossible... Hence the conclusion: "The key to a political settlement lies in the hands of Israel and the U. S. A."

The terrorist organisations scheming to annihilate Israel have not even a robbers' key to a political settlement. . .

The tasks of the Arab anti-imperialistic forces

We see that the non-recognition of Israel, in the opinion of a Rakach member, makes a solution rather difficult, but not impossible. Regarding the quality of the State of Israel, that is to be recognised (in order to make the solution easier. . .) he has some interesting critical remarks. An Israeli people exists in Israel - says the thinker of Rakach, and we are grateful that he at least recognises our existence. "A growing difference is developing between it and the Jewish communities" in the world. "The Arab and non-Arab anti-imperialistic forces should deepen this dividing line, in order to make it more difficult for the aggressive, pro-imperialistic Zionist policy. The recognition of the Israeli people and of its right to self-determination is a vital necessity for the campaign against Zionism and imperialism and to tear the people of Israel away from the grip of Zionism. "

The Arab anti-imperialistic forces should fight against reactionary ideas in their own countries, whereas the campaign against Zionism - as far as it is necessary - is the task of the progressive Israeli forces; that is what we have naively been thinking till now. But Emile Touma does not think so. It appears that in his opinion, the Arab anti-imperialistic forces are those that should fight to deepen the separation between the people of Israel and the Jews in the world. It seems that Emile Touma and people like him find it difficult to get used to the idea that the relations between the people of Israel and the Jews of the world are the affair of the people of Israel and the Jews of the world - just as the relations between the Arabs of Morocco and the Arabs of Kuwait are the affair of the Arabs. It would be interesting to know how Touma and his companions would react if somebody urged the Jewish anti-imperialistic forces to deepen the separation between the Arabs and Islam, for instance.

Disputants

And all this is written in an article that is meant as a dissociation from the plans to annihilate the State of Israel, because this, obviously is the purpose of Touma's article. He states that "the recognition of the Jews' right to remain where they are now calls for a recognition of their right to independent political existence", defining the opposite attitude as an "erroneous, reactionary approach" (a reactionary approach of the anti-imperialistic forces!), an approach that "pushes the Israeli masses

into the arms of reaction and imperialism", and finds, that without recognizing the Israeli people's right to self-determination "there is no possibility to mobilise supporters for the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination." Touma's Jewish comrade, W. Ehrlich, had defined the programme of establishing "a democratic Palestine" as "an elegant form of the demand to annihilate Israel".

So we have arrived at a situation where even Rakach is forced to admit, that the central slogan of the "Arab anti-imperialistic forces" represents "a reactionary, erroneous approach" denying the rights of the Israeli people. Defending the Israeli people's elementary rights requires opposing those that are scheming to deprive it of these rights.

But even when Rakach pretends to defend Israel's rights, it does a deceitful job, because Emile Touma argues, while embellishing reality, with "part of the Arab anti-imperialistic forces". He conceals the fact that the plans to annihilate Israel are supported by all 14 Arab states, and that the leaders of "Al Fatah" - who have inscribed on their banner the slogan of annihilating Israel - are welcome in Moscow, in Berlin, at the Congress of the French Communist Party, and that those with whom Rakach declares day and night its identification, either do not dissociate themselves from the slogans of "Fatah" or adopt them overtly themselves, as, for instance, the East German leader Prof. Albert Norden.

In short - the disputants are the Arab chauvinists and their fellow-travellers. Obviously, the split in the C. P. I. was caused over the issue - whether or not to fight overtly against the Arab chauvinism and those following its footsteps. Had Rakach really wanted to defend the rights of the Israeli people, it would have had to launch an overt, frontline campaign against those threatening these rights and, thus Rakach would have had to admit that Maki is right. Considering that Rakach is evading an overt, comprehensive campaign to defend the rights of Israel against all those violating these rights and against all those supporting the violators - there is nothing genuine in its claim that it dissociates itself from the schemes to annihilate Israel.

(Kol Ha'am, 19.3.1970)



MOSHE DAYAN'S SON AGAINST ANNEXATIONS

The young Israeli actor Assi Dayan, son of the Minister of Defence, Moshe Dayan, recently caused a sensation. In an interview published in Israel's most widely-read afternoon paper "Ma'ariv", Assi Dayan expressed his firm opposition to any annexation of Arab areas by the State of Israel. He said:

"I am vehemently opposed to this word and to everything emanating from it. I do not consider as sacred anything that refers to a plot of land as such. I would prefer that we give up all the areas, including Jerusalem and the Golan, as soon as possible. At least, we should express our readiness to do so. I do say so with an emphasis that this is the price I am ready to pay for a real peace. What frightens me is that various "isms" are created in the country around the subject "Annexation". I don't like to say so, but an impression is created that if Jerusalem is divided (municipally) this would mean wasting the blood of those who fell for her sake. I am afraid that in the course of time we shall deviate and misdirect our real intentions concerning the war - as if the war was waged for the areas and not for our very existence.

What I say is a political solution - only in the conditions of peace, of course. But I shall say more: There is still the problem of refugees left. We have to undertake ourselves the solution of the refugee problem by settling them in the areas that are today under our rule. One of the important results of the Six Day War is that we have the possibility to solve the problem of the refugees without mediators.

The noisy cries of the "don't budge an inch"-type - whoever be the shouters - is, in my opinion, something awful..."

★ ★ ★

MORE STRIKES

The workers' struggles are spreading despite the absence of peace and the growing military tension. The following is a list of strikes that took place during May 1970: The post office employees struck in demand for improving their working conditions. The Ashdod port workers struck for a retroactive premium payment for over-time. The workers of the "Voltex" factory, Afulah, struck against dismissals. The employees of the Israel Dockyards waged a struggle for wage increase. The workers of Yuval Gad, Ashkelon, struck against the refusal of the management to make advance payments on premium allowances. The Agudath Israel teachers, struggled against the delay in the payment of their salaries, the fuel operators of Lod Airport struck for better working conditions, workers of Rosh Ha'ayin struck against the non-payment of social benefits, the employees of the Beisan Local Council struck against dismissals and against the attempt to cut their wages, the villagers of Revaya struck near the Knesset building with the demand to improve their conditions.

Sixty-five strikes took place in Israel in the first four months of 1970. This is a substantial increase compared with the same period in 1969.

The review of the strikes published by the Institute of Economic and Social Research of the Histadruth in May 1970 proves a rise in the number of strikes, of strikers and days of strike. Taking into account both full and partial strikes, there were 144 strikes in 1969 compared with 100 in 1968. 56% of the strikes in 1969 broke out without the approval of the Histadruth, compared with 52% in 1968.

As to the causes of the strikes - the highest percentage of the strikes was waged for an increase in wages and social benefits. The results of the struggles prove that only a small percentage of strikes was unsuccessful. On the other hand, an increased number of class struggles was crowned by complete or partial success. In other cases the negotiations on the demands of the workers continued.

An increased number of strikers was persistent in pursuing its objectives.

More strikes than before lasted for over 6 days and up to 9 days.

Not only the "second Israel" of new immigrants is taking part in the struggle. Not only low-paid industrial workers are striking. Many strikers are members of the free professions. The days of strike in this sector almost doubled during 1969. 78% of all strikers in 1969 belonged to the free professions. This proves that a considerable part of the working people is not prepared to put up with class exploitation, with the lack of a proper reward for increased output.

Israel's society is in a complicated, difficult situation. The campaign for Israel's existence is shared by the whole people. It is the desire of a great part of our people to prevent a new total war and to reach a just peace. At the same time, an internal social class struggle is deepening, and rousing stormy controversies. The employers try constantly to divide the workers, to sow despair in their ranks, confusion and weakness. In spite of this, the class struggles are developing.

The working people in Israel is no fifth wheel. The workers do not ask for mercy. They are the central social force - in production, in building, in defence and in the campaign for peace. The campaign for social justice, for the honour of the working people is no secondary cause. This is an elementary campaign with deep roots, linking the present with the future, when the people will be a master of the fruit of its toil and of its fate. The exciting struggle of the workers, waged in solidarity for the defence of their interests is not only for their own benefit, but for the benefit of the general development and the enlightened character of the whole Israeli society.

(Esther Vilanska, Kol Ha'am, 4.6.70)

(Continued from p. 37)

After citing a few concrete examples to prove his views, Gavriel Moked concludes:

"As I said at the beginning, we need a militant left in Israel; but we shall not revolt against "our" chauvinism just to be the tails of pan-Arab chauvinism".



IMPLICATIONS OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BANK OF ISRAEL

by Raul Teitelbaum

In connection with the publication of the annual report of the Bank of Israel for the year 1969, the director of the bank, Mr. David Horowitz made a statement that was a mixture of pessimism and optimism with regard to the future of Israel's economy in the current year. On one hand, he pointed to a substantial decline in exports and to a sharp increase in the deficit, but on the other hand he told about a surprising rise in the economy's foreign currency reserves. In addition, he promised that there will not be a recession, at least not this year, although there is a certain slowdown in the economic activities during the first months of the year.

However, judging by the figures published in the Bank of Israel's annual report, which is a really competent analysis with regard to the developments in the economy in the past year, it is evident that there is no recession and no slowdown as far as profits are concerned. Let us quote some of the instructive figures that appear in this report.

★ It appears that the speculators of the stock exchange succeeded in increasing their profits in the past year. The average profit on a share traded at the Tel Aviv stock exchange was 12.2% compared with 8.8% in 1968. Especially prominent is the group of shares in commerce and industries. The rise in their rates is explained by the Bank of Israel as a result of the "high profitability of the industrial corporations in 1969 that caused a rise in the dividends payed". It also appears that the number of companies that paid dividends increased from 56 in 1968 to 61 in 1969, and the amount of payments rose from 78 million to 93 million Israel pounds.

★ In the chapter on industries, the bank reports that, as a result of a decline in the wages paid per production unit in industries, a trend that has been continuing since 1967, and also because the nominal wages in industries did not change substantially, as was expected, chiefly because of the offer of a cheap labour force from the administered areas, "it is most probable that the quick growth in profits from industries will continue".

★ The profits of the banks continued rising sky-high. The development of the total profits of banking institutions - says the report - points to an increase in the rate of profit growth in 1969, considering that the total profits amounted to 80 million, a 40% rise, whereas in 1968 the total profits amounted to 57 million IL, a 34% rise compared with the previous

year. It appears that for every 100 IL of self-owned capital, the banks made a profit in the past year of over 23 IL compared with 18.7 IL in 1968 and 8.5 in 1966.

★ The Bank of Israel also points out that in the past two years there was a rise in the profitability of exports. It appears that one of the most important elements in this rise was the fact that the wages per production unit in Israel declined in 1968 by 7%, and in 1969 an additional fall of 5% occurred in wage expenses. In this connection, a comparative index of the labour wages per production unit in Israel and the developing Western countries is published. Whereas the wages per production unit have fallen in Israel by 7% in the past four years, the wage expenses per production unit in the developed Western countries have risen by over 8%.

As a result, the share of the wages in the total income of the economy continued declining in 1969, while the share of profits rose simultaneously. Last year, the wages were 62.6% of the private income compared with 63% in 1968, 66.3% in 1967 and 71.2% in 1966. However, taking into account the growing number of employees, the gap in the income categories is even wider.

If we deduct from the income of the wage-earner the amounts he has to pay on income tax and national insurance, it appears that the real net wage of the wage-earner has remained, in fact, frozen at the 1968-level. According to the Bank of Israel report, it grew in the past year by 0.9% only, after it fell by 0.4% in the previous year. As we said - there is no recession in profits. But even when there is no recession at all in the economy, the recession in the workers' wages remains in force.

(Kol Ha'am, 4.6.70)

★

★★ Hevrat Ovdim, the Histadrut Holding Company, endorsed the Histadrut economic sector's financial plan for 1970 totalling IL. 137,250,000. The financial sources are the trade union insurance and pension funds. The breakdown of the programme is - 36.5 percent for industry, 4.6% for farming, 21.3% for housing, 5.8% for cooperative marketing, 3.6% for general development, 13.1% for Kupat Holim (The Sick Fund), 1.8% for fishing and shipping, 0.2% for hotels and the remainder for "miscellaneous projects".

SOLIDARITY

S. MIKUNIS ON HIS MEETINGS WITH THE WEST-EUROPEAN LEFT

In mid-May 1970, Com. Mikunis, Secretary-General of Maki, visited several countries in Western Europe on a mission on behalf of the Party. Upon his return to Israel, Com. Mikunis was interviewed by a "Kol Ha'am" reporter.

At a mass meeting in Brussels

Com. Mikunis was invited to address a meeting organised in Brussels by the "Union des Progressistes Juifs en Belgique" to mark the 22nd anniversary of Israel's independence. This is not an organisation under the direct control of the Belgian Communist Party, but it is linked with the Party. Many members of the Union disagree with the stand of the Belgian Communist Party on the Middle East, others approve of it, some have not yet made up their minds on the issue. This is, in fact, the Jewish left. The "Union" holds a free forum of discussion to which leaders of various organisations and parties are invited from time to time to debate the issues of the Israel-Arab relations.

The meeting was attended by many Jewish and non-Jewish youth and students. Com. Mikunis reviewed in his speech Israel's achievements during the 22 years of its existence, and explained at length the principal issue: Israel-Arab peace and how to promote it.

Many questions were asked by the audience at the end of the lecture, and the speaker gave convincing answers to each point.

Press Conference

At a press conference, the Israeli guest explained mainly elementary issues of the nature of the State and the conflict in the Middle East. The big Belgian paper "Soir" gave an extensive report on the criticism of Maki on the "national unity" government and the one-sided policy of the Soviet leadership. The more leftist "Dernière Heure" reported that the Secretary-General of Maki pointed out that his Party "which is opposed to the American influence in Israel, also bitterly deplores the standpoints chosen by the Soviet Union". The Belgian press gave a fair coverage of the views of Maki - except the weekly of the Belgian Communist Party, "Drapeau Rouge", whose

foreign affairs correspondent found it improper to define as terrorists the killers of civilians by the shell-fire on Kiryat Shemona. . .

A meeting with Communist leaders in Belgium

Nevertheless, the Secretary-General of Maki was invited to talks with the representatives of the Belgian Communist Party. This was at the time when the representatives of 18 Communist parties in European capitalist countries were meeting to prepare demonstrations against the American invasion of Cambodia. The top party leaders were not yet back from Paris, and Com. Mikunis was met by the members of the Central Committee, Jean du Bosh and Rosine Lewin, who is also the Chief Editor of "Drapeau Rouge".

"I rejected an attempt to lead polemics based on fragmentary quotations from our publications" - says Com. Mikunis - "and I switched the debate to the fundamental ideological subjects that are connected with the State of Israel and the conflict in the Middle East."

Talks with the leaders of the Dutch Comm. Party

From Belgium, Com. Mikunis continued his journey to Amsterdam, where he had a lengthy conversation with the honorary chairman and the veteran leader of the Dutch Communist Party, Paul de Groot, the Party Chairman Henk Hoekstra, and the head of the Party's foreign relations department, H.J. van Ommeren-Averink. They listened attentively and gave interesting information on the achievements of their own struggle and on the problems of the Netherlands.

The Dutch Communists regard the split between the Soviet Union and People's China as the main evil. The congresses under the patronage of Moscow are, in their opinion, mere 'bluffing'. As long as there is no Soviet-Chinese unity, there can be no normal situation in the Communist movement - but the objective conditions will force both parties to mend the discord. The Dutch comrades, at least, are hopeful that things will change for the better - without supporting one side against the other.

In their opinion, the continuation of the split is undermining the foundations of Communism, and producing revisionist deviations. The strength of the Dutch Party lies in its adherence to the foundations of Leninism, in its organisation and policy.

The leaders of the Dutch Communist Party appreciate the desire of Maki to build a strong movement for peace and security, against annexations, and for a front with the Zionist left.

"We parted with a general agreement that it is useful and vital to hold such meetings more often" - Com. Mikunis wound up his report.

At the end of the interview, Com. Mikunis stressed that an initiated policy for peace is needed in order to raise Israel's prestige in world public opinion. By advancing our struggle for a change in Israel's policy, Maki will gain more sympathy in the international communist movement.

M. SNEH IN PARIS

At the same time, Com. M. Sneh, chairman of the C. P. I. Central Committee, was visiting Paris, where he addressed a mass meeting marking the 22nd anniversary of the State of Israel. The meeting was organised by "L'Union des sociétés mutualistes juives de France", and was attended by an audience of about 2000. The chairman was Henri (Chaim) Sloves - a well-known lawyer, writer and dramaturg, and a veteran member of the French Communist Party, who praised the desire for peace filling the hearts of the soldiers of the Israel defence forces. He emphasised the defensive character of the war waged by Israel.

Claude Lanzmann, co-editor of Jean P. Sartre's "Temps Modernes", expressed enthusiastic esteem for the stand of Maki and M. Sneh's personality. He underlined the international value of Maki's approach for the world communist movement. Another speaker was W. Carol, the Secretary-General of the "Union".

The success of the meeting was, no doubt, an achievement for the pro-Israeli circles among the Jewish left in France, considering that the opponents who accept the official Communist Party line conducted a vehement campaign to boycott the meeting and the visit of M. Sneh. This fact was also prominent at another meeting at Nancy, held likewise with the participation of the guest from Israel. This meeting, too, was attended mainly by young Jewish members of the French Communist Party.



PROF. GIULIO MAZZON'S VISIT TO ISRAEL

The visit to Israel of Prof. Giulio Mazzon, Secretary-General of the Italian Partisans Association (A. N. P. I.) and member of the Bureau of the International Federation of Resistance Fighters (F. I. R.), roused most favourable echoes in the press, in the Israel radio broadcasts as well as among all the organisations of the Israeli anti-Nazi fighters. The visit took place from May 23 to May 27, 1970.

In his meetings with the secretariat of the Union of Anti-Nazi fighters in Israel (affiliated to F. I. R.), with the coordinating committee of the organisations of anti-Nazi veterans, and the victims of Nazism in Israel and the representatives of the World Federation of Jewish Fighters, Partisans and former camp inmates, Prof. Mazzon expressed the fraternal solidarity of the resistance movement in Europe with their comrades in Israel. The guest explained to the leaders of the organisations in Israel the stand of F. I. R. with regard to the Israel-Arab conflict, and the opinion of the Federation that the conflict must be solved by peaceful means only, and on the basis of the U. N. O. resolutions that guarantee the rights of all parties. In the joint conversations, the necessity was emphasised of intensifying the joint struggle against the revival of Nazism and fascism, against racism and anti-Semitism - a struggle symbolising the year in which all the peoples of Europe and the people of Israel are marking the 25th anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany.

The Committee of the organisations of anti-Nazi fighters in Israel and the executive of the World Federation of Jewish Fighters held a festive reception in honour of the guest.

Dr. A. Bermann, chairman of the Union of Anti-Nazi Fighters in Israel, who was one of the speakers, expressed in the name of the Union high esteem of the guest for his stand and activities within the framework of F. I. R. and on other occasions - as a loyal friend of the fraternal organisations in Israel, as a devoted fighter for the cause of peace, understanding and friendship between all the peoples.

Prof. Mazzon visited the Museum of the Holocaust and of Heroism in Jerusalem and was received by the Executive Committee of the General Federation of Labour in Israel. At a special press conference in Tel Aviv, Prof. Mazzon denounced, and expressed his deep shock, at the murder of Israeli children on the Lebanese frontier. He condemned these abominable deeds of the Arab sabotage organisations.

RESOLUTION OF THE F. I. R. BUREAU (April 1970)

"The conflict in the Middle East might turn into a world war at any moment. The escalation in the war in causing casualties among the innocent civilian population, among women and children, as happened in the cases of attacks on airplanes outside of the zone of war, as well as in the air-raids on Bakr Al Bahir, incidents that were a shock to world public opinion. The Security Council resolution of 22. 1. 67 has remained a dead letter, and only the full, careful implementation of this resolution will make possible a settlement of the conflict in the interest of all the peoples concerned. "

ISRAEL'S ANTI-NAZI FIGHTERS DEMAND TO FREE THE POLITICAL PRISONERS IN GREECE

A conference of activists of the Union of Anti-Nazi Fighters in Israel that took place in Tel Aviv on May 30, 1970, expressed complete solidarity with all the anti-fascist and democratic prisoners in Greece, including the Greek national hero Manolis Glesos, who have been deprived of their freedom for years. The Union presented its protest to the representative of the Greek authorities in Israel against the cruel persecution and the continuation of the arrests, and demanded the liberation of all political prisoners and detainees from the prisons and concentration camps in Greece.

The conference also called all its activists and members to participate in the relief campaign for the flood victims in the Socialist Republic of Romania.

The conference called to take steps for peace between Israel and the Arab countries based on the Security Council resolution of November 1967, and expressed its support of peace without annexations.

Other resolutions of the conference demanded to respect the cease-fire on both sides and to beware of hitting civilian targets on either side, especially children.

Dr. A. Berman, chairman of the Union, reported on the discussions of the F. I. R. Bureau and its resolutions. A. Hass, Secretary of the Union, reported on the activities of the organisation in marking the 25th anniversary of the victory over Nazi Germany, as well as on the programme of activities to mark this autumn 15 years of the foundation of the Union of Anti-Nazi Fighters in Israel.

AID FROM ISRAEL FOR THE FLOOD VICTIMS IN ROMANIA

When the dimensions of the flood disaster and the heavy losses of human life and property in Romania became known, the Executive Committee of the Israel Federation of Labour dispatched to the victims, through the Romanian trade unions, 100 kilograms of medicaments as a contribution of solidarity of the workers of Israel.

A special actions committee to aid the flood victims was set up in Tel Aviv by the Israel-Romania Friendship Committee. A fund drive was launched to collect contributions, clothing and medical supplies for the tens of thousands of homeless.

The Industrial Service Corporation in cooperation with the Solda Export Company dispatched a thousand blankets, and "Elda", the Israel Foreign Trade Corporation rushed to Romania an urgent shipment of medicaments and foodstuffs.



THE PARIS CONFERENCE OF THE ISRAEL-PALESTINE COMMITTEES

By the end of March 1970, a conference of the Israel-Palestine Committees took place in Paris. It dealt with the problems of the Israel-Arab conflict and the ways to its solution. Participants in the conference were the representatives of various European leftist organisations, mainly from the New Left, as well as representatives of Mapam and the "Matspen" group from Israel.

In connection with this conference, the Israeli literary critic Gavriel Moked wrote (in "Kol Ha'am" of 21.5.70):

"It is note-worthy that the Paris conference was organised by a body (Israel-Palestine Committees) advocating a firm stand for Israel's right to self-determination and political existence together with a recognition of the Palestine entity and of the necessity to start a dialogue with its adherents, while opposing the trends of a "creeping annexation". This body has also gained the sympathy of personalities from the left (mainly on the European continent) such as Jean-Paul Sartre, who even dispatched a message of greetings to the initiators. However, it is deplorable that, for some reason or the other, representatives of various left organisations

in Israel, such as Maki, were not invited to the conference. Nor is it clear why nobody has approached the leaders of the Arab Communists in Israel, who, even though they follow the line of pan-Arab chauvinism and blindly obey the "line of the world centre", they are still, in my opinion, more internationalist than various leaders of the Palestinian belligerent organisations (leaders who were invited but did not come to the conference that was attended only by very few Arabs). It is also deplorable, for instance, instance, that no member of the Israeli New Left (SIAH) was present at the conference. Although it was announced at the beginning of the conference that a representative of this group would arrive, if he arrived, nobody saw nor heard him (at least in the plenum and in the principled discussions). So it appears that left political groups in Israel were represented only by Mapam on the one hand and "Matspen" on the other, following an invitation according to an undefined "key". The members of "Matspen" claimed they were also representing three other groups in Israel, including the Israeli New Left in Jerusalem.

A still more striking defect was the absence of the Palestinian representatives, and this was the reason that during three days of continuous discussions (in English and French) in a youth hostel of a Paris suburb, the Palestinian cause was presented (in its chauvinistic form) by "Marxists", who call themselves "Palestinians", of the "Matspen"-type, like Akiva Or and Eli Lebel. I must admit that I would have preferred to argue with pan-Arab nationalists or real Palestinians rather than with Or and Lebel; but to my regret, as I said, there were almost no real Palestinians, and their erroneous approach that refuses to admit the right to self-determination of the Jewish nation in Israel, was presented by "supra-national" revolutionaries of "Matzpen". Even if we had convinced them, we would not yet have reached an accord even with a single authentic Palestinian.

The absence of more representative opponents of annexation in Israel, and of the Palestinians, created at the conference a considerable feeling of frustration that was only slightly counter-balanced by the invitation and presence of various personalities from the Israeli left, such as Dr. Amnon Kapelyuk or Dr. Jeremiahu Yuval, and the representatives of the European left, including Jewish groups. Anyway, even at a conference where many important elements "concerned" were missing, one could feel with great tensivity, that the first condition for breaking the deadlock between the Israeli left and the Arab left (and above all: the Palestinian left) is to overcome the chauvinism on both sides. From the point of view, the "Matspen" people play effectively the role of the "Devil's advocate" by deceiving not so much the Israelis, but rather the Palestinians, the other Arabs and the left in Europe."

(continued on p. 28)

Progressives for Peace in the Middle East (G.B.)

May 28th, 1970

Dear Chaverim,

Jewish Communists, Left-Socialists, Peace-workers and former chaverim of Mapam (G.B.) in England met recently at an Inaugural Conference and merged to set up a new national organisation 'Progressives for Peace in the Middle East (G.B.)' with branches in London, Manchester and in the English Universities.

We aim i) to work within the British Socialist and Peace Movement for peace in the Middle East and for Israel-Arab Rapprochement;
ii) to give encouragement to all Left forces in the Middle East working for peace and for the right of self-determination for all peoples, such as the Israeli Communist Party ('Maki') and The Israeli New Left ('Siach') and similar Arab groups.

The following Resolution was agreed on and summarises our policy.

- " 1) The present conflict in the Middle East is a tragic confrontation between the State of Israel and the Arab States in which the victims have been the Palestine people;

it is NOT, as generally claimed on the Left, a struggle between the Imperialist U. S. A. backing Israel and the anti-Imperialist forces, lead by the U. S. S. R. , supporting the Arab States.

We consider that the Six-Day War of June 1967 was a war of national defense on the part of Israel against the intention of the Arab military rulers to destroy Israel.

However, we consider that a just and stable peace between Israel and the Arab States CAN be attained, based on mutual recognition of the national and legitimate rights of all the people concerned.

- 2) We regard the Security Council Resolution of November 1967 as an acceptable basis for an agreed solution to the continuing Israel-Arab conflict.

3) While supporting the national defense of Israel, we are opposed to the present government of 'National Unity'. We oppose its anti-working class programme and we deplore its contradictory attitude to a peaceful solution of the Israel-Arab conflict.

4) We oppose permanent annexation of territory occupied during the Defense War as being inconsistent with the achievement of permanent, recognised, safe and agreed boundaries for the State of Israel.

We equally oppose the August 1967 stand of the Arab rulers not to recognise Israel, not to negotiate with Israel and not to make peace with Israel.

5) We believe that the Palestinian people must be allowed to decide for themselves the political future of their territory (West Bank, Gaza Strip) in accordance with their wishes.

Equally, they must accept the right of the Jewish people in Israel to self-determination.

6) A progressive social development in the Middle East will not proceed through destruction of the State of Israel.

A Socialist solution to the economic and social problems of Israel and the Arab countries can only be considered after there is an end to the national conflict.

We appeal to all Progressives, Peace-workers, Socialists and Communists in England to help initiate a dialogue between Jewish and Arab progressives on the basis of this Resolution. "

We are now planning active campaigns for Peace in the Middle East by all our branches.

We shall also make all efforts to explain the aims of 'Maki' and 'Siach' to the British Left and to keep the British Left informed of your political efforts in Israel.

Fraternal Greetings.

Dr. A. Packter.

National Secretary

'Progressives for Peace in the Middle East (G.B.)'

1870

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...