

# JEWISH AFFAIRS

15¢

Vol. 1, No. 3

October 1970

## CONTENTS

<u>Meir Vilner, The Palestinian Question at the Present Stage of Development.</u>	1
<u>Jewish Youth Activists in the Service of Zionism and Imperialism.</u>	9
<u>Committee for a Just Peace in the Mid- East, Statement on the Middle East</u>	12
From Der Veg	
<u>Dr. Goldman Declares: Soviet Union     Is for Political Solution in Middle East</u>	13
<u>Voices of Reason in Israel</u>	14
<u>Tawfig Toubi Denounces Hi-jacking</u>	15
<u>Hyman Lumer, The Mikunis-Sneh Group: A Picture of Political Degeneration.</u>	17
<u>Questions and Answers</u>	22
<u>Events and Views</u>	24

Published by the Communist Party, U.S.A., 23 West 26th Street, New York, N. Y. 10010  
Editorial Committee: DAVID FRIED, JACK KLING, ALEX KOLKIN

THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION AT THE PRESENT  
STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT.

(From comrade Meir Vilner's essay "Summaries and Conclusions," in Arakhim, organ of the C.P. of Israel on questions of theory and practice, No.9, July 1970.)

One of the biggest failures of the Israeli rulers, of the Zionist leadership and of American imperialism backing them, is on the question of the Palestinian Arab people.

The Israeli leaders - thus we have warned since the June war - are detached from reality, the international as well as the Mideastern one. They deceive themselves, so we said, when they think the Palestinian Arab people will reconcile itself to the occupation, that "time will do its work". We said that the conquered people, especially under the present regional and international conditions, will not only fail to reconcile itself to the occupation, but that the struggle against the occupation will be intensified and become unbearable for the occupier.

The Palestinian Arab people, whose rights and whose very existence the Israeli leaders wanted to eliminate once and for all by means of the June war, has not only not been wiped off the Mideastern map, but has become a national and political factor of great weight in the region and the international arena, in a measure it had not been previously.

As far back as a year ago some ministers in Israel, such as Israel Galili, dared appear in public and declare with nationalist arrogance that no Palestine Arab people exists. In an atmosphere of unbridled militarist self-confidence, the racist senselessness led many Zionist leaders to positions and statements with which hardly any racialist in Rhodesia, South Africa and other places would compete.

The policy of brutal oppression in the occupied areas, the Zionist policy of denying the rights of the Palestinian Arab people and its very existence, the policy of perpetuation of the occupation and territorial annexations, the sufferings of the refugee masses, driven out from their homeland, their lands and their homes for more than 20 years, their redoubled sufferings during the June 1967 war and after, when many of them became refugees for a second time, the turning of additional hundreds of thousands of Palestinian Arabs into refugees as a result of the June war--all these have intensified and deepened the hostility towards Israel in the Arab world in general, and among the Palestinian Arab people in particular.

In this difficult situation it is hard to exaggerate the great importance of the appearance of anti-imperialist, patriotic forces in Israel, which have stood up against the policy of aggression and territorial expansion of the ruling Zionist pro-imperialist circles, for the recognition of the just national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including the right of the Arab refugees to choose between return to their homeland or receipt of compensation according to the UNO resolutions.

Our Communist Party has fulfilled a highly important task in this struggle. Thanks to the principled policy and struggle of our Party, and thanks to additional forces of fighters for peace in Israel, which have lately raised their voices against the prevailing aggressive and anti-national policy, no image of identity between the reactionary government ruling Israel and the popular masses in Israel has been created. Thanks to our internationalist and patriotic policy we have found a common language with the Arab Communist parties and with other anti-imperialist forces in the Arab world fighting for peace, in the struggle against the common imperialist enemy, for our and their freedom, against occupation and for a just peace.

At the same time one must not ignore the fact that the aggressive June war, opened by the Israeli government, the occupation and all the acts of oppression of the Palestinian Arab people by the Israeli rulers, have helped to extend extreme positions among certain parts of the Palestinian Arab people and in various circles in the Arab countries.

Side by side with the correct principled and realistic positions of the Communist parties and many anti-imperialist circles, of President Nassar and the UAR Government and of other Arab states, who accept the Security Resolution of November 1967 and are ready to implement it, we see extreme positions of leaders of the Palestinian resistance movement and of certain Arab governments.

The struggle of the Palestinian Arab people against the occupation and for its national rights has won the growing sympathies of all progressive mankind. At the same time those battle slogans which call in question the right to existence of the State of Israel, evoke reservation and opposition.

After the June war on immense development of the Palestinian factor has begun. Before the June War, the positions and speeches of Ahmed Shukeiri who was then the chairman of the Palestinian Liberation Organization, evoked anger instead of sympathy. With his speeches, in which he preached the liquidation of Israel, he brought immeasurable harm to the just struggle of the Palestinian Arab people for its national rights, and aroused great joy among the imperialists and the Zionist leaders. These understood very well how to use Shukeiri's speeches against the right to existence of the State of Israel for their own purposes, in order to justify

their non-recognition of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arab people.

The June war, the occupation, the aggravated refugee problem, the policy of creation of faits accomplis in the occupied areas, coupled with the degradation of the Arab masses of inhabitants--all these have with time led to the development of a mass Palestinian Arab national movement. The Palestinian organisations have assumed a new character. Now they have become a national movement, which expresses the struggles of the Palestinian Arab popular masses against the occupation and for their national rights. Thousands and tens of thousands of Palestinian Arab youth, workers, fallaheen, women and mothers, students and teachers, people belonging to all strata, volunteer and are ready to sacrifice their lives in the struggle against the occupation, for national and human freedom. With many the struggle for national liberation becomes integrated with the struggle for progressive social changes. It is a fact that the peoples of the whole world sympathize with the Palestinian Arab people, its sufferings and its struggle against the occupation and for its legitimate rights.

At the same time criticism is sounded and opposition is expressed on the part of the anti-imperialist forces in many countries against those parts in the program of the Palestinian resistance organizations which deny the fact of existence of an Israeli nation, its rights to self-determination and as a result, the right to existence of the State of Israel as a sovereign state.

\*

Our Communist Party of Israel, and together with us, the international Communist movement and the majority of anti-imperialist and progressive forces in the world, start from the fundamental assumption that Palestine, whatever the causes and circumstances, has become in the course of its historical development, a bi-national country; at the side of the Palestinian Arab people a Jewish people has developed in the country--a Jewish nation. (One ought not to mix up the notion of a Jewish nation developing in Palestine with the Zionist notion of an extra-territorial, world Jewish nation).

Every nation has the right to self-determination. Under the new conditions which developed in Palestine, in view of its being turned into a bi-national country, the correct and realistic solution of the national question is the realization of the right to self-determination of the two peoples, the Israeli people and the Palestinian Arab people.

The Zionist reactionaries denied from the beginning, and deny to this day, the right to self-determination and even the very existence of the Palestinian Arab people. Already in the 1948 war of independence they worked for preventing the establishment of a Palestinian Arab state and the realization of the right of the Palestinian Arab people to self-determination according to the UN resolution of 1947, and exerted efforts for a maximum expansion of the

territory of the Jewish state and for the removal from their homeland of a maximum of Palestinian Arabs.

A successful struggle against the Zionist aspirations to expansion, and for failing the imperialist designs in our region, can be waged only on the basis of a democratic program, apt to rally all peoples in the anti-imperialist struggle, apt to win the support of the socialist world and the anti-imperialist forces. This has to be a program which is correct in respect of principle, practical and realistic in respect of the balance of forces in the world and in the region.

Our point of departure for every fundamental solution of the Palestinian question, as of any other national question, is the interest of the anti-imperialist struggle, the interest of the independence of the peoples and the interest of international peace and security. The form of solution of a national question is always concrete, according to the time and place.

In the reality of Palestine, where there exist two nations, any solution that takes into consideration the right of self-determination of only one of the two is not correct in respect of principle, nor is it realistic. Any such representation of the solution assists the imperialist forces, which are interested in dividing the peoples in our region in order to rule them. When such a program is brought up by Palestinian factors, it evokes the joy of the imperialists and the Zionist rulers of Israel.

Those paragraphs in the program of Palestinian resistance organizations which deny the right to sovereign existence of the State of Israel, as a consequence of the assumption (which in the historical past was correct, but is no longer valid in the new reality), that no Israeli nation exists at all, to which the right of self-determination could be accorded--those paragraphs are used as a main political weapon by the Israeli rulers and the Zionist leaders, and also by imperialist propaganda. Demagogically they imbue the Israeli youth and public, and also world public opinion with the theory of "there is no option." This theory says that the question is not that of retreat from the occupied zones and of the implementation of the Security Council Resolution, but the very refusal of the Arabs to recognize the right to existence of the State of Israel within any frontiers.

In various circles among the Palestinian resistance organizations the plan for the establishment of a Palestinian, democratic, Jewish-Christian-Moslem state has been discussed. Even if ignoring the religious criterion in this definition, which creates a partition within the Palestinian Arab people itself, the question arises: What is the realism of such a plan? Now the question on the agenda is not whether to establish the State of Israel or not, its existence is a fact, recognized by the United Nations and by the countries of the world, by East and West alike.

If the debate refers to the remoter future, one cannot ignore that there are possibilities in various directions, including the establishment of a

federation of states in our region, a narrow federation which would include the State of Palestine and the State of Israel, or a Jordanian-Palestinian state and the State of Israel, and many more possibilities. But whatever the development might be, it can only be the outcome of the free decision of the peoples, which will draw nearer to each other as a result of social changes inside each one of the states. Federations can be established, but they must not be imposed.

The presentation of a plan of a Palestinian democratic state for all the Arab and Jewish citizens, while abolishing the Israeli sovereign state, as a condition of a peace settlement between the State of Israel and the Arab states and as a condition for the solution of the Palestinian question, is not correct on principle and makes things easy for the common enemies of the Palestinian Arab people and the Israeli people--imperialism and its Zionist henchmen.

Therefore the question is: what is our attitude to the national question and its solution? Is it a bourgeois-nationalist or a proletarian class point of departure? Do we take into account the general interest of the struggle against imperialism, for national independence and socialism or are we ready to stand against this general interest, against the forces of socialism and progress in the world?

Under the concrete historical conditions, in view of the balance of forces in the world and in the Middle East, that attitude which presents as condition for the solution of the Palestinian problem the calling in question of the very right to existence of the state of Israel, as a sovereign state is not correct, is not realistic, and causes harm first of all to the Palestinian Arab people itself.

We, the Israeli Communists, warn day in and day out against the grave consequences for Israel as a result of the aggressive, pro-imperialist and anti-Arab policy of the Zionist rulers. We warn the Israeli people that the rulers of Israel, who are most closely linked with American imperialism, are liable to bring a national disaster upon Israel, that they endanger the future, the very existence of the State of Israel.

But there exists a difference in principle and quality between the disastrous consequences which the prevailing Zionist Israeli policy might bring upon Israel, and between the presentation of non-existence of the State of Israel as a political target by the National Liberation movement of the Palestinian Arab people and the stipulation of basing any settlement on the acceptance of the program of establishment of a Palestinian democratic Jewish-Moslem-Christian state.

This theme has important topical repercussions: with a part of the Palestinian factors the principled position which denies the right of existence of the State of Israel is also connected with their opposition to the Security Council Resolution of November 1967, which demands the Israeli withdrawal from all areas occupied in the June war, a just solution of the question of the Palestinian Arab refugees in accordance with the UNO resolutions, and the recognition of the sovereign existence of all the states in our region, including Israel, within recognized and secure frontiers.

The question arises: from the point of view of the Palestinian Arab people, does the Security Council Resolution solve its national question, does it ensure its rights?

No doubt the Security Council Resolution is a compromise resolution which was accepted unanimously by the great powers and the other members of the Security Council. The Security Council Resolution took into consideration the aspect of principle of the problem, the right of the peoples, as well as the balance of forces in the international arena, when there still exist two world systems, the socialist and the capitalist, and also the balance of forces in the region. And like every compromise, it does not completely solve all the problems which it deals with.

Still, it would be a mistake and a detachment from international and regional reality not to see that the Security Council Resolution is a positive resolution, in respect to peace and security in the Middle East and in the world as well as in respect to ensuring the rights of the peoples, including those of the Palestinian Arab people.

In respect to the Palestinian Arab people, whose struggle is linked with the general anti-imperialist struggle in the region and the world, the implementation of the Security Council Resolution will restore to it its lands, which were conquered by Israel in the June war. It will make it possible to solve the refugee question by giving them the right to choose between return to their homeland and the receipt of compensations - in accordance with the UNO resolutions.

These are very fundamental matters in favor of the Palestinian Arab people. Thus the Security Council resolution in a rather large measure advances the full solution of the Palestinian problem.

The question is: what is the alternative, in the concrete Mideastern and international circumstances? The real alternative is not between the Security Council Resolution and a finer and better solution, but between the all-round implementation of the Security Council Resolution and the status quo--the present situation of Israeli occupation and unbearable conditions of the members of the Palestinian Arab people in refugee camps.

Every Arab factor speaking against the Security Council Resolution deceives himself if he thinks that by that he hits the enemies of the Palestinian Arab people. Objectively, he plays their game, helps their designs to perpetuate

the occupation and to prevent the refugees who wish to do so, from returning to their homeland.

The Security Council Resolution states that after its full implementation all the controversial questions or those which have not been solved, will be solved politically and not by force.

From the point of view of the historical development of our region, the complete solution of the national question will be connected with progressive social developments in the Arab countries and in Israel, which will put the whole complex of relations on an entirely different basis when the points of departure of each side becomes social-class and not only national.

After the implementation of the Security Council Resolution various problems are liable to crop up, such as questions connected with the rights of the Arab population in Israel, whose weight will be augmented by the return of Palestinian Arab refugees. These are problems whose correct solution will depend on the balance between the progressive and reactionary forces within Israel, and also, of course, on the general developments in the region and in the world.

Questions that are liable to arise in the future will have to be solved in the course of the years by political means; according to the rights and interests of the peoples and according to the general interests of the anti-imperialist struggle for peace, the independence of peoples and socialism.

It is the Zionist circles ruling Israel - and the American, British and West German imperialists backing them - who are responsible for the tragedy of the Palestinian Arab people. It is they who are responsible for the aggressive June war, which brought a further heavy disaster upon the Palestinian Arab people as well as disaster upon the neighbouring Arab states and the Israeli people itself.

The Zionist circles which rule Israel and their imperialist godfathers are not only the enemies of the Arab peoples; they are also the enemies of the Israeli people. They push it to an abyss and are liable to bring on it a national disaster.

For the attainment of their targets the ruling Zionist circles are prepared to bring about such an escalation of the war in the Middle East as will involve the great powers in a confrontation and will endanger world peace. Therefore the anger increases among the peoples against the aggressive and annexationist Israeli government and there is a growing demand on the part of the peoples of the entire world for the withdrawal of Israel from all the



occupied territories and for the implementation of the Security Council Resolution, in all its parts. The Israeli rulers are more and more isolated in the international arena.

Inside Israel itself the opposition to the governmental policy is seriously increasing, as well as the demand for withdrawal from the occupied areas within the framework of implementing the Security Council Resolution. The rulers of Israel, whose policy is increasingly failing abroad and at home, are grasping at the extreme speeches and positions of certain Palestinian factors, as a drowning man grasps at a straw, in order to evade withdrawal from the occupied territories and to evade recognizing the rights of the Arab refugees, to which the Security Council Resolution obliges them.

When we, Israeli Communists, discuss this problem, we have a special right to do so. At all times have we fought against the Zionist anti-Arab, pro-imperialist policy, always have we struggled for Israel's recognizing the national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, always have we accused the Israeli rulers and their imperialist godfathers of responsibility for the disasters befalling the Palestinian Arab people.

But one must not ignore the fact that historical experience has taught that errors and incorrect and extreme positions of the leadership of the Palestinian Arab people have assisted the Zionist leaders and the imperialists to carry out their plans against the Palestinian Arab people.

We look upon the Palestinian Arab people as a brother and friend. No force and no terror and intimidation from the side of the reaction ruling Israel will deter us from considering the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people as an anti-imperialist struggle, and the Palestinian Arab national movement as an anti-imperialist national movement. We are in solidarity with the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people against the occupation and for its legitimate, and just national rights.

Therefore, as friends we say: any plan for a solution of the crisis in our region which includes the denial of the sovereign existence of the State of Israel, is not correct; it is not just and not realistic. The interests of the Palestinian Arab people and of the Israeli people alike, the supreme interests of the anti-imperialist struggle, the liberty of the peoples, of peace and social progress demand today the rallying of the peoples in our region in a joint struggle for the implementation of the Security Council Resolution of November 1967. The implementation of the resolution will deal a serious blow at the American imperialists and its Zionist stooges, will solve fundamental questions of the Palestinian Arab people and will free the neighbouring Arab countries from occupation, will bring peace and security to all the Arab peoples and to the Israeli people, will create better conditions for social changes in the countries of the region.

JEWISH YOUTH ACTIVISTS IN THE SERVICE OF  
ZIONISM AND IMPERIALISM.

The tremendous political upsurge of youth has in recent years frightened the rulers of our country. Among the Jewish people, the Zionist leaders of organizations such as Hadassah, Bnai Brith and other organizations, are worried that increasing numbers of Jewish college youth are opposing the militaristic and aggressive policies of the Israeli government and identifying with the anti-imperialist struggles of the Arab, African, Asian and Latin American peoples. These organizations view with alarm the alienation of many Jewish youth from the traditional religious, social, economic and political institutions of the American Jewish establishment. They are determined that these youth must at all costs not be permitted to move toward the left and especially not in the direction of Marxism-Leninism and the Communist Party.

In this connection, the June 1970 issue of Hadassah Magazine devoted almost its entire space to articles on developments among American Jewish youth.

The first of these articles is "Letter To A Young Man of Our Time" by the writer Elie Wiesel, who raises the question of "what it means to be a Jew" in these times and to what being a Jew commits one. Behind all the mystical language of the article, the answer is typically Zionist, with complete disregard and contempt for non-Jews.

In talking of Auschwitz the author states:

"Remove its Jewish aspects and Auschwitz appears devoid of mystery."

It is of course undeniable that the suffering<sup>\*</sup> of the Jewish people in the concentration camps was by far the most frightful of all the Nazi bestialities. But the fact remains that the Jews were not the only ones. Yet nowhere in this lengthy article is there any mention of the millions of Russians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks and others who were also slaughtered by the Nazis. He states that "to be a Jew is to work for the survival of a people." Further: "You cannot fulfill yourself as a Jew if you feel no bond with those who share your dilemmas and your contradictions: the Jews in Israel, in the Soviet Union, in the Arab countries." This is his answer to a young Jewish man with many questions.

(\* -and slaughter)

But we would say to this young man that it is not necessary to embrace Zionism or bourgeois nationalism to survive as a people. The Jewish people will survive long after Zionism and the imperialism which nurtures it are discarded. Jewish youth need no Wiesels to tell them that "by struggling on behalf of Russian, Arab and Polish Jews, I fight for human rights everywhere." They know that the fight for human rights requires a fight against racism and imperialism and against real, not conjured-up anti-Semitism.

The other major article in this issue is a symposium entitled "Jewish Student Activists Speak Out." Hadassah introduces this article with the following comment: "Since the Six-Day War scores of radical Jewish student groups have sprung up on college campuses throughout the country. They issue publications, engage in religious experiments, fight for Jewish studies in the college curriculum, conduct Zionist activities and help organize demonstrations for Russian Jewry and against Pompidou's policies."

Participants in this symposium were Philip Horn as moderator, director of the University Department of the American Zionist Youth Foundation, and seven New York and out-of-state College student leaders of newly-formed Jewish Student Unions and editors or co-editors of their newly issued publications. Their type of radicalization and rebellion is not the kind that frightens the Pentagon and the Big Business interests. Their activism and "militancy" has sprung up because these Zionist youth feel that the established Jewish organizations, institutions and leadership are ineffective, are losing the Jewish youth and are failing the Zionist cause. Their activism is designed to create a mass base that will enthusiastically and militantly carry out reactionary Zionist policies that they feel existing Jewish organizations are incapable of carrying out. Typical were the comments by Chauva Katz, who describes herself as a "fiery Zionist", who helped form the Radical Zionist Alliance:

"It was not enough," she said, "to have a private Zionist consciousness-- this consciousness had to be shared". Marty Kaplan, Vice-President of the Jewish Student Union of C.C.N.Y. said: "We felt that the Jewish newspapers and magazines were not serving any purpose for the college community. Our newspaper 'The Flame', centers around Zionism and Israel." Jonathan Lifschutz of Hemagshimim states that their aim is to "further education of Jews on campus in terms of Israel and also to combat Arab propaganda." We wonder what Arabs they are talking about, or for that matter, what newspapers, since it was our impression that the American press and TV were so totally pro Meir, Dayan and Eban.

Even the physical taking over of the offices of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies was justified on the grounds "that it is no longer serving the Jewish community but serving hospitals which are not Jewish and YMHA's in non-Jewish neighborhoods. We have been asking them to give more to Jewish education and Jewish Day Schools." Again: "Groups like Federation got their funds from the Jewish community and they should be responsive to the Jewish community. Children are not getting a Jewish education and by the time they get to campus, they completely disregard their Judaism."

Clearly the differences are not over goals and objectives but rather over the methods to achieve them. The students were also worried that the ap-

proach of the American Jewish leadership to Israel is "inadequate" and they were critical of the American type of Zionism which consists of "planting Jewish National Fund Trees, giving money to U. J. A. and going to Israel once every 2 years." Apparently nothing short of all Jewish people migrating to Israel and giving up the democratic and revolutionary struggles in their own lands will satisfy them.

To justify their anti-Soviet policies and activities, they constantly assert that the danger is not now physical extinction but rather spiritual extinction which, they say, is just as bad. This becomes a cover for doing nothing about the real anti-Semitism of fascist Right-wing forces in our country and the world. Instead they try to divert the energies of the Jewish masses into campaigns against the socialist lands by fabricating false tales of anti-Semitism. They utilize every means to distort the basic truth of socialist society--that racism and anti-Semitism are hostile and alien ideologies to the working class and are being eradicated. But there are other Zionist youth who are beginning to question the line of their elders and to oppose the policies of the Israeli government, just as the youth in Israel are doing.

We are confident, therefore, that this attempt by these Jewish organizations to drive a wedge into the Jewish youth movement will ultimately be defeated and that Jewish youth will take their honorable place alongside other American youth in the struggle against racism, imperialism and war.

\* \* \* \*

STATEMENT ON THE MIDDLE EAST

(Issued on September 25, 1970 by the Committee for a Just Peace in the Mid-East, 100 E. 16 St., New York City 10003. The Committee has also sponsored a public meeting on these questions. We present the statement for the information of our readers.)

The hearts of peace-loving people everywhere were gladdened a few weeks ago by the acceptance on the part of the U.A.R. and Jordan, as well as Israel, of the U.S. proposals for a 90 day ceasefire. During the ceasefire period, both sides were to initiate talks with UN Representative Gunnar Jarring, as a first step towards meaningful peace negotiations. That struggle for a just peace within today's realities can be a contribution to the greater liberation of the peoples of the Middle East from imperialist oppression and exploitation. The Middle East must not be diverted from the promise of a future of freedom, independence and social progress as mutually respected countries. In a struggle for such goals and demands of the various peoples, it is a disservice to the cause of securing peace with justice, to condone or encourage the recent terror tactics and actions which are making pawns of the lives of innocents whether in the form of hi-jacking of planes by Arab resistance forces or by the seizure of hostages and the threatening of Arab people with death by the Israeli government.

We see now that peace talks are being sabotaged by Israel's unfounded charges that the U.A.R. has violated the Suez Canal area ceasefire terms. It must be noted that even the U.S. at first termed these charges inconclusive but was compelled to reverse itself under pressure of the Israeli government.

It is evident that the Israeli rulers are determined not to enter into peace negotiations based on the UN Resolution of November 22, 1967, which calls for withdrawal from occupied territories and a just solution of the refugee problem.

The situation is becoming more ominous. Merchants of death and oppression who have no regard for the future of Israel have launched an intensive war propaganda campaign within the United States. After years of criminal, brutal and shameful genocidal aggression by U.S. imperialism in Southeast Asia, the the same forces in monopoly ruling circles seek to continue the U.S. on a war course with an increased war budget and greater monopoly profits, by making the Middle East with its rich oil fields the battlefield. The threatening breakup of the Gunnar Jarring peace talks is leading to a deepening of the Middle East crisis. The danger of a widening war is increasing. If the hostilities should break out again, the blood of countless Israeli and Arab youth will be spilled in an unjust, futile and self-defeating war of aggression by the Israeli militarists seeking the annexation and settlement of occupied territories and the denial to the Arab refugees of their just rights.

Statement (Continued)

The people of the U.S. and the world over are clamoring for peace in the Middle East, which can best be attained on the basis of complete acceptance of the UN Security Council Resolution.

The strong peace feelings of many nations was a major factor in initiating the ceasefire. The reluctance of the Israeli government to follow through with the Gunnar Jarring talks endangers the possibility of peace negotiations. The pressure of world opinion and of public opinion in the U.S. must be exerted upon the Israeli government to fulfill its promise and begin the talks.

The deep desire of the American people for peace and the action of peace forces in our country are of vital importance for the achievement of a political settlement in the Middle East which is premised on the recognition of the inviolability of Israel as a state and Israel's withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories.

We therefore feel the necessity for organized action by Americans to work for peace in the Middle East.

\* \* \* \* \*

From DER VEG, Progressive Israeli Weekly

August 12, 1970

DR. GOLDMANN DECLARES: SOVIET UNION IS FOR  
POLITICAL SOLUTION IN MIDDLE EAST

Dr. Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Jewish Congress, reiterated in an interview in Switzerland his firm belief that the Soviet Union is interested in a political solution of the Israeli-Arab conflict. The interview took place August 9 on the Bern radio.

It was conducted a day after the acceptance by the UAR and Jordan on one hand and Israel on the other of the proposals to declare a cease fire and initiate talks with the U.N. Ambassador Gunnar Jarring as an intermediary.

Dr. Goldmann welcomed this turn of events. He emphasized that the consent by Gamal Abdel Nasser and Israel to these talks represent the first meaningful steps towards peace in the Middle East. (As it turned out, Dr. Goldmann's hopeful expectations did not materialize. Gunnar Jarring's mediation efforts have been stalled due to Israel's refusal to participate in the talks. Nasser died of a heart attack on September 28.)

"This is the first time in twenty years that we can see on the horizon

Goldmann, cont'd

an opening for the liquidation of the conflict," Dr. Goldmann said.

"We have to express our deep appreciation for Nasser's position," declared Dr. Goldmann, "he had the courage to accept the American plan in the face of the opposition of several Arab countries and the Palestinian liberation movement."

Commenting on the Palestinian refugee question, Dr. Goldmann pointed out that a solution to this problem can be found only if "special adjustments are made to meet the needs of the Palestinians and by recognizing the necessity for a homeland for the Palestinian Arab people."

As the subsequent events have shown, Dr. Goldmann's assumption that Israel was going to accept Gunnar Jarring's mediation was premature. The leader of the Jewish Congress showed, however, a great deal of insight in his evaluation of Nasser's readiness for negotiation.

\* \* \* \* \*

September 9, 1970

VOICES OF REASON IN ISRAEL

Histadrut Leader for Political Solution

Yitzhak Ben-Aharon, General Secretary of the powerful Israeli labor organization, Histadrut, noted in a lecture, in Herzlia (Aug. 26) that peace in the Middle East can be achieved only through a political solution. We present excerpts from Ben-Aharon's talk which was printed in the newspaper Al Hamishmar. The leader of the Histadrut stated:

"If the present attempt to initiate peace negotiations should fail we must bear in mind that the Israeli-Arab conflict can be resolved only through a political solution, because all the factors involved in this war have come to an impasse. The people must be told the truth, there is only one struggle that can bring us victory, and this is the struggle for peace. We cannot project a perspective of eternal war. The key issue is not to gain more territory, but to achieve a lasting peace within secure borders."

Ben-Aharon emphasized: "No one believes that we can conquer all the Arab governments and dictate to them our peace conditions in Cairo."

His statement would have been still more welcome if he had added that secure borders could only be borders mutually agreed to in a peaceful way. At the same time it must be noted that Yitzhak Ben-Aharon has a much better understanding of the existing situation than Golda Meir and Moshe Dayan.

\* \* \* \* \*

September 16, 1970

TAWFIK TOUBI DENOUNCES HIJACKINGS I

Tawfik Toubi, leader of the Communist Party of Israel and Communist Knesset Deputy denounced, in a speech in the Israeli legislative body (Sept. 15), the airplane hijackings by Palestine commandos.

Following are excerpts from T. Toubi's Knesset speech:

"The hijacking of four civilian airplanes with hundreds of passengers and the attempt to hijack an El Al airplane by a Palestinian organization that calls itself 'Peoples' Front'; the blowing up of the airplanes and the holding of about 50 of the passengers as hostages--these adventurist acts have rightfully aroused the indignation of public opinion all over the world.

"Such criminal acts must be denounced regardless of the motives of their perpetrators."

"Our Communist (Knesset) delegation has always criticized such adventurist actions as acts of international lawlessness, which cause suffering to innocent citizens and could only serve the purpose of those who seek to inflame hatred between Jews and Arabs.

"We demand the immediate release of all the passengers that are being held as hostages. Hijacking airplanes and seizing hostages adversely affects the rights of the Palestinian people and their struggle for civil rights.

"One also gets the impression that the adventurist acts of airplane hijacking and seizing hostages is being



M.E.

utilized by the (Israeli) government as a coverup for its policy of rejecting every effort to reach a just peace.

"We denounce very energetically the numerous instances of seizing hostages by both sides.

"Such inhumane acts on the part of the Israeli government nullifies its moral right to condemn airplane hijacking and holding hostages in the Arab world."

Toubi referred here to the arrest by Israeli authorities of 450 Arabs in the occupied territories as a reprisal against the hijacking. These arrests were criticized by certain government officials.

They led to sharp protests in most of the cities in the occupied territories. Arab prisoners in Sechem declared a hunger strike against them.

THE MIKUNIS-SNEH GROUP: A PICTURE OF  
POLITICAL DEGENERATION.

By: Hyman Lumer

In 1965 the Communist Party of Israel split into two groups, one headed by Meir Vilner and Tawfig Toubi, the other by Shmuel Mikunis and Moshe Sneh. Each called itself the Communist Party of Israel. At that time other parties, including the CPUSA, took the position of calling for reunification and of extending recognition to neither group as the Communist Party of Israel.

Yet it was clear even then that the group headed by Mikunis and Sneh had already moved far in the direction of Jewish nationalism and Zionism. Increasingly it had centered its attack on "Arab chauvinism" rather than on the aggressive, pro-imperialist policies of Israel's ruling circles. And it had begun to align itself with Eshkol as against Ben Gurion, under the illusion that the former represented a turn to a more enlightened course.

In 1967, this opportunist, bourgeois-nationalist trend culminated in joining the ranks of those who portrayed the Israeli ruling-class aggression as a war of self-defense against an imminent threat of annihilation. With this act the process of political deterioration became very rapid.

Since war, in the famous words of Clausewitz, is a continuation of policy by violent means, to justify the war it became necessary to justify the policies of the Israeli government which preceded it. Hence the Mikunis-Sneh group has progressively abandoned whatever Marxist-Leninist position it once held. Today its degeneration is complete.

Few in Israel any longer regard this group as a Communist party or even as part of the Left. An article in the Jewish Digest of January 1969 (Israel Kollar, "Israel's Political Parties and the Occupied Areas"), after describing the position of Rakah (the Communist Party of Israel, led by Vilner and Taubi), goes on to say:

"To the right of this group is an assortment of Israelis now concentrated in four parties, the Communist Party (the Mikunis-Sneh group-H.L.), the United Labor Party, the Israel Labor Party, and the Independent Liberals, who, in reality, constitute one political outlook with minor and infrequent deviations." (Emphasis added.)

On my recent trip to Israel I spoke to a number of leading figures in the peace movement. Several of them told me (and without my asking) that they did not consider the Mikunis-Sneh group as part of the opposition to government policy, let alone part of the Left.

Thus, the well-known journalist Amos Kenan characterized it as "the Left wing of the Labor Party"--the party of Golda Meir. For the past year or more, he said, it had supported the government positions and hence could not be considered part of the opposition.

Ya'akov Rittin, head of the Left Union of Zionist Socialists, a group which has split off from Mapam, said: "Sneh has gone farther than the Mapam leaders. He has moved like an express train, with no stops. He generally supports government policy. Sneh is no Communist." The comments of others were similar.

The false differentiation between Ben-Gurion and Eshkol has now developed into an equally false differentiation between the leaders of Gahal and Dayan as the "hawks" and Meir, Eban and their supporters as the "doves." On these grounds the attack is centered on the former and the latter are supported, overlooking the fact that despite their differences all of them are adherents of a basic policy of aggression and expansion.

This position was dramatically demonstrated earlier this year when the vote on a motion of no confidence in the government was taken in the Knesset at the time of the Goldmann affair. As expected, the Communist and "New Force" (Ha'olam Hazeh group) deputies voted for the motion and others solidly against it--with one exception, Sneh, the one deputy of the Mikunis-Sneh group, abstained.

Of this action an article in Ha'olam Hazeh said: "Sneh's abstention from voting non-confidence in the government--and that on the occasion of such a clear issue as Goldmann's peace mission--is indubitably a further great leap in the turncoat career of the 61-year old leader. "It practically withdraws the Mikunis-Sneh group from the opposition," the article added.

Sneh also attacked Goldmann sharply, as did Eban and others in the government.

The approach of the Mikunis-Sneh group to the U.N. Security Council resolution is essentially that of the government. It is viewed not as a document whose basic provisions are to be accepted in advance by both sides as the basis for negotiations, but rather as one to be accepted only "in principle" with the meaning of its provisions to be then debated in negotiations. Thus, a communique of the Political Bureau issued in June of this year calls for "reaffirming the acceptance of the Security Council resolution of November 22,

1967, including all its provisions, their agreed interpretations to be determined in negotiations between the parties through the U.N.O. Emissary."

The position on withdrawal from the occupied territories is also substantially that of the government. In a Knesset speech last May, Sneh declared: "We must say immediately: we shall withdraw only to mutually agreed borders of peace."

Golda Meir, at the time of her visit to the United States, stated that Israel would withdraw only to secure and defensible borders. Implied in both statements is a rejection of the resolution's declaration of the "inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war" and the intention of bargaining over how much of the conquered territories would be returned. Indeed, Sneh has maintained that acquisition of territory by war, when necessitated on grounds of security, is not annexation. But this is tantamount to a rejection of the resolution itself, and this rejection the Mikunis-Sneh group shares with the Meir regime.

The Mikunis-Sneh group has gone over to Zionism, posing as the advocate of a "modernized" Zionism. The essence of its position is described in an article in Ha'aretz (September 5, 1968), based on an interview with Sneh, as follows:

"M. Sneh's party advocates Jewish emigration to Israel as an uninterrupted process which will fortify the Jewish nation in Israel and will strengthen its ties with the Jewish communities in the diaspora, because it supposes there is a possibility of existence and development of Jewish minorities in democratic regimes in the capitalist world as well as in the reformed socialist world.

"M. Sneh's party feels that the world Zionist Organization is undergoing an incurable crisis. At the same time, Sneh advocates a democratic world Jewish organization for the realization of the Jewish people's attachment to the State of Israel as well as for defense of the rights of the Jews in the diaspora and also for the spreading of Jewish culture and Jewish education."

Such an organization would be formed by a merger of the World Zionist Organization and the World Jewish Congress, according to Sneh. This position, which resembles that of certain Zionist elements in this country, is a basic departure from Marxism-Leninism. And it betrays its anti-Sovietism in the formulation "reformed Socialist world", that is, one that is cleansed of its alleged "anti-Semitism."

- Anti-Sovietism has become the hallmark of this group as it has of all such renegade groups. Mikunis, Sneh and Company have become fully a part of the slanderous campaign against the Soviet Union based on fraudulent allegations of persecution of Soviet Jews. When a group of prominent Soviet Jewish personalities held a press conference to protest these slanders as well as the barbarities being committed in the occupied territories, this group adopted a vicious resolution condemning the Soviet Union for "using Soviet Jews to promote the vilification of Israel. Thus it aligned itself fully with the anti-Soviet elements in Israel and elsewhere."

Sneh regards the Soviet Union as a "dictatorship of the bureaucratic apparatus." In an interview with Ha'olam Hazeh (October 9, 1968), he said that the balance of truth with regard to the Soviet Union is "that socialism has not yet been realized in the Soviet Union or any other country belonging to the Socialist camp."

The USSR is also accused of pursuing imperialist aims along with the United States, and of using "Arab-Chauvinism" as its instrument for this purpose in the Middle East. In the discussion preceding the group's last convention, S. Mikunis wrote that "the Soviet Union built its perspective of influence in the Middle East upon adjustment to the chauvinist anti-Israel frame-of-mind of the Arab countries' rulers."

It is the Soviet Union which is regarded as the source of the danger of war in the Middle East. A resolution adopted by the Central Committee in June states that the CC "appeals to the Communist and Worker's Parties, to the forces of peace in all countries, to exert their full influence to prevent Soviet intervention in the Middle East conflict." The resolution goes on to assert that Israel can be expected to do everything possible to prevent a clash; if one occurs, it will be the Soviet Union's doing.

More, the Soviet Union is alleged to be involved with U.S. imperialism in a plot to divide the world up between them. Sneh, in a Knesset speech last May, expresses this most brazenly. He said that "the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union are at present of a complex nature; they are rivals, competitors, clashing one with another--but at the same time they are also talking one with another, dividing up assets and coming to terms one with the other, and discussing the establishment of a cartel between both for the purpose of world domination..."

Thus does this renegade grouping join in the Trotskyite and Maoist distortions and vilifications of the Soviet Union. And this in addition to becoming part of the current campaign of anti-Soviet slander emanating from the Israeli ruling circles and the U.S. State Department, and vigorously pursued by Zionist organizations everywhere.

Quite naturally, the spokesmen of the Mikunis-Sneh group have had the bourgeois communications media fully opened up to them. They are published freely in the bourgeois press, and Sneh writes frequently for Yediot Aharonot, one of the most reactionary newspapers in the country.

They will earn these privileges by the services they perform. For example, an article in Ma'ariv (August 10, 1970) by Yehuda Lahav, a writer for the Mikunis-Sneh newspaper Kol Haa'm, makes a vicious attack on the Communist Party of the United States. He insinuates that the Party's policy on the Middle East and on the Jewish question generally was dictated by the CPSU, and in return for this alleged subservience the CPSU provided the necessary funds for re-establishing a daily newspaper. This is not the only example of such slander, but it suffices to show the depths to which these people have sunk.

On the other hand, as an organized force this group is becoming more and more inconsequential. It organizes no demonstrations, public meetings or other mass actions of its own, and plays little role in the popular struggles of today. Its youth organization has disintegrated. Its newspaper has been reduced from a daily to a weekly. Its vote in elections to the Knesset, Histadrut and other bodies has declined. Many members and leaders have left its ranks, including some members of its Political Bureau, and its membership is dropping.

A good part of those who have left have entered the Communist Party of Vilner and Toubi. This party, which took a principled, Marxist-Leninist stand against the war and fought courageously for its position under conditions of isolation and severe persecution, has grown in numbers and influence. And within the world Communist movement it has won virtually universal acclaim for its heroism and recognition as the real Communist Party of Israel. On the other hand, the Mikunis-Sneh group, which has long forfeited any right to the name "Communist," has been dropped from the ranks of the world Communist movement--and properly so.

All this prompts certain questions: what is one to say of those in progressive Jewish circles in the United States who continue to accept this decadent grouping as "the Communist Party of Israel?" What is one to say of those who publish and circulate its writings here and who parrot its anti-Marxist ideas as "Marxism"? And what is one to say of those who speak of "two Communist parties" in Israel as a device for legitimizing this group of renegades?

The answer seems clear.

\* \* \* \* \*

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Q. Why doesn't the Soviet Union allow the Jews to emigrate when they want to?

A: All the Socialist countries follow a general policy of restricting emigration. This policy is motivated primarily by the unceasing efforts of the leading capitalist countries, and especially the United States, to drain the Socialist countries of their skilled and professional manpower, as well as to secure defectors to be used as instruments of anti-Sovietism and anti-Communism.

In the Soviet Union the laws on emigration apply, of course, to Jews and non-Jews alike. Under these laws the government has permitted the emigration of a certain number of Jews to Israel (roughly some 3,000 a year), especially to reunite families, though obviously not all who ask are permitted to go. There is a substantial group of such Soviet emigrants living in Israel today--and a sizeable part of them who would like to return to the Soviet Union.

What is being demanded of the Soviet Union is that it makes an exception of its Jewish citizens and permit them to emigrate freely. Aside from the questionable propriety of thus exempting one particular group from the application of the law of the land, there are other obvious reasons why the Soviet Union would not accede to such demands.

First, the Israeli ruling circles are making a concerted drive for Jewish immigration for the purpose, among others, of settling the occupied territories with Jews. This is part of their policy of de facto annexation of these territories through a series of accomplished facts. Second, going hand in hand with this, an all-out campaign of poisonous slander against the Soviet Union is taking place, falsely charging that Soviet Jews are suffering severe repression, and in addition are not permitted to leave the country to escape the persecution.

Clearly, were the Soviet Union to permit unlimited emigration to Israel under these circumstances, it would be lending itself to the expansionist aims of the rulers of Israel at the expense of the Palestinian Arab people in the occupied territories--aims which the Soviet Union has strongly condemned and opposed. Moreover, it would be lending credence to the fraudulent allegations of "Soviet anti-Semitism" which today form the core of monopolist reactions whole anti-Soviet crusade.

At the same time, there is no real evidence that large numbers of Soviet Jews want to go to Israel. To be sure, numerous anguished letters, petitions and other documents are being offered as evidence. But even if all of these are authentic, which is highly doubtful, one finds the same names recurring

among their signers. In reality they are the work of a small but highly vocal group of pro-Zionist Jews which the anti-Soviet forces, through their highly publicized campaigns, strive to blow up into a mass movement.

The overwhelming majority of Soviet Jews have reacted to the anti-Soviet slanders with great anger and indignation, and have made it quite clear that they look upon the Soviet Union as their homeland. As for those who wish to emigrate to Israel, the Soviet government is obligated, it seems to us, to take into consideration not only their desires but also whether permitting them to go harms the interests of the entire Soviet people and the anti-imperialist struggle generally.

("Questions and Answers" will be a regular feature of Jewish Affairs. Please send us your questions.)

\* \* \*



EVENTS AND VIEWS

The Israeli newspaper LAMERKAV of August 28 contains an interview with Uri Avneri, Knesset Deputy and head of the Há'olam Házek group (the "New Force"). Avneri was asked: "What kind of borderline are you proposing?"

He replied: "We have reached a clear decision. We think that the Israeli borders should be based on the borderline that existed on June 4, 1967 (the day before the start of the 1967 war)."

He said further: "We are for these borders because we realize that we can not have peace on the basis of any other borderline." He added that any border adjustments that might come should be minor in scope "in order not to give the impression of manipulating for the purpose of annexation."

\*

"War songs were popular a year ago but people are now fed up with them," said Miss Dalia Heller, who edits the HIT PARADE for the (Israel) State Radio.

"Composers have stopped writing them and singers don't want to perform them any more." (Moshe Brilliant, Tel Aviv, in NEW YORK TIMES, September 24, 1970.)

\*

Benjamin Dimshitz, Vice-premier of the USSR, was honored on his 60th birthday with the Order of Lenin for his untiring labors for the Soviet people.

Dimshitz is an engineer by profession, a graduate of the Moscow Polytechnic Institute. More than 25 years ago he contributed greatly to the industrialization of the USSR as a builder of factories and industrial complexes. Since 1959 he has held important government positions. At one time he was Chairman of the Soviet Planning Commission.

\*

The Communist Party of Israel announces the conclusion of a highly successful 1970 fund drive. With a quota of 75,000 Israeli pounds, the total collected came to 101,225 Israeli pounds, exceeding the quota by 35%. It is also noteworthy that the drive was completed a full month before the deadline.

\*

## Events and Views, Continued

The Moscow Publishing House for Creative Literature has just issued a collection of poetry by the young Soviet Yiddish writer Yitzhah Borisov. The poems were published in Russian translation in 25,000 copies.

\*

Arthur I. Waskow writes in the NEW YORK TIMES (October 21, 1970), in a column entitled "The Jewish Contradiction":

"For older Jews the importance of the Diaspora is simple enough, it supports and assists those Jews who have returned to Zion and created the State of Israel.

"But the Jewish youth in America is not so easily satisfied. For many young Jews, the irony--they would say 'hypocrisy'--of being a 'bond-buying Zionist,' of supporting Israel without settling there, puts too great a strain on youthful idealism. They say that ancient chant 'Next year in Jerusalem,' now rings untrue; it is always possible, if the chanter means it, to go this year. And if not, why keep on chanting it?"

(Dr. Waskow, a Fellow of the Institute for Policy Studies, is known as an opponent of the Indochina war and as author of "The Freedom Seder.")

\*

We learn as we go to press that the public meeting called by the Committee for a Just Peace in the Mid-East at the Hotel Diplomat in New York was attended by nearly 400. The main speaker was Dr. Herbert Aptheker. A resolution was adopted calling for resumption of negotiations and full acceptance of the U.N. Security Council resolution.

\* \* \* \*