


ZIONISM
Through
the Statements
of Its Leaders

Lionel DADIANI

ZIONISM Through the Statements of Its Leaders

As Anti-Communist and Anti-Soviet Struggle	24
A Enemy of Progress and Racial Discrimination	34
Reaction and Anti-Semitism: Two sides of the Same Coin	45
Zionism's Economic-Social Campaigns	50
Reaction to Social Democracy	58
Conclusion	75

Lionel DADIANI

 Novosti Press Agency Publishing House
Moscow 1986

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1986

0303010000

© Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1986

CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Offspring and Weapon of Imperialism	8
An Anti-Communist and Anti-Soviet Brigade	24
A Form of Racism and Racial Discrimination	34
Zionism and Anti-Semitism—Two Sides of the Same Coin	43
Zionism's Pseudo-Socialist Camouflage	50
Zionism Versus Democracy	58
Conclusion	75

CHAPTER 1

The first part of the book is devoted to a general introduction to the subject. It discusses the history of the subject and the various methods used to study it. The author also discusses the importance of the subject and the need for further research.

The second part of the book is devoted to a detailed study of the subject. It discusses the various aspects of the subject and the different theories that have been developed. The author also discusses the practical applications of the subject and the need for further research.

The third part of the book is devoted to a study of the subject in relation to other subjects. It discusses the connections between the subject and other areas of knowledge and the need for further research.

The fourth part of the book is devoted to a study of the subject in relation to the future. It discusses the challenges that the subject faces and the need for further research.

Introduction

About ninety years have passed since the World Zionist Organisation (WZO) was officially founded in August 1897. And it will soon be forty years since the state of Israel came into existence. What are the ideology and policies of Zionism today? What is the present state of Israel like?

Zionism emerged and developed under the active patronage of the governments of a series of imperialist states that were competing with one another to secure the service of this reactionary nationalistic trend. The imperialists readily took up the Zionist slogan about forming a "Jewish national home" in Palestine, having realized that this would help them implement their plans and achieve their objectives in the Middle East, as well as in countries where Jewish communities existed.

The ideologists of Zionism tried to elaborate their ideology in a way that would cover up its true class essence and attract as many Jews as possible to its ranks from all classes and strata of the population in different countries of the world. This ideology was

formulated in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and in subsequent years underwent almost no major changes.

The ideology of Zionism has always been characterised—and this is even more true today—by eclecticism, pragmatism and truly unlimited demagoguery.

This ideology is a hodge-podge of nationalistic-chauvinist, pseudo-socialist, clerical-religious, irrational-mystic, bourgeois-liberal, conservative and pro-fascist theories and ideas. Zionism has always included—and still does today—a whole mixture of ideological trends, political parties and groups that outwardly seem different. However, their common ideological and political platform is nationalism, chauvinism and racism.

Within different sections of the Jewish population the Zionist theorists have often stressed and continue to stress different components of their ideology and programme; they have particularly advocated and still continue to advocate today those specific dogmas and concepts of Zionism that, in their opinion, best suit a given situation, period of time, and audience. The Zionists resort to the same tactics in an attempt to disorient and win over to their side a part of the non-Jewish population.

The progressive French scholars Henriette and Paul Jacot have written in this connection: "Hiding its class essence, Zionist ideology comes out as a skillfully selected set of religious ideas and legends blended with facts and falsehoods, which enables it to mislead millions of people. Arguments about Zionism often do not refer to concrete and historically authentic facts, but touch upon only ideological issues relating to, for example, religious belief, particularism, cultural traditions, national aspirations,

'historical rights and the inherent incompatibility of Jews and non-Jews.'"¹

The cornerstone of Zionist ideology is the thesis that Jews of all countries of the world constitute an "extraterritorial World Jewish Nation."

Zionist theories about the "perpetuity of Zionism," the "non- and supra-class character of the Jewry," the "return of the Jews in a Jewish state to the land and to manual labour," the "improvement of the structure of the Jewish people," about the "muscular Jew" and so on are aimed at deceiving and intoxicating the Jewish working people, blunting their class consciousness, inculcating nationalistic dogmas and sentiments in them.

Zionist ideologists and propagandists pay special attention to demagogic slogans about the "establishment in Palestine (now in Israel) of an "egalitarian society," a "kingdom of labour," a "state of prosperity."

Among the main Zionist myths designed to convince people that Zionism expresses and protects the interests of the Jews and that it offers a solution to the Jewish problem are the myths about "the Jews as a Biblical people," "Israel as a sacred land," "the salvation of the Jews" by Zionism, the "continuity of Israel,"² the "return of the Jews to their historical homeland," the "carrying out of the behest of Jehova,"¹ the "abnormality of the Jews living in the

¹ Henriette et Paul Jacot, *Contribution à une analyse historique du sionisme*, Cahiers de l'Institut Maurice Thorez, No. 23, 1971, p. 63.

² The Zionists claim that the Jewish population of all countries ("the people of Israel") have always sought to come to Israel from wherever they may be. With a stroke of the pen Zionist leaders claim that the state of Israel, established in 1948 by a decision of the United Nations, is the direct successor and lawful continuation of the ancient Jewish kingdoms of David and Solomon.

Diaspora,"² the "special creative power of Israel,"³ "Israel as the embodiment of the Jewry," the "Founding Fathers of Zionism,"⁴ "Israel being the focus of Jewish life," the "Jews being able to live the fullest life nowhere but in Israel."

Being a nationalistic-chauvinist trend from the outset, Zionism does its utmost to pass itself off as a progressive movement.

But the facts, which are stronger than the most subtle demagoguery and the most inventive propaganda, disprove this claim of the Zionist leaders.

Offspring and Weapon of Imperialism

In the early days the "Fathers of Zionism" did not seek to conceal its colonialist nature. In a letter to Cecil Rhodes, one of the founders of the British colonial empire, Theodor Herzl wrote: "I believe that Zionist idea, . . . is a colonial idea. . ."⁵ He wrote that

¹ This refers to the Biblical legends, according to which God, Jehova, bequeathed the "Land of Canaan" or "Eretz Israel" (this is how the Judaic clergy call Palestine) to the mythical forefather Abraham, and subsequently to the equally mythical Prophet Moses.

² This is how the Zionists and the Judaic clergy refer to all countries where Jews live, with the exception of Israel.

³ This Zionist formula includes both the Jews of all countries and those of the state of Israel.

⁴ Zionist and pro-Zionist literature make it a point to extol the so-called Fathers of Zionism (Theodor Herzl, Max Nordau, Ber Borochov, Nachman Syrkin, Vladimir Jabotinsky, etc.) and portray them as outstanding personalities who worked for the wellbeing of the Jewish people day and night.

⁵ *Herzl Yearbook*, Herzl Press, New York, 1960, p. 43.

the Zionist programme in Palestine should "form a portion of a rampart of Europe against Asia," and be "an outpost of civilisation as opposed to barbarism," a post of Western culture on the shortest route to Asia.¹ Somewhat later the Zionist ideologists were at great pains to conceal the colonialist nature of Zionism by invoking hypocritical formulas about the "civilising mission" and "burden" of the white man in the Arab East. And finally they declared Zionism to be a national liberation movement.

By calling on the Jews to set up a state "of their own" in the "land of their ancestors," the Zionists sought to tear the Jewish working people away from the revolutionary movement of the proletariat. This was one of, if not the main, causes that led the imperialist circles and the Jewish reactionaries to render the Zionists vigorous assistance and support already in the first decade of the 20th century and especially after the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917. So it is by no means an accident that the British imperialists, with the full consent of Washington and the Entente countries, hastened to adopt the Balfour Declaration² on November 2, 1917, just a few days before the socialist revolution in Russia.

In 1919 Louis D. Brandeis of the Supreme Court of the United States, the leader of American Zionists and a prominent liberal, bluntly told Britain's

¹ Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State*, American Zionist Emergency Council, New York, 1946, p. 30.

² In its Balfour Declaration the British government expressed its agreement to form, in due time, a "Jewish national home" in Palestine. The Declaration was made by British imperialists in order to free themselves from the commitments made to Arabs concerning the inclusion of Palestine into an Arab state. It served to deepen antagonisms between the Jewish and the Arab peoples of Palestine, for its aim was to secure British rule over Palestine with the help of Zionists.

Conservative Foreign Secretary Lord Arthur James Balfour that he (Brandeis) was interested in Zionism solely for the purpose of finding ways to prevent the spread of revolutionary ideas among the Jews. Balfour's answer to this was: "Of course these are the reasons that make you and me such ardent Zionists."¹ In his turn Winston Churchill (then Secretary for War and Air) wrote in 1920 in regard to the Jewish question that "Zionism was the answer to international communism," and that "Zionism must therefore win 'the soul of the Jewish people'."²

The pro-imperialist essence of Zionism (which is anything but a national liberation movement in religious form as the Zionists allege) is obvious not only to Marxists, but also to bourgeois figures and scholars who examine the facts. For instance, the prominent French publicist Philippe de Saint Robert has written: "From Herzl to Ben-Gurion, the founders and realizers of Zionism were not believers; they were the conscious and organised initiators of an entirely political enterprise which, prior to clinging to British imperialism, did not fail to offer its services to Wilhelm II."³

The Zionists are pursuing two main aims: to establish their ideological, political and organisational control over as many Jewish communities as possible in various countries, and to secure by any means the resettlement of what they call their "historical homeland" with as many Jews as possible, predominantly

¹ Ezekiel Rabinowitz, *Justice Louis D. Brandeis, The Zionist Chapter of His Life*, Philosophical Library, Inc., New York, 1968, pp. 112-113.

² Terence Prittie, *Eshkol of Israel: The Man and the Nation*, London, Museum Press, 1969, p. 69.

³ Philippe de Saint Robert, *Le Jeu de la France en Méditerranée*, Julliard, Paris, 1970, p. 206.

young people. They need "builders and soldiers of Zion."

For several decades the Zionists used the term "national home" for tactical reasons. This was a deception, an act of duplicity on the part of Zionist leaders, since by "national home" they have always meant a "Jewish state."

In Palestine the British mandate authorities pursued the traditional colonial policy of *divide et impera*, and they set the Arab and Jewish populations against each other while supporting the Zionists. By the time the First World War broke out the plans of the Zionists almost completely accorded with the imperial strategic interests of Britain. A memorandum issued by the General Staff of the British War Office on December 9, 1918, emphasised: "The creation of a buffer Jewish State in Palestine, though this State will be weak in itself, is strategically desirable for Great Britain..."¹

Claiming "historical" and even "divine" rights of the Jews to Palestine, the Zionists, with the help of British and world imperialism, laid the foundation for a "purely Jewish state," i. e. a state based on chauvinism and Judaism. According to the Balfour Declaration, "the Zionist colony in Palestine would be of service to the whole of Europe, a real European outpost in Afro-Asian surroundings."² The United States for its part worked out detailed plans as early as 1919 aimed at ultimately turning "Jewish

¹ *The Strategic Importance of Syria to the British Empire*, General Staff, War Office, December 9, 1918, F.O. 371/4178, PRO. Quoted from: *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Vol. VI, No. 3, Spring 1977, p. 106.

² George Jabbour, *Settler Colonialism in Southern Africa and the Middle East*, Beirut, Palestine Liberation Organisation Research Centre, 1970, p. 37.

Palestine" into an American bastion in the Middle East.

In carrying out their plans the Zionists attached great importance to their allies and patrons. Before the Second World War, and especially in the war years, the Zionist leaders, without breaking their ties with the ruling circles of Britain, reoriented themselves mainly towards the United States as the leading force in the capitalist world. The formation and consolidation of this alliance was also facilitated by the fact that by that time the directing centre of international Zionism had virtually shifted from Europe to the United States.

In a letter to President Franklin Roosevelt dated May 5, 1943, his Personal Representative General Patrick J. Hurley reported from Cairo that the Zionists were seeking to turn the future "Jewish state" into a hegemonic state in the Middle East region. The general informed the White House that the Zionist programme in Palestine envisioned "Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control."¹

Regarding Zionism as one of the key instruments for carrying into effect their hegemonistic plans, especially those for the Middle East region, the US ruling circles began to give the Zionist leaders substantial support. This is why they promoted in every possible way the establishment of the state of Israel, which for them was a convenient "springboard" for gaining a foothold and further penetrating into the Middle East. The United States, an imperialist power heading for global hegemony, chose Zionist-led Israel to be one of its main outposts in the Middle East region; it also sought to make active use of re-

¹ *Foreign Relations of the United States, Diplomatic Papers, 1943, Vol. IV, The Near East and Africa*, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, 1964, pp. 776-777.

actionary Arab regimes. In their turn the Israeli ruling circles and the leaders of international Zionism, defending common imperialist interests and also pursuing their own aims, agreed to have the "Jewish state" turned into the imperialists' gendarme in the Middle East, virtually into an estate of the Western, above all US, monopolies.

Expressing the point of view of the US ruling circles, Senator Edwin C. Johnson said in March 1945 that "a Jewish Palestine is needed as an anchor and bulwark in the Middle East."¹ It was precisely this aim that dictated the essence of US-Israeli relations, which began to be called "special relations" several years after the foundation of the state of Israel and led to "strategic cooperation" between Washington and Tel Aviv.

In 1973, Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir explained Israel's strategic importance to the US, saying that "Israel is really a safeguard for the maintenance of American interests in the area, and the first line of defence [i.e. penetration, consolidation.—*Author*] for American interests in the Mediterranean basin."²

Already in 1949 the first Israeli head of government, David Ben-Gurion, continuing traditional Zionist policy, came up with the idea of forming an official alliance between Israel and the imperialist forces. While visiting the United States in May 1951 he made the policy of the Israeli ruling circles plain saying that Israel had always been and would remain on the side of the Western powers.³ In 1952 a military agreement and one concerning a US loan to Israel were signed. The former was kept secret till 1961. Israel had already proposed to the United

¹ *The New York Times*, March 19, 1945.

² *Ha'aretz*, March 7, 1973.

³ *l'Humanite*, June 9, 1967.

States and Great Britain the conclusion of a military pact in 1951, and in 1955 it expressed willingness to grant the use of its territory for American bases, and also to become a member of NATO and of a Mediterranean military alliance under the aegis of the United States. For a number of reasons, however, mainly because it did not wish to demonstrate its pro-Israeli sympathies owing to the stance of the Arab nations, Washington did not venture to bind itself at the time by a formal alliance with Tel Aviv. The US ruling circles did not deem it necessary to conclude an official military pact with Israel since the latter was already championing US policy in the region with increasing zeal every year. A former Israeli Minister of Defence Ezer Weizman said on this issue: "Washington doesn't need to ask us for bases; without being asked, Israel will give the United States everything it requires..."¹

The Israeli government gave full backing to Eisenhower's aggressive doctrine (January 1957) spearheaded against the national liberation movement in the Middle East, and fought against the Arab nations seeking national emancipation. When the national-patriotic, anti-imperialist forces got a foothold in Syria in 1957, Israel joined the United States in raising a hue and cry over the turning of that country into a "base of international communism."

Calling on the United States to take resolute actions, Ben-Gurion wrote the following to the US Secretary of State John Foster Dulles: "I believe the free world ought not to accept this situation. Everything depends on the firm and determined line taken by the United States..."² Washington was at the time planning an intervention against Syria with

¹ *Le Monde diplomatique*, March, 1980.

² Michael Bar-Zohar, *Ben-Gurion: The Armed Prophet*, Prentice Hall, New York, 1969, pp. 241-242.

the help of the forces of neighbouring states, above all Turkey and Israel. The support of the Soviet Union and progressive world opinion for Syria frustrated the aggression that was in the making.

After the anti-imperialist revolution in Iraq Israel gave unqualified backing to the landing in July 1958 of American troops in Lebanon and of British troops in Jordan. What is more, the Israeli government was willing to assist the imperialists in suppressing the popular uprising in Lebanon.

As a result of Ben-Gurion's secret trip to Ankara in August 1958, Israel concluded an "unwritten alliance" with the then reactionary government of Turkey, with the Shah of Iran and with the Emperor of Ethiopia; it was a pro-imperialist, anti-Soviet, anti-communist alliance. In September 1970, the United States and Israel again planned a large-scale aggression against Syria, this time using mainly the Israeli armed forces. But this time too the American imperialists and Israeli Zionists did not risk unleashing a war against Damascus.

World imperialism, and US imperialism in particular, is promoting ever wider multilateral ties between Israel and the Republic of South Africa. Under the patronage of the United States and NATO, the racist regimes of South Africa and Israel virtually established a "triple axis" in the mid-1970s by bringing into their alliance the bloody regime of the Shah of Iran. The Iranian revolution and the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Africa and the Arab East buried the "triple axis." The Tel Aviv-Pretoria alliance, however, even today presents a grave danger to the Arab and African nations, especially as Israel possesses an atomic bomb arsenal.

Although Israel is not an official member of NATO, it is virtually tied with it in many ways. Way back in the late 1960s a centre was set up at the

headquarters of the North Atlantic Bloc in Naples for coordinating the operations of NATO's naval aviation in the Mediterranean Sea with those of the Israeli air force. Israel's special services take an active part in coordination conferences conducted by the USIA (United States Information Agency) and other respective institutions of the NATO countries.

Israel's secret services are involved in many reactionary, pro-imperialist plots to overthrow the legitimate governments of countries in the Mediterranean area, the Middle East and Africa. For instance, Israel's intelligence service Mossad was one of the accomplices in the coup staged in Ghana to overthrow its progressive President Kwame Nkrumah (1966). It also helped the Portuguese colonialists in Angola and Mozambique, the separatist rebels in Biafra (Nigeria) and Tshombe, the puppet of the imperialists, in the Congo. Mossad participated in organising the anti-government plot in the Republic of Seychelles exposed in November 1979, and so on.

The closest ties existed between the Israeli intelligence service and SAVAK, the secret police of the Shah of Iran. A large section of the middle and top echelons of SAVAK got their training under the guidance of men from Mossad. Israel and the United States supplied SAVAK (and similar services in other countries) with refined torture equipment. Employees of the secret services of these countries taught the Iranian butchers how to handle these instruments of torture and themselves participated in torture.

After the victory of the revolution in Iran, Israel, prompted by the USA, feverishly engaged in subversive activities against the new regime.¹

¹ At the same time Israel, not without the knowledge of the United States, supplied Iran with arms through middlemen so that Teheran might become more entangled in the war against Iraq.

Israel also had a hand in the organisation of subversive activities against the Afghan revolution. The emissary of the Afghan counter-revolutionaries Zia Khan Nassery said in an interview with American journalists in January 1980 that Sadat and Begin had discussed at their meeting held in Aswan the question of supporting the Afghan "rebels." The Afghan anti-government terrorist grouping Jamiat-i-Islami maintains close contacts with the secret services of the United States, Israel and Egypt.

In Latin America Israel, acting as the confidential agent of Washington and using its observer status at the Organisation of American States, supplies huge consignments of arms and gives every assistance to the blood-thirsty dictatorships in Chile, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Paraguay, Haiti and other countries. Tel Aviv did its utmost to keep Somoza's anti-populist regime in power in Nicaragua. At the present time Israel is one of the states actively helping the anti-Sandinista "contras."

Since the proclamation of the state of Israel there have been six wars in the Middle East region. After the Israeli-Arab war of 1948-1949 unleashed by the imperialist forces, Zionists and Arab reactionaries, Israel annexed 6,600 square kilometres of territory designated for an Arab state of Palestine.

During the tripartite aggression against Egypt in October 1956, Israeli troops seized Sinai Peninsula by a surprise thrust, and Britain and France landed troops for the occupation of Suez Canal. The chief objective of the Anglo-Franco-Israeli aggression was to overthrow the progressive government of Gamal Abdel Nasser. Thanks to the resolute support Egypt received from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, from the Arab nations and all other anti-imperialist forces, the Suez venture of the Anglo-French imperialists and Israeli Zionists ended in

fiasco. In the spring of 1957 Israel was compelled to withdraw its troops from the Sinai Peninsula. The aggressors were in such deep isolation that the United States of America, guided by tactical considerations, preferred in that period to refrain from giving open support to its allies.

Throughout subsequent years the Israeli leaders adhered to their aggressive anti-Arab course, and they continue at every step to demonstrate their loyalty to world imperialism and especially to US imperialism. This was particularly apparent during the Israeli aggression against the Arab states in 1967, prepared with the most active participation of the government bodies and intelligence services of the United States and some other NATO countries. At that time the imperialists and Zionists were once again attempting to eliminate Nasser's progressive regime, which represented the vanguard of the Arab national liberation movement, and to overthrow Syria's anti-imperialist government. And although these plans of the reactionaries were frustrated by the heroic struggle of the Arab peoples and by the determined support for their just cause by the USSR and other socialist countries, the West was on the whole content with the results of the Israeli aggression, believing that subsequent events in the region would develop in a direction to its liking and to its advantage.

It was during the 1967 war that the United States irrevocably put its stakes on Israel as its chief ally and main stronghold in the Middle East. By that time US imperialism had gained a firm foothold in the Middle East at the expense of Britain and France, and had become the primary enemy of the Arab liberation movement.

As a result of the aggression of 1967 Israel oc-

cupied part of the territory of Egypt (Sinai Peninsula) and Syria (the Golan Heights), as well as the west bank of the Jordan River, East Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip.¹

The area of these Arab territories then occupied by Israel totalled more than 60,000 square kilometres, four times greater than the area allocated to Israel by the UN General Assembly resolution of November 29, 1947, concerning the partition of Palestine. With the support of the imperialists, the Zionists are pursuing a policy of permanent expansion in the Middle East.

It should be recalled that the Proclamation of the State of Israel of May 14, 1948, designated the whole of Palestine, two-thirds of whose population were Arabs, as "Israeli land," and deliberately failed to delineate the frontiers of Israel. All policy documents of the Zionists also lay claim to the *whole* of Palestine. In 1951, Ben-Gurion emphasised: "We have set up a dynamic state bent upon... expansionism."² In 1969 he asserted that "Today it (Israel) is not complete, since only 20 per cent of its land is settled..."³

In March 1972, the Knesset (Israel's parliament) passed a resolution alleging that "the historic right of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel is beyond challenge."⁴ It was also declared that among the

¹ The west bank of the Jordan River, including the eastern part of Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip, were to become, in conformity with a UN General Assembly resolution of 1947, part of an Arab state on the territory of the former mandated Palestine. After the war of 1948-1949, the west bank and East Jerusalem came under the administration of Jordan, and the Gaza Strip, under that of Egypt.

² *State of Israel Government Year Book*, Jerusalem, October 1951, p. 402.

³ *The Jewish Observer*, June 13, 1969.

⁴ *The Jerusalem Post*, March 17, 1972.

Zionist parties "there was little difference of opinion... about the Jewish people's historic rights to Eretz Israel," and that "the difference was over the feasibility of realizing these rights just now." Thus, the Zionists have not given up their programme strategic plans of creating, with imperialism's help, a "Great Israel," and many Zionist leaders dream of an Israel that extends "from the Nile to the Euphrates." Some Zionist leaders (and this was reflected in the documents of the World Zionist Organisation, e.g. in the memorandum presented in 1919 to the Paris Peace Conference) lay claim to part of the territory of Lebanon (up to the Litani River) and of Syria (along the width of Homs Province in central Syria). Others want Transjordan (now the Kingdom of Jordan), the whole of Sinai and even Cyprus.

Such is the programme of the Zionists. "The wisdom of Israel *now* is the wisdom to wage war," declared the apostle of Zionism David Ben-Gurion, "that and nothing else, that and only that."¹

In 1968 the Israeli Zionist publicist Marc Hillel admitted frankly in his book *Israël en danger de paix* (Israel Before the Threat of Peace): "Up till now only blood has promoted the growing popularity of Israel... in Jewish communities consisting of mighty contributors. Without a crushing blow, such as the war and victory of June 1967, we might ponder once again what would have come of Israel."²

Israel has more than once carried out the function of imperialism's regional policeman. It is always creating tensions on the borders, conducting so-called anti-guerrilla raids in the territories of neigh-

¹ Michael Brecher, *The Foreign Policy System of Israel*, Oxford University Press, London, 1972, p. 276.

² Marc Hillel, *Israël en danger de paix*, Fayard, 1968, pp. 71-73.

bouring Arab states, and speculating in every possible way on problems of "security" and "defence." Israel is virtually acting as a tester of the latest American weapons and electronic systems, and helps Washington "perfect" combat equipment and methods of waging "small wars."

Israel's policy of regional hegemonism,¹ which complements the global hegemonism of the United States and has served it for a number of years, was also geared towards Africa. In the period from 1967 to 1973 nearly all African states not only stopped maintaining military, political, economic and cultural ties with Israel, but also broke off diplomatic relations with it. Over the last few years, however, the United States and Israel, with Egypt's support and relying on certain local quarters, have been trying to encourage those African countries which retained some kind of economic ties with Tel Aviv to restore political relations with Israel, and to galvanise Israeli influence in the so-called moderate African states.²

The Camp David agreements, the separatist treaty of March 26, 1979, concluded between Israel and the Sadat regime, were regarded by Washington and Tel Aviv as landmarks in turning the Middle East into a sphere of American-Zionist influence and domination. The ruling circles of the United States and Israel were particularly glad when on May 17, 1983, they managed to impose the so-called peace agreement on Lebanon, which had grown weak as a result of Zionist attacks and long-standing religious clashes.

¹ We remind the reader that the UN General Assembly resolution of December 14, 1979, on the Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations condemns, among other forms of hegemonism, the Israeli-Zionist form of hegemonistic policy.

² As a result, Zaire and Liberia restored diplomatic relations with Israel in 1983.

However, the plans of the imperialists and Zionists proved to have been built on sand. The heroic struggle of the Lebanese patriots led the Lebanese government to annul on March 5, 1984, the enslaving agreement; Israel's relations with Egypt are virtually at a freezing point. In February 1985, the Israeli invaders were compelled to start withdrawing their troops from the "land of cedars."

However, the Arab lands captured in 1967 continue to be occupied and "Zionised." According to UN data, the Israeli authorities confiscated about 60 per cent of the territory on the west bank of the Jordan River and in the Gaza Strip; about half a million Palestinians living there had to leave their homes. The Arab population of East Jerusalem decreased by 32 per cent; about 80,000 Syrian Druzes were banished from the Golan Heights. Approximately 140,000 Palestinian workers are being used by the colonialists as cheap labour in Israel. The Zionists are building more and more settlements in Arab lands: the number of Israeli settlers in the occupied territories has now reached 140,000. In the occupied Arab lands there are already about 200 Israeli settlements, mostly militarised, and new ones continue to spring up. The influential Zionist and pro-Israeli lobby in the United States, like the Israeli government, is making feverish efforts aimed at turning Israel into a permanent, most privileged US ally in the Middle East.

After talks held in September 1981 between President Reagan and the then Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, strategic interaction between these two most aggressive states of the present day—the United States and Israel—was proclaimed. On November 30 of the same year, the ministers of defence of these countries, Caspar Weinberger and Ariel Sharon, signed a Memorandum of Understan-

ding on Israeli-American Strategic Cooperation.

During the visit paid to Washington in November 1983 by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir and Israeli Minister of Defence Moshe Arens, new far-reaching agreements on "strategic cooperation" were concluded between the United States and Israel. A Joint American-Israel Committee has been formed to coordinate the military policies of the two states. The *Financial Times* (December 2, 1983) emphasised that "the new forms of strategic, economic and political cooperation agreed during the Washington visit of Mr Yitzhak Shamir, the new Israeli Prime Minister, appear to give Israel virtually everything it wanted [for implementing its policy towards its Arab neighbours.—*Author*], with no political trade-off by the US." According to the same newspaper issue, Shamir made this blunt statement: "The history of the Israelis' actions has always been that they've asked for something and that they don't give anything in return."

In November 1983, agreement was reached on, among other things, the establishment of "free trade" relations between the United States and Israel. Let us recall that under the "free trade agreement" signed in 1972 by Israel and the European Economic Community, no duties are imposed on Israeli exports to the EEC countries, and tariff on European exports to Israel is gradually being reduced and will be totally cancelled in 1987.

The Israeli government's dangerous policy of aggression has been intensifying that country's international isolation, deepening the political, economic, social and moral-psychological crisis in the Israeli state and society, and bringing about a drastic worsening of the working people's living conditions. This policy is also implacably increasing Israel's all-round dependence on the United States. Even the leader of

Israel's Labour Party, Prime Minister Shimon Peres, said several years ago when he was Minister of Defence: "In exchange for friendship with the USA, Israel is forced to pay politically ... The truth is that in the relationship with the USA one loses independence..."¹

An Anti-Communist and Anti-Soviet Brigade

The Zionists proclaimed their profound animosity towards socialism as soon as they came on to the political scene. They met the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 with extreme hostility. They took an active part in the attack of the joint forces of counter-revolution and intervention against the young Soviet state and its Communist Party.

Failing to gain social support from the mass of the Jewish people, in Soviet Russia Zionism became completely bankrupt ideologically and politically. In these conditions the Zionists, like other enemies of the Revolution, gambled on subversive activities against the world's first socialist state. One of the Zionist leaders, D. Pasmanik, who was a follower of Wrangel during the Civil War in Russia and afterwards became a White émigré, wrote with malice in 1924: "We must do our utmost to set up a unified anti-Bolshevik front that has one single aim—to overthrow the Bolsheviks." Already in the 1920s the Zionists and their allies advanced the slanderous slogan of "defending the Jews against Soviet anti-Semitism."

Anti-communism and anti-Sovietism, like chauvinism and racism, are characteristic not only of Right-wing Zionism (its fascist and pro-fascist wing), but of

¹ *Ma'ariv*, February 16, 1976.

all Zionist trends, including the most leftist ones. Quite frankly explaining the chief cause of the anti-communism of the Zionists, the Israeli newspaper *Ma'ariv* wrote on July 25, 1968, that "the very call of communism for the liberation of the peoples makes it an enemy of Zionism and impels Zionism to fight against it."

The entire widely diversified propaganda and organisational apparatus for the main Zionist centres of the World Zionist Organisation—the Jewish Agency for Israel and the World Jewish Congress, and also those formally "non-Zionist" organisations that are actually very close to them (B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, the American Jewish Forum, the Alliance Israelite, the United HIAS Service, Inc., and many others)—serve the purpose of "psychological warfare."

The Zionist-led Israel of today has long become one of the centres of anti-communism and anti-Sovietism. The American Zionist Mark Braverman wrote a few years ago: "Politically Israel clearly would fit in with the Western bloc. Her main enemy is the Soviet Union. Her leaders are strongly anti-communist."¹ The ruling circles of Tel Aviv systematically distort historical facts about the Soviet Union's attitude towards the state of Israel, the Israeli-Arab conflict, and a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The young generation in Israel is being brought up in the spirit of anti-communism; they are being induced to believe that the USSR is an enemy of Israel and of the Israeli people, that it is pursuing a policy of anti-Semitism and seeking to eliminate the state of Israel.

¹ *The New Jews*, Edited by James A. Sleeper and Allan L. Mitz, A Vintage Book, New York, 1971, p. 81.

In 1956, Israel set up an East Europe News Agency, whose releases are widely used by the United States Information Agency (USIA), the subversive Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, and a number of reactionary publications in the West. In February 1985, Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres sent US President Ronald Reagan a letter informing him of Israel's consent to build on its territory a powerful transmitter for the Voice of America so as to increase the number of provocative and slanderous broadcasts beamed at the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist community.

Today anti-Soviet and anti-communist propaganda is conducted round the clock not only in Israel, but also by international, regional and "national" Zionist centres and especially by their specialised agencies whose job is to kindle a "psychological war" and to carry out all manner of slanderous, provocative acts against the USSR, other socialist countries, and the world communist movement. Among these agencies, whose number is always increasing, are: the Permanent Leadership of the International Conference of Solidarity with Soviet Jews formed in 1978 by the 29th Congress of the World Zionist Organisation, the Prisoners of Zion Commission, the European Conference on Soviet Jewry, the Latin American Congress—Latin American Conference on Soviet Jewry, the Institute of Jewish Affairs under the World Jewish Congress (with headquarters in London and a branch in New York), the International Strike-Force Group Against Anti-Semitism, and the International League for the Repatriation of Russian Jews.

The Zionists and pro-Zionists hold influential positions at Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. Many of them are editors and announcers at the Voice of America, the BBC, Radio Canada Inter-

national and Deutsche Welle, and work for the foreign broadcast services of some other Western countries. As to the Voice of Israel, the main content of all its broadcasts is Zionist propaganda, anti-Sovietism and anti-communism.

In the United States there are dozens of large and hundreds of small Zionist organisations that specialise in slander and insinuations against real socialism, and try to sow strife between the nationalities inhabiting the USSR, to bring about nationalistic and religious "explosions" and to "erode" socialism. The keynote is set by the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, formed in 1970. This Conference serves as an umbrella for nearly a hundred different Zionist and pro-Zionist organisations, and has branches in 200 US cities. The National Conference on Soviet Jewry engages in large-scale gathering and processing of materials discrediting the USSR's domestic and foreign policies, organises all manner of anti-Soviet actions (including "protest demonstrations" against the development of US-Soviet economic, scientific and cultural ties), and exerts constant pressure on the pro-Israel and Zionist lobby in the US government and Congress. In this endeavour the National Conference on Soviet Jewry cooperates closely with such well known lobby organisations as the Council of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organisations (Presidents Council), which has connections with the White House, the Department of State and other top echelons of the Administration, and the American-Israeli Public Affairs Committee, which is linked with the US Congress.

Among representatives of American scientific circles, anti-Soviet activities are conducted primarily by the so-called Academic Committee on Soviet Jewry. It specialises in the fabrication of rumours about allegedly oppressed Jewish scientists in the USSR.

The clerical organisation *Al Tidom* (Don't keep silent) conducts anti-Soviet activities among the religious section of American Jews. Fascist thugs from the Jewish Defence League, the Jewish Armed Resistance and the Jewish Direct Action, with the connivance and virtually with the support of the authorities, often resort to terrorist and provocative acts: they attack Soviet diplomats and members of their families, try to disrupt concerts by Soviet artists touring the United States, explode bombs at *Aeroflot* (Soviet Airlines) agencies, shoot at the Soviet Mission to the United Nations and at the flats of some Soviet citizens, and indulge in other similar acts.

These organisations and others like them regularly convene all kinds of "conferences" and "symposiums" where, with the assistance of other anti-communist and anti-Soviet elements, deal with the non-existent "Jewish problem in the USSR" and cause an uproar over "Soviet anti-Semitism under the mask of anti-Zionism," "the trampling of Jewish culture under socialism," etc.

The most tumultuous of such "conferences" were conducted in Brussels in 1971 and 1976, and in Jerusalem in 1983. The organisers of these anti-Soviet assemblages counted on no small political and propaganda dividends. The "conferences," however, were condemned by broad sections of the world community, including a number of Jewish organisations. The last of the conferences took place virtually without comment in the bourgeois press because the juggling with facts at the conference was too obvious.

Using unscientific dogmas about the existence of a "world Jewish nation" and the "perpetuity of anti-Semitism" as a pretext, the Zionist centres are always seeking to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries, and trying to send their emissaries to the Soviet Union and other socialist states. These

emissaries attempt to create nationalistic and oppositional views among some of the Soviet Jews and urge them to set up nationalistic circles under the pretext of learning Hebrew. They also try, with the same subversive purposes, to organise clandestine "religious," "scientific" and "cultural" seminars, and "clubs for meeting and exchange of opinion," all of which are widely advertised by the Zionist and imperialist mass media. All these channels should, according to the design of the Zionist leaders, inculcate in a section of Soviet citizens of Jewish nationality the provocative idea of "double loyalty."

By speculating on the problem of reunifying families and on the religious feelings of some people, by extolling Israel as a "flourishing" state and declaring it to be the "homeland of all Jews," the Zionists hope to lure to Israel a million Soviet Jews.

But many former Soviet citizens who went to live permanently in Israel and other capitalist countries became bitterly disappointed when confronted with the realities of bourgeois society. This is testified by the thousands of tragic destinies of those people who thoughtlessly abandoned their native country and learned from their own sad experience what the "barrier of social incompatibility" meant.

Realizing the impossibility of their plans to provoke an exodus of Soviet Jews, the Zionists today harp on their slogan for the "free development of Jewish culture in the USSR." The idea underlying this slogan was explicitly spelled out by the Director of the "Cultural Division" of the World Jewish Congress' Executive Committee I. Garkavi: "As to ... the requirements of Jewish culture, they must not be met unless that culture is necessary to Israel."¹ The

¹ *Undser Vort*, Paris, January 4, 1975.

Zionists dream of some kind of modified "cultural-national autonomy" for Soviet Jews.

The Zionists never fail to participate in any of the provocational-slanderous anti-Soviet and anti-communist campaigns organised by imperialists. For instance, the Zionists, together with other die-hard reactionaries, strongly oppose détente in international relations, inflate the myths about the "Soviet military threat," about "Soviet involvement in international terrorism," about "violations of human rights in the USSR and other socialist countries," and so on. In order to increase tensions they accused the US government of being too "soft and moderate" towards the USSR and of lagging behind it in the military matters. The Zionists are now urging the Reagan Administration to take a harder line towards the socialist countries.

International Zionism and the rulers of Israel have been doing everything within their power to cast suspicion on Soviet policy in the Middle East—a policy that aims at achieving a just and lasting peace in the interests of all the peoples and countries in that explosive region. The Zionist mass media accuse the Soviet Union of pursuing "the traditional foreign policy of tsarism" in the Middle East, of "destabilising the situation in the region," of taking advantage of the Arab-Israeli conflict "to penetrate" the region. The Zionists label the Palestinians as "Moscow's agents," and claim that a future Palestinian state "will quickly fall into the hands of Russian military advisers." Using lies and falsifications the Zionist leaders are trying to deceive and mislead the ruling circles of "moderate" Arab states.

The Zionists take a common stand with all kinds of "dissidents" (who themselves usually form a bloc with the Zionists), and act jointly with them. The Zionists go out of their way not only to cultivate and

fan nationalistic and émigré sentiments among a section of the Jewish community in the socialist countries, but also to cause them to drift away from Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The Zionists and pro-Zionists were among the founding members of the Committee for the Free World, an international anti-communist and anti-Soviet organisation formed in 1981. The founders of the committee have set themselves the task of conducting an intensive propaganda campaign in defence of the "ideas of the West" and participating most actively in the imperialist struggle against the USSR and the entire socialist community, against the world communist movement, against the progressive developing countries and national liberation movements. The Zionists and their supporters seek to direct the activities of the International Parliamentary Group for Human Rights in the Soviet Union, which was set up in the spring of 1984 and includes right-wing MPs of the United States and other Western countries.

From the late 1950s and early 1960s the ruling circles of Israel began to train anti-communist cadres from African, Latin American, and Asian countries in several schools.

This is financed by substantial funding by the AFL-CIO (American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organisations), the British Trades Union Congress, the West German Friedrich Ebert Fund, Swiss and Scandinavian social-reformist organisations, and also by EEC agencies and by a number of monopolies in the United States and other countries.

The Zionists and pro-Zionists were active participants in the counter-revolutionary coalitions in Poland (1968, 1980-1981) and Czechoslovakia (1968-1969). In the spring of 1968 the Zionists, alongside other

enemies of socialism, increased their activities in the Polish People's Republic. International Zionism managed to mobilise some Polish citizens of Jewish origin to fight against the people's government in the anti-Polish campaign. In alliance with other anti-socialist forces, the Zionist centres perpetrated provocative and slanderous acts against the socialist system and socialist democracy in Poland, and against the Polish United Workers' Party. Together they collaborated closely with the subversive Radio Free Europe, with the reactionary émigré journal *Kultura*, published in Paris, and with other anti-communist centres.

In the period from 1980 to 1981 the Zionist centres, like numerous other reactionary organisations abroad, began to promote ties with the anti-socialist Committee for Public Self-Defence-Committee for Defence of Workers (KSS-KOR), and with extremist elements in the Solidarity trade-union association. Coordinating its actions with the CIA, West Germany's Federal Intelligence Service (BND), and other Western secret services, Mossad contributed to aggravating the Polish crisis.

On many occasions the Israeli government called for stepping up the campaign against socialist Poland, and Ariel Sharon went so far as to accuse the ruling circles of the United States and of the West European countries of failing to take timely and appropriate actions to combat the Polish People's Republic. After the collapse of the reactionary schemes against Poland, Zionist propaganda actively joined the campaign to subvert the Military Council for National Salvation and all other socialist forces in Poland.

When a Right-opportunist group was temporarily in power in Czechoslovakia and when the reactionary forces of the world, with the help of the Social

Democrats, tried to restore the capitalist system in the country under the banner of "socialism with a human face," the Zionists too stepped up their subversive activities against the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. Analysing the situation in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and in the country as a whole after the 13th Congress of the CPC, the Plenary Meeting of the CPC Central Committee noted in December 1970: "Considerable influence in the struggle against socialism in Czechoslovakia was exerted by forces that originated from positions of Zionism—one of the instruments of international imperialism and anti-communism."

The Right-wing opportunists (some of whom assumed, to a greater or lesser extent, a Social-Zionist stance) were associated with Zionist circles in the West. They tried, among other things, to compel the government of Czechoslovakia to give up its policy of supporting the Arab nations. The Communists-internationalists of Czechoslovakia thwarted all these intrigues: counter-revolution and opportunism were routed.

The formation of the Anti-Zionist Committee of Soviet Public Opinion (a voluntary public organisation) in 1983 further escalated the anti-Soviet hysteria of Zionists and their patrons.

The Israeli and international Zionist propaganda machines, with the support of the imperialist-owned mass media, launched another campaign accusing the Soviet Union of anti-Semitism and of being "anti-Israeli."

Zionism's subversive activities against the USSR and the entire socialist community, and against the world communist movement are a form of repayment to the imperialists for the enormous financial aid and the permanent military-political and economic support that they give to the ruling circles of Israel.

A Form of Racism and Racial Discrimination

In one of his letters Theodor Herzl asserted that the Arab population of Palestine "will find in the Jews excellent brothers."¹ In the utopian novel *Old-New Land*, which came out in 1902, the "Father" of Zionism drew an idyllic picture of the Arabs' "prosperity" in a "Jewish state," the prosperity being due mostly to the activities of the Zionists. This book of propaganda was written primarily for non-Zionists and non-Jews, and also for Jews who opposed Zionism.

Theodor Herzl's true attitude towards the Palestinians can be seen in the numerous anti-Arab, chauvinistic-racist statements contained in his book *Der Judenstaat* (The Jewish State), and especially in his *Diaries*, in which his letters, pronouncements and "thoughts for myself" are collected. It is important to note that Article III of the draft Charter² that the Zionist leaders planned to submit for endorsement to the Sultan of Turkey, and on which Herzl worked simultaneously with his novel *Old-New Land*, spoke about the right of the Jews to banish the Arab population from Palestine.

The Israeli leaders did not fail to use the methods and tricks of the "Fathers" of Zionism to camouflage the Zionist policy towards the Palestinians and other Arabs. Before the formation of the state of Israel, Ben-Gurion made this hypocritical statement: "We

¹ T. Herzl, *Gesammelte Zionistische Werke*, Tel Aviv, 1934, pp. 484-486.

² What is meant is the draft document, on the basis of which the planned Jewish-Ottoman Colonisation Association for the Settlement of Palestine and Syria was to colonise the "Promised Land."

will have to treat our Arab and other non-Jewish neighbours... as if they were Jews, but make every effort that they should preserve their Arab characteristics, their language, their Arab culture, their Arab (sic) religion, their Arab way of life, while making every effort to ... gradually raise the standard of life. ...”¹ The Proclamation of the State of Israel, dated May 14, 1948, says that the state of Israel “will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens, without distinction of race, creed or sex.” The Palestinian Arabs were promised full citizenship and proper representation in Israel’s bodies of authority.

However, the history of the Zionist colonisation of Palestine, like the development of the state of Israel, shows that the entire policy of the Zionists towards the Arabs is essentially racist. Guided by the racist slogan “a people without a land to a land without a people,” and acting in conflict with history, with the realities, with justice and international law, the Zionists regard the Palestinian Arabs not as a sovereign nation but as undesirable aliens.

On April 9, 1948, the Zionist terrorist group Irgun Zvai Leumi (National Military Organisation), whose leader was the future Israeli Prime Minister Menachem Begin, together with Stern Gang terrorists attacked the Arab village of Deir Yassin and slaughtered almost all the villagers, among whom were children, women, and old people. This massacre was meant to intimidate the Arabs and impel them to flee. In response to this and other acts of terror, to the dissemination of all kinds of frightening rumours, to ruthless oppression and repression, a month later (that is, before the formation of Israel) 200,000

¹ Don Peretz, *Israel and the Palestine Arabs*, The Middle East Institute, Washington, 1958, p. 93.

Palestinian Arabs left their homes. In all, more than 800,000 Palestinians ran away or were driven away from their native places between 1947 and 1949.

The Deir Yassin massacre (which was only one of many bloody operations against the Arabs before as well as after the formation of Israel), and not the hypocritical statements cited above, reveals the true Zionist approach to the Arab problem. Begin wrote: "The massacre was not only justified, but there would not have been a state of Israel without the victory of Deir Yassin."¹ He dared call that massacre a "victory."

The great physicist Albert Einstein, whom the Zionists unsuccessfully tried to win over to their cause, asked Chaim Weizmann, who was to become Israel's first president: "What about the Arabs if Palestine were given to the Jews?" Weizmann, who was considered to be a relatively moderate Zionist, replied arrogantly: "What Arabs? They are hardly of any consequence."²

The first Israeli Minister of Education, Prof. Benzion Dinur, the historian, expounded the Zionist position on this matter as follows: "In our country there is room only for Jews. To the Arabs we say: 'Shove off'; if they don't agree, if they resist, we shall push them out by force."³ The well-known Zionist leader Moshe Dayan, who was Chief of General Staff, Minister of Defence and Minister of Foreign Affairs, uttered with cold cynicism: "Zionism is being realized at the expense of the Arabs."⁴ "You, Israelis," Menachem Begin said, "should never have mercy in your hearts when you kill your enemies."

¹ *The Spectator*, May 18, 1961.

² Alfred M. Lilienthal, *What Price? Israel?* The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, 1969, pp. 172-173.

³ *Témoignage Chrétien*, No. 1629, September 25, p. 21.

⁴ *Information Bulletin*, Communist Party of Israel, No. 6, 1973.

You should never be kind to them, so that we may undermine the so-called Arab culture, on whose ruins we shall build a civilisation of our own." The former Chief of General Staff of the Israeli army, Raphael Eitan, who is now a deputy to the Knesset from the ultra-Right party *Tehiya*, declared: "All Arabs are the same regardless of whether they live in Araba, Ramallah or Gaza. They all have to be done away with. The aim of our policy is to force them to emigrate... Everything must be done to make them go."¹

A Conservative member of the British Parliament, R. J. Maxwell Hyslop, recalled his talk with Dr. David Hacoheh, a prominent figure in Israel's social-Zionist Labour Party in the following way: "... (He) spoke with great intemperance and at great length to us about the Arabs. When he drew breath I was constrained to say: 'Doctor Hacoheh, I am profoundly shocked that you should speak of other human beings in terms similar to those in which Julius Streicher spoke of the Jews. Have you learned nothing?' I shall remember his reply to my dying day. He smote the table with both hands and said: 'But they are not human beings, they are not people, they are Arabs.' He was speaking of the Arab refugees."²

The Arab national minority in Israel has the status of third class, and not even second class, citizens. The Israeli authorities systematically confiscate the land of the Arabs (of the refugees as well as of those who remained in the country), and deprive them of water. In the mid-1970s the Israeli government owned about 75 per cent of all the land in the territory of Israel within the pre-1967 borders, and the Jewish National

¹ *Koteret rashit*, Tel Aviv, January 26, 1983.

² *The Times*, November 28, 1975.

Fund¹ and private Jewish landlords owned another 20 per cent. Hence the Arabs possessed slightly over five per cent of the land. But even this small portion of Arab-owned land is constantly shrinking: in the period from 1980 to 1982 an additional area of more than 350,000 dunams was taken away from them in Galilee and Negev.

According to UN data, the property confiscated by the government of Israel from the Arab refugees is worth 560 million dollars (in 1948-1949 prices). Apart from this, a sizable portion of the property of the Palestinians was appropriated by individual Israeli citizens.

The 700,000 Arabs living in Israel are constantly subjected to national discrimination; they are persecuted and their rights are infringed upon. Israel has about 170 discriminatory laws directed against the Arabs.

The Arabs living in Israel get the hardest and lowest-paid jobs. The average annual income of an Arab worker totals, at most, 70 per cent of a Jewish worker. Arab fellahs can sell their produce only at lowered prices. A large section of working Arabs have no social rights, including the right to rest and recreation, to unemployment benefits, etc. Only a third of the Arab population of Israel is insured against illness. The political rights of the Arab national minority are extremely limited. Arab women in Israel suffer a double oppression—both as women and as members of a people oppressed by the military-racist regime.

The Arabs are ruthlessly discriminated against in education. Primary schools for Arab children in

¹ Jewish National Fund—a Zionist institution (established in 1901) that confiscates and buys up lands from the Arabs.

Israel lack teachers. Progressive Arab teachers are not given jobs. The Arabs make up 16 per cent of Israel's total population, but only two per cent of the students at higher education establishments are Arabs. Arab culture is being blocked.

In the occupied territories the Israeli authorities are pursuing a policy of genocide. Murders and massacres, arrests and imprisonment in concentration camps, a military-police regime and exploitation of cheap labour—these are the realities of Israeli occupation, which Zionist propaganda endeavours to present as “the most liberal occupation that history has ever known.”

Owing to constant and methodical Zionist indoctrination of the population, the majority of Israelis have become racists. Thus, according to the results of an opinion poll conducted in Israel, published in the newspaper *Davar* (The Word) on August 3, 1984, fifteen per cent of the Jewish citizens favour the banishment of all Palestinians from the occupied territories. In other words, these people share the fascist doctrines of the religious-extremist group *Gush Emunim* (Band of Believers) headed by the obscurantist rabbi Meir Kahane and of the extreme rightists of the army's top brass. Among those questioned 43.5 per cent favoured letting the Arabs remain in the captured lands provided Israeli domination is retained and provided the Arabs are not granted voting rights. These 43.5 per cent of the respondents are mostly supporters or sympathisers of the Right-wing *Likud* bloc. Another 15.5 per cent of the respondents want the annexation of the occupied territories with the formal granting of political rights to the Palestinians (apparently this is the point of view of a section of the *Likud* membership), and only 26 per cent spoke out for the right of the Palestinians to self-determination. Moreover, the majority of the res-

pondents have in mind not the right of the Arab people of Palestine to set up an independent state of their own alongside the state of Israel, but a Camp David-like administrative autonomy, which is somewhat like South Africa's Bantustan.

Thus, 58.5 per cent of the Israelis questioned favour the banishment of the Palestinians or some form of apartheid. Among them are quite a few members of social-Zionist parties, especially the Israel Labour Party—MAI. "These alarming results of the opinion poll," writes the Israeli publicist Amnon Kapeliuk, "also show that among the older generations (from 30 to 60 years of age) the banishment of the Palestinians is demanded by every tenth Israeli, while among the youth this demand is made by every fourth."¹

Way back in 1966 Professor George R. Tamarin of Tel Aviv University asked more than a thousand pupils of the 4th-8th classes the following question: "Suppose that the Israeli Army conquers an Arab village in battle. Do you think it would be good or bad to act towards the inhabitants as did Joshua towards the people of Jericho?", i.e. exterminate them. The number of affirmative answers wavered between 66 and 95 per cent, depending on the school, kibbutz or town.²

The foreign press not infrequently notes that the Arabs in Israel are in a similar position as the Puerto Ricans and Blacks in the United States, and as the Africans in the Republic of South Africa. Even the Tel Aviv newspaper *Ha'aretz* admitted several years ago that "Israeli policy towards the Arabs is comparable only with the policy that the United States

¹ *Le Monde diplomatique*, September 1984.

² *New Outlook*, Tel Aviv, January 1966.

³ *Der Spiegel*, November 20, 1967, p. 142.

pursued towards the Red Indians in the last century.”³ And the notable British historian Arnold J. Toynbee writes of Zionist racism: “The evil deeds committed by the Zionist Jews against the Palestinian Arabs were comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis. The most tragic thing in human life is when people who have suffered impose suffering in their turn.”¹

Racism is so deep-rooted in Israel that the so-called Eastern Jews—those of African and Asian origin who make up more than half of the country’s Jewish population—are virtually discriminated against. The children of Afro-Asian Jews constitute 60 per cent of primary school pupils, 15 per cent of the graduates of secondary schools, and a mere three per cent of university graduates. Seventy-eight per cent of Jewish children who live in poverty are of African and Asian stock. The Eastern Jews have an insignificant representation in the bodies of state authority (they comprise no more than three per cent of the employees here), in the leadership of political parties and trade unions, and in the parliament. The per capita income of the Eastern Jews is half that of the European Jews.

Zionist racism is by no means aimed against the Arabs only. Nearly all Zionist theorists and leaders propagate, to a greater or lesser degree, racist theses about “the purest race,” the “nation created by God” and the “exclusive world Jewish nation.” For instance, Max Nordau made this purely racist assertion: “We might boast of some good qualities which

¹ Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*, Vol. VIII. Oxford University Press, London, 1953-1954, p. 290.

² *Max Nordau to His People: A Summons and a Challenge*, published for the Nordau Zionist Society by Scopus Publishing Co., New York, 1941, p. 92.

do not pertain to any other nation to the same extent.”² One of the Zionist leaders, Nahum Sokolow, has written: “Absolute purity does not exist, but relatively the Jews are doubtless the purest race among civilised nations.”¹ With great zeal the Zionists oppose assimilation and mixed marriages; they want “purity of the race.” When the Knesset discussed in 1970 the question of “who is a Jew,” Golda Meir said: “Mixed marriages and assimilation are the most terrible danger to which the Jews have been subjected over the centuries.”²

“I believe,” Ben-Gurion declared, “in our moral and intellectual superiority, in our capacity to serve as a model for the redemption of the human race.”³ While inventing and spreading chauvinistic propaganda about the Jews, the Zionist ideologists at the same time call the peoples of Asia and Africa “backward and primitive.” The Zionists also make all kinds of racist attacks against the Slavs and the peoples of the Baltic and other regions.

Characteristic of the Zionist leaders is an arrogant and racist attitude towards world opinion and towards any UN resolutions that are even slightly critical of Tel Aviv’s expansionist, aggressive, anti-Arab policy. “The only thing that matters is what the Jews do,” Ben-Gurion, for example, taught, “and not what the goyim say...”⁴ Golda Meir was equally cynical when she declared: “In our eyes UN resolutions are worthless.”⁵

¹ Nahum Sokolow, *History of Zionism, 1600-1918*, Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1919, Vol. I, p. 189.

² *Le Nouvel Observateur*, February 22, 1970, p. 25.

³ *Forum*, Jerusalem, No. 3, 1957.

⁴ *Paris-Match*, May 1970, p. 49.

⁵ Daniel Le Gac, *Au nom de la Palestine*, Paris, 1975, p. 135.

Zionism and Anti-Semitism— Two Sides of the Same Coin

The thesis about “age-old anti-Semitism” is one of the basic tenets of Zionist ideology and propaganda. For instance, the Zionist leader Chaim Weizmann asserted: “I believe the one fundamental cause of anti-Semitism... is that the Jew exists. ...The growth and intensity of anti-Semitism is proportional to the number of Jews or to the density of the Jews in a given country.”¹

Zionist theorists claim (and in this they have the support of many Social-Democrats and bourgeois liberals) that Zionism had emerged as an inevitable and defensive reaction to anti-Semitism. For instance, the director of the institute of contemporary history in London, Professor Walter Laqueur, asserts: “Zionism is a response to anti-Semitism.”² This is of course untrue. In their class essence anti-Semitism and Zionism are akin and they feed from the same source—bourgeois nationalism.

Proceeding from their chauvinist class aims, both the Zionists and the anti-Semites distort the history of the Jews and interpret the Bible in their own way (on the basis of their nationalistic racist “blood principle”). Moreover, the Zionists declare the Jews to be the “chosen people,” the “aristocrats of history,” while the anti-Semites impute to them everything that is negative, noxious, vile, and treacherous, and put them at the centre of human vices and shortcomings. Hence while basing themselves on

¹ *The Jewish Case Before the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine as Presented by the Jewish Agency for Palestine*, Jerusalem, 1947, p. 7.

² Walter Laqueur, *A History of Zionism*, Schocken Books, New York, 1976, p. 590.

seemingly different, but basically similar racist theses, the Zionists and anti-Semites nourish and complement each other. They have formed virtually a common front against the objective, progressive process of natural, voluntary assimilation, against mixed marriages and against the interpenetration of cultures; they advocate the "purity of the race and blood," i.e. they uphold the traditions and atmosphere of a new kind of ghetto, especially in spiritual matters.

Zionism and contemporary anti-Semitism have the same class roots and premises: they are the result of the same antagonistic capitalist social relations. Anti-Semitic governments, statesmen, and politicians in the capitalist countries have always sought and continue to seek contacts and collaboration with the Zionist leaders because they have identical class interests and a common hatred for socialism. In the past the overwhelming majority of Zionist leaders have often cooperated and continue to cooperate with inveterate anti-Semites.

Far from having ever really fought against anti-Semitism, Zionism, as a matter of fact, has been and is its ally. The declarations by Theodor Herzl, Vladimir Jabotinsky and some other "fathers" of Zionism on the need to use anti-Semitism to realize their Zionist aims and plans are widely known. A prominent Zionist leader of the past, Arthur Ruppin, said in his turn that "anti-Semitism is the strongest agitator for Zionism."¹ The late Nahum Goldmann, the Honorary President of the World Jewish Congress and formerly the President of the World Jewish Organisation and of the World Jewish Congress, warned that the current decline of anti-Semitism "might constitute a new danger to Jewish survival,"

¹ A. Ruppin, *Die Juden der Gegenwart*, 1920, Jüdischer Verlag, Berlin, p. 246.

and that it "had a very negative effect on our internal life."¹ "If in result of the swastikas there will be a movement among the various Jewish communities," wrote in 1960 Ishar Harari, a Knesset deputy from Israel's bourgeois Liberal Party, "and they will pack their belongings in order to immigrate to Israel, I don't see any disaster in this matter."²

In 1917 the former leader of British Jews, Claude Montefiore, who had by that time broken with Zionism, had every reason to say: "It is very significant that anti-Semites are always very sympathetic to Zionism."³ The well-known American political writer Hannah Arendt wrote that the SS butcher Eichmann had always despised the Assimilationists, that the Orthodox Jews bored him, and that he loved the Zionists because they were "idealists" like him.⁴ By "idealists" Eichmann meant fanatical racists.

The contemporary Israeli sociologist I. Eylam, admitting that an ideological similarity exists between anti-Semites and Zionists, remarked: "Zionism has never considered anti-Semitism to be an abnormal, absurd, monstrous, secondary phenomenon. Zionism regarded anti-Semitism as a natural phenomenon..." The author further emphasised that "the anti-Semites are nearly always prepared to pat the Zionists on the back."⁵

The Zionists not only regard anti-Semitism as their ally, they also use it to the utmost and live parasitically off it. They do not even hesitate to whip up anti-Semitism in a number of countries. For example, in

¹ *The New York Times*, July 24, 1958.

² *Information Bulletin*, Communist Party of Israel, Nos. 3-4, 1969.

³ Quoted from: *Daily World*, May 16, 1970.

⁴ Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, The Viking Press, New York, 1973, p. 41.

⁵ Quoted from: *Arachim*, No. 1, 1972.

1951 the Zionist leaders, in an attempt to “encourage” the emigration of Jews from Iraq and other Arab countries, ordered a synagogue and several Jewish-owned shops in Baghdad to be blown up. Such actions occurred in other cities as well. The editor of the social-Zionist newspaper *Davar*, Avraam Sharon, wrote in 1952: “... If I had power, as I have the will, I would select a score of efficient young men—intelligent, decent, devoted to our ideal and burning with the desire to help redeem Jews—and I would send them to the countries where Jews are absorbed in sinful self-satisfaction. The task of these young men would be to disguise themselves as non-Jews, and plague Jews with anti-Semitic slogans, such as ‘Bloody Jew,’ ‘Jews, go to Palestine,’...”¹

One of the Messiahs of Zionism prophesied that the formation of a “Jewish state” would promote the gradual overcoming and disappearance of anti-Semitism. We know today that this prophecy has not come true. In many capitalist countries anti-Semitism exists and has even been growing; it is directed primarily against the poorer sections of the Jewish population.

This is admitted, in one way or another, by many Zionist leaders themselves (naturally, with reservations). For instance, Nathan Rotenstreich, Professor of Philosophy at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, notes that the state of Israel has not only failed to solve the problem of anti-Semitism but “deepened and reinforced the problem by arousing anger against what the Jews have done [against the Arabs.—*Author*].”²

The Zionist leaders falsely claim that nowadays

¹ Alfred M. Lilienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin*, the Devin-Adair Company, New York, 1965, p. 47.

² *Dispersion and Unity*, Jerusalem, No. 21/22, 1973-1974, pp. 45-46.

“anti-Semitism is increasing, disguising itself as anti-Zionism,” and that in the socialist countries there is discrimination against Jews. They have also cooked up such falsehoods as “the anti-Semitism of de Gaulle and his adherents,” the “anti-Semitism of the leftists” and of the “New Left,” the “anti-Semitism of the Blacks” in the United States, the “anti-Semitism of B. Kraisky,” etc. When the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution condemning Zionism, the Zionists and their allies began to accuse nearly the whole of the United Nations of anti-Semitism.

Labelling people as “anti-Semites” is a favourite trick of Zionist propaganda. On September 17, 1948, in Jerusalem, Zionist terrorists murdered the UN mediator in Palestine Count Folke Bernadotte, formerly President of the Swedish Red Cross. He was assassinated because he had protested against the bloody anti-Arab actions of the Israeli ruling circles. The Zionists slurred the UN mediator by declaring him an anti-Semite. Yet it was widely known that during the Second World War Bernadotte had helped to save tens of thousands of Jews who were in Nazi concentration camps. The Swedish count was accused of being a “pro-Arab anti-Semite” who wanted to neutralise Jerusalem and decrease the area of Israeli territory, while all he was doing was merely demanding the fulfilment of the UN General Assembly resolution of November 29, 1947, on the partition of Palestine.

There is another reason that Bernadotte was murdered. The Zionists decided to assassinate him because he was well informed about the negotiations that the Jewish Agency had carried on with Himmler’s people in order to buy the lives of the Zionist elite in a number of European countries, at the cost of hundreds of thousands of “ordinary Jews,” who would perish in Nazi gas chambers.

Another frequently used trick of Zionist propaganda is to accuse Jews who oppose the ideology and practices of Zionism of anti-Semitism. Any criticism of the aggressive, anti-popular, and anti-national policy pursued by the Israeli government and by all the international Zionist organisations is declared by the Zionist top brass to be an anti-Semitic action hostile to Judaism and to the state of Israel.

The famous doctor Alexandre Minkowski from Paris used to be an active supporter of the Israeli ruling circles ideologically and politically. He also assisted in collecting funds for Tel Aviv. But after the barbarous acts of aggression and genocide perpetrated by the Israeli military in Lebanon in the summer of 1982 Professor Minkowski (like many other prominent representatives of Jewish communities in Western countries) began to denounce the Begin government and organised a doctors' committee in defence of the Palestinian people. In retaliation the Zionists launched a massive slander campaign against Minkowski.

Zionist propaganda accuses the Arab states (especially the progressive ones) and the Palestine national liberation movement of "anti-Semitism" and of wanting to "destroy the state of Israel."

These accusations are groundless. Even such a figure as Moshe Dayan made it quite clear that the Arabs' attitude towards the Israelis was by no means chauvinistic, racist, or anti-Jewish. "It is not true," he observed, "that the Arabs hate the Jews for personal, religious, or racial reasons. They consider us—and justly, from their point of view—as Westerners, foreigners, invaders who have seized an Arab country to turn it into a Jewish state."¹

¹ Noam Chomsky, *Peace in the Middle East? Reflections on Justice and Nationhood*, Vintage Books, New York, 1974, p. 53.

The viewpoint of Arab progressive-minded people on this issue was spelled out by the outstanding leader of the Arab national liberation movement, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser. He made the following remark in November 1967, i.e. several months after the Israeli aggression in the "1967 War": "Jews are our cousins. We have coexisted for centuries. Zionism has created problems in relations between the Jews, Arabs and Christians. We can live together in the land, but none of us can seize the whole of this land and drive the others out of it."¹

Spokesmen for the anti-imperialist forces in the Arab East have emphasised repeatedly that they are fighting against imperialism and against Zionism, its ally and agent, and not against the Jews, not against Judaism.

In fact it is the Zionist leaders and their ideologists who come out as real anti-Semites. In the first place, they propagate and fan hatred and contempt towards the Arabs, who are also Semites; they pursue a racist, anti-Arab policy in Israel itself and especially in the occupied territories—a policy that adds up to genocide. Second, the Zionists impose on the Jewish population of different countries their reactionary ideology and their doctrine of "dual loyalty," which is in contradiction with international law—a doctrine that maintains that Jews should be loyal not only and not as much to the country where they live, as, above all, to Israel. The Zionists cause and provoke mistrust towards the Jews among the population of many countries, and kindle anti-Semitic prejudices and sentiments. Third, the Zionists snub and insult, persecute and blackmail broad sections of the Jewish population in different countries of the world, for they regard as "true Jews" only those who are

¹ *Northern Neighbours*, November 1973, Supplement.

members of Zionist organisations and accept the dogmas of Zionism, i.e. a minority of Jews. Fourth, the policy of Israel's Zionist rulers is *anti-national* and in effect threatens the very existence of that state and of the Israeli nation, which is still in the process of formation.

Zionism's Pseudo-Socialist Camouflage

Soon after the formation of the World Zionist Organisation in 1897, petty-bourgeois politicians appeared, who began to preach a combination of Zionism and socialism. Their aim was to limit the participation of working Jews in the revolutionary movement, to make them join social-Zionist parties, to enhance and deepen the illusion existing among a section of them that the establishment of a "Jewish state" would be the only way to get rid of rightlessness, oppression, and exploitation. By proclaiming themselves to be "socialists" and "defenders of the interests of the proletariat," the "leftist" Zionist leaders sought not only to broaden Zionism's base, but also to acquire allies in the ranks of the working-class and trade-union movements in Europe and America, of Social-Democratic parties, and among leaders of the Second International.

The unscientific and nationalistic thesis about the "special road of development" of the Jewish working class and the feasibility of solving the Jewish question by creating a "national home" in the "land of our ancestors" very soon brought the adherents of Zionist "socialism" into the camp of reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries. The class essence of

social-Zionism and the dialectics of social development, with the inexhorability of a natural historical process, led to the fact that the eclectic and utopian-romantic schemes about the "struggle for socialism" in the "land of our fathers" remained only on paper.

Since 1933 the community of Jewish colonists in Palestine has been virtually ruled by the social-Zionist MAPAI (Israel Workers Party). After the formation of the state of Israel, MAPAI (and afterwards the Israel Labour Party—MAI¹) was invariably the main party in the government coalition until the summer of 1977. From 1939 to March 1978 MAPAI-MAI, together with other social-Zionist parties, played a leading role in the World Zionist Organisation.

Its leaders always pursued a policy of colonisation, characterised by the consistent implementation of three slogans—"annexation of lands," "capture of labour," and "Jewish products." The Zionists also advanced the hypocritical slogan of "Jewish defence" and, with the help of the Histadrut (General Federation of Labour in Israel), formed Haganah² military detachments. A certain degree of influence in the country was and is wielded, to this day by MAPAM (the United Workers Party), which was a left-Zionist party for a number of years.

Even today pseudo-socialist phrases play a noticeable role in the ideological arsenal of MAPAM, which some people in Israel and in the West call a "Marxist party." But in practice MAPAM's leadership resorted to demagoguery and other tactics to give the reactionary government a "left-wing" disguise.

In the first period of Israel's existence social-

¹ MAI was formed in January 1968 through the unification of MAPAI with two parties akin to it.

² Haganah—principal underground military self-defence organisation of Palestine Zionists.

Zionist propaganda, with the backing of the Social-Democrats and bourgeois liberals, widely advertised two of Israel's specific institutions—the Kibbutzim and the Histadrut trade-union sector, declaring them to be the “basis” of Zionist socialism.

In reality, however, the majority of Kibbutzim are militarised cooperative-communal agricultural settlements, whose members own nothing but their personal belongings. The Kibbutzim are entirely dependent on capitalist banks, loan funds, and private firms, which actually exploit them. In recent years the Kibbutzim have been increasingly hiring workers on the side, mostly Arabs; hence they have been acting as collective exploiters of wage labour. In today's Israel the Kibbutzim are essentially a source of cheap labour and a convenient form of educating the youth and new immigrants in the spirit of Zionism.

Already in mandated Palestine, a very wide network of different types of cooperatives with their affiliated trade unions, led by the pseudo-socialists, were turned into a component part of the Zionist colonial apparatus. This apparatus operated in coordination with, and at times under the virtual supervision of, the British administration. In this way, the foundations of the bourgeois economy of the future “Jewish state” were laid. Set up on the basis of the cooperative movement, the trade-union and cooperative sector of the economy very soon became not only an apparatus for financing and reinforcing the social-Zionist parties and the workers' elite, but also a source of enormous profits for the bourgeoisie. Through the credit and monetary systems and the stock exchange, finance capital, and in a large measure foreign capital too, have always actively used this sector of the Israeli economy (as well as the public sector) for their own interests; and today they are using it on an even greater scale.

The business activities of the Histadrut and of the cooperatives under its control in no way differ from the economic activity of the bourgeois state. This activity constitutes the basis for the development of the state-capitalist structure in Israel. Unlike the case in many young states in Asia and Africa, Israel's cooperative movement is devoid of an anti-exploiter and anti-imperialist edge. In Israel an essentially complete integration has taken place of the administrative apparatus of the conciliatory trade unions with the cooperative institutions into a system of state-monopoly capitalism. The major part of the so-called trade union sector in Israel is, in fact, a component of the military-industrial complex.

In 1969, the Israeli "working-class" leader Asher Yadlin (Secretary General of Histadrut Enterprises) admitted openly that the Histadrut "islets of socialism" were "in practice no different from any other capitalist organisation" (except for its trade union ties) and that Histadrut Enterprises operated "just like any other private firm."¹ One of the MAPAM leaders, P. Merhav, in his turn complained in 1975 that Histadrut increasingly degraded to the position of an appendage to the Ministry of Finance since economic policy was dictated by the latter. Merhav wrote that the authority and prestige of Histadrut had been declining in the eyes of the workers for they saw in it nothing but a government agency.

In his day Ben-Gurion formulated the programme of the Zionist "socialists" in the following way: "The Labour Movement [read: the pseudo-socialists.—*Author*] has never desired to acquire power in Zionism. Its aim has been not power but *faithful* service, and to this end it has striven to unite all sections of the people round the Zionist

¹ *The Sunday Times*, July 27, 1969.

Movement.”¹ And further he said bluntly: “Immigration and colonisation—these are the two Tablets of the Covenant of Palestinian Labour [this refers to the Zionist movement.—*Author*]. Immigration gave us form, and upon colonisation rests our existence...”²

After the formation of Israel and especially after the wars of aggression unleashed by its ruling circles, the process of constant amending the social-Zionist parties went so far that it is now practically impossible to distinguish between the Zionist bourgeois and the “workers’” parties.³ What is taking place inside the Zionist camp is not a class or an ideological struggle, but a more or less serious and long-standing disagreement over tactics (occasionally over strategic matters, too) within the framework of a common ideology and policy. Underlying these differences and arguments has been—and still is—the desire to promote to the maximum degree the achievement of Zionism’s goals. Inter-party and personal rivalry aimed at expanding and strengthening a given party’s position inside the World Zionist Organisation and the World Jewish Congress, and also in Israel’s state apparatus and economy, the pursuit of higher and more lucrative posts—these factors form the background, though not unimportant, against which differences and struggles rage within the Zionist Establishment.

¹ S. Levenberg, *The Jews and Palestine, A Study in Labour Zionism*, Poale Zion, Jewish Socialist Labour Party, London, 1945, pp. 180-181.

² *Ibid.*, p. 176.

³ The central organ of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, the newspaper *Vorwärts*, noted on December 27, 1973, that the MAI, “having been a government party for many years, bears so many different political trends that it can no longer be said that it is a Social-Democratic party...”

While trying to pass for a “workers’” party, MAPAI-MAI has done everything to consolidate in Israel the domination of the big bourgeoisie, which is closely connected with a number of financial-industrial monopolies in the United States and other Western countries. In the past MAI leaders lavishly sprinkled social-reformist formulas into Zionist dogmas and slogans, whereas over the last few years they have been doing so only when addressing groups of the Socialist International or congresses of Social-Democratic parties. Since they do business with statesmen of the imperialist countries and with representatives of monopoly capital, MAI leaders negotiate with them about loans, investments, deliveries of the latest types of weapons, and plans for Israel’s participation in imperialist actions against the socialist countries and national liberation movements.

The Israeli scholar and public figure Daniel Amit wrote in 1977: “Israel’s Labour Party managed to pass for what it had never been. The impression it created was all the more deceptive since over the last ten years at least, it was considered irreplaceable and gradually abandoned all the political and social positions which could serve as a watershed between itself and its Right-wing rival, the *Likud* bloc. It was precisely owing to this that on the day of the elections [the elections to the Knesset in May 1977.—*Author*] *Likud* was able to declare with a clear conscience that it would fulfil all the promises of the Labour Party and go even further; its members were better nationalists, weren’t they? Its capitalists had greater freedom of action, hadn’t they?”¹

Under the leadership of MAI and MAARAH the successive Israeli governments, by all their activities in both domestic and foreign policy, virtually paved

¹ *Le Monde diplomatique*, October 1977.

the way for the advent to power of the ultra-Right *Likud* bloc.

If MAPAI-MAI is somewhere on the extreme right flank in the Socialist International, then MAPAM is probably the most Right-wing of all Left socialist parties. Zionism has made them like that. The same is true of the international associations of these parties—the World Labour Zionist Movement¹ and the World Union of United Workers Parties (MAPAM-PO'ALE ZION-HASHOMER HATSAIR).²

The early elections to the Knesset held in 1977 showed that a considerable section of the electorate, dissatisfied with the policies of MAI and MAARAH, fell prey to the demagogy of even more reactionary parties. The electorate voted for these Right-wing parties in protest against the ruinous course of the previous Cabinets. *Likud* and its allies adroitly used the numerous failures and mistakes of the social-Zionist leadership to their own advantage. They managed to make a sizable part of the electorate believe that they would offer a better thought-out and positive government course that would improve the country's international position and the life of the people. As a result, the ultra-nationalistic, pro-fascist *Likud* bloc won the largest number of votes, and its leader Menachem Begin became head of the most reactionary government in the history of Israel. In 1981 the Labour Party lost the parliamentary elections once again.

Though it found itself in the parliamentary opposition, MAI gave active support to the Begin and Shamir Cabinets on almost all issues, and especially on foreign policy matters. Sometimes MAI leaders

¹ This association, set up in 1907 and reorganised in 1932, today has branches in 22 capitalist countries.

² This union (set up in 1954) today unites parties akin to MAPAM in 17 capitalist countries.

even criticised the *Likud* government from the Right, from more "hawkish" positions. On the whole, the strategy and tactics of the social-Zionists in the period from 1977 to 1984 were directed at bolstering up "workers'" parties, which were going through a crisis, and at attempting to return to power when favourable changes took place in the internal and international political situations.

In July 1984, early elections to the Knesset were held once again. This time the social-Zionists failed to return to power because the electorate saw no difference between the two Zionist blocs. More and more people in Israel are saying that there are two *Likuds*: *Likud A* and *Likud B*.

In September 1984, after long parliamentary manoeuvring, a government of national unity was formed, in which all the top posts were divided on an equal footing between the leaders of MAI and *Likud*. In this old-new government, as it is generally referred to in the country, the Prime Minister during the first half of the four-year term will be the Labour Party Chairman Shimon Peres, and the *Likud* leader Yitzhak Shamir will take over in the second half of the term. The composition of the Peres-Shamir Cabinet is so reactionary (suffice it to point out that Ariel Sharon heads one of the ministries) that MAPAM refused to vote for it and dissolved the coalition with MAI.

Social-Zionism is facing a crisis not only in Israel, but in all countries where Zionist "workers'" parties are operative. For instance, a member of the Central Committee of the social-Zionist party *Po'ale Zion* (United Labour Zionist Organisation of America) Miriam Mann admitted several years ago: "The clichés and slogans about the role of labour in society and about the socialist Zionist revolution were to me very 'old hat'..." Further on she objected to the

description of Zionism as the “national liberation movement” of the Jewish people.

The crisis of social-Zionism is deep-rooted, all-embracing and irreversible. So is the crisis of Zionism as a whole.

Zionism Versus Democracy

Israel's present political regime and the policies pursued by both Tel Aviv and the international Zionist centres irrefutably prove that the declarations of the Zionists, designed to convince world opinion that Zionism and democracy are inseparable, are entirely groundless.

Let us recall that the “fathers” of Zionism were virtually opposed to even bourgeois democracy. For instance, Theodor Herzl (by no means the most reactionary figure among the founders of Zionism) said that the nations of that time were incapable of a democratic form of government and would be even less capable of it in the future. His idea of a “Jewish state” was a “democratic monarchy” with a “constitution of a moderately elastic nature,” and it is only because there was no descendant of the ancient Jewish royal dynasties that he would settle for an “aristocratic republic.” The political creed of this conservative monarchist was: “Politics must take shape in the upper strata.”¹

The anti-democratism of today's Israel derives from Zionism. Uri Avnery wrote: “In a Zionist

¹ Theodor Herzl, *The Jewish State*, American Zionist Emergency Council, New York, 1946, pp. 144, 145.

organisation there is not even a shade of democracy. There are no real elections. There is no genuine control. All business is conducted by means of conspiracy, under the system of 'You help me and I'll help you,' 'One hand washes the other,' with both hands being unclean."¹ Uri Avnery's testimony is all the more valuable because for a number of years he was a Zionist functionary and knows well the machinery of both Israeli and international Zionism. One of the leading figures in the American Jewish Committee, the lawyer Meir Sulzberger, is also familiar with the theory and practice of Zionism; he emphasised that Zionism was a negation of democracy. Here are two examples. The President of the Zionist Federation of France, A. Blumel, visited the German Democratic Republic in the early 1960s and praised its government and its attitude towards the country's Jewish population. For this he was removed from his post. The leaders of the World Zionist Organisation and of Israel could not forgive A. Blumel this "grave sin," nor his statement, made after a visit to the USSR, that there is no anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union.

In the spring of 1978 the *Jewish Sentinel*, a Chicago-based American-Jewish weekly, wrote in an editorial: "Woe betide the Jew in organisational life [of a Jewish community.—*Author*] who dares to express a contrary opinion: he is immediately beset by harsh voices, stamped upon and isolated from any leadership role from then on."

Israel is one of the few states today that does not have a constitution as a unified code of law. The absence of a constitution in the accepted sense of the word, and of a law on the rights and freedoms of

¹ *Ha'olam Haze*, January 26, 1972.

citizens enables the ruling circles more freely to indulge in all manner of lawlessness and despotism.

The ultra-reactionary laws from the times of Ottoman domination in Palestine and the emergency decrees of the British authorities remain in force (partly or fully) in Israel today, even though the Knesset in 1948 decided to annul them. The repressive British colonial laws serve as the legal basis for Israeli courts to pass rigorous sentences and for severe political censorship.

Israeli legislation on citizenship (the Law of the Return of 1950, the Citizenship Law of 1952, etc.) contradicts the elementary rules of democracy since it is based on the racist concept of a "Jewish state." Noam Chomsky, the well-known American scholar of Jewish origin and Nobel Prize winner, wrote on this issue: "If a state is Jewish in certain respects, then in these respects it is not democratic."¹

Even the very first Israeli governments set up a subtle system of methods and means to hamper the activities of the Communist Party in every possible way, to try to isolate it from the Left-wing forces, to intimidate and discourage members of all progressive organisations. The Shin Beth (Israel's Internal Security Service) and the police department handling special cases maintain systematic surveillance of citizens whom the authorities regard as "political suspects." A close and permanent watch is kept on oppositional organisations and on many civil servants.

Under a government decision, Shin Beth is empowered to tap the telephones of citizens. It was once disclosed that hidden microphones and other eavesdropping equipment were installed in the flats of not

¹ Norman F. Dacey, *"Democracy" in Israel*, Southbury, 1976, p. 23.

only communist deputies to the Knesset, but also in those of MAPAM General Secretary M. Yaari, of one of the leaders of the Liberal Party, P. Bernstein, and of some other prominent bourgeois politicians.

The CIA's secret report on Israeli intelligence, which was drawn up in March 1979 and became public after the occupation of the US Embassy in Teheran by Iranian students in November of the same year, notes that the Shin Beth is almost entirely free to act as it sees fit. The report says: "The young Israeli, whose life is well documented, rarely enjoys the luxury of privacy," with everything from school records to "political affiliations, voting records, family history, political persuasions and friends scrutinised."¹

Israel's 1957 law on "state security" undermines the basic rights and democratic freedoms of citizens. Political views that contradict government policy are designated by this law as "treason"; "any contact with a foreign agent" is punishable by a 15-year sentence, and in some cases by life imprisonment. Moreover, the law is formulated in such a way that any contact between an Israeli citizen and a foreigner can be considered by the authorities and by the court as a "contact with a foreign agent." In contravention of the democratic rules for legal proceedings, under this law the public prosecutor is not obliged to prove the guilt of the accused; it is the latter who must prove his innocence.

Other oppressive laws were issued by social-Zionist governments, such as the laws on "the jurisdiction of military courts," on "punishment for insulting a policeman," on "violation of public order," and a number of others. For example, a 1972 law entitles a

¹ Scott Armstrong, *Israelis Have Spied on US, Secret Papers Show*, *The Washington Post*, February 1, 1982.

judge to sentence the accused to 20 years' imprisonment even in the absence of evidence, provided he is convinced that the accused "intended to commit an act against state security."

To complement earlier undemocratic laws, the *Likud* government adopted a number of new, even more reactionary ones (the laws on "combatting terrorism," on "organisations," on "protection of private life," on the "settlement of labour conflicts," on "compulsory labour during a state of emergency," on the "inviolability of the person," an amendment to the Citizenship Law that can deprive any person of citizenship who, in the opinion of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, is "not loyal enough to the state," etc.).

Military censorship by the information service of military intelligence (Aman) has virtually continued in Israel since 1948. The entire issue of a newspaper or magazine is subject to censorship, and not just reports on military matters. In 1957 and 1958 the ruling circles issued a number of legislative and administrative measures drastically limiting freedom of speech. The Law on State Security stipulates up to 15-year imprisonment for divulging "secret information." In 1957, with the sanction of the parliamentary commission for foreign affairs and defence, the government extended the force of this law to practically all aspects of the activities of the mass media. Freedom of the press is seriously threatened by the 1965 law on "curbing slander," which grimly warns journalists against making allegedly "unverified reports."

There is a systematic violation of the relatively progressive laws adopted as a result of the Israeli working people's struggle—laws concerning labour relations (equal pay for equal work, regulation of the length of the working day and the establishment of

days off, prohibition of night-time work and overtime, etc.). Many laws vital to the working people were not adopted altogether, such as those concerning the reduction of the working week for persons in arduous jobs, the provision of unemployment benefits, severance pay, the establishment of a minimum wage, etc.

The government and the management of Histadrut, together with employers, are doing their utmost to nullify Israel's formally existing "right to strike". Civil servants who go on strike are severely punished. Strikers are beaten up, arrested, put on trial, dismissed from their jobs, and snubbed in every possible way. Already in 1951 the government used military force to put down a sailors' strike. Such measures have been repeatedly resorted to ever since. Under a 1969 law, notification of a strike must be given two weeks in advance. In 1972 the government pushed through a law prohibiting strikes in economic sectors proclaimed "vitally important"; this involves public sector industries, which employ about 20 per cent of the country's work force. This law provides for a two-week "cooling off period" between the announcement of a strike and its beginning, during which compulsory arbitration takes place. And a 1975 law entitles employers to deduct up to 50 per cent of the wages of workers participating in partial strikes, refusing to do overtime, or not wishing to fulfil excessive work quotas.

The constant restriction of the working people's social rights and the government's assault on trade-union freedoms are a typical feature of Israel's political regime.

The crisis of bourgeois parliamentarism has deep roots in Israel. The well-known Israeli lawyer Professor Benjamin Akzin has admitted: "The Cabinet ... is also the body that guides and directs the

work of the *Knesset* itself. Thus, both as regards the executive powers vested in the Cabinet and as regards the powers belonging to the legislative body, the supreme direction of national affairs is, to all intents and purposes, in the hands of the Cabinet."¹ The West German magazine *Der Spiegel* remarked in October 1973 that in Israel "parliament can hardly say anything."

The Knesset is unable to control the government's activities in such important areas as foreign policy and matters of security, military spending and the income items of the budget. Since the days of Ben-Gurion, the government has enjoyed practically complete freedom in financial policy.

The main questions of state policy are decided in Israel by a small group within the government without consulting the parliament. For example, the decision on deliveries of Israeli arms to the Federal Republic of Germany was adopted in 1959 without having been debated in the Knesset and without its consent. The Israeli public learned about the deliveries not from their government, but from an article in *Der Spiegel*. In 1960 several Knesset deputies asked the Minister of Finance what sources Israel, with its enormous foreign debt, used to grant loans to several African states, especially since the budget made no provision for such expenditures. Although Israeli statesmen are known to be experts in demagoguery, this time the Minister of Finance preferred to give no answer; no verbal tricks could conceal Israel's neocolonialist act—it had been subsidising a number of African states with funds obtained from Western monopolies for the purpose of

¹ *Public Administration in Israel and Abroad, 1960*, Israel Institute of Public Administration, Jerusalem, 1961, p. 8.

fortifying the imperialist powers' positions in these countries.

Many international agreements concluded by the Israeli government are not submitted to the Knesset for ratification. For example, the United States and Israel concluded the Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement,¹ under which Israel in effect undertook a number of military commitments. When the opposition in 1962 demanded that the Knesset should consider that agreement, the ruling circles replied that they believed it was beyond the competence of the Knesset.

Israeli Cabinets make wide use of their right to issue emergency decrees. As the Israeli lawyer I. Dror noted, major importance is attached to the numerous government commissions, to which the Cabinet delegates wide powers and which operate as a central coordinating mechanism in the spheres of economic policy, legislation, etc.

Already under Ben-Gurion it became an established practice in Israel that the Prime Minister was the leading figure in state and socio-political life and wielded truly dictatorial powers in deciding a whole series of issues. Owing to his wide powers, to his position of leadership in the main party of the government coalition, and also to the support of international Zionism, of the United States and some other imperialist powers, the head of the Israeli Cabinet wields almost unlimited state and administrative power in Israel.

Actually the Israeli government is accountable to the Zionist and pro-Zionist monopolists. "Business talks" on this topic took place, for example, at several conferences of millionaires held in Jerusalem

¹ The agreement was signed in July 1952, but it was not until eight years later that it was published in the official newspaper *Reshumot*.

after Israel's 1967 aggression. In the summer of 1969 the then Prime Minister Golda Meir, Minister of Finance Ze'ev Sharef, Histadrut General Secretary Aharon Becker, Minister without Portfolio Pinhas Sapir (who is also General Secretary of MAI), and Minister of Defence Moshe Dayan reported back, in the true sense of the word, to the British multimillionaire Sir Marcus Sieff, the French Banker Baron Edmond de Rothschild, the president of a powerful American concern B. Carter, and to other magnates of finance capital. On behalf of the Israeli government "Socialist" Z. Sharef announced, among other things, that foreign investors who put their money into the "development" of the occupied Arab areas would be granted all privileges. The capitalists need supply only from 20 to 30 per cent of the total sum of investments, and the remainder is provided by the Israeli treasury; the government guarantees a ten-percent profit on capital invested from the very first year of commissioning the project.

The conference of Jewish millionaires from different countries who met in Jerusalem in April 1968 demanded that the government "keep the cooperative sector of the Israeli economy on a starvation ration." The social-Zionist Cabinet at once obediently declared its willingness to liquidate the state's share in a number of enterprises in order to give even greater encouragement to the investment of foreign private capital in the Israeli economy. The selling off to capitalists of government and Histadrut shares in various companies proceeded at top speed.

Israel's highly influential Judaic clergy not only participate very actively in propagating racist views and dogmas, but have also left the mark of religious obscurantism and anti-democratism on some branches of legislation, on legal procedure, and on the activities of the Knesset and of many state agencies.

All questions pertaining to the personal status of citizens have been brought within the jurisdiction of the rabbis. Only religious marriages are valid in the country. In addition to the economic and political inequality suffered by women in any bourgeois society, they are designated as second-rate human beings by the Halakah.¹ Thus, under Israeli law women cannot act as witnesses in lower courts; in the event of a divorce the Israeli woman loses the rights of motherhood in regard to her children when they reach six years of age; to obtain a divorce a woman must appeal to a rabbis' court requesting it to urge her husband to "turn her out of doors"; a married woman has a right to the property she owned before her marriage, but if the family breaks up all the property acquired during the years of married life goes to her husband. Even the wedding ceremony betrays the inequality of the sexes, the *Jerusalem Post* wrote on January 8, 1965; the woman is "bought" and the man proclaims her his wife; there is no return of affection.

A government commission set up in 1957 and headed by a MAPAI member of the Knesset, Ora Namir, pointed to conspicuous cases of inequality and discrimination against Israeli women. In its conclusions submitted to the government in 1978, the commission offered 241 recommendations aimed at eliminating inequality of the sexes in Israel. Most of these recommendations were rejected. "Sex equality in Israel is mostly a myth," the *Los Angeles Times* noted on April 13, 1978.

In conformity with the canons of the Talmud, many thousands of Israeli citizens are officially considered to be "inferior Jews" and are not allowed to

¹ Halakah—the normative section of the Talmud, the code of religious and domestic laws and of the legal rules of Judaism, compiled by rabbis in the period between the 5-2 centuries B.C.

marry "full-blooded Jews." By 1976 the Ministry of Religious Affairs, with the assistance of the Ministry of the Interior, had prepared 144 "black lists" containing the names of 10,000 Jews deprived of the right to marry. "Pity the Israeli Jew who discovers that his grandmother, great-grandmother or great-great-grandmother was not Jewish or was converted to Judaism by the wrong kind of rabbi," writes the American author Norman F. Dacey. "This break in the female line makes him officially non-Jewish, automatically nullifies his marriage in Israel, puts his children's names in the 'Black Book'..."¹

How reminiscent this is of the infamous Nuremberg laws of Hitler Germany!

In February 1970, in spite of protests from those with progressive views and sharp criticism on the part of some deputies, above all the Communists, the Knesset adopted a law according to which an Israeli citizen is considered to be of Jewish nationality on racial and clerical-religious grounds. The law, which is reminiscent of the Nazis' "racial passports" with their racist principle of "blood purity," stipulates that only a person who is born of a Jewish mother or who has been converted to Judaism can be considered a Jew. Hence Israeli legislation proclaims the racist principle of dividing citizens into those enjoying full rights and those not possessing full rights, into "pure" and "impure" Jews. "It is one of the bitterest ironies of fate," says Judge Haim Cohn of the Supreme Court of Israel, "that the same biological and racist approach which was propagated by the Nazis and characterized infamous Nuremberg laws should... become the basis for the official determination or rejection of Jewishness in the state of Israel."²

¹ Norman F. Dacey, *"Democracy" in Israel*, pp. 21-22.

² *The Times*, July 25, 1963.

Under MAPAI-led governments, up to one-third of instructional time in Israel's state schools went to the study of the Old Testament, the Talmud, and religious mythology and the teaching of so-called national consciousness (or "Jewish education") was introduced. The Begin government intensified the religious-chauvinist indoctrination of the younger generation.

One of the main factors that is constantly eroding the very foundations of bourgeois democracy in Israel is militarism, which is inherent in Zionist ideology and policies.

Already under Ben-Gurion the military elite (and the directors of secret services) began to play a major and ever increasing role in all spheres of life in Israeli society. It was those years that produced such bitter witticisms as "An Israeli is a soldier who has eleven months' furlough a year," or "What is more correct: Israel possesses an army, or Israel is possessed by an army?"¹

Since 1967, Israel has been, if not first, then one of the first countries in the world in terms of per capita military spending and in the number of servicemen for every 10,000 of the population. The *Likud* government pushed the country even further along the road of militarisation. By 1984, the per capita annual military spending exceeded 1,000 dollars, which is four times the amount in the NATO countries. In 1983, for every 10,000 Israelis there were 462 men in the army—a world record of a kind. "Israel's regular army today numbers 172,000 and the reserve corps exceeds 450,000 men. Consider also the following figures: 24 per cent of the country's able-bodied

¹ Answering, as it were, this question, Israeli journalist Amnon Kapeliuk entitled his article on the role and place of the armed forces in the country (published in April 1982 in *Le Monde diplomatique*): "Israel: A Country Possessed by an Army."

population (aged between 18 and 45) are in the army, 11 per cent are in the police force and in the intelligence service, and 15 per cent are employed in war industry enterprises. The French *Le Monde diplomatique* has noted that in Israel "the army's influence is decisive in the life of every individual as well as in the national economy."

Israel's army consumes 35 per cent of the gross national product, more than 50 per cent of the state budget,¹ half of all scientific research, and half of the country's imports. This is another "world record." Retired generals and top officers occupy many key posts in the government, in the state apparatus, in the leadership of Zionist parties, in observation councils, in the management of private, state-owned and "trade-union" firms, etc. Militarism, the cult of the army and violence pervade all areas of the Israeli state and society today.

The state terrorism practised by the Israeli Zionists and the "New Order" established by the Zionists in occupied Arab territories are akin to the "New Order" that the Nazis sought to impose on the peoples they had enslaved. The atrocities perpetrated by the Israeli military on Lebanese soil, or earlier in the Gaza Strip, for example, are comparable only to the atrocities committed by the Nazis in occupied territories.

In past years only the Communists used to warn against the growing threat of the increase in fascism in Israel; lately even some Zionist leaders have publicly spoken about this. For example, the former editor-in-chief of the Histadrut newspaper *Davar*, Iehuda Gotthelf, wrote in 1979: "The bacilli of

¹ Taking into account interest payments on foreign loans, the lion's share of which goes to military spending, the military expenditure in 1984 amounted to over 70 per cent of the state budget.

neofascism, or however we refer to it, exist in our country too." Former MAPAM leader Victor Shemtov had to admit in June 1980 that "conditions prevail in the state for the emergence of fascism."¹ A Knesset deputy from the same party, Chajke Grosman, said in turn that the Prime Minister and the *Likud* Ministers had started a "movement towards fascism." Even a *Likud* parliamentary deputy, Abraham Sharir, called for the strengthening of democratic institutions, among which he included the Knesset, the government, and political parties, otherwise "there will be a serious danger of a dictatorship being established in Israel."²

Critical voices, reflecting growing alarm in connection with the constant onslaught of fascist reaction in Israel, are increasingly heard abroad too, and they even come from prominent Jewish leaders. There were particularly many critical statements made during the 1982 war in Lebanon.

It is sufficient to cite the appraisal made by a person who has studied the Middle East problem for a number of years and has a comprehensive knowledge of it. In an interview with *The Guardian* on September 5, 1982, former Chairman of the Socialist Party of Austria and Head of the Austrian Government Bruno Kreisky, who is also one of the Vice Presidents of the Socialist International, emphasised: "The position of Palestinians in Israel is apartheid. They have nearly no rights, economically they are displaced, politically they are displaced, and they are dominated by the Israeli army. Now the Israelis are making war. ... They are not willing to sit down and negotiate with the Palestinians. This is fascist. I don't

¹ *Davar*, June 12, 1980.

² *Ma'ariv*, Tel Aviv, January 17, 1980.

hesitate to use this expression. This is the real fascism; ...”

Already in the mid-1920s a fascist wing was formed within the Zionist camp; this was the so-called Revisionist Party headed by Vladimir Jabotinsky. Today Israel has its own fascist party called *Techiya*, a pro-fascist party *Herut* and its youth organisation *Beitar*, the *Kach* group headed by the fascist rabbi Meir Kahane, the *Gush Emunim*—a religious-fascist organisation, the so-called Movement for Great Israel (which emerged on an inter-party basis), and many other ultra-Right-wing groups.

In the 1930s the leader of the pseudo-socialist wing inside the Zionist camp, D. Ben-Gurion, often discussed things with V. Jabotinsky and criticised the plans and methods the latter proposed. In those days MAPAI members often referred to the Revisionists as fascists. But when he came to power, Ben-Gurion implemented virtually the entire programme of the Revisionists. Members of the extremist Zionist terrorist organisations *Irgun Zvai Leumi* (ETZEL) and *Lohame Herut Israel* (LEHI), and of the Stern Gang were included in the personnel of the Israeli army and intelligence service. *Irgun's* leader from 1943, M. Begin, became Minister of the “government of national unity” before the 1967 war, and in 1977 headed the Israeli Cabinet. When in the summer of 1983 Begin resigned because of a nervous breakdown caused mainly by the complete failure of Israeli plans in Lebanon, he was succeeded by another professional ultra-Right terrorist—Yitzhak Shamir.

Shamir was the right-hand man of Abraham Stern, and in 1941 together with him signed a letter¹ sent to Nazi Germany's Embassy in Ankara. The letter said:

¹ The letter failed to be delivered because it was intercepted by British counter-intelligence.

“In reality, in our views, we are like you. There is no difference whatsoever. We identify ourselves with you. Therefore the question arises why we should not work together...”¹

In a letter to the Nazi naval attaché in Ankara (who was a resident spy of the Abwehr, the military intelligence branch of the high command of the German armed forces) dated January 11, 1941, the Stern Gang leaders proposed to enter into an alliance with the Nazis and expressed their complete agreement with Hitler's “New Order” in Europe. The letter, written with Shamir's help, said: “The establishment of a historic Jewish state on a national and totalitarian basis, which will enter into relations established by treaty with the German Reich, will in the future preserve and strengthen German positions in the Middle East.”²

We only have to add that the letter was prepared by the Stern Gang at a time when Hitler's Germany had already started the mass annihilation of the Jewish population.

Shamir was the head of LEHI when the members of that gang murdered Count Folke Bernadotte. During the investigation of the case a warrant was issued for the arrest of Shamir as the man responsible for the execution of terrorist acts by LEHI. But he quickly went into hiding and stayed there until 1949, when Ben-Gurion declared an amnesty for LEHI. In the period from 1955 to 1965 Shamir headed the European branch of Mossad and in 1977 became Chairman of the Knesset. During the Knesset's discussion of the Camp David agreements Shamir vehemently criticised them from ultra-Right positions and

¹ Quoted from: *Zo Haderekh*, September 14, 1983.

² *Bestand 47-59, Deutsche Botschaft Ankara, July 22, 1940-June 24, 1941, E. 234152 und 234155-58.*

abstained in the vote on them. But this did not prevent Begin from making him Minister of Foreign Affairs in 1979. In the "government of national unity" formed in 1984 this super-hawk has been holding the posts of Deputy Prime Minister and of Minister of Foreign Affairs, and is getting ready to change places with Shimon Peres and to head the Cabinet.

It would be a mistake, however, to equate Zionism with fascism. This would be wrong not only because among the rank-and-file members of many Zionist parties and organisations there are quite a few opponents of fascism, but also because a number of Zionist parties, despite their reactionary positions, cannot be classified as fascist.

Conclusion

The feverish attempts of the Zionists to bring together in the "land of the fathers" as many Jews as possible from various countries and to bring the Jewish population of the whole world under their influence are failing. The overwhelming majority of Jews have no intention of emigrating to Israel. What is more, according to various sources, from 1,500 to 2,000 Jews have been leaving Israel every month over the last few years. The number of emigrants has lately been equal to, or even greater than, the number of immigrants. One-third of those leaving are natives of Israel. Among them there are many young people who do not want to live in the "barracks state," to die or be crippled in the numerous wars being unleashed in the Middle East by the imperialists and Zionists.

The French researchers into Middle East problems, A. Gresh and D. Vidal, emphasise that this exodus "is a symbol of the crisis shaking the 'Jewish state' and, on a more general plane, Zionism."¹

¹ A. Gresh and D. Vidal, *Proche-Orient: une guerre de cent ans*, Messidor, Paris, 1984.

The Zionists alleged that with the establishment of a "Jewish state" the life of Jews in other capitalist countries would become easier, and that anti-Semitism would disappear. But the policy of Israel's ruling circles and of international Zionism towards the Palestinian and other Arab peoples (for example, the policy of "dual loyalty" propagated and practised by the Zionists) have led to the opposite results.

Despite the frenzied opposition of the Zionists, the natural process of the voluntary assimilation of Jews continues throughout the world. Thus, in capitalist countries where the Zionists and rabbis (with the virtual support of the anti-Semites) are doing their utmost to inculcate ideas of Zionism and national-cultural separatism in the mass of the Jewish population, mixed marriages amount to 45-50 per cent of the total. In the United States today more than half of the Jews who get married choose as their spouses persons of non-Jewish origin; in the Federal Republic of Germany the percentage of mixed marriages is reaching 60.

Another indicator of the crisis of Zionism is the fact that progressive and revolutionary ideas are spreading among the Jewish population in Western Europe and America, especially among the youth.

Criticism of the policy of Israel's ruling circles is increasingly heard today even in those political circles (for instance, in the Socialist International) and in those Western countries (for instance, in the EEC countries) that formerly gave full backing to Tel Aviv. World-wide condemnation of the Israeli government's course is acquiring more and more varied and severe forms.

The overwhelming majority of Jews in all countries reject Zionism, its dogmas and concepts, and especially its theses about a "world people" and "dual loyalty." Zionist ideology is being opposed not only

by Marxist-Jews, but (to a greater or lesser extent) also by many bourgeois scholars. A very typical example is provided by the reply of the Professor of Philosophy at the University of Paris, Jacqueline Hadamard, to the pro-Zionist multimillionaire Edmond de Rothschild, who appealed to French Jews during the 1967 war to pay a "tax" for Israel. She wrote: "No, I do not belong to the Jewish 'people'. Like most French Jews I belong to the French people, who gave the world the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen, freedom to the slaves, the status of citizen to Jews in 1791, and Zola's *I Accuse*." And she emphasised: "The pro-Semite, who considers himself to belong to a 'chosen people' is every bit as racist as the anti-Semite."¹ Despite the efforts of the Zionists and their allies, only 17 per cent of the French Jews responded positively to Rothschild's appeal and paid the "tax". In the United States only 20 per cent of the people of Jewish origin contribute money to the United Israel Appeal.² The picture is about the same in Jewish communities in other capitalist countries.

Working to promote peace and social progress and acting in the interests of working men in all countries, of all the world nations (including Israel) and of working Jews in all countries, Communists are firm and consistent in exposing the ideology and policy of Zionism. They strip away the false theoretical and propaganda disguises, and point, among other things, to the danger that the Zionists pose to the people of Israel and to the Jewish population of other countries. The struggle of the socialist states, of the international communist and national liberation movements against Zionism, against the aggressive

¹ *Le Monde*, July 9-10, 1967.

² United Israel Appeal—an organisation that collects funds for Israel.

policy of the ruling circles of Israel, and also against anti-Semitism, which has struck deep roots in many capitalist countries, constitutes an important component of the world-wide struggle waged by the progressive, democratic and socialist forces against imperialism and its allies.

Лионель Яковлевич Дадани
СИОНИЗМ УСТАМИ ЕГО ЛИДЕРОВ

на английском языке

Цена 25 коп.

The Novosti Press Agency (APN) is an information agency sponsored by Soviet public organizations. Its motto is "Information for Peace and International Friendship".

APN publishes illustrated periodicals, newspapers and weekly, fortnightly and monthly magazines in 46 foreign languages and circulates them in 130 countries.

APN publications provide information about Soviet home and foreign policy, about the life, problems and achievements of the peoples of the USSR in various spheres—the economy, science, culture, the arts, education and sport—as well as about their ties and cooperation with the peoples of the world.

Read and subscribe to Novosti Press Agency publications! You may take out subscriptions at APN offices and the press departments of Soviet embassies, as well as at firms and organizations in your country which distribute Soviet periodicals.

