



ib

5-6/68

21st Plenary Session of C.C., C.P. of Israel

A year after - M. Vilner

Concerning an interview with a certain
correspondent - statement by M. Vilner

instead of Butter - T. Toubi in Knesset

HX

632

A1

W9

no.1670

INFORMATION BULLETIN

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL

MAIN

C O N T E N T S :

	<u>Page</u>
21st Plenary Session of C.C., C.P. of Israel	2
A year after - M. Vilner	7
M. Vilner interviewed by l'HUMANITE	17
"Time table" concerning A. Eban's "four point programme" (Zo Haderekh editorial)	22
Demonstrations in occupied territories - mark the 5th of June	24
Concerning an interview with a certain correspondent - statement by M. Vilner	26
On the danger of neo-nazism	30
Guns instead of Butter - T. Toubi in Knesset	33
State enterprises at auction - by T. Gozansky	36
Drive to collect 75,000 IL for Party Funds	42

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

THE 21ST PLENARY SESSION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF
THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL
.....

From the 23rd to the 24th of May, the 21st Plenary session of the Central Committee of the C.P. of Israel took place, in the presence of the members of the Central Control Commission. The chairman of the session was MUN'EM JARJOURA, member of the Central Committee.

MEIR VILNER, Secretary of the Political Bureau, reported on the first part of the thesis in preparation of the 16th Party Congress.

DAVID (SASHA) KHENIN, member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the C.C., reported about the political situation and Party work.

Most of those present spoke in the discussion which was summed up by the reporters, and resolutions were taken.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE 21st PLENARY SESSION OF THE CENTRAL
COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL

On the 16th Congress

1. The Central Committee resolves that the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel will be held from the 30th of January to the 1st of February 1969.
2. The C.C. confirms the first part of the theses in preparation of the 16th Congress, the report and summary of comrade Meir Vilner.
3. The C.C. calls upon all party organizations and bodies, on all party members and sympathizers, in preparation of the 16th Congress to intensify the struggle for a political, peaceful solution of the crisis in our region, in accordance with the Security Council Resolution of November 1967; for ensuring the democratic freedoms; for the defence of the interests of the workers and popular masses; for the unification of forces in the struggle of progress; for the strengthening of the Party and broadening of its ranks; for an increase in the distribution of the Party press; for the full success of the Party Funds Campaign.

On Our Party Work

1. The Central Committee confirms the report and summary of Comrade D. Khenin about the political situation and the Party work.
2. The C.C. calls upon the party members and sympathizers for intensified activity to ensure success for the Communist List in the election campaigns for the Trade Union of Clerks and

the TU of Food Producing workers of the food industries. The success of the Communist List in the elections of the Agricultural Labourers Union ought to be a lever for further successes.

3. The C.C. opposes the decision of the Executive Committee of the Histadrut (Trade Union) concerning the introduction of a levy for financing the activity of the political parties. This tax violates trade union principles and increases the burden of the workers. The C.C. calls upon the working class to act for the abolition of that levy.

Greetings to the French Communist Party

The Central Committee sends warm greetings of solidarity to the French working class and its Communist Party, to all the forces that fight together for a higher living standard of the working people, for the abolition of one-man rule, for democratic and progressive changes in French society, in economy and educational institutions.

Greetings to the Italian Communist Party

The Central Committee sends fraternal proletarian greetings to the Italian Communist Party on the occasion of its great success in the parliamentary elections, and wishes the C.P. of Italy further successes in the strengthening of the forces of the Left and the Party's struggle for fundamental changes in Italian internal and foreign policies.

ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION

The Central Committee points to out the great historic chance to bring about a fundamental change in the relations between Israel and the Arab states in favour of peace and the security of Israel and all the countries of the region, by means of carrying out the Security Council Resolution of November 1967. The Security Council in its resolution "emphasizes that no territory may be acquired by war, that the need exists for acting in favour of a just and stable peace, in which every state in the region will be able to live in security"--(The C.C. resolution quotes the Security Council resolution in full).

Instead of lending a hand to the implementation of the Security Council Resolution, the Israeli Government has employed tactics of evasion, intended to delay as far as possible the solution, to sustain the occupation, to confront the world with faits accomplis; this policy stems from the dangerous delusion that they could ignore the rule that in our days "no territory may be acquired by war".

As a result of this, Israel becomes more and more isolated in the international arena. The Eshkol-Dayan-Begin Government, by its acts of annexation, acts of repression and creation of faits accomplis in the occupied territories, by its disregard of the decisions taken by the UNO General Assembly and Security Council, has aroused an increasing anger against itself in world public opinion, and has caused decisions of condemnation directed against the government, at the Security Council, at the Meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Dakar and at the session of the UNO Commission for Human Rights in Teheran.

By its policy and acts the "National Unity Government" causes serious damage to the cause of peace and security, to the national interests of Israel.

In spite of the fact that the governments of UAR and Jordan have given their official and explicit consent to the carrying out of the Security Council Resolution in its entirety, the Israeli Government persists in its refusal to bind itself to the paragraph concerning the withdrawal as part of implementation of the Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967. This policy of the Government obstructs the efforts made to find a political solution of the crisis and a peaceful settlement.

The Israeli Government which had previously asserted that the Security Council Resolution is made of one piece and that the Arab states demand only the carrying out of paragraphs concerning the withdrawal - has now become involved in crisis and confusion, as the governments of the UAR and Jordan have officially stated before the UNO envoy Dr. Gunnar Jarring that they accept the Security Council Resolution in its entirety, comprising all its parts, and have proposed to him to work out a concrete time-table for the implementation of the Security Council Resolution. The Eshkol Government was compelled to manoeuvre and to employ new tactics.

When, as a result of the positive and unequivocal position of the UAR and Jordan, and the pressure of world public opinion and in accordance with the demand of the UNO envoy, the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister were compelled to declare the acceptance of the Security Council Resolution in its entirety - the governmental crisis broke out, and the contradiction within the Government were intensified.

The extremists in the Government are expressing an aggressive, unbridled position and oppose any expression of consent to the Security Council Resolution, even for the purposes of political manoeuvring. The other group of members of the Government, who also demand the annexation of a part of the occupied territories, has been compelled to take into account the aggravation of the isolation of Israel in the UNO and in

world public opinion, and also the recent limitations of the backing given by American imperialism. They were compelled to assert that the Government consents to the Security Council Resolution.

The fact that the Government has been compelled to change its previous decision and to assert that it consents to the Security Council Resolution, in spite of the statement of some different views, added to the consent - proves that the rigid unrealistic policy has failed, proves the correctness of the warnings issued by our Party that only by carrying out the Security Council Resolution it is possible to find a political peaceful solution of the crisis, for the benefit of the people of Israel and the Arab peoples, guaranteeing the just and legitimate interests of all peoples concerned.

The governmental crisis is not over. The contradictions within the Government will inevitably intensify. The "National Unity Government", persisting in territorial annexations, is unable to bring about a political solution of the crisis, a peaceful settlement. It may cause a deepening and aggravation of the crisis, a new kindling of war.

Israel needs a fundamental change of its official policy, a government that does not fail to avail itself of the great historic chance, a government that acts for the implementation of the Security Council Resolution.

The continuation of the crisis that followed the June war carries in itself great dangers for Israel. Time is not in favour of those bearing the banner of aggression and occupation. American imperialism is not a friend of Israel. It uses Israel for its rapacious colonialist objects in our region, put our country on a volcano, endangers our future.

The continuation of the crisis means the continuation of bloodshed, exacting numerous victims on both sides; it means the unceasing loading of the burden of war expenditures upon the shoulders of the workers and popular masses, and a general offensive against the rights of the working people; it means a serious threat to the democratic and civil rights.

Today ever more and more realistic and critical voices are raised against the policy of the government. There is a growing recognition of the lack of realism of the government policy, of the infeasibility to ensure security for Israel and the establishment of peace between Israel and the Arab states by a policy of territorial annexations.

The national interest of Israel demands a fundamental change of the official Israeli policy.

The Communist Party of Israel calls upon the working people, upon all persons and circles possessing national responsibility and political realism, to raise their voice, and regardless of ideological differences and party adherence, to unite all forces in the struggle to prevent a new outbreak of war, for the implementation of the Security Council Resolution - for peace and security of Israel and all the peoples of our region.

A YEAR AFTER

.....

By MEIR VILNER

A year has passed since the war of June. A sufficient period for analysis, deliberation and reassessment in view of the new data of what has happened.

One thing is evident to many in Israel. War did not solve any problem. It exacerbated all problems. The nightmare of war continues to hover over our heads. Victims fall unremittantly. Army budget assumes astronomic measures. Oppression in the occupied areas grows and arouses wrath in all the world against the oppressor. Our Communist Party is no longer alone in Israel in its evaluations. No few people are convinced that they were led astray. Let us review the events.

The Causes of War

On 27th September 1966 - 8 months before the 5th of June 1967 - an Israeli weekly edited by a certain Member of Parliament appeared with a front page: "THE TREAT OF WAR! AMERICANS DESIRE TO ATTACK SYRIA." The front page showed Chief-of-Staff Rabin with the additional words:

"The real background for Rabin's declaration"

Inside the weekly on two full pages extends a script under a huge headline with figures flowing with blood.

WARNING!

The incorrect war in the incorrect moment!

Besides the script a caricature: An American, the bearded Uncle Sam shooting Israeli soldiers as shells on target on which is written Syria! The script said: IT IS A SERIOUS WARNING! The Government of Israel are facing a general disintegration in their political campaigns! They intend to reduce themselves to a submissive satellite to a foreign power. This power demands from the Government of Israel to perpetrate an act which totally contradicts the national interests of the country and whose sole objective is the service to a foreign intelligence organization. This service is liable to cost the country heavily during many years! All this does happen behind the back of the public, of parliament and of enlightened public opinion, only the invocation of this public opinion may - at the last moment - prevent an adventurous embroilment whose outcome we cannot conjecture!", and then this weekly expounds specifically what it means.

In Syria an attempt for a coup has failed! The slogan of the accomplices, among whom the commander of the Israeli front, was the prevention of communist domination in Syria. It was the last attempt of the C.I.A. of the United States of America to save this country from what they considered as the beginning of

reducing this country to a people's republic with the Soviet bloc. The fact that the accomplices sought at once a political asylum in Jordan, where they were allowed to give political declarations, testify to the coordination with USA! Johnson is now under the apprehension that a significant failure in Syria, in addition to his defeat in Vietnam will lead to the destruction of his party in the coming elections!

In the form of an interview in BAMAHANE (the official organ of the army) Major General Izhaq Rabin gave an unprecedented declaration which had tremendous repercussions throughout the world. In this declaration Rabin specified that the object of the Israeli defence campaign was collision with the regime in Syria in contradistinction to the objective of the Israeli Army regarding any other Arab country, including Egypt. The regional commander David Elazar declared that the Israeli army will not reconcile itself with the renewing of deflecting the Jordan sources by Syria. In Paris a denial was immediately issued concerning the news published prominently in evening dailies that deflection was renewed. The weekly reveals that the Syrian commander on the Israeli front, colonel Abu Asali, organized a series of terroristic acts along the frontiers before the attempt made in Syria of the coup of which he was one of its initiators. The weekly writes "Undoubtedly the very commander initiated these acts as part of the preparation for a coup - whether for the subversion of the regime in Damascus or to lead to Israeli acts which might shake the regime. Damascus has deadly fear of foreign intervention under American direction. She has no interest whatever to supply pretexts and expenses for such intervention. Had the moulders of the Israeli policy Israeli considerations only, they would have stood aside and let Syria be cooked in her own broth. The very abstention of Israel to act according to American dictation and for American interests would have yielded an ideal opportunity for opening a new page in the relations with Syria and even with Moscow. The Government of Israel are adopting the opposite way. This declarations herald one thing: Integration in the American campaign."

The editor of the weekly adds the following words uttered by a French personality which he met that week in Paris, with which he fully identifies himself:

The Americans are prepared for the decisive stage in the war on the region and oil. Had a counter-coup succeeded in Syria itself, there would have been no need for the employment of Israel. But owing to the defeat of this attempt America does contemplate a military intervention from abroad - and this may stem only from Israel. America has already begun to supply ammunition to Israel, contrary to its declared policy since the establishment of the state. This reminds us of the arming of Israel by the French prior to Sinai operation. America may

demand of Israel to launch a limited military operation which does not reach Damascus but will for example occupy some part of the Syrian territory under the pretext of occupying the region of deflection. Such operation if it leads to the destruction of the Syrian army on the frontier will remove the influence of the army in the internal arena and enable the pro-American politicians to seize the reins of power in Syria." This weekly is generally of good information. It is no communist weekly. Its editor has forgotten on the 5th of June 1967 what he himself wrote at the end of September 1966. He enthusiastically supported the war. But we are not concerned at the moment to judge the consistency of this weekly.*) The fact is that now few people of those who in June 1967 changed their tastes had had not long ago soberly assessed the situation, understood who was preparing for war in our region and for what object. They understood that the duty of an Israeli patriot is to foil the American project and not hire himself out as a mercenary weapon for the oil magnates of Wall Street, to save Israel from a war not for its interest and which, in the last analysis, will bring unimaginable harm to Israel. It is ironical indeed that they who in June 1967 said the above words were declared as "anti-Israeli" by those who said the same words a short time before. The historical truth does not change even though some of those who understood it temporarily - deny it afterwards. It was not in vain that the war of June has obtained finance, military equipment and political backing from the government of the United States. The American project was portrayed by this weekly from exact information. Evidently, Syria was only the first object in the American project. Next, was Egypt whose anti-imperialist policy, its close connections with the Soviet Union and its internal social changes were a sting in the eyes of the imperialist powers headed by the United States of America. The rulers of Israel in 1967 as in 1956 deluded themselves that the Israeli gains from the implementation of the project would be territorial aggrandizement. The project was changed in its details but not in its objects and essence, when Egypt, from knowledge of this project, concluded a defence treaty with Syria. The fact that Jordan also concluded a treaty with Egypt does not change at all the assessment of things. The rulers of Jordan were obliged to adopt the same line - otherwise the Jordanian people, who were excited by events, would have demanded a change of regime in Jordan.

Propaganda mouthpieces in the Arab countries and even Arab politicians contributed no little to the execution of the project. The chauvinist anti-Israeli propaganda which did not differentiate between the people of Israel and the government of Israel and which adopted a threatening language towards Israel have also contributed to the increase of tension. The

*) HA'OLAM HAZE, edited by Uri Avneri, Member of Knesset.

chauvinist declarations and the closing up of Tiran straits before Israeli navigation - provided pretexts for attack and assisted the Eshkol-Dayan-Begin government to convince the majority of the people of Israel and of great parts of public opinion in the Western world that Israel was faced with a danger of attack and the threat of annihilation. We, the Israeli communists, when we rose against the launching of war on the 5th of June, had in view the defence of peace and of the national interests of Israel. In spite of the tremendous propaganda for war, for the false slogan of "no other alternative", we have defended the real interests of Israel and have ^{called} not to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the American and British oil magnates, have called for the solution of all the outstanding problems between Israel and the Arab countries, including the problem of free navigation in the Tiran straits by political means.

The decisive argument of the supporters of war was that Israel was facing an immediate attack, and a threat of annihilation and so it had no other alternative but to launch a preventive war.

What Is The Truth?

Truth is otherwise. Let us bring the evidence of the initiators and supporters of war. The Minister of Labour Yigal Alon, one of the extremist representatives in the government said in a student gathering in the Hebrew University in Jerusalem that he rejected the conception that there was an additional reason for launching war other than free navigation in the Tiran straits. The closing up of the Tiran straits was a sufficient reason for war. Israel had no need for any other reason in order to launch a military onslaught on Egypt. If there is any place for apology it was not because we launched the war on the 5th of June but because we did not launch it before that (Ma'ariv and Ha'aretz of 10.7.67). Lately Minister of Defence Moshe Dayan admitted that the sole question on the agenda in May/June 1967 was the question of navigation in the Tiran straits. Minister of Defence Dayan in an interview to Ma'ariv (30.4.68) answering a question "In what measure war was inevitable?" he said "What does it mean inevitable? There was, obviously, a possibility to reconcile ourselves with the closing up of the Tiran straits... People abroad began even to make statistics on how many Israeli ships actually pass through the Straits of Eilat. In other words, it was possible to prevent war on the condition that the straits remain closed before Israeli navigation."

The Minister of Defence, then, does not connect the war with the threat of attack on Israel, or with the threat of annihilation etc., as the official propaganda of those days used to do at those times. As regards the navigation in the

straits it was absolutely possible to solve the problem by political methods; had it not been exploited as a pretext for war. The government of Egypt gave a positive reply to the demand of UNO General Secretary U. Thant not to employ embargo until settlement. Nasser intended to send his deputy Zakaria Mohei El-Din to the United States to hold negotiations in this score. Anyhow, the acceptance of the principle of solving controversial problems between Israel and the Arab countries by military means may prove to be a two edged sword against Israel.

But let us return to June 1967. The Prime Minister himself L. Eshkol admitted in an interview which he gave to "Yediot Ahronot" that the Egyptian military layout in Sinai prior to the war was a defensive and not an aggressive one. Thus the Prime Minister stated his assessment of the situation in May 1967 after the entrance of the Egyptian army to Sinai.

The order of forces in Sinai and the general military activities there testify to the setting up of an Egyptian defensive arrangement South of Israel. (Yediot Ahronot 18.10.67)

This declaration of L. Eshkol was criticized by some papers who accused him of lack of cautiousness in giving public declarations, contradicting the official government line of propaganda, which assumed that the Egyptian army in Sinai was marshalled for an attack on Israel.

It is not fortuitous, either, that the extremist militant Member of Parliament David Ben-Gurion did not support the launching of war in June. His opinion was that it was imperative to ensure the direct participation of the United States or of some Western power in the war as was the case in 1956. Otherwise the war had to be postponed even for a prolonged time. In the semi-official "Davar" close to the Prime Minister L. Eshkol a long informative article was published on 30.6.1967, entitled "From May 15 to June 10" by Haim Ya'ari. He states: "The surprising thing in this propaganda against the hesitation of Eshkol is the fact which may not be known to many that during those very days a well-known leader of Rafi went from one minister to another and advised them lest they venture to launch war on the United Arab armies because it was doubtful whether the Israeli army could withstand them alone. Without an all powerful ally, he contended, it was impermissible for us to contest the Arabs and particularly, to act against the opinion of De Gaulle. Today, he said, the Israeli army should entrench itself and wait until we obtain an ally. I know that on the 2nd of June - three days before the breaking out of war - when Dayan, Begin and Joseph Sapir had already been entered the government, the same man still exerted efforts and warned against launching war."

On the same day and on the same subject "Ha'aretz" writes in an article by Arie Gelblum "On a firm military attitude Rafi has no monopoly. Ben-Gurion, for instance, in contrast to Dayan, was against war while Eshkol was just for it." According to the press the opinion of Ben-Gurion (and even of Member of Knesset Shimon Peres) was the following:

"War is inevitable. But it is imperative to delay it. It is imperative to be entrenched for half a year or one year for preparation." (Shlomo Nakdimon "Towards the zero hour" - page 99). It is obvious, then, that Ben-Gurion did not at all estimate that Israel was facing the threat of military attack.

Declarations have lately increased by the Prime Minister and other ministers that the war of June was planned and the delay in launching it for some weeks (after the Egyptian declaration regarding the closing up of Tiran straits) was first of all a result of the necessity to politically prepare the Israeli and world public opinion for an Israeli war initiative (with American backing). A sharp article was published by Shabtai Tevet in "Ha'aretz" which opposes such declaration and, considers them as destructive to the official Israeli information line.

Public opinion - he writes - was ready to believe that in May 1967, Israel faced the danger of extinction because Arab countries were united to annihilate it; but now the contrary had happened. The Prime Minister and other ministers say that they predicted victory. They had no doubt at all that the bewilderment which preceded this victory was nothing but a stratagem, in other words "a performance". Such attitude portrays Israel in the eyes of those who were afraid for her existence and security as a swindler. Not as a poor Samson only but as a healthy Samson, shrewd and cunning. It is now seen differently, because it employed deceit.

"It is evident that those who were afraid for the security of Israel among the peoples of the world may feel now deceived when the Prime Minister and his ministers adopt a version which maintains that the bewilderment was preconceived. Such interpretation represents Israel as aggressive from the beginning, which by means of ruse succeeded to steel world public opinion when its real aim was only to grob additional territories from the Arabs. If in fact Eshkol performed this bewilderment only in order to deceive people, if his confused language has no other purpose but to play on the chord of qualms of Christian conscience because of the holocaust, whilst actually he was, as he himself relates, a carnivorous wolf who assumed the gait of a fox - undoubtedly no danger was imminent for the existence and freedom of Israel nor for the physical and spiritual security of its citizens. All these were but an unpalatable pretext for launching a war of conquest" (Ha'aretz" 18.4.68). In my opinion "Ha'aretz" is unjustly irritated by the Prime Minister,

Levy Eshkol behaves according to the rule "The time has come to reveal..

The Prospects

The question may be asked, then, what is the morality in the incitement against us, when we, the communists, revealed the truth in the fateful days and did not accept that the government of national unity would lead the people of Israel and world public opinion astray. We did not float with the stream of fraudulence and hypocrisy and spoke the truth which is now divulged publicly little by little by those directly involved in the war: The governments of the United States and Israel.

These are but the beginnings of revelations. Undoubtedly many more will be uncovered as was the case with the war of Sinai-Suez in 1956. Life does prove that we, the communists, were right, while the rulers did simply deceive the people.

The more the truth is revealed, the more the attitude to the official Israeli policy undergoes changes both in Israel and among world public opinion. If during months, the extreme nationalist movement boisterously shouted in the streets and in the press for "all of Palestine", these last days this movement is seen as ridiculous and irritating for many circles, even government circles. The official Israel is so isolated now in the international arena as it had never been since the establishment of Israel 20 years ago. This isolation has particularly grown in the last months when it was evident to everyone that Egypt and Jordan are ready to accept and implement the Security Council resolution of 22nd November 1967 as a whole, with all its terms - provided that Israel should do the same. So, many of those who supported the June war are embarrassed. If it was really a war for existence according to the version of the authorities at that time, they ask, why then, the government insists on its demand for territorial annexations as a condition for settlement whilst the governments of Egypt and Jordan are ready, in accordance with the Security Council resolution, to take far-reaching steps towards Israel:

1) To annul belligerency, 2) To respect, (on mutual basis) the sovereignty, territorial integrity and the national independence of Israel and of its rights to live peacefully within secure and recognized frontiers - free from menace and use of force. Evidently such things may be achieved if Israel on her part will implement what she is bound to do by the Security Council resolution:

The withdrawal of the Israeli armed forces from the territories occupied at the last war in accordance with the principle "No territorial gains by means of war". Egypt and Jordan are, as is well known, ready also, in accordance with the Security Council resolution to give Israel guarantee for

free navigation. But Israel should, on her part, accept what is laid down in the Security Council resolution as regarding just settlement of the refugee problem. Egypt and Jordan also accept to establish demilitarized zo. on both sides of the frontiers in accordance with the Security Council resolution.

There is, then, a great historical prospect for a fundamental change in the relations between Israel and the Arab countries for the benefit of peace and security of both Israel and the Arab countries, with the implementation of the Security Council resolution.

The "government of national unity" was compelled, after internal struggle, to declare its acceptance of the Security Council resolution, as a whole. This very fact proves that their inflexible and unrealistic policy has failed. But the decision of the government does not testify that "the government of national unity" is wholeheartedly ready to assist in the implementation of the Security Council resolution with all its terms including the term of withdrawal from the occupied territories. On the contrary, all the signs show that the "government of national unity", in spite of embarrassment and contradictions within it, insist on the principle of territorial annexations. The desire for territorial annexations is today the major impediment in the way of the success of Dr. Jarring's mission for the implementation of the Security Council resolution.

Thus, the policy of the government may lead to the deepening and sharpening of the crisis and even to a new military conflagration.

The 21st plenary session of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel held on 24st May this year, assessing the situation a year after the war of June states:

Israel needs a fundamental change in the official policy, a government which shall not miss the great historical prospect, a government which shall act for the implementation of the Security Council resolution. The continuation of the crisis breeds serious threats for Israel. Time does not act in favour of the continuous occupation of territories. The continuation of the crisis means additional victims on both sides, drastic curtailment in the development and service budgets, additional taxes levied from the workers and the people; general attack on the rights of toilers (such as the freedom of strike) and on the democratic rights of the people.

In this connection, the announcement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Parliament on 29th May this year arouses anxiety. He proposed a four-stage plan for peace settlement. The plan of the Minister of Foreign Affairs (direct negotiations, agreement, peace treaty, implementation) does not provide a reply to the fundamental object demanded from Israel: withdrawal

from the occupied territories.

And this at a time when Egypt and Jordan are ready to comply with all the terms of the Security Council resolution which concern them. Had the government accepted unequivocally (and not as a diplomatic stratagem) the Security Council resolution as a whole, they would have not put direct negotiations as a condition for any approach and would have declared that if the Arab countries are ready to accept the resolution as a whole - Israel is ready to withdraw from all the occupied territories.

Instead of the above, the representatives of government among them the Prime Minister and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, continue to declare that they demand territorial annexations. Thus, the Prime Minister has declared lately in an interview which he gave to "Lamerkhav" (31.5.68), that he was not prepared for any negotiations on Eastern Jerusalem and that he continued to maintain that the security frontier of Israel should be on the Jordan. When he was asked what is the difference between a security frontier and political one he answered:

"The meaning of the words is that direct control of the Jordan valley should be in our hands. In other words - that the Jordan river should be the frontier where Jordanian tanks and forces are allowed to be stationed only on its East bank, while Israeli tanks and forces should control its West bank." No need for comment. The correspondent of "Lamerkhav" continued to ask: "In the spirit of the plan proposed by Minister Yigal Alon?" To this the Prime Minister answered "Yes, more or less in the spirit of this proposal." Thus, the Prime Minister gave his backing to one of the most "hawk" plans - that of Minister Yigal Alon!

The policy of territorial annexation can only end in failure. It is a policy of officials detached from international Middle Eastern and even Israeli reality. They are able, as they are doing these last days, to demand, from the people, additional victims and belt tightening in order to finance the expenses of occupation. But they will find themselves more isolated not only in world public opinion but also in Israeli public opinion.

Every sensible person understands that withdrawal shall come anyhow because there is no alternative. The national interest of Israel, the interest of peace and security demand that withdrawal shall come as a part of the political solution by peaceful means in accordance with the Security Council resolution. Any postponement of the solution does only render harm to Israel itself. Let us not rely on the American "friends". They are helpless militarily and politically in Vietnam. In the Arab world they suffered political collapse as a result of the June war. All their calculations failed. Now they try to

rehabilitate their positions in the region and "hint" to the government of Israel that they have to adopt a less obstinate policy. On this the Israeli Ambassador in Washington Y. Rabin reported lately to the government which invited him for consultations. Minister of Defence Moshe Dayan let it be understood that without American backing it is not possible to continue occupation. When he was asked in an interview to "Ma'ariv" of 30.4.68, whether Israel is able to maintain the present situation for an unlimited time he answered:

"From an economic point of view - yes. From a military one - yes. From a political one - the key is in the hands of the United States. In other words, if the United States are prepared to let us maintain our policy - we can do so." Revealing words! But it has to be borne in mind that the stand of the U.S. government is not fixed in a vacuum - USA is not all-powerful - neither in Vietnam nor in the Middle East.

The withdrawal from the occupied territories within the scope of the implementation of the Security Council resolution will not only not violate legitimate Israeli interests, its safety and security but will, on the contrary, lead for the first time to a more healthy and secure situation than that prevailed during all the 20 years of Israel existence. On the other hand, the continuation of the present situation will bring in its wake serious threats for Israel.

So the order of the day is to listen to the voice of reason, to the voice of peace-loving people and opponents of annexations in Israel, to the friendly advice of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and in word and deed to accept the Security Council resolution as a political way out of the crisis.

At the end of one year, it may be said that our party was right in its assessment of the June war and in its plan for the solution of the crisis created by the war. Our party will do its utmost to mobilise the broadest front in Israel, of all circles and personalities, with national responsibility and political realism independent of their ideology and party affiliation, to work for a change in the Israeli official policy, for a policy which will end blood-shed and open a new page in Israeli-Arab relations. Our people is not interested in an additional war, nor is it interested in annexations which thwart the prospect of peace. Our people is interested in the development and in economic prosperity of our country, in normal relations with the Arab countries, in the renewal of diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, in a happy future for our sons and daughters.

The implementation of the Security Council resolution is the key for opening new horizons for the State of Israel.

INTERVIEW OF M. VILNER IN L'HUMANITE

"THE POLICY OF FORCE LED BY THE ISRAELI LEADERS
IS THE OBSTACLE FOR A PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT"

[L'Humanite, organ of the C.C., French Communist Party addressed the following questions to Comrade M. Vilner, Secretary, Political Bureau, Communist Party of Israel on the occasion of one year after the war in the Middle East. L'Humanite published the questions and answers on 5.6.1968.]

QUESTION: A year after the June 1967 war, grave dangers continue to exist in the Middle East. What are the principal reasons for this?

ANSWER: It is true that one year after the June war the situation in the Middle East is still very tense, the blood-shed continues and there exists the incessant danger of a new outbreak of war.

The principal reason that until now no peaceful, political solution of the crisis in our region has been found, lies in the policy of the government of Israel, which refuses to lend a hand to the carrying out of the resolution adopted by the Security Council on November 22, 1967, because it includes a withdrawal from the occupied areas and negates any territorial advantages accruing from the war.

If there were an iota of truth in the original official assertion of Israel's ruling circles, which alleges that they started the June war having had no choice, in order to save Israel from the danger of annihilation which allegedly, threatened her, they would accept with joy the Security Council's November resolution, which assures, along with Israel's withdrawal from the occupied areas, the abolition of belligerence with Israel on the part of the Arab states, and the recognition of the right to existence and security for all states (including Israel) in our region. Particularly when the UAR and Jordan have officially expressed their consent and readiness to carry out on their part the Security Council resolution, if also Israel will do the same.

There is no doubt whatsoever that, if there were no aspirations to territorial annexations, it would be possible to find immediately a way out from the present crisis and, subsequently, to proceed towards a comprehensive peace settlement.

For this there are many proves. The Defence Minister, General Moshe Dayan, affirmed in an interview given on January

19, of this year to the daily "Ha'aretz", as follows:

"Possibly Abdel Nasser will be prepared to come to terms with us on condition that we retreat to the old frontier. For this one has to return to the June 4-lines and then, possibly, Abdel Nasser will be prepared to declare the abolition of belligerence, free shipping in the straits of Eilat and perhaps also to promise something in the matter of Suez. If we are prepared to return to the previous line - we shall have solved, to a great extent, the Egyptian problem."

The editor of "Ha'aretz" asked him: "And you, aren't you in favour of this?"

Dayan replied: "I am definitely against."

The Chief-of-Staff, General Haim Bar-Lev, declared at a meeting of military correspondents after the operation against Jordan in February, this year, that the object of the military operations is "THE IMPOSITION OF IMMEDIATE TERMS OF SETTLEMENT ON THE ARAB STATES... WE CAN IMPOSE ON JORDAN A SETTLEMENT IF WE SKILFULLY EMPLOY OUR MILITARY FORCE, WHICH WILL OBLIGE HUSSEIN TO ASK US TO COME TO TERMS WITH HIM... WE CAN IMPOSE ON HIM A POLITICAL SETTLEMENT IF WE FORCE HIM TO ASK FOR IT, BECAUSE OF HIS LACK OF CHOICE. AND THIS WE CAN ONLY IF WE ARE ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BORDER." (Meaning the cease-fire line.) These words were published by the daily "Ma'ariv" on 19.2.68.

This is a candid admission of the fact that the desire to dictate to Jordan political terms and a separate agreement by means of military pressure is the principal reason for the incessant tension on the Israeli-Jordanian cease-fire line.

Of course, one must not detach the position of the Israeli rulers from that of the US government. Just as they could not have started the war without the military, economic and political backing by the USA, they could not persist in the occupation without American backing. As the Minister of Finances, Mr. Pinhas Sapir, has lately stated, the June war cost Israel more than 3 milliard Israeli Lira. Israel is now more dependent on American imperialism than any government during the 20 years of the existence of the State of Israel.

For the US rulers the June adventure was a total political debacle. Not only were the projected objectives not achieved, but the results of the war were the opposite of what was intended by its oversea sponsors. The regimes in the UAR and in Syria did not only fail to collapse, but became even more firmly rooted.

In addition to the principal factors for the continuation of the perilous situation in our region, i.e. American imperialism and the Israeli ruling circles, it must be said, that certain Arab factors too impede the peace settlement by not supporting the Security Council resolution and disputing in advance the feasibility of a solution by peaceful means: By this they render more difficult the finding of a political solution, which the Arab peoples as well as the people of Israel are interested in.

QUESTION: What is the reaction to this state of affairs in Israel itself?

ANSWER: As a result of the continued tension the differentiation inside the Israeli society has expanded. On one hand, the extremists have become still more aggressive and conduct a noisy propaganda "against the return of liberated territories from the soil of the historical homeland", threaten everyone that voices any reservation with regard to the stubborn policy of the government, demand still bigger military budgets, lowering the standard-of-living and a still stronger hand vis-a-vis the population of the occupied territories.

At the same time a process of sobering down, of thinking anew, takes place within many circles. Our Communist Party is not standing alone more in its opposition to the policy of the government, as it was last June. Many want peace and renounce annexations.

At a public opinion poll organized by the research institute "Dahaf" in April of this year, 76% of those asked replied with "yes" to the question: "Is peace with the Arabs essential for our continued existence as a state?" To the question: "What is the security situation of Israel?" 57% replied "Disquietening" and 13% "grave". Only 19% defined it as "encouraging" and another 6% as "quiet". These results show a process of disappointment with the results of the June war, and of a growing unrest concerning our whole future, if no peace will be achieved with the Arab peoples. This does not mean that the majority of the people already understands what impedes peace. Thus, 80% at this time same poll said in their reply that the government "does enough for the achievement of peace in the region".

Not a few circles in Israel are beginning to come out openly and courageously against the predominant adventurous line, against the policy of conquests and annexations. Confusion has penetrated even into government circles and contradictions have become sharper.

A wide public echo was aroused by the words of the religious professor of the Jerusalem Hebrew University, Dr. Ishayahu Leibovitch, published on April 12, this year, in the daily "Yediot Ahronot" within the framework of an interview:

"Annexation? A disaster... the ruin of the state, destruction of the people, collapse of the social structure, corruption of man... this will be a Secret Police state, which will establish the general atmosphere, considerably affecting our elementary freedoms - freedom of speech, expression and association. Corruption will be fabulous... Social decadence will be followed by physical extermination... What is, then, the alternative? To abandon the governing one and a half million of Arabs, to return to the status quo of June 5... Some speak of federation. Well then, federation means imposing colonialism, imposing the rule of a Quisling..."

Even David Ben-Gurion, the ex-Premier, admitted in his discourse at the solemn session held at the Knesset in honour of the 20th anniversary of the State of Israel on May 6, this year, that "the international political situation of Israel has never been as feeble as today."

The Police Minister, Mr. Eliyahu Sasson, admitted during a debate in the leading body of the Israel Labour Party that time acts not in favour of Israel, and called for a more realistic policy.

QUESTION: What is your assessment of the activities of the Sneh-Mikunis group?

ANSWER: This group which supported enthusiastically the opening of the June 1967 war, have gone ever farther. When on March 21, this year, the Israeli army carried out a cruel raid on Jordanian territory, in the refugees' camp of Karameh, a raid which caused many victims on both sides and which was denounced even by some pro-government circles in Israel and unanimously by the Security Council - Dr. Sneh appeared in a leading article in "Kol Ha'am", on 22.3.68, justifying the new act of aggression in the name of "defence necessities".

QUESTION: What is the situation in the occupied territories?

ANSWER: A general policy of repression is conducted in the occupied regions; blowing-up of houses, collective punishments imposed on whole towns and villages, mass arrests.

The occupation has aroused resistance to the occupation and this resistance is growing. In its wake repression is growing, which again intensifies resistance. One's heart aches

because of the loss of so much blood of Jews and Arabs, shed almost daily. One cannot see any alternative way-out from this lamentable situation, but the carrying out of the resolution taken by the Security Council on November 22, i.e. to find a political solution which will put an end to the occupation and consequently to the resistance to that occupation.

The policy of repression and trampling underfoot of elementary human rights in the occupied territories injure not only the people living under the boot of the occupation army, but causes in its wake serious damage to Israeli society, to the education of the youth, and institutes the principle "might is right".

Already by now not unconsiderable fascist winds are blowing through Israeli society.

QUESTION: What is the point of view of the Communist Party of Israel as to the way to achieve a stable peace in the Middle East?

ANSWER: The first step, in our opinion, must be, under today's circumstances, to solve the actual crisis with political means and peacefully, in accordance with the Security Council resolution. This will liberate the Arab peoples from the Israeli occupation and the Israeli people from belligerence with the Arab states and from the challenge to the right to existence of Israel. The settlement proposed by the Security Council includes these mutual obligations. In a freer and calmer atmosphere, on a base of equality and with international assistance, it will be possible in accordance with the Security Council resolution to approach the solution of the fundamental questions, such as the fixation of stable borders between the states, the solution of the Arab refugees problem, freedom for Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal, the distribution of common water sources, etc. All this must be solved on the basis of respecting the just and legitimate national rights of the people of Israel as well as the Palestinian Arab people.

In accordance with these principles it is possible to achieve a stable peace and cooperation between Israel and her Arab neighbours, for the benefit of all the peoples. Such a solution cannot coincide with the continuation of imperialist intervention.

TIME TABLE

Editorial, "ZO HADEREKH" - 5.6.1968

When the UAR Foreign Minister, Mahmoud Riad, informed Gunnar Jarring, on May 9th, of his government's readiness to accept and implement the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 as an entity, he proposed also that Dr. Jarring should fix the time table for the implementation of the resolution.

This proposal puts additional stress on the seriousness of the basic announcement. The proposal to fix a time table is not only an important tactical move, but also a practical step of considerable importance towards the implementation of the said resolution.

It is true, that the resolution itself makes a clear distinction between the first stage - the realisation of the principles of retreat; the abolishment of the state of belligerency; the recognition of the right of all the states in the region to existence and security, and the second stage - the need of solving the question of free navigation, the refugee problem; the guarantees of territorial integrity. But the fact that no authoritative time table has yet been fixed for the implementation of the resolution gives the opponents of the resolution greater possibilities for maneouvering.

The Egyptian government's proposals of May 9 have placed the Israeli government into a difficult situation. Its ambassador in the USA, general Itzhaq Rabin, defined this situation when he said (in an interview to "HA'ARETZ" daily, on May 31) that "we are not yet in the defensive, but we are at least in a position of reacting."

The Israeli government reported to Mahmoud Riad's proposal by a four-staged plan presented by Foreign Minister A. Eban to the Knesset on May 29th. These four stages, in his opinion, should be: face-to-face negotiations between Israel and each Arab state on the basis of a proclaimed consent, that the tendency of the negotiations is the establishment of peace; agreements on all disputed problems; the signing of peace treaties which will include the agreements; working out of the arrangements for the implementation of the agreements.

Eban's plan does not provide any stages for the implementation of the Security Council resolution. It does not even provide for its implementation at all. The Arab states have made it clear that they will not negotiate nor come to an agreement with the Israeli government, which persists on the occupation, does not support the implementation of the Security Council resolution and is acting contrary to the resolutions of the UNO. Moreover,

even the USA government distanced itself from the demand of the Israeli government that the signing of peace treaties should precede the beginning of the implementation.

Eban's plan is a challenge to the nations of the world because of its provision that any new "deployment" of the army may come only after solving the territorial problem - or, in other words, this is a clear refusal to withdraw. Hence, Eban has not presented a plan for solving the crisis, but a plan against its solution, a plan intended to create better conditions for diplomatic manoeuvring for perpetuation of occupation and annexations.

This manoeuvre, however, is too transparent and will not help Israel out of its isolation.

More and more circles in Israel are inclined to the view that the situation can be saved not by diplomatic manoeuvres, but a change of policy. The great historic opportunity to bring about peace and security to Israel by the implementation of the Security Council resolution stage by stage, should not be missed.

We who demand a peace treaty preceding the beginning of the implementation of the resolution will not reach peace. But the beginning of the implementation of the Security Council resolution will pave the way to a just and stable peace.

DEMONSTRATIONS IN THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

MARK THE 5TH OF JUNE

.....

The Arab people in the occupied territories, in the West Bank, Jerusalem, and the Gaza strip marked the passing of a year after the June war and occupation by various means of mass actions demonstrating their opposition to the occupation.

On 5.6.1968, all schools closed-down, pupils and teachers absented themselves in protest against the war and occupation.

The whole occupied territory was heavily patrolled. Army and police units demonstrated in force to intimidate the population, while military governors resorted to various methods of threats and intimidation to break the spirit of the population.

In Nablus and Tulkarm a general strike was proclaimed in the two towns during the whole day of 5th of June.

In various places, mainly in Jerusalem, monuments for the victims of the war and occupation were erected and large numbers of people laid wreaths in memory of the victims.

In Betlehem a large demonstration of women took place ending by laying wreaths in memory of the victims of the war and occupation in the cemeteries of the town. Other similar demonstrations took place in Ramallah and El-Bireh.

Jerusalem witnessed the most active expressions of protest and was the scene of clashes between the police, frontier-guards and the demonstrators.

A number of fighting demonstrations took place on Wednesday 5.6.68 which clashed with the police. Demonstrations continued also in Thursday and Friday. Jerusalem, the holy city, appeared in these days as an armed military camp and the streets of the Arab sector appeared as battle-fields. Armed soldiers patrolled the streets, took positions on the walls of the old city, and armoured cars were placed in main squares of the town.

In their attempt to dispense the demonstrators the police did not differentiate between men, women, children and old people who were targets of police wrath and blows and many were wounded and arrested.

AL HAMISHMAR wrote on 6.6.68: "The police suppressed with a forceful fist the demonstration. With the help of frontier-guards, young people were dragged with blows to the police prison cars."...

Yet the Arab population of Jerusalem for three days continued their protest demonstrations against the war and occupation.

In the Gaza strip

Gaza town, and other towns of the strip marked the year after the war and occupation with a full scale strike during the whole day of 5th of June, 1968. However, two weeks before Gaza was the scene of a series of demonstrations where tens of thousands particularly women and school pupils demonstrated against the high-handed and oppressive behaviour of the occupation authorities. The army resorted to force in suppressing the demonstrations, to the extent of firing at the demonstrators. Five secondary school girls were wounded as a result of firing at a demonstration. Doctors and nurses of one of the hospitals of the town, demonstrated before the offices of the military governor in protest against the maltreatment of demonstrators who were brought to the hospital in a serious condition.

*

A year after the war, the Arab people in the occupied territories are united in their opposition to the occupation and in demanding the implementation of the Security Council resolution as was expressed by many a declaration and a petition signed by prominent and representative personalities.

ABOUT AN INTERVIEW WITH A CERTAIN CORRESPONDENT

On Friday, 14.6.1968, the organ of Mikunis-Sneh, "Kol Haam", published on the first page and in great prominence, a correspondence about an interview given by Comrade M. Vilner to the correspondent of a Czechoslovak journal. The correspondence is written in the usual poisonous manner. This newspaper confronts the replies given to the questions of the Czechoslovak correspondent by Comrade M. Vilner and by S. Mikunis. M. Vilner was quoted as having said some replies which every straight forward reader immediately understands that before us is a provocative act.

The correspondent of "Zo Haderekh" approached Comrade M. Vilner, and asked for a response. We publish herewith the reply of Comrade M. Vilner:

Nearly before a month, some one who presented himself as Gabriel Laub, correspondent of the journal of the Czechoslovak press-men organization, the "Reporter", contacted me by telephone. He related that he is already two weeks in Israel staying with his mother in Tel-Aviv in King George Street, and that now he finds himself free to contact me and ask for an interview for the "Reporter". I fixed for him a date for the interview.

The interview turned sometimes to a discussion. It was strange for me to hear from a journalist from a socialist country things written in the guide-books of the Israeli Foreign Ministry for foreign tourists. All what he knows about our region was: "The Arabs want to destroy the State of Israel and the Jews..."

What are the dangers threatening socialist Czechoslovakia according to G. Laub's opinion?

"There exists a Soviet threat of intervention in our internal affairs". G. Laub asked me in a provocative manner once or twice, whether I am in favour or against Soviet intervention in the affairs of Czechoslovakia. When I expressed my astonishment about the questions and said that he is being trapped by the anti-Soviet Western propaganda, he obstinately and enthusiastically spoke about the news that appeared these days in the Israeli press concerning the concentration of Soviet armies on the Czechoslovak-Polish frontier for the purpose of intervening in Czechoslovakia. I told him: if you read the Israeli press why did you not read also that an official Czechoslovak spokesman denied these provocative news designed to put a wedge between socialist Czechoslovakia and the USSR and instigate anti-Soviet feelings in Czechoslovakia?

I told him that it is astonishing that he believes every anti-Soviet rumour spread in the West and that he in general raises the idea of Soviet military intervention in Czechoslovakia. On this he answered: What about it, did not Professor Hager of D.D.R., did he not call openly for intervention in Czechoslovakia?

I said: Never did I hear that Professor Hager called for intervening in Czechoslovakia, and I am astonished that a journalist from Czechoslovakia easily gets caught by anti-Soviet and anti-socialist propaganda circulated by the imperialist propaganda mouthpieces. Prof. Hager criticised something. One can agree or disagree to what he said, but to say that he called for military intervention, this is a slander which only enemies of socialism are interested in spreading it.

By the way, all through the talk G. Laub did not mention once the imperialist element, not concerning the events in the Middle East (the USA imperialism) nor concerning the dangers threatening Czechoslovakia (West-German revanchism). All what he said was against the Soviet Union, D.D.R., Poland and of course against the "Arabs".

There were moments, when I wanted to put an end to this discussion-interview, but I was restrained. At the same time I stressed very clearly that since he is taking notes only of parts of my replies, and in order to avoid mistakes I request to see the full text of the interview before it is published. G.L. promised that within one-two days he will bring me the text of the interview and I would be able to check it. This is how we departed. In the meantime one week, two weeks, a month passed without seeing G. Laub nor the interview, until it was published in the press that in the Israeli paper Kol Haam and in a Czechoslovak paper will be published simultaneously an interview by G. Laub with the Israeli Foreign Minister Aba Eban, in accordance with a special arrangement by the two papers, and this took place.

On Tuesday 11.6.1968, I received by post a letter from Prague from G. Laub enclosing a copy (in Czech) of the interview with me. In his letter dated 5.6.68, G. Laub writes inter alia: "Excuse me please for sending the notes about our talk just now, but I was able to copy them only on my way to Prague. The interview will be published in Literarny Listi newspaper next week."

The copy of the interview enclosed in the letter was defective. Lines were missing at the end of one page, but G. Laub with his disrespect did not even fill by hand the missing lines so that what he intended to publish would be complete.

I asked immediately one of my comrades to translate the interview inspite of the missing lines. When I read the interview I understood that before me is a well prepared provocation.

vulgar distortion in the replies and even the questions were edited differently.

On the same day 11.6.68, I cabled the editorial board of "Literarny Listi" and G. Laub notifying them that: "In contradiction with my request and with the clear promise of G. Laub, I received only today the text of the interview. The interview includes distortions and specially concerning the Middle East crisis. I request persistently not to publish the interview." On Thursday 13.6.68 I received a reply cable from G. Laub: "Regret, it is late. The interview has been printed already. Send corrections."

Next day on Friday 14.6.1968, Kol Haam published a provocative correspondence which adds distortions to the distortions of G. Laub.

ACTUALLY THE CORRESPONDENCE WAS PUBLISHED IN KOL HAAM ON THE SAME DAY WHEN THE INTERVIEWS (MINE AND S. MIKUNIS) WERE PUBLISHED IN "LITERARNY LISTI" IN PRAGUE (THURSDAY), since Kol Haam of Friday is set-up and closed in the printing-press on Thursday.

It is clear that G. Laub found a way how to coordinate with Kol Haam the publication of the interview with me and with S. Mikunis before he left Israel to Prague, while he "did not find time" to uphold his promise and show me the interview before its publication.

After this, I understood even more the great importance of the right words of the General Secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Comrade A. Dubcek, when he warned that the anti-socialist elements are trying to exploit the correct and positive process of democratization in Czechoslovakia.

G. Laub made the dish very salty. Even not every bourgeois journalist shows such contempt to elementary journalistic ethics, and gets entangled with such small lies and such big political distortions.

It is a pity to occupy more space in the newspaper to unmask all the distortions of G. Laub. I will only mention examples:

G. Laub alleged that I said: "It is of no importance if the diplomatic relations will be renewed or not". This is a vulgar and intended distortion.

Our Communist Party sees as a vital necessity for the State of Israel the existence of diplomatic and friendly relations with USSR, Czechoslovakia and other socialist countries. We write and speak about this daily. We also show the way for renewing diplomatic relations - by the government

of Israel assisting in the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22nd November 1967 - which is in the existing conditions the only possible political solution to the crisis in our region.

As far as I know, this is also the position of the fraternal Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and of the Czechoslovak Government. G. Laub may hold views opposed to the views of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, but why should he resort to defective methods.

By the way, he did not find it necessary to interest himself also in the situation existing in the occupied territories.

G. Laub does dis-service to the cause of peace in our region and bad service to the people of Israel who is interested in a peaceful settlement in accordance with Security Council resolution.

In connection with "Al-Fateh", G. Laub again distorts maliciously my words.

The only words which G. Laub quotes from me nearly correctly in this subject were: "I am for putting an end to sabotage activity, but I see no other way other than putting an end to the occupation." I said exactly: "I am for putting an end to sabotage activity, but the occupation raises opposition and creates the ground for sabotage activities. The opposition to occupation increases oppression. The heart aches for the victims falling on both sides."

G. Laub shows his intentions when he presents the renegade S. Mikunis as the "General Secretary of the Communist Party of Israel" and the Communist Party of Israel as the "New Communist List" (the name which the authorities forced on the list of our Party in the Parliamentary and Histadrut elections).

In conclusion: This was a provocation against the Communist Party of Israel.

M. VILNER IN PARLIAMENT ON THE DANGER OF NEO-NAZISM

.....

The question of the growing power of neo-nazism in Western Germany will be discussed in the Foreign and Defence Commission of the Knesset, following the raising of the subject by the Communist parliamentary group.

M. VILNER: LET THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL VOICE THEIR OPPOSITION!

With great attention and sensing the seriousness of the subject, parliament discussed the motion for the agenda of Meir Vilner, M.K.. He said:

"We submit a motion for the agenda - the question of the growing power of neo-nazism in Western Germany and the threat emanating therefrom to the cause of peace and especially to our people. At the end of the deliberation parliament should adopt a decision expressing concern and anxiety in view of the growing influence of Hitler's heirs in Western Germany and demanding of the Bonn government to ban the National-Democratic Party (N.D.P.) of Adolf von Thadden."

M. Vilner detailed election successes of the NDP and continued: "The West-German paper "Die Tat" writes that the NDP programme is similar to that of the Hitler party as two drops of water.

Well-known Slogans

"The neo-nazis went to the elections under the slogan "Give your vote against the red danger" which was the slogan used by Hitler before he launched the second world war and annihilated six million Jews and millions of others.

"The neo-nazis call for tearing off territories from the Eastern neighbours of Germany and of other European countries. They call for the preparation of a war of revenge, for the destruction of the German Democratic Republic, for supplying the Bundeswehr with nuclear weapons. They again instil the poison of racialism and antisemitism into the German people - with the support of German monopolist circles.

"The paper "DAVAR" (May 6, 1968) reports that in the last election campaign in Baden-Württemberg the contention was raised that Jews were responsible for the downfall of Nazi Germany in the second world war. The secretary of the Central Council of German Jews, Dr. H.G. Van Dam, reacting to this, said that this is not only neo-nazism but pure nazism.

"The NDP was able to succeed and become a dangerous force because the aims of the basic policy of Western Germany are the same: non-recognition of the frontiers fixed by international agreements after the war, opposition to an international agree-

ment against the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the preparation of a great army for a war of revenge and the striving for the destruction of the DDR - all this under the banner of anti-communism which was also the banner of the third Reich.

What Is Prohibited and What Is Permitted

"The government of Bonn have outlawed the consistent anti-fascist party - The Communist Party of Germany, as it was outlawed by the nazis when they seized power. At the same time they turned a deaf ear to the anti-nazi demand in Germany itself and in other parts of the world for banning the NDP. This is not accidental. The President of Western Germany, Heinrich Lübke was an active member in the nazi party and built nazi concentration camps. The Kanzler Georg Kiesinger was an active nazi in the Hitlerite Foreign Service. No wonder that in Western Germany the neo-nazi organizations were not banned, in violation of the Potsdam agreement. Kiesinger chose to pettify the seriousness of the growing neo-nazi force, saying that the designation "Neo-nazi party" for the party of Von Thadden is a far reaching generalization which missed its aim. He even dared to turn to the Israelis and to wave the bogey of the communist threat.

"It may be noted that most of the Israeli press opposed the whitewashing. Thus "MA'ARIV" correspondent in Bonn writes on the 10th of this month: 'The neo-nazi party headed by long standing nazi functionaries of aggressive antisemitic outlook adopted much of the outlooks of the nazi party of the Third Reich period and gained a foothold in Germany today.' "Ma'ariv" correspondent explains the matter saying that the Americans began after the war, to behave leniently towards all the nazi criminals. They liberated them from prisons and even let some nazi leaders get high ranking positions in the Federal Republic."

What Do the Emergency Law Remind Us?

Nowadays a fateful struggle is being waged in Western Germany against the fascist emergency laws which will come into force in June. These laws will enable the Bonn government to rule in a dictatorial and unrestricted way, to suppress the rest of the democratic freedoms and to prevent any parliamentary control. Even the Western press agencies such as Reuters' assess that 'The new emergency laws remind many that Hitler exploited emergency articles in the Constitution of the Weimar Republic in order to impose absolute rule after the provocation of the Reichstag fire in 1933.' The emergency laws aroused great opposition in Western Germany.

We, the people of Israel, have a special interest to raise our voice against the growing power of neo-nazism, against the threat of a dictatorship of the sort of Adolf Hitler in Western Germany. No one should dupe oneself that Western Germany ruled by Hitlerite generals and capitalist magnates who financed Hitler, may

become a 'shelter for a rainy day' for Israel. The steps taken by the Thyssen and Mannesmann companies have shown that imperialist monopolies German and others, are unable to be a prop for the people of Israel or for any other people. Has the time not come to break up the close ties of the Government of Israel with the rulers of Bonn and the German financial magnates?"

Let the Year 1933 Never Return in Germany

"We do not want the growth of the forces responsible for Osviencim and Maidanek, for the gas chambers and mass extermination. It is a case of national honour of our people, most important today. Nazism constitutes a great threat to our people and to the people of all the world. Let us not be passive. Let us raise the voice of the people of Israel with the utmost force. Let the neo-nazi party in Western Germany be banned! No return to the year of 1933 and the abominable events that took place thereafter return!"

The Discussion

E. TALMY (MAPAM MK) raised afterwards the subject of the growing wave of antisemitism and the threat of neo-nazism. She combined the description of the growing force of neo-nazism in Bonn with malicious calumnations against Poland and the Soviet Union.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs, A. Eban, replied in the name of the Government:

"I approach this subject and identify myself with the anxiety expressed when this subject was raised for deliberation. There is no place here for international apathy, still less for Jewish and Israeli apathy."

But in the course of his speech he tried to alleviate things for Bonn and incited against People's Poland. He insolently alleged: "It is doubtful whether it is possible to talk on a new antisemitic wave in Germany. There are antisemites in that country and there are some antisemitic manifestations, mostly individual. There is also a paper which continues the tradition of nazi publications. Viz: the "Deutsche National und Soldaten Zeitung". All these do not constitute what is called 'an antisemitic wave' as is unfortunately and to the disillusionment of every genuine man, manifested in Poland."

Unanimously

Unanimously, with the consent of the initiators, Parliament decided to transfer the subject to the Foreign and Defence Commission, where M. Vilner will present the subject.

GUNS INSTEAD OF BUTTER

Defense Budget Increased by 500 Million I.L.

The Knesset, in its session on May 8, 1968, approved the proposal to add another 500 million IL for defence purposes.

The Communist Party group voted against; the votes in favour were cast by the coalition parties, Agudat Yisrael, S. Mikunis and U. Avneri.

The Minister of Finances, P. Sapir, said one had to choose between guns and butter and implied that we had to choose guns instead of butter, telling the Knesset: "We have no option but to have bigger defence expenditures at the expense of expenditures in other domains." He added: "Only in the last 5 years the defence budget has increased fourfold. The present defence budget, as compared to that of the previous year, has doubled; its share in the State Budget and in the Gross National Product has increased."

The Minister admitted that the occupation, the prolongation of the military service to 3 years and the armament race are among the causes of the increase in the defence budget. He said: "I am sure everyone can imagine what IL 2.2 milliard mean. This is a gigantic amount, three times as much as our entire annual budget for development activities; overt defence expenditure is one and a half times more than direct taxes."

TAWFIQ TOUBI: THE OCCUPATION FURTHER REMOVES PEACE AND INCREASES THE PEOPLE'S BURDEN

T. Toubi, M.K., the Communist spokesman, said in the debate about the government proposal: With the addition which the government wishes to add to the overt defence budget, and taking into account the special budgets and reserves, total expenditure for defence purposes will amount to IL 2.7 milliard which is more than 43% of the entire budget. Besides this there are IL 100 million for indirect defence expenditures, such as the Frontier Guards and the paving of defence roads.

20 Years Have Passed and There Is Still No Peace

20 years have passed since the foundation of the State of Israel. We Jewish and Arab communists took our stand in favour of the desire of the two peoples for independence and the shaking off of British colonial rule. We supported the historic resolution of the UNO General Assembly in 1947, which recognized the independence and sovereignty of the two peoples of the country. We supported the foundation of the State of Israel and our comrades took part in the campaign to secure its

independence and sovereignty; and at the same time we supported the right of the Palestinian Arab people for national independence.

As an integral part of the people of Israel we fought throughout all these years, from the foundation of the State, for the achievement of the Israeli people's aspiration - the establishment of a just and lasting peace between Israel and the Arab countries. 20 years after the foundation of the State the Israeli people still looks for peace and does not see it on the horizon.

Taking upon ourselves full historic responsibility we say: No policy of force, no weapon and no money which are to be sustained by this bill, no military victory in a war, will ever resolve the fundamental problems of Israel, all of which center around question of achieving peace with the neighbouring Arab countries. 11 months have passed since the June war, the aim of which was allegedly to solve once for all Israel's problems. And what have the government ministers to say today, after so big military victory and so many victims? The Defence Minister, M. Dayan, in his interview to "Ma'ariv" (30.4.68) promises further wars ad infinitum, till one side will finally defeat the other one. Of course, Dayan, rejects the existent possibility of a peaceful settlement because he is not prepared to pay the price demanded which is renunciation of conquests and annexations. This is a shocking prognosis.

The conquest has not only not brought any security in its wake, but has further shaken it. Innocent victims on both sides fall every day. The war has not only not made easier the people's conditions, but has made its lot still more difficult. The Minister, Sapir, said that the war is still continuing, that it has already cost IL 3 milliard and that it is a bottomless barrel.

At Whose Expense?

And now another half milliard will be turned aside for the war and occupation machine; another loan, two thirds of which is to be taken out of the workers' pockets. Besides that, the curtailment of the Development Budget by IL 200 million cancels funds earmarked for building and housing young married couples, for slumclearing programmes, construction of vital roads, industrial development, building of hospitals, waterworks etc. The meaning of all this is less employment, less development, less social services. This is the price of the bankrupt policy of the Government.

The Way Out

No occupation and no annexation, no settlement in the occupied territories in order to injure still further the rights of the Palestinian Arab people in its homeland; no policy of provoking world and Arab public opinion, as brought to its expression in this year's military parade in Jerusalem; not the intensification of repression and persecution in the occupied territories; not the way of the "educational campaigns", of proclamations of curfew, state of siege and acts of vindictiveness, steps which have been taken this week against the population of Ramallah and Al-Bira - not in this manner will Israel find the way to good neighbourly relations and to peace. The only way today to achieve peace lies in carrying out the Security Council Resolution of November last, the paragraphs of which say: The Israeli Army's withdrawal from occupied Arab territories, cancellation of belligerence and recognition of the right of all states in the region to sovereign existence within secure and agreed frontiers. This is now the order of the day; this will render it possible to progress toward a solution of the other problems on the basis of honouring the just rights of the peoples, such as the rights of the refugees, shipping etc., all which will secure peace.

It is essential today that the Government of Israel consents to implement the Security Council Resolution in its entirety, especially as the United Arab Republic and Jordan have bound themselves to act in accordance with the Security Council Resolution, if Israel too will act thus.

The craving for conquests and annexations on the part of Israel's rulers, who are leaning on the rulers of the USA, prevents today the people of Israel to reach the arrangement of a just and stable peace with the Arab states.

Not by any anti-communist and anti-Soviet policy, not by restrictions of freedom of movement, not by administrative orders against communists and opponents of war, not by schemes of further impairing democratic rights and the freedom of action of our Communist Party, will the rulers of Israel save their bankrupt policy. The interest of Israel, the interest of peace, the ensuring of a happy and prosperous future for Israel in this region demand a speedy and fundamental change of the government's policy.

Caring for peace and security, opposing the Government's policy of war, we propose to return to the Government the bill of the loan and the bill of the budget.

By Tamar GOZANSKY. (from "Zo Haderekh", 10.4.1968) :

[Upon the initiative of the Government of Israel, a "world economic conference" was held in Jerusalem on 1.4.1968. This conference was attended by a large number of businessmen, millionaires, bankers, people like Rotschild, Warbourg (Britain), Wolfson (Britain), Carter (USA) Bronfman (Canada) etc., who under cover "Jewish national care" for Israel's welfare looked for better opportunities in Israel to make more profits with the government's assistance. We publish here-under an article by Tamar Gozhansky appeared in "Zo Haderekh" 10.4.1968 on the subject].

For a whole week the economic conference, i.e. the conference of the millionaires and the senior executives, filled the columns of the local press. Besides lengthy reports on the addresses and proposals we were able to read also pathetic descriptions of the participants to the conference. About Francois Ferrare, the chairman of Baron Rothschild's concern, for instance, it was said that he looks like an aristocrat... We are certainly not exaggerating by saying, that official Israel danced and leaped around Jewish capitalists from the U.S.A., Great Britain, France, South Africa, Latin America and Canada.

"The price of success"

The dance around the foreign millionaires didn't exceed the bounds of the usual governmental policy. It was only a higher stage in the transfer of the true ownership of the Israeli economy to the financial giants of the capitalist world. During the past two years the government adopted a few measures aimed at facilitating the activities of the big industrialists and merchants, and especially of the foreign investors. The government decided, among other measures, to grant the foreign capitalists bonuses at the rate of up to one third of the investment, and together with loans up to 80% of the investment, to lower the property tax and the tax on undivided profits, to found a company that will pour additional millions into the pockets of the industrialists and to loosen the control on foreign currency. These facilities were so comprehensive, that even bourgeois newspapers had to admit that "in the past two years things were done that in their liberal dimensions had no precedent in the Israeli economy ("Haaretz", 29.3.68).

However, the facilities and bonuses granted to foreign capital, that were greatly expanded after the conference of

millionaires (August 1967), did not yet satisfy the demands of the investors. Hence the government hastened to announce the following additional facilities on the very eve of the conference (it was opened in the evening, and in the morning of that day the government endorsed the proposals): To lower the income tax on profits, that remain in the hands of the companies, from 25 to 15 percent; to permit accelerated amortization within four years instead of ten; to permit profitable enterprises to merge with losing ones (according to accounts) and to be exempted thereby from paying income tax and a few transfer taxes.

After the government had endorsed the additional facilities Messrs. Eshkol, Sapir and Sherf went proudly to the opening of the conference: The speeches they were about to hold at the conference had already an ample security in the form of decisions about granting the capitalists additional facilities. Not without reason these decisions of the government were termed "the price that it (the government) agreed to pay in order to ensure the success of the conference.

The promises of Eshkol and Sapir.

If one summarizes the addresses of Eshkol and Sapir at the Jerusalem conference one can say, that they resembled very much the cries of auctioners, who praise the goods for sale without bothering who will buy them. It wasn't, however, an indifferent auction: On sale were the properties of the State of Israel, but the buyer wasn't necessarily he who made the highest bid...

The addresses of Eshkol and Sapir at the economic conference were full of high sounding phrases about the achievements of the Israeli economy and its prospective development, but their essence were the practical proposals. Eshkol declared in his address: "We always considered the decent profit of an industrialist not only warranted, but even desirable and necessary. "He further explained that in order to achieve "decent profits" one has to lower the costs of production (i.e. to lower the wages), to make the enterprises more efficient and to make the workers and employees mobile (i.e. to fire many of them for reasons of efficiency).

The minister of finance, Mr. Sapir, promised the millionaires that the government would continue sharing in the risk of developing modern and military industries; in addition, however, he appealed to them to acquire shares of those state enterprises that have reached already a reasonable level of profitability. Sapir put up at auction the government's shares in "Tefahot" - Bank, in "Chemicals and Fertilizers", in the Electric Company, in the Hypothecary Bank and in the "Industrial

Development Bank", shares whose total value reach the sum of 140 million I.L.

The government evidently promises the foreign millionaires to continue, and even to extend, its policy based upon:

- (a) The sale of profitable state enterprises to foreign capital;
- (b) The setting up of enterprises involving business risks at the expense of the state budget;
- (c) The continuation of the policy of wage-freezing and efficiency dismissals.

Eshkol, Sapir and Co. waited most humbly for the words of the representatives (who elected them?) to the millionaires' conference, in order to realize whether their latest steps had really satisfied the masters.

The millionaires from all over the world were quite outspoken: The facilities are very nice indeed, but not sufficient. Lord Sieff, one of the owners of the English supermarket net "Marx and Spencer", demanded additional facilities in the sphere of taxes and investments and called for restricting the government's intervention in the Israeli economy. Victor Carter of the U.S.A., whose capital is mainly invested in the manufacture of plastic materials (his investments in Israel exceed two million dollars), called for "creating the proper atmosphere for investments". Allan Bronfman of Canada formulated the same idea as "providing for an economic climate encouraging profits". To put it briefly: Grant us concessions in taxes and duties, dare not to set up state enterprises and enable us to make business, and then we, the foreign capitalists, shall come to you.

It would, however, be mistaken to assume that the American and European millionaires were interested only in the "insignificant" problem of getting profits out of their investments. At the final session of the Jerusalem economic conference there was passed a resolution dealing with the economic policy of Israel, that reflects the attitude of the foreign investors towards the economic problems in their entirety. The foreign capitalists demanded from the Israeli government to base its economic policy on the following principles:

- (1) To limit the rate of growth of consumption (by this term they don't mean the luxury consumption of the millionaires);
- (2) To lower the rates of import duties protecting the local production (This will lead to the closing down of many small and medium enterprises and to the dismissal of their employees);
- (3) To encourage mobility of workers (which means efficiency dismissals at the discretion of the management);

- (4) To encourage the merger of enterprises (aimed at the swallowing of small enterprises by big ones);
- (5) To establish an efficient set of incentives for investors and exporters;
- (6) Not to tie up wage raises to increases in productivity (i.e. the increase in work productivity won't serve as a basis for demanding higher wages);
- (7) To encourage the system of production incentives (i.e. the sweating system based on norms and premia).

In other words : The foreign capitalists demanded from the Israeli government to pave the way for their investments by following a policy aimed both against the workers and other wage earners (wage freezing, efficiency dismissals, sweating system) and the petty bourgeoisie (exposing the local production to competing imports and encouraging the merger of enterprises).

HOW PROFITS ARE MADE

The picture won't be complete, however, if we don't cite one example, at least, of how foreign millionaires invest and draw profits in Israel. If we don't describe this way of "investing" someone is likely to say: "True, the investments involve some inconveniences, but after all they develop the economy."

The government decided recently to set up a roof organization for the chemical industries. Jerry Sudarsky, one of the managers of the biggest chemical firm in the western world, was appointed to head the organization. In an article published in the economic supplement of "Jerusalem Post" (31/3/1968) this Mr. Sudarsky explains the foreign capitalists the advantage awaiting them from investing in the roof-organization "Israeli Chemicals". These are his words (translated back from Hebrew): "Usually an investor in a foreign country needs a local partner to help him developing the programme, and now Israel is able to offer a strong, established and experienced company operating as a private company by the name of "Israeli Chemicals". Sudarsky explains further that now, when the government has already developed the chemical industries, it would be worth while to the foreign capitalists to hasten and invest their money in them.

The day after the publication of Sudarsky's article the press announced, that the government had bought the shares of the American owners of the "Petrochemical Works" (which are part of the enterprises managed by Sudarsky). How did this

come about? Doesn't the government emphasize again and again its intention to draw foreign capital, and now it "nationalizes" enterprises and acquires the shares of foreign investors?

But reading further on it became apparent that the government hastened to acquire the shares of the American partners because "Petrochemical Works" were not profitable and this failure aroused "considerable disappointment among the foreign investors". The American and South=African investors held 75 percent of the shares of "Petrochemical Works", but nevertheless they wouldn't share the company's losses. At first they agreed that the government should grant subsidies, in order to make the balance sheet appear profitable and to let the shareholders have dividends, but in the meanwhile they became "fed up" and wanted their money back.

This example only demonstrates the significance of the government's appeal to foreign companies to invest in Israel. The foreign enterprises are called to invest in Israel without risking anything: If there is a profit it will be theirs, and if there is a deficit the government will cover it - either by granting subsidies or by reacquisition of the shares. Hence the foreign capital flowing into Israel is interested only in profits and doesn't care about the national origin of the foreign investors. If so it becomes clear that they are not interested in the flourishing and independent development of the Israeli economy, but only in the opportunity to amass profits.

Will matters turn out like this ?

By the way : One of the practical decisions adopted at the Jerusalem economic conference was designed to set up such a "profit=ensuring" body. We mean the decision whereby there is to be set up an investment company with a capital of 100 million dollars, that will acquire shares of different enterprises in Israel - both existing and future ones. This means doubtlessly the acquisition of shares in profitable enterprises, like those state enterprises put up at auction by Mr. Sapir.

As to this new investment company a few revealing facts were reported. Firstly the minimum investment in the new company will be 100,000 dollars, which means that it will be an investment company of "big shots" only. Secondly it becomes apparent that some of the participants to the conference demanded from the government a minimum interest of eight percent, according to the saying "What is sure - is sure". Thirdly it was reported by well=informed sources, that the minister of trade and industry was opposed to the setting up

of the new company arguing, that there are already too many investment companies in this country, whereas the finance minister and his friends within the country and abroad demanded to set up a company with a higher capital. At last a compromise was reached - to set up an investment company with a capital of 100 million dollars.

The company has already been set up. The state enterprises will be sold to foreign capital (as long as they are profitable) and Israel's toilers (who were not invited "for some reason" to participate in the Jerusalem conference) will have to produce the profits in exchange for wage-freezing, efficiency dismissals and the broadening of the norms' system. Will matters turn out like this?

DRIVE TO COLLECT 75 THOUSAND ISRAELI LIRAS FOR
THE PARTY FUNDS

.....

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Israel has issued a call to party members, sympathizers and members of the Y.C.L. of Israel, to working people and fighters for peace in Israel:

On May Day 1968 we have started to collect donations for the funds of the CP of Israel, with the aim of gathering 75 thousand IL in preparation of the 16th Congress of our Party.

The responsible struggle of the Communist Party of Israel for safeguarding the day-to-day and historical interests of the working people of Israel, for the attainment of peace with the neighbouring Arab states and for securing a happy and prosperous future for the working masses in an independent, democratic and peace-loving Israel demands unlimited devotion for our lofty ideals.

Out of its loyalty to the cause of peace, brotherhood between our two peoples, the Jewish and the Arab, out of our responsibility for the security and future of Israel, our Party took its stand against the aggressive June 1967 war, called for its immediate cessation, and is now acting for the implementation of the Security Council resolution of 22.11.1967, which calls for the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from occupied territories, the cancellation of belligerence between Israel and the Arab states and the recognition of the right to existence and security of all states in our region.

Our Communist Party has fulfilled its patriotic and international duty, in spite of threats and terror. The communists, members of the Party and its representatives, are holding aloft the banner of peace, independence, brotherhood of peoples, democracy and struggle against imperialism and chauvinism.

The Eshkol-Dayan-Begin government obliges the popular masses to pay war taxes and bear the cost of aggression. But you are called upon to donate and collect donations for the success of the Drive of the Communist Party of Israel.

ISM-IN-THE-20TH-CENTURY---<0172047A

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



HX 632 A1 W9 no.1670
World communism in the 20th
century.

0172047A MAIN

MAY - JUNE 1968

COMMUNIST PARTY OF ISRAEL
CENTRAL COMMITTEE - FOREIGN RELATIONS DEPARTMENT
P. O. B. 26205, TEL-AVIV, ISRAEL