

**INFORMATION BULLETIN
COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL**



1/84

JANUARY - 1984

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES UNITE

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
* The 19th. Plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel	3
* Confrontation and Prospects By Meir Vilner	7
* Motion of No-Confidence in the Israeli Government Speech of Tawfiq Toubi	29
* Loss of a Communist leader Hanna Naqqara - a devoted patriot and internationalist	34
* Documents and Materials:	
- Communique regarding the talks which were held in Moscow between the representatives of the Communist Party of Israel and the representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union	36
- Greetings to the 7th. Congress of the German Communist Party	39

19th. PLENARY SESSION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL

On December 30, 1983 the plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel took place, with the participation of the members of the Central Control Commission.

The session was presided over by comrade Tamar Gozanski , candidate member of the Political Bureau.

Comrade Meir Vilner, the General Secretary, lectured about the political and economic situation and the struggles of the workers. Comrade Tawfiq Toubi, the Deputy General Secretary, delivered a report about the work of the Political Bureau and the Secretariate.

A debate took place which was summed up by the lecturers. The Central Committee confirmed the lecture, the report and summings-up and adopted resolutions.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE 19th. PLENARY SESSION OF THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL

* FOR BREAD, WORK AND PEACE

The Shamir-Arens-Cohen-Orgad government pursues an offensive which is unprecedented in its scope and its reflections on wages and living standard of the working class: The real wage has been eroded in the last three months by 50%; the advanced payment on the account of the cost-of-living allowance was nothing but a mockery; thousands of workers are fired every month, while young people who look for work join the queues of the unemployed at the labour exchange bureaus; the drastic cut in subsidies for basic products and the sharp rise of the prices for products and services constituted a central component of the inflation, which reached in the last three months an annual rate of 500-600%; the government drastically restricts the public services: education, health, welfare and aggravates the crisis of the local councils.

The government is getting ready for carrying out the plan

of the finance minister, Cohen-Orgad, which is based on the false assumption that the remedy of the sick Israeli economy depends on a sharp lowering of the living standard of the workers, by means of eroding the real wages and exacting heavier taxes and compulsory payments and by means of an additional restriction of credits and investments which will lead to dismissals and unemployment.

The policy of Cohen-Orgad, which hits hard, first of all, the wage-earners, also hits the medium strata, producers and suppliers of services, and the free professions. This situation, creates objectively, a common interest of the wage earners and medium strata for struggling against the Shamir-Cohen-Orgad policy, which serves the interests of the big capital, the state-monopoly capitalism, the military-industrial complex the banks, the big contractors and their like.

* * * * *

The economic crisis in Israel is a combined crisis: A crisis of the military economy of the state monopoly capitalism, and a crisis of the economic-military dependence on the United States. The increase of the foreign debts of Israel up to 30 billion dollars; the peak which was recorded in 1983 in the deficit of the current accounts and the balance of payments, 5.5 billion dollars, the decline in the reserves of foreign currency by one billion dollars in 1983 - these dangerous developments bring Israel closer to the brink of bankruptcy. Their cause, the tremendous military spendings since the June 1982 war, and their background, what is called American "assistance". The Israeli experience proves again that the integration in the aggressive plans of the USA against the national liberation movements, against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries leads to the loss of independence, to political bankruptcy and to an economic and social crisis. Moreover, the USA openly stipulates the continuation of the military and economic assistance on a sharp lowering of the living standard of the workers and popular masses in Israel.

The Central Committee states that the policy of the Likud government brings about an economic and social disaster, the restriction of production and export, mass unemployment, an annual inflation of hundreds of per cent, all these will still more deepen the social polarization and the impoverishment of the wage-earning strata, the petty bourgeoisie and medium strata.

The Israeli economy is facing a grave situation not because the wages of the workers in the country are high, but because it cannot any longer bear the burden of the war in Lebanon, the

colonial settlements, the maintenance of the occupied territories and the grand-scale arms acquisition towards the next war.

The extraction of Israeli economy from the general crisis, the intensifying and perilous dependence on American capital, the lack of economic growth, the inflation of hundreds per cent, the enormous external and internal debts; is an impossible task under the conditions of the continuation of the war in Lebanon, the continuation of the occupation and the colonial settlements in the West Bank, the Gaza strip, the Golan Heights and the continuation of militarization of the economy. The withdrawal of the Israeli army from Lebanon, the cessation of the preparations for a war against Syria, the cancellation of the global strategic service to Washington and the embarkment on a road of comprehensive and just peace, in whose centre stands the Israeli-Palestinian peace, on the basis of two states for two peoples, will enable an essential cut in the military spendings, which, together with the reimbursement of the debts due from the past wars, swallow up more than two thirds of the state budget, and they are also the causes of the inflation and the deepening of the dependence on the USA. Such a fundamental change in the policy will pave the road to the remedy of Israeli economy and to progressive socio-economic changes

* * * * *

The Central Committee extends warm greeting to the masses of workers in production and the services, who are waging a hard struggle against the employers and the government, in defence of their wages, against the dismissals and the worsening of the working conditions. The workers of Timna (copper mines), "Ata" (textile) and Rogozin (textile), dockers and railwaymen, the tens of thousands of state workers, are waging the struggle in spite of the threats of dismissals and the use of the means of coercion used against them.

The Central Committee strongly condemns the attack of the police and Frontier Guard personnel against the Timna workers, who tried to protest against the closing-down of the enterprise, and the attack of policemen against Arab building workers in Rishon-Lezion. The Central Committee also denounces the use of confinement-to-work orders imposed (by law court-IB) on workers who declared a strike or who adopt sanctions, and also the attempt at hitting those workers by means of tententious descriptions in the communication medi-

The Central Committee assesses that the fermentation among the working class has created a new situation, which obliges an adequate action of the trade unions and the Histadrut. A number of trade unions such as the state employees, the trade union of the teachers, the TU of the engineers, and others, have already taken steps and declared a labour conflict. However, the Histadrut leadership, which had lent its hand to the delay which had emptied of its content the advanced payment for the cost-of-living allowance, continues paying lip service to the struggle in defence of the wages and for the rights of the workers, while declaring its consent to the lowering of the real wage "if the burden will be distributed equally".

The workers and all the wage earners must defend their rights against the combined onslaught of the employers and the government. In addition to specific demands, the workers are demanding a monthly payment of the c.o.l. allowance at the full rate of the rise of index, with full linkage to the graduated taxes, the points of exemption and grants for children; payment of wages once in two weeks; a minimum wage of 60% of the average wage, stopping the tide of dismissals and guaranteeing work to the unemployed and the prevention of curtailment of the public services.

The Central Committee demands from the Histadrut leadership to declare a country-wide protest strike against the policy of government and employers, which hits hard the working class.

The Central Committee calls upon the party organisations and all members to intensify the trade union activity and to initiate together with other factors struggles and protest actions against the anti-worker policy of the government and for bread, work and peace.

ZO HADEREKH, January 4, 1984

CONFRONTATION AND PROSPECTS

By Meir Vilner

Never since the second world war, has the international situation been so complicated and perilous as it is today. At first sight there is a contradiction in the situation. In the fifties, when the cold war developed, the relation of forces in the world was different. The main imperialist power, the USA, had then definitely a military superiority over the Soviet Union, chiefly in nuclear weapons. In spite of this, I do not think that we reached then, even in the days of the crisis around Cuba in 1962, such an international tension as dangers which exist today

THE SHARPENING OF INTERNATIONAL CONFRONTATION

Today the relation of forces is different. From the military aspect, equality exists between the Soviet Union and the United States. One may say that if not only the military correlation of forces is taken into account, but also the all-round ideological, political, social and moral power, the Soviet Union enjoys superiority over the capitalist regime in the USA.

But precisely at the time of the new balance of forces, the danger of a world war has intensified, as a result of the aggressive policy of the American administration, which has abandoned detente and strives with all its might to turn back by force of arms the wheel of historical development.

Despite this, the situation is not as it was before the second world war, in respect of numerous aspects. One of the most important ones is the fact that within the chief imperialist power, the United States, the internal situation differs from that which prevailed in Nazi Germany before the second world war. In Germany of that time, the financial magnates succeeded in putting into power a fascist regime and in completely suppressing all opponents, first and foremost the communists and socialists. They succeeded in uniting around them, by lure and by terror, considerable parts of the German people for the preparation of an aggressive war for the domination of the world. Today there exists no such situation in the USA nor in Germany. Widest masses even struggle against the ruling policy which endangers world peace, the very existence of mankind.

And if the situation is not as it was before the second world war, if the internal situation, in the state which constitutes the main force endangering world peace, is not as the same internal situation which prevailed in nazi Germany before the opening of the war, and if the balance of forces in the world is far from being what it was once, but the power of the Soviet Union, in the military sphere is definitely equal to that of the USA, the question arises: if these are the circumstances. why do we assess that the danger of a world war has increased; that the very threat which engenders from a third world war is comparably much graver than the second world war; that the imperialist powers, and in particular the United States, are liable to act in accordance with the diabolic slogan: Better dead than red. In other words: it is better to die than having communism victorious.

Today arms are qualitatively completely different. Even though in the second world war, the USA twice made use of atomic arms in the attack on Japan, if the third world war, God forbids, will break out, it will be a nuclear-missile war which is liable to lead to the annihilation of the human civilization. The bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was a barbarian act of experimenting the new weapon. The bombing did not stem at all from any military necessity for defeating Japan. The outcome of the war had already been decided as the result of the defeat of nazi Germany and fascist Italy in Europe, and as the result of the war which the Soviet Union conducted already then in China against Japan. The modern arms and the special dangers inherent in a third world war are obvious.

However, to our great regret, in the Israeli society, in contrast to the European and even the American society, no such perception of the danger (except within small groups) exists regarding the character of the danger to world peace and the definit results in case of such a war, for the Middle East and for the very existence of the peoples in the Middle East, including the Israeli people. This is one of the fundamental weaknesses of the situation in Israel. The lack of perception of this danger leads many to a weak, and therefore not resolute, criticism of the ruling policy. The majority of the people in general considers everything only in the limited local sphere and in a chauvinist spirit. They do not comprehend that by wanting to dig a pit for others, they dig also a pit for themselves, for their own people too.

The arms race in the world has reached now a most dangerous stage because it might come out of all control. The Soviet

et Union will never open war. It has already unilaterally declared its commitment not to be the first to use nuclear arms and not even conventional arms.

As against this, in the USA, there is an open talk about the aspiration to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union, a "limited" atomic war and about a "local" nuclear war.

The deployment of the new American rockets in Europe is a preparation to the possibility of a nuclear surprise attack on the Soviet Union and its allies, or what is termed a "limited nuclear war in Europe". Of course, every such war will not remain limited nor local, but will immediately turn into a world war.

The military significance of the deployment of the American medium-range missiles in Europe is that within 5-6 minutes these missiles can hit urban and industrial targets in the European part of the Soviet Union. The calculation of the American atomic madmen is that the Soviets will not have time to react adequately because of the shortening of the warning down to a minimum. No wonder that the Soviet Union has decided immediately to take counter-measures, in order to ensure its own defence and that of its allies.

The US invasion of Grenada and its military intervention in Lebanon may be seen as links in the policy of aggressive confrontation of American imperialism. The president of the USA, Reagan, has officially proclaimed that the aim of the American policy is to act against the social system in the Soviet Union and not only in the Soviet Union. We have before us a prominent and grave example of official policy of the USA, and also some of its allies, for exporting counter-revolution. They maliciously term the internal social revolutions in certain countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America "Soviet expansionism". When the people in El Salvador fight for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, the Reaganist call that "Soviet penetration". When the people in Nicaragua succeeded in toppling the regime of the fascist dictator Somoza, they call that "Soviet expansionism". In spite of all this, it has to be emphasized that we must not only see what imperialism is doing. If we see only this, the picture will be one-sided.

A mighty force of peace and socialism exists. In the centre of this force stands the Soviet Union which is developing

continuously.

The propaganda mouthpieces in the west, including Israel, sometimes try to create confusion by means of falsifying decisive facts about the Soviet Union. In the Soviet Union, especially in the last year, it has been frequently pointed out that things are not yet satisfying, goals which have not yet been achieved, and the new measures and modern methods for correcting things and improving organization. What for they do this? Not in order to avoid an economical failure in the Soviet Union, as they say in the west, but in order to achieve the maximum from the tremendous opportunities which the socio-economic socialist system provides. The Soviet Union gets stronger from year to year, every year the industrial production increases at a higher rate than in the west, where there are also decreases in production and where a deep economic, social and moral crisis exists. In the Soviet Union the living standard rises every year and the real wages rise continuously. Every year the health and educational services are expanded. The construction of dwelling-houses is the greatest in its scope in the world.

The Soviet Communist Party says: all this is very nice but we can achieve still more, if we apply the scientific and technic innovations in all branches and in the whole country, if there will be no delays and pauses due to inefficient transportation; if the raw material will be supplied everywhere in time, if the organization of work and labour discipline will be stricter. In order to attain these changes, educational and moral means are being used but also administrative means against anyone who does not perform his work properly, and means of material encouragement to those who excel in their work, are also being used. In other words: the achievements of the Soviet Union in the sphere of economy, society and culture are enormous. Yet, it aspires to still greater success which is possible to be achieved under the conditions of the socialist regime.

The year 1983 was very interesting. Not all the problems were yet solved and not all proposals for improving efficiency were applied, but already a rise of more than 4% has been recorded, that is to say, an increase of more than 1% as compared to the increase in the industrial production in 1982. And today one per cent means billions of roubles. And there are many branches in the economy in which the Soviet Union already today has surpassed the United States, for instance in steel and oil. Although it has not yet reached the

American level of production of electricity, it is coming close to it. Also in the technological respect there is a significant advance. There are technological items which American corporations are already now eager to buy from the Soviet Union.

Generally speaking, one can say that the Soviet Union, that the socialism, enables a higher rate of economic development than the capitalist regime. This had already been proved long ago. What the Soviet Union wishes to achieve is a faster rate of development than that which exists now, despite the fact that now too, this rate is an extraordinary success, in comparison with capitalism.

Under capitalism the question is posed: either a high inflation or mass unemployment. This is so, in the USA as well as in West Europe. In Israel, up to now, the results of the policy were: a very high inflation and a relatively not high unemployment. Now we will be facing both, mass unemployment and a very high inflation. This is the Israeli "innovation" contributed to the bourgeois economic science, which stems from the special conditions in Israel, and first of all the exceptional military expenditures, both in their weight in the national production and in their part within the state budget.

In spite of the efforts of the United States to check the revolutionary process in the world, it will not succeed in this, will not be able to change the laws of historical development.

THE SITUATION IN THE REGION ANALYSED FROM THE CLASS POINT OF VIEW

On the background of the international situation, as I have tried to describe it, we must analyse the situation in the Middle East. First of all we have to say here that it is impossible to analyse the situation in the Middle East without connecting it with the international situation. This is a fault committed by many, when they do not connect the wars and struggle for national liberation in this region with what is happening in the world. Moreover, there has not been as yet any period in which the problems of the Middle East were to such a high degree international problems, as they are today. First of all because it is difficult to solve them in the present international situation, in the prevailing situation of relations between impe-

rialism and socialism, and in particular between the United States and the Soviet Union.

In the 19th. Congress of our Party, in February 1981, we assessed:

"Having suffered very significant defeats in Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Iran and South Yemen, which weakened its positions, imperialism has proceeded to a counter-offensive with the help of the reactionary forces in the region, and especially so by the Sadat regime in Egypt. Imperialism frantically started setting up military bases instead of the lost ones and even intensifying its military presence and forging new military alliances. The Camp David deal is an important link in the chain of this imperialist strategy." ("The 19th. Congress", English edition, p.37)

I wish to stress our definition that "imperialism has passed on to a counter-offensive": This takes place when the correlation of forces in the world has changed to the detriment of imperialism and when many countries which have liberated themselves have embarked on a road of progressive development and some of them even on a road of socialist orientation. The imperialism is attacking not because it has been strengthened. It is carrying out the counter-offensive after many defeats, from a position of weakness in relation to socialism and the national liberation movements. With reference to the Camp David deal which was cited as an example of this strategy of imperialism, reality has proved its meaning. Whoever from among the peace forces, supported it and still supports it, is closing his eyes in face of the reality or does not want to see that this deal has removed comprehensive and stable peace in our region still further away, enabled the opening of the war in Lebanon and was one of the points of American imperialism turning away from detente towards international power confrontation, thereby endangering world peace.

Our 19th. Congress also dealt with the matter of Lebanon. The Lebanese problem did not start last year, with the American-Israeli aggressive war. At the 19th. Congress we accurately defined matters and is worthwhile to reread the book of the 19th. Congress, in order to understand what is happening now:

"In the framework of the universal struggle of American imperialism and the ruling circles in Israel against the Palestinian Arab people and against the anti-imperialist national movement in general, one must see the incessant aggressive actions of Israel against Lebanon. Their aims are:

1. To liquidate the national existence of the Palestinian people:
2. To assist the forces of the right and fascism in Lebanon in their struggle against the patriotic forces; to prevent stability in Lebanon, in order to prepare the soil for its division;
3. To seize power over Southern Lebanon by means of the Israeli mercenary Haddad. Southern Lebanon has virtually been turned into a territory under Israeli occupation;
4. To bring pressure to bear upon Syria by means of provocation against her army in Lebanon and from time to time direct provocation in Syria.

The biggest and cruellest aggressive action against Lebanon in the period between the 18th. and 19th. Congresses was the Israeli invasion, which was termed "Operation Litani". "Operation Litani" was one of the most barbarian actions since the beginning of the Israeli-Arab conflict. The big invasion of the Israeli army began on March 15, 1978. ("The 19th. Congress", English edition, p.173-174)

When we celebrated the 60th. anniversary of our Party, we quoted, inter alia, David Bengurion's words in connection with Lebanon. He said these things even before the establishment of the State of Israel. They are published as a supplement to the 4th. volume of his memoirs. This is how things sound today. They also teach one what is the meaning of the ruling zionist policy. Not always we say: The policy of the Likud government, the extreme right or the policy of the Alignment (Labour Party Mapam). We sometimes use the expression: "The ruling zionist circles" and mean by this both those who ruled for 29 years (the Alignment) and those who are ruling now. David Bengurion said on July 29, 1937 in Zurich, at the world conference of the Ichud Poalei-Zion (Z.S. Hitachdut) the following things:

"Lebanon is the natural ally of the Jewish Eretz-Israel (the whole territory of Palestine is here called "Eretz-Israel" I.B.) The Christian nation in Lebanon has no opportunity to multiply by Aliya (immigration) from outside. Lebanon is also surrounded by a Muslim Arab sea; it also constitutes an enlightened island surrounded by a primitive desert population (this is how he referred to the Arabs- M.V.).

Lebanon needs our friendship and support not less than we need its help. Not all inhabitants of Lebanon are Christians and not all Christians are members of one (religious) community. The ruling community is that of the Maronites and they

are a minority and without a Jewish neighbourhood they have no independent future. The neighbourhood of Lebanon guarantees the Jewish State (which then had not yet been established - M.V.) a true ally from the first day of its establishment, and it is quite conceivable that on the northern side of the south-Lebanese frontier which borders on the Jewish State we will have the first opportunity of expansion with the full consent of our neighbours who need us". (D. Ben-Gurion, Memoirs, vol. 4, p. 367).

This is Zionism as it was and as it is now. And not as persons like Yossi Sarid (Members of Knesset from the left wing of the Alignment-Labour Party - I.B.) describe it when, saying that once Zionism had allegedly been different and even the acme of perfection.

At the 19th. Congress of our Party we analysed the class character of the regimes in the Middle East. Without analysing the class character it is impossible to comprehend the politics, the changes in policy, the contradictions and the lack of consistency and stability, the perils and hopes. We said at the 19th. Congress:

"In the Middle East, as in other regions in the world, it is impossible to understand the events without a class analysis, without seeing that the exploiting classes prefer quite often their narrow class interest to the national interests of their peoples. They are afraid of the workers and fellahin, the sons of their own people, of the progressive social changes and more than once they join hands with imperialism, and sell their homelands. With the help of imperialism from the outside and the liquidation of the democratic liberties inside, they strive for preserving the privileges of the exploiting classes." ("The 19th. Congress", English edition, p. 165)

In this analysis we gave a defined political meanders in various Arab countries. The exploiting classes, also including the anti-imperialist national bourgeoisie, are afraid of the revolution and are not consistent. They are also liable, as experience has proved, to cross over to reactionary positions in certain situations. At the same time we said at our 19th. Congress that in spite of this complex character of the bourgeoisie and also of land-owners' strata we must see that;

"In all the internal struggles one must take into consideration that the main contradiction is that between the peoples and imperialism. An anti-imperialist national front on the broadest basis is the national interest of the Arab peoples, with the exemption of groups of capitalists, which are connected with foreign capital, of reactionary bureaucracy and army officers, who by means of oil and bribes from the foreign mo-

nopolies have been conducted to betray the interests of their people and country." ("The 19th. Congress", English edition, p. 165).

In accordance with that it is possible to comprehend the character of the anti-imperialist national front which was set up in Syria already years ago. In this front, the Syrian Bath Party is the first violin, and the Syrian Communist Party and additional political groups take part in it. The present regime in Syria took steps against foreign capital. Also, certain social reforms were carried out, but the capitalist social system in Syria has not changed fundamentally. Moreover it is the evaluation of the Syrian Communist Party that in the socio-economic respect, in respect of the interest of the workers and fellahin, the authorities in Syria are not at all concerned about them. Their situation is difficult, there is social exasperation. Inner democracy is quite restricted. One may add what the Syrian authorities, the Syrian Bath Party did in Lebanon at Tel-Zater with the military assistance of Israel, according to the revelations of Begin in the Knesset. This intervention weakened the anti-imperialist positions of Syria and led, at a certain time, to a confrontation between Syria and the Progressive Patriotic Front in Lebanon and the PLO. This was in 1976.

How must one explain this from the class aspect and from the political aspect? The leadership of Bath in Syria took such steps because it feared that in Lebanon the forces of the left are liable to emerge victorious and will constitute the regime in Lebanon. Syria found it correct to "balance" the situation and attack the forces of the PLO and the patriotic forces.

Therefore the principled question arises: If this is so, on what grounds do we, and not only we, define the policy of Syria as an anti-imperialist policy? Syria is the chief Arab country which since the Camp David accords, and still earlier, has stood together with the national liberation movements in the region and together with the Soviet Union, against the Camp David accords, which were intended to advance the American penetration into the region and to liquidate the right of self determination of the Palestinian Arab people. In spite of all the military, political and economic pressures on part of the rulers of the USA and Israel, in spite of all attempts to bring about internal reactionary upheavals in Syria, the regime of the Syrian Bath has not deviated from the anti-imperialist line. The fact that the USA and Israel are preparing now a war against Syria has no other reason

except the anti-imperialist independent policy of Syria. Syria has, as it is known, an agreement for friendship and cooperation in all spheres, with the Soviet Union. Soviet military personnel and Soviet modern arms are in Syria for its defence, in case the USA and Isarel will attack it.

With reference to this issue the position of the Soviet Union towards the internal struggle within Fateh must be clarified. The Soviet government has told the Syrian government that what it is doing in Tripoli with the support of the rebels within Fateh, their attack on the elected bodies of the PLO, and Arafat's leadership, is something that must not be done and helps objectively the rulers of USA and Isarel who are preparing a war against Syria. The rulers of Syria claim officially that they do not participate in the fight against the forces of Arafat. Then they were told: You do not prevent this, and without you, the attack upon the forces of Arafat could not have been carried out. Also, at the last visit of the Syrian deputy prime minister and foreign minister, Khaddam, he certainly heard from the deputy prime minister and foreign minister of the Soviet Union, A.Gromyko, that the behaviour of Syria in that matter brings enormous harm to Syria itself and contradicts all objective necessity of the unity of struggle against the common dangers. In the joint statement between Syria and the Soviet Union, which was published at the end of Khaddam's visit in Moscow, on November 11, 1983, it was said:

"The two sides positively assess the beginning of the political dialogue between the rival Lebanese groups as a step which opens a prospect for an internal Lebanese settlement, on the basis of a national agreement. In the course of the talks, the importance of the unity and coordination of action of the Arab states was stressed, in order to frustrate the dark aggressive plans of the USA and Israel".

In the speech of Gromyko at the time of Khaddam's visit, he said:

"We see as an urgent and important task to overcome the quarrels and rebuild the unity in the ranks of the national liberation movement of the Palestinian Arab people, which must also in the future appear as an active factor in the anti-imperialist struggle in the Middle East".

In the Soviet press, various appeals were published, among them the official announcement of the government of India, which calls for stopping the attack against the PLO leadership and Arafat. In his reply, Khaddam adopted clear anti-imperialist positions and condemned the intervention of the

USA in Grenada. In the joint statement between Syria and the Soviet Union, they demand that the aggressive invading force of the USA should immediately leave Grenada; they express solidarity with the people of Nicaragua against the aggressive threats of the American imperialism. Khaddam thanks the Soviet Union for the assistance given to Syria against the danger of an Isareli-American aggression, for the assistance given to all the Arab peoples and also for the assistance to the Palestinian Arab people in their struggle for self determination and for an independent state of their own. In the joint statement it is also written that the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people; the two sides confirm their commitment to the Syrian-Soviet agreement for cooperation".

From all this it is completely clear that the Soviet Union is against the rebellion within Fateh and everybody who publishes anything else, intentionally falsifies and incites against the Soviet Union. Thus, for instance, behaves Avneri.

It is of course possible to revoke everything with one stroke and say that the actions of Syria are reactionary and that all the rest is just empty talk. This is not so. Two things exist: The anti-imperialist positions are a fact, they are expressed not only in talk, but also in votings in the UNO, in the political confrontation with the USA, in the rejection of the American plans in the Middle East and in the international arena, in the all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union. It is true that the position of the regime in Syria towards the occurence in Fateh stands in contradiction to its general position. This is a contradiction to its own position and behaviour. This is not a contradiction to our evaluation. Syria also today, conducts an anti-imperialist foreign policy and maintains friendly relations with the Soviet Union, not because of any proletarian or communist ideology, but because of a correct understanding of its national interest, and on the other hand it does things which completely contradict the interest of progress, and its own interest, when it will have to face the realisation of the threats of aggression on part Israel and the USA.

REGARDING THE INTERNAL STRUGGLE IN "FATEH"

With regard to the internal struggle in "Fateh", our principled attitude is determined by the three following criteria:

1. The political positions of each of the sides.

2. The attitude of the sides regarding the unity of the Palestinian national movement and its independence.

3. The reflection of the positions of the sides upon the general struggle in the Middle East and the world for peace, national liberation and social progress.

With regard to its political position, the PLO has today a correct, just and realistic peace plan which was adopted at the 16th. Palestinian National Council which took place this year in Algeria. This plan adopts the political plan which had been formulated in the summit conference of the Arab states and the PLO in Fez, and it also adopts the Soviet peace plan for the Middle East, which was presented by L. Brezhnev in September 1982 and was confirmed anew by Y. Andropov. This peace plan declares: Mutual respect of rights; two states for two peoples, Israel and Palestine; the borders previous to the June 1967 war; and a just solution to the question of the Palestinian refugees in accordance with the UNO resolutions.

The leaders of the rebels in "Fateh" call in question the resolutions of the National Council of the PLO and strive for turning back the PLO towards old positions which have become obsolete and which are liable to deprive the PLO from its great political achievements and push it 20 years back. Hence it is clear that the elected leadership of the PLO headed by Arafat represents the PLO and its correct policy, while the leadership of the rebels represents a political line which is harmful to the just cause of the Palestinian people.

Regarding the second criterion, it is clear that anyone who wants to impose his opinions on the PLO by means of military attack with the assistance of any Arab state, in this case - Syria, hits hard the unity and independence of the Palestinian national movement.

From our assessment of these two subjects, stems also the assessment of the third criterion. The rebels in "Fateh" by their harmful positions and their attempt at carrying out a "military coup", in order to impose those positions and themselves on the PLO, disconnect themselves from the forces of peace and socialism in the world, objectively play into the hands of the US imperialists and the rulers of Israel, who do not at all conceal their malicious pleasure at the internal struggle within "Fateh", which weakens the organisation, the unity of the PLO and

the unity of action between the PLO, the patriotic national forces of Lebanon and Syria, which is vitally necessary for preventing a new Israeli-American aggression.

Saying this, we do not ignore that there can be legitimate criticism and discussions in the PLO, just as in any anti-imperialist national movement. But, this must be carried out by political and democratic means. Whoever tries by force of arms to impose his own opinion and to change the democratically elected and most authorized leadership, only isolates himself from his own people.

How did it start? Let us define things accurately. The struggle began with the demand on part of the opposition for organizational reforms in "Fateh". This started with criticism of individual decisions of Arafat and without authorized resolutions of the institutions of "Fateh". This started with criticism of lack of collective work in the leadership and lack of democracy and criticism of corruption.

The criticism at the beginning was directed against the appointment of the new commanders in the Lebanon Valley, which had been carried out by Arafat. This appointment was at the cost of commanders who had excelled in defence of Beirut. These appointments aroused opposition. It is possible to assume that the demand for reforms and democratization was logical. Afterwards it turned out that the issue is not only this point. It became clear that there is also political criticism. At first, the political criticism concentrated on the negotiations which Arafat held with King Hussein of Jordan, on his agreement in principle to establish a confederation with Jordan - a confederation of two independent states, which would be sett-up after the establishment of the independent Palestinian State. The opponents claimed that Arafat had no mandate at all to conduct such negotiations. Afterwards, at the Palestinian National Council in Algiers, where the programmatic resolutions were adopted - retroactively, and in principle, the idea of confederation was confirmed.

The formula speaks about the possibility of setting up a confederation with Jordan after the establishment of an independent Palestinian State. This means that the form of ties with Jordan will be fixed by the independent Palestinian State. Afterwards a discussion developed and it turned out that the rebels do not at all consent to the resolutions of the National Council, that they do not consent to the principle

of two states, that is to say, the establishment of a Palestinian State in the West Bank, including East Jerusalem, and in the Gaza strip, and Israel will continue to exist within the borders of 1967. They returned to the formula of "secular-democratic state".

As against this, one must point out, that Syria till this day has not renounced its support to the resolutions of the Fez Conference.

The question arises: If this is so, why does Syria support the opponents of Arafat within "Fateh", who oppose the leadership of Arafat - that is to say, the attempt to negate the independence of the PLO and subordinate it to Syria instead of free coordination between the two? Of course, this is also, to all appearances, connected with the idea of "Greater Syria" and there is the influence of the rickety relations between Syria and Jordan.

Apparently it suffices that Arafat conducts negotiations with Hussein in order to contract the hatred of President of Syria, Assad, and the Bath party.

There is an opinion that the PLO and Arafat should, after their exit from Beirut, give up the independence of the PLO for the benefit of Syria. What is the argument of those who hold this view? After the exit from Beirut, they claim, one had to be realistic - to relinquish the independence of the PLO's decision for the benefit of Syria within the framework of a front of the PLO, the patriotic forces in Lebanon and Syria. The dominant force is naturally Syria, and therefore one must adapt himself to this situation. This is even formulated as follows: The intervention of Syria in the PLO is not so dangerous as the alternative that Jordan will speak on behalf of the PLO and that pressure will be exerted to relinquish the right to self determination of the Palestinian people, in accordance with the Reagan plan. They pose this in the following manner: Either relinquishing the independence of the PLO and go with Syria, or giving consent to Hussein's talking with the Americans about the Reagan plan, that is to say not an independent Palestinian State, and no independence of the Palestinian decision.

Whoever poses the question in this form, is very far from reality. For what is the meaning of stating that the PLO will not be independent but tied up with one Arab state - Syria? The meaning of this is that there will not be one PLO that the PLO will no longer be the sole representative of the

Palestinian Arab people. If the PLO will be Syrian, King Hussein will set up a Jordanian PLO and Saudi Arabia will set up a Saudian PLO, and even Israel and the USA will perhaps attempt to organise a group of Quislings and call them PLO.

At a press conference on behalf of the rebels in "Fateh" which was broadcasted by Radio Damascus at the beginning of November 1983, the spokesmen of the rebels raised a number of complains. Inter alia, they said: We are accused of not being loyal to the resolutions of the Palestinian National Council. But we claim that Arafat violates the resolutions. Who decided to liquidate the Palestinian Convention? Arafat - so they say - completely contradicts the Palestinian National Convention by announcing: A Palestinian State alongside the State of Israel, and not "a united secular state". Of course these are futile assertions, for it was not Arafat alone who held up the peace plan of Fez and of the Soviet Union, but it was confirmed in the supreme and authorized institution of the PLO - the Palestinian National Council.

An additional claim raised by the rebels was: Arafat has committed treason by meeting with zionists, as if this was a violation of the resolutions of the PLO institutions. The question which arises is: Is the PLO interested that it will be recognized or not? We, Israeli communists, in spite of our ideological and political rivalry with the zionists consider something positive in the fact that not only we recognize the PLO and hold talks with the leaders of the PLO, but that also other circles recognize the PLO and hold talks with it. We do not, indeed, ignore the fact that these circles supported and support the Camp David deal, which denies the right to self determination of the Palestinian Arab people and which is intended to further a military American penetration into the Middle East. We consider the Camp David accords as a deal intended to remove still further a comprehensive peace in the Middle East, in which all the peoples here are interested. But at the same time we are interested that there will be a general recognition of the PLO as the sole representative of the Palestinian Arab people. The cause of peace demands also that the Israeli governemt recognizes the PLO, that also the American administration recognizes it. What is the meaning of the demand to convoke an international conference for the solution of the conflict in the Middle East, a demand which numerous international factors raise, among them the Soviet Union, the PLO and also the summit conference of the Arab states in Fez supported it? Who must participate in

it? The PLO is supposed to sit in this conference together with Israel, Arab states, the Soviet Union, the USA, under the auspices of the UNO. The PLO will sit with the representatives of the Israeli government and not with a representative of the Communist Party of Israel, also not with Matityahu Feled, but with much worse persons and if the Israeli government and the American administration will be compelled to sit with the PLO, this will be an enormous success for the PLO, for the cause of peace in the Middle East. And none else than the former prime minister, Itzhak Rabin has said: If we recognize an independent representative of the Palestinian Arab people, the PLO or any other organization, this is in practice already a recognition of an independent Palestinian State.

When not long ago, a public delegation from Israel visited the Soviet Union, and member of Knesset Shulamit Aloni and a representative of "Peace Now", Beni Barabash refused to meet with a representative of the PLO in Moscow, we criticized that. A representative of the PLO wants to meet with them; what is wrong with that? It is to be wished, that everybody will recognize the PLO as an independent and sole representative of the Palestinian people; this will bring peace nearer.

The rulers of Syria claim that Arafat, Hussein and the USA have already reached an agreement about everything, that in fact Arafat has already betrayed, but he has not succeeded in obtaining the approval of the PLO. Arafat says that the president of Syria, Assad, has since long reached an agreement with the USA, that he has betrayed and he will slither down to the positions of Sadat in Egypt. What do we say?

Indeed, there have been cases in history where leaders have betrayed, also leaders of states who at a certain stage pursued a progressive policy, also heads of national movements. There where even communists who betrayed. But it is impossible to pursue a policy on the ground of futile suspicions that perhaps this person or another will betray. We can pursue a policy only on the basis of facts of today and not on the basis of suspicions and insinuations. If someone will betray in future, we will then act accordingly.

But what is the reality? What is the real situation today? Syria pursues an anti-imperialist policy, in spite of the fact that its support of the rebels in "Fateh" contradicts this policy. And also Arafat pursues an anti-imperialist policy, but he, too, has done certain things which have caused harm, things

that were exploited by the rebels, although he is prepared to make amends, as he has declared. In conclusion we say: We cannot pursue a policy on the ground of speculations regarding the future. What do they want indeed? To push Syria into the hands of the Americans or to push the PLO into the hands of the Americans?

What was the reaction among the Palestinians towards the crisis in "Fateh"? The truth is that at the beginning many in the PLO supported the opponents of Arafat and did not call them rebels, but "opposition". Many criticized certain steps of Arafat, especially in the organisational field. There were also people who criticized the character of the talks with Hussein. All this changed completely in the course of time. The first change came with the beginning of the military actions on part of the rebels. People started to understand and to ask themselves: If the rebels demand more democracy, are their acts democratic? To kill Palestinians, is this more democratic? To cause civil war - is this democracy?

Secondly, what has still more diminished the influence of the rebels is the fact which has come to light that they do not at all agree with the resolutions of the Palestinian National Council, that they want to turn back the PLO to the days when it was isolated in the world, when almost no one supported it, nor its programme and its methods of struggle.

At a survey of public opinion that was made in the West Bank, it turned out that 93% of the inhabitants consider Arafat the elected, legitimate and authorized leader of the Palestinian people.

A world wide appeal was adressed to President Assad, which was signed by Palestinian intellectuals from the whole world, including Israel. Also our comrades signed this appeal. In the appeal the following was said: "Hands off the Palestinian people, hands off the PLO, help immediately to stop the slaughter!"

In the West Bank, the rebels in "Fateh" and Syria are now almost completely isolated. A similar situation exists among the Palestinians in Lebanon. When representatives of the rebels came to the refugee camp Nahr Al-Bard which had been occupied by them, together with journalists whom they brought from Damascus, the camp inhabitants told them: "We do not want to hear you, we support Arafat". This happened also in villages in Lebanon which were occupied by the rebels. There is no

doubt whatsoever that the decisive majority of the Palestinian people supports the elected leadership headed by Yasser Arafat and the programme of the PLO, which was adopted by the Palestinian National Council in Algier.

But there is an aspect to which we must pay attention and be careful. There are circles in the West Bank, and not only there, who appear against Syria in such a form as if the enemy was Syria, and not the occupation, nor the Americans. There are people who lose their heads completely and only curse Syria, as if there were no Reagan and Schultz, as if there were no Shamir and Arens, as if there was no danger of an aggressive war against Syria and no continued aggression against the PLO and the patriotic forces in Lebanon. Indeed, the situation is complex, but one must not lose his head. We oppose what Syria is doing now in Tripoli, that is to say the assistance given to the rebels. At the same time we are against the aggressive war, which is planned against Syria by Israel and the USA. It is the interest of the Palestinian and of the Israeli peoples to prevent a war against Syria. A war against Syria is a danger for the entire Middle East and also for world peace. There is no contradiction at all in our position: on the contrary, we are most consistent. Also in complex situations we, communists, act coolheaded and support in every case the just side, the just cause.

OUR POSITION AND TASK

Criticism was voiced regarding the reaction of the Party towards the events in Tripoli. Before dealing with this, the very situation must be defined: There have been stages in the development. What exists today, is not the same that existed a month ago. Our position, as I have explained it, was determined from the beginning, however, at the beginning, the situation was not so grave and there were serious attempts for mediations. The Central Council of the PLO elected a six-member delegation, including a representative of the Palestinian Communist Party, for mediating between the two factions in "Fateh". At that stage, the emphasis was correctly put on 'Stopping the confrontation, restoring the unity, discussing reforms, but in a democratic form. The leadership of the PLO, headed by Arafat, agreed to carry out reforms. And really, negotiations started, but they failed because of the rebels who had decided "to go to the end". At that stage the crisis assumed a most perilous form and then we began publishing our full assessment and position in public, we also criticised Syria, without losing our head. Now, too, especially in Israel, where a war is being prepared, together with Washing-

ton, against Syria, which wages a general policy of national independence and peace and prepares its defence, together with the Soviet Union, one must not act in such a manner that an atmosphere of justifying aggression against Syria might be created. The defence of Syria against an aggression is not only a defence of Syria, but a defence of the whole Middle East.

Let us not forget that Syria is close to the borders of the Soviet Union.

Defence of Syria would be defence of world peace. This is also the real interest of Israel whose integration in the aggressive global plan of the Reagan administration is liable to bring about a catastrophe on Israel.

There are some who say, particularly in the circles of the Israeli government, that the present weakening of the PLO is an achievement of the war in Lebanon. This is an incorrect evaluation. We stick to our evaluation that the war in Lebanon, as even many of those belonging to the Establishment in Israel sometimes admit - was a crushing failure. The PLO did not emerge weakened from the war in Lebanon. The PLO left Beirut under its flags, with an unprecedented international support, and in a shaken internal situation within Israel, as the result of the war. True, from a military aspect, the PLO could not withstand the most modern American arms which were used by Israel for the first time. What has now weakened the PLO, is the internal conflict within "Fateh", the conflict between Syria and the leadership of Yasser Arafat and also the contradictions among the Arab states, such as between Syria and Jordan. The unprecedented division in the Arab world, is the cause for weakness and not the alleged success of the war in Lebanon.

There is an opinion which says that the two sides in "Fateh" are as a matter of fact the representatives of the Palestinian bourgeoisie. Even if that is so, one must ask: Does that mean that one must send both to the devil?

There are some who think thus: We are the Party of the working class; we must see that the Palestinian bourgeoisie has gone bankrupt; its two organisations are killing each other, and that, only the Palestinian working class and its party, together with their allies, can successfully lead the Palestinian national movement. This whole attitude is oversimplified and unrealistic. First of all one must ask:

Do objective conditions exist among the Palestinian Arab

people and in the Arab world for a class change of the character of the leadership of the Palestinian National movement? We consider that there are no such conditions. It is true that the leadership of Arafat is not a leadership of the working class; it is a patriotic-national leadership of the bourgeoisie or petty bourgeoisie. This is a leadership which conducts an independent, anti-imperialist policy in spite of errors and weaknesses. The outstanding representatives of the working class and the masses of the Palestinian people are waging a struggle within the PLO for a correct political line and for allies who are ready to prevent a deterioration of the orientation and programme. One must not be caught by adventurist illusions which do not reflect reality.

We must always ask: Who will gain from the internal conflict within "Fateh"? An analysis of the situation teaches us that from that internal conflict only American imperialism and the Israeli occupants will gain and this is very well understood by the ruling circles in Israel and the USA. In the American "Newsweek" of November 20, 1983, it was written that the Reagan administration hopes that the internal conflict within the PLO will open the way for the advancement of the American "peace process" in the Middle East, that is to say the broadening of the American military penetration. In Washington they hope that certain circles in the West Bank, such as Elias Freidj, the mayor of Bethlehem and Rashad El-Shawa, the former mayor of Gaza, will abandon the PLO and Syria.

The war minister, M.Arens, has said not long ago in the Knesset: "The Palestinians in the West Bank will comprehend reality and adapt themselves to it. It is not a national tragedy to be a national minority in a democratic state, like Israel". In other words, with all the differences between them, Arens proposes to the Palestinians what Abu-Mussa proposes to the Israeli people: to be a national minority in a "democratic state". Also Ben-Eliezer, the coordinator of the activities in the occupied territories, has said something similar. Hence it is clear that the whole internal conflict within the PLO and between the PLO and Syria, causes only damage.

And let us not for a moment forget that the rulers of Israel and the USA are preparing a new war and the danger is very serious. Why do they prepare this war? Because Syria is an anti-imperialist country, because Syria does not follow the line of the American plans, because Syria, with all

its shortcomings is waging, an independent policy, supporting a just and realistic peace plan and is acting, together with the Soviet Union, for achieving these aims. The policy of Syria constitutes an obstacle to the whole aggressive American planning, both in the Middle East and the world. Just to talk about the existence of a danger of war against Syria and not to comprehend why the Americans want to overthrow the regime in Syria is superficial talk. One must connect the war preparations against Syria with the situation in the region, and with the Palestinian question. If the American imperialists and the Israeli rulers will dominate Lebanon and will set up a pro-imperialist satellite regime in Syria, the, most serious blow will be dealt to the Palestinian cause and the prospects of peace in our region, and first and foremost, one must not forget that such a development would intensify the danger of a world war.

The situation in our region has become still more complicated by the entry of the American, French and British troops into Lebanon. NATO prepares the next war not only against Syria. They want to break the patriotic-national forces in Lebanon, to "clean up" Lebanon not only from the PLO, but also from the patriotic forces and the left forces.

What is our task, the task of the Communist Party of Israel, under the circumstances which have developed? Our task is first of all to struggle against the occupation and oppression on part of the Israeli rulers, to struggle against the strategic partnership with the USA and against the preparations of an aggressive war. We must wage an ideological and political struggle. We must explain and emphasize the relation between the struggle for putting an end to the wars and for the establishment of peace in the Middle East and the struggle for peace in the world, against the dangers for the existence of mankind, which stems from the policy of Washington.

We must struggle against the danger of fascism, against the destructive economic and social policy of the government and for equality of rights. All this we must do out of class attitude for understanding the Israeli and general developments. Therefore, what is very much needed, is the strengthening of the ideological education of the party and sympathizers. Only the deepening of the ideological and Marxist-Leninist teachings might enable one to comprehend any situation, however complicated it may be: it enables one to analyze matters with a warm heart, but with a cool head.

Our Party has proved that it is able also in the most

complicated situations to apply creatively the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and thus to serve in the best way the real interests of the two peoples in this country, and the cause of peace and progress in our region and the world. We have guarded our independent considerations and correct tactics.

Of course, we are not angels; We, too, are apt sometimes to do certain things either too early or too late, but till now these have been completely secondary issues. It is not by any chance that we stress that if our Communist Party will make a serious mistake, we are liable to cause much harm to our Party and also to others. And on the contrary: our correct policy positively influences not only certain circles in this country, but also abroad.

We struggled and will continue struggling against all sorts of pressures and harmful influences - against right opportunism and against left adventurism. There are some people who accept the Marxist principles, but by their super revolutionism they cause great harm to the struggle and in practice play into the hands of the enemy. We have learned from Lenin to struggle against the infantile disorder of leftism, we also have learned from Lenin to struggle against the rightist deviators and opportunists of the sort of Kautsky, who once had been a Marxist and slithered down to rightist opportunism.

Our ability to deal with the issue which has been presented by me, strengthens the rallying of our Party around the correct, well-considered and revolutionary policy of the Central Committee.

We have before us no easy times; we will face them honourably, despite the complications and difficulties, until we will at long last see the light at the end of the tunnel.

ARAKHIM, Hebrew Edition of Peace and Socialism,
December 1983

(From a speech of Meir Vilner in a meeting of Party activists in Tel-Aviv)

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE ISRAELI GOVERNMENT

Speech of Comrade Tawfiq Toubi in the Knesset

On January 25, 1984, the parliamentary groups of the Democratic Front for Peace and Equality, the Alignment and Shinui called for a vote of no-confidence in the government.

Comrade Tawfiq Toubi substantiated the proposal of the DFPE. He said:

"The polls of opinion and the reactions of the public show that the Likud government, also in its new metamorphosis as the Shamir government, has lost the confidence of the wide public. In the Knesset, too, the parliamentary basis is slipping from under its feet. If the heads of the government had at least a slight sense of public responsibility, they would present their resignation and ask the popular masses to express again their views about their elected representatives after a stormy period of entanglement and debacle in the Lebanese war, the economic ruin and social crisis - the bitter fruit of the Likud rule.

But the fear of the coalition components from losing the rule at new elections nails them to their seats in the Knesset and the government, and they continue paying bribes to blackmailers who exploit the severe crisis which afflicts the government.

I think that the heads of Likud undermine the parliamentary regime and the Knesset itself by not drawing the natural conclusions from the failure of their policy and the loss of the trust of the public and parliament. Each and every voting constitutes a shake-up and running to and fro; every voting and every motion of no-confidence starts a haggling with this or other of the junior partners composing the coalition and even with that or the other single Member of Knesset, in order to overcome the danger of a failure in the voting.

Negotiations and agreement among the parliamentary groups for the establishment of a government coalition are a natural and normal procedure, but that at each voting one has to

come to a new agreement, and that before every voting one must sew a new patch on the disintegrating clothes of the coalition by help of a needle of bribes, makes you ridiculous, you cause the parliamentary regime to assume a bad odour; you undermine its foundations.

Members of Knesset, every additional day, on which the Likud government continues ruling enhances the political and economic catastrophe which stems from that rule. We have no confidence in the Likud government because of its policy of perpetuating the occupation, colonial settlements, annexation and trampling underfoot the rights of the Palestinian people, because thereby it removes peace further away from Israel and the region and will lead to yet another and yet another war. We have no confidence in this government because of the aggressive war in Lebanon, which continues now for the 20th. months and which demands every day additional sacrifices in blood and money, for the interests of the United States - and all this is in vain. There is no way to stop this war and its disasters but by the withdrawal of the army from Lebanon and returning it back home.

We have no confidence in the Likud government because of its anti-worker economic and social policy, which daily hits the living standard of the popular masses, the workers, the slum dwellers and the Arab population, while the banks and big capitalists enrich themselves ever more.

We have no confidence in the Likud government which from year to year intensifies the policy of national discrimination and lack of equality towards the Arab population, takes under its wings and fosters anti-Arab racism and nationalism, which after all imperils also the whole Israeli society.

Last week has brought us a new exposure which demonstrates the social disaster to which the Likud government leads - the government of war and big capitalists. The annual survey of the Department of Research and Planning in the National Insurance Institute disclosed frightful facts which have accumulated as a result of the rule of a government which, when it was established, pretended to care for the people. The truth is that the data of that survey are in a minor key and very reserved in relation to reality. We also criticize the fact that the survey of the National Insurance Institute bypasses in its conclusions the Arab population and I want to ask until when the various sorts of research and survey will continue excluding 16-17 per cent of the population in this

country and put them beyond and outside the pale of research and data. In spite of that, it becomes clear from the survey that in the course of the five years of the rule of the Likud government, from 1977 to 1982, the number of the poor within the Jewish population who live under the line of poverty, has reached a million, which constitutes 14 or 15 per cent of the Jewish population of the State. 220 thousand persons, out of whom are 110 thousands children in families of wage-earners, together with 300 thousands persons who have left the circle of labour and live only on the income from the National Insurance Allowances, live today under the line of poverty. This is a grave situation.

The survey summarizes many data about the increase of poverty, social distress, the growing number of poor children, and social polarization. If the survey had also dealt with, or analyzed the situation among the Arab population it would have revealed the graver situation among the Arab population, because of the fact that many of those who are entitled to social insurance do not receive the insurance allowances because certain arrangements have bypassed them; and because of the racist discrimination which exists with regard to the children's allowances, which discriminates between a Jewish and an Arab child, and thereby increases the number of families who live under the poverty line among the Arab population.

As to the survey itself, it includes a great number of data, but I would like to point out yet another datum which characterizes the whole policy of the Likud government.

It turns out that the share of the lowest decimal in the sum total of the general income after transfer payments, that is to say, the payments of national insurance allowances, has gradually declined from 3.1% in 1977 to 2.4% in 1981. Parallel to that, the share of the highest decimal in the sum total of the general income, after the transfer payments, has increased from 24.8% to 26.3%. These figures prove how the rich people of this country have prospered and flourished under the rule of the Likud, and how the labouring strata have been pushed into ever greater poverty and distress.

This development, has as its source the erosion of the wages and especially the decline in the value of the minimum wage, and also the decline in the value of the insurance allowances which are continuously eroded. Particularly steep was the decline in the old age pensions and the children's allowances in the course of the year 1982 and the first half of 1983.

The prime minister, Shamir, exempt himself and his government from the duty to draw conclusions from the survey of the National Insurance Institute, and while speaking to the "Ma'ariv" newspaper on January 18th. he declares in flaming anger that the data in the report, is a lie. Such reaction from the side of the prime minister resembles the reaction of that Turkish admiral who had been sent by the Sultan to deal with a complicated situation in Malta, returned back and exempted himself by the notorious words: Malta - yok! (There is no Malta!) Thus the prime minister exempt himself and his government by saying: Poor people and poverty - yok! Is this a serious attitude on part of the prime minister, when he yet adds that the Likud has improved the situation of the poor and has raised the level of the services. Today the finance minister has attempted to proof this, but in vain.

Let the prime minister and the finance minister ask the minister of education why he threatens all the time to resign in protest against the curtailments of teaching hours, against the closure of clubs for youth, culture and sports clubs, and against the fact that many children drop out from kindergartens. Is that the improvement of services? Let the prime minister and the finance minister ask the inhabitants of poor neighbourhoods, about which the finance minister spoke today, in Musrara, the Katamons, Ajami in Yaffo, the inhabitants of the Arab quarters in the mixed towns - Haifa, Yaffo, Acre, Ramleh, Lod - if their situation has really improved or has deteriorated still more?

Ask the Yehoshua family in the neighbourhood of Salama in Tel Aviv, whose son Shimon was killed while defending his right for human domicile, ask them if their situation has improved? Let the prime minister and the finance minister ask the inhabitants of Netivot, of Yeruham, who we see daily on the television screen, let them ask still others how they now manage to make ends meet till the end of the month.

Members of Knesset, the policy of the Likud government is anti-popular, anti-worker, its class policy in the service of big capital and the banks - here we have one side of the factors which have led the country and the masses of the people to an economic chaos, a social crisis and the distress of broad strata of the people. However, one cannot understand the depth of the abyss and cannot look for a realistic way-out without comprehending the policy of perpetuating the occupation, the policy of territorial expansion, annexation and colonial settlements, and the ignoring of the right of the Pa-

lestinian Arab people to national independence, that this policy prevents peace and leads every few years to a new war, that this policy costs much money, this policy does not only prevent mothers to sleep at nights, but also prevents the slice of bread from the children and increases poverty. All this is happening at a time when the spendings for colonial settlements in the occupied territories have reached in the last three years 1980 - 1982 almost 2.5 billion dollars, according to Ra'anan Weitz, the head of the Department for Settling of the Jewish Agency, and when according to the plan for the next four years another 2.5 billion dollars will be spent.

For the war in Lebanon 3-4 billion dollars were spent and every day an additional million dollars are being spent, at whose expense is it?

Members of Knesset, is it not at the expense of the slice of bread of the living standard and the level of education? And if, from June 1967 according to the data of the Bank of Israel in its latest report the official military expenditures - not the real ones which are much higher, but the official ones, have increased from 10% of the GNP (Gross National Product) prior to June 1967 to 26% in 1983, just imagine how much the military expenditures have increased.

Thus we see the main cause of the social and economic crisis, the inflation, the high cost of living, the bankruptcy and the ever increasing poverty. Therefore, there is a need for changing the policy from a policy of service to capital, towards a policy of concern for the masses of the people, and at the same time it is vitally necessary to put an end to the policy of war and occupation, to the policy of colonial settlements and the violation of the rights of the Palestinian Arab people. Otherwise, this government and any government which will pursue the same policy, will continue galloping towards a catastrophe which will lead this country from one abyss to the other and I hope that the popular masses who are anxious today about their fate, the mothers who are anxious about their sons, the fathers who are concerned about the education of their children, the slum dwellers who wish and aspire to get a human domicile, I hope that they all will understand that the only way is to remove this government, the government of war and occupation, to bring back the sons from Lebanon, to make just peace with the Palestinian people on the basis of coexistence and mutual respect of rights, and to arrive at a cooperation and decent life, in order to develop and prosper in Israel and the whole region.

LOSS OF A COMMUNIST LEADER

HANNA NAQQARA - A DEVOTED PATRIOT AND INTERNATIONALIST

Hanna Naqqara, the prominent communist advocate and fighter, died on January 1, 1984 in Haifa at the age of 72.

His coffin was set up in the Arab Orthodox College in Haifa. He was eulogized by member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Israel, Dr. Emile Touma, a comrade-in-arms and friend of the deceased throughout a long period of struggle. He spoke on behalf of the Central Committee of the Party. After him, advocate Menahem Waxman spoke, on behalf of the Haifa branch of the Union of Lawyers. In the name of the Committee for the Defence of Arab Lands and of the Arab Lawyers spoke Muhammed Mi'ari, who pointed out the firm support which the deceased had given to the Committee, he was followed by Professor Kalman, of the Haifa Technicum. He pointed out the firm belief of the deceased in the feasibility of coexistence of two peoples in this country on the basis of mutual respect of rights. The ceremony was conducted by Youssif Munir, a relative of the deceased and himself the chairman of the Orthodox Association in Lod (Lydda).

At the ceremony of the Arab Orthodox College in Haifa, numerous personalities from all over the country and many leaders and members of the Communist Party of Israel took part, at their head comrade Meir Vilner, the General Secretary of the Party; comrade Tawfiq Toubi, the General Secretary Deputy; comrade Tawfiq Zayyad, Mayor of Nazareth and the judge Muhammed Hubbeishi. Also present were a great number of Jewish and Arab lawyers, colleagues of the deceased. At the end of the ceremony the people present, passed by the coffin.

On the fresh grave dozens of flower wreaths were laid on behalf of the institutions and public figures.

*

The old-time communist leader, Hanna Naqqara, was born in the village of Rama in Galilee in 1911. He was brought up in Acre. After graduating from the faculty of Law in the University of Damascus, he worked as a lawyer in Haifa. Throughout all the years of his work as lawyer, he combined professional work with a ramified public activity. He defended Palestinians who were arrested by the British mandatory authori-

ties and took an active part in the revolutionary national activity. In the forties he headed the Arab Orthodox Club in Haifa and turned it into an important political and cultural centre. At the same time H. Naqqara established connection with the League for National Liberation.

In 1949 Hanna Naqqara joined the Communist Party of Israel and acted in its ranks with devotion until his last day. He occupied leading posts in the Party, among them, membership in the Central Committee and in the Central Control Commission.

In the framework of his public activity he played an important role in the struggle against the policy of national oppression of the Arab population in Israel. He was one of the initiators of the Committee of Defence of Arab Lands, which was founded in 1975, and which declared the 30th. of March, 1967 as "Land Day".

In his last years he wrote a book on the problem of confiscation of lands from the hands of the Arab population and about the public struggle against the acts of confiscation. The book is under press in the United States, in the English language.

True to his internationalist world outlook, H. Naqqara acted for the unity of the Jewish and Arab democratic forces in the struggle for just peace and for defence of the democratic freedoms. He devoted much of his energy to ramified activity within the framework of the Friendship Movement Israel-USSR and until his last day was a vice-president of the Movement. H. Naqqara took an active part in the activity of the Israel League for Human and Civil Rights as a Deputy President, he was also head of the Association of Democratic Lawyers.

ZO HADEREKH, January 4, 1984

DOCUMENTS AND MATERIALS

COMMUNIQUE REGARDING THE TALKS WHICH WERE HELD IN MOSCOW BETWEEN THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL AND THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION.

On January 18th. 1984 a meeting was held between member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union, K. Chernenko, candidate member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the Central Committee, B. Ponomarev, and deputy head of the International Department of the Central Committee of the CPSU, K. Brutens, and between a delegation of the Communist Party of Israel which was composed of the General Secretary M. Vilner, member of the Political Bureau Uzi Burstein, secretary of the Central Committee George Toubi, and Leon Zahavi, candidate member of the Central Committee.

The representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union spoke about the achievements in the implementation of the resolutions of the 26th. Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the resolutions of the sessions of the Central Committee which were held after the 26th. Congress and about the steps which the USSR has taken in the field of the foreign policy, steps which are directed at preserving world peace and against adventurist militarist policy of the imperialist circles of the United States.

The delegation of the Communist Party of Israel expressed full appreciation to the consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union as reflected in the declarations of the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and chairman of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union Yuri Andropov from September 28th. and November 24th. 1983.

The delegation of the Communist Party of Israel spoke about the struggle of the party against the aggressive policy of the ruling circles in Israel, directed against the Arab countries, against colonization and cruel oppression of the population in the occupied Arab territories, for rallying all the peace forces, irrespecton of ideological believes and for achieving just and stable peace in the Middle East. The Israeli Communists are struggling against the attack on the rights

of the workers, resolutely opposing the discriminations against the Arab population in Israel, against the intensifying danger of fascization of the political life and against the raging anti-Soviet incitement in the country.

The representatives of the CPSU expressed their solidarity with the struggle of the Israeli Communists Jews and Arabs who as patriots and internationalists are opposing the policy of occupation pursued by the Zionist ruling circles, and are struggling for a just settlement of the Middle East conflict, and for peace and friendship among the peoples.

The participants of the meetings determined that the aggressive policy of the USA coupled with the grave escalation of the arms race have led to the serious aggravation of international tension and have intensified the danger of nuclear confrontation. The USA arrogantly declares different regions of the world as "regions of vital interest" for the US and rudely tramples underfoot norms of international law and the sovereignty of states. An example of this - the American invasion of Grenada, the US acts of intervention in Central America, the military intervention in Lebanon and the campaign of blackmailing and threats against Syria. By widening its military presence, by establishing military bases and by the deployment of its army on the territory of other states, the USA aspires to exploit them in order to advance its aggressive plans against the Soviet Union, against other states of the socialist community and against national liberation movements.

The representatives of the two parties declared that the deployment of the new American missiles in Western Europe carries in its wake a real threat not only to the peoples of the socialist states but also to the peoples of the Middle East and North Africa.

In view of the new conditions which have arisen today, both sides stressed the importance of the united intensified activity of the peace forces in order to block the way in face of the growing danger of war and restore the process towards easing international atmosphere.

The representatives of the CPSU and the Communist Party of Israel pointed out that the aggressive and annexationist character of the American-Israeli agreements regarding "strategic cooperation" have already been expressed in the USA and Israeli acts of intervention in Lebanon. The alliance which

was established between the USA and Israel under the pretext of opposing the "Soviet threat" is directed against the sovereignty and interests of the peoples of the Middle East and Africa. It also contradicts the vital interests of the people in Israel whose territory is being turned into a base for the deployment of American military equipments.

The participants of the meeting expressed their resolute opinion regarding the necessity of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli, USA and NATO armies from Lebanon and to put an end to the provocations and threats directed against Syria. They expressed their support to the irrevocable national rights of the Palestinian Arab people including the right to selfdetermination and the establishment of their own independent State. Just peace in the Middle East can be achieved only by the withdrawal of the Israeli army from all the Arab territories occupied since June 1967, ensuring the right of all peoples and states in the region - including the state of Israel - to free development and secured existence. Both sides condemned the policy pursued by the USA and Israel aimed at imposing upon the Arab countries separate deals which prevent the achievement of a comprehensive settlement and aggravate the situation in the Middle East. They declared again, that the Middle East conflict can only be solved through common efforts, by convening an international conference with the participation of the USSR, the USA and all parties involved including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people.

The representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of Israel stressed that under the present conditions there is a special importance for a common and united action of the Communist and workers parties. They expressed their opinion regarding the further development of the cooperation between the Soviet and the Israeli Communists on the solid basis of Marxism Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The meeting was held in a warm and comradely atmosphere.

To the 7th. Congress,
German Communist Party
Dusseldorf

Dear comrades,

We have much pleasure in sending our warmest fraternal greetings to your 7th. Congress, wishing it full success.

Your Congress meets at a time, fateful for Europe and the world, with the deployment of Pershings and cruise missiles on the soil of the Federal Republic, in disregard of the opposition of the majority of your people and of the active participation of hundreds, of thousands in militant protest demonstrations. The Federal government has taken the grave step of enabling the US rulers to deploy these missiles in Western Germany, thus endangering the peace of Europe, the future of your people and the destiny of mankind.

Your Party played a vanguard role in awakening the people's consciousness, in the wake of which the anti-war movement has reached unprecedented dimensions.

We are united in the well-founded hope that the peace loving and anti-war forces of the world, in all their breadth and diversity, will be able to preserve world peace in face of all the aggressive acts of imperialism. A major role in this struggle is played by the principled policy of the Soviet Union, combining the sincere endeavour to come to an understanding, acceptable to both sides, with the prime determination not to enable imperialism to attain military superiority.

Dear comrades,

The Middle East is one of the most dangerous hotbeds of war. The recently concluded strategic agreement between the rulers of the USA and Israel is directed against peace in our region and in the world. It is directed against the just aspirations of the Palestinian Arab people for self determination and the establishment of their independent state, against the patriotic forces of Lebanon, against Syria as well as against the Soviet Union. It stands in harsh contradiction to the interests

of the people of our country and renders it politically, economically and militarily more dependent on the United States.

Our Party, together with other peace forces, is fighting for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all Israeli forces from Lebanon, for the withdrawal of Israel from all Arab territories occupied since June 1967, against any war adventures, especially against the threat of war against Syria. We are continuing our struggle for a just, comprehensive and durable peace in the region, for safeguarding world peace. We are struggling for defending the interests of the working people, the democratic rights and for equal rights to the Arab population in Israel.

We are convinced that the way to solve the Middle East conflict and its core, the Palestinian problem, is the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East, under the auspices of the UNO and the participation of the Soviet Union, the USA and all the parties involved in the conflict, including the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian Arab people.

Dear comrades,


Close fraternal relations bound our two parties by the same ideology, by the same objectives, by the common world-wide struggle for peace, democracy, progress and socialism.

Long live the German Communist Party !

Long live Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism !

Long live Peace ! long live Communism !





C O M M U N I S T P A R T Y O F I S R A E L
C E N T R A L C O M M I T T E E - F O R E I G N R E L A T I O N S D E P A R T M E N T
P . O . B . 2 6 2 0 5 , T E L - A V I V I S R A E L
C a b l e A d d r e s s : I S C O M P A R T E L - A V I V