

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL  
CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPARTMENT

X

# Information Bulletin

IN THIS ISSUE:

CC, CPI HOLDS 12TH PLENARY SESSION

TASKS OF THE HOUR, BY E. HABIBI

SOUNDS THAT KILLED THE MUSIC, BY R. LUBITSCH

THIS BE A GOOD YEAR, A YEAR OF PEACE

ISRAEL'S GOVERNMENT WITHOUT MAKE-UP, BY T. TOUBI

PROGRAMME AND POLITICAL BUREAU, CPI

LIFE AND ACTIVITIES

HX

632

A1

W9

No. 1299

MAIN

S:


CENTRAL COMMITTEE,  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF

10 KATZELNICKIY  
STREET

TEL AVIV  
ISRAEL



OCTOBER 1966



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2018 with funding from  
University of Alberta Libraries

## Contents

---

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE C.P. OF I. HOLDS ITS 12th PLENARY SESSION	2
TASKS OF THE HOUR by Emile Habibi	2
SOUNDS THAT KILLED THE MUSIC by Ruth Lubitsch	7
MAY THIS BE A GOOD YEAR, A YEAR OF PEACE	12
ESHKOL'S GOVERNMENT WITHOUT MAKE-UP, by Tawfiq Toubi	16
COMMUNIQUE OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU, COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL	29
FROM PARTY LIFE AND ACTIVITIES:	
I. Communist trade union activists meet to discuss struggle against unemployment and high prices	33
II. Two thousand in mass election meeting in Nazareth	34

THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE C. P. OF I.  
HOLDS ITS 12th PLENARY SESSION

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel held its 12th plenary session on September 9th-10th 1966, with members of the Central Control Commission attending. The meeting was chaired by Central Committee member Salim el-Kassem.

Political Bureau member Emile Habibi reported on "recent political developments in Israel, the Middle East and the international arena, and the Party's tasks".

David (Sasha) Henin, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee, gave an account of the activities of the Political Bureau and the Secretariat.

After a discussion, in which the majority of the Central Commission members took part, and which was summed up by Political Bureau Secretary Meir Vilner, the meeting endorsed the report, the account of activities and the summing-up of the discussion, and also took a number of decisions.

At the conclusion of the Central Committee session, Comrade M. Vilner greeted, on behalf of the Central Committee, its member Pnina Feinhaus, on the occasion of her 40 years as member of the Communist Party in our country.

TASKS OF THE HOUR

by Emile Habibi

(Extracts from a report on the political situation and the Party's tasks delivered by Comrade Emile Habibi to the 12th Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel, held on 9-10th September 1966).

Comrade E. Habibi stressed the gravity of the present international situation, stemming from the continuation and escalation of American aggression in Vietnam. "The Chinese leaders' splitting anti-Soviet positions, now more marked than ever, hamstringing the efforts to unite all anti-imperialist forces in the fight to put a stop to U.S. aggression and avert a fall into the abyss of a new world war" — said Cde. E. Habibi.

The reporter then dwelt on the extremely serious consequences for the cause of peace and Socialism, resulting from the fresh anti-Soviet outbreaks in China. "We agree with the view held by the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. and the other fraternal parties, that this stand of the Chinese leaders, actually does a great service to U.S. imperialism...."

"It is our opinion that all of us, all the forces of Communism and of progress are duty bound to learn the lesson of the hapless 'Chinese experiment', just as we learnt — and are still learning — the reasons that led to the mistakes committed in Stalin's time. And the very first thing we must clearly realize is that this process of deterioration leads to nationalist, anti-Soviet postures. Our Party is resolutely opposed to views appearing here and there, to the effect that Communists can best strike roots among their people by multiplying criticism of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. We are of the opinion (which, as always, continues to guide us) that, in the light of the dangerous international situation and of the state of affairs in our movement, the most urgent internationalist duty consists in tightening the fraternal links of solidarity with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has been placed by history in the forefront not only of the Communist camp but also of the modern world's progressive forces. The C. P. S. U.'s 23rd Congress has proved that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is the only one whose policy, fund of experience and weight of international responsibility enable it to assume a central role in uniting the Communist movement and the entire world democratic movement...."

Cde. E. Habibi then went on to speak of the way the Middle East was feeling the influence of the Vietnamese war and stressed the division of roles between American, British and West German imperialism. The British Press is quite explicit about the fact that "maintenance of the British position East of Suez" — which is how the Labour Government defines its policy — was executed in concert with the American aggressors; the latter have charged the British and the pro-imperialist governments of the Middle East — Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Israel — with the task of safeguarding the U.S. imperialists' rear in the area. This is how we interpret the blueprint for an "Islamic Pact", the

steady flow of American and British arms to the reactionary regimes of the Middle East and the fact of the U.S. having become the chief supplier of weapons for the Eshkol government.

The statement made by the commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S. concerning President Johnson's resentment at the opposition to American aggression in Vietnam voiced by broad sections of U.S. Jewry as well as the "understanding between Johnson and Eshkol" on this score is at one and the same time a badge of honour for the Jewish masses in the U.S. and an alarm signal to all friends of peace and progress in our country, in the face of the Eshkol government's dangerous pro-imperialist policy.

We regret to note that, in its efforts to obscure the Eshkol government's place in U.S. global strategy and the political price that government is paying in return for the arms deals with the U.S., the Mikunis-Sneh group does nothing to increase the vigilance of our country's progressive forces.

In his articles M. Sneh evades this crucial problem and turns his entire attention to the fact that the Eshkol government is made up of working-class parties. We in no way belittle the significance of this composition but still the determining criterion is the threat it poses to peace and people's independence. We shall — said the reporter — spell out to our people in all its gravity the danger that stems from the fact that the pro-imperialist governments of the Middle East (including Eshkol's) are partners in the global strategy of American imperialism.

The next point to be dealt with by Cde. E. Habibi was an analysis of the Middle East situation, characterized by yet additional achievements for the Arab peoples' movement of national and social liberation, in spite of the imperialists' attempts at setting up an "Islamic Pact". The fiasco of the latest abortive coup in Syria is but fresh proof of the fact that imperialism and pro-imperialist reaction have ceased to be omnipotent factors in the area.

The reporter gave high praise to the cessation of the dirty war waged in Iraq against the valiant Kurdish people and the acknowledgement by the Arab national liberation movement of the Kurdish people's right to national self-determination. This is an event of very great import for the future evolution of relations between the peoples of the Middle East — stressed E. Habibi.

The reporter condemned the campaign of persecution unleashed against progressive forces in Jordan, first and foremost the Communists. "This campaign will but increase the isolation of the reactionary regime in Jordan and bring its collapse nearer in sight. . . ."

"The fresh gains of the progressive national-liberation movement in the Arab countries deepen the crisis affecting the policy of the area's pro-imperialist governments — in Israel just as in Jordan and Saudi Arabia and other countries. At the same time we call for more vigilance in anticipation of further provocations against peace. . . ."

"Our Party welcomed the agreement recently concluded between Israel and Syria, through the agency of U.N. Observers, which brought about a relaxation of tension on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee. This agreement shows there is every possibility of maintaining calm on the borders and stopping the descent down the slippery path of war.

"However, the failure of the attempt to overthrow the new Syrian regime from within, compels us to warn against possible attempts by imperialism to create once more tension and try to topple this regime from without. News of a fresh increase of tension on the Israel-Syria border must serve as an alarm signal. Today, more than ever, we can point to the correctness of our slogan: 'The way for Israel to reach the haven of security is to march, not with imperialism against the Arab peoples but with the Arab peoples against imperialism' . . . ."

Cde E. Habibi condemned negative phenomena in Syria, especially anti-Israeli statements.

The reporter then went on to speak of the situation in Israel and of the tasks facing the Party, dwelling on the aggravation of the political-economic crisis affecting official Israeli policy. . . . "The upheavals that have shaken almost all of Israel's political parties are a consequence of the fact that this same policy far from solving any one of Israel's basic problems has merely aggravated all of them. The delusion that Eshkol's government might be able to extricate our country from the throes of this crisis is now going by the board. And it was precisely at this moment — with aggravated internal upheavals affecting the political parties and an all-round crisis brought about by the traditional policy — that the Mikunis-Sneh group dealt a serious blow

at our Party by splitting it, the only party that presents our people with an alternative — a policy of non-dependence on imperialism, peace with the Arab peoples, democracy and social progress. By obscuring the true nature of government policy from nationalist positions the Mikunis-Sneh group is doing great damage to the cause of grouping forces for a change of policy.

"Despite all existing difficulties our Party is determined to fulfil its patriotic duty by the Israeli people. We shall intensify the struggle of the workers and of the whole of our people under the watchword : 'Bread, Work and Peace!'..."

E. Habibi spoke at great length of the present economic crisis, expanding unemployment and rising cost of living, wage freeze and suspension of the cost-of-living allowance, all in accordance with the Government's programme of "economic restraint". The speaker branded the Eshkol government's economic plans, which hit at the working people and open wide all gates before foreign monopoly capital...

"Despite all the jingoist propoganda on the theme of 'defence requirements', the working class is far from being passive, but, on the contrary is stepping up its struggle, thus setting off internal stresses and strains within the Government and within the Coalition parties. Fearful of the intensified struggle of the broad masses, the Prime Minister plans legislation aimed against the right to strike and announces plans for changes in the electoral system.

"We criticize the right-wing in Mapam and the Mikunis-Sneh group for throwing a smokescreen around the Eshkol government.

"There does exist a perfectly practicable alternative and it is this : Strengthening of the Left-wing opposition to Eshkol's anti-popular policy, its unity and a broadening of the scope of this Left-wing opposition's mass activities. We reject any theory (from wherever it issues) that alleges the vital necessity of Mapam's remaining in the Government. We appeal to Mapam not to fall back once again on arguments of the "dice are cast" variety, which she adduced to justify her staying in the Ben Gurion government (at the time of the 1956 Suez-Sinai war — trans.). The paramount duty before Israel's patriotic forces



is to reinforce the Left-wing opposition. Mapam's place is in that camp and that is where the working class expects it to be.

"Unity of all Left forces in the fight for bread, work and peace — that is the order of the day."

(From "Zu Haderekh" 27.9.66)

### SOUNDS THAT KILLED THE MUSIC

by Ruth Lubitsch

On Yom Kippur (the Day of Atonement), during the prayer for the "well-being of Soviet Jewry", Israel's rulers should, by all rights, have beaten their fists on their breast and chanted: "We have sinned, we have done wrong" and said out aloud: "Our people wanted good relations with the USSR and we acted in defiance of this wish." And if the representatives of Israeli policy thought of evading this examination of conscience, the Soviet communique cancelling the projected exchange of visits by Soviet and Israeli symphony orchestras, came as a reminder to the Israeli authorities to desist from their hostile policy toward the Soviet Union and to expose before the Israeli people the grave repercussions of this policy.

The truth is that we would really have liked to extend our country's hospitality to the Moscow State Orchestra and have our excellent Philharmonic Orchestra demonstrate its great virtuosity in the USSR.

The obstacles to this taking place, however, are not to be found in the field of music; it transpires that the "high-pitched" and jarring notes of anti-Soviet propaganda torpedoed the concerts planned. The sole culprits are, therefore, the anti-Soviet political "conductors" and it is they whom our Philharmonic Orchestra and public should bring to account. The Israeli public will once more have to work very hard to eliminate the various hurdles obstructing the development of cultural and artistic ties between our two countries.

It has all happened before :

The ruling circles and the Israeli Press were furious at the Soviet announcement cancelling the Israel Symphony Orchestra's visit to Moscow. "Ha'aretz" (23.9.66) asked with feigned innocence : "Is it really necessary to waste words in order to prove that no 'anti-Soviet campaign' whatsoever is taking place in Israel ?" This is the attitude taken up by most other newspapers too.

It needs no great effort of memory to enumerate a whole series of assemblies (some of them at Government level) such as the convention of leaders of municipal authorities, activities carried out by the "Ma'oz" association (society for "defending Soviet Jewry"!) which is assisted by the Government and widely publicized over the "Kol Yisrael" network, "Soviet Jewry Week" etc. Anti-Soviet incitement proceeded apace and even got worse these last months despite the expansion of cultural, scientific and touristic links these last years.

The atmosphere has lately been troubled by the distribution of provocative leaflets against the USSR during a performance of the Moscow State Circus; neither the Government nor the Ramat Gan Municipality has reacted appropriately to this grave incident.

The public's mind has been not a little poisoned by the scandal which broke out over singer Geula Gil's interview on her return from a series of concerts in the Soviet Union — when the Press enthusiastically "seized the occasion" and filled pages on end with unfounded accusations and unfriendly words for the USSR (alleging, among others, the arrest in Riga of a 15 year old Soviet Jewish girl for having asked Miss Gil's autograph — trans.). In addition, the Israeli branch of the World Jewish Congress decided to hold a public meeting under the chairmanship of Tel Aviv's Mayor, M. Namir.

As in all preceding years, this year, too, the anti-Soviet smear campaign reaches its highest level with the opening of the U.N. General Assembly, where efforts will be made in the context of the Cold War to debate the "problem of Soviet Jewry". This explains the anti-Soviet demonstrations taking place in the U.S., openly joined by Senators and other official American personalities, petitions appealing for the "salvation of Soviet Jewry" etc.

Dozens of Israeli artistes have appeared in the Soviet Union where they were warmly received by the inhabitants of the towns they toured as well as by Soviet Jewish citizens. They added to Israel's good name and contributed to improved relations and understanding between our two countries. On the other hand, there were people who poisoned the wells of expanding cultural ties — orally and in writing, through the channels of "private" organizations and of Government bodies as well. And now comes this great wave of astonishment and protest at the USSR's reaction.

We for our part have always explained that these cases of hostile propaganda toward the Soviet Union sabotage our relations with that country. Now all kinds of commentators come forward to "expound" the reasons that impelled the Soviet Union to take such a step. The "Ha'aretz" version is that the projected visit "would have roused anger in the Arab world linked with Moscow", and its cancellation was intended to satisfy the Arab world . . . . one could really think the Arab world came to birth just now!!!

#### Uninvited guardians :

The discussion is an old one still going on and getting even more acrimonious.

Who, in fact, do Soviet Jews "belong" to ? > Who is responsible for their destiny ? In our time and age, with the continued existence of states with their various regimes, the Jews of the USSR are considered Soviet nationals just like all other inhabitants of the Soviet Union, they are subject to the provisions of the Soviet Constitution, the Soviet authorities are responsible for their lives and anything that concerns the Jews of the USSR concerns, too, all its other citizens.

The Soviet State has begun the large-scale construction of Communism, and tens of millions of Soviet citizens are partners in these majestic projects. The Jewish citizens, just like everyone else, are taking part in this great historic task in the framework of the world's most democratic society, whose basis is the ban on exploitation of man by man.

As far as Soviet Jewry is concerned, however, Israel's ruling circles reject this fundamental law of international relations. Their idea is that Soviet Jews are potentially "future citi-

zens of the State of Israel", and, as such, are under the patronage of Israeli and Zionist guardians.

"Davar" (23.9) wrote : "We do not have the right not to do this : it is our national and moral obligation to sound the alarm over the deprivation of Soviet Jews' rights."

As for "Ha'aretz", it wrote on this same subject : "The rulers of the Kremlin persist in calling illegitimate Israel's desire to give of its spirit to the Jews of the Dispersion (Jewish communities outside Israel — trans. ), including the Jews of the Soviet Union. We have been contesting this thesis for the last 49 years and the argument still goes on. We can never reconcile ourselves with this theory and Mr. Eshkol is as far from such a reconciliation as is any other Jew. We are now witnessing the unsuccessful end of the experiment carried out by the Premier for three consecutive years and aimed at moving the Soviet leadership from its stand, without of course giving up Russian Jewry...."

This theory — delicately described as "giving of the spirit of Israel" and which really means interfering in the USSR's domestic affairs — is opposed not only by the "rulers of the Kremlin"; it is also fought by all those who realize the grave harm caused the State of Israel by its rulers' complete identification with the theory and practice of Zionism and by making relations with other states conditional on their acceptance of (Zionist) ideological positions and basing these relations on subversive activities and pressure.

The Soviet Government takes an extremely serious view of this attitude of the Israeli Government and holds it responsible for the worldwide propaganda campaign being waged against her in the context of the Cold War and at the bidding of U. S. imperialism.

#### The USSR wants normal relations :

E. Selfter wrote in the New Year eve issue of "Ha'aretz" : "The Soviets have lately been putting out frequent hints to Israel, that if she wants a normalization of her relations with the USSR, she must first of all normalize her attitude toward Soviet Jewry. If Israel wishes to be treated like any other pro-Western state, she must not show any more concern for Soviet Jews or be more active on their behalf than, for instance, Italy with regard to the Catholics of the USSR."

On the same topic Y. Tadmor wrote in the New Year eve edition of "LaMerhav" : "The USSR is exceptionally sensitive to Israel's concern for the fate of Soviet Jewry. The USSR charges Israel with authorship of the systematic worldwide campaign against her. There was also no lack of hints that cessation of this campaign would have positive results in the political sphere."

Government circles therefore know full well that the very first condition for an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union, is for Israel's rulers to call off the campaign they are conducting in Israel itself and in the world at large "in defence of the rights of Soviet Jewry and for its salvation".

#### Soviet Jews loyal to the Soviet regime :

Some people put on a pose of innocence while others ask quite sincerely the question : Is it really forbidden to raise a protest against oppression and discrimination of Soviet Jews, as is done for the Jews of other countries, is that really considered unwarranted interference ?

It is, of course, perfectly legitimate and even mandatory to voice one's opinion and even protest when discrimination and persecution takes place in any country. There was, for example, room for Israel's rulers to protest against anti-Semitism in Argentina, the U.S. and West Germany, or against the persecution of Negroes in the U.S. It is no accident such protests were never voiced, whereas Israel's rulers are extremely voluble when it comes to protesting against imaginary persecutions and attacks on the rights of Soviet Jewry. E. Selfter, who cannot be suspected of harbouring any very great sympathy for the USSR, writes :

"Israeli personalities who have recently been to the Soviet Union and gone into the problem of the Jews' attitude toward emigration (to Israel), have come back with the impression that, even if the gates were opened, only a few would come. A large part of Soviet Jewry — including also members of the generation that received a Jewish education in its childhood — views the USSR as its homeland and is loyal to the Soviet regime, despite all its criticism of certain phenomena of that regime (including its attitude toward Jews)" - ("Ha'aretz", 14.9).

This appraisal certainly does not point to Soviet Jews being

the victims of persecution. The argument that the Soviet authorities are allegedly trying to hinder contacts between Soviet Jews and Israeli citizens is perfectly groundless, too. This is confirmed by the thousands of Israeli citizens who have visited the Soviet Union. It is quite natural that many Soviet Jews show interest in Israel.

Soviet Jews reject, however, the uninvited guardianship offered by Israel's rulers and the Zionist movement — a patronage aimed at calling into doubt Soviet Jews' loyalty to their homeland. This propaganda is very harmful indeed. . . .

The article concludes :

Israeli circles sincerely desirous of bettering relations with the USSR, must first of all rebuff the hostile propaganda which further disturbs Israeli-Soviet relations, and fight for the cessation of anti-Soviet incitement in any shape or form, for a change in Israeli policy toward the Soviet Union. Manifestations of goodwill in deeds and not words are the only way to bring about better relations, with closer ties in the fields of culture and art and all-round friendship between Israel and the Soviet Union. Only a different Israeli policy, one of genuine independence and neutralism, only it alone can bring about improvement in relations between the two countries, only it can lead to the establishment of ties that are not just indispensable but actually of decisive importance for the future of Israel and its development.

(Abridged)

("Zu Haderekh" Editorial 13.9.1966)

#### MAY THIS BE A GOOD YEAR, A YEAR OF PEACE

As is the custom every year, so, too, on the eve of the New Year 5726, the sons and daughters of Israel send greeting cards to their relatives and friends, wishing them a good year, a year of peace, security, economic well-being and source of livelihood.

It is not with rejoicing in their heart that the citizens of Israel welcome the New Year 5726. They find it hard to really believe that they have seen the last of a year and its accompanying evils. The cause of their scepticism lies in the speeches deli-

vered on the eve of the New Year by Prime Minister L. Eshkol and Chief of General Staff Y. Rabin.

In his "Kol Yisrael"(Government broadcasting service — trans.) speech of 11.9.66, the Premier's message for the working class and all working people was one of growing unemployment, the arbitrary withholding of the cost-of-living allowance for the next two years and stepped-up exploitation of the workers. As against this, he promised increased support for investors of capital and exporters. This speech of the Prime Minister served but to add to the anxiety gnawing at the hearts of working people and redouble their concern for their families' subsistence. Eshkol failed to present our people with any plan for peace, for the relaxation of tension; on the contrary, he spoke the language of threats.

Of even greater import is the statement by the Chief of General Staff, which appeared in the New Year issue of "Be Ma-hane", official organ of the Israel Defence Forces. It goes without saying that the content of the above mentioned interview was not just the result of the Chief of Staff's own cogitation. There is not the slightest doubt whatever that the Prime Minister and Minister of Defence L. Eshkol gave his approval to the statement and possibly even gave precise instructions for the way it should be phrased.

The Chief of General Staff reveals the cards of Government policy : its objective is to overthrow the present regime in Syria just as in 1956 the goal had been to overthrow the regime in Egypt. After having arbitrarily accused Syria, and Syria alone, with the entire responsibility for border tension, the Chief of Staff goes on to say quite explicitly that — in contrast with the policy pursued toward other Arab states — military actions undertaken by Israel against Syria are aimed "against the regime". "As far as Syria is concerned, then, — said the Chief of General Staff — the problem is essentially that of a clash with the regime. We can perhaps draw a parallel between the situation now obtaining and that which existed in the sphere of Israeli-Egyptian relations at the time of the Fedayeen raids in 1955-56. . . ."

A rather interesting comparison, it may be said, even though the Chief of General Staff denies attaching any great importance to historical comparisons. This does not, however, stop him from doing just that. The only way to interpret this comparison is as follows :

In 1956 the Ben Gurion government entered into collusion with the governments of France and Great Britain and started off a war that endangered Israel's very future and world peace; now, in 1966, all indications point to the Government's readiness to work — hand in glove with the U. S. Government — for the overthrow of the present Syrian regime, which maintains friendly relations with the USSR and is carrying out social reforms of a progressive nature.

Just this week a group of officer mercenaries tried to organize a revolt against the present Syrian regime, with the help of the Jordanian and Saudian monarchs, with the U. S. and British governments by no means passive observers on the sidelines.

A question that begs an answer is the following : Is it pure chance that this latest plot was commented in identical vein by "Kol Yisrael" and by Radio Amman ? It is certainly no mere accident that, after the fiasco of their abortive coup, these officers should flee from Syria precisely to Jordan, where they were granted political asylum.

Only a few months ago official circles tried to deny the fact that Washington — together with the governments of Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Israel — was hatching plots to topple down the new Syrian government, by any and every means. The latest developments have confirmed these fears. This week saw an attempt at overthrowing the regime in Syria, with the avowed complicity of Jordan and Saudi Arabia.

With the failure of the attempted coup there is a growing danger that Washington might wish to resort to other means to gain its ends and might, with this objective in mind, avail itself of the "good offices" of the Israeli Government. Is not just this the political implication of the comparison drawn by the Chief of General Staff between our present relations with Syria and those with Egypt in 1956

It would appear that the escalation of American aggression in Vietnam has provided encouragement for our own militarists.

In taking a stand against the Government's policy with its utterly irresponsible attitude toward the fate of the nation, we Communists are actually safeguarding Israel's security, independence and very future, protecting the lives of our sons and daughters, and defending our towns and villages.



We reject anti-Israeli declarations when such are made by Syrian leaders. We reject threats to use force and the actual resort to force across border lines, from whatever side they issue.

A serious deterioration of the border situation can only be averted if we clearly realize the specific source of tension on the Syrian border at the present period : the U.S. government's schemes to overthrow the present Syrian government. It is no coincidence that, of late, the U.S. has shipped large quantities of arms to Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Israel — and, what is more, types of weapons which they had not, up till then, been willing to supply.

The stepped-up arms race brings in its wake grave economic difficulties as well as intensification of the onslaught on the working people's interests and rights.

The statements made by Eshkol and Rabin on the eve of the (Jewish) New Year are in crying contradiction with the longings and aspirations of our people who earnestly desire peace, economic development and a higher standard of living.

Despite the jarring notes resounding in these statements of the Premier and the Chief of General Staff, we remain optimistic in the belief that the forces of peace among our own people together with peace fighters the world over will bar the way before the American strifemongers and prevent them setting off a conflagration in our part of the world.

Let us group together all the sound forces of our people in the struggle to preserve calm on the borders, safeguard peace, and effect a change of official policy — that Israel may pursue a policy of peace, true independence, equality of national rights and social progress.

May the year 5726 be a year of peace and of success for the working people in their united struggle to safeguard their interests. Happy New Year!

("Zu Haderekh", 27.9.1966)

ESHKOL'S GOVERNMENT WITHOUT MAKE-UP

by Tawfiq Toubi

I

Ben Gurion's fall from power resulted from the bankruptcy of official Israeli policy, of which he had been the very personification; the crisis took the form of a bitter internal struggle within Mapai, culminating in that party's split.

At that juncture, broad segments of the Israeli public nurtured the expectation that the changes in the personal composition of the Government would mean an end to the traditional Israeli policy — the pro-imperialist and anti-democratic, anti-Arab "from positions of strength" and anti-working-class course. There were many who hoped the Eshkol government would steer Israel's ship of State toward new shores, in the direction of genuine independence and neutralism, a change of attitude toward the Arab countries and adoption of a policy safeguarding the interests of our country's working people.

We have never been indifferent as to the struggle waged by Ben Gurion and his followers to have Ben Gurion returned to power. Together with other democratic forces we fought against Ben Gurionism and to prevent Ben Gurion's recapturing the reins of government, because we viewed him as a spokesman of the virulently militaristic and anti-democratic trends at work among the ruling circles. Already at the very height of that struggle we warned against the "policy of continuation", proclaimed by Eshkol, and we stressed that such a policy was pregnant with the danger of reactionary changes and of an even graver bankruptcy.

Then, already, we noted that B-G's departure would better the prospects of success in the public's fight for democratic reforms, on the condition that it keep up the struggle against the "policy of continuation".

The Mapai leadership had its own reasons for replacing B-G by Eshkol. That party's leadership meant to use these changes of office-holders (accompanied by a certain shift in tactics and style) to save traditional Israeli policy and adapt it to the fresh winds blowing in the world. The change in style and behaviour, as reflected in an abundance of declarations ending

with the call for peace and even "an invitation for the spirit of Tashkent" to come to our part of the world, as well as statements expressing a desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union, were actually a screen meant to conceal the continuation, nay the intensification of the old Israeli policy in various fields.

We warned against opinions which even found their way into our Communist Party and which "Kol Ha'am" has been playing up ever since the split of August 1965, that saw Israeli policy in the light of wishful thinking, thus undermining the vigilance and weakening the struggle of the democratic forces and of the Left-wing forces inside the labour movement.

Following the elections we criticized Mapam's joining the Government and concluded that, to all intents and purposes, this step would weaken the struggle against Eshkol's government and provide "Left-wing cover" for its reactionary policy, which is contrary to Israel's national interests and to the bread-and-butter interests of the working people. Once, already in the past, Mapam had been a victim to the delusion of pursuing a struggle "from within", which led it to partnership in, and responsibility for the aggressive war launched in 1956 against Egypt in collusion with the British and French imperialists.

We considered it our duty to continue the struggle against the Eshkol government and against its anti-labour, anti-Arab and anti-Soviet policy, as a prerequisite for the mobilization of all healthy forces in the struggle to change that policy.

The true nature of Eshkol's government is not revealed either by the manifold pious declarations of its desire for peace with the neighbouring countries and improved relations with the USSR or by Mr. Sneh's view (expressed in the "Kol Ha'am" issue of 2.9.66) that "the Israeli labour movement, apart from the Communists, constitutes the public basis for the present government". What really characterizes the government is the fact of its continuing in the old beaten path, traced by preceding governments, whose public basis, too, was formed by the "Israeli labour movement, apart from the Communists..." This going in the old trodden path takes the shape of continued subservience to imperialism — a policy antagonistic to the cause of peace between Israel and the Arab states, persistent anti-Soviet propaganda and the adoption of measures directed against the working class. We do differentiate between a govern-

ment based on workers' parties and one with another basis (although, in actual fact, Israel has not yet had another government than one based on right-wing labour parties), but the yardstick for our stand toward the government is the policy it pursues on key issues and not its composition.

The essential features of Eshkol's policy :

a) In the sphere of Israeli-U.S. relations : Still closer links with the main imperialist power and integration in its global strategy.

The "Ha'aretz" special correspondent in the United States, Eli Eyal, wrote as follows (23.9) : "During Johnson's administration (and Eshkol's too - T. T. ) all fig-leaves have been dropped in the field of Israeli-U.S. relations and these really and truly were laid bare : the U.S. aids Israel in the teeth of Arab protests . . . what Kennedy did in muted tones, Johnson is doing in the glare of publicity. What Kennedy refrained from doing — inviting the Israeli Premier to Washington as an official guest — Johnson did and even played it up. For Kennedy Israel had been a part of the whole complex of foreign relations and an object of foreign policy. For Johnson, however, Israel also lies within the realm of U.S. home policy, influencing, as it does, American Jewry in determining its stand. . ." So, previously a pawn in U.S. foreign policy, Israeli-U.S. ties have now become an instrument of U.S. internal politics, the objective being to influence U.S. Jewry to support government policies. The picture of U.S. -Israeli relations described above takes the following concrete forms :

\* For the very first time in the history of the State of Israel, the U.S. is officially, directly and openly meeting the majority of Israel's military requirements. This military assistance is being extended in the framework of a doctrine elaborated by U.S. Defence Secretary MacNamara, according to which the U.S. shall aid their friends in every possible way so as to enable them to stand on their own feet and stand guard over peace (pax Americana, of course).

\* Continuing Israeli activity on both the political and military levels in support of imperialist intervention against the Arab peoples' movement for national and social liberation and in defence of reactionary, pro-imperialist regimes. This lately manifested

itself in political and military pressure brought to bear on Syria; concerted action with the Iranian Government to "check Nasserist penetration" (Premier Eshkol's trip to Teheran), which is in fact assistance to the Islamic Pact.

\* Support for Johnson's Vietnam policy, while leaving some room for manoeuvring. It is no secret that the Israeli Government is trying to influence U.S. Jewry into supporting Johnson's stand on Vietnam. This was shown by President Shazar's declarations made during his United States visit in July 1966, in which he tried to enhance Johnson's prestige in the eyes of American Jewish public opinion, by depicting him as a lover of peace and a protector of small peoples. A further proof of this line is provided by a "New York Times" report (11.9.66) telling about the Israeli Government activity to explain to American Jewry that opposition to President Johnson's Vietnam policy is detrimental to U.S. assistance to Israel. . . . Even though the content of this report was timidly contradicted by an Israeli Foreign Ministry spokesman it received fresh confirmation in Abba Eban's statement to the "Ha'aretz" Political Correspondent (11.9.66), to the effect that "in view of the elections lately held in South Vietnam, Israel might reconsider her decision not to establish diplomatic relations with that country. . . ."

b) In the sphere of Israeli-West German relations : Not just continuation but actually consolidation of the all-round collaboration with the Bonn Government.

Eshkol has set up diplomatic ties with Bonn and acted as host to German diplomats with a Nazi past, signed an economic accord with West Germany and flung the gates of our country wide open for West German capital. It also transpires that Eshkol is going on with the Israeli-Bonn arms deals which provoked, at the time, an outburst of public anger and even triggered off a government crisis. In an article by N. Lavi, the newspaper "Ha'aretz" (14.9) informs us that "in Ben Gurion's days 'Ahdut Ha'avoda' could set off a government crisis over the sale of arms to Germany; now in the days of the Eshkol government, which has 'Ahdut Ha'avoda' and Mapam ministers, weapons are still being sold and sent to the Bundeswehr".

c) In the sphere of Israeli-Soviet relations : Continuation of the smear campaign against the USSR on the subject of Soviet

Jewry with all the high-sounding phrases about the wish for better relations with the Soviet Union and the other Socialist states.

The anti-Soviet smear propaganda conducted under the guidance of the Eshkol government, allegedly out of concern for Soviet Jews, has already wrought great harm to relations between the two countries. To no avail have been all the warnings and advice tendered to the Israeli authorities, to refrain from their meddling in this sphere, which is the exclusive concern of Soviet Jews themselves and of the Soviet Government. As a result of this incitement and other anti-Soviet activities, the projected exchange of visits by Israeli and Soviet philharmonic orchestras has been cancelled and (Israeli-Soviet) relations become further strained.

d) In the field of nuclear disarmament : Pursuance of efforts to "increase Israel's deterrent power in all types of weapons" and continued opposition to denuclearization of the Middle East.

"Ha'arets" (14.9.66) wrote in this connection : "In Ben Gurion's days, Mapam — and to a considerable extent 'Ahdut Ha'avoda' too — moved heaven and earth against certain defence establishments. Today, under Eshkol, these same plants are still working but the noise has stopped..." Mapam's leader, M. Ya'ari, too, has recently confirmed the irresistible urge to obtain weapons of all categories.

e) In the field of Israeli-Arab relations : Additional deterioration of relations between Israel and the Arab states.

All along the line, from unilateral action to divert Jordan river waters and commissioning of the National Water Carrier, with ostentatious disregard for the position of the neighbouring (Arab) countries, through threats to employ force and its actual use on 4 occasions in connection with Arab activity in the vicinity of the Jordan and its tributaries; the attempts to create accomplished facts in the Israeli-Syria frontier demilitarized zone, in contempt of the rights of Syrian fellaheen deprived of their lands or denied free access to them — in defiance of the Armistice Agreement; stepped-up military activity against Syria (the "El Fateh" organizations's very dubious and provocative actions having been seized as a pretext), which fitted in very nicely with the imperialist pressure turned on against the new, progressive regime in Syria.

The Chief of Staff's interview, carried by the New Year edition of "Be Mahaneh" (official organ of the Army), was further proof of the situation's gravity and buttressed our argument that intensification of friction with Syria is aimed at serving the imperialist interest of toppling the present regime in Syria. Y. Rabin (the C. G. S. ) was perfectly candid about the whole thing : "The problem with Syria, then, is essentially that of a clash with the regime. We can perhaps draw a parallel between the situation obtaining now and that which existed in the sphere of Israeli-Egyptian relations at the time of the Fedayeen raids in 1955-56. . ." No value whatsoever is to be attached to the clarifications made, in the wake of public protests, by the Prime Minister who claimed that a "certain passage in the Chief of Staff's interview has been misconstrued". The reason for our scepticism is that, in the very same statement, the Premier, in fact, went on to give his approval to everything Rabin had said, and even more : we have learnt ("Ha'arets", 19.9.66) that "it appears now, in the light of the statement made by the Government's Private Secretary, that the content of the Chief of Staff's interview had, in its broad outlines, been previously concerted with Prime Minister and Minister of Defence, Levi Eshkol".

Y. Rabin's statement should serve as a warning of the dangers inherent in any new adventure as well as disclosing the motives for the tension and incidents that have recently occurred on the Israel-Syria border.

It is clear, then, that Eshkol has learnt absolutely nothing from the fate of his master adventurer predecessor and in his obstinate pursuance of B-G's policy, a policy of force and the creation of accomplished facts, he is liable to bring Israel to the very same position Ben Gurion brought her to in 1956.

f) In home policy : An economic offensive against the working class and the broad masses with the aim of bringing the standard of living down and ensuring still greater profits for capitalists.

This attack on the labouring strata of the population represents an extremely negative balance for a government "whose coalition basis is constituted by the labour movement with the exception of the Communists".

In a "Davar" (semi-official newspaper — trans. ) interview published in the supplement to the New Year issue, Eshkol answered a question touching on criticism levelled at his leader-

ship. He said : "As far as I understand there are no complaints in the field of foreign policy or in that of defence . . . as for wages, that is a problem previous governments have hardly dealt with. On every issue raised the answer was : that's a matter for the Histadrut. Whether it was a matter of wages or of the c-o-l allowance, it was invariably referred to the Histadrut. And if I or Sapir did intervene, it was only unofficially. That is how things stood for 18 years, while Ben Gurion was in charge. Unlike its predecessors, this government has been very thoroughly going into economic and labour problems. Together with the Histadrut, the Government has taken up the problem of restrained economic activity. We have overcome the problem of wildcat strikes which plagued the country for years on end. We have also solved the problem of unjustified payments of the cost-of-living allowance. Is not this purposeful leadership?" . . . In the course of the same interview, Eshkol voiced his regret at the Histadrut decision in favour of a 15% wage rise for 1966-67, adding that even though industrial workers had received a 10% rise for 1966, he was sure there were employers who would not pay out the whole 5% increment due for 1967 or would even pay nothing at all and the "workers don't mind at all" — these are the cynic words of Eshkol.

So does Eshkol laud his "working-class" government to the skies, even though in its acts it is unmistakably hostile to labour — as proved, in fact, by the Prime Minister's own words.

As for the democratic liberties and the attitude toward the Arab population, suffice it to note the following : the ever-present threat to introduce changes in the electoral system; the inclusion, in the Law for the Constitution of Government, of a clause endangering the freedom of publication; the drafting of bills designed to restrict the freedom of class struggle. Military Government is in effect still in place and used in exactly the same way as before — its "black lists" are getting longer and there is an increasing number of orders restricting Arab citizens to their places of residence and others compelling them to report at police stations several times a day. The seizure of Arab lands is proceeding as before; the policy of national discrimination is still in force and even aggravated with the general worsening of the economic situation.

Such is the harvest reaped by the policy of the Eshkol govern-



ment, a government "based on the labour parties" and whose main pillar is the "Alignment", a Government in whom some people saw a Left-ward shift in Mapai and in the labour movement. It is an undisputed fact that this Government, and all its participants without exception, are galloping down the same old beaten path, and that is the criterion that (as in the past) will always determine our stand toward the Government. The fact of Mapam and 'Ahdut Ha'avoda' participating in the government has not had the effect of promoting positive changes — for all the existence of internal contradictions — but has served as a means of braking the democratic struggle against the policy of continuation and as Left-wing cloak to mislead working-class and democratic elements.

The Eshkol government's policy record shows how our Communist Party was right in the position it adopted vis-a-vis that government from the very day it was formed, in the warnings it has issued as to the consequences of that policy, in revealing its real positions before the broad masses and public opinion, in exposing its dangerous stratagems, in organizing public struggles against its economic and social policies and in its calls for a grouping of democratic forces to fight the Eshkol government's policy in all fields.

## II

The record of the Eshkol government is a slap in the face for the Mikunis-Sneh group's opportunist and nationalistic stand and its unprincipled manoeuvring with regard to the Eshkol government which they began to pursue ever since the change of course they effected in themselves and in their policy, following their breakaway from the Communist Party.

The facts of life have contradicted M. Sneh's evaluation of Eshkol's government (during a speech in Haifa, reported in "Kol Ha'am", 29.5.66), claiming that official Israeli policy had made the first steps away from the old course.

Let us examine some of the appraisals and positions put forward by members of the Mikunis-Sneh group, in the light of the policy actually conducted by the Eshkol government.

One of the features characteristic of the positions adopted by the Mikunis-Sneh group is the striving to obscure the nature

of the Eshkol government's ties with imperialism and minimize the bearing these ties have on government policy as well as some strenuous acrobatics in an attempt to find evidence of quite imaginary "shifts" and "changes" in the government's policy.

For instance, the resolution of their Central Committee as published in the "Kol Ha'am" edition of 31.5.66, contained various points to make up a... "correct general line for the Communist Party". The first point defined the State of Israel as a "nation-state with a capitalist regime" and rejected all attempts to question its legitimacy by calling it an "imperialist base" and such like (rejections which are per se correct); while the second point explains the way they wish to wage "an indefatigable struggle to have the Israeli-Arab dispute, like all other disputes, settled by peaceable means" and so forth. These two important points fail to make any mention whatsoever of the Israeli rulers' pro-imperialist policy or of the need to fight it, though precisely such a struggle is the very best guarantee for the disappearance of such definitions as "imperialist base" which are current in the Arab camp and even among progressive anti-imperialist circles.

The absence of this important truth leaves its stamp on all of the positions taken up by the Mikunis-Sneh group, which are marked by their pooh-poohing of the grave significance of these ties with imperialism and, more particularly, of the implications these links have for Israel's relations with the Arab countries as well by their failure to realize the dangers inherent in the Eshkol government's adventurist policies.

The members of the Mikunis-Sneh group — true to their views on the nature of the Israeli-Arab conflict and on the source of tension in the area, reject any idea of imperialist influence being behind steps taken by the government and armed clashes on the border. M. Sneh even thought fit to note ("Kol Ha'am", 29.5.66) "a few first steps taken by official Israeli policy away from the old course (the underscoring is mine - T. T.) . . . . a) the absence of any military reprisal for the border incidents caused by Syria — in opposition to the American plan for the overthrow of the present government in Damascus. The necessity must be urged on the government for continuing this course of action and persisting in it in the future, too. . . ."

Sneh, of course, is not to be blamed for Eshkol's refusal to "restrain himself" but he is very much responsible for describing the Government's position in a false light, even going as far as to claim it had adopted a stand that was "opposed to American plans". We would very much like the Government to really act in that manner, for that way Israel would save itself a great deal of trouble. Unfortunately, however, the facts speak quite otherwise; suffice it to mention Chief of General Staff Rabin's insistence on the need to act against the present regime in Damascus.

Communists who wish to change this policy and free Israel from imperialist influence must, on no account, stutter and beat about the bush nor ridicule official Soviet statements in the mistaken belief that, in so doing, they are defending "Israel's honour ..." and "... rebuffing slander hurled at her". Such attitudes do considerable damage to the fight for Israel's detachment from subservience to imperialism and the struggle for peace, since they cut away the basis for joint action with the anti-imperialist forces in the Middle East and on a world scale, while only cooperation with these same forces promises success in the struggle for Israel's true interests.

Immediately following their correct criticism of Rabin's declaration, the "Kol Ha'am" editors saw fit to take up the defence of the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister and write that Rabin only expressed his own personal opinion whereas "our government", "our Premier" and "our Foreign Minister" hold quite different views ... In "Kol Ha'am's" opinion (12.9.66) : "Rav-Aluf (Major General) Y. Rabin's words do not even conform to declarations made by the Prime Minister of Israel. The Israeli Government has proclaimed on more than one occasion that it has not set a course on a "head-on collision with the Syrian regime" and that it wants to honour the Armistice Agreements. The Government has also proclaimed its readiness to do its part in settling the problem of land cultivation in disputed areas (in the Israel-Syria border Demilitarized Zone) as well as other outstanding problems in the area. Foreign Minister Abba Eban said at the time that Israel does not intend to interfere in Syria's domestic politics..." What wonderful loyalty to the Coalition, and without even being a member! We can let it pass if "Kol Ha'am" attacks only Chief of General Staff Rabin, while leaving the Government and its Premier alone, even though Rabin's statement merely

reflected government policy. But why these fulsome praises addressed to the Government? Wasn't it after all, the Prime Minister himself who gave his O.K. to Y. Rabin's interview in "Be Mahaneh", or are there perhaps "two distinct lines" — that of the Prime Minister and that of the Minister of Defence? (L. Eshkol holds both these posts — trans.). How is it possible thus to describe a government which, just less than two months ago sent its planes to bomb Syrian territory, a government that persists in committing various violations of the Armistice Agreements and threatens large-scale use of force against Syria? As for the theory that this kind of talk is needed to form the broadest possible front against Rabin, it actually obscures the real nature of government policy. Who, it may be asked, benefits from such description of the Eshkol government, which has such intimate ties with the U.S. and with Bonn, as contained in "Kol Ha'am" 13.5.66, in M. Sneh's article "Around Us" M. Sneh writes : . . . "Official Israeli policy, inextricably bound, throughout the years to the Western imperialist powers, has now begun to admit that it no longer sees any sense or purpose in exclusively leaning on this world camp alone, and wishes to broaden the basis of its international ties by extending them to countries of the Socialist and neutralist camps. It would be very useful for this emergent trend to pass from the realm of thought and speech to that of concrete acts. . ."

Do things really stand that way?

Who benefits from such talk, which is in contradiction not only to the facts of the present but also to those happening at the time those words were spoken? — for instance, M. Sneh's above-mentioned Haifa speech ("Kol Ha'am", 29.5.66). Here Sneh pointed out amongst "the first steps taken by official Israeli policy away from the old course. . ." to ". . . a shift in Eshkol's stand re denuclearization of the Middle East as shown by his agreement to incorporate a clause to this effect in any agreement on disarmament or on a general reduction of armaments, and the Israeli Government must be requested to first voice its willingness to accept an agreement forbidding the introduction of nuclear weapons into the Middle East — as an opening for additional agreements etc. . ." On this delicate subject, M. Sneh wrote also as follows ("Kol Ha'am" 24.4.66) : "As for the crucial issue of its nuclear policy, the Government is see-sawing between Ben

Gurion's "military atomics" and our demand for it to support the idea of Middle East nuclear disarmament, i. e. between two diametrically opposed positions. . . ." We are well aware of Eshkol's adherence to Ben Gurion's "military atomics", whereas the shift in the Government's position toward nuclear disarmament coming as a result of "our demand" would seem at the very most, to exist in M. Sneh's imagination.

Abba Eban went off to the U.N. General Assembly determined to reconsider the Government's decision not to establish relations with the Saigon regime (A. Eban's statement to "Ha'aretz" 18.9.66). As for the Vietnamese problem, the stand to be taken will be closer to the United States' than to that of France with its call for the withdrawal of American forces. . . as the "Ha'aretz" correspondent puts it. "Kol Ha'am's" Jerusalem correspondent (12.9.66) hurries to proclaim that : "The Israeli Government is, in fact, trying to maintain a position of non-alignment on the Vietnam question. . ." Is it really true to say that the Israeli Government's policy on Vietnam is one of non-alignment? Does the "Kol Ha'am" correspondent express official Israeli policy better than the speeches made by President Z. Shazar during his U.S. tour or than D. Hacohen, Chairman of the Knesset's Foreign Affairs and Defence Committee who said an American defeat in Vietnam would be a victory for all the enemies of Israel ("Davar" 24.8.66).

### III

In his article entitled "From within" ("Kol Ha'am", 2.9.66), M. Sneh starts out with a large number of false premises, from which he arrives at erroneous conclusions. However, in his opinion, when determining its attitude toward the present government and choosing appropriate slogans, the Communist Party must take into consideration the "top level reached at the time by the social consciousness of the most progressive elements among the Coalition labour parties. . . ."

However, far from boosting class consciousness or drawing additional sections of the population into the fight for a change of policy, M. Sneh's positions with regard to the Government actually consolidate backward and nationalist influences among the progressive sections of the public, thus obstructing the formation of a

democratic grouping of forces and the stepping-up of the struggle for a change in policy.

It is also apparent that M. Sneh's approach to the Government consists in flattering it and covering up for it; far from reaching the "top level" of class consciousness it does not even come up to the "medium level" attained, for example, by those thousands of working people affiliated to Mapam or the twenty members of Mapam's central body, who have strongly urged their party to leave the Coalition and join the opposition struggle against the Eshkol government's anti-popular policies. Such views are also current among sections of the "Achdut Ha'avoda" party. The very fact of the public struggle now going on at the economic and other fronts, is a refutation of M. Sneh's attitude and approach toward the present government.

The above-mentioned article ("From Within") also deals with the struggle now going on inside Mapam, as to whether it should remain in the Coalition following the government's endorsement of the new economic anti-labour programme. The implication of M. Sneh's analysis is a clear "Left-wing" advice to Mapam to remain "within". . . . M. Sneh thus repeats the arguments of the leaders of Mapam and "Achdut Ha'avoda" to justify their "constructive" participation in the Government. M. Sneh thinks the present government is "the best possible one under present circumstances". But isn't it equally true that every single one of Israel's past governments, too, was "the best possible one for its time", taking into consideration that their base was also right wing labour parties? This never stopped the Communist Party from pursuing its struggle against these governments. The situation is basically the same today: we are fighting against a regime whose policy is injurious to Israel's national interests.

Carried away by enthusiasm for his "creative tactics", M. Sneh has reverted to old, time-worn arguments to justify his opportunist and nationalist positions. M. Sneh went off supposedly to change things but now we see he is the one who has changed. He recoiled from swimming against the current and we now see he is swimming with the nationalist current. As for the Communist Party of Israel, it will pursue its tested path and in its consistent struggle side by side with the broad masses — in the light of political developments inside Israel and in the world at large — will effect a change of course, toward peace and Socialism.

COMMUNIQUE OF THE POLITICAL BUREAU,  
COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL

We say "No!" to war!  
We shall defend peace !

It was with great regret and concern that the Israeli public and all those who have the cause of peace at heart, learnt of the murder of 4 soldiers of Israel's Border Police, killed on Saturday (8.10.66), when their vehicle blew up on a mine, and of the act of sabotage carried out against a Jerusalem residential quarter, with 5 civilians wounded. The strained and dangerous state of relations between Israel and her neighbours continues to take its toll of casualties — fatal and wounded. We condemn these acts of sabotage and murder and express our sincerest condolences to the victims' families. No positive solution and, in fact, nothing good whatsoever will come of these adventurist acts. The only ones to gain by a state of tension and bloody clashes on the borders are the enemies of peace, the enemies of the peoples. Those who urge reprisals and military action by Israel, do not serve the interests of Israel, but those of the enemies of peace, the imperialists who want to exploit the Israeli-Arab conflict with the aim of intervening against peoples' independence and against peace.

That is why, today more than ever before, we appeal for the maintenance of peace and abstention from all adventurism.

These grave events are inextricably bound up with the serious dangers menacing peace in the area as well as the machinations engineered by the imperialists and their agents.

Middle East peace is gravely threatened. The imperialists — first and foremost the U.S. — hatch plot after plot against the peoples of the region, now in particular against the Syrian people who have taken the road of anti-imperialist development and social progress. The menace of armed intervention hangs over Syria. Imperialism's agents in the Middle East are once again brandishing the bogey of "Syria coming under Soviet and Communist domination". Jordan, for its part, threatens military intervention while Saudi Arabia has allocated huge sums for this very purpose — and in all this they are spurred on and sustained

by the imperialists who seek to turn back the wheel of history in the Middle East. Fitting into this diabolical chorus is the statement made by the Chief of General Staff Rav Aluf (Major General) Rabin and carried by the New Year Eve issue of "Be Mahane" (official organ of the Israel Defence Forces) that "the problem with Syria is essentially one of a clash with the regime", and that the present state of relations with Syria is "reminiscent of the situation existing in Israeli-Egyptian relations at the time of the Fedayeen raids in 1955-56".

This declaration, as well as similar ones made by other high-ranking Army officers (such as the one made at a Haifa Nahal (Pioneering-Combatant Youth Units — trans.) rally by Northern Command's Aluf (Brigadier) D. Elazar, threatening military action against Syria) are bellicose statements arousing great anxiety and profound concern and also fraught with great dangers for Israel's own well-being and security. The Premier's correction to the effect that "a certain passage in the C. G. S's statement was misconstrued" served, in fact, but to confirm the statement's content; it certainly did nothing to lessen the gravity of these threats voiced by the Chief of General Staff. which could not but have received the Prime Minister's approval and been drafted in consultation with him.

Just as, in 1956, Government spokesmen pretended the aggressive Sinai operation against Egypt was dictated by the need to halt fedayeen activity, so, too, now Army commanders try to justify their call for the same kind of war against Syria by the need... "to overthrow the regime that stands behind the 'El Fateh' organization and carries out diversion of Jordan river waters..."

We, who branded and condemned fedayeen activity in 1956, also condemn today acts of sabotage carried out by members of 'El Fateh'. We explain and repeatedly stress the fact that no act of war, whatever its scale, will settle any problem in relations between our country and its neighbours. The only way to do this is by scrupulously honouring every single provision of the Armistice Agreements and in a constant effort to resolve disputes over frontiers and over border lands through negotiated agreements and with the assistance of M. A. C. (Mixed Armistice Commission) machinery — and not by creating accomplished facts



and resorting to a policy of armed force and military raids, as has sometimes been the practice of Israel's rulers.

We have, on more than one occasion, demanded that the Israeli Government return to the Israel-Syria and Israel-Egypt Mixed Armistice Commissions and call off the policy of boycotting these bodies. When the National Water Carrier was commissioned we again explained that any unilateral action taken, in the absence of an agreement, with regard to waters common to Israel and its neighbours will only serve to envenom the Israeli-Arab quarrel. We urged abstention from the use of force and cessation of all unilateral action, as well as serious efforts to arrive at an accord on the exploitation of joint Israeli and Arab water resources.

Today, it is a well-known fact that the Sinai operation and Israel's participation in the tripartite aggression against Egypt in 1956 was the outcome of collusion and collaboration with the imperialists who sought to topple the anti-imperialist regime of Gamal Abdul Nasser for having dared to place the Suez Canal under Egyptian control. Israel's participation in this aggressive adventure caused untold damage to Israel's real interests, her future relations with the Arab countries and the prospects for peace with them. The Israeli people are still paying to this very day the price of that unhappy adventure — the Sinai operation.

Today again we have to sound the alarm. We are consistent in condemning 'El Fateh's' provocative actions, as well as bellicose declarations by some of Syria's leaders.

The truth of the matter, however, is that the danger of war stems from quite a different source : the imperialists' striving to overthrow the present regime in Syria with its policy of carrying out progressive social reforms, following an independent political line and fostering ties of friendship with the Socialist countries — first and foremost the Soviet Union.

Following the failure of repeated reactionary coups in Syria, the disclosure of the latest U. S. -Jordanian -Saudi imperialist plot to bring down the regime there is a growing danger of direct military intervention against Syria. This is the background for the bellicose threats voiced by Jordan's rulers, on the one hand, and by Israel's, on the other.

There is no chance whatever of success for any armed imperialist intervention against Syria (whether overt or covert). Any such attempt is doomed to failure.

Israel's genuine national interest, her future in the Middle East and the need for peace with her neighbours dictate prevention of yet another adventure à la Sinai.

We call the broad masses of the Israeli people, who earnestly desire a life of peace and goodneighbourly relations, to a public struggle to scotch the adventurist war plans hatched against Syria.

The cause of peace, Israel's future and her implantation in the Middle East, the true interests of the Israeli people, the necessity for cooperation with the peoples around us and the establishment of goodneighbourly ties with them, all require Israel to march with the Arab peoples against imperialism instead of with imperialism against the Arab peoples.

Israel's true interest and security will be promoted by serious efforts to work out a peaceable settlement of the Israeli-Arab dispute, based on reciprocal acknowledgement of the national rights of both peoples concerned. A policy that strives for peace necessarily entails Israel's recognizing the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people and, first and foremost, the refugees' right to choose between return to their homeland and financial compensation; this will pave the way to a just peace settlement as well as to the Arab countries' recognizing Israel and her legitimate rights.

The wish of the great mass of the Israeli people is for peace, goodneighbourly relations and cooperation with the Arab peoples. That is why we call on all the forces of peace, on all those who have Israel's security and wellbeing at heart, to raise their voice to protest and condemn aggressive and bellicose statements made against Syria and act to prevent war.

\* Israel must, at all costs, refrain from any intervention in Syria's internal affairs, at imperialist bidding. The regime in Syria is the exclusive concern of the Syrian people themselves.

\* Let us act to maintain calm on the borders and arrive at a peaceable solution of all disputes with Syria and any other neighbouring country!

\* Let us defend peace and prevent war!

Communist Party of Israel,  
Political Bureau.

Tel Aviv, 10.10.66.

FROM PARTY LIFE AND ACTIVITIES :

I

COMMUNIST TRADE UNION ACTIVISTS MEET TO DISCUSS  
STRUGGLE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT AND HIGH PRICES

Some two weeks ago, a rally took place with the participation of a large number of Jewish and Arab workers, who are trade-union activists at their place of work. The meeting was called by the C. P. of I's Central Trade Union Department to debate the Government's new economic programme and its implications for the working class. The opening speeches were made by Cdes. Y. Irge, member of the Histadrut's Executive Committee, and T. Guzhansky.

Cde. Irge devoted his speech to exposing the anti-working class and anti-popular nature of the plan. The employers and the capitalists — Israeli and foreign — will be the first to gain from expanding unemployment, non-payment of the cost-of-living allowance in July and the onslaught on wages; all of this, however will not bring us an inch closer to economic independence. Government policy (under Eshkol, just as under Ben Gurion) failed to bring about the development of the economy's key sectors and was thus unable to ensure permanent employment for workers and professional people. As for Cde. T. Guzhansky, her speech revolved around the argument adduced by official spokesmen, alleging that workers' supposedly high wages are the factor making for inflated production costs, difficulties in the export field and the increase in unemployment.

The rise in productivity has "soaked up" all wage boosts.

The head of a Tel Aviv plant workers' committee, Nissim Bracha, described the workers' discontent at the Government's economic programme. The workers see it as a means of arbitrarily withholding the cost-of-living allowance and threatening the workers with dismissal in the event of their resorting to struggle.

Binyamin Shnitzer, member of a workers' committee (Tel Aviv) gave examples from various enterprises proving that the rise in productivity had "soaked up" any wage boost. Suspension of C-o-l allowance payments and wage freeze projects will bring the bosses profits of dozens of millions of dollars.

Salvator Cohen ("Tnuva" Dairies, Haifa), too, told of the frantic efforts made by the workers to fulfil production norms, which end up with additional dismissals of personnel.

Yisrael Vodovouzov (Acre) underlined the importance of bringing to the various places of work all the facts brought up at the present meeting, in order to arm the workers in their struggle.

Mohammed Shreidi (Oum el-Fahem) described the difficult condition of the Arab workers; they are the very first victims of unemployment, since very many of them work in the building trade and in services and also because of the discrimination from which Arab workers suffer. The unemployed Arab worker returns to his village but there, too, he finds no source of livelihood since a great many lands have been confiscated. Cde. Shreidy told of a case when, thanks to his insistence on a worker's right to obtain work, an Arab worker forced Beit Brenner (headquarters of Tel Aviv-Jaffa Workers Council) functionaries to arrange for his getting employment.

Other participants in the discussion were Cdes. Rina Nof (Tel Aviv), Salim el Kassem (Nazareth), and Mohammed Haddad (Ramleh). The debate was summed up by Cde. Sacha Hinin, member of Political Bureau, Communist Party of Israel. In his speech, Cde. Hinin highlighted the possibilities of developing activity among workers and stressed the need to meet more often with workers with the aim of helping them in their fight against dismissals and attacks on their rights. The need now is to unite workers — irrespective of political views — in the struggle against the government's new economic programme, for the workers are the very first to be hit by present policy.

## II

### TWO THOUSAND IN MASS ELECTION MEETING IN NAZARETH

More than two thousand people from Nazareth and the district assembled in a big mass meeting on Saturday afternoon (8.10.66) in the open air in Nazareth in response to the call of the Nazareth Local Committee of the C.P. of Israel. The mass meeting opened the election campaign for the Nazareth Municipal Council. Elections will be held on 24.11.66.

New local elections are to be held in Nazareth after the

Minister of Interior arbitrarily dissolved the Nazareth Municipal Council elected last November to which seven Communist Councillors were elected out of fifteen. Mapai and Government circles through pressure and intrigue sabotaged all efforts for a wide coalition to manage the Municipal affairs insisting on excluding the Communist councillors from the town administration. The dissolution of the previous elected council was strongly opposed and condemned as a scandalous anti-democratic act by the people of Nazareth and the democratic public opinion in Israel. The appointment of an official committee to administer the Arab town of Nazareth was an infringement on their rights and an attempt to force another composition of the town council.

Comrade Tawfiq Toubi greeted the meeting in the name of the C. C. of the C. P. of I., and said that the democratic forces of Israel support the people of Nazareth in their efforts for a democratic local administration of Nazareth. Your struggle for a democratic Municipal administration is not a narrow party interest, it is the interest of the people of Nazareth, that is why we call for a wide democratic front which will sweep those cheap agents of the ruling circles who know nothing better than to obstruct the development of the town, slander the name of its people and serve faithfully the architects of the policy of national oppression towards the Arab population. Your struggle for a democratic administration is a struggle for strengthening the cause of peace and understanding between the two peoples, the cause of democracy and progress.

Comrade Yeshua Irge, member of the Histadrut's Executive Committee, addressed the meeting. He said :

"The Eshkol Government's policy is basically the same as that pursued by Ben Gurion's toward the Arabs : they are discriminated against in every sphere of life. As a member of the C. P. I. who has lived many years in this country I say to you : (anti-Arab) discrimination, Military Government and eviction (of fellaheen) from the land are also a blow dealt at Israel's future existence, which, in itself, does not conflict with the national interest of the Arab citizen or of the Palestinian Arab people."

Next spoke Comrade Emile Habibi :

"The rulers of our country must absolutely replace their present totally bankrupt policy toward the Arabs of Israel.

Last year's elections to the Nazareth Town Council placed the ruling circles before an entirely new situation, with the fiasco of the "Alignment" — a grouping composed of all kinds of thoroughly corrupt "leaders". Mapai wants to try its luck once more. Success in Nazareth would encourage them to continue their pernicious policy.

There is every prospect of the popular struggle succeeding in Nazareth. That is the answer that Nazareth's citizens must give the Government, an urgent indication that it is up to it to put an end to its present policy toward the Arabs.

E. Habibi went on to say : "It is quite impossible to ignore Communist influence in Nazareth. We have a broad mass and there is no force in the world capable of severing our people from us. We are proud of the trust shown us by our people and are ready to assume the responsibility this confidence involves.

Cde. Fouad Houri, who leads the C. P. of I's list of candidates for the forthcoming Nazareth municipal elections, dwelt on the Party's election platform. He appealed for the formation of a broad front, the better to serve the interests of the town's inhabitants. Cde. F. Houri stressed that this call did not stem from weakness and that the Communists are perfectly ready to assume exclusive responsibility for the town's affairs, if so entrusted by the masses of its citizens.

Others to speak at the meeting were Ghassan Haviv, of the Y. C. L. Secretariat and 'Omar 'Asfour of Kfar Kassem. The poets H. Ibrahim, Tawfik Zayad and Samiah el-Kassem read from their works.

Those present at the meeting made an on-the-spot contribution of IL. 4116 to help pay for the Communist Party's electoral campaign in Nazareth.

M-IN-THE-20TH-CENTURY-----0172047A-----

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



HX 632 A1 W9 no.1299  
World communism in the 20th  
century.

0172047A MAIN

