

ARAB PALESTINIAN  
**RESISTANCE**

MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME II - 12a

OCTOBER 1970



12 a

# ARAB PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE

Vol. II - No. 12a

October 15, 1970

## CONTENTS

- Editorial ..... 4
- Political Scene ..... M. T. Bujairami 6
- Review of Events (Sept. 1970) ..... 12
- Gamal Abdul Nasser ..... 20
- International Opposition To Zionism .....  
..... George Jabbour 24
- The Fighters (short story) .....  
..... Walid Haj Abed 40
- Israel And Negotiations .....  
..... Ibrahim Al-Abid 44
- Misinforming World Public Opinion .....  
..... V. Pyatigorov 51
- The Case of the Palestinians .....  
..... Shawkat Uthmani 59
- Palestine Question in World Press ..... 71
- Documents (King-Crane Commission) .... 82
- Book Reviews ..... 89





The liberation of Palestine, the repelling of the Zionist-imperialist invasion of the Arab Homeland and the liquidation of the Zionist presence in Palestine, from an Arab viewpoint, is a national duty; its responsibilities fall upon the entire Arab Nation, governments and peoples, the Palestinian people being in the foreground.

Article 15 of the  
Palestine National Covenant

---

**Correspondence:**

The Editor,  
Resistance,  
P.O.B. 3577  
Damascus, Syria

**Price per copy**

---

Syrian piasters 100  
4/—  
\$ 0.50

---

Editor: **M. KHURI**

---

## Editorial

According to press reports, the United States has withdrawn from the Big Four talks on the Middle East. The excuse given for this withdrawal is Israel's allegation that the United Arab Republic has violated the cease-fire agreement.

Actually it was Israel that violated the cease-fire in the very first week by sending spy planes over the Suez Canal. On September 16, the New York Times reported that the United States had evidence that Israel had been violating the Middle East cease-fire by conducting reconnaissance flights over Egyptian territory and by strengthening her fortifications along the Suez Canal.

But the United States government is not disturbed over Israeli violations of the cease-fire. They are only disturbed over alleged Egyptian violations. This is not to be wondered at because, as the late President Nasser put it, «Every one knows America's attitude to the Palestine problem and America makes no attempt to conceal it. America declares this attitude every day and it only remains for them to say that they are one with Israel.»

Recently, the United States has agreed to supply Israel with Phantom planes, electronic equipment and air-to-ground missiles. Moreover, Israel has been promised 500 to 1000 million dollars for armed purchases and to prop its strained economy.

American aid encourages Israel to proceed with its aggressive and expansionist policy. More direct encouragement has been revealed in a statement made by President Nixon to a group of Chicago editors, at the height of the Jordanian crisis, in which he said that either Israel or the United States might have to intervene in Jordan on behalf of the Jordanian authorities.

Nixon's statement underlines the Zionist-imperialist identity of interests and attitudes as well as the Imperialist-Zionist-Arab reaction alliance — an alliance which is a natural outcome of prevailing conditions in the Middle East. To quote President Nasser again: «Imperialism supports and arms Israel. Imperialism supports and arms Arab reaction. And as imperialism is the source of the planning, the two sides that obtain its support cannot be in conflict with each other.»

*Resistance*

---

# POLITICAL SCENE

by M. T. Bujairami

What happened in Jordan last month (September 1970) was but one stage of the multilateral conspiracy against the Palestinian people, whose continued persistence remains one of the major obstacles that hinder America's plans for the Middle East.

From the very beginning of the events in Jordan, it was evident that a large scale genocide crime was being carried out by America's agents in Amman, intended to annihilate the Palestinians in less than three days, according to the calculations of the CIA. While whole blocks were being demolished in the Jordanian capital and hundreds of people were being killed indiscriminately, the West expressed its «grave concern» over the lives of the hijacked hostages and wanted to use their tragic situation as a convenient pretext for direct military intervention.

America was following these developments minute by minute. Her forces in the Mediterranean, Cyprus, Turkey, West Germany and other places were alerted and ready to be air-lifted across Israel to Jordan. Meanwhile, a swift Israeli build-up was observed in the West Bank and the occupied Golan

Heights. A vicious alliance was being formed, similar to the first European alliance against the French Revolution in its early days.

While the bloody battle was raging in various parts of Jordan, Nixon was touring the Mediterranean area to exert full military pressure on the Arabs; and a series of threats were issued by senior American, British and Israeli officials to the effect that intervention would be inevitable if the King Hussein's throne were to be in danger. This was reminiscent of Austria's threat to the French people on behalf of Louis XVI. Thus encouraged, the little 'Nero' proceeded to assert that his was the only power that should survive in the Jordanian-Palestinian entity, even if this were to lead to a brutal massacre and a bloody civil war

America made it crystal clear that Uncle Sam wanted «powerful» friends and allies in this sensitive part of the world; and the king wanted to prove to the White House that he was qualified to be regarded one of the «trustworthy» and «powerful» allies.

As usual, the king and his co-plotters miscalculated the power of the Arab masses. They wanted the battle to be of short duration and a decisive one; and, after a long series of carefully-planned preliminary measures, they thought it would prove easy to destroy the Palestinian resistance forces in less

than three days. The king's armoured forces surrounded Amman; and on September 16th, launched the attack with clear orders to «shoot on sight,» the aim being to exterminate the commandos and demolish their strongholds even in the densely populated quarters and the refugee camps. Through this fierce onslaught, they thought it would be easy to bring about a final rupture between the masses of the people and the freedom-fighters. But complete cooperation between the masses and the commandos exceeded every expectation and made possible to repel the king's forces time and again. The Palestinians were fighting for survival and were able to survive for two consecutive weeks. The king had to admit his failure and began to speak of misleading reports by his intelligence concerning the real power of the commandos.

Far from ending the Palestinian Revolution, the campaign of the Jordan authorities accelerated the achievement of full unity between the forces of resistance and the people — a unity baptized in blood. Scores of Jordanian officers and soldiers refused to become an instrument of blind murder and wanton destruction in the hands of the maniacs, who ran amok in the streets of Amman and other Jordanian cities.

Even now the situation in Jordan and the whole of the Middle East area, is far from being stable. After the sudden death of Nasser, America and her

allies were encouraged to resume plots aimed at liquidating every form of Arab defiance, struggle or rejection of American plans for the future of the Middle East.

Although Nixon cancelled the maneuvers of the Sixth Fleet, similar maneuvers were carried out in Turkey by American naval and air forces.

Although America claims to be working for peace in the Middle East, the American representative has been suddenly withdrawn from the four-power peace talks in New York. Moreover, although America claims to be «neutral» and «even-handed» in dealing with the Middle East situation, Nixon has ratified a law providing for the selling to Israel of large quantities of American arms and for supplying Israel with the money needed to pay for them and to help Israel's hard-pressed economy. And yet America says that it is Egypt, and only Egypt, which is responsible for the breach of the present «balance of power» because Egypt is accused of having moved defensive installations in the Canal Zone.

Both Israel and America have made a great fuss over the accusation. Moshe Dayan publicly declared that Israel would easily find a «military solution» for the problem; he also boasted that Israel was more powerful than the Arab states put together. And yet Nixon has claimed that the Arabs want to throw the Jews into the sea!

As for the Palestinians, America has not only

encouraged King Hussein to exterminate them, but has also given him the means of fulfilling this task; and although the American president has described the Palestinians as an «irresponsible force of sabotage» that should be treated accordingly because they threaten the U.S. «peace» initiative and America's interests in the East Mediterranean, yet Nixon is now ready to deal with them, to give them (and their Arab brethren) huge sums of money, in addition to the creation of «a Palestinian state» in the West Bank of Jordan. But it is implicitly understood that this state would be only a puppet of Israel and possessing no power at all. Its creation is also intended to promote Palestinian and inter-Arab conflicts. Obviously America wants simultaneously to make use of Palestinian hatred of the king, and to appear in the guise of the «kind friend» who offers a «suitable solution» for the Palestinian problem.

Meanwhile, Israel's integration into America's NATO strategy is becoming more and more active and complete as can be seen in what happened in the small West German town of Fitzenhaus, near the city of Castle. In this town and while the Jordan events were raging, NATO officers were seriously studying practical steps of a possible multilateral intervention in the deteriorating Middle East situation. In all the Fitzenhaus deliberations, Israel's army and navy were fully represented and fully

collaborating with NATO's generals and espionage experts, who consider the East Mediterranean as an area of special and vital importance.

America, Israel and the reactionary Arab forces are making no secret of the fact that they are co-ordinating their activities in a very close manner. They want to exploit the present crucial circumstances in the Arab Homeland, following the death of Nasser and the heavy blow which, they believe, has been dealt to the Palestinian resistance movement. They think that the course of events has been favouring them and want to utilize these events to serve their interests and plans. They seem to have forgotten that the wound, though severe, has only served to strengthen the Palestinian commandos and enhance the strength of the Arab masses that shield them. «Divide to Rule» is no more applicable in the Arab Homeland.

These are, in brief, the main features of America's relentless campaign of military and political pressure against the Arab countries at the present stage. It is all reminiscent of the policy adopted by the late John Foster Dulles in 1956-1958—a policy of directing threats in a tense atmosphere in order to intimidate the Arab people to succumb to Washington's pressure. But the Arab people will persist in their just struggle and will fight and repel all vicious attempts. Despite everything, the Palestinians shall win and shall survive! ■

# REVIEW OF EVENTS

(September 1970)

## Ten Tragic Days

Jordan, the Arab countries and the world, passed through ten tragic days, extending from Sept. 17 to 27. During those tragic days, the country was torn by savage war and bloody fighting, which cost thousands of lives, and caused massive destruction. Jordanian towns and villages in general and Amman in particular, were at the mercy of the Jordanian Army's artillery fire, directed against civilian targets and especially against the refugee camps of «Wehdat» and «Jebel El Hussein.» where more than half a million Palestinian refugees live.

## Review of Events

---

The massacre committed by the hireling Jordanian regime, against the masses of the people in Jordan and against the Palestinian commandos, represented a confrontation between the forces which believe that the liberation of Palestine can be secured only by armed struggle and those who do not want to take that course but prefer the path of talks, negotiations and dependence on international forces, in seeking a solution to the crisis in the Middle East.

## Rifai Government Dismissed

It was assumed, in accordance with the terms of the agreement signed by the Jordanian authorities and the Central Committee of the Palestine Resistance movement, that the Jordanian troops would be pulled out of Amman to the barracks and positions which they occupied before the eruption of fighting, and that Palestinian commandos would likewise be withdrawn to positions to be fixed later.

The agreement had been concluded in the presence of the 4-member Arab commission, formed to deal with the tragic events which had taken place in Jordan, between August 30 and Sept. 4, 1970.

But King Hussein and senior army officers,



## Resistance

such as Zeid Bin Shaker, and the Bedouin tribes, loyal to the Hashemite throne, forced the Rifai Government to resign.

On 15th Sept., everything indicated that the bloody confrontation was imminent and inevitable. The «Jeune Afrique» correspondent in Amman described the prevailing atmosphere at the time as explosive.

King Hussein, himself, told the «Le Figaro» correspondent that it was impossible for such a state of affairs to continue, that the army could no longer tolerate such a situation and that he himself had to choose between peace and war.

The King chose war. He adopted a series of measures by which he violated provisions of the agreement concluded between the representatives of the commandos and the Rifai Government. In particular he violated provisions relating to:

1. the withdrawal of Jordanian troops from Amman.
2. The sowing of hatred among the Jordanian armed forces against the commandos.
3. Commission of provocations against Palestinian personalities.

## Review of Events

4. Committing, or attempting the assassination of some commandos.
5. Dismissal of the Rifai government.

Immediately after the dismissal of Rifai, the Da'oud-Majalli military government was announced. The commandos and the masses of the people then became convinced, that the authorities were determined to carry out their evil plans.

Soon after, the authorities asked the commandos to surrender their arms. On the eve of Sept. 16-17, Amman was on the alert, awaiting the bloody onslaught of the hireling regime and the kings' Bedouin soldiers.

At dawn on 17th Sept., Jordanian artillery and tanks began shelling residential quarters and refugee camps. King Hussein's troops smashed into the city. Everything they saw moving on the streets drew a shattering blast of fire. At the sight of any movement in a building, the army blasted it away with all kinds of weapons. Mortars, 50-caliber machine-guns, armored cars, and heavy artillery were used. At the «Wehdat» Camp, houses crumpled and some went up in smoke; the wailing of women floated across the valley and were heard by foreign press correspondents trapped at the hilltop in the Intercontinental Hotel.

Even stout buildings were torn apart. Flimsier structures were just flattened. The fighting spread from street to street. It raged for ten days. Thousands lay dead or injured. Famine and water shortage did their worst. Much of Amman lay in ruins. Tens of thousands were homeless, hungry and thirsty. But despite the ferocious onslaught by the King's Bedouin soliers, using all types of weapons, from artillery to automatic rifles, the commandos held their ground. The army failed to achieve the blitzkrieg victory it planned to achieve.

Eric Rouleau, correspondent of the independent newspaper, «Le Monde», quoted the King as saying, that he had been misled by his Intelligence Services, who presented him with an embellished account of the situation, assuring him that he would suppress resistance easily. He hadn't thought the masses of the people would take up arms to defend themselves and the commandos. The people, however, were well aware, that the liquidation of Palestinian resistance would be no more than a preliminary step, intended to enable King Hussein's regime to bargain freely over the lawful rights of the people of Palestine.

### The Maxim Circle

For three successive days, bitter fighting raged

around the Maxim Circle in the Hussein mountain in Amman.

Foreign press correspondents, trapped in the Intercontinental Hotel have described the battles which raged around the Maxim Circle, as testifying to the courage and bravery displayed by the Palestinian Revolutionaries.

The commandos and the masses of the people had to defend themselves. Therefore, the extent of the fighting widened and the commandos were able to liberate the northern parts of Jordan and control its second largest city, Irbid, as well as the towns of Jerash, Salt and Zerka.

### The Palestine Liberation Army

Troops of the Palestine Liberation Army stationed in Syria moved into Jordan to prevent the authorities there from continuing their brutal butchery of the Palestinian people. King Hussein alleged that Syrian troops were invading Jordan. But well-informed circles realized that the king was in fact trying to find an excuse for the intervention of foreign troops on his behalf.

### Arab Mediation

At the outset of the fighting, Arab attitude was characterized by neutrality. Soon after that, Tunisia called for a summit meeting of Arab Kings and Presidents to be held in Cairo. It was attended by nine Arab states. A four-man delegation, headed by Sudanese President Jaafar El Numeiri, visited Amman twice. During the first visit, the delegation could not obtain a clear picture of the situation, because all it did was meet with King Hussein at his Al Hummar Palace which is 11 Kilometers outside Amman. During the second visit, the delegation had the opportunity to see battered Amman and the terrible destruction wrought by the troops of the hireling regime. They also met with Mr Yasser Arafat, Commander-in-Chief of the Palestinian Commando forces, and Chairman of the Central Committee of the Palestine Resistance Movement. Mr Arafat, later accompanied the delegation to Cairo, where an agreement between King Hussein and Palestinian commandos was concluded and signed in the presence of Arab kings and Presidents.

### What Next?

One may be prone to divide the blame equally between the two contending parties. But the world

has come to know who played the part of the ruthless butcher. Had the commandos wanted to rid themselves of King Hussein, this could have been done easily. The King himself had admitted to the correspondent of Le Monde, Eric Rouleau, that he had been shocked to discover that his own chauffeur, to whom he entrusted his children was a commando and that his own cook performed important duties in one of the Palestinian commando organizations.

The acts which were committed in Amman and other Jordanian towns and villages cannot be described as being simply brutal and criminal. They are more than that. What had really taken place in Jordan can only be understood in the context of the struggle that is going on between those forces believing in the Palestine cause and fighting for the liberation of Palestine and those who consider liberation injurious to their interests. ■

## GAMAL ABDUL NASSER

---

On September 28, Egypt and the Arab World lost a great and inspired leader. We give below selected statements made by the late President Nasser on various aspects of the Palestine issue and the Palestinian Revolution:

---

● We should never forget the struggle of the resistance movement of the valiant people of Palestine, who have been subjected to a most terrible persecution since 1948 when they were ousted from their homeland.

(May 2, 1969)

● As we speak about the Palestinian people's resistance, which has broken out everywhere in the territory the enemy occupied after June 1967, we must mention the resistance of the Palestine Arab people in valiant Gaza; these



people who refuse to surrender. We must also mention the Palestinian people's resistance in the West Bank and in Jerusalem, which the Israelis are seeking to turn into a Jewish city. We shall in no circumstances accept the fait accompli Israel is trying to impose in Jerusalem.

(March 27, 1969)

- There are two prerequisite conditions for a peace settlement in the Middle East, Israel's unconditional withdrawal from all Arab territories occupied in 1967, including Jerusalem, and the ensuring of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs.

(February 9, 1970)

- Palestinian resistance — and this is something which all should know and accept as a sure and definite thing, as an article of faith — has come to stay. It will continue its activity until the Palestine Arab Homeland is restored and is assured of playing its appropriate role in the all-embracing struggle of the Arab nation.

(November 6, 1969)

- No one can now suppress Palestinian resistance, let alone attempt to liquidate it. No one can now bring back the initial conception of the problem when it was misrepresented as one of the refugees, or a merely human problem.

Above all other things, the question is one of a homeland and a people.

(November 6, 1969)

- It is the right of the organizations of the Palestinian resistance to reject the peace initiative and the UN Security Council resolution on which it is based; for this resolution might be adequate to remove the consequences of the aggression committed in June 1967, but it might not be adequate for the demands of the Palestine revolution.

(January 20, 1970)

- Imperialism supports and arms Arab reaction; imperialism supports and arms Israel. And as imperialism is the sole source of the planning, the two sides that obtain its support and arms cannot possibly be in conflict with each other; they must be cooperating, though perhaps through a third party and this third party plans for both Israel and reaction.

(February 5, 1967)

- Everyone knows America's attitude to the Palestine problem; America makes no attempt to conceal it. America declares its attitude everyday. It only remains for them to say they are one with Israel. They have said everything short of that.

(February 22, 1967)

## **INTERNATIONAL OPPOSITION TO ZIONISM**

**by George Jabbour**

---

The following discussion of growing international opposition to Zionism and Israel especially as manifested in the two solidarity conferences with the Arab people held so far and in the more vigorous UN treatment of the question of Israeli violations of human rights, is based on a recent publication by the author entitled «Settler Colonialism in Southern Africa and the Middle East.» The publication is described by the author as an interpretative essay which attempts to present «a reasonably coherent interpretation of similarities among the settler regimes in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Israel.»

---

The Israeli June 1967 aggression against three Arab states highlighted and illustrated the fact that Israel is bent on aggression; and its refusal to withdraw from the territories occupied as a result of the aggression, highlighted and illustrated the fact that

Israel is also bent on expansion. Israeli treatment of the civilian population in the territories occupied as a result of the June aggression highlighted and illustrated the fact that the Israeli settler authorities are bent on denying these civilians their basic human rights. The Israeli aggression of June represents a setback for the Palestinians as well as for the Arabs, but on the other hand, it helped the world understand better the gravity of the threat to the security of the area, posed by the Zionist settlers.

On the non-governmental level a remarkable development prompted by the June aggression has been the convening of special conferences in support of the Arab peoples. The first such international conference in support of the Arab Peoples took place in New Delhi between 11 and 14 November 1967. Though it was hastily organized, delegates from some fifty countries took part in it. Krishna Menon and Romesh Chandra of India were among a number of internationally distinguished participants in the conference. Due to the general atmosphere of shock that had permeated the Arabs at their military setback in June, the conference was more concerned with the direct effects of the aggression, and with regard to this the resolution passed by the conference called for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops to the position prior to

## Resistance

June 5, 1967. But the resolution also noted the wider aspects of the problem. It noted, for instance, the Zionist urge for expansionism; it paid attention to the «settlement aspects» of Zionism when it mentioned critically that: «(An) Israeli call went out to millions of foreign settlers who are citizens of other countries and whose livelihood was not in danger to come and occupy lands taken by force from the Arabs.» The resolution also did not neglect to mention that «Israel must implement the UN resolutions including those concerning the return of Palestinian refugees to their homes.»

The second International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples was held in Cairo on the 25th of January 1969. The Cairo conference was more significant because of 3 factors:

1 — Israel's expansionism was further illustrated by its consistent refusal to withdraw from lands occupied as a result of the June aggression, despite the wording of the Security Council resolution of 22 November 1967.

2 — Armed Palestinian resistance which was re-activated starting from September 1967 was, in early 1969, a force of undisputed significance.

3 — The organizers of the conference had

## Opposition to Zionism

enough time to prepare for it. Thus delegates from 75 countries participated, including a number of internationally distinguished personalities. In addition, fifteen international non-governmental organizations were represented.

The Second International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples reiterated the views developed previously. It hailed the Palestine armed resistance movement and insisted that no peace could be achieved in the Middle East if the people of Palestine were denied the right to self-determination and the right to exercise their sovereignty over their homeland.

International opposition to Zionism and its practices in Palestine is especially outspoken with reference to Israel's inhuman treatment of the civilian population in the areas occupied during the June aggression. As a matter of fact, so many articles have been published even in the press of the imperialist countries, condemning the Israeli practices in the occupied territories, that the most ardent Zionist sympathizer has to admit that Israel's world image has changed. Golda Meir, herself, confessed to the London Sunday Times of June 15, 1969 that «our image has been worsened in some way... It hurts us that this change has taken place...»

This changing international atmosphere was reflected even in the UN — not only in the General Assembly but also in the Security Council where the U.S., the most enthusiastic and most powerful supporter and backer of Israel, still enjoys a considerable influence. We will not concern ourselves here with the series of condemnations that were thrown at Israel after the June aggression as a result of its raids across the cease-fire lines on Arab targets, civilian and military, in the neighbouring countries. We will only discuss the UN attitude towards crimes for which even Israel cannot disclaim responsibility — these crimes concern Israeli inhuman treatment of the civilian population in the occupied territories.

Concern over the fate of the civilian population in the occupied territories was one — and the only thing — that the Security Council in its series of meetings during and after the June aggression was able to agree upon in resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June 1967, and it was also the only thing that the General Assembly was able to agree upon in its Fifth Emergency Special Session which started on 19 June 1967. Both resolutions [237(1967) and 2252 (ES-V)] concerned themselves with humanitarian assistance to those affected by the aggression, and called inter alia upon the government of Israel to facilitate the return of those who had fled the areas

of military operations. The 22nd session of the General Assembly concerned itself with the same problem in its resolution 2341 (XXII) A and B of 19 December 1967.

The most serious UN consideration of the inhuman treatment inflicted on the civilian population in Israeli-occupied areas came in 1968. The forum was that of the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council. During its 24th session, the Human Rights Commission considered cases showing systematic violations of human rights. On 27 February 1968, the Commission adopted unanimously, except for the abstention of Israel, resolution 6 (XXIV), a «moderate» resolution which re-affirmed the right of all refugees from areas which were subjected to military operations, to return to their homes. The resolution also requested the Secretary General to keep the Commission informed about the development of the situation. This was not the only action taken by the Commission. Reports of the inhuman treatment to which the civilian population of the occupied territories was subjected, left its impression on the members of the Commission. Thus considerations of such treatment were resumed on 8 March 1968. As a result of those considerations, the Commission decided by 14 votes to one (Israel) with 7 abstentions, to dispatch a telegram to the Israeli authorities expressing alarm at



press reports regarding systematic destruction of Arab homes in the Israeli occupied territories, and calling upon the Israeli authorities to desist forthwith from acts of destroying homes of the Arab civilian population in the occupied areas.

1968 was also Human Rights Year, proclaimed as such by the UNGA in its resolution 2339 (XXII) of 18 December 1967. An international conference on Human Rights was convened by the UN, at Teheran, between April 22, and May 13, 1968 in order «to review the progress made in the twenty years since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to formulate a programme for the future.» The Teheran conference was a most proper forum to discuss the plight of Arab civilian population in the Israeli-occupied territories.

Thus, resolution No. 1 of the conference was devoted to this human rights problem. The resolution, a long one, (based itself in the preamble on previous UN resolutions, on reports of the UNRWA's Commissioner-General, on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, on the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 regarding the protection of civilian persons in time of war, and on the Human Rights Commission's actions during its 24th session. The operative part included 6 paragraphs in which the conference expressed «its grave concern for the violations of human rights in Arab territories occupied

as a result of the June 1967 hostilities» (paragraph 1), drew the attention «of Israel to the grave consequences resulting from disregard of fundamental freedoms and human rights in the occupied territories» (paragraph 2), called on «the government of Israel to desist forthwith from acts of destroying homes of the Arab civilian population... and to respect and implement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 in occupied territories» (paragraph 3), reaffirmed «the inalienable rights of all inhabitants who have left their homes... to return, resume a normal life, recover their property and homes and rejoin their families»... (paragraph 4), requested «the General Assembly to appoint a special committee to investigate violations of human rights in the territories occupied by Israel, and report thereon» (paragraph 5), and requested the Human Rights Commission «to keep the matter under constant review» (paragraph 6).

Israel, however, was insistent on pursuing a policy that jeopardized the rights of the civilian population in the occupied territories. Furthermore Israel refused to apply UN resolutions regarding the repatriation of the refugees and those who fled their homes during the June aggression. Meanwhile, on 31 July 1968, the Secretary General submitted a report to the Security Council in which he informed

the Council that resolution 237 (1967) of 14 June and General Assembly resolution 2252 (ES-V) were not implemented due to Israeli objections to the method of their implementation. He also underscored the Israeli refusal to receive a humanitarian mission which could help in the implementation of the resolution and which would study the situation of the Arab population in the occupied territories.

On 20 September 1968, at the request of Pakistan, the Security Council started examining the Secretary General's report of 31 July 1968. After a prolonged discussion, the Security Council adopted resolution 259 (1968) of 27 September 1968 in which the Council expressed its concern for the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of Arab territories under Israeli occupation, asked the Secretary General to dispatch urgently a special representative to those Israeli-occupied territories, and requested the Israeli authorities to receive, cooperate with and facilitate the task of such a representative.

But Israel again refused to receive such a special representative or to cooperate with him. Thus, the Secretary-General brought this fact to the attention of the Security Council in his report on 14 October in which he confessed his inability to send such a representative on account of the intransigent Israeli attitude. Israeli disregard for human rights

and for Security Council and General Assembly resolutions in these instances has been obvious.

The 23rd session of the General Assembly took note of all this, and subsequently on 19 December 1968, it adopted two resolutions: one on the general question of refugees and their right to return to their homes (resolution 2452 (XXIII), A, B, and C) and the other on the specific question of Israeli violations of human rights (resolution 2443 (XXIII)). The first resolution is not of great importance to our particular concern, except perhaps part A of it, which requests the Israeli government to take immediately all effective measures to allow the refugees from the 1967 hostilities to return home. Resolution 2443 (XXIII) was a comprehensive one in regard of Israeli practices in the occupied territories. Its preambular part not only mentioned all Security Council and General Assembly resolutions adopted on the subject, as well as the resolutions of the Human Rights Commission and the Economic and Social Council, but also mentioned in detail the resolution adopted at the International Conference of Human Rights. The five operative paragraphs of the resolution dealt with the Assembly's response to Israel's challenge of human rights. In paragraph 1, the General Assembly decided «to establish a special committee of three member states to investigate Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the

population of the occupied territories». In paragraph 3 it requested «the government of Israel to receive the special committee, to cooperate with it and to facilitate its work», and requested «the special committee to report to the Secretary General as soon as possible and whenever the need arises thereafter». The three members were to be appointed by the president of the General Assembly, and the Secretary General was requested to provide the committee with all the facilities necessary for the performance of its task.

Thus the General Assembly took charge of the problem, placed it in its proper perspective and devised a means to deal with it by establishing a special committee, similar in status to the General Assembly's special committee on Apartheid. Though the resolution was not passed by a large majority, the voting being 60-22-37, yet the majority of Afro-Asian countries supported it, while Israel, the United States and some African states such as Malawi and Lesotho opposed it. No Asian state voted against it. The Israeli delegate, right after the vote, hastened to say that his government continued to oppose the terms of reference of this special committee!

The establishment of the special committee was hindered not only by the Israeli objection, but also by the death of the President of the 23rd session of

the General Assembly. After consultations with member states, a meeting of Vice-Presidents of the 23rd session of the General Assembly took place in June to discuss the person who could replace the deceased president in making the nomination. Finally, on 23 June, 1969, the Secretary General advised member states that the head of the Peruvian delegation, who was also a vice president of the 23rd session, would take up the duties of the deceased president in this respect. After lengthy consultations, the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting Human Rights of the Population of the Occupied Territories was constituted of Ceylon, Somalia and Yugoslavia. On 11 November 1969, the special committee held its first meeting, elected Mr. H.S. Amerasingh, permanent representative of Ceylon to the UN, as its Chairman, and requested the Secretary General to inform the government of Israel that the committee had been constituted and to request that government to receive it.

At any rate, the obstacles and delays that surrounded the implementation of the General Assembly's resolution 2443 (XXIII) did not deter the Human Rights Commission from taking up the issue of Israeli violations of human rights. The twenty fifth session of the Commission, which began in February 1969, had before it a report by the Secretary General on the situation with regard to human

rights in the Israeli occupied territories. The Commission considered this report under a sub-item on the study of situations which reveal a consistent pattern of violations of human rights. On 3 March, 1969, by a roll-call vote of 13 in favour to one against (Israel) and 16 abstentions, the Commission decided to establish a special Working Group of Experts to Investigate Allegations Concerning Violations by Israel of the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, in territories occupied by Israel as a result of hostilities in the Middle East. Under the resolution, the Working Group was empowered to receive communications and hear witnesses and was requested to report its conclusions and recommendations to the next session of the Commission. In the same resolution the Commission reiterated its previous position, affirming the rights of peoples who had fled their homes to return to them, deplored Israel's continued violations of human rights in the occupied territories, particularly the acts of destroying the homes of the Arab civilian population, of deporting inhabitants and of resorting to violence against inhabitants expressing their resentment of the occupation; and called on Israel to put an end to such acts. The Commission also expressed its deep concern with regard to Israel's refusal to abide by the 1949 Geneva Convention, and decided to include the question of human rights in the territories occupied as a result of

the hostilities in the Middle East as a separate item of priority in its next session.

In accordance with the resolution, members of the Working Group would be the same as those composing the membership of the Working Group of Experts established under the Commission's resolution in its 23rd and 24th sessions on the treatment of political prisoners in South Africa.

Three points should be mentioned in this regard. The first is that out of the 16 abstentions, only two were from Afro-Asia — the Congo (Kinshasa) and the Phillippines, and the rest of the abstainers were the United States, the United Kingdom, several countries in Western Europe and Latin America, Australia, New Zealand and Greece. The second point is that the membership of the group of experts was the same as the membership of a group of experts previously established to investigate human rights violations by South Africa. Thus, the two settler states, members of the UN, Israel and South Africa, were subjected to investigation regarding their human rights policies by the same working group of experts. The third point is that Israel, like South Africa before it, has again refused to receive the working group of experts, thereby, again like

South Africa, tacitly acknowledging that allegations levelled at her are essentially valid.

The working group of experts visited the three Arab countries which were subject to Israel's aggression in June 1967 (United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria), plus Lebanon. In those four countries it heard a considerable number of witnesses at hearings open to the public held during the month of August 1969. Those hearings made quite an impression on the population of the states visited as it was felt that the UN was seriously concerning itself with human rights violations in the areas occupied by Israel.

Thus, though long over-due, the UN has started interesting itself seriously in the inhuman treatment inflicted on the natives by the Israeli settler state. The extent of the UN involvement in the clear cases of violations of human rights is still small. It encompasses only such violations as took place after the June aggression. So far, the discriminatory treatment of the natives of Palestine who are considered second-class citizens in Israel is still beyond the UN's supervision and intervention. So far, the right of the Palestinians to self-determination is still denied. Justice has not so far been rendered to the natives of Palestine, nor has it been unequivocally

expressed by the UN. Yet it is clear that «... UN organizations... have been growing increasingly hostile to Israel's position in the over-all Arab-Israeli dispute».(\*) ■

---

(\*) Richard Falk, «The Beirut Raid and law of Retaliation», A.J.I.L., Vol. 63 (3), July 1969, p. 419.

# THE FIGHTERS

(short story)

by: Walid Haj Abed

The following short story gives an authentic and moving account of a resistance operation, carried out by Palestinian «Fighters» in enemy territory in a very dark night. In the operation, one of the fighters is killed.

The blood in their veins felt the movement in the middle of the night. The leader who was walking a few yards ahead looked back and whispered to them to be careful and the three men felt the guns under their arms. The guns were as cold as the silence which they were penetrating. Hamid looked back in the direction of the Syrian village which they had just left but he noticed that the lights had been put out, so he knew that it must have been past midnight. Ahead of them they could see a few lights

## The Fighters

coming from one of the enemy settlements at the foot of the mountain.

Hamid looked around and saw the shadows of his two comrades, Rabah slightly ahead of him, and Ali to his right. They were all breathing heavily under the loads they carried on their shoulders. «Pretty soon,» he thought to himself, «they'll put down these loads, and then the silence will be shattered, and the darkness will be light.»

The march went on, but from the ground came a vibration of some heavy thing moving towards them from the distance. They all felt the imminent danger at the same moment. They automatically froze in their places, and the first one to make a move was Rabah, the leader. He whispered: «It's a half-track. It's going westwards. Lie down and don't make a move unless they spot us.» But the vehicle went past them, and they got up and resumed their walk after making sure that it had disappeared.

Hamid looked right at Ali and noticed that he was tense and silent. «Could he be afraid?» he asked himself. Perhaps he was; everybody is at a moment like this. The important thing is to know how to dispel all fear when the right moment comes. From the front came Rabah's quiet but sure voice: «we're only half an hour away from the target. Be careful;

this place is heavily guarded.» He walked on, and the two comrades followed into the darkness of the night.

Hamid could not get rid of his lonely thoughts. The night seemed darker and darker. All the dark nights of a lifetime seemed to combine together and form a thick wall in front of him. He had always hated the night, ever since his father was killed by the enemy and he had to earn his living by selling pieces of cake at the entrances of movie houses. And then when the film was over he had to spend the rest of the night lying down on the sidewalk of a dark street, wishing for a warm bed and the love of a mother. But he had to live, and the need to survive made a tough man of him.

Rabah stopped and pointed to the army camp about one kilometer ahead of them. «This is the target,» he said, «get ready.» In a few minutes they were ready. Ali was sent to an adjoining hill to cover the withdrawal, and the two fired their rockets. First the ammunition storage was hit and then the observation tower. And then the darkness of the night turned into continuous patches of bright red. The guns roared from all directions, and in the midst of all of this Ali was calling them to withdraw. Rabah gave the orders to go back, but Hamid saw that half-track coming down the road. He shot another rocket and the vehicle blew up in one bright

flame. Rabah looked back at Ali, pleased with what he'd done. But in the light of a bomb which exploded a few yards away he saw Ali lying down on the ground and his neck was covered with blood. He came closer and started to carry him, but Ali whispered that it was too late. The wound was serious. Rabah nodded and bent down to kiss Ali's forehead. Ali saw two big tears flow down the brown rough cheeks.

Moments later the shadows of the two men were running in between the lightning and the roaring of cannons and machine guns. Ali kept firing in the direction of the advancing troops, giving them the impression that the group of commandos was still in its position. They were coming closer, and the bullets whistled past him or hit the ground right next to him. He had to continue the fight, but a thick cloud was gradually covering the whole universe around him. Once more he felt the darkness of a thousand nights wrapping him in its midst. He could not stand the thought of being beaten by the darkness. He gathered all his strength and stood up firing his machine gun at the soldiers who were by now all around tumbling down the hill, and suddenly the firing stopped and the darkness of the night covered the place again with a deep silence. ■

## Israel And Negotiations

by: Ibrahim Al-Abid

---

Since the June 1967 War, Israel has been wont to declare its belief that the only way to establish permanent peace in the area is through direct negotiations between it and the Arab States. This plea for negotiations seems, at first sight, to be innocent, logical and to reflect a positive, realistic and peaceful policy. However, a glance at the background of the conflict in the area and at the pattern of the Israeli political and military conduct from 1948 to the present time, as expounded in the following questions and answers, will show the falseness of this plea and its remoteness from any desire for a just and permanent peace in this part of the world.

---

### **WHY DOES ISRAEL INSIST UPON DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS?**

1. Israel has been established on the ruins of another entity, Palestine. Its people are individuals gathered from other countries, occupying the lands of the original inhabitants of Palestine, who have been made to disperse in dozens of countries. The soil on which Israel stands is occupied territory, not land owned or bought by the present occupiers. Israel exists because Palestine does not exist. The Israelis are there because the Palestinians are not where they ought to be, in the land of their fathers and forefathers. The mere existence of Israel is a condition which leads to the non-existence, to the abolition of Palestine and its original inhabitants. The mere existence of Israel means non-recognition and non-acceptance of the Palestinian Arab people and its natural right to live in its homeland and to enjoy its right to self-determination. The Arabs' non-recognition of Israel becomes, then, a negative response to Israel's positive non-recognition of Palestine and the Palestinians, to its expulsion of the Palestinian Arabs, to its usurpation of their public and private property, and to their displacement by aliens from different parts of the world.

Here lies the root of the Palestine Question. The Palestine problem, in fact, is a conflict between



the Palestinian Arab people and the Zionist Movement allied with imperialism in its old and new forms, with its old and new leaders. From this, also stems the Palestinian rejection of direct negotiations with Israel. For this call involves basically a recognition of Israel, i.e. a guarantee for it to continue enjoying its gains. The principal Zionist political end for the establishment of a State has been reached. Most, not all, of Israel's avowed territorial aims have been realized. The greatest part possible in the present circumstances of its demographic task, to decrease the number of the original Palestinian inhabitants under its rule to a size easily manageable, while substituting for them about two sixths of World Jewry, has been achieved. By calling for immediate negotiations, Israel desires to invest with legality these acts which have been realized through the use of force. In other words, Israel intends by its plea, to legalize and perpetuate its act of forcibly uprooting and dispossessing the Palestinian people.

2. By calling for direct negotiations with the Arab States, Israel aims to remove the Arab Palestinian people and to obliterate its entity because this people represents the party originally involved in the problem and because it is the rightful and legitimate party entitled to determine the future of Palestine. The Palestine people is the principal party directly involved in most of the questions in

dispute. The Arab States are not empowered by the Palestinian people. Therefore, they have neither the competence nor the right to make decisions in the absence of this people, or on its behalf, in matters that deal with its homeland and destiny.

3. By insisting upon direct negotiations, Israel aims at winning a political victory, namely the implicit recognition of Israel when it has not yet declared its agreement to withdraw from the territories it occupied during the 1967 aggression. In a deal like this Israel emerges as the only winner. If the Arabs refuse to negotiate they lose; if they accept, Israel gains.

4. Israel realizes that if the Arab States were to agree to direct negotiations, a pre-condition which Israel knows is unlikely to be fulfilled, these States, since Israel occupies vast and important areas of their territories, would not be in a position to negotiate over the basic issues of the Palestine problem, namely the Israeli presence itself as a usurping entity established on Arab land and the resulting dispossession and expulsion of the Palestinian people.

5. Possibly, Israel is sure that the Arab States will reject this method of negotiating. Therefore, by

insisting upon it, Israel continues to retain the territories it occupied in 1967, while it blames the Arab States for refusing to negotiate over the present crisis.

**IS ISRAEL'S CALL FOR DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS EXPRESSIVE OF A TRUS WISH TO ESTABLISH PEACE?**

1. While Israel declares her desire for, and insistence upon negotiations, she simultaneously takes a series of measures which indicate she has no intentions of ever withdrawing from all the territories she occupies:

- a) she annexed Jerusalem, in defiance of the U.N. General Assembly and Security Council decisions that she desist from taking such a step;
- b) she is building a series of fortified colonies in the newly occupied territories;
- c) she refused to allow the Palestinians who fled from their homes in the wake of the June 1967 war to return;

- d) instead, she is calling for more immigrants to fill her newly acquired territories.

2. Israel refuses to state publicly the limits of her territorial ambitions. She has introduced a new expression into the lexicon of the crisis — «secure borders.» Levi Eshkol seemed to think that the Suez Canal was the best natural frontier between Israel and Egypt, and Moshe Dayan believes the Jordan River is the best dividing line between her and the Hashemite Kingdom, while various Israeli leaders insist that the Golan Heights should be retained. On what basis are the Arab states to negotiate with Israel?

3. There can be no doubt that the sort of peace, Israel hopes to impose on the Arab states is not practicable and therefore cannot be lasting. It would be closer to the truth to say that Israel's present insistence upon direct and bilateral negotiations is expressive of her fears of the re-emergence of the Palestinian people on the scene as the main party concerned in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The present Palestinian Resistance Movement constitutes an

ever-growing danger to the Israeli presence on the Palestinian soil. Israel waged the June 1967 war, among other things, as a first step towards destroying this movement. Now she simply desires to finish off the job through negotiations, without having to contend with the Palestinians. ■

## MISINFORMING WORLD PUBLIC OPINION

by: V. Pyatigorov

The Zionists, with organizations in many countries, exercise tremendous influence on world public opinion. Through this influence they misrepresent the facts of the Palestine issue and help Israel deceive people in the imperialist countries regarding Israel's nature and intentions. Following are excerpts from an account of Zionist and pro-Zionist propaganda organs in the West, which appeared in the August issue (1970) of the Soviet Journal «International Affairs.»

It would be difficult to exaggerate the role played by the information and propaganda services of Israel and the Zionist organisations in Western countries in misinforming world public opinion about the situation in the Middle East on the eve of the aggression and after it.

Israel's cooperation with foreign Zionist organisations provides her with great possibilities to

control and direct the activity of many organs of the press, radio and television and publishers and film distributors in the capitalist countries.

British journalist Terence Prittie, in his book *Israel—Miracle in the Desert*, which was published even before the June (1967) war, wrote about the importance to Israel's foreign policy of broad political, economic, ideological and cultural ties with Jews living in other countries. He wrote that «the Jews of the Dispersion in Western countries... will always function as a bond of sympathy and interest between Israel and their own governments».(1)

Such ties are especially strong between Israel and the USA. The American Saturday Evening Post wrote that members of the Jewish community controlled a good half of the large publishing houses in the United States.(2) The Zionists have secured a remarkable position in the political life of the USA. American Zionists are part of a «closely knit, well-financed and efficiently run movement which, in its control of American public opinion and its domination of American media of information, has won for Israel the unique position that country occupies today».(3)

Politicians of various orientations want to ensure themselves the so-called Jewish vote at elections. Candidates pay close attention to the fact that over 74 per cent of American Jews are concentrated in 14 large cities, and 75 per cent in six

states (New York, where Jews account for 14.9 per cent of the population, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Massachusetts and Ohio), with 178 electoral votes.(4)

The US Defence Department has pointed out exactly why not a single influential US politician wants to oppose US support for Israel: «It would be a dangerous move for either of our major political parties, and one which experience indicates neither will make, to disavow American sponsorship of Israel.»(5)

Just how Zionist organisations and the press dependent on them influence the country's political life and public opinion can be seen from the following examples:

In December 1960, the then newly-elected President—John F. Kennedy—was faced with the problem of choosing a Secretary of State. Arthur Schlesinger, a Kennedy adviser at the time, writes that Kennedy was more and more inclined to appoint Senator Fulbright. «He liked Fulbright, the play of his civilised mind, the bite of his language and the direction of his thinking on foreign affairs.»(6) But Senator Fulbright never became US Secretary of State. One of the main reasons was Fulbright's disagreement with an extreme anti-Arab policy, which had long been a source of serious dissatisfaction to the Jewish community. «But finally..

the President-elect yielded and struck Fulbright's name from the list.»(7)

Incidentally, in 1963, the same William Fulbright, whose career had been thwarted by the powerful Zionist lobby, submitted a report to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the problems of the Zionist movement in the USA. The thick file of testimony, at first kept secret, threw a certain amount of light on the real aims of the largest Zionist organisation in the USA—the United Jewish Appeal. According to the report, more than \$5 million, collected from American citizens, was used by various Zionist organisations to mould American public opinion in favour of Israel.

These funds, as Senator Fulbright ascertained, were used for the «cultivation of editors,» «placement of articles on Israel in some of America's leading magazines, the preparation of radio and television programmes sympathetic to Israel, and subsidising trips to Israel by public opinion moulders,» especially Christian clergy, members of scientific circles and people working in the mass media.(8)

Thus, Zionist organisations indoctrinate the American public, implanting the idea of Israel as a «small democratic David, fighting an evil Arab Goliath.» Especially serious is the fact that they directly influence people who make important state

decisions, thus ensuring official US support for Zionist political aims.

Zionist organisations in the USA keep in close touch with the Republicans as well. We know that both parties, since they serve the needs of various monopoly groups, in the final analysis protect the interests of big capital and directly depend on it. As for Zionism its ties with the monopolies are well-known.

The will of the big American monopolies and Zionist organisations of the USA is also carried out by such public figures as Senator Jacob Javits (Republican), who has close ties both with the Rockefeller empire and with the Zionist organisations. Exactly a week before the Israeli aggression, Senator Javits threatened the UAR with «military measures», declaring that the USA could fight «side by side» with Israel, since it had sufficient means to pursue military operations simultaneously in Vietnam and the Middle East. Later, the senator urged that the United States should become the «chief supplier» of arms and military equipment to Israel. People like Javits are unfortunately not rare in the ruling circles of the country.

It is no secret that US Middle East policy did not undergo any fundamental changes once the Republican party came to power. On January 22, 1970, the Associated Press news agency reported from official sources that four of the President's top

advisers had been granted honorary posts in the Zionist organisation—the United Jewish Appeal, the extent to which such a symbiosis suits the bosses of international Zionism and the extremist leaders of Israel can be seen from statements made by Defence Minister Moshe Dayan. As far back as June 1968, he declared cynically: «The position of the United States means a lot more to Israel than the Security Council decision.»

This open cooperation on the part of ruling circles naturally makes the Zionists' task much easier; but even in the Western countries which do not officially support the Israeli aggression, the Zionists have not laid down their arms. In France, for example, a large portion of the press, contrary to the government's declared policy, adopted a markedly pro-Israeli position in 1967.

The results of a public opinion poll published in *Paris-Match* showed that in early 1970 the number of French people sympathising with Israel had dropped by 60 per cent compared with 1964. As time passes the fumes of propaganda are losing their efficacy, but the Zionist machine has done its job and ensured definite circles' moral support for the aggressor when it was needed.

Western journalists, James Aldridge tells us, are by far not always personally «enthusiastic Israel

supporters.» Another British journalist has related what kind of pressure they are subjected to: it was enough to show a television programme setting forth the Arab position for thousands of telephone calls to come in to the television company protesting against British television daring to speak favourably of the Arabs. It is not difficult to guess who inspired this display of emotion.

Zionist circles have considerable control over the publishing business in Western Europe, most often using the following method: A pro-Israeli author offers a manuscript to a Zionist organisation or receives an order for a book from it. The Zionist organisation negotiates with a publisher and guarantees him compensation for his losses if the book turns out to be a failure. Then the Zionists contact advertising and sales agencies which ensure wide distribution of huge editions of books expounding the Israeli view point.

One of the levers used by Zionist organisations is economic pressure on the press. It is well-known that in capitalist countries most of the press organs depend heavily on returns from advertising. The Zionists spend enormous sums of money on advertising, on the condition that a definite selection of material is made. The *British Guardian* suddenly stopped printing articles by Michael Adams about

the difficult situation of the Arabs in occupied territory. The reason for the disappearance of Adams' articles from the pages of the Guardian was that the newspaper was threatened with the withdrawal of well-paid advertisements. ■

---

REFERENCES

- (1) Terence Prittie, *Israel—Miracle in the Desert*, London, 1967, p. 216.
- (2) *Saturday Evening Post*, May 18, 1968.
- (3) Alfred M. Lillienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin. An American Perspective of the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, New York, 1965, p. 4.
- (4) *Ibid.*, p. 6.
- (5) *Ibidem*.
- (6) Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., *A Thousand Days*, Cambridge, 1965, p. 139.
- (7) *Ibid.*, p. 140.
- (8) See Alfred M. Lillienthal, *op. cit.*, pp. 26-27.

**THE CASE  
OF  
THE PALESTINIANS**

by Shawkat Uthmani

---

In the following article, Pakistani writer Shawkat Uthmani gives the story of the Palestinian liberation struggle and asserts that the dreams of Zionism of exterminating the Palestinian Arabs and «building up an empire from the Euphrates to the Nile will share the fate of Hitler, Mussolini and the ilk.» The article is based on a discussion of «The relationship between world imperialism and world Zionism» which appeared in the March and April (1970) issues of the *Islamic Review of London*.

---

The case of the Palestinian Arabs is as simple as anything. Today, the entire 92% that formed the Arab population of Palestine is either in camps or

floating all over the world, including the neighbouring Arab countries.

The plight of the Palestinian refugees is a heart-rending story, and British imperialism is responsible for inflicting all these miseries on these simple Arabs who had nothing but their lands to till and homes to look after.

But the brave Palestinian people did not give up their freedom-struggle from the very date that the United Nations partitioned their land and ushered in a foreign Zionist state in Palestine.

The story of Arab deeds of bravery is an epic story, which can be compared either with the resistance fighters of France against the Nazi hordes, or with the Vietnam heroes fighting against an alien plaguing their fertile land.

### **The story of the Palestine Liberation Struggle**

Here begins the story of the Palestine Liberation Struggle:

It was on 14 May 1948 that the State of Israel was proclaimed. The first act of this Fascist State was to put all Arab villages under military rule. No Arab was allowed to leave his village without a written permit from the Military Governor, even to go out to look for work or to obtain medical aid. And

we have this authentic information that Arab children died in the laps of their mothers waiting in the corridors of the Israeli Governor's building for a permit to go to see a doctor. And lo, the travel permit, if at all given, laid down a special route for an Arab. Any deviation from the prescribed route was punishable.

And their lands: If any Zionist settler decided to have the Arab land that he coveted, the Governor was to see that such a land was handed over the moment it was demanded, without any complaint. Legal term applied was that it was sold by the Arab.

We do not propose to linger over the atrocities that Zionism perpetrated on the Arabs. We close this point with a quotation from Dr. Hans Kohn, an eminent Jewish writer, who contributed a long article in the Autumn-Winter issue of the Menorah Journal of 1958. It is a non-Zionist American-Jewish publication. The article was entitled, Zion and the Jewish National Idea. Among other things the article contains the following lines:

«They treat the Arabs with hostility and cruelty, deprive them of their rights, offend them without cause, even boast of these deeds, and nobody among us opposes this despicable and dangerous inclination.»



For a long time the world conscience remained dormant and impervious to the fate of the Palestinian refugees. The United Nations passed resolution after resolution enjoining Israel to take back the refugees. But nothing happened. These resolutions were not worth the paper on which they were written.

Then came the June 1967 War between Israel and the Arabs, and it added several hundred thousand more refugees to the number already in glut.

In the meanwhile, the Palestinians had started organising themselves. For a long time some of the Arab States took no notice of Palestinian resistance, nor did they encourage it; as a matter of fact, some had evinced a very hostile attitude.

But with time, the clouds of misunderstanding cleared to the extent that even reactionary Arab Heads began to espouse the cause of Palestine liberation.

One by one all the Arab countries realised their duty of aiding the Palestinians to regain their lost motherland. And not to speak of the Arabs alone, the progressive States and organisations the world over veered round the cause of Palestine. From the Far West — Latin America — the Palestinian cause got ovation and support.

## BIRTH OF AN ORGANISATION

Encouraged by the world response to their cause, the Palestinians of all political views set on organising themselves into an organisation.

A National Conference of the Palestinians met in a session on 2 June 1964. It was a representative gathering of all the Palestinian Arabs.

Among other energetic steps the Conference took, it recommended the setting up of the Palestine Liberation Organisation. This P.L.O. received recognition from all the Arab countries who met in a Summit Conference in Alexandria from 5 September to 11 September 1964. This Summit went further and recognised the value and necessity of organising a Palestine Liberation Army — and this Army played a very meritorious role in the June 1967 Arab-Israeli War.

It is not without interest to recall some of the proceedings of the June 1964 Palestinian National Conference.

This Conference passed many ambitious resolutions. Their organisational value was tremendous. The Conference set up Palestine Committees in almost all the Arab inhabited areas — from the villages to the towns. The Conference recommended to

establish representative offices in Moscow, New Delhi, Peking, Belgrade, the United Nations and in all the African capitals.

Moreover, this Conference proclaimed a National Charter with 29 articles. The most important points of this Charter can be summed up as follows:

The right of self-determination after liberation; to recognise all those as Palestinians who resided in Palestine until 1947; and to recognise their children too as Palestinians; Jews of Palestine-origin to be regarded as Palestinians; different ideologies and different social, political and economic creeds not to distract people from uniting for national liberation.

Three motives to govern the Palestinians:

1. National Unity,
2. National mobilisation and liberation, and
3. Belief in the principles of Justice, Freedom, Sovereignty and Self-determination coupled with Human Dignity.

Thus, the solid foundations of a central organisation of all Palestinian people were laid at this Palestine National Conference. And the devoted among the Palestinians began to move from capital to capital to seek support for their honest cause.

And the publicity that the Palestine cause has been gaining ever since 1964 is tremendous. Far and wide the people are asking now as to what this Palestine Question is. And except the morbid pro-imperialist people of the earth, all sane peoples are supporting the cause of liberation, both of the Palestine and the Vietnam peoples.

### REVOLUTIONARY STRUGGLE

Every revolutionary struggle in the world has produced its own intellectuals, poets, leaders, fighters and martyrs. The strength of the liberation movement grows daily through the intellectual guidance it gets from its theoreticians, and derives inspiration from its fighters.

And when a whole nation is under subjugation and tyranny, the entire populace rises against the tyrant. From time immemorial many names are echoing through the corridors of world history.

And the enemies of the liberation movement have always denounced the freedom-fighters as «terrorists» and misguided people.

Palestine movement is not free from getting inimical broadcasts from the imperialist-controlled press, radio and television.

One hears daily from the Voice of America and the B.B.C. about the slanderous designations given to the Palestinian resistance fighters.

\* \*

As a man of the press, the writer of these lines is so often startled when foreigners ask the question: Why do the Arab Commandos not leave Israel in peace?

They repeat the same old theme expressed by the Western bourgeois press and television. «LOOK, ISRAEL WANTS TO LIVE IN PEACE, but look at these Commandos, they would not allow Israel peace! «After all,» they say, «Israel is the country of the Israelis.»

Such people forget history; they forget the fate of the millions of Arab refugees in camps, shivering in cold, burning in scorching heat of the desert in Summer, and suffering indescribable loss in their meagre property and health when the rains overtake them and their tents.

The world conscience is sleeping. The moribund imperialism in its last of life has been more cruel than ever before, and gloats over the sufferings of the people, because they have different colour and

creed than its protagonists. One wonders if the capitalists have any creed, except that of making money!

A very small incident affecting Israel is repeated ad nauseam with sympathy on the Western chain of broadcasts. But when hundreds of young girls are injured during the Israeli police and military attacking the demonstration of the schoolgirls, no voice of protest is heard from the West — not even when several demonstrators die by the Israeli bullets — young girls, boys, children, infants and old men and women. How dead is the Western conscience!?

### **CAN THE PALESTINIAN ARABS BE EXTERMINATED?**

From Ben Gurion to Golda Meir, from Abba Eban to the lowest Zionist, every one has been citing the example of colonisation of the American Continent, and refuses to define the boundaries of an Israeli State. All these people have been pinning their faith on the extermination of the Arabs and have, since 1948, taken gradual steps to frighten and drive the Palestinians into deserts while taking over their fertile lands, homes and properties.

Nobody disputes an historic truth that superior civilisations had conquered and exterminated the people with no code of life, or no mode of govern-

ment. The European settlers were able to reduce the Red Indian population of the Americas to zero. The Aryans came to India and drove away the aborigines to hills and mountains and into dense jungles. But these very Aryans could not reduce the Dravidians of South India to any lower strata than that of their own. The reason was that the Dravidian civilization was not inferior to that of the Aryan invaders from the north.

Granted, there are no original inhabitants in Australia and if they are, maybe they are in negligible number; but the Arabs are neither aborigines nor any people of an inferior civilization to any known civilization of the world.

As a matter of fact, the Arab contribution to the world civilization in general, and to the European one in particular, is immense.

### **BOASTS AND RETORTS**

Flushed by a transitory victory, Zionism is today boasting too much. The world remembers very well how, flushed by their victories, the Nazis had boasted of capturing Moscow and bringing Stalin and Moscow leaders to Berlin dragged by chains with rings in their noses. «He laughs best who laughs last.» This is a very common English adage.

With all the might that Zionism commands, resting on Anglo-American imperialism, it cannot and will not be able to crush the liberation forces now active in Palestine, and in the areas surrounding it — from the Atlantic Ocean to the Arabian Gulf (commonly known as the Persian Gulf).

And the Western Europe, to which Mr. John Draper has alluded to in the foregoing lines, is once more awakening to realities and realises that, with all its support, Zionism cannot win the final victory.

In the battles of destinies and continuous struggle for freedom the issue neither lies with the present nor with the past. It always lies with the FUTURE. And the Future lies with Patience and Steadfastness.

The students of history remember very well Hitler, Mussolini and the lieutenants of Hitler, like Goebbels and others who continued boasting and sabre-rattling throughout the years beginning from 1939 to 1945.

But history decided differently. Wheels of destiny were turning against the aggressors and boasters. The Potsdam Pact of the three leaders of the anti-Nazi Front decreed differently. The signatories of this Pact were the people who entered Berlin in triumph.

And when the Nazis had announced in boastful tones their challenge to Stalin, there came resounding the Voice from Moscow, «Napoleon could at least pass a night in the Kremlin (in Moscow after his conquests), but Hitler should be satisfied with the pictures and a photograph of Moscow only.»

The analogy is very simple: The dreams of Zionism of building up an Empire from the Euphrates to the Nile will also share the fate of Hitler, Mussolini and the ilk. The united powers of imperialism would not be able to change Destiny. Sure enough, Destiny lies with the revolutionary forces of the world who would usher in an era of Justice and Peace. Blatant talks of the aggressors will be drowned and rest at the bottom of the deepest deep.

Nobody denies that the destructive power of Israel is a part of the NATO strategy as guided by the Pentagon. Today, it looks as if the Future lies with aggression. But history gives us ample proof of the success that the resistance movements have gained — beginning with the French and Yugoslavs during World War II.

And this leads us to the final conclusion, and that is, the World will once more see a Free Palestine and a Free Vietnam. ■

## PALESTINE QUESTION IN WORLD PRESS

---

The three extracts from world press presented below cover important aspects of recent developments of the Middle East situation: (1) «Golda the Spoiler» by Peter Jenkins (The Guardian — London, September 9, 1970) explains that «the most powerful single obstacle in the path of peace is the policy of the Israeli government.» (2) «The Agony of Amman» by Newsweek reporter Arnaud de Borchgrave, (October 5, 1970) describes the brutalities committed by the Jordanian troops against Palestinian Resistance fighters as «sheer butchery.» (3) «U.S.-Israel: Dangerous Alliance» by V. Laptev (New Times — Moscow, October 7, 1970) discusses Washington's anti-Arab policy as manifested during the recent events in Jordan.

---

### 1. Golda the Spoiler

It is the right moment (although it may not be a popular one) to reassert that the most powerful single obstacle in the path of peace is, and has been

since the June War, the policy of the Israeli Government in Jerusalem.

Israel's policy rests on force. She has not accepted the UN resolution of Nov. 22, 1967. She has at no time stated her minimum conditions for peace. She insisted until last month's cease-fire agreement upon direct negotiations with the Arabs, and has since, at the first opportunity, withdrawn from the Jarring talks in New York. She has throughout impeded the efforts of the Four Powers and the two Super Powers to set negotiations in motion. She has shown little understanding of Palestinian grievances and made no constructive proposals for answering them.

The consequences have been the opposite of what Jerusalem presumably intended. Prospects for peace have receded, the dangers of war increased. Reliance on force has not weakened Arab resistance but hardened it. Palestinian nationalism has exploded (It was not even mentioned in the UN resolution of 1967; now it has become an inescapable factor complicating any settlement).

Israel's deep-penetration bombing of Egypt from the beginning of this year was a startling example of the counterproductive use of excessive force.

The political result was also the opposite of what Israel intended. Because the dangers of a Super Power confrontation in the area had also grown,

Russia and America at last acted together to bring about a cease-fire.

Israel's error of seeking peace through violence is now being compounded for the upteenth time. There may be justice in an eye for an eye, but it is practical folly in the situation which exists. The mass arrests in the occupied territories at the weekend and the threat, according to a Tel Aviv newspaper, of executions if any harm befalls the hostages in Amman seems calculated to exacerbate the situation just as there was hope of it improving.

## 2. The Agony of Amman

Along with more than a hundred other foreign correspondents, Newsweek Senior Editor Arnaud de Borchgrave was pinned down in Amman's bullet-scarred Intercontinental Hotel for almost a week.

When the fighting subsided and links with the outside world were finally reestablished, de Borchgrave cabled this report:

In almost a quarter of a century of foreign reporting, I cannot recall anything remotely similar to what I have seen in Jordan. I have witnessed inter-tribal massacres in Africa and the slow, steady blood letting in Vietnam, But there has been nothing like the devastation — both in lives and property — that Amman has suffered.

The irony is that the world was largely uninformed about what was happening, for the international press corps was cooped up in the «Intercontinental» and largely out of action. It was, moreover, made quite clear to us that there was a curfew on, and that anyone seen on the street — including us — would be shot on sight. And there seemed to be little doubt that some of the Bedouin troops — who had somehow learned that many of the European correspondents among us were pro-fedayeen — would have enjoyed shooting the lot of us.

One afternoon, the Bedouin troops bivouacked in the hotel compound began looting the hotel shops. While they stole shirts from the Esquire Mans' Shop, their comrades kept their guns pointed at the windows so that they could fire at any cameraman foolish enough to try to film the scene. At one point, they went so far as to drag an Iraqi correspondent out of the hotel and make him lie on the ground with a gun pointed at his head. He was accused of taking pictures from the window.

Most of the time, we tried to stay clear of trouble. The photographers kept off the balconies. With bullets constantly thudding against walls and shattering windows, and with incoming tank and mortar rounds impacting just across the street, most of the Newsmen sat in the corridors typing or catnapping. Occasionally some of us would crawl

back into our rooms for a quick peek out the window at the action.

Once, as I was walking up the stairs I heard voices shouting, «Arnaud, are you all right?» There was a foot-wide hole in my corridor wall. A 50 caliber machine-gun bullet had pierced the steel frame of my window and gone diagonally across my room at face level, entered my clothes closet, blasted the corridor wall and wound up against the wall on the other side of the passageway.

When finally the fighting began to wane, we wanted to find out what had actually happened during those crucial days, when we were penned up in the Intercontinental.

Some of the gaps were filled in by Europeans and Americans, who had by now left their hiding places in various sectors of Amman and were crowding the hotel lobby, awaiting evacuation. They all reported heavy fighting and hearing the cries of the wounded as they lay in the streets. Some, they said, were shouting «Help me, neighbour, help me!» In the lobby, one British woman, with five children, was so shell-shocked that she could not fill out her embarkation card.

As I write this report — on Friday, Sept 25, — the resistance of the fedayeen has virtually stopped in Amman. Smoke from burning buildings hovers over much of the capital. Fire engines rush about the streets. The appearance of water trucks brings

out crowds of people with water buckets. There are still a few pockets of Palestinian resistance, as I well know.

The army is no longer returning the fire and it may be that the king has ordered his troops to end the slaughter. There seems to be no doubt that some of the Jordanian troops, particularly the Bedouins, went completely berserk. They shelled houses without apparent reason. They revived an old Bedouin custom of breaking the fingers of some of their prisoners so that their captives would not soon be able to pull a trigger against them. And foreigners who have seen the carnage wrought by the Bedouins in the Palestinian refugee camps are absolutely disgusted. Said one European: «It was sheer butchery.»

To check some of these reports, a few of us toured the parts of the town that the Jordanian Army was willing to let us see. The 50-bed Ma'asher Hospital was treating 125 wounded, most of whom were from Al-Hussein refugee camp for Palestinians, and what they said left little room for doubt that the Jordanian Army had engaged in a wholesale slaughter of civilians.

Arafe Abou Ma'amar, 24, who had a shrapnel wound in his right leg, said he had seen his wife and two children killed by Jordanian fire. As he talked, a woman nearby lay unconscious with a bullet in her neck. The woman in the next bed had had her

left arm amputated. There were babies, aged 1 to 3, who were missing eyes or limbs.

About 45,000 Palestinians lived in Al-Hussein camp before the fighting began, but according to the survivors the camp now is 80 percent destroyed.

### 3. U.S.-Israel: Dangerous Alliance

The developments in Jordan, and especially around it, have to a certain extent spotlighted the attitude of the different countries to the Middle East issue. At the same time they underscore the responsibility of those who continue to sabotage a political settlement in that region — Israel and the United States primarily.

Tel Aviv spent the first few days after the guns along the Suez Canal had fallen silent on August 8 assuring the world of the seriousness of its intentions.

But it was not long before mines began to be laid in the «waters of peace,» and by none other than Israel.

Tel Aviv began by procrastinating. Two whole weeks passed before the Israeli government named its representative, Abba Aban, who announced that he would come to New York for the opening of the 25th U.N. General Assembly in mid-September. His deputy Yosef Tekoah — Israel's permanent representative at the United Nations — met Gunnar Jarring only once, after which he hurried off to Tel



Aviv «for consultations.» This comedy of «appointments» and «consultations» ended on September 6, when the Israeli government announced its decision to suspend its participation in the Jarring peace talks. After that Israel openly proceeded step by step to whip up tension.

To justify their sabotage of the peace settlement efforts, Israeli government leaders and newspapers, backed by the U.S. «big» press, unleashed an all-out propaganda campaign against the United Arab Republic and other Arab states, accusing them of violating the ceasefire.

Actually, as has now come to light, it was Israel herself that violated the ceasefire in the very first week by sending spy planes over the Suez Canal.

The United States, the New York Times reported on September 16, «had evidence that Israel had been violating the Middle East ceasefire by conducting reconnaissance flights over Egyptian-held territory and by strengthening her fortifications along the Suez Canal.» News to this effect was also broadcast on that same day by the Voice of America, which is operated by the U.S. government. This amounted to official confirmation by Washington of the Israeli violations.

Why, then, one may ask, did the Israeli government agree to the ceasefire and the resumption of the Jarring mission instead of rejecting this initiative outright? Because Golda Meir's government was

afraid of finding itself diplomatically isolated and, consequently, did not risk rejecting a proposal that had already won widespread approval. That is the main thing. Secondly, as subsequent developments showed, the Israeli rulers planned to take advantage of the new situation to reiterate their territorial claims. It was not by chance that the Israeli government proposed to turn the temporary ceasefire into a permanent one without, of course, first settling all other questions, that is, without withdrawing from the occupied Arab areas. These trial balloons, however, did not have much effect.

When Foreign Minister Eban was asked on August 10 if Israel would be «ready to withdraw back to the frontiers that existed before the 1967 war, if she got what she wanted,» he virtually exploded: «There aren't any old frontiers... We have to create, we have to establish the frontiers because the armistice demarcation lines have vanished.» Mrs. Meir later confirmed this by saying «there can be no question of withdrawing Israeli troops from all the Arab territories captured during the June 1967 war.» The Israeli stand on this issue remains the same to this day.

When Israel finally decided to stand firm by this policy, it was announced that Mrs Meir would make an «unofficial» visit to the United States.

The United States decided to satisfy Israel's

requests for additional deliveries of offensive weapons. According to press reports, it has agreed to supply Israel with 32 Phantoms, electronic equipment and air-to-ground missiles. Moreover, Israel has been promised \$500 million to \$1,000million for arms purchases and the needs of her hard-pressed economy. These promises of military and economic aid can only be regarded as additional proof that the United States is encouraging and supporting Israel's policy of settling the Middle East crisis by force.

Some American newspapers, notably the Washington Post, and the Israeli press are trying to create the impression that the United States, while remaining the supplier of Israel's key armaments, has not altered its, «neutral stand» on the Middle East conflict. But this is by far not so. At a press conference after her meeting with President Nixon, Mrs. Meir said Israel would not resume the peace talks even if the United States furnished her country with sufficient modern military equipment. Summing up her talks in the United States, the Israeli Premier said that Washington «fully understands Israel's position.»

And so, the direct connection between Israel's aggressive policy and the United States' anti-Arab stand on the Middle East issue remains as before.

Washington's anti-Arab policy was clearly

manifested during the recent events in Jordan. On the very same day that he talked to Mrs Meir, President Nixon told a group of Chicago editors, according to the Miami Herald, that either Israel or the United States might have to intervene with their armed forces «to aid the government, of King Hussein.» The excuse for U.S. intervention, he explained, could be «protection of U.S. citizens in Jordan» but suggested that «Israel rather than the United States would intervene on Hussein's behalf.»

The events in Jordan have given the United States and Israel another excuse to torpedo the peace talks, which, it is claimed, cannot in any case be held until the situation in that country is normalized.

With the Jordanian crisis, U.S. imperialist policy in the Middle East has come the complete circle: first, «understanding» between the United States and Israel, then agreement on additional U.S. arms deliveries to Israel, and lastly open threats of intervention and large-scale military preparations.

The situation in the Middle East remains highly tense and fraught with danger for international peace and security. ■

# Documents

## The King-Crane Commission

---

At the end of World War I, President Wilson appointed an American Commission of Inquiry, the King-Crane Commission to ascertain the wishes of the people of Syria and Palestine concerning their political future, after they had freed themselves, from Turkish domination.

In June 1919, the Commission visited Palestine and Syria and had contacts with representatives of all classes of the people. On August 28, the Commission submitted a report to the U.S. delegation at the Paris Peace Conference. The report stated that there was unanimous support in the whole of Syria for the demand of independence and for the rejection of foreign rule offered to them in the guise of the Mandate.

With regard to Palestine the Commission expressed the conviction that the Zionist program constituted a gross violation of the rights of the Palestinian people and a deviation from the principles proclaimed by President Wilson. The report recommended restriction of Jewish immigration into Palestine and a rejection of the idea of making Palestine a Jewish State. Naturally such a report did not please members of the Peace Conference who were meeting at Paris to divide the spoils of the war. It was therefore noted and neglected.

## Documents

---

We give below the full text of the fifth Recommendation of the King-Crane Commission report, which relates to Zionism and Palestine:

---

We recommend, in the fifth place, serious modification of the extreme Zionist program for Palestine of unlimited immigration of Jews, looking finally to making Palestine distinctly a Jewish State.

(1) The Commissioners began their study of Zionism with minds predisposed in its favor, but the actual facts in Palestine, coupled with the force of the general principles proclaimed by the Allies and accepted by the Syrians have driven them to the recommendation here made.

(2) The Commission was abundantly supplied with literature on the Zionist program by the Zionist Commission to Palestine; heard in conferences much concerning the Zionist colonies and their claims and personally saw something of what had been accomplished.

(3) The Commission recognized also that definite encouragement had been given to the Zionists by the Allies in Mr. Balfour's often quoted statement, in its approval by other representatives of the Allies. If, however, the strict terms of the Balfour Statement are adhered to — favoring «the

establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine,» — it can hardly be doubted that the extreme Zionist Program must be greatly modified. For «a national home for the Jewish people» is not equivalent to making Palestine into a Jewish State; nor can the erection of such Jewish State be accomplished without the gravest trespass upon the «civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine.» The fact came out repeatedly in the Commission's conference with Jewish representatives, that the Zionists looked forward to a practically complete dispossession of the present non-Jewish inhabitants of Palestine, by various forms of purchase.

In his address of July 4, 1918, President Wilson laid down the following principle as one of the «four great ends for which the associated peoples of the world were fighting»: «The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery.» If that principle is to rule,

and so the wishes of Palestine's population are to be decisive as to what is to be done with Palestine, then it is to be remembered that the non-Jewish population of Palestine — nearly nine-tenths of the whole — are emphatically against the entire Zionist program. The tables show that there was no one thing upon which the population of Palestine were more agreed than upon this. To subject a people so minded to unlimited Jewish immigration, and to steady financial and social pressure to surrender the land, would be a gross violation of the principle just quoted and of the people's rights, though it kept within the forms of law.

It is to be noted also that the feeling against the Zionist program is not confined to Palestine, but shared very generally by the people throughout Syria, as our conferences clearly showed. More than 72 per cent — 1350 in all — of all the petitions in the whole of Syria were directed against the Zionist program. Only two requests — those for a united Syria and for independence — had a larger support. This general feeling was voiced by the «General Syrian Congress,» in the seventh, eighth and tenth resolutions of their statement.

The Peace Conference should not shut its eyes to the fact that the anti-Zionist feeling in Palestine and Syria is intense and not lightly to be flouted. No British officer, consulted by the Commissioners, believed that the Zionist program could be carried

out except by force of arms. The officers generally thought that a force of not less than fifty thousand soldiers would be required even to initiate the program. That of itself is evidence of a strong sense of the injustice of the Zionist program, on the part of the non-Jewish populations of Palestine and Syria. Decisions, requiring armies to carry them out, are sometimes necessary, but they are surely not gratuitously to be taken in the interests of a serious injustice. For the initial claim, often submitted by Zionist representatives, that they have a «right» to Palestine, based on an occupation of two thousand years ago, can hardly be seriously considered.

There is a further consideration that cannot justly be ignored, if the world is to look forward to Palestine becoming a definitely Jewish state, however gradually that may take place. That consideration grows out of the fact that Palestine is «the Holy Land» for Jews, Christians, and Moslems alike. Millions of Christians and Moslems all over the world are quite as much concerned as the Jews with conditions in Palestine, especially with those conditions which touch upon religious feelings and rights. The relations in these matters in Palestine are most delicate and difficult. With the best possible intentions, it may be doubted whether the Jews could possibly seem to either Christians or Moslems proper guardians of the holy places, or custodians

of the Holy Land as a whole. The reason is this: the places which are most sacred to Christians — those having to do with Jesus — and which are also sacred to Moslems, are not only not sacred to Jews, but abhorrent to them. It is simply impossible, under those circumstances, for Moslems and Christians to feel satisfied to have these places in Jewish hands, or under the custody of Jews. There are still other places about which Moslems must have the same feeling. In fact, from this point of view, the Moslems, just because the sacred places of all three religions are sacred to them, have made very naturally much more satisfactory custodians of the holy places than the Jews could be. It must be believed that the precise meaning, in this respect, of the complete Jewish occupation of Palestine has not been fully sensed by those who urge the extreme Zionist program. For it would intensify, with a certainty-like fate, the anti-Jewish feeling both in Palestine as «the Holy Land.»

In view of all these considerations, and with a deep sense of sympathy for the Jewish cause, the commissioners feel bound to recommend that only a greatly reduced Zionist program be attempted by the Peace Conference and even that, only very gradually initiated. This would have to mean that Jewish immigration should be definitely limited,

## Resistance

and that the project for making Palestine distinctly a Jewish commonwealth should be given up.

There would then be no reason why Palestine could not be included in a united Syrian State, just as other portions of the country, the holy places being cared for by an International and Inter-religious Commission, somewhat as at present, under the oversight and approval of the Mandatory and of the League of Nations. The Jews, of course, would have representation upon this Commission. ■

## BOOK REVIEWS

Two recent publications of the Palestine Liberation Organization Research Center, Beirut (Lebanon), are reviewed below, namely, G. Jabbour's «Settler Colonialism in Southern Africa and the Middle East» and Singh and Helou's «An Examination of Documents on which the State of Israel is Based.»(1)

(1) Books published by the P.L.O. Research Center are obtainable from: P.L.O. Research Center, Colombani St. off Sadat St., Beirut, Lebanon.

**Settler Colonialism in Southern Africa and the Middle East** — by George Jabbour. P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, Lebanon. 216 pages, L.L. 8.

This is an outstanding study by a competent scholar on an important subject that has, so far, received little attention from writers on the Palestine issue.

The study is described by the author as an interpretative essay that seeks to present «a reasonably coherent interpretation of the similarities between the three settler regimes in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Israel.»

The underlying assumption of the study, in the words of the author is «that there is a pattern of behaviour which is identical in its general lines exhibited by those European settlers who have formed political entities in non-European lands and that this pattern of behaviour is quite recognisable in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia and Israel.»

The book starts with a brief account of the atmosphere of colonialism and imperialism that prevailed in the late 19th and early 20th centuries that is during the period in which Europeans settled in non-European lands. It investigates special features of the settlement; pretexts used to justify it—mainly

possession of a superior dynamic civilization —, the search for legitimacy, systematic acquisition of land, and the racist and oppressive treatment of the natives.

In reviewing the struggle put up by the natives to the alien invaders and the growing international opposition to European settlers, the author traces the rise and development, after World War II, of national liberation movements in colonized countries the efforts of the Afro-Asian, tri-continental and non-aligned countries exerted to help these movements and the role played by the United Nations in opposing the two major evils of racism and colonialism.

The author adverts special attention to what he calls a «personal bias.» «It has always seemed to me unjustified for the world,» he asserts «to unequivocally condemn the discriminatory practices of the settlers in South Africa, to unequivocally condemn the usurpation of power by the settlers in South Rhodesia, and at the same time to be more lenient in respect of the crimes the Zionist settlers have committed and are still committing in Palestine,

when the basic lines of all these regimes are identical to one another, then the three regimes are but manifestations of the same colonialism, settler colonialism.»

The explanation of this leniency, however, is not far to seek. It lies mainly, in the powerful control which the Zionists enjoy over capital and information media in the West and in the close alliance that has existed, since the inception of the Zionist movement between Zionism and the colonialist powers. It also lies in the role which Israel plays as the instrument of neo-colonialism and world imperialism.

«Settler colonialism» is a well-written and scholarly work. It represents a valuable addition to existing literature on the Palestine issue.

---

**An Examination of Documents on Which the State of Israel is based** — by Bhim Sing and Angelina Helou. P.L.O. Research Centre, Beirut, Lebanon. 117 pages, L.L. 2.

This lucidly-written and well-documented book examines the major documents on which the artificial creation, of the so-called state of Israel, is based. It begins with a brief survey of the elements of a state and then proceeds to attempt a legal and political definition of Israel.

The documents examined are the Basle Program of 1897, the Balfour Declaration of 1917, the Palestine Mandate 1922 and the United Nations General Assembly Palestine Partition Resolution (No. 81, November 29, 1947).

The legality of the Balfour Declaration, the Palestine Mandate and the Partition Resolution is challenged. The pressures and manipulations that produced these documents is exposed. In challenging the legality of the Partition Resolution the following three points are raised: Are the terms of the British Mandate over Palestine consistent with the Covenant of the League of Nations? Is the forcible partition of Palestine consistent with the objectives of the Mandate and the principles of the UN Charter? Does the plan of partition in its adoption and forcible execution fall within the jurisdiction of the UN General Assembly?



**Resistance**

The conclusion arrived at by the authours as a result of investigation is that Israel is «not a state in the legal sense of the word. It is rather a cataclysm of wars, conflict—the natural outcome of the unlawful—of negating justice to the majority party, the Palestinian Arabs.» ■

# RESISTANCE

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Enclosed please find cheque for .....

covering a year's subscription

to RESISTANCE (12 issues)

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... Country .....

Mail to :

**RESISTANCE (P.L.A.)**

**P. O. Box 3577**

Please send cheques through Central Bank of  
Syria — Damascus

Rates : \$ 7.00, £ 3.00, L.S. 25.00

---

**ISSUED BY : Directorate of Moral Guidance,  
Palestine Liberation Army,  
Damascus ( Syria ).**

---





Sea of Galilee