

*part 1*

**THE STRUGGLE  
FOR  
POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE  
PEACE AND SECURITY**

## 1. WE HAVE REASON TO BE PROUD OF OUR PAST

All the time that we have been a movement with an ideological and political program we have linked peace and security together. In the Diaspora we were among the first to defend the Jewish masses just as in Israel we were always in the front rank of the defenders of the Jewish community. The first experiences of our movement were connected with heroic deeds and acts of sacrifice on behalf of the Jewish masses in the galut (exile) and the Jewish settlement that was taking shape in Israel. There is a direct connection between the defense of Jewish lives against rif-raf in Lvov in 1920, the fighting in the ghettos, the War of Liberation and the Six-Day War.

These facts do not contradict our constant aspiration toward peace with our neighbors. The example of "HaShomer" which strove toward peaceful and brotherly relations with the Arabs while providing excellent protection for the young Jewish community was always before our eyes. As long as we were a small minority in our country the majority of the Zionist movement was faithful to the vision of the brotherhood of peoples and equality. In the resolutions of the Zionist congresses of the 1920's and 1930's there is a demand for unrestricted immigration to Israel combined with a striving toward a regime of political equality between the two peoples irrespective of their numerical relationship.

In the 1920's and 1930's many efforts were made to reach an agreement with the Arab nationalist movement and leaders of the bourgeois parties such as Rutenberg, Ussishkin and Klvariski cooperated with this effort. The leaders of Mapai at that time played a major role in the attempts to reach an understanding. In this respect there was no basic difference in approach between the leaders of "Ahdut Ha'Avodah" ("The Unity of Labour") such as Berl Katznelson, Kaplanski, Ben Zvi and David Ben Gurion and the leaders of "Hapoel Hatzair" ("The Young Worker") such as Arlozorov. Jabotinsky's Revisionist Party - like its heirs in "Herut" ("Freedom") today - constituted the chauvinist, adventurist minority and held many inflammatory demonstrations but the vast majority of the Zionist Federation had strong reservations about this. When the Zionist Congress convened in

1933 the Revisionists demanded that it declare our aspiration to majority Jewish rule in Eretz-Yisrael (The Land of Israel). Since their request was denied, Jabotinsky and his comrades decided to walk out of the Congress and split the Zionist movement. The leaders of the Haganah - Eliahu Golomb, the representative of the Histadrut, and Sadiah Sushani, the representative of the general public - sent a telegram to the Congress in which they rejected the Revisionist demand root and branch and warned against its provocative character.

That year the security of the Jewish community was very precarious. We were between the hammer and the anvil - the hostility of the British administration on one hand and the implacable enmity of the Arab leadership on the other. But it wasn't only considerations of security that united the Zionist Congress against Jabotinsky and his followers. The general aspiration of the Zionist movement to link our security with a striving for peace between the Jewish people returning to its historic homeland and the Arab people which had been living in Israel for generations was equally important.

2. WITHOUT A TRUE KNOWLEDGE OF OUR PAST WE SHALL BE UNABLE TO DECIDE ON OUR FUTURE.

It is possible that there are members in our ranks who will be dissatisfied with the way in which I deal with contemporary problems - that is to say, with my way of seeing them comprehensively and in their historical perspective. In their opinion our independent mission has become a kind of burden that must be lightened considerably or slightly. But I believe that I express the sentiments of most of the movement in assuming that our present deeds are rooted in our past and serve as a point of departure to the future. In the opinion of members to whom the mission of our movement is dear, historical truth is important. And it is incontrovertable that the facts are constantly being falsified by the improvers on history starting with "Herut" and ending with authors who are members of Mapai. They endeavor unceasingly to obscure a number of their past mistakes and failures in order to attribute them to us. They have been especially fond of denying their spiritual offspring and laying them on the door step of our movement

and party. They distort history to induce forgetfulness of their previous positions and misrepresent ours. These writers have energetically devoted themselves to two special subjects: our relation to the Soviet Union and our relation to the Jewish state and bi-nationalism.

### 3. THE CUSTOM OF DISCRIMINATION

The same spirit of discrimination characterizes the campaign waged by certain circles against the concept of bi-nationalism of Hashomer Hatzair and Mapam. Heaven forbid, for example, that they should recall Ben Gurion's excellent and progressive book "We and Our Neighbors" in which he declares his faith in the common destiny of the Jewish and Arab peoples and the unbreakable bonds between them. Speaking of the future of the Jewish and Arab peoples in Israel, Ben Gurion declared: We'll rise together and we'll fall together.

To anyone who knows Ben Gurion today such proclamations will sound incredible. Nowadays it's impossible to find a trace of Ben Gurion's appearance before the British Royal Commission in 1936 headed by Lord Peel in the papers of Mapai or any other party. This occurred during a severe crisis between us and the Arab community in Israel. Today the leaders of Mapai are diligently trying to make us forget their support of bi-nationalism and make Hashomer Hatzair a kind of scape-goat. This perverted propaganda is distributed so assiduously that it has even begun to undermine the self-confidence of many of us.

Things came to such a pass that one of the editors of "Chotam" declared in the journal of youth Hashomer Hatzair and Mapam that we always failed and caused others to fail. But at the same time he hastens to promise us that he continues to be a member of Mapam and even an exemplary one. It seems that he and others like him who are anxious about our public image don't feel comfortable when they meet people and re-examine the history of Hashomer Hatzair and Mapam these days. Therefore, let it be said clearly: we don't have any reason to be ashamed of our heritage and we have every right to be proud that we "lagged behind" the leaders of Mapai by ten years

the country, the community and the state and must not fail. Before the establishment of the State of Israel we rejected personal acts of terrorism of dissident organizations and reacted violently against the dynamiting of the "King David Hotel" that took the lives of dozens of innocent people. We spurned "activist" projects and demanded that the armed struggle be connected with immigration and settlement goals and be free of all acts of personal terror. Nevertheless we assumed the full burden of discipline even for those projects which were not to our liking. We also acted in this way during the Sinai Campaign. As we know, Mapam had reservations about this war initiated by Israel and the fact that interests were joined to those of the British and French. But when the die was cast and we were faced with an accomplished fact - we continued to bear the responsibility demanded by a coalition government because we believed that Israel, even though mistaken as in this case, must not fail in her military confrontation with an enemy that plots her destruction.

##### 5. MAPAM SUPPORTED THE SIX DAY WAR WITH ALL ITS HEART

There has only been one military test since the establishment of the State of Israel with which we have not been in complete accord - the Sinai Campaign. Nevertheless, we participated in it in the name of national solidarity just as we accepted responsibility for the War of Liberation and the Six-Day War. These two wars differ basically from the Sinai Campaign in that they were forced upon us by the Arab states. What is unique about the Six Day War is the fact that we had never been so isolated in our struggle. In the War of Liberation inspite of the perfidiousness of Great Britain who hoped to profit from our defeat, the two great powers and all the other European countries including France supported us. The socialist countries not only mobilized political help for us but also gave us military aid and supplied man-power by opening wide the gates of immigration. On the eve of the Six Day War, however the only world power that apparently supported us did not fulfill her obligation to open the Straits of Tiran by force. In the hour of trial we remained alone against all the Arab armies. The Soviet Union - in contrast to her stand at the time of the War of Liberation - opposed us (almost) as a beligerent. France, to whom circles in Israel burned so much

22



incense that they raised her to the rank of an ally on whom we could rely in all circumstances, not only opposed us but has not desisted from her hostile attitude from the end of the fighting to the present day.

It can be said that the entire state - with the exception of the court Jews of the "New Communist List" - is united behind the justness of our struggle today. This war was forced upon us. The blockade of the Straits of Tiran was an act of aggression that necessarily led to large scale military action. This deeply engraven awareness that the danger of extinction threatens us in the form of Arab armies pouncing on us from all sides gave the Israeli army the crushing power and wonderful sense of self-preservation that assured us a victory the like of which has never been in the history of our people.

#### 6. EXCEPTIONS ON TWO "FRONTS"

On the eve of the Six Day War all the Israeli leaders proclaimed that we were not going to war to make conquests but to defend our independence and existence. When the fighting subsided the very same people declared that all we wanted was direct negotiations with the Arab states to fix boundaries that would guarantee permanent security and a stable peace. We vanquished our enemies, and the Jordan River, the Suez Canal and the Golan Heights serve as armistice lines. People drunk with victory whose presumption had driven them mad began to make themselves heard. They stated publicly that Israel shouldn't withdraw from a single foot of conquered territory. For them the territory on this side of the cease fire lines has long since ceased to be "occupied" territory and has become "liberated" territory and "patrimony". Whereas the adventuristic Revisionist stand was isolated and opposed by the whole Zionist movement in 1933, today we are faced by a wide and varied front that causes much more concern. As we said, the conquerors of the "entire homeland" include our closest comrades in Achdut Avodah and even Moshe Shamir. After shattering the covenants of socialism, he is now breaking the tablets of law of the brotherhood of peoples.

Our convention is before us and there is nothing wrong with the freest internal argument. But argument is one thing and active participation in establishing fronts is another, especially when it contradicts the historic path and political decisions of our party.

On what have Moshe Shamir and his companions declared a holy war? They set out on a campaign of conquest which tries to destroy all hopes of negotiations for peace in this region from the outset. Such true-blue and famous settlers as Menachem Begin and Shmuel Tamir demand - together with Moshe Shamir and members of Achdut Avodah - the establishment of at least 100 settlements not only on the Golan Heights but also throughout the territory of the West Bank of the Jordan. It is their intention, therefore, to settle Jews in areas very densely populated by Arabs. Among the conquerors of the "entire homeland" are those who dream of mass Arab emigration beyond the cease fire lines in the hope that they will succeed in solving  $\frac{1}{2}$  or  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the problem in this way. But the truth is this: if the Israeli military government in the occupied territories isn't much worse than the government that ruled the Arab minority in Israel for the past twenty years, there isn't any reason why the number of Arab inhabitants living under Israeli rule today (approximately 1,300,000) shouldn't double in the next twenty years just as the number of Arab inhabitants of the state of Israel has doubled in the twenty years of her existence.

It appears, therefore, that our patriots are preparing a situation that will require the Jewish half of the State of Israel to dominate the Arab half. Of course, they pin their hopes on Jewish immigration that hesitates to appear but the most optimistic can't predict when hundreds of thousands of Jews from the Soviet Union will come to Israel or when the Jews of the United States will immigrate - even in tens of thousands. These days we are told that tens of thousands of Jews that recently fled from Lybia, Tunis, and Morrocco not only aren't coming to Israel but also refuse to do so and prefer to concentrate in immigrant camps in France and Italy. We must make an heroic effort and call upon all our potential strength in order to make a path for immigration. If things change and immigration begins there is more than enough room within the borders of Israel for a

population of three million, four million and more. Do all these saviors and redeemers go out on their campaigns of conquest to achieve nationalist goals that can be explained to our friends in the world? Will they accomplish anything except our isolation among the nations of the world with the paths of their biblical language?

And if all this isn't enough, we have been blessed not just by one but by two types of initiators of fronts that oppose our stated policy. I don't think that any party except Mapam would permit its members to join fronts and slogans that contradict its decisions and its program. But we have a number of important members who seek to rally around them a group of fighters for the State of Palestine. It seems that two states - a Jewish State and an Arab State - in all of Eretz Yisrael aren't enough for them. Their activity is designed to give us the benefit of another Arab State so that three states will be crowded into the same area. These comrades promise us that the proposed state will be tied to Israel by a peace treaty but they don't explain how it is possible to prevent this state from joining the United Nations, belonging to the Afro-Asiatic bloc, becoming a member of the Arab League, submitting to the dictates of Nasser and finally developing an irredentist movement within the boundaries of Israel and demanding the restoration of the partition boundaries of 1947. These members don't explain to us how they will prevent the new state from electing nationalist leaders like the Mufti with the support of an organization like "El Ard" or even "The New Communist List". We see, therefore, that the same danger that once threatened us from the west, that is to say from the Gaza Strip, will, in the future, also threaten us from the east.

#### I. ON THE ORIENTATION OF THE STUDENTS OF JABOTINSKY

I'll expound a little on the orientation of our party toward the outside world. It is natural for a small embattled country to seek a foothold in its orientation to foreign powers. There isn't any world power that some party or other in Israel hasn't pinned its hopes on. Hopes were placed not only on the United States but also on England, France and the Soviet Union. It is also possible to cite other quite amazing



orientations.

At the beginning of the Second World War a few years after "Crystal Night" following the enactment of the Nuremberg Laws and the extermination of Jews in concentration camps one of the illegal organizations of Etzel orientated itself toward the Italian Fascists and some Etzel groups didn't even recoil from placing their hope in the Nazis.

As far as these students of Jabotinsky are concerned it is possible to argue that the entire movement wasn't responsible for every single group. But it is a fact that that entire camp was always eager to hire itself out to some foreign country as mercenaries. They offered themselves to the British Empire in exchange for Israeli inclusion it it as the "Seventh Dominion". Finally they wandered around in our midst as the allies of Jaque Soustelle and the Generals who attempted to crush the rebellion in Algeria. Until recently they prided themselves on being the authors of the eternal alliance with France and especially with the France of De Gaulle. But in this orientation they were not alone.

#### 8. ON THE ORIENTATION OF DAVID BEN GURION AND HIS STUDENTS

The students of David Ben Gurion in Rafi are a special case. They weren't satisfied with just an orientation toward De Gaulle's France and they sought an address for themselves for a "rainy day" - strangely enough - in the form of Western Germany. But as far as the orientation of their teacher is concerned it is best to begin at the time he made an about face from bi-nationalism and an aspiration toward the brotherhood of peoples to a partition policy under British guardianship and the establishment of the Jewish state in a tiny part of Eretz Yisrael. This isn't the only change in Ben Gurion's policy that we could mention.

In 1942 after the U.S. and Great Britain sealed up every crack to prevent Jewish immigration to Israel, David Ben Gurion held a party for functionaries and distinguished people at Hotel "Biltmore" in New York. On that occasion he promised himself and the assembled guests that after

the war Churchill and Roosevelt would grant us a Jewish state in all of Eretz Yisrael. Ben Gurion also day-dreamed that those two powers would mobilize "Liberty" ships when they became available, to transport a million Jews to Israel every year. In these declarations Ben Gurion did not rely on any promise, obligation or even hint on the part of these two western politicians. From the beginning to the end this program was only the product of Ben Gurion's wishful thinking. The tragic side of this program was the fact that Ben Gurion did not know that at the time - 1942 - the council - may it be remembered in eternal infamy - in which Hitler and his hangmen - Goering, Himler and Eichman - met and planned the "final solution" of those same millions of Jews who were prospective candidates for immigration to Israel after the war met near Berlin. When, reacting to the Biltmore program, I suggested a less ambitious program to the Zionist Executive Committee that called for the immigration of no less than a quarter of a million Jews every year (instead of the average of 60,000 that entered Israel since 1948). I was attacked as a "minimalist" by people like Berl Katznelson and even by the present Prime Minister.

In the meantime the butcher did his work and finally the Holocaust was revealed in all its horror. The Zionist executive lead by Dr. Chaim Weizman and David Ben Gurion required all the means at their disposal in order to break the British blockade of Israel at the end of the war. It then became apparent that Roosevelt, Churchill and their successors had no intention of carrying out the imaginative Biltmore program. They even refused to lighten the suffering of persecuted Jews. After Churchill left the political arena Atlee and Bevin played the leading roles in British politics. And it was they who sealed up all the approaches to Israel almost hermetically. In the face of the "White Paper" policy, the "Biltmore Program" was forgotten, the dreams of a Jewish state in all of Eretz Yisrael vanished and in their stead came programs of compromise and resignation. Although our movement opposed these plans, we understood the motives of Chaim Weizman and David Ben Gurion and what forced them to settle for such minimalist programs very well. The Morrison Program is that kind of a solution; it suggested the creation of a Jewish canton under British rule in the area of western Eretz Yisrael. This program had

followers even among the members of the executive of the Zionist Movement.

In 1946 while Ben Gurion was sojourning in Paris, Zionist notables and functionaries were called to discuss the Morrison plan. Zisling - on behalf of Achdut Avodah - and I went to Paris even though we weren't invited to participate in these consultations. It was known that we opposed the Morrison plan and for some reason Ben Gurion prevented our participation in the talks. To the present day I don't know exactly what Ben Gurion thought of the Morrison plan. It is known, however, that Ben Gurion made desperate efforts to convince Bevin but without success. Bevin, that villain, even vetoed the suggestion of the Zionist Executive to preserve the British Mandate in return for 100,000 immigration certificates.

But that isn't the end of the orientations of the former leaders of Mapai. In the same year, 1946, that is to say a year after the decision at Lake Success to establish a Jewish state in part of Palestine, David Ben Gurion made a speech in favour of Jewish rule in the western part of Eretz Yisrael. He also expressed a willingness to leave intact British rule in the Arab part of the country whose center would be Nablus - (Schem) which is to say, the same "patrimony" without which our life isn't worth living according to Moshe Shamir.

And now we pass on to a political project, perhaps one of the most important, that can be chalked up to the credit of David Ben Gurion. I am referring to the negotiations with the Soviet Ambassador in London, Maisky. In my opinion this is one of the decisive dates in the history of our political struggle for independence. If Ben Gurion had nothing else to his credit except this meeting and the agreement which resulted from it that would suffice for him to be considered one of the first fighters for our political independence. Of course it is possible to have reservations about his giving up - even temporarily - the right of Soviet Jews to return to Israel in exchange for Soviet support for the creation of a Jewish state in part of Eretz Yisrael. It can be assumed that in addition Ben Gurion accepted the obligation that Israel would pursue a neutralist foreign policy after the establishment of the state. All in all it can be

We have already shown that those who favoured an orientation toward De Gualle are faced with the bankruptcy of their policy. The same kind of one-sided orientation to a western country also characterized our reliance on France and England before the Sinai Campaign. This was soon replaced by an equally lopsided reliance on the U.S. accompanied by the aspiration to conclude a political and military pact with her. But to the displeasure of the formulators of Israeli policy, Eisenhower and Dulles didn't hasten to include us in the famous "Eisenhower Doctrine" which sought to form a military alliance between the U.S. and a number of Arab countries in our vicinity. The fact that the leaders of the U.S. wanted to exclude us from their considerations, is a slap in the face to our permanent critics that unceasingly declare that Israel is an "imperialist tool".

9. ON THE PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY IN THE POLITICAL PROGRAM OF OUR MOVEMENT

And here we have the confrontation of two opposites; in contrast to all the orientations that I have enumerated above, our movement has pursued a policy that has remained basically the same in the generation since the ratification of our first ideological program in 1927 even though we had to adapt it to a new situation when we had a chance to acquire independence - if only in part of Eretz Yisrael. How has this program worked out in practice?

A) At the time of the mandate we aspired to the concentration of a majority of the Jewish people in all of Eretz Yisrael living under a bi-national socialist regime. We demanded the right of unrestricted immigration and political independence but we always linked independence with political equality between the two peoples.

B) We supported the Zionist Executive's policy of cooperating with the government of the British mandate as long as it did not deny its obligations to us and did not jeopardize the goals of immigration, settlement and development of the country.

It can't be denied that during the term of office of the present Prime Minister a certain change in Israeli foreign policy occurred due to his sincere efforts and those of the Foreign Minister, Abba Eban, to seek paths to understanding with both the East and the West. As a result there was some improvement in our relations with the Soviet Union for awhile. Relations with the governments of the Eastern Bloc deteriorated until they reached their nadir in recent months but that shouldn't cause us to despair. We must look at our relations with this part of the world with an eye to the distant future and the knowledge that a narrow, winding path leads towards renewed cooperation with it. It has been our experience more than once or twice that when a favourable opportunity presents itself the British and French prefer the friendship of 80 million Arabs to friendship of 2½ million Jews living in Israel just as much. The cold and selfish calculations of President De Gaulle in the recent crisis aren't essentially different from the cold and selfish calculation of Eisenhower and Foster Dulles to by-pass Israel in their regional plans and alliances. Nor is it essentially different from the cynical big-power considerations of the leaders of the Soviet Union before, during and after the Six Day War.

#### 10. ON THE ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION IN THE SIX DAY WAR

We shall return to the subject of the conduct of the Soviet Union during the Six Day War in another chapter. The U.S.S.R.'s reservations about the plot of her proteges to annihilate us were only verbal. She encouraged the aggression of our neighbors with arms, propaganda and political support. No one has the right to ignore the role that Soviet arms have played in our region. In our ranks one solitary effort was made if not to justify at least to reveal understanding for the motives of the Soviet Union in her role as the almost sole supplier of arms to our Arab neighbors. In the past it was possible to argue that the Soviet Union supplied arms to Egypt as a counterweight to the establishment of the Bagdad Pact which was expressly directed against the Soviet Union. But these days the members of the Bagdad Pact compete with each other in acquiring the friendship of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union supplies arms to a few of them and especially to Iraq. The Soviet Union is protected from the side of Pakistan, Persia, and Turkey. Even when the point of



the Bagdad Pact was directed against the Soviet Union, the U.S.S.R. wasn't justified in arming Egypt and Syria to the hilt. These arms were never directed against American or British imperialism but were primarily directed against us. If the Soviet Union continues to supply arms worth billions of dollars to the neighboring Arab countries after the Bagdad Pact has fallen apart even though she knows full well that they can only be intended for use against us, it is only world power considerations and enthusiasm for conquering strategic positions in our area that determine her whole policy. In these selfish considerations the Soviet Union is no different than all other world powers that seek to achieve an advantage over their rivals. It can not be that the Soviet Union was unaware of the nature of activities such as the closing of the Straits of Tiran and the concentration of many armored divisions along all our borders when the Arabs tightened their strangle hold on us. The Soviet Union abandoned Israel to the intrigues of her satelites. This was was an anti-humanistic and anti-socialist policy. It is difficult to imagine that any one of us would be capable of defending this conduct in any way.

#### 11. THE FABLE ABOUT THE SECURITY DEFECT

It may be recalled that the Six Day War was preceeded by a two week waiting period that gave the American government time to end the quarrel by breaking the blocakade on the Straits of Tiran together with other naval powers who clearly expressed their opinion against the closing of the Straits. In the meantime the Arab states completed their military preparations. They imagined that we would reconcile ourselves to the strangling cord that they intended to tighten around our throats. It was clear to Mapam and all the other parties in the coalition government that the blockade of the Gulf of Akaba and the military siege along all our frontiers were acts of aggression and military provocation. We had no doubt that we must react to aggressive acts of this kind with the utmost vigour. There were evil minded people who spread vicious slanders to the effect that our Knesset members in the coalition cabinet refused to draw these necessary conclusions. The rumor mongers sought to attribute a host of evils or at least some security deficiency to us but their

plot failed miserably.

Fortunately, we found brothers in misery who shared this wilful vilification. All of us remember that Ben Gurion and his students in Rafi delighted in a military bungler and security risk before the war. They whispered that the Chief of Staff was sick, that the leadership of the army was perplexed and indecisive, and that only the appointment of David Ben Gurion to be Prime Minister and Moshe Dayan to be Minister of Security could save the situation. As we know the leaders of Mafdal (the National Religious Party) also lent their support to conniving by threatening to resign from the Eshkol government and join the right-wing, anti-worker opposition. This threat frightened the Secretariat of Mapai to such an extent that contrary to the position of the heads of the "Ma'arach" ("Alignment") it decided that Moshe Dayan should take Levi Eshkol's place as Minister of Security. At first the heads of "Ma'arach" wanted to offer this position to Yigal Alon but due to the joint pressure of the right and excited street elements, Moshe Dayan was appointed. We didn't see any reason or justification to separate the positions of Prime Minister and Minister of Defense. But I must point out by the way that after Mapai decided as she did, we didn't personally oppose the appointment of Moshe Dayan as Minister of Security.

I don't want to skip this matter because it has internal ramifications. Of all the parties in Israel the right regards Mapam as the biggest thorn in its side. It is no wonder, therefore, that we were the first target of their attacks. The rabble-rousing that they directed against us was so malicious and criminal that it succeeded in causing bewilderment and chagrin even in the hearts of some of our members. For a moment it seemed that the idea that the leadership of our movement showed poor judgement was even accepted by our members. In the meantime reality has managed to chastise those malignant rumors.

## 12. HOW WE STOOD THE TEST

Today the war is behind us and we can survey it from some

distance. Much as we may ponder about it, there is no doubt that what happened was almost a miracle. There have been heroic struggles in the history of our people. It can be said that the history of the Maccabean Wars repeated itself in the War of Liberation and that the Six Day War was the climax in the annals of the struggle of the Jewish people. In this was there wasn't any community that didn't contribute the best of its manpower, blood and strength. In this spirit of self sacrifice the integration of Diasporas in our state was demonstrated to a degree that we didn't dream of. After all that has been said above it would be superfluous to point out the part of our movement and party and the whole kibbutz movement in this heroic struggle that our people waged against its foes. It seems to me that we wouldn't be immodest if we said that there wasn't any group in Israel that revealed a greater spirit of sacrifice on all fronts than our sons and members from village and city. All this, of course, doesn't prevent the chauvinist right from directing its poisonous propaganda against us.

### 13. HOW TO ACHIEVE PEACE

Today we face a problem that is just as serious as heroic resistance to all the armies that threatened us. I mean the question of how to achieve peace. In the twenty years of our independence there have already been two additional military "rounds" and peace is still beyond our grasp. If it was difficult to forecast such a decisive military victory, our path to hoped for peace is even more uncertain. On the path to peace it is necessary to overcome not only external obstacles but also internal ones. First I'll deal with the former.

Mapam's program for peace and security after the Six Day War is based on a plan formulated in 1961. After the war we didn't want but which we were compelled to fight we had to insert changes in our original plan appropriated to the new circumstances. Our program is based on two fundamental assumptions:

- A) Tireless search for stable peace

B) Concern for boundaries that can guarantee the security of our country for a long time.

Our party's peace plan opposes the idea of the annexation of territories that belong to the neighboring countries along with their dense population. At the same time it demands boundaries that can be defended with greater security. We believe that this plan can serve as a basis for negotiations with our protagonists. We must know: from after the War of Liberation to the days before the Six Day War we favoured negotiations without prior conditions but the recent war that was forced upon us teaches that this time we must demand negotiations based on previous conditions. These conditions must include the minimum which we can not give up. This minimum doesn't mean dictating terms; it means emphasizing the necessity of determining boundaries that will guarantee our peaceful existence and future. The inclusion of those border changes in the present peace program of Mapam is, therefore, an inescapable necessity resulting from the new circumstances.

There are those who contend that there is no need to go into detail about the conditions or premises for negotiations. However, it seems to us that it is necessary to do so for the following reasons:

A) In order to show world opinion concretely, clearly and unmistakably why we can not return to the pre-war boundaries that permitted Syrian artillery to threaten our settlements from the Golan Heights and the Egyptian army to threaten us from the Gaza Strip, to show everyone why we can't permit the Jordanians to exploit the holiness of the ancient city of Jerusalem, to shell the new city or use cities like Kalkilia and Tulkarem to bombard Tel Aviv with long range cannons once again.

B) In order to indicate the imperative minimum required to guarantee the security of Israel, which can block the road before the chauvinist right whose conquistadorial propaganda, unfortunately, also has some influence in one party or another within the coalition. This

propaganda aids hostile propaganda in foreign countries that seeks to represent Israel as an aggressive country that went to war for expansionist reasons. The echoes that reach us from abroad confirm that the Israeli right thereby strengthens the main arguments voiced against us by both Arab and communist propaganda.

In general, Mapam's explanation coincides with that of the Foreign Minister, Abba Eban. Like him, we demand that:

A) The cease fire lines be exchanged by permanent, agreed-upon boundaries determined by negotiations for peace between Israel and her neighbors.

B) The State of Israel will help the representative of the United Nations, assuming that his main task is to bring the two sides together for the purpose of direct negotiations.

C) The armistice agreements of 1949 will only be supplanted by an agreement about a stable peace and no support should be given to temporary agreements of no war and no peace that exist to the present time.

D) Until such time the State of Israel will not retreat from the present cease-fire lines.

#### 14. WHAT ARE WE TO DO IN THE MEANTIME?

It is well argued that we can't simply wait - perhaps for a few years - until King Hussein agrees to negotiate with us either with or without Abdul Nasser's consent. Must we sit with our arms folded during all that time? Or would it be better to utilize it to lay the basis for peaceful coexistence among the population of the occupied territories? In the meantime we must strengthen the pro-peace elements of the population by deepening mutual understanding and confidence and weakening the influence of subversive and terroristic groups. The policy of our government in the occupied territories is being carried out in this spirit at



the present time and we must support it firmly. This policy strives to improve economic conditions and develop independent administrative institutions. In our opinion, no effort - or even partial effort - has been made as yet to solve the refugee problem. This is a mistake that must be corrected. Slightly more than 300,000 refugees remained within the boundaries of the State of Israel and the occupied territories. Part of them make their own living or are supported by relatives who emigrated to other Arab countries, and part of them are completely dependent on the food cards of United Nations' institutions. It is obvious, therefore, that this problem can be solved in the years ahead of us at least in part by absorbing the productive elements among the refugees into economic pursuits in the Gaza Strip, the West Bank of the Jordan, or the State of Israel. Even some progress towards solving this painful problem could deprive our critics of their most poisonous means of propaganda. To this should be added the necessity of completing legislation to guarantee true and complete equality to the Arab minority living in the State of Israel. If this will be our policy it can be hoped that the elements that aspire to peace and cooperation between the State of Jordan and the State of Israel will multiply and be strengthened in the areas subject to our rule. Thus a force will come into being that will serve as a bridge between us and our neighbors and bring the desired date of peace negotiations closer. It is self explanatory that we shall not be sorry if in the course of time the center of gravity shifts from the East Bank of the Jordan to the West Bank, the present rulers of Jordan do not play the main role, and the population of the occupied territories plays the dominant role in the striving for peace. Just as we recently changed details of our peace program formulated in 1961 in keeping with altered circumstances, it is also possible that we'll need to change details of our present plan for peace and security if conditions change.

#### 15. INTERNATIONAL MORALITY AND JUSTICE ARE INDIVISIBLE

Now, too, the Soviet Union demands that we evacuate the occupied territories unconditionally in spite of her vote in favour of the British resolution which was adopted unanimously. This Soviet demand doesn't in

the least take into consideration the fact that the decision of the Security Council combines Israeli withdrawal with the conclusion of a peace agreement between Israel and the Arab states. The Soviet demand means that the conqueror should surrender to the conquered. If we acceded to this demand we would return to the situation that existed before June 5, 1967. It is a fact that before that date Soviet propaganda demanded our withdrawal to the partition boundaries of 1947. Not long before the crisis leading up to the Six Day War the Russians began talking about the Straits of Tiran as "Egyptian territorial waters" in order to justify the closing of the Straits. They went so far as to define Eilat as a place held by Israel as booty from her aggression in 1948, that is to say, from that same War of Liberation in which the Soviet Union supported us wholeheartedly. De Gaulle began to cast doubt on our legitimate right of navigation in the Straits of Tiran. In as much as we did not submit to the dictation of Moscow nor to that of De Gaulle, the Soviet Union and France began a joint campaign against us. The Soviet Union began to compare us to the Nazis and De Gaulle made his infamous anti-Semitic speech.

We weren't the first small nation that Soviet policy horribly mistreated. There is another small nation in the Near East that hoped to enjoy the protection of the Soviet Union where its military leaders had been trained and educated. I mean - the Kurds. They, too, were abandoned to their oppressors and exterminators because of selfish and world-power considerations of the Soviet Union. The fact that the leader of the Kurdish rebellion had been a general in the Red Army wasn't enough to change the favorable attitude of the Soviet Union toward the slaughterers of his people.

We must declare unequivocally: by no means shall we reconcile ourselves to the desire to identify the selfish world power interests of the Soviet Union, which are often satisfied at the expense of small nations with the interests of Socialism in general. When the Soviet Union was attacked by the Nazis she knew how to draw the conclusions from that war that was forced upon her. She didn't demand of herself the withdrawal of Soviet troops to the boundaries existing before the outbreak of hostilities. Not only did she grant herself boundaries of victory but she even fixed

boundaries of that kind at the expense of her Socialist allies - to which Russian control of most of Romanian Moldavia attests. We had complete understanding for the cruel necessity of determining the Oder-Niesse as the final secure boundary between Germany and Poland even though this entailed the expulsion of millions of Germans as refugees to the other side of this border. But morality and justice are indivisible. We shall never agree that one measure of morality and justice be used for the interests of large nations and another be used for small nations like us.

We shall continue to stand upright and we shall know how to voice our grievances and demand justice wherever we meet the representatives of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. We must warn against their opportunistic policies that find a multitude of reasons to justify the Machiavellian policy that they pursue to satisfy their selfish needs at the expense of others.

But at the same time we wouldn't be just toward the Soviet Union and her allies if we found them guilty in all their international relations. We don't have the right to forget that the Soviet Union has made - and is making - supreme efforts to defend Cuba and to defend the Vietnamese people in their war against imperialism. At any rate we must repeat that in all that concerns our area the Soviet Union makes a travesty of elementary justice and those same socialist principles in whose name she appears in the international arena and the forum of the peace movement.

#### 16. ON THE CRISIS IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THE PEACE MOVEMENT AND US

In the world peace movement we supported the Soviet policy of peaceful co-existence and had reservations about the Chinese policy of marching to the threshold of war. To our sorrow the policy of China and the Soviet Union towards us is identical. There was a time when the delegations of the Soviet Union in peace movement conventions made efforts to bring about talks between Israel and the Arabs. At that time they sincerely endeavored to bring us together with the Arab

representatives for direct negotiations between Israel and her neighbors without any prior conditions and without any intermediaries. The United Israel Communist Party supported this stand and a public opinion poll then conducted throughout the country revealed mass identification with Mapam's approach. But since the Sinai Campaign the Soviet Union has helped those that sought to exploit this forum only for the aims of the Afro-Asiatic countries and finally as an efficient propaganda tool in the hands of Arab chauvinism.

Since we love peace, we shall be the last ones to give up our representation in any international forum willingly in which matters of peace - either of our region or of the entire world - are discussed. We must appear in every forum of this kind in order to prove the justness of our case and reveal the designs of those who would exploit the peace movement to besmirch us and bring the national and socialist liberation movement of the Jewish people into contempt. We must state that the incitement against Israel from the platforms of the world peace movement has taken fearful forms of late. We shall not be silent nor shall we rest until the peace movement once again fulfills its true fighting role for peaceful co-existence, national and social independence and liberation of all peoples without discrimination and without any distinction between large nations and small ones.

The question is asked: won't a way be found to settle the serious argument between the Soviet Union and us? In my opinion it would be a fatal mistake on our part to listen to counsels of despair and to decide that the situation is hopeless. In another part of this thesis I express satisfaction with the proclamation that our party published on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution while I was overseas. It was a pronouncement that didn't hesitate to find fault with all the contortions of the internal and external policy of the Soviet Union. But, on the other hand, we did not refrain from indicating the positive elements in the efforts of socialist construction. The present ebb tide in our relations with the Soviet Union is no proof that it is no longer possible for a change for the better to occur. We shall hope that this change - if and

when it comes - will not be just a tactic but will herald the recognition of the right of Israel to permanent peace and the right of the Jewish minority living in the Soviet Union to self determination and immigration to Israel, on the part of the U.S.S.R.

Everyone knows that before the Six Day War the Soviet Union permitted the unification of families which accounted for a considerable part of the thin trickle of immigration that reached us at that time. It is possible that we shall see another period of good will and sooner or later an improvement will occur in our relations. In this event, it will be the irony of fate if Mapam, of all parties, now joins the ranks of those who have given up hope. We must await the day when the communist camp becomes convinced that the State of Israel is a progressive and peaceful factor in the Near East and our aspiration to concentrate the majority of our people in its historic homeland does not conflict with the just interests of the Soviet Union and her allies in the Near East. Mapam must, therefore, diligently see to it that the windows to the socialist world remain open in the hope that though the desired change may tarry, it will certainly arrive.

If I am not mistaken it was Dr. Goldman who declared that the road to peace between the Arab states and Israel passes through Moscow. More carefully, but in the same spirit, Abba Eban requested the Soviet Union to bring the "spirit of Tashkent" to our region also. But those who declared that peace in this area depends first of all on Israel and her opponents and that it will be largely determined by an agreement between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. were closest to the truth. In any case every one agrees that our might and military victory do not in themselves guarantee the desired peace. For this, help is needed from without. In times of trouble we must rely first of all on ourselves and on the Jewish people wherever they may be but at the same time we mustn't forget that we live on the cross-roads of three continents and we are not a nation that can live in isolation. Although we rely first of all on ourselves and the Jewish people in the Galut (exile), we must not ignore the need to seek friendship and understanding among as many countries as possible and abstain from one-sided orientations that have often proven to be false



orientations in the past. This was demonstrated again when France placed an embargo on the shipment of arms to Israel. First of all we must continue to struggle for just a peace that will take the place of just wars - peace that can open a new page in the relations between Israel and the Arab states around her.

#### 17. IN CONCLUSION

A) If we compare the political policy that guided our movement from the ratification of the first ideological program of Kibbutz Artzi to the present with the various constantly changing orientations of other parties we shall have the right to conclude - and even with a little pride - that there is no other movement or party in Israel that has been as faithful to the principles of Zionism, Socialism, and the brotherhood of peoples. We aimed at the concentration of the majority of the Jewish people in its historic homeland and the restoration of the completeness of the country by means of peace and agreement when Kibbutz Artzi was founded, and we have the same goals today.

B) Without a true knowledge of our past which I surveyed retrospectively in this chapter, all attempts to determine our road to the future lack a third dimension.

C) The students of Jabotinsky and their supporters have been waging - and continue to wage - a rather vigorous campaign to blur the past of the "underground" movements, Etzel and Lechi, in order to give the credit for the independence of the State of Israel to terrorist activity. This is a campaign which is accompanied by the defamation of the Hagana in general and our movement in particular. We and our partners in Haganah have the sacred obligation of revealing the whole truth so that the public may know what role the Haganah and the Zionist workers' parties played in the defense of the Jewish community in Israel, the Ghetto fighting, the struggle against the "White Paper", the War of Liberation and the establishment of the State of Israel.

D) In spite of the drawn-out argument between our opponents and ourselves about the ways to insure a maximum of security while at the same time hastening the arrival of peace, our movement and party have always followed the policy of freedom of debate and the right of opposition while maintaining discipline and solidarity in carrying out decisions. Both in the Diaspora and in Israel - before as well as after the establishment of the State of Israel - we have always regarded ourselves as sitting in the same boat with all the other parts of our nation in everything concerning defense and security.

E) Mapam regards the Six Day War as a war that was forced upon us by our enemies. After our victory, too, we regard it as a defensive war waged not to make conquests but to defend our peace and security.

F) I suggest that our convention approve the manifesto of the Party Executive on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the October Revolution. This proclamation contained strong criticism of the anti-socialist and anti-humanitarian approach of the Soviet Union before, during and after the Six Day War which wholeheartedly supported the enemies who rose to destroy us. But the proclamation also points-up the constructive achievements in the socialist countries approvingly.

G) As part of the entire Jewish community which revealed an exemplary spirit of sacrifice during the Six Day War regardless of country of origin and community, our fighting sons stood the glorious test. It is our obligation to emphasize their wonderful record and the heroic struggle of the whole Israeli army and its leaders. The Israeli army's mighty victory can be attributed to its officers, the Commander in Chief, Yitzchak Rabin, and Levi Eshkol, the former Minister of Security, without ignoring the real merits of the present Minister of Security. We must bring this truth before the public in the face of the wave of vilification of the reactionaries who maliciously spread fables and fabrications about security deficiencies before, during and after the fighting. This smear campaign that attacked, among others, the Prime Minister and the General Staff, did not by-pass us. This

campaign failed completely. Now the campaign is being waged by an expansionist and chauvanistic movement which strives to achieve the unity of Eretz Yisrael by military might. Our party must continue to be vigilant in the presence of the expected dangers to worker-pioneer hegemony and hopes of peace from the side of reactionary elements.

H) Israel must be faithful to two principles: 1) In times of trial and distress we must rely first of all on ourselves and the Jewish people wherever they may be to fight the enemies that rise to destroy us. 2) In our striving toward a stable peace that will be based on agreement and the brotherhood of peoples, we must utilize every opportunity to win friendship and understanding in both the West and the East.

I) The forum of the world peace movement became a platform for unbridled incitement against our country and a tool in the hands of Arab chauvinism after the worsening of relations between Israel on the one hand and the Soviet Union and her allies on the other. The enmity of this movement toward Israel has now reached the point that in recent conventions the Israel Peace Committee wasn't even given the right to defend itself against its critics. Together with our partners in the Peace Committee our party must fight unflinchingly this digression of the peace movement from its true mission which finds expression in the struggle for peaceful co-existence and the support of wars of liberation of nations large and small. We shall not be silent nor shall we rest until this change occurs.

J) For the past twenty years we have favored the restoration of the completeness of Eretz Yisrael by means of an agreement with the Arab people. In the present circumstances we regard a federative agreement between the two governments that exist within all of Eretz Yisrael - that is to say between Israel and Jordan - as the way to realize the vision of the unity of Eretz Yisrael. We oppose the campaign of chauvinist elements drunk with victory who demand the exploitation of our victory for purposes of conquest and annexation of territories densely populated by Arabs. In this movement that seeks to add territories

with a population of more than a million Arabs to the State of Israel we see a danger to the sovereignty and national character of the State of Israel. This movement also augments the enmity around us and strengthens hostile propaganda in the international arena. On the other hand our party suggests a number of border changes that can serve as a guarantee of stable peace and security. Our peace plan which was approved by the institutions of the party will be brought to the convention for ratification. Until the hoped for peace arrives the government of Israel must encourage the peace-loving elements in the occupied territories by an economic, social and educational development policy, develop institutions of self government and make an effort to solve the refugee problem to some extent, abolish military rule and grant full equality to the Arab minority in the State of Israel. In this way a peace-loving force may appear in the occupied territories that will serve as a bridge to the hoped for peace with our neighbors.