



The Other Israel

Newsletter of the Israeli Council
for Israeli-Palestinian Peace

May 1984

No 8

Editor: Adam Keller

Editorial Board: Uri Avnery, Matti Peled, Yaakov Arnon, Haim Bar'am, Yael Lotan, Yossi Amitai

Introduction

The results of the vote in the Herut Party central council, * in which Ariel Sharon had challenged Itzhak Shamir's leadership, have sent shock waves throughout the Israeli political scene. Before the vote, Sharon was almost completely isolated in the government and the Herut leadership; he had to contend with Shamir's powerful faction, which includes Defense Minister Arens and Finance Minister Cohen-Orgad. David Levy, the deputy prime-minister, considered until then Shamir's main rival, had also agreed to support Shamir and refrain from challenging him (through, as it turned out, some of Levy's people voted for Sharon). Under these conditions, Shamir's supporters regarded the vote as a foregone victory, while the most optimistic in Sharon's camp hoped for thirty percent. In the actual vote, Sharon won no less than forty-two percent.

This outcome was not the result of intrigues and manipulations; it has a much deeper, a much more dangerous and sinister significance. It is a reflection of a mood at Herut's grassroots level, a mood reflected in that party's 1000-member central council.

For more than a year, since Sharon's removal from the defense ministry, Israel's leaders have been acting out an elaborate masquerade. While not changing, in any essential way, their annexationist policies, they have contrived to create a smiling, reasonable, "moderate" image. This policy, while greatly successful in reestablishing their position in American public opinion, and not without effect even on some weaker sections of the Israeli peace movement, had, to a growing degree, alienated them from their power base. Herut's basic creed is aggressive, chauvinist nationalism. Its members and supporters have been accustomed to having this served, undiluted, by a powerful demagogue, a "strong leader". The disappearance of Menachem Begin, Herut's Founding Father and its unquestioned leader for thirty-five years, had left a vacuum filled by neither Shamir, Arens, nor Levy. It

is this vacuum which Sharon is attempting to fill. His style is much cruder than Begin's; and while Begin had been sincerely concerned for the democratic rights of Jews, Sharon shares no such concern. That, however, may be exactly what his audience wants. In a recent opinion poll, conducted by the monthly *Monitin*, no less than thirty-two percent of the respondents favored replacing parliamentary democracy with "a strong leader." This is Sharon's natural constituency. Sharon has not yet won a decisive victory, but he clearly has a lot of power and those, in Israel and abroad, who regarded him as a "has been" have, undoubtedly, made a very serious miscalculation.

* * *

Ariel Sharon's growing power has also had a very significant effect on the other side of the political spectrum. Among supporters of the peace movement, Sharon's rise has greatly increased the "stampede syndrome" – that is, the tendency to vote for Labor instead of independent peace lists. This is understandable, though not justifiable: faced with the threat of Sharon, whose return to power literally means a mandate for new Sabras and Chatillas, all Labor's sins seem to pale in comparison. Nevertheless, this is a dangerous tendency. It is enough to mention that, because of a similar phenomenon in 1981, the Sheli Party lost its Knesset representation, and thus no non-Communist Knesset Member outrightly opposed the Lebanon War in its first, crucial, week.

At the time of writing the "Alternative" Party is conducting negotiations with various Arab groups to create a Jewish-Arab electoral list that will present an unequivocal alternative to Sharon's policies. It is not yet clear if these negotiations will prove fruitful.

* * *

When we began publishing *The Other Israel*, we intended to publish an 8-page issue monthly. Various difficulties have deflected us from this course in the past few issues. We hope we have now overcome them, at last, and have returned – as of this issue – to our regular monthly schedule.

The Editor

* The Herut Party is the dominant partner in the ruling Likud bloc, which also includes the so-called Liberal Party and several smaller right-wing splinter groups.



Chronicles of the Peace Struggle

This section chronicles the struggle for peace going on in Israel in all its forms: demonstrations,

The main Israeli peace organizations mentioned here:

○ Peace Now – Israel's largest protest movement, follows a moderate line and seeks to extend its influence into the political center.

○ CSBU/CAWL – The Committee for Solidarity with Bir-Zeit University / The Committee Against The War in Lebanon – a protest movement following a more radical line and ready to demonstrate even on very unpopular issues.

○ "Yesh Gvul" (there is a border / there is a limit)

– A group of reserve soldiers who refuse to serve in Lebanon.

○ "Parents Against Silence" – an organization of parents whose sons serve in Lebanon.

○ ICIPP – The Israeli Council for Israeli-Palestinian Peace – our own organization, which specializes in legitimizing contacts with the PLO.

○ "Campus" – a Jewish-Arab student movement.

○ Forum – an organization of lecturers at Tel-Aviv University.

○ The Abu Ali-Shahin Defense Committee – an ad-hoc organization formed to prevent the deportation of a moderate Palestinian leader. Unlike the other organizations mentioned, it is composed both of Israelis and of Palestinians from the occupied territories, the first such organization ever formed.

In previous chronicles we mentioned several demonstrations in protest of the mistreatment of Arab prisoners in Nve-Tirtza women's prison. We are glad to report that no further demonstrations were needed, since the prisoners won their demand that they not be forced to cook for their guards.

The present chronicle covers the months March and April, 1984.

■ 11 - 25/3 – "Forum" held a series of lectures at Tel-Aviv University to discuss racism in all its forms and manifestations. The lectures aroused much public interest because they pointed out the undeniable parallels between racism in Israel and that found in other countries.

■ 13/3 – At Tel-Aviv University, "Campus" members picketed to protest a lecture given by former chief-of-staff Rafael Eitan, known for his racist views.

– Workers of the Israeli Public Works Authority had, for the past month, refused to enter Lebanon, demanding that if caught in a guerrilla raid they (or their families) receive compensation equal to that of soldiers. On the 13th, they radicalized their position, declaring they would not enter Lebanon under any circumstances because they are afraid for their lives. Never before, during a war, did Israeli workers make such a bold public assertion. (See issue 6-7, Chronicles for February 5th.)

lawsuits, political art, etc. It includes the actions of both regular peace organizations and non-political individuals and groups, as well as some positions taken by members of the political and military establishment.

– Contrary to all expectations, the Knesset rejected a proposed bill to make "Ha'tikva" officially the Israeli National Anthem. "Ha'tikva" ("The Hope"), anthem of the Zionist movement, has never been officially declared the Israeli National Anthem, and is indeed unsuitable as an anthem representing the aspirations of all citizens of Israel, since it contains such lines as: "So long as a Jewish Soul lives within a Jewish Heart . . ." The Knesset's consideration toward Israel's Arab citizens, in rejecting this bill, came as a pleasant surprise, considering the Knesset majority's past record in similar cases. This can be seen as an indirect result of the Lebanon War and the upheavals caused by it in Israeli public opinion.

– A reserve lieutenant was jailed for 28 days for refusing to serve in Lebanon.

■ 14/3 – The formation of the Abu Ali-Shahin Defense Committee was announced at a press conference in Jerusalem.

■ 15/3 – Members of the Bir-Zeit student council visited Tel-Aviv University as the guests of "Campus."

■ 16 - 19/3 – A delegation of the Soviet Peace Committee visited Israel. At a meeting in Tel-Aviv, Matti Peled and Labor M. K. Ora Namir acted as hosts to the delegation, in return for being the Soviet committee's guests in Moscow several months ago. (See issue N° 2.)

It should be noted that, regardless of our attitude towards the Soviet Union's internal and external policies, it is a power which cannot be ignored in Middle Eastern politics. Therefore, it is part of the Israeli Peace Movement's task to push towards a more balanced Israeli attitude towards both superpowers, ending Israel's role as an American vassal and making her a neutralist state.

■ 17/3 – During the Purim holiday, when it is customary to wear masks and costumes, there were almost no soldier costumes to be seen on the streets – a great change from the years after 1967. A similar phenomenon was observed several months ago, at the Jewish New Year, in the themes of New Year greeting cards.

■ 20/3 – Two reserve soldiers were jailed for 28 days for refusing to serve in Lebanon. One of them, Dr. Evron Polakov, aroused special interest. A philosophy lecturer at Tel-Aviv and Beer-She'ba universities, he wrote an article in prison setting out a philosophical justification for refusing to serve in Lebanon, which was printed in the press and caused a fresh controversy.

■ 21/3 – Students and lecturers at Haifa University protested a decision by a university disciplinary court to suspend Amir Mahul, Chairman of the Arab Students' Committee, for a whole semester because of his part in a demonstration against Ariel Sharon on January 10th. Several days earlier, Mahul was arrested by the police and interrogated about his activity in the Communist Party, despite the fact that it is a perfectly legal



activity. In what seems, in contrast, a strangely lenient attitude, a Haifa court gave only suspended sentences to four racist students who in 1981 broke at night into the Haifa Technion student dormitories and attacked and injured several Arab students, including one girl.

■ 22/3 - Rami Giv'oni, a former extreme right-winger who turned into a pacifist because of his shocking experiences in the Lebanon War (See issue 6-7, Chronicles for February 15th), returned his military documents to the Defense Ministry, and was sentenced to 14 days imprisonment. The Giv'oni case aroused much public interest and controversy.

- Most members of a reserve paratrooper company demonstrated at the Defense Ministry in Tel-Aviv upon their discharge from Lebanon, protesting the uselessness of their service there.

■ 23/3 - Two groups of reserve soldiers and officers, one numbering 27 and the other 31, separately sent - without knowing of each other - letters to the Prime Minister calling for withdrawal from Lebanon. One group even contained a "Gush Emunim" member who, while continuing to support annexation of the West Bank, had learned by experience the futility of the Lebanon War.

- Hundreds participated in a meeting to protest the government's intention to deport Abu Ali-Shahin, a moderate Palestinian leader. The meeting took place near Dahania, in the Gaza Strip, where the army is holding Shahin incommunicado. (See the supplement to issue 6-7.)

■ 24/3 - Members of "Campus" eluded army roadblocks to reach Bir-Zeit University, where they participated in a day-long voluntary work-camp. This was intended as an act of solidarity with Bir-Zeit University, whose old campus was closed by the army.

■ 24 - 30/3 - Residents of Petah-Tikva demonstrated against the Communications Ministry, which kept them waiting many years for telephones, while it installed telephones in the West Bank settlements without delay. ("The Green Line," Israel's pre-67 border, is not very far from Petah-Tikva, and some of the lines in the city's telephone exchange were allocated to the settlements.)

■ 25/3 - A kibbutz was arrested by the police at an anti-war demonstration near the Prime Minister's office. The police claimed his use of a megaphone was disturbing the cabinet meeting, though many previous demonstrations used megaphones without interference from the police.

- Members of the UKM (United Kibbutz Movement) met with Hana Senora, editor-in-chief of the East Jerusalem Al-Fajr.

- Members of the Abu Ali-Shahin defense committee picketed the Defense Ministry in Tel-Aviv, protesting the plans to deport him.

■ 26/3 - The Supreme Court issued an interim injunction against deporting Abu Ali-Shahin, pending a final decision by a three-member bench.

■ 30/3 - In many Arab villages and towns, demonstrations took place to mark "Land Day," the 8th anniversary of the 1976 Arab general strike in which six Arab citizens of Israel were killed by the army. The largest demonstrations were organized

by the Communist Party and its allies. Uri Avnery and Matti Peled of the ICIPP participated in a meeting organized in Nazareth by the Progressive Movement, the main opposition faction in the municipal council.

- An article in Yediot Aharonot described sharp political arguments between Israeli soldiers serving in Lebanon, arguments that sometimes took place even immediately after they had come under fire.

■ 31/3 - At Kibbutz Ayelet Ha'shahar people from 18 places in the Galilee held a meeting, calling for withdrawal from Lebanon. Significantly, one of the speakers at the meeting was Labor M. K. Aharon Nahmias, the Mayor of Tzefat, who is not at all considered a "dove."

■ 1/4 - Michelle Ohayon, a young film director who, as a child, immigrated to Israel from Morocco, presented her movie, "Pressure." It concerns a love affair between a Jewish girl and an Arab, who is arrested on charges of planting a bomb in Jerusalem.

- Members of Kibbutz Ga'ash picketed the Prime Minister's office in Jerusalem, demanding withdrawal from Lebanon.

■ 4/4 - "Forum" held a meeting at Tel-Aviv University at which many lecturers expressed solidarity with their comrade Dr. Polakov, jailed for refusing to serve in Lebanon. (See March 20th.)

■ 5/4 - A kibbutz was jailed for 28 days for refusing to serve in Lebanon.

■ 6/4 - At the "Spring Song Festival" of the Tel-Aviv Boy Scouts, most of the songs written and presented contained anti-war themes. In the winning performance, the singers were dressed in black and were carried off the stage in coffins. It should be noted that the Israeli Boy Scouts are considered to be a non-political youth movement. Recently, hot political controversy entered their ranks because of the application of boys from "Alfey Menasheh," a West Bank settlement, to join the movement and establish a branch at their settlement. On May 29th, all Israeli Boy Scouts are to vote whether or not to accept the settlers.

■ 8/4 - Members of several kibbutzim demonstrated at the Prime Minister's office. Referring to the Passover holiday, they called: "We did not leave Egypt to enter Lebanon!"

■ 9/4 - The Campus-Labor coalition won a landslide victory in the Tel-Aviv Student Union elections. (See article on the universities.)

■ 11/4 - 4,000 people in Haifa signed a CAWL petition, calling for immediate withdrawal from Lebanon and negotiations with the PLO.

■ 12/4 - "Network," an umbrella organization under which 16 Jewish-Arab organizations are united, held a meeting at Tel-Aviv University to discuss ways of combatting racism and chauvinist propaganda in school education.

- Several members of Kibbutz Kerem Shalom were arrested at a Gaza Strip settlement for demonstrating against a seminar, held under the auspices of the extreme right-wing Minister of Science, Yu'val Ne'eman, which purported to give a scientific rationale for a new Israeli occupation of the Sinai Peninsula.

- Ran Cohen, Chairman of the Sheli Party, published an article accusing Ariel Sharon of being



personally and directly responsible for the death of 40 Israeli soldiers in Lebanon, in addition to his responsibility for the whole war.

— Four Palestinians hijacked an Israeli bus, beginning a long chain of events. (See separate article.)

■ 14/4 — In Haifa, members of the "Alternative" Party met with various Arab groups to discuss the possibility of forming a joint Jewish-Arab electoral list.

■ 15/4 — A soldier was jailed for 14 days for refusing to serve in Lebanon, four days after he was released from a previous prison term on the same charge.

■ 19/4 — The CAWL appealed to the Supreme Court and obtained an injunction against the Jerusalem municipality and police, which had tried to forbid it from holding a program of political theater in a Jerusalem garden. The CAWL had, however, to drop a bowling game in which the bowling pins bore pictures of government ministers, as the police and the municipality claimed this was an incitement to violence. This satirical show, entitled "War and Games," is intended to reach a public much wider than the usual participants of peace demonstrations.

— In Kibbutz She'faim, a meeting of Jewish and Arab teachers took place to discuss education in Israel. Dr. Sami Mar'ay, a well-known Arab educator, sharply criticized the educational system in the Arab schools. It is not yet clear if there is any connection between this and Dr. Mar'ay's arrest a few days later. (See April 25th.)

■ 24/4 — A "Peace Now" delegation visited Egypt and met with several senior officials and ministers.

■ 25/4 — Dr. Sami Mar'ay, an Arab lecturer at Haifa University and a well-known expert on education, was arrested late at night on charges of "meeting a foreign agent," a reference to a meeting he had with a Palestinian in Rome. Most of the investigation centered, however, on Dr. Mar'ay's political and cultural activities. Upon his response that these activities are legal, the investigators replied that security considerations sometimes overrule the law. The investigators also attempted to intimidate Dr. Mar'ay, one of them telling him: "I am a wolf and you are a sheep; I am going to eat you; the best thing you can do is commit suicide."

After one day, Dr. Mar'ay was released with the help of M. K. Shulamit Aloni, who intervened on his behalf. Hundreds of political and academic figures have strongly declared their support for Mar'ay and protested his arrest. On April 30th, he was interviewed on Israeli television and described his horrifying experience, shocking many viewers.

■ 27/4 — Many political and literary figures, including Matti Peled and M. K. Shulamit Aloni, participated in a meeting in honor of author Emil Habibi. Habibi, a member of the Communist Party, is considered one of the foremost living Palestinian writers and is famous throughout the Arab world. The occasion of the meeting was the translation into Hebrew of Habibi's book "The Opessimist" (that is, half optimist, half pessimist). This book, considered by critics to be a masterpiece, describes in a picaresque, tragicomic way the life of the Arabs in Israel from 1948 to the mid-seventies. Many critics compared the book's anti-hero to "The Good

Soldier Schweik"; others, to some of Sholem Aleichem's Russian Jews. In both cases, the comparison is to members of oppressed minorities who express bitter irony and self-mockery. This book's translation from Arabic to Hebrew, by the Arab poet Anton Shamas, is a major work in itself, due to the book's rich and difficult language.

■ 30/4 — Members of Kibbutz Kerem Shalom demonstrated to protest a meeting held near the Egyptian border by former North Sinai settlers, who commemorated their unsuccessful struggle against withdrawal from the Sinai, and some of whom expressed a desire for a new Israeli conquest there.

ICIPP activities

In April, ICIPP activities were concerned primarily with organizing the Issam Sartawi Memorial Meeting, held in Tel-Aviv on April 10th, the anniversary of his assassination. The meeting was organized under unfavorable political conditions, in the aftermath of the April 2nd attack by Palestinian fighters, in which an Israeli civilian was killed and 47 wounded in Jerusalem's main street. This attack was, of course, used by government spokespeople to depict all members of the PLO as terrorists and falsify the truth about their movement. In these conditions, every routine and technical step involved in organizing a political meeting became a small political struggle. It should be mentioned, for example, that the owners of several public halls in Tel-Aviv refused to let them for this meeting; the Israeli Radio, while agreeing to broadcast an invitation to the meeting, refused to add, after Sartawi's name, the words "may his memory be blessed," traditionally used in Hebrew when mentioning the dead; Gershom Schocken, editor-in-chief of the liberal Ha'aretz, forbade the publication of the ICIPP emblem, consisting of the crossed flags of Israel and Palestine; and a new copy of the emblem had to be made, because the police had confiscated and destroyed the one used in last year's meeting.

Despite all these obstacles, the meeting was very successful. The chief event was the awarding of the Sartawi Literary Prize to two authors, the Israeli Amos Kenan of Tel-Aviv and the Palestinian Raja Shihadeh of Ramallah.

Shihadeh received the prize for his book *The Third Road* which describes his life as a Palestinian under occupation and as a lawyer representing landowners whose lands are confiscated for Israeli settlements. The "Third Road" of the title is the road of neither fleeing nor fighting, but of "Sumud", an Arab word that means staying closely attached to the land and refusing to leave it for the life of a refugee. (The concept of "Sumud", a response to the trauma of 1948 and a determination that it will not

** In this respect, an improvement can be noted in comparison with 1978, when a meeting to commemorate Said Hammami had to be cancelled because no public hall was found willing to host it. How sad and ironic it is that advancement towards peace is measured in the blood of martyrs!*



be repeated, plays a major part in Palestinian consciousness.)

Kenan's book, *The Road to Ein-Harod*, takes place in a bleak future, after a brutal coup d'état in Israel. The two protagonists, an Israeli and a Palestinian, flee Tel-Aviv and set out on a dangerous journey to Ein-Harod, in the north of Israel, where resistance continues. Kenan had deliberately chosen Ein-Harod (Ein-Jalud in Arabic), a spot of deep historical significance for both Israelis and Palestinians. Ein-Harod is the fountain where the biblical judge Gideon tested the courage of his men, and in modern history it is one of the oldest and most important Kibbutzim, around which much of the Zionist pioneer myth centers. Ein-Jalud also represents one of the greatest military victories in Arab history, where a medieval Arab army defeated the Mongol hordes which threatened to overrun the Middle East, and the PLO has a regiment called "Ein-Jalud" which participated in the Lebanon War. As Kenan makes clear, Ein-Harod is for him a symbol of the future happy coexistence of both peoples.

After the awarding of the prizes, several speeches were delivered by Israelis and Palestinians (text following). A particularly moving moment was when Sartawi's voice filled the hall, recorded at a London meeting in which he participated jointly with Uri Avnery, a month before his assassination.

The last speaker was Othman Sartawi, a relative of Issam's, who invited the ICIPP to hold next year's meeting in Sarta – the West Bank village that is the original home of the Sartawi family.

Within the Israeli Television, a confrontation developed over the Sartawi Memorial Meeting between television reporters who wanted to cover it and the new director general of the Israeli Broadcasting Authority, Uri Porat. Porat, a well-known right-wing journalist, had been appointed by the government several days previously for the purpose of tightening its control over the electronic media. Finally a compromise was reached: Amos Kenan was interviewed on television, but the prize-awarding ceremony itself was not shown.

* * *

Our second project in memory of Sartawi, the monument to be erected at Acre – his birthplace – found a response exceeding all expectation. Already, 6,500 dollars out of the necessary 10,000 have been collected. Our readers are asked to continue sending contributions that will enable us to start preparations for erecting the monument soon.

* * *

Two weeks after the Sartawi Memorial Meeting, Dr. Sami Mar'ay of Haifa University, who had been one of the main speakers, was arrested in what seems an obvious case of political harassment. (See *Chronicles* for April 24th.)

The ICIPP joined the many personalities and organizations who condemned this act, and lawyer

Aharon Pinhasi, the ICIPP secretary, sent a letter to the attorney general, asking him to investigate the police's conduct towards Dr. Mar'ay.

The ICIPP was also involved in defending Abu Ali-Shahin, the moderate Palestinian leader whom the government intends to deport from the Gaza Strip. ICIPP members took part in the formation of the Shahin Defense Committee and in the protest actions it organized. (See supplement to issue 6-7.)

* * *

At the end of April, an ICIPP delegation consisting of Uri Avnery, Matti Peled and Ya'akov Arnon met in Europe with senior members of the PLO to exchange views about the situation on both sides. The Palestinian side is at present engaged in preparations for the Palestinian National Council (PNC), due to meet in the near future. At present, negotiations are taking place in Algiers between Abu-Jihad (Halil El-Wazir), Arafat's deputy, and representatives of George Habash's Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), Naif Hawatmeh's Democratic Front (DFLP) and the Palestinian Communist Party. But, whether or not these agree to attend the PNC meeting, it seems that Arafat is determined to break with the custom of reaching unanimous decisions, which in practice gave a veto power to the minority and prevented any real decisions from being reached. This time, Arafat means to use his two-thirds majority in the PNC to push through decisions enabling the PLO leadership to conduct a free and independent policy towards the Americans, the Jordanians and the Israelis. The delegates from the occupied territories, if allowed to attend the PNC, might greatly increase the votes in Arafat's favor. Unfortunately, the Israeli military authorities have in the past prevented them from attending, and are quite likely to do so again.

Another problem discussed was the forthcoming general elections in Israel. The PLO leadership shows keen interest in these elections, another indication of the long road they have travelled since they considered Israel a monolithic, hostile mass. They would like to see the formation of an electoral list uniting all the peace forces in Israel, including the Communist Party (Rakah) and capable of influencing the political center. These two aims are, however, contradictory to a great degree because of Rakah's unpopularity. If such a list is not formed, the PLO will welcome all lists which support the Palestinian right to self-determination.

Another point discussed was the recent attacks by Palestinians on Israeli civilians. The PLO senior officials who met with the ICIPP delegation completely denied that Arafat or any of his supporters had spoken in favor of these acts. Public confirmation of this was given a few days later by Arafat himself, when in two newspaper interviews, to the *London Observer* and the *Paris Nouvel Observateur*, he unequivocally condemned attacks on civilian targets, and also called for negotiations under U.N. auspices between the PLO and Israel, based on the principle of mutual recognition. Predictably, both the Israeli government and the Labor Party leadership rejected this proposal.



The following article is reprinted here from the English-Language edition of the East Jerusalem *Al-Fajr*.

A Palestinian Remembers Sartawi

The following is the text of a speech delivered by Dr. Sari Nusseibeh of Bir-Zeit University at the Issam Sartawi Memorial Meeting.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

This is a sad occasion indeed. We commemorate not only the fatal blow dealt to an honourable and patriotic man of peace. That, of itself is sad enough, to be sure.

But we also commemorate a sad, symbolic occasion. We commemorate the deep injury sustained by an oft-forgotten, feeble and discarded part of the overall history of confrontation between our peoples. I mean, the human factor, the brave endeavour to look beyond suffering, beyond the present grotesqueness of the human condition in the Palestinian-Israeli conflict — and to see, beyond all, this, a peaceful landscape of justice and human reconciliation.

It is sad that Sartawi died but it would be sadder to think that his struggle for peace was merely a struggle in a vacuum, in a phantom world, a pointless voyage through illusions, with windmills as foes and fools as friends.

But Sartawi's endeavours were not pointless, nor were they illusory. Whether he, or other people, knew it or not, his endeavours in fact fitted sanely and naturally in an on-going and inevitable process bringing together, welding, and binding, two peoples whose fates have become inevitably interlocked, for better or worse, and who are bound to end up accepting each other, as fellow citizens in one state, or as equals in neighbouring states, or whatever, jointly, in the land of their ancient forefathers, Jews and non-Jews, of Babylonian or Philistine descent, however genetically constituted, whether of the seed of Abraham, or of the Hebronite's Ephron the Hittite.

Sartawi's front line endeavours were natural, and rational, because they were merely anticipating the final stages of the long war of the modern Palestinians; it was a war that began years back, perhaps in 1917, with the Balfour Declaration. Since then, and for a period of over 65 years, the Palestinians had been engaging in their national struggle. They had fought

against their own backwardness, their own disorganisation, against their friends as well as against their enemies. They had built up their representative institutions, held their national congresses, starting with the first Palestinian congress held in March 1919 in Jerusalem; they had set up their own fighting forces, established their independent national personality in the world-wide map of politics; they had stood up to the fiercely advanced technologies of the Israeli armed forces, produced their own natural folklore, their novelists, poets and heroes; they had withstood the discrimination against them of their Arab brethren, clutched to their soil with their bare fists, exposed their innocent breasts to army bullets, suffered the torture and humiliation of Israeli and Arab jails and interrogation cells, travelled through the Arab world like fugitives, often slipping illegally through borders for want of respectable visas and passports; the Palestinians grovelled on their hands and knees, painfully inching their bloodied way across a thorny landscape of intrigues, failures, frustrations, sacrifices, misfortunes and massacres. The Palestinians fought and demonstrated, they sold their services, their brains, and their expertise. They sacrificed their lives and fell victims in Lisbon and in Nablus.

The long war of the Palestinians, Sartawi guessed, must be drawing to an end. The world at large had come to recognise the PLO and the national rights of the Palestinian people. It was now simply left to Israel to see eye to eye with the rest of the world, and to accept the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people, including their sovereign right to freedom and independence in their own state on their national soil. With this final stage in mind, Sartawi began to establish contacts with Israelis, to pave the way, through dialogue and direct human interaction, for the final day of peace and reconciliation.

The other side of the coin of sovereign statehood and independence for Palestinians is not only theoretical or eventual, but also functional and immediate acceptance of Israel and of Zionism. In its 16th session last year, the PNC accepted the Fez plan of partition in Palestine and welcomed the Brezhnev peace proposals which explicitly stipulate and endorse coexistence between Israel and an independent Palestinian state. The PNC's acceptance of these peace plans constitutes a conceptual leap in Palestinian national thinking; it is a brave and progressive crystallisation of ideas which began taking shape in 1974, when the PNC endorsed the transitional political programme, and it



shows clearly the PLO's readiness at its highest legislative level to come to terms with reality, but not at the expense of Palestinian national dignity.

However, the PNC committed a grave error when it failed to provide this brave conceptual leap with a functional handle. The PNC shied away from endorsing official PLO contacts with Zionists, even when it was obvious that the establishment of an independent Palestinian state alongside Israel requires the establishment of contact with the Zionist establishment in Israel. PLO official contact and dialogue with Zionists thus remained a taboo. Even Arafat's meetings with progressive Zionists was considered a transgression of PNC rules, and a sign of 'deviant' political behaviour.

Such were the obvious seeds of contradiction between theory and practice, the gap in the Palestinian position through which the bullet that killed Sartawi could pass. In the very same 16th session of the PNC, resolutions were passed confirming that the PLO is the sole interlocutor on behalf of the Palestinians, that no other party has the right to negotiate on their behalf. The indications were clear. The PLO wished itself to be party to any negotiations with Israel.

It did not wish Jordan to be an interlocutor on behalf of the PLO. And yet, while the PNC thus insisted on the very line that Sartawi followed, it shied away from legitimising the means to pursue this line, and legitimising his brave efforts. It is a dilemma between means and ends in modern Palestinian politics that proved fatal once, and that must be rectified.

But what happens next?

Much lies within Israel's reach. Especially

as the elections come to an end, Israel will have to go through a very difficult test, perhaps the most important historical test it has had to go through since its inception. It will have to decide whether to force its way mightily but blindly into an inevitably dark and risky future, or to take heed of the Arab reality within which it exists and, foremost, of the Palestinian national element in this reality, thus securing for itself, and the Palestinians, a stable and dignified existence. It will no longer do to pay lip-service to peace. It is past the time of political acrobatics, of maneuvers and of trial balloons. Mr. Peres's signals to Jordan, coupled with his stated rejection of the PLO as a partner in possible negotiations, do not contain a single grain of credibility. Mr. Peres can make peace with Jordan. But it is not against Jordan that Israel went to war in the Lebanon. It is not Jordanian nationalism that is held captive in the occupied territories. It is the Palestinians through their legitimate representative institutions, that are engaged in their long war of national liberation and independence, not Jordan. Mr. Peres knows this, along with millions of other people, in this region and abroad. If Israel does not wish merely to pay lip-service to peace, if it does not wish merely to prevaricate, but wishes to seek real peace, and justice, then let it extend a direct peace challenge to the PLO. Let Sartawi's endeavours, and friends, gain credibility and strength. Perhaps, with such a direct and clear peace challenge extended to the PLO, the PNC can, when it next meets in a month, as it is due to, reciprocate this peace challenge, thus proving that all the Palestinian and Israeli blood that has so far been spilled has not been spilled in vain.

Comment

Anti-Arab undergrounds uncovered

In the last few months, anti-Arab terrorist underground groups have been being regularly uncovered. The group most recently apprehended had intended to blow up six Arab buses on April 27th; had they succeeded, the number of casualties might have reached 300, by police estimates. This seems the most important group apprehended so far, in terms of its numbers, about 30, and its professionalism in planning and executing its terrorist activities, a professionalism strongly reminiscent of that displayed in the bombing attacks on three West Bank majors in 1980, and in the murder of three Arab students in the Hebron Islamic college, crimes apparently committed by the same group.

Perhaps the most telling aspect of this latest apprehension is the identity of those arrested; they include several reserve and regular army officers, at least one police major and some leaders of "Gush Emunim" and central figures in both the West Bank and the Golan Heights settlements. The settlers can thus no longer disclaim responsibility for this terrorist group, as they have done towards previous groups which were called "religious crackpots," "lunatics," etc. To a certain extent, the discovery of the new group compromises the government itself, which maintains a close partnership with the settlers. (When the list of those arrested was read at a cabinet meeting, several ministers found they knew most of the people on it very well, and at least one of those arrested is rumored to be a personal friend of Ariel Sharon.)

There can no longer be any doubt that there is a genuine, pronounced change in government policies regarding these underground groups. The earlier, almost open toleration of their terrorist activities (it is now, more than ever, clear that they



could have been apprehended much sooner) has turned into a confrontation. The pressures exerted by Israeli and world public opinion do not wholly account for this change, though they played a part in bringing it about. It seems the government realized, at long last, that the terrorists were getting out of hand and might endanger the government itself. Most probably, too, Shamir's replacement of Begin played an important part. Like Begin, Shamir was the leader of an anti-British underground organization; but unlike Begin, who remained in political opposition for thirty years, Shamir had entered the Israeli Intelligence Service in Ben-Gurion's time, becoming a senior operative, and apparently soaking up the outlook of an organization dedicated to preserving the government's security. Also, Begin felt a sentimental attachment to all extreme right-wing organizations, even when they flouted his authority, and regarded them as "prodigal sons"; Shamir is known, since his underground days, as an unsentimental and tough man. Finally, the Likud leaders might feel that the forthcoming elections will be decided by voters standing at the political center, between Likud and Labor, and that these may be favorably impressed by the anti-terrorist crackdown.

Whatever the government's motives, its new policies are a welcome change from previous ones. It must never be forgotten, however, that while Israeli occupation in the West Bank, Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and South Lebanon continues, many actions of the Israeli security apparatus constitute official, legal terrorism; anti-terrorist actions undertaken by this same apparatus can be considered, in effect, merely attempts to get rid of unofficial competition. Terrorism in all its forms cannot be uprooted as long as the system of occupation continues.

Postscript: as this article goes to print, Rabbi Moshe Levinger, leader of the Hebron settlers, has been arrested by the police, apparently by order of Prime-Minister Shamir personally. If followed through, this might be the heaviest blow the settlers have ever suffered. It is not clear, however, how far the government might go without undermining its own basic annexationist policies.

The bus hijacking affair – terrorism and censorship

By a queer coincidence, of a kind common in the Middle East, the night of April 12th. in which Ariel Sharon made his political comeback, was also the night an Israeli bus was hijacked by four Palestinians, who held its passengers hostage. Unlike previous such attacks, the attackers were poorly trained and armed, not even having any firearms. Apparently, though George Habash's Popular Front claimed responsibility for the attack, it was carried out by a group of Gaza Strip youths acting on their own initiative. Thus was exposed another paradox of the Lebanon War: Israel destroyed the centralized military structure which the PLO had, until June 1982, in South Lebanon, a structure which enabled

Yassir Arafat to impose his authority and effectively enforce the 1981 ceasefire; now, as a direct result of the war waged "to eradicate terrorism," Israel may face the emergence of isolated Palestinian groups, driven to terrorism by despair and uncontrolled by any central authority – a dismal prospect for Israelis and Palestinians alike.

The focus of public interest soon shifted to another issue, however – the fate of the hijackers. According to the first military communique, issued right after the bus was recaptured by Israeli soldiers, two hijackers were killed and two captured alive. A second communique, issued several hours later, claimed all four were killed. A third, issued after the discrepancy was noticed, claimed two hijackers "died on their way to the hospital." These contradictory communiqués were followed by statements by both Prime Minister Shamir and Defense Minister Arens that "no terrorist who attacks us can expect to come out alive." Photographs, taken by several news photographers, showed two hijackers being led, alive, away from the scene. All this evidence gave rise to a grave suspicion: that the two were executed without trial, a barbaric and illegal deed whether they are considered POW's or even common criminals, as is Israel's official position. It was also suspected that Defense Minister Arens, who had directed operations in person, may have himself given that illegal order. All public debate was stifled, however, by a heavy blanket of censorship. The focus of the affair thus shifted again, towards the question of censorship and freedom of the press in Israel.

To understand what happened next, a few words must be said about the unique Israeli system of censorship.

Israel has a particularly draconian, undemocratic censorship law, inherited from the British colonial regime. It gives the censor wide powers to forbid the publication, not only of military information, but of any material, including political views. It also gives the government the right to close a paper or its printing press without trial for printing uncensored material. The full force of this law is felt, however, only by the East Jerusalem Arab press. (See issue No 3). The Israeli press operates, since 1948, on the basis of an agreement with the government, according to which only material dealing with defense is submitted to censorship. Also, there exists an "Editors' Committee," in which the editors of daily newspapers (but not of weeklies), participate. This committee is briefed by the Prime Minister and other senior ministers, and given much information, plus an explanation of why the government wants it kept secret. In return, the editors act as self-censors and withhold publication of the information. The editors also undertake not to appeal to the Supreme Court against the censor.

Not surprisingly, the main fight in the bus hijacking affair was carried out by two papers who are not members of the Editors' Committee: *Ha'olam Hazeh*, which, as a weekly, is ineligible, and which is anyway opposed in principle to the system of self-censorship; and *Hadashot*, a new daily which is in fierce competition with the older, established papers which are trying to strangle it out



of existence. Both papers were forbidden by the censor to publish the pictures in their possession of bus hijackers being led away alive. In Ha'olam Hazeh's April 16th issue, almost a whole page was left blank, where these photos should have appeared. Under threat of appeal to the Supreme Court, however, the censor gave in and allowed the pictures' publication in the next issue. *Hadashot*, which had featured prominent accounts of the whole affair translated from the foreign press (particularly *The New York Times*), was not yet allowed to publish its picture and, strangely, did not appeal to the Supreme Court.

After the affair leaked out, Arens felt compelled to take at least a token step. He appointed an investigating commission, headed by Gen.(Res.) Meir Zorea. Zorea, although having a reputation for personal honesty and integrity, is also known for his extreme right-wing views. Also, a commission appointed by Arens is naturally unable to investigate the actions of Arens himself, which can be done only by a judicial commission of inquiry, such as the one which investigated Sabra and Chatilla. Perhaps realizing all this, Arens convened the Editors' Committee and asked it to withhold news about the appointment of the Zorea Commission, until its conclusions are submitted; to which the editors, most ignominiously, assented. The editor of *Hadashot*, however, decided to defy censorship, and published the formation of the Zorea Commission in his paper's headline. By order of the furious Arens, the censor ordered *Hadashot's* printing press closed for four days — the first time in almost twenty years such a penalty was imposed on a Hebrew-language paper. The Supreme Court also upheld, in this case, the penalty imposed by the censor. The court's arguments for its verdict have not yet been published, but it may have been influenced by the precedent of East Jerusalem Arab papers, several of which were closed by the censor without any protest from the Jewish press.

Astonishingly, after the closure of *Hadashot*, the other, more established, papers allowed their commercial and professional rivalry with *Hadashot* to blind them to the danger threatening freedom of the press in Israel. Not only did they not protest, but some of them even justified the censor's decision, claiming that *Hadashot* had "broken the rules of the game." ("The Game" being the system under which Israeli newspapers uphold censorship voluntarily, in return for being spared its harsher forms.)

Thus, the four Palestinians who hijacked the bus unintentionally exposed some of Israeli society's worst weaknesses: Principally, of course, the brutality and inhumanity of illegal executions (with which, it is to sad to say, many Israelis agreed wholeheartedly when hearing of them); the poltroonery and short-sightedness of many Israeli newspapers, including some that consider themselves liberal or left-wing. Large sections of the peace movement were also found wanting, in particular "Peace Now," which kept completely silent on the whole affair, its leaders probably afraid of being branded "defenders of terrorists." The action of Ha'olam Hazeh and *Hadashot*, as well as of others, such as a group of 24 law professors who demanded an impartial investigation, far from completely fill this void.

The crisis in Israel's economy

Today there is no disputing the fact that the economic situation in Israel is very grave. There is a general feeling that we are on the verge of a crisis; that there is danger of increased unemployment, together with a decline in the reserves of foreign exchange. The basic facts are generally known: the 1983 deficit of 5.1 billion dollars in our current balance of payment accounts, and an annual inflation rate (from December '82 to December '83) of more than 190 percent.

The main questions are: why are we in such a disastrous situation, and how do we achieve a change in the right direction?

The answer is that the state is trying to do too much at the same time. We have defense and foreign policies which force us to spend enormous amounts for defense, we wage a war in Lebanon and follow a very expensive settlement policy in the occupied territories. At the same time we are trying — officially — to maintain the principles of the welfare state and to protect the real value of wages, and all this without reducing the profits of the private sector. In addition, there has been no reduction of the subsidies to industry and agriculture for capital loaned to them, nor a reduction in subsidies to the consumers by increasing prices of subsidized consumer goods, and we seek to avoid an increase in taxes on income or expenditure.

There is no doubt in my mind that the government is responsible for this tragic situation. It has been unable or unwilling to fix an order of priorities according to which real resources are allocated for different purposes.

Israel as a state has been in the relatively favorable position of being able not only to dispose of its own Gross National Product (GNP) for its needs, but in addition to that of an increasing import surplus. The relevant figures show how dependent we have become on other economies (and governments).

In 1965 (before the Six Day War) a population of about 2.5 million produced a GNP (at 1983 prices) of about 10 billion dollars. 68 percent was spent on private consumption, 10.5 percent on public civilian consumption, 10.5 percent on defense, 30 percent on gross investment * . We spent about 1/6 more than we produced. The deficit in our balance of payment was 0.5 billion dollars, the total net national foreign debt was 1.7 billion dollars and the rate of inflation was 7.7 percent.

In 1972 a population of 3.2 million produced a GNP (at 1983 prices) of about 17.5 billion dollars, 57 percent was spent on private consumption, 11 percent on public civilian consumption, 21 percent on defense and 32 percent on gross investment. We

* For readers who are not economists: the numbers add up to more than a hundred percent, because the import surplus is added to the G.N.P. (ed).



spent about 1/5 more than we produced. The deficit in our balance of payment was 1.1 billion dollars, our total net national foreign debt was 4.3 billion dollars, and the rate of inflation 12.9 percent.

In 1983 a population of 4.1 million produced a GNP of about 24 billion dollars. 68 percent was spent on private consumption, 11 percent on public civilian consumption, about 23 percent on defense and 24 percent for gross investment. We spent about 1/4 more than we produced. The deficit of our balance of payment was 17 billion dollars and the rate of inflation was 145.7 percent (average prices of 1983 compared with those of 1982; inflation during 1983 reached 190.7 percent). *

How can this disastrous development be changed? To this question there is no purely economic answer, because the problem does not derive from purely economic causes. The solution of our economic problems lies in a radical change of our military, settlement and foreign policies. Only through an Israeli-Arab and Israel-Palestinian peace, brought about by negotiation with the PLO, and Israeli withdrawal to the 1967 borders, can our expenditure for defense, settlement policies and foreign policy be brought into a framework that will allow us to maintain the principles of our welfare state.

Dr. Ya'akov Arnon

Dr. Arnon, a member of the ICIPP Executive, is a former director-general of the Israeli finance ministry.

** In these figures, the cost of settlements is not included in the defense expenditure as it should have been. No exact figures are available regarding this expenditure, and it is carefully camouflaged among other budgets. (For example: schools in settlements - in the education ministry's budget; roads for settlements - in the transportation ministry's budget; etc.) The finance ministry has become quite adept at hiding settlement expenditure under the most unlikely and innocent-sounding entries. It is estimated that in 1983, about 600 million dollars were spent for that purpose.*

The Israeli Universities: An Arena of Struggle

The Israeli universities play a far more significant role in Jewish-Arab relations in Israel than the percentage of students in the general population would suggest. To understand why this is so, a few words should be said about the students' background.

The average Israeli Jewish student grows up in a purely Jewish environment. In a city like Tel-Aviv, for example, almost the only Arabs he (or she) sees

are considered socially inferior: the construction workers who build his home, the street cleaners, etc. All of them are "non-persons", noticed only in their absence, when garbage piles up in the city streets, on Muslim holidays. . . Then, there come three years of army service, where Arabs are either enemy soldiers, or a hostile occupied population harboring "terrorists".

It is at the age of twenty-one, a short time after discharge from the army, that the average Jewish student enters the university. There he (or she) meets - for the first time - educated Arabs, who consider themselves his equals, and do not hesitate to say so; who are, moreover, proud of their Arab and Palestinian identity.

The shock of these first meetings can lead the new student in one of two opposite directions. One is a growing hostility, leading to open racism. Israel's universities are constantly giving birth to racist groups and organizations, whose basic complaint is that "the Arabs are too arrogant" and similar arguments (including, sometimes, the well-known sexual innuendo about "the vile Arabs who are seducing Our Girls"). In many cases, such groups resort to violence in their efforts to "teach the Arabs their proper place".

Fortunately, there are Jewish students who take the opposite position, that of dialogue and cooperation with the Arabs. During the last ten years, a Jewish-Arab student movement was built up, in almost all the Israeli universities, known as "Campus" (in Hebrew, this word is formed by the initials of "Student Social and Political Involvement Group"). This movement was involved in many struggles, concerning both student and general politics. "Campus" activists have been and continue to be the backbone of many anti-war, anti-annexation organizations. But "Campus" is much more than a political movement - it is a social unit, greatly influencing the whole outlook of its members, making them feel that cooperation is natural while segregation is an aberration. During the Lebanon War "Campus" was put to a severe test, when many of its Jewish members were called up (at the beginning of the war, almost nobody refused to go - this started only later) while many of the Arab members were concerned about their relatives in the Lebanon refugee camps and among PLO fighters. "Campus" passed this test successfully, and the special relationship existing between its Jewish and Arab members was not disrupted.

Only a minority of the students adhere to either of the clear-cut alternatives: "Campus" or the various racist and extreme right-wing groups. The majority of the Israeli students are politically indifferent, materialist people, whose main concern is to get their degree as quickly as possible and get the best jobs they can. Both sides try - each in its own way - to increase the political consciousness of this majority and win it over. It is a long, hard, never-ending struggle taking many forms, from the most pacific to the most violent.

One of the arenas where this struggle is particularly fierce is the student unions. During the seventies, the right-wing ran the unions. In 1970, Likud-affiliated students won the student-union elections. Many analysts regard this as the harbinger



of the Likud victory in the 1977 general elections. Immediately after winning, the Likud students instituted a new, anti-democratic electoral system, which perpetuated their rule, using every possible dirty trick, from jerrymandering and the creation of "rotten boroughs" to simply turning off the lights and stuffing the ballots in the darkness. The student unions became stepping-stones in the career of young right-wing politicians (several Likud M.K.'s started their careers in this way). At the same time, the unions became the strongholds of annexationism and racism in the universities. The worst situation developed in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where the student union initiated countless acts of violence against Arab students and "Campus" members, as well as providing cadres for extreme right-wing activity outside the university, like "Gush-Emunim" actions in the occupied territories. The situation in Jerusalem wasn't helped by the existence of a strong Arab nationalist current among the Arab students, which regarded the Arab members of "Campus" as "too soft", and which made several provocative declarations that played straight into the right-wing's hands.

The university authorities played a most inglorious role at this stage. As right-wing violence spread from university to university, the university authorities responded by banning all political activity. Claiming "impartiality", the authorities refused to distinguish between peaceful demonstrators and the hooligans who attacked them using clubs and even knives. In Tel-Aviv University Mr. Aharon Shlush, an ex-policeman with no academic qualifications, was appointed as dean of students, and started his job by banning such activities as demonstrating, collecting signatures on petitions, or distributing leaflets. At about the same time, Beersheba University expelled many students who participated in peaceful demonstrations. Similar measures were taken in other universities, as well. The cowardly behavior of the university authorities can be partly explained by the fact that the Likud M.K.'s of student union origin formed a strong lobby, with a considerable influence on the allocation of funds to the universities.

To counter this double challenge, "Campus" sought allies. The fight for democratic freedom in the universities has been taken up by organizations of university teachers, who disagreed with the universities' official policy. (The same organizations also support the West Bank universities, when the military authorities curtail their academic freedom.) In the fight for the student unions, "Campus" formed an alliance with the Labor-affiliated students. This alliance is loose in Jerusalem, and more firm in Tel-Aviv University, where "doves" predominate among the Labor students.

For several years this alliance fought the elections, but was foiled each time by large-scale election fraud, carried out almost openly. Then, in 1980 and 1981 it organized successful boycotts of the union elections, and finally founded new, separate unions. Meanwhile, the old, right-wing unions started to disintegrate. Their leaders started using their power to make private, financial profits in various ways, like selling the concessions for



NO COPYRIGHT!

The Other Israel is not a commercial magazine, but a publication dedicated to the widest possible dissemination of the views contained in it. Therefore, we hereby freely waive our copyright, and invite our readers to copy and distribute *The Other Israel*, provided only that the copy is faithful to the original, and does not change or distort it in any way.

The Other Israel
P.O.B. 956
Tel-Aviv 61008
Israel

Please send a subscription to:

Name
Address
.

I enclose

- \$ 30 for 6 months
- \$ 50 for 1 year

I can't afford the above sums, therefore I send \$

Our account number is 527624, Bank Ha'poalim, Zion Circus Branch, Jerusalem .

Readers preferring to transfer money directly to our account are asked to inform our subscriptions section, at the above address.

* * *

Readers visting Israel and wishing to meet with ICIPP members are invited to call Adam Keller in Tel-Aviv, phone number (03) 227124 .

TO OUR READERS
Publishing "The Other Israel" means a constant struggle against rising prices, under one of the world's highest inflations rates.

To continue, we need your help! We are aware that our subscription rates are high, and are ready to make allowances for those who can't afford them.

We call upon all readers who have not yet subscribed to do so.

The Editor

ת.ד.א. 1001
PAR AVION



PRINTED MATTER
D 137 1757

The Sender

THE OTHER ISRAEL

P.O.B. 956

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL

61008

operating student cafeterias, bookstores, etc. A big internal fight developed between various factions for control of a travel agency, originally founded to provide low-cost tours to students, which turned into a big business run by the right-wing clique. Finally, the head of the Tel-Aviv student union was arrested by the police, and brought to trial on no less than thirteen separate charges of fraud and embezzlement.

All these events forced the university administrations to act. In Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem they finally dissolved the old unions and held new, university-supervised, elections, in which the "Campus" - Labor coalitions won big majorities. This victory can be partly attributed to the effects of the Lebanon War, the horrors of which changed the views of many student soldiers.

Postscript: This article was originally intended for publication in *The Other Israel* N^o 3, but its publication was delayed due to a lack of space.

In the last half year, the right-wing students, under a new leadership, have launched a counter-offensive. They managed to recapture the Haifa Student Union, by a narrow margin, but failed in Tel-Aviv University, Israel's largest. In the Tel-Aviv campaign, lavishly financed with government funds, they resorted to the most inflammatory forms of incitement, combining racist accusations against Arab students with charges of "treason" against students who refused to serve in Lebanon and those who wear the ICIPP emblem (see issue 6-7). They even went so far as to publish a "black list" of "known communists and PLO supporters."* There was also one case of physical violence, in which an anti-Likud student was assaulted and his nose broken. Despite (and perhaps also because of) all this, they lost heavily in the elections, and their representation shrank from 22 to 18 seats in the 67-member student union council, the majority 49 seats going to the Campus-Labor coalition. In Jerusalem University, the right-wing forces seem to have disintegrated, and they may not contest the elections at all.

The new student unions have already made some notable achievements in the field of Jewish-Arab relations. Arab members have been admitted to student union executive committees, and been treated with complete equality. Recognition was accorded the Arab Students' Committees, directly elected by the Arab students, which were previously boycotted and sometimes persecuted. Also, in the student unions' struggle against the government's intention to raise tuition fees, the new unions have rejected their right-wing predecessors' demand that the fees be lowered only for students who served in the army (thus discriminating against Arabs, who are not drafted). The new unions are demanding, instead, that students pay according to economic ability and not according to nationality or army record.

* The name of Adam Keller, the editor of this publication, who studies history at Tel-Aviv University, appeared on the "black list", along with those of most peace activists in the university. He considers this an honor, and would have been greatly insulted had his name been found not worthy of inclusion.