



RESISTANCE

in the **MIDDLE EAST**

No. 2 spring 1971

Price .25

the liberal occupation **IN GAZA**
the debate on **PALESTINIAN NATIONAL UNITY**
report of **AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL** on **IRAN**
on **JERUSALEM HOUSING PROJECT**

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL

'STABLE' TURKEY ERUPTS

ALGERIA: oil nationalization, american investments

IRAN: trial of palestine group, shah's plans for the gulf

ISRAEL: how to get rid of the Israeli New Left,

the Golan Heights colonization,

'black panthers' of Israel

OMAN: the new sultan's plans for the Dhofar guerrillas

SUDAN: open war on communism



Editorial

Certain features of American foreign policy have all the predictive certainty of planetary movements. When Nixon calls for Israeli withdrawal from the Arab lands conquered in 1967, or when he negotiates for a temporary Egyptian-Israeli cease fire, we can be sure that he neither means what he says nor says what he means. Hardly had the "Rogers Plan" for the Middle East been made public, when Washington began assuring Golda Meir that it didn't actually mean total withdrawal. Simultaneously, "cease-fire" has come to mean an open-ended military commitment, making available to Tel Aviv "the full range of U.S. weaponry" (in the words of the late Mendel Rivers); very possibly a "full range" of 2 billion dollars. We ask our readers why the U.S. offered a Peace Plan it knew would never be acceptable in the first place.

First and foremost, the whole Rogers Plan rests on Israeli withdrawal and Arab recognition of the Zionist state, discretely deny the population directly concerned, the Palestinians, any say in their own future.

By promising some territorial concessions to Egypt and Jordan, while denying the Palestinian resistance any voice, Nixon has further divided Arab regimes, created dissensions among the Palestinians, and sown confusion among the Arab masses. Perhaps, it has been suggested, a Palestinian elite, beating a panicky retreat under the blows of Hussein's September offensive, will flee to a few concessions by the Great Powers, perhaps even a client state on the West Bank. Just two weeks ago, however, the Palestinian National Council meeting in Cairo, rejected the "carrot" of a West Bank state, although within the P.L.O. and Fateh some dissension has developed; certain moderate leaders considering a West Bank solution as "not out of the question."

Indeed, it was precisely Nasser's increasing accommodations to the Rogers Plan that isolated the Palestinians diplomatically and offered the green light for Hussein's genocidal assault on the whole Palestinian people. And if any doubt still lingered as to Washington's real aspirations to liquidate the Palestinian liberation movement, Nixon rushed to rearm Hussein and prepared the Mediterranean fleet for a direct intervention if Hussein began to topple.

The Rogers Plan, then poses a direct threat to peace in the Middle East and to the very exist-

tence of the Palestinian people. From the standpoint of imperialist trade and military strategy, Washington must dominate the Middle East--the crossroads of Asia, Africa and Europe. But of course, of even more immediate concern to Washington, is the preservation of "free World" control over the region's oil, which provides 75% of Western Europe's oil consumption. The Palestinian Resistance challenges this imperialist control by its inevitable confrontation with the "Status quo", and in that confrontation it sets a highly contagious example of independent struggle to all the Arab masses to pull their nations out of enforced underdevelopment and neo-colonial control. Meanwhile, the Rogers Plan plays both sides of the fence: arming Israelis, arming Hussein, and hoping to exclude the Palestinians from any return to their homeland. The Palestinian movement so far has rejected this scheme, and it deserves our unconditional support.



Van Ben Born

"The Russians are determined to control this region. This is their historic ambition and it is necessary to view the occurrence today in the war front of the area from this point of view.

"The Middle East is essential to the national security of the U.S.A. It is essential to NATO and also from this aspect the Middle East is essential to the security of the U.S.A. and the result is first of all to supply Israel with all the equipment necessary to enable her to self defence, a thing which I have no doubt that she is able to do. But furthermore, we, the Americans, have to repeatedly clarify to the U.S.S.R that the area is essential to us and we'll see in Russian movement an obvious and concrete danger to the security of the U.S.A."

States by Senator Henry Jackson in a visit to Israel.

Maariv 1.8.71.

the liberal occupation

IN GAZA

The following is a literal translation of a leaflet distributed in Hebrew and Arabic by the Israeli League for Civil and Human Rights (affiliated with the UN International League for the Rights of Man, NY), with additional information sent to me by the chairman of the League concerning the situation in Gaza. What is equally terrifying is the semi-official response to the accusations of the League published in the Israeli leading newspaper *Ha-Aretz* on January 26, 1971 under the title: "Denial of Torture and Molestation in Gaza". A translation of this item will constitute the second half of this article. What happens today in Gaza is not accidental, but a necessary consequence of the Israeli decision that the Gaza Strip is non-negotiable; of the Israeli-Jewish demand for a territorially privileged position, a demand, which like any demand for a privileged position leads necessarily to oppression. Nothing can justify the Israeli policies in the occupied territories.

The Israeli League for Civil and Human Rights, P.O. Box 20178, Tel-Aviv. Stop the Horrors of Gaza.

The myth of the "liberal occupation" is shattered. In a public address in Haifa said Moshe Dayan [the Israeli Defense Minister]: 'A year ago Israeli Defense Forces in Gaza were ordered to shoot at the source of fire when there is shooting in the streets; that is, when our soldiers are fired at, they have to respond by shooting back at the source of fire. If that happens to occur in a market place and the gunman escapes into the market crowd, it is permitted to fire after him, even if other people get hurt. I was responsible for that order, and I would not complain if people were injured in the streets. But the soldiers have refused to obey the order; they have refused to shoot into the crowd, explaining that they simply cannot. I am happy that they have refused. One must shoot, but one must see the common future.' (Yediot Aharonot, Jan.7.1971)

One can learn from the honored minister that the situation in Gaza has reached such measures that soldiers refuse to obey an order that permits mass murder, out of the simple human understanding that an order, even if issued by a minister, cannot oblige the murder of innocent citizens. We have reasons to assume that the minister did not present the situation accurately however, as not all of the soldiers have refused to obey his order. The widest read paper in the country does not, as we do, express its support for the soldiers who have refused to shoot. Instead in an editorial it expressed the following pious request addressed to the commanders: "to see at least that the soldiers will receive a thorough explanation that sometimes there is no other way but implementation of drastic and 'unpleasant' steps..." (*Ma'ariv*, Jan.7,1971). Indeed, allowing mass murder does very much require an explanation. A few days after this editorial was published the papers announced that for the first time units of the Israeli Border Police had been transferred to Gaza "in order to carry out there

the tasks of policing and managing security" and that "they are known for their rough hand" (*Haaretz*, 1.11.71). It will be recalled that Israeli Border Policemen, nicknamed "the green berets", were found guilty in the massacre of Kufir Qasim [*in 1956*], where they murdered cold-bloodedly 49 people, (including women and children) in one day. The stiffest penalty actually implemented for these vile murders was 3 1/2 years imprisonment, while the man directly responsible for the murder order was fined one Agora [*the equivalent of one American cent*]. Since then these units have registered, especially since the occupation, an infamous chapter in the history of national oppression.

For the first time since the war the Israeli press admits that the issue is not that of a "liberal occupation". It is an issue of the most widespread acts of oppression. There are areas populated by thousands of people under curfew for weeks. Workers strike, pupils strike, merchants strike. There are mass detentions, conveyor-belt trials and shooting into crowds. Yet the reports in the Israeli press are fragmented and usually incorrect. The situation is much worse than it is portrayed in Israeli newspapers. We are here making public additional facts which are not published in the Israeli press. We registered these facts only after careful examination. They were reported to us by people whose hearts told them that they "cannot witness such things and remain silent." They have consequently acted at the command of their consciences. We are presenting you herewith [*details*] of the situation in Gaza as it really is:

--Israeli Border Police patrolling Gaza in addition to arms also carry whips. They stop resi-



dents, beat them brutally and literally break their bones in order to instill fear and terror. With their whips they flog people like cattle.

--The beatings and brutal floggings have caused many people to flee from I.B.P. patrols as soon as they appear in an area. That is the true reason for what is afterwards described in the press as "shooting at people who attempted to escape." In this manner hundreds of people, including women, children and aged have been injured. The Israeli press attempts, as usual, to deny this. Ha-Aretz, Jan. 15, 1971 carried the following item:

"The reports of foreign correspondents to the effect that the Gaza hospitals are filled with patients beaten and shot by the security forces are completely unfounded. [This denial probably relates to the report published by a group of foreign correspondents who visited the Gaza Strip independently and reported in *Nouvelle Observateur*, Jan. 1971.] In a visit I conducted in three Gaza hospitals (the Baptist Hospital, Shafa and Nasir) I found in all the three only three Gaza residents." Not only does the testimony of eye witnesses contradict this description given by a Ha-Aretz correspondent, but it further cannot withstand the most elementary scrutiny if compared to the daily reports of the number of injured. And indeed on the very same day (Jan. 15) *The Jerusalem Post* correspondent reported six people alone in the Baptist hospitals, who, by the doctors testimony, suffered from "injuries caused by 'beating'". On the same day he was shown by Dr. Tarazi at the Shafa hospital two men beaten by security forces.

--But with the situation existing today in the Gaza Strip most injured do not receive hospital treatment at all. The interrogation of suspects is conducted with terrible brutality. An Israeli doctor who worked in the Gaza Strip reports: "A man was brought in with bullets in his legs. After first inspection it was obvious that one leg was lost but the other could be saved if the man was immediately taken to the Ashkelon hospital. Security men refused, and by order of the senior commander the wounded man was taken away. After four hours he was brought back and his second leg was lost too."

--Searches in refugee camps and huts are accompanied by acts of molestation and the destruction of the few belongings that people have. These searches are carried out by the I.B.P. and the Army Reconnaissance Units who are in the habit of undressing women almost or completely naked, claiming "search" and lining them up for long periods against the wall. A bus full of nun-nurses on their way to a hospital was stopped and the nuns were subject to this procedure. After intervention of international bodies [including the International Red Cross] the procedure is no longer carried out in the main streets, but is conducted in side alleys. Women's watches and

gold are robbed in high daylight and the few belongings of poor families are wantonly destroyed. [I would like here to refer the reader to Peter Gross: "Arabs Hate Israelies and Arabs in Gaza, A Land of Despair Dust and Poverty", *The New York Times*, Feb. 2, 1971.]

--Thousands of people are detained. Due to "lack of space" in ordinary prisons a huge detention camp was erected next to the seashore, opposite the "work battalion" place. Horrifying screams are heard emerging out of this place for long hours; admission into that camp is barred even to soldiers.

--A detention camp for families of "wanted" men was erected in the center of the Sinai, at Nahl in the Quseima area, and is in the process of accelerated expansion. Women and children, whose sole crime is being relatives of "wanted" men are jailed in this forlorn place. By this criminal act against women and children the oppressive administration has attained a new climax of barbarity. To add hypocrisy to the crime an order was given that at least one man be exiled in accompaniment of every such family so that "it could not be contended that we desecrate the Arab woman's honor".

--Male relatives of "wanted" persons (brothers, nephews, cousins) are exiled to another detention camp in Sinai, in the Abu Rudeis area, this by an official exile order, under the instruction of the authorized authorities. Their crime is being relatives of a man who is merely a suspect!

So much for the information published by the Israeli League leaflet, calling for a demonstration of protest on Monday February 1st in Jerusalem in front of the Israeli Parliament (Knesset). In a letter accompanying the leaflet the chairman of the Israeli League informed me of fines of IL500 (about \$140) on Gaza shopowners for every day they shut down their shops, and of the "encouragement" of mass immigration from Gaza to the west bank, and of other repressive policies. When the demonstration by the Israeli League was held it was attacked violently by a counter demonstration launched by the Israeli branch of the Jewish Defense League.

The direct responsibility for the above policies is shared by Defense Minister Moshe Dayan and the generals Aviram and Sharon, who are in charge of the immediate implementation of the Gaza Strip policies. On January 26, 1971 Israel's leading paper, HaAretz

paper, Ha-Aretz published on its front page a semi-official response to these accusations which were first made public in an anonymous letter titled: "A Report Submitted by Two Officer Eye Witnesses in the Ranks of Second Lieutenant and Acting Officer on What Takes Place Today in Gaza, 17.1.1971". The semi-official response appeared

in Ha-Aretz under the title: "Denial of Torture and Molestation in Gaza". After quoting almost verbatim the accusations listed above it says:

The Spokesman of the military administration in the Gaza Strip totally and unequivocally denied these accusations, and added: "Such kinds of torture would not have been passed over in the town, where everything is open and to which access is free. There has been no approach or complaint from the Red Cross."

This is published just above a small news item at the lowest part of the page, titled: "Red Cross Concerned About Israeli Acts in the Territories", where it says that the president of the International Red Cross has expressed his concern about the Israeli policies in the occupied territories. The Ha-Aretz correspondent in Gaza continues as follows:

In visits I have conducted in three hospitals in Gaza (Shafa, Baptist and Nasir) only a few isolated cases of men who complained they had been beaten by clubs or whipped by soldiers were reported to me. It should be noted that in Gaza the Israeli Border Police is operating and not the Israeli Army. Soldiers operate mainly in refugee camps and the other Gaza Strip cities. From hospitals it was reported to me that a number of people [One wonders how many?] were brought with broken arms or legs. Some were attended to and sent home, and few were hospitalized. At the Hasir hospital, where she is hospitalized, a young girl from the Jabaliyya refugee camp, Maiza Abd al-Mawla (19) told me "I stood in the camp in the company of a number of other women; a jeep came suddenly from the distance driving fast and rammed me against the wall and so I was injured."

Why were you rammed against the wall?, I asked.

"I don't know. I just stood there."

The girl is hospitalized with broken hands and legs. The doctors showed me her x-ray taken at the hospital. A doctor at the Nasir hospital

said that six pregnant women were brought to the hospital from the Shati refugee camp for child delivery. One, as the result of beatings on her belly, he said. The others delivered but cannot be released from the hospital because there has been a curfew in Shati for three weeks already and people who left the area are not allowed to return as long as the curfew lasts.

A Concentration Place for Suspects: In an investigation I carried out in Gaza yesterday, it became clear that a place for concentration of males has been erected in Gaza. They are detained there for the purpose of interrogation after a breakout of terrorist activity and are released if it becomes clear that they are not involved in terrorist activities.

In Sinai a detention camp has been erected, concerning which an official announcement has been released. The detention camp has been erected because the Gaza jail is filled up. The International Red Cross asked to visit the new detention camp and was given permission to do so. [What did the Red Cross report?]

Israeli Border Policemen no longer carry clubs and whips as they used to carry after the first days of their transfer to Gaza. This is by high order. In the few hours' tour I took in Gaza and in conversations with leaders and local residents I did not hear of torture as described in the anonymous letter [and of torture otherwise described, did you?].

Searches carried out by Israeli Army forces in the Shati refugee camp looking for guns, hand grenades and ammunition--after receiving information that these are hidden under the floors--resulted in houses being destroyed, but these will be rebuilt by order of the Defense Minister. The building is delayed for the time being because of a shortage of cement.

Edited by: Uri Davis, vice-chairman of The Israeli League for Civil and Human Rights.

ما رام هناك انسان جين جائج يضطهد
مروا اوائى على الارض فان الحرية
هبة فارغة لا معنى لها
-باك بنادى دفاعه الاخير- راجع صفحة ٨-

The Palestine National Council, meeting in Cairo behind closed doors since Sunday, temporarily interrupted the study of the plan for national unity presented by the leader of the Palestinian resistance, Mr. Arafat, because of profound disagreements which are said to have come up during the debates.

The leftist movements proposed several important modifications to the original plan, demanding in particular the disbanding of the Central Committee of the PLO and the formation of an executive committee which would be charged with selecting the members of a new National Council. The composition of this new "Parliament" is the object of lively discussions among the representatives of the commandos, and no agreement has yet been reached, each group wanting to assume the leadership of the Council.

Elsewhere the Palestinian Popular Congress, convoqued simultaneously in Cairo by the Palestine National Council, rejected in its final communique the idea of a Palestinian state in Transjordan and Gaza.

The Congress brought together both Palestinian and Jordanian personalities and called for national unity of the two banks of the Jordan, the establishment of a government favorable to the Palestinians in Jordan, and the creation of a popular national front.

Arafat's Plan

Mr. Yasser Arafat, president of the Executive Committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization, presented to the Central Committee of the Palestinian resistance, meeting Saturday in Cairo, a plan of "national unity" with the objective of unifying the operations of all the Palestinian organizations. This plan comprises the following six general principles:

- 1) The PLO is the organ which brings together in one organization all the Palestinian revolutionary forces "to carry out the armed struggle to liberate the totality of Palestinian territory". This command must develop a unified general strategy in the various fields.
- 2) All commando organizations, all fighting forces, all federations and all independent personalities can participate in this "national unity" provided they respect the Palestinian national charter as well as the resolutions of the National Council.
- 3) The merger of these organizations is the highest level of unification that we seek, that we encourage, and for which we are struggling. Nevertheless, each organization has the right to maintain its internal self regulations provided that it disbands all its other organs, which should merge with those of the PLO.
- 4) The National Council will work out the military, political and financial strategy that all the organizations agree to abide by.
- 5) A general command will be created which will

An Interview with Hawatmeh

Of all the leaders of the Palestinian resistance meeting at the National Council in Cairo, Mr. Nayef Hawatmeh, leader of the Democratic Popular Front, is perhaps the only one about whom there is a consensus. While extoling the most radical ideological positions, he has always conformed, tactically, to the directives and discipline of the Central Committee, of which he is a member. While Mr. Hawatmeh is himself against the total merger proposed by Mr. Arafat, he is being called upon to arbitrate the dispute between Fateh and the Popular Front of George Habash over the unification of the military forces of the resistance.

He declared to us, "It is certain the tendency in the Arab countries and the rest of the world is in the direction of an overall negotiated settlement. The petit bourgeois and Arab reactionary regimes as well as the imperialists have joined hands to force the resistance to accept a compromise. There is no doubt that the Palestinian popular war has been affected by its setbacks in the field since last summer, coupled with the surrender of the Arab regimes.

"...Instead of revising its principal options in order to readapt them to the new realities of the region, the movement is seeking refuge in the idea of Palestinian national unity which is based on two diametrically opposed notions. The first would like to empty the revolution of its political character to the point of compromising its objectives, which is tantamount to surrendering the resistance to the right wing. That's exactly what President Sadat advocates when he talks of a single strategy encompassing the strategies

Hawatmeh... cont'd from p.6

of the Palestinians, the Syrians, Iraqis, etc., one that favors in the end the resolutions of the Security Council and the UN. The D.P.F. categorically rejects this choice.

"The second notion of 'national unity', which is our proposal, implies a readjustment of our previous alliances and the establishment of new relationships among the commando organizations on the order of a common front whose fundamental objectives would be (1) the political and formalized independence of each component force, and (2) the adoption of adequate measures to prevent the Palestinian people from participating in any compromise political solutions.

"All this requires the creation of a Jordanian-Palestinian national front which would struggle against Zionism and fight for the liberation of Transjordan. This implies as well that the resistance revise or rectify its relations with the Arab regimes and collaborate directly with the Arab liberation movements without passing through the intermediary of the established regimes. Now, this national union is today coming up against obstacles which can't be overcome in a few days: The greatest obstacle is the contradictory interpretations which each one of us wants to give to Palestinian national unity."

Between the Hammer and the Anvil

Considering the position taken by Fateh, the resolutions of Mr. Hawatmeh exclude straight off the creation of a unified general command of the resistance. Even the delegates of the Congress recognize this as a rejection of a general command.

Why then reject the creation of a Palestinian state?

"We must first specify," emphasizes the leader of the D.P.F., "that the idea of creating this state is an integral part of the political solution, and this asks the Palestinian people to renounce their historical and natural right to reclaim all of their land. Moreover, in this state which is being 'offered' to us we would find ourselves caught between the hammer of Jordanian reaction and the anvil of Zionist militarism."

You then choose armed struggle. Could you reconcile this with a peaceful solution?

"The solution which is proposed to us carries within it the seeds of the liquidation of the Palestinian cause since it is centered around the recognition of the state of Israel with secure and acknowledged borders. This compromises from the start the exercising of our right to reclaim our homeland through armed struggle, there being no other alternative. It is clear, therefore,

that there exists a glaring paradox between the proposed solution and the pursuit of popular armed struggle."

What do you expect from the National Council?

"No miracles. At best it would help to maintain a certain cohesion among the various organizations of the resistance movement so they can confront together their numerous detractors and prevent the Palestinian people from participating in a compromise political solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. But the Council meeting can also fail because of the two cross-currents--conservative and progressive--which exist inside the resistance movement, threatening to neutralize it. The resistance movement is a prisoner of its political and ideological contradictions and is being faced with the international political realities. Translated from Le Monde 3.4.71

Arafat... cont'd from p. 6.

assume the responsibility of leading the Palestinian revolution.

6) The fundamental condition of unity of action is to abide by the decisions of this general command.

The plan presented by Mr. Arafat foresees the administrative structures of the PLO as including a National Council, a Central Committee, a Political Bureau, a military command of the revolution, a national fund, and other bodies. It divides the forces of the Palestinian revolution into three parts: regular troops, commandos, and militia.

The General Staff of the revolution will direct military activities and establish the necessary plans to this effect. It should reorganize the forces of the revolution for which a united fund is to be decided upon by a new National Council.

Translated from Le Monde 3.2.71

DAYAN ROCKS MARRIAGE CODE

In a move which threatens to break up Israel's coalition government, Defense Minister Moshe Dayan is reported to have proposed amending the nation's religious marriage code to allow illegitimate persons to wed.

This would be revolutionary in Israel, where the synagogue conducts all marriages. In Orthodox Jewish circles illegitimacy denotes a status as severe as ex-communication to a Roman Catholic.

The Christian Science Monitor
3.10.71

It is happening...

IRAN

Trial of Palestine Group

Several of the 18 political prisoners appealing against sentences of three years to life imprisonment imposed by a military tribunal on December 31 have alleged that they were tortured by the Iranian security police (Savak).

The 18 were sentenced for conspiring against the security of the state and being members of an illegal organization. Contrary to earlier reports they were arrested about a year ago.

Most were caught in small groups trying to cross into Iraq. Three were arrested in Teheran and the police say they found arms in their houses. All but two are students or recent graduates.

Apparently because of foreign press reports and the pressure of civil rights groups abroad, the authorities have gone out of their way to dispel the impression that the trial is secret.

Two of the defendants, Masaoood Batahi and Shoq-rullah Paknejad, have described themselves as Marxist-Leninists. Most of the others said they were left wing. Iranian military law provides for sentences of between three to 10 years for being a member of the Communist (Tudeh) Party, propagating its doctrines, or for activities against the monarchy.

Those caught near the Iraqi frontier have claimed that they were on their way to Palestine to join the fight against Israel. The military prosecutor implied today that their real motives were to obtain guerrilla training in Iraq or Palestine for use on return to Iran.

Excerpts from *The Times* (London), 1.18.1971.

Shah's Plans for the Gulf

"Iran will use force to occupy Abu Musa and Tumb, if necessary." The Shah announced, in a recent interview, published in *Ettala'at* a semi official Tehran daily (Air mail edition, February 20, 1971.). He said that Iran is ready to replace Britain as the protector and the guard of the Gulf. "We are the only count-

ry which has the necessary military and economic possibilities to protect and support this region."

The shah emphasized that after the British leave the Gulf, Iran will occupy the three islands (Abu Musa, Tumb, and Bani Tumb) situated at the opening of the Gulf. "These islands belong to us...We will get them back with force, if necessary, because I do not want to watch the auction of my country."

The Shah expressed concern about the spread of "the destructive acts by the leftists" in the Gulf region and said that the reason for his concern is that they threaten the oil exports of Iran. If these Islands fall in their hands, that will be a disastrous danger."

In the same interview, the Shah warned Libya that they should not raise their demands in oil talks too high and should behave in a rational and logical manner and not ask for increases above those achieved by the Gulf area countries. Otherwise, Iran cannot support them in these talks.

Recently, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Abu Dhabi, and Qatar got a 35¢ per barrel increase in crude oil prices. Libya, with the sulfur content of her oil much lower than that of the Gulf area, and with much lower cost of transportation of her oil to the European markets, is carrying out separate negotiations with the oil companies for price increases.

ALGERIA

oil nationalization

The French state-owned oil company demanded tonight that Algeria nationalize 100 per cent of the company's holdings there, rather than 51 per cent, and pay a "just indemnity".

At the same time, the French Government--"without challenging the principle of cultural and technical cooperation"--made known its feeling that the "unilateral" decision of Algeria to

take control of oil resources there would "profoundly modify" relations between the two countries.

In oil industry circles it was explained that 100 per cent nationalization was preferable to 51 per cent because in the former case compensation could be demanded for the entire investment. Since the Algerian Government has long demanded control of oil revenues in order to industrialize the country, the industry fears that there will be no profits left for the minority interests to send home.

In all, the French oil industry hopes to recover an indemnity in the area of three-quarters of a billion dollars for its proved oil reserves of 800 million tons in the Algerian Sahara.

France has recently been getting 30 per cent of her petroleum and a substantial part of her natural gas from Algeria at the most advantageous import rates in the world.

Conservative newspapers here were scathing today in their charges of official French weakness toward the Algerians. The independent *Le Monde*, however, said the government had received ample warning.

"For several weeks," *Le Monde* said, "the tactic of the French authorities has consisted of stalling for time, dragging out negotiations they could not control, hoping to improve their positions through the conference of Teheran, then that of Tripoli, as if the stake was limited to oil taxes or the price of a barrel of oil."

The reference was to conferences on prices paid by oil companies to producing nations.

Le Monde questioned whether the 1965 agreement on oil and aid had been as favorable to Algeria as is widely maintained here. It suggested that French-Algerian relations should end the "privileged ties" of the past to achieve a more realistic basis of mutual interests.

Excerpts from *The New York Times*, 2.26.71

american investments

The United States and Algeria are planning a massive joint enterprise to liquefy natural gas in this country, transport it across the Atlantic in tankers, recompress it and pipe it to American consumers.

The project, involving capital investment

on a scale comparable to Egypt's Aswan High Dam, foresees a minimal U.S. outlay of 600 million dollars, according to President Houari Boumediene. Almost certainly the figure would climb considerably higher.

From the American side it would be supervised by the El Paso Gas Company. Loans to finance it would be raised by the Export-Import Bank if the Federal Power Commission approves. Bank President Henry Kearns visited Boumediene last week and according to the latter the talks went well.

Apart from stipulated profits the essential American benefit derived would be a share in Algeria's huge gas reserves thus relieving pressure on our own. Boumediene sees nothing incongruous in partnership between Algeria and the leading capitalist state. He explains: "We can't risk tying ourselves to doctrines that events will soon bypass. This is no longer 1917 [date of the Bolshevik revolution]. This is a time when men are going to other planets."

"We wish to build a Socialist society adjusted to realities and suitable to our traditions. It cannot be atheist because we are religious moslems and we will not impose Socialism by force. Moreover we wish to keep certain private sectors. We want foreign capital to help and we will pay acceptable profits. During this phase of our development there is coexistence between the Socialist, nationalized sectors and private sectors and we definitely encourage capital investment.

To achieve these purposes Boumediene is eager to implement the projected huge Algerian-U.S. gas development. He promises a decent profit to U.S. investors, saying: "In this world you get nothing for nothing." Some day Algeria will certainly nationalize all petroleum as well as gas deposits but Boumediene promises equitable indemnification.

Thus, in this age of ideological convergence and the outmoding of rigid doctrine, a new pragmatic relationship of immense importance seems to be developing here. American capitalism would help finance Algerian Socialism's growing pains-- each for its own benefit

Excerpts from *The New York Times* 2.26.1971.

As long as there exists, on earth, an imprisoned/ hungry/ oppressed/ deprived/ or illiterate human being, freedom is an empty word without meaning.

From Paknejad's last defence.

(See Trial of Palestine Group, p.8)

TURKEY

'stable' turkey erupts

Premier Suleyman Demirel of Turkey, finally resigned, on March 12, under threats by the Armed Services chiefs that they would assume direct powers unless he stepped down. "The main question facing Turkey was therefore whether the successors of Mr. Demirel could long keep order in a time of acute political instability without further Army intervention..."

"In a joint memorandum to President Sunay and the heads of both houses of the Turkish Parliament, the services chiefs said (that) unless Mr. Demirel quit, ... the armed forces were determined to take over the administration, relying on their legal right to protect the republic... They backed up their words by moving troops into Ankara and alerting Air Force units." (Emphasis added.)

The main figure in the emerging new power junta is General Gurler, commander of ground forces. "General Gurler was trained in the United States, Britain, and Italy and is well known to American and other NATO staff officers, who have worked with him in the affairs of the NATO alliance."

Mr. Demirel's resignation climaxed months of "political instability" in Turkey, mostly caused by a wave of anti-American activities. "...As leftist guerrillas in Latin America have demonstrated, a handful of dedicated extremists can embarrass and even rock a government." (Newsweek, March 15, 1971.)

On February 11, the U.S. embassy warned all American service personnel and civilians in Turkey against "a rash of anti-American incidents, including bombings or possible kidnappings."

(About 20,000 U.S. Army personnel and their families are based in Turkey.)

Four days later an Air Force sergeant was kidnapped from inside a U.S. military installation which is located on the outskirts of Ankara. He was released 17 hours later.

Less than three weeks later four American airmen were kidnapped on their way home from a radar station near Ankara. The kidnapers, members of the Turkish Liberation Army, asked for \$400,000 ransom for their release. They also circulated a four-page typewritten manifesto in which they claimed responsibility for all recent bomb attacks on American buildings, two bank robberies and last month's kidnapping of the American sergeant. The manifesto was addressed "to all peoples of the world and the people of Turkey" and stated that the aim

of the Liberation Army was "to clean Turkey of American and all foreign enemies." It appealed to all "progressive" Turks from workers and peasants to officers and employees to support their struggle and pointed out that "the liberation and complete independence of Turkey would be possible only through armed struggle."

The Turkish police swiftly started a search for the kidnapers and arrested one of them as he was about to park the airmen's car near the Soviet Embassy in Ankara. The captured kidnapper, under harsh police interrogation gave the names of the other four who took part in the kidnapping. They were all former or present university students and active in Dev Genc, a revolutionary youth group headed by Deniz Gezmiş, a student sought by the police for suspected "terrorist activities."

45,000 police and soldiers were immediately ordered onto Ankara's campuses to search for the Americans. The troops were met by a hail of bullets, dynamite sticks and gasoline bombs. At the Middle East Technical University in Ankara, students, organized by Dev Genc members, barricaded themselves in the various buildings and waged a seven hour battle against the police search. One student and one gendarme were killed and at least 20 students and two gendarmes were wounded. More than 350 students were arrested. The Liberation Army released the Americans after six days.

The Turkish government in its tough treatment had the total support of Washington. The U.S.-Turkish relations are very warm and in the words of one American official, "We can't conceive of anything Demirel might be doing that he isn't doing. It seems that he is committed at last to cleaning up this whole business."

The government believes that these "communist mafias", as Demirel refers to them, are inspired by Latin American urban guerrilla tactics. In fact they are called Turkish Tupamaros in Turkey. "A good deal of such [Latin American guerrilla theories] literature has been circulating in bookstores and on campuses recently and has been a topic of discussion among youth and intellectuals. But if the inspiration came from far away Latin America, practical aspects such as training and weapons have emanated from neighboring Al Fatah land."

"During the last few months, several young Turks have been caught while illegally crossing the Turkish-Syrian border on their way to or from Al Fatah camps. Some were seized with arms, explosives, and propaganda materials."

"Dev Genc", which is a far-leftist revolutionary youth group, has been conducting a campaign for what it calls the 'establishment of a revolutionary ring 'to fight American and Israeli imperialism. Dev Genc's close contact with Al-Fatah has been known to Turkish authorities. Intelligence reports on this disclosed at National Security Council meetings recently caused deep concern among the council's military members.

At police headquarters where students were taken for questioning, about 200 reportedly had received Al Fatah training."



Aside from attacking police stations, bombing American buildings and kidnapping, many "have also been conducting intimidation campaigns, such as visiting houses of wealthy people and

telling them that their houses will be seized 'when revolution comes.'

"Police have records on few dozen urban guerrillas, particularly on well-known university dropouts such as Deniz Gezmiş and other Marxist revolutionaries."

"Before the Liberation Army's appearance, most of these terrorists were members of Dev Genc, which as a legal organization was quite active in universities and was popular among leftist radicals. But there has been disagreement within Dev Genc, and some members expressed disapproval of terrorism."

"The formation of the underground Liberation Army is seen as a result of this discord..."

Turkey's current acute crisis actually began last June. Sixty six percent devaluation of the Turkish lira brought drastic price increases. Striking workers rioted in Istanbul and other cities, and the army imposed martial law for three months."

There has also been growing unrest among the youth which has resulted in many clashes between the university students and the police, or between militant rightist and leftist students. "Campuses throughout Turkey are now divided into two camps: Marxist revolutionaries and religious fanatics. They battle against each other fiercely, seize university buildings threaten professors, order class boycotts, and close faculties."

"Their violence has gone beyond the limits of the campuses. The leftist radicals have just launched a new 'offensive' against foreign capital investments in Turkey, causing damage to Western companies in Ankara and Istanbul."

"Marxist revolutionaries have also been reported active among between 3 million and 5 million Kurds in eastern Turkey, especially since Iraq's Kurdish minority signed a peace agreement with the Baghdad government last March. Turkish and Iraqi security chiefs have held conferences on the Kurdish problem."

In December, 1970, a new wave of strikes swept Turkey. "Workers began to occupy industrial plants, especially in the Adana area near the big U.S. Air Force base of Incirlik. Peasants seized the lands of landlords in impoverished areas of eastern Anatolia. "Students occupied buildings and defended women and men dormitories against police searches for "subversive element

These developments in general, and the appearance of the Liberation army in particular, irritated the Turkish generals, who brought pressure on the government "to restore order". In December, General Batur (Air Force commander) asked President Sunay to intervene to bring a "national government". In February, General Tagmac (chief of staff) warned that the armed forces would "not long remain patient in the face of assault upon their honor."

Demirel lost no time in introducing a series of bills early this year "to curb disorders" and "to fight subversion". One bill provides heavier jail sentences for the occupation of schools and factories and for resisting the police. Another bill restricts people's right to hold marches and demonstrations. It provides sentences up to nine years in jail for unauthorized demonstrations.

Many student groups, however, have already announced their intention to resist these measures "by any means necessary".

Demirel had hinted that the government may call upon the army to preserve his regime against attacks if police fail to control the situation. This could even mean proclaiming martial law.

Thus far the police has issued a list of suspects, mainly students belonging to Dev Genc. One of Dev Genc leaders, Ertugal Kurkcu, has rejected such charges of complicity, but says nevertheless, "we are fighting totally against imperialism."

Kurkcu charges that the Turkish secret police was behind many of the recent dynamite explosions which have occurred around the country,

cont. on page 18

SUDAN

open war on communists

The speech made on Feb 12 over Omdurman Radio by Major General Gaafar Annemeiry, Sudanese prime minister and chairman of the Revolutionary Council, constitutes a virtual declaration of war against the country's Communist Party.

"These traitors," he said, referring to the Communists, "have been opposing the revolution of May 25, 1969, since its very inception, and have been obstructing its progress," thus putting an end to the alliance concluded between the two main political forces of the country after the 1969 coup.

In fact, the rift between the regime's military elements and their allies on the extreme Left took place last November, when the Revolutionary Council ousted three of its members known to be sympathetic to the Communists, retired thirteen left-wing officers and ordered the arrest of the Communist Abdel Khaliq Mahgoub.

Basic Causes

These moves, coming as they did only a week after the signing in Cairo of the agreement to create a federation of Egypt, Libya and Sudan, left no room for doubt as to the immediate causes of the rift. Besides, the Communists had never hidden their opposition to any Arab union or federation, on the grounds that it was premature.

The opposition of the Sudanese Communists to the idea of a three-nation federation probably sealed their fate. From the very outset there have been basic differences of opinion over the scope and substance of the organization destined to become the country's fundamental political framework. The Communists saw it as a front grouping of all the country's progressive forces, in which they and the mass organizations under their control could operate independently.

General Nemeiry and his friends, however, had a marked preference for a single party, as in Egypt, incorporating the Communist Party and the trade unions.

In October 1969 the controversy over the subject became less academic, and General Nemeiry's supporters won their first victory when they ousted former Prime Minister Babikir Awadallah, considered too soft on the extreme leftists. General Nemeiry strengthened his hold on the government by combining the functions of revolutionary council chairman and prime minister. However, the various plots hatched by the Right (the

General claimed in December 1969 that in six months there had been ten attempts to overthrow his regime) delayed the showdown between the military faction and the Communists.

Old Quarrel

These two forces were to join hands once more in March 1970, to put down the rebellion led by the imam el Hadi Abdel Rahman el Mahdi, spiritual leader of some 6 million Ansars, who was killed on April 1 while trying to flee across the border into Ethiopia. Once the right-wing Moslem threat had been taken care of, the old quarrel flared up again. Four days later the Sudanese government put the dead imam's nephew, Sadia el Mahdi, and Mr. Mahgoub on a plane bound for Cairo.

The expulsion of the Communist leader was obviously designed to rid the government and the party's moderate wing of a very dangerous adversary. But the job was botched, and only served to intensify Communist opposition to the government. Mr. Mahgoub's views--he himself was allowed to return to Khartoum in July 1970--dominated the party's national conference held in August. A minority of moderates refused to accept the conference resolutions and broke with the party.

Since then their influence has waned considerably, and it is significant that in his speech last Friday General Nemeiry did not even bother to make a distinction between "moderate" and "extreme" Communists when he announced his intention to destroy "the so-called Communist Party," adding that "there is no justification for the existence of the Sudanese Communist Party."

The general has a tough job on his hands. The Sudanese party is the most powerful Communist movement in the Arab world. It is well organized, accustomed to repression of all kinds, and enjoys wide support at the grass-roots level, among the working classes and the peasantry.

Jean Gueyras, *Le Monde Weekly*, Feb. 17, 1971

The Secretary of State's declaration that U.S. guarantees are more vital than "geography" aroused concern in Jerusalem.

"This is not the borders of the U.S.A. but of the Jewish people," responded Prime Minister Golda Meir. "We cannot trust what Rogers offers us even if he does so with the best of intentions."

Defence Minister Moshe Dayan in a public meeting on March 17 said, "If geography is unimportant in the case of Israel, as Rogers claims, then why is it essential for the Americans in Laos, Cuba, and Berlin?"

OMAN

the new sultan plans to crack down on the guerrillas

The new Government of this sultanate on the Arabian peninsula is embarking on its most determined military drive yet against leftist rebels in the southern province of Dhofar.

The war in Dhofar now consumes more than half of Oman's \$100-million annual oil revenue,...

Ever since the former Sultan Said bin Taimur was deposed by his son last July, the Government has been mobilizing its forces for what it hopes will be a decisive blow against the rebel guerrillas. Another battalion has been raised to strengthen the Sultan's armed forces, led by British officers. During the last three months, the force has been deployed around the mountainous areas of Dhofar, where the Chinese-directed rebels have gained control over the population of 35,000.

The rebels have launched attacks recently as close as the fringes of the Sultan's fortified southern seat, Salala, and there have been isolated incidents of rebel infiltration into vulnerable areas farther north in the country.

Although the British officers directing the war are the first to admit that decisive blows are difficult to deal against an elusive guerrilla enemy, it is hoped that the next three months may show the first tangible signs of headway in the war.

The rapid development of the British Royal Air Force base on Masirah Island, which belongs to Oman, lends weight to the theory that Oman has been earmarked for an important role in the event of a British withdrawal from the Persian Gulf area.

And there is hope here for a greater Oman, which would mean an absorption of the sheikdoms of Fujaira, Ras al Khaima, Umm al Qaiwain and Ajman.

Excerpt from *The N.Y. Times*
2.14.1971

LEBANON

Several thousand demonstrators marched to the Lebanese Parliament here Tuesday to protest a visit by David Rockefeller, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank. His two-day visit here included talks with top Lebanese Government officials. The protest was organized by leftist parties.

The Christian Science Monitor, 3.10.71

ISRAEL

"Black Panthers" of Israel

Jerusalem.- A demonstration against social discrimination took place Wednesday afternoon in front of the mayor's office in Jerusalem. It was organized

by the Movement of the "black panthers" (young people of oriental origin belonging to poor families), but hundreds of students (including high school students), members of Matzpen and intellectuals, such as writers Amos Kenan and Dan Ben-Amatz, also participated.

The demonstrators protested against the preventive arrest of 15 young men by the police, in order to prevent the demonstration from taking place. In spite of the warnings lanced by the Minister of Police, Mr. Chlomo Hillel, several hours later, this illegal demonstration took place-- the first in several years--in front of hundreds of police. The demonstrators immediately dispersed, calmly.

The 15 men arrested are six "black panthers" and 9 members of Matzpen, of which one is the leader of this leftist movement, Haim Hanegbi....

"We have had enough"; "Why do ten persons sleep in a room while they construct comfortable houses for the new immigrants of Europe and America?"; such were some of the slogans of the young "panthers", who have distributed tracts denouncing the police who had tried to prevent their meeting. They said notably; "Is it permitted to demonstrate in Israel only in favor of the Russian Jews, that is the community of Golda Meir?"

The circles which occupy themselves with social affairs in Jerusalem estimate that if the precarious situation of the disfavored classes does not get better, there will be growing activities on the part of the "black panthers".

Le Monde, March 5, 1971.

At a press conference, in mid-March, the Secretary of State, Mr. Rogers announced, "The United States is perfectly prepared to play a leading role in guaranteeing the security of Israel." He assured the Israelis that a U.S. presence "is the most adequate possible guarantee that you can conceive of in modern life."

Van Ben Born



How to get rid of The Israeli New Left

The Israeli New Left is worried. In its opinion "innocent victims" are being slain due to the strong hand of ZAHAL (Israeli army) in Gaza.

The terrorism has been going on in Gaza against Arabs and Jews for much too long, accompanied by a feeling that there is no efficient government there. All the victims caused by that terrorism are not - according to the New Israeli Left - innocent victims. Only those who fall "victim" to the rule of order are considered innocent victims.

The New Israeli Left also knows a secret which no one in history has known up to now: how to conduct a war without creating innocent victims.

According to the New Left the solution in our case is that the Arabs in Gaza recognize the State of Israel and that Israel recognize "the right of the Palestinian nation to self-determination," and which this mutual recognition will occur all will be well in the end...

I suggest that ZAHAL follow the advice of the New Israeli Left to stop its strong hand for one week on the condition that during this week all the members of the New Left go to Gaza, tour the area and enjoy it and occupy themselves with propaganda for their idea of peace. Why not? After all the Arabs in Gaza do not read their advertisements in Ha'aretz.

So let's see them. They can go meet the Arabs in Gaza face to face.

And one, two, three there will be no more New Left in Israel.

The problem is that the New Israeli Left knows this too.

That's why they are sitting in Tel-Aviv publishing advertisements in the Hebrew papers against the strong hand in Gaza.

And what's easier than that?

*From article written by Arieh Galblum.
Haaretz, Jan. 71*

Who will invit us?

Vice President Agnew in response to a question about the possible involvement of the United States in the Middle East said:

...Let us assume that Israel will be invaded --will they suggest to us that we will remain idly on the side? Will nobody be found who will say we should not get involved in that case?!

Maariv 8.1.71.

an area settled is an area not to be returned....

THE CASE OF THE GOLAN HEIGHTS

Following David Ben Gurion's time proven axiom that an area settled is an area unlikely to be handed back for whatever reason, the Israelis are vigorously pursuing a far-reaching program aimed not only at settling as many Israelis on the Golan as possible, but also turning the area around.

...the basic goals of the master plan [for the Golan] remain essentially unchanged:

1. Providing maximum population as a necessary condition for the determination of the area's future.
2. Answering Israel's security needs.
3. Forming an effective economic base that will link Israel's economy, rather than live off it.

Specifically, the plan calls for:

A population of 55,000-60,000 within 10 years...

Seventeen new agricultural settlements (eight moshavim, or cooperative villages, and nine kibbutzim) that, according to their attitudes, will produce cotton, beef, vegetables and flowers for exports, apples, and nuts. The expected cost of this portion of the program (gigantic by Israeli standards) is \$100 million.

A "snow ski to water ski" network of recreation and tourism centers including a ski resort on the slopes of Mount Hermon, to cost about \$8.3 million to construct; a water recreation resort on the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee (\$5.9 million); and a hotel complex at the proposed regional center at Slukia (\$6.8 million).

Twelve agricultural settlements are already in existence on the heights-- nine kibbutzim and moshavim and three border outposts scheduled to become civilian settlements later on.

This enormous settlement operation (Merom Golan's 1970-1971 budget is close to \$3 million) can hardly be justified by security considerations or economic reasons alone. Viewing this massive construction and road-building effort throughout the Golan, one can hardly escape the conclusion that, regardless of whether Syria decides to join the peace talks or not, Israel is in the Golan to stay.

*Excerpts from The Christian Science Monitor
3.3.1971.*



amnesty international

reports on

IRAN

In October 1970, Dr. Hans Heldmann visited Iran on behalf of Amnesty International (AI). He was accompanied by an Iranian student from the University of Mainz, Hossein Rezai. Rezai was assigned by the Austrian section of AI to act as Dr. Heldmann's interpreter in Iran and to report with him afterwards. Dr. Heldmann was expelled from Iran within ten days of his arrival. Rezai was kidnapped by the Secret Police (SAVAK) on his way to the airport, and is now in jail in Iran.

Here are excerpts from Dr. Heldmann's report to Amnesty International:

New information about growing persecution actions in Iran for political reasons lay at the basis of our mission. Since the beginning of this year over 1000 persons are said to have been arrested; within the last month at least two prisoners are said to have been tortured to death; in this month legal proceedings (the majority secret) are supposed to take place before military courts; political prisoners are said to be convicted through falsely incriminating testimony obtained through narcotic treatment and then executed.

Mr. Rezai and I were under recognizable surveillance from the time we arrived. The secret police's supervision of us was as we-- only later and only partially-- had to realize, perfect-- including surveillance of our telephone conversations in the hotel room. Our surveillance was demonstrated to us in many ways.

The access to potential sources of information proved to be very difficult-- even more difficult than during my earlier visits in December 1965, and April 1969. The terrorizing of the population and the brutality of the oppression had taken on an unforeseen dimension. We know that people we spoke with and also such people with whom we could have considered speaking were intensively threatened from SAVAK with disappearance forever in prison. After this we were only partially successful in obtaining contacts.

Mr. Rezai was summoned to a conference with the secret police on Tuesday 13.10 from 20:30 until about 24:00 A.M. Among other things, the prospect of both of us being imprisoned was indicated. Mr. Rezai had the impression from this conversation that after our meeting with the authorities, actions against us were to be expected.

Since the Iranian secret police confiscated all the written documents I had in my possession at the time of my departure, I am dependent on my own recollections of the various conversations for this report. With Mr. Rezai's arrest, his documents also completely disappeared.

In various conversations we learned: since the beginning of this year a great number of people have been arrested for political reasons. Usually the relatives of these people have gone for months without news of their fate although the Iranian right of notification of the relatives within 48 hours of an arrest is prescribed. The prisoners are held until some sort of judicial process, without knowledge of the accusations against them. It isn't known which of the about 1000 who were arrested this year have been indicted or convicted. The press doesn't report political punitive procedures. They are not public, but take place before a secret military tribunal. Political prisoners are regularly tortured in the prisons, with the exceptions only of those few prisoners who are too well known within or outside the country. The families of the prisoners are frequently exposed to psychological terror and economic pressure. (For example, the wife of a prisoner is threatened with being slandered throughout the country as a prostitute, being imprisoned and treated as a prostitute.)

The already available announcement about the torture death of the holy man Saidi and the graduate of the polytechnical school in Tehran, Nikdawudi, are confirmed. Saidi is said to have ultimately died from the introduction of boiling water into the intestine. According to a medical attestation available to me from the clinic of the central detention center Nikdawudi had suffered the following injuries, leading ultimately to death: broken vertebrae in the neck, injuries to the spinal cord, and from discs shoved between the vertebrae, leading ultimately to complete lameness of all extremities and intercostal muscles.

In general I can state that the Confederation of Iranian Students has reliably reported on the use of torture and on the persons herein referred to. That applies especially to the particular political prisoners mentioned in that report.

We were only able to learn of the occurrence of one of the political trials taking place at that time, that of Dr. Sheibani, but were not able to

obtain admission to the proceedings.

On Monday, 19.10, we went to see the state secretary Nikucha in the Ministry of Information who referred us to General Director Tabatabai as the director of the department competent in dealing with our situation. We proved our identity here as representatives of Amnesty International through presentation of our commission instructions and a certified translation of them in the Persian language, and stated our requests in detail. I asked especially for comment on the then available information on the treatment of political prisoners, clarification on the fate of a list of prisoners, known to us, and for knowledge of the names of other prisoners. I brought up the cases of death that were known to us. I asked finally for access to these political punitive trials and for the opportunity to talk with the prisoners. At the time I emphasized that it was not my concern to expose the authorities through the publication of uncovered grievances, but that I followed the exclusively humanitarian goal of Amnesty International, to accomplish the safeguarding of the International basic rights of political prisoners, as recognized also by Iran. In this respect I offered to treat all statements and proceedings as confidential--under the assumption that an end would immediately be put to violation of human rights.

Mr. Tabatabai promised us the prompt support of the Ministry of Information.

On Tuesday, 20.10, I received over the telephone the information that on this day the announcement of the judgement in a two week long undecided secret military trial against the doctor and author, Dr. Sheibani was to be expected. (Dr. Sheibani was arrested approximately 3 months earlier, after he had given a short speech at the burial of the murdered, in prison, Saidi). Mr. Rezai and I, about an hour later, renewed our request to be admitted to this military trial proceeding as observers, at the office of Mr. Tabatabai. Mr. Tabatabai was allegedly uninformed about this proceeding--he promised to immediately find out himself and pass our request along. According to our arrangement with him, we inquired again at the Ministry of Information every hour, during which time Mr. Tabatabai's secretary put us off from hour to hour and finally about 14:00 said that Mr. Tabatabai couldn't be reached further that day.

At 16:00 on the same day, Tuesday, 20.10, two police officers in civilian clothes visited me in my hotel and told me, with the help of Mr. Rezai as interpreter, that I must leave the country immediately, that day or else I would be arrested and forcefully expelled. After questions and remonstrations they presented their identification papers and stated that a written expulsion order didn't come into question, nor did an explanation. I was an undesirable person; my mission

through Amnesty International was unimportant; my stay was entirely dependent on the will of the authorities. It was unimportant that until now no other country had expelled a representative of A.I.. The expulsion did not concern Mr. Rezai but he could depart with me. My remonstrations merely had the effect of extending the time limit until the next morning.

About 17:00 I booked the return flights for myself and Mr. Rezai in the Lufthansa office. In the meantime, one of the two police officers had come to the hotel again in order to make sure that we had booked our flight. In his conversation with Mr. Rezai he had emphasized that he was an acquaintance of Mr. Rezai's father. He had then offered to drive Rezai to the airport immediately so he could settle the departure formalities, which Iranian citizens must complete on the occasion of their departure. Mr. Rezai had left the hotel at approximately 17:30 with the police officer. I myself had awaited the visit of a gentleman from the German embassy at the hotel--I had privately notified the embassy of the expulsion order.

Mr. Rezai had told me that he probably wouldn't return until 4 a.m. the next morning because he wanted to say good-bye to his family and friends. He has been missing since then. At the time of my departure from the hotel on Wednesday, 21.10, he had not turned up. My own inquiries at the airport and Lufthansa offices yielded no trace of him. Allegedly his passport was not there either.

After I had already gone through the passport check and baggage clearance, I was brought back by a uniformed police officer because another customs inspection of my luggage was to be made. At the customs office I was surrounded by 2 uniformed police officers and 4 or 5 plainclothesmen. A plainclothesman searched my luggage. My complete portfolio of documents from my activities in Iran was confiscated, also all my correspondence with A.I., addresses in Tehran and BRD, my notebook of handwritten records, also such things out of my local law practice--telephone numbers, notes, and reports of the Confederation of Iranian Students which had informed me of addresses of Iranian authorities, names and fates of political prisoners. My protests were completely ignored, even by the Lufthansa directors who had noticed the incident and come over. The spokesman for the secret police had explained to me in English: That was routine supervision of all passengers, for the safety of air traffic; a written confiscation authorization was unnecessary; a receipt for the confiscated materials was also unnecessary; that the documents were from and for the A.I. was unimportant; that included were also files from my law practice was

cont. on page 18



Jerusalem Housing Project: architecture and colonization

"Jewish immigration to Jerusalem is the fundamental question. For more than 100 years Jerusalem had a Jewish majority and we want to keep this up without touching the legitimate interest of the minorities... preventing the division of Jerusalem again".

Zev Sharef, Israeli
minister of housing.
(The N.Y. Times
2.16.1971)

On Feb. 15, 1971 the Israeli ministry of housing announced that it was going to continue working on the four housing project situated around Jerusalem. This announcement came after a brief delay in the project due to severe international criticism from various "authorities" as:

(1) U. Thant who: "charged Israel Friday with violating Security Council resolutions by conducting housing construction in Jerusalem. He demanded an immediate halt." (

Note: Construction inside occupied territories is an act in violation of the Geneva convention 1948.

(2) Five Israeli architects from the ministry of housing who after voicing their criticism of the plans for Jerusalem were fired by Mr. Sharef for "talking with forked tongues".

(3) An international panel of "experts" formed by Mayor Teddy Kolleck. "The panel included such well-known architects as Phillip C. Johnson and Louis T. Kahn of the United States and Bruno Zevi of Italy, as well as city planners such as Prof. Charles M. Haar, chairman of the Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University.



The panel criticized what it termed lack of inspiration and vision in the planning effort for Jerusalem and attempts at prosaic solutions in a center of faith and poetry. It also noted the absence of any Arab or Moslem representatives on the planning group.

The project itself "envisions the construction of up to 35,000 units capable of accommodating 122,000 new Israeli residents almost half of Jerusalem's present population in the territories that were seized from Jordan in the six-day war." (*The New York Times*, 2.16.71) When talking about the political implications of this plan Zev Sharef bluntly said, "To settle new immigrants as quickly as possible in order to keep Jerusalem a Jewish city." He said that as far as the Arabs were concerned (Zev Sharef is talking here about thousands of Arab families that will have to be evicted from their homes to make room for the new housing) the government would in the future provide housing for them near Ramallah and Bethlehem. It should be pointed out that at a time when bulldozers are sweeping away the hills of East Jerusalem, the question of the Arabs who are being kicked out is still a distant affair for the future. All the public information available on the fate of these Arab families indicates that the Israeli Government has not gone any further than empty verbal promises to resettle them. For example, on February 22, 1971, in *The Christian Science Monitor* we find statements like, "He [Zev Sharef] added there was enough space in the eastern city and its outskirts including Ramallah and Bethlehem, to build 30,000 units for East Jerusalem Arabs in the density called for in master plan. *He did not say this would be done.*" (Emphasis added)

Arab protest over this has very bitter and the comments of City Planner Meron Benevinisti "I don't blame them for protesting, I probably would do too in their place. But we are going ahead with our plans" reflect the amount of "concern" being given to these protests.

We have dealt at some length with the Jerusalem Housing Project because it is a familiar topic to anyone who follows the American press. However, the Jerusalem housing project is only one of a whole range of similar projects being carried out in the territories occupied after the 1967 war (Golan heights for example) and even in areas like the Galilee where up to recently the commonly used expression "Jewsification of the Galilee" meant removing Arabs from the area by a variety of means including economic and military and replacing them with Jews.

What is being done to Jerusalem and its



people is a deliberate policy symbolic of the kind of relationship Zionism has instituted as regards its relations to the Palestinian people.

The Building plan Mr. Sharef added "is a plan with a Jewish goal" Pointing to models of the new construction, he said, "This is a Zionist Exhibition"

The quotations in this article are taken from: The Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 20, 1971 and Feb. 22, 1971; and The New York Times, Feb. 16, 1971.

American financier David Rockefeller, who was touring Israel as a private citizen, paid a call on Prime Minister Golda Meir Wednesday. He had conferred earlier with Egypt's President Sadat, Jordan's King Hussein and Lebanon's President Franjeh.

Mr. Rockefeller left Israel Friday on his way to South-east Asia.

Mr. Rockefeller took umbrage at the repeated insinuations by newsmen that his interest in the Middle East was motivated by oil and finance. He agreed that the region's enormous oil resources were a factor that "cannot be overlooked," although it was of far greater importance to Western Europe and Japan than to the U.S. But any possible question of oil property expropriation, he said, was totally eclipsed by the much more profound question of peace.

The Jerusalem Post Weekly, 3.16.71

Amnesty International... cont'd from p.15.

unimportant. The policemen refused to give me their names. I noted down immediately the following remarks of their spokesman: "I promise you, you will get everything back in 3 days-- with the exception of those things that are important to us." And to my question of what was important for them, he answered, "The things that are important for you." Also at this time, they prevented me from going back into the inner area of the airport.

As a result of the expulsion we were unable to receive further documents and information which had been promised to us.

During the night of Thursday, 22.10, a German-Press--Argentor announcement arrived from Tehran at the local press offices: the Iranian government announced that they had expelled the German attorney Heldmann because of communist contacts and declared him "persona non grata" and had arrested his Iranian friend because of the same information.

On Friday, 23.10, the Tehran correspondent for Le Monde reported a statement by the Iranian authorities that Rezai was being held on the Charge of having impaired the security of the state.

On Tuesday, 27.10, the Iranian embassy in Koln stated to the press: "Heldmann is unwelcome. We expelled him from Iran because he obviously confused the University of Tehran with the University of East Berlin. We could not accept that in our democracy. Rezai was not arrested, but is only being held in custody. After an investigation of the matter, he will be released."

It is certainly superfluous to mention that I am neither conscious of Communist contacts in Tehran nor of any connection between my stay there and unrest at the University of Tehran.

After all the to date experiences and especially since my last observations of the unimaginable way in which justice and law in Iran are cynically ignored it is my opinion that --when if at all possible --only the most intensive pressure of world public opinion can move the Iranian authorities to return to the principles of a civilised nation in their treatment of their supposed political opponents.

Turkey... cont'd from p. 11

In order to justify their repression against the revolutionary left.

All quotations are from *The Christian Science Monitor*, 12.16.70, 2.13.71, 2.24.71, 3.5.71, 3.6.71, 3.10.71, 3.13.71, unless otherwise specified.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL

This letter was signed by seventeen American intellectuals, including Paul Jacob, Louis Kampf, Noam Chomsky, and David Deutch.

It appeared as an advertisement in Ha'aretz 27.11.1970.

We, American citizens, Jews and non-Jews, are deeply concerned about recent reports that seem to indicate a growing threat to democratic liberties in Israel.

According to the May 3, 1970, *Jerusalem Post*, for example, Minister without portfolio Israel Galili called for "widespread, reasoned and downright public condemnation of all poisonous comment which goes beyond the bounds of criticism permissible in a democratic state".

According to the same report, "in Mr. Galili's opinion, the condemnation should not be left to the government alone, but a spontaneous campaign must be waged against it though without, God forbid, being carried away by witch-hunting." If a Minister of the Government has called for "spontaneous action" against views he has declared to be "poisonous" and impermissible, the fact that he appeals to "reason" and disclaims any witch-hunting intentions can hardly dispel the suspicion that he is in fact, intentionally or not, calling for mob assault against dissenters.

More recently still, in the July 15, 1970, *Maariv*, under the headline, "Action Against Israelis Who Slander the State Abroad Will Be Considered," we read, "The Foreign and Justice Minister were invited to a meeting of the coalition leadership to make a final decision on action to be taken. There was general agreement that this phenomenon must be stopped." The news item continues: "Mr. Y. Klinghoffer (A member of the Knesset) said that he will press for a law that will permit revocation of the citizenship of Israelis who slander the state abroad."

If this report is accurate, we cannot help but wonder why the government is considering such severe measures to repress dissent. Do the dissenters against whom these proposed measures are aimed speak for a growing number of Israelis? Are some of their criticism valid? If the Knesset should enact such laws, it will be following a dangerous path.

We know, from our own recent national experience, that efforts to stifle dissenting views debase the culture of a nation, pervert

its values, distort its priorities, and can lead to dangerous adventurism and even national catastrophe. Our own country still suffers severely from the irrationality, the fears, the hatreds which are the legacy of McCarthyism. We are led to wonder if the spirit of Joe McCarthy is being reborn in Israel today. If this is so, the cost to Israeli society will surely be severe.

The quality of a society can largely be judged by the way it treats its dissenters. Certainly, no state can claim to be democratic unless its dissidents are allowed to speak their piece, without fear of punishment and reprisal.

Much of the good will Israel enjoys in world opinion derives from its democratic image. Proposals such as those cited here can only have the effect of alienating enlightened world opinion, while endangering Israeli society itself by inhibiting debate at a moment when completely free and open discussion is surely as essential as at any time in Israel's history.



Van Ben Born

[In reply to questioning in the Knesset last week], Mr. Dayan said: He was still of the view that Sharm-e-Sheikh without peace was better than peace without Sharm.

The Jerusalem Post Weekly
3.16.1971.



Van Ben Born

Defence Minister Moshe Dayan told the Knesset last week that 34 families of wanted Gaza terrorists had been banished to Abu Zneima on the western coast of Sinai to prevent them helping the wanted members of the family. There are no "concentration camps", he said, using his questioner's phrase, and five of the 34 families are already back home-- their relatives being in jail.

The Jerusalem Post Weekly
3.16.1971.



LeFolley

The Christian Science Monitor

Resistance is produced by a group of Arab, Israeli, other Middle-Eastern, and American volunteers. We would appreciate comments, suggestions, articles, cartoons, and financial contributions. Checks should be made to Middle-East Publications. Our address is:

Resistance
P.O. Box 82
MIT Branch
Cambridge, Ma. 02139

SOLIDARITY STATEMENT

DEAR PALESTINIAN BROTHERS IN ARMS,

I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO GIVE YOU MY MOST FRATERNAL GREETINGS AND ALSO RENEW OUR ENTIRE SUPPORT FOR YOUR JUST STRUGGLE AGAINST THE ISRAELI AGGRESSORS COMMANDED BY THE AMERICAN AND BRITISH IMPERIALISTS, FOR LEGITIMATE NATIONAL RIGHTS.

OUR PEOPLE IN SOUTH VIETNAM ARE GLADELY CONVINCED THAT YOUR STRUGGLE WILL DEVELOPE MORE AND MORE STRONGLY THROUGH OUR PEOPLE & EXPERIENCES WE KNOW THAT YOUR STRUGGLE WILL MEET MANY DIFFICULTIES AND SACRIFICES, BUT WITH OUR DETERMINATION AND UNITY WE WILL TRIUMPH OVER ALL MANEUVERS OF THE ENEMY SO BELLICOSE AND OBSTINATE.

FINALLY I WISH OF ALL MY HEART, THAT THE PALESTINIAN BROTHERS WILL WIN EVERY DAY GREATER VICTORIES.

MY FRIENDLY WISHES TO YOU AND YOUR STRUGGLE

Ng Thi Binh

NGUYEN THI BINH