

WHO THREATENS ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE?

By Moshe Sneh

IN a recent note to the United States government, Israel protested against the rearming now going on in the Arab states. Egypt alone bought sufficient equipment for a fully armored division, 100 jet planes, 260 Sherman and ten Centurion tanks, quantities of heavy guns, pocket submarines and torpedo boats. And this rearming is going on in Iraq, Transjordan and other Arab countries as well.

The main supplier of arms is, of course, Great Britain, although small quantities are also sold by Belgium and Italy. But these countries are only the direct agents. The main source of these arms is the United States. The American secretary of state, Mr. Dean Acheson, said a number of times that in his opinion the continuation of these supplies to the Arab states is desirable and has his full support.

Moreover, Britain, which supplies arms to the Arab states, is herself at the receiving end from America. In the new agreement regarding arms supplies to the Atlantic Pact countries to the value of \$1,000,000, a special clause was inserted allowing Britain to supply arms to countries outside the Atlantic Pact in accordance with her previous treaty obligations. This same agreement forbade all other countries to send or sell arms to countries outside the Atlantic Pact. The interpretation of these clauses as far as the Middle East is concerned will certainly be that all Middle East countries, apart from Israel, will receive supplies.

Cairo radio has announced the Egyptian government's opposition to peace talks with Israel and the spokesman added in the name of "reliable Arab sources" that "the battles of the 'Second Round' with Israel will commence before the end of the year." Rearmament, accompanied by these threats, surely indicates a real danger. Yet we must not be satisfied by looking only at the surface, but should try to find out the sources of the danger.

Last week the United States government proposed to the Arab countries that they should conclude a Friendship Pact with her on the same terms as the recent agreement between the United States and the Lebanon. In his speech before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the American House of Representatives, Mr. McGhee, the assistant secretary of state, spoke with great frankness about his government's interest in the Middle East. He said: "The Middle East can be of vital importance to our national interest, both in peace and in war. In peacetime America is prepared to open commercial and cultural contacts in the area, but as far as the 'cold war' is concerned, the air lines passing through the area and the natural resources to be found there are of even greater importance."

These words of the State Department official directly

MOSHE SNEH is a former commander of the Haganah and at present a leader of the United Workers Party (Mapam).

responsible for Middle East affairs, show clearly what are the reasons for the proposed friendship treaties between America and the Arab countries, and what is the real background for the supply of arms to the Middle East. But in this area, an area which America wishes to transform into her strategic base, there exists the State of Israel. Washington would like to include Israel in this "sphere of interest" as well. This desire is the root of the Egyptian talk of the "Second Round." The arms arrive in the Middle East by way of Britain and the threats are conveyed to Israel through the medium of the Arab states—but the real source of both is in Washington.

Government circles in Israel have worked out a policy to break the encirclement of our state by means of a separate peace with Abdullah. The government has been making approaches in this direction for over a year now. The political commentator of *Haaretz* who, as a rule, is a reliable spokesman of the Kiryah, writes: "In political circles it is pointed out that Israel has failed in these negotiations. On the one hand, they spoiled her relations with the East, and on the other, nothing positive had been achieved, and relations with the United States, which desires the conclusion of a treaty, have also not improved."

The rearmament of the Middle East is directed against three factors: against the Soviet Union, against the progressive forces in the Arab countries and against Israel. Common sense requires that Israel, if she wishes to guard against the danger, should seek closer relations with the other two potentially attacked factors. Official Israel policy, however, is proceeding along diametrically opposed lines. It seeks security by making approaches to the source and the instrument of the danger, to Acheson and to Abdullah.

Program for Security

In the face of this threat we should seek our security by means of three fundamental principles. First, we must transform our whole people into a "fighting nation" and make the Israel Defense Army a real popular force, by organizing every settlement, suburb, factory and farm into defense units able to withstand the shock of attack.

Secondly, there must be a sharp turn in our foreign policy in order to lead us out of the one-way street leading only to London and Washington. We must seek to establish closer relations with the Soviet Union and the popular democracies and free ourselves from economic, political and military dependence on the United States. This is the way we succeeded during the Arab invasion, in spite of the

open enmity of Great Britain and the arms embargo of the United States. This is the only way we can withstand the pressure on our independence and remain faithful to our obligations in the cause of world peace.

Thirdly, we must find friends in the Arab states. These will not be found in the ranks of their ruling circles. A

progressive democratic regime in Israel, showing friendship and real equality to the Arabs and a preparedness to cooperate with the progressive democratic forces in the neighboring Arab states, will make a breach in the wall of enmity put up against us by the reactionary Arab governments; a breach destined to widen into the gates of peace.

LOCKOUT IN THE UPA

By Samuel Cohen

THE Social Service Employees Union (UOPWA) has represented the interests of workers in many Jewish agencies over a period of years. Because of the union's militancy in defending the rights of the workers and its opposition to the cold war, the union has become the target of the government, the press and the national CIO leadership. And as we pointed out in *JEWISH LIFE* last month in the article "Union-Busting in Jewish Agencies," the leadership of Jewish communal organizations have become full-fledged partners in the conspiracy to destroy the SSEU. Since that article was written, the attack has been stepped up. Not even those who suffer little from illusions, would have believed that the United Palestine Appeal heads would go so far as to *lock out* its 18 employees—all members of the SSEU.

What are the facts?

To date the management-organized CIO company union has failed miserably. It was unable to win majorities either at the New York City or the national office of the United Jewish Appeal, could not win a single member at the United Palestine Appeal and could not budge the majority of members at the Federation Employment Service. The CIO union could not do the job even with the active support of management. Management therefore proceeded to ignore its employees entirely.

As the prime target Henry Morgenthau Jr., UJA general chairman who is spearheading the attack, chose United Palestine Appeal, of which not a single employee is a member of the new CIO company union, the Community and Social Agency Employees' Union. Ellis Radinsky, executive director of the United Palestine Appeal, a constituent agency of the United Jewish Appeal, called the employees together on April 19 and threatened to fire any employee who participated in protest demonstrations against the UJA anti-labor policy. In the meantime, negotiations which had opened on a new contract bogged down. The following week Radinsky called the staff together once more and announced that the agency would no longer recognize the Social Service Employees' Union. "I will recognize any other union of the employees," he told the 100 per cent UOPWA staff. "Will you recognize the CIO company union?" one employee asked. Mr. Radinsky nodded assent.

The next day, the employees visited Radinsky in a body

and told him that they would not be deprived of their union representation. They asked for a meeting between the union and a special committee of the board of directors of the United Palestine Appeal. Radinsky refused and ordered the employees to return to their desks immediately or be fired. The employees refused to be frightened by such an ultimatum. Radinsky then summarily fired the entire staff!

The staff refused to leave the agency offices. The result was the first sit-in in the history of the UJA. After a series of provocations, including an attempt to lock out every employee who had left the offices for food, Radinsky and his cohorts wearily withdrew for the night. But Radinsky left two UPA "representatives"—two armed Pinkerton detectives whom he had hired, presumably to "guard the property."

It seems, however, that the Pinkerton agency, for reasons of its own, had no desire to be tossed into the middle of the agency's attempt to lock out its employees. When a union official protested to the Pinkerton agency, a Mr. Carroll of the Pinkerton Agency told the union: "Mr. Radinsky double-crossed us. He never told us that this was a lockout." The Pinkerton men were immediately withdrawn from the premises of the UPA. The next morning, April 27, the employees were barred from re-entering the agency, which they had left earlier that morning. The staff drew up a picket line at the UPA offices at 41 East 42nd Street and have maintained it ever since.

Unfair Labor Practices

At the national United Jewish Appeal office, Henry Montor, \$40,000 a year executive vice-chairman, who owes his position to the personal intervention of Morgenthau, carried out his superior's orders to the letter. He stalled on the signing of a fund raiser's contract for more than two months. Then on March 31, a majority of the employees stopped work to demonstrate their determination to win a new contract. Management's reply was in the form of a memorandum breaking off relations with UOPWA and recognizing the pitifully small minority CIO "union," which admittedly represented less than one fourth of the staff. This followed a severing of relations with UOPWA