

## OUR STRUGGLE FOR PEACE AND NEUTRALITY

The following premises can be derived from the resolutions of the Mapam Central Committee — June 23, 1960 — on the international situation and the problems of peace in the light of the failure of the Summit Conference:

- 1) Even before the U-2 incident, American foreign policy showed signs of drawing back from the spirit of Camp David. This was exemplified by the announcement on resumption of underground testing, a return to a tougher attitude on the Berlin and German questions, etc.
- 2) The spy plane and the global mobilization order of the U.S. Secretary of Defense which followed the incident, added fuel to the fire.
- 3) The fate of the Summit Conference was settled, actually, even before it met. There followed an atmosphere of tension and suspicion between the powers, a sharper Cold War.
- 4) Nevertheless, there remains one predominant factor which has acted for a lessening of tension during the past two years: humanity's determination to prevent a new cataclysm, which would carry with it both victors and vanquished.
- 5) The idea of peaceful co-existence between the rival systems, which has been promulgated by the socialist camp and partisans of peace in various countries, is gaining support in the capitalist world as well. At the same time, we must not overlook the fact that a discussion is taking place within the socialist camp as to which strategic and tactical

paths are most practicable for guaranteeing peaceful co-existence.

- 6) Mapam supports every outlook which regards the principle of peaceful co-existence as a means for solving disputed issues in a peaceable manner. We are deeply convinced that a way can still be found to convene a Summit Conference and other forms of contact for mutual understanding between nations.

★

Two years have passed since then, United States presidents have changed, but basically nothing has changed in the relations of the two blocs engaged in Cold War. Tension has continued, reaching a peak during the blockade on Cuba and the real danger which hovered over the world in the wake of that blockade. Undoubtedly, the removal from Cuba of missiles and even heavy bombers by the Soviets, was the major contribution to saving the peace.

From the close of the Summit Conference in Paris to the prevention of an invasion of Cuba brought about by the peace policy of Krushchev's Soviet Union, the socialist camp continued the debate cited in the above-mentioned resolutions of our Party on the tactics and strategy to be followed in order to maintain peace between the socialist and capitalist worlds. It is my impression that among us there is no difference of opinion regarding the debate between the Soviet Union and China, and that all of us back the peace policy of the Soviet Union. An important point has been verified in the process: Though the Soviet-Chinese debate has since grown sharper, it has brought out in sharp relief the sincerity of the desire for peace felt by the socialist bloc gathered around the Soviet Union. We are part of the World Peace Movement, in which the delegations of the socialist world play a central role.

As for the State of Israel: We believe that for the sake of her security and future, she must guard her neutrality and place herself outside the arena in which the two blocs grapple. There was a time when our country kept to a policy of non-alignment. In those days, David Ben-Gurion could declare that "Alignment with one of the blocs endangers the very existence of the State of Israel". But last year the Prime Minister tried to wipe out traces and correct history. In an address before the Knesset he said that I was the one who had opposed neutralism, and that I had demanded one-sided alignment with the Soviet Union. I took the trouble of publishing excerpts from my 1949 Knesset speeches so as to prove, irrefutably, the absurdity of the Mapai leader's claims. For, in those speeches, I hadn't budged an inch from a neutral policy, but had warned that the days of Mapai non-alignment were numbered, and that it would soon disown this policy. Indeed, that is what happened.

Even at that early date, it was Mapai's view that a policy of non-alignment with one of the blocs did not bind her to neutrality from an ideological point of view. This approach to non-alignment helped Mapai prepare the ground for an absolute attachment to the "free world". But, at the time, both our parties were convinced that were Israel to drop its line of non-alignment, her very existence would be endangered. And both parties understood that non-alignment did not mean ideological neutralism, though we understood the term differently. A number of years have passed, and those who now stand at the helm have changed from top to toe. They have come to realize that "neutralism is a conformist slogan" and that it is non-alignment with one of the blocs that may endanger the existence of the country.

What is the real truth? When our state, in the first years of its existence, followed a policy of non-alignment and dared refute the American directives, as in

the examples of our advance south of Beersheba and our opposition to internationalizing Jerusalem — we succeeded in strengthening the backbone of American Jewry and gaining its enthusiastic support. What years could compare to those of non-alignment and independence in terms of the readiness of American Jewry to volunteer, body and soul, in the service of Israel? We haven't heard that those Jews felt themselves bothered by "double loyalty". They supported us in a manner so forthright and unflinching as to seem today almost a legend.

In contradistinction: Since the outbreak of the Cold War, since the turnabout of our policy-makers on non-alignment, the Jews of America go out of their way to demonstrate their American patriotism. Even veteran Zionists declare preference for their bonds with America over those with Zion. Our Prime Minister helps them to the best of his ability by nurturing the concept of "Friends of Israel" divorced from Zionism. By denying the right to existence of the Zionist Organization in America and of the Zionists themselves, because they choose to remain in Diaspora, the Prime Minister brings a glow of pleasure to the faces of all assimilationists and adherents to "the Immortal Diaspora". It should come as no surprise, then, that the responsibility for the United Jewish Appeal and other forms of support for Israel have been placed in the hands of non-Zionists.

We had a taste of this sort of mix-up during the Soblen Affair. Our American notables began showering us with cables, begging us, for God's sake, not to damage the reputation of the all-powerful F.B.I. by keeping it from its prey. Thus, those who identify neutralism with pro-Communism, made haste to comply with the demand of the American intelligence service, handing Agent MacShane his victim.

That is unilateral dependence and its reward. Another U.S. election year has passed and the State De-

partment is back to its time-honored way of giving concessions to the Arab rulers at the expense of the State of Israel. This is especially apparent in the case of the Arab refugee problem. America's statesmen still expect us to support all sorts of doctrines and unidirectional obligations, while they themselves follow a freer course.

One couldn't say that this one-sided dependence on the United States gives our statesmen a feeling of security against some "rainy day" of ostracism and isolation. With disappointments following each other in swift succession, they furtively seek something to substitute for an ally. For a long time, such a substitute was found in an all-out orientation on DeGaulle's France. Mapam especially valued France's aid in bolstering our defenses. We were ready, therefore, whether in the government or without, to take a neutral stand in matters of controversy between France and ourselves. But our government went to an extreme; there was nothing our statesmen would not do for this unwritten pact: They were ready to back atomic tests in the Sahara Desert, to raise their hands in the U.N. against combatant Algeria, and to broadcast descriptions of the Algerian patriots as "terrorist gangs". But it was enough for DeGaulle to sign the Evian Agreements, and our statesmen began suddenly to wax enthusiastic over independent Algeria. They discarded the advice they gave DeGaulle in favor of partitioning Algeria, and so forth. But even this friendship may soon appear to be built on thin reeds. And our statesmen sense this. While this unflinching support begins to flag, we see the platform taken more and more often by the man who banks his policy on the latest address for arms procurement, the man who seeks a new foundation. There is nothing wrong in receiving aid from Germany. We have repeatedly declared that we are willing to receive aid for Israel's security from every source, as long as it is not connected with conditions which would

enslave us. But even if this help be given, it will be overshadowed by the shocking fact that this very same Germany is at the same time helping Egypt develop missiles directed against our security. We see any help from Germany as a continuation of the reparations due our people. But to extend this into an orientation on Germany against that distant "rainy day" is as far-fetched as East from West. This German people, with its one hand gives us reparations for the third of our people which it exterminated, while with the other hand it helps Nasser prepare missiles which endanger the survivors of the holocaust who have gathered in our land. Now is the time our statesmen have found fit to declare the appearance of "another Germany", which supposedly has overcome Nazism completely and has become as pure as the dew.

We do not wish to underestimate the effort of the past several years toward winning friends in Africa. The very fact of our having been, for centuries, a downtrodden people, makes it obligatory for us to forcefully oppose the policy of racial discrimination practiced in South Africa. We congratulate our government on the manner of its vote in the U.N. censuring this discrimination.

We also regard warmly the aid given to many African states. But despite the blessing bound up in the very nature of these acts, they cannot offset the great damage caused our country as a result of our unilateral dependence on the Western bloc.