



BULLETIN
of the
REPUBLIC OF IRAQ

May/June

1965

Contents

Editorial	1-2
Iraq Oil—May Production Figures	2
Press Conference by Professor al-Bazzaz on Kurds in Iraq	3-4
Press Statement on Kurds in Iraq	5
The "Observer" and the Kurds in Iraq	5
Background on the Kurdish Question	6
Facts on Political Prisoners in Iraq	7
Palestine Day in London	8-12
Mr. Mushtak's Lecture on Palestine Day: When will the West awake?	12-15
Text of President Gamal Abdel Nasser's Message to the Arab Students' Union in the United Kingdom on the Occasion of Palestine Day, 1965	16
Communiqué on Arab Socialist Union Meetings in Cairo	17-19
U.A.R.—Iraqi Unified Political Command: Joint Communiqué	20-21
The Arab Information Ministers' Conference in Amman	22
Let Us Forget	23
The Jordan Waters	24
Palestine National Congress	24-26
The Palestinian Diaspora, by E. Mannin	27-31
Palestine: The Broken Triangle, by E. Childers	31-37
Zionism's Impact on Canadian Jews	37-39
The Keepers of the Rings, by Qishtaini	39-40
Plight of Arabs in Israel	40-41
The Arab Representatives' Resolution on Palestine	42
Al-Bazzaz Visits the U.A.R. Tourist and Information Centre	43-44

UNIFIED NATIONAL EMBLEM

According to a decision taken at the joint meeting of the Iraqi National Council of the Revolutionary Command and the Council of Ministers held on 26th May, 1965, the Iraqi Republican emblem was made similar to that of the U.A.R. This is the Arab eagle of Saladin on our cover.

Apology to our Readers

Due to certain unforeseen technical circumstances this issue of the *Bulletin* has been involuntarily delayed.

Editorial

Bulletin
of the
Republic of Iraq

WHAT PRICE ISRAEL?

Seventeen years have passed since the Palestine calamity, and there is little sign that the conscience of the West has been stirred, less hope that the Zionists will ever abandon their insane ambitions. Only recently, in London, Levi Eshkol told a nation-wide television audience that neither he nor his colleagues were interested in any plan for the Jordan waters but their own, which is the total employment of these waters in the service of Israel. There was little adverse comment to these remarks, and in fact the Zionist cause is now well served by a new English law designed, under the guise of attacking racialism, to protect international Jewry to such an extent that it is now an offence punishable by imprisonment to criticize the Jews.

Only recently Eshkol and his friends were celebrating what they presume to call "Independence Day", a curious name for a day won by intrigue and bloodshed. When he said that Israel must be ready "to repulse aggression", he was again trying to convince world opinion that the Arabs are aggressive, that the innocent Zionists only want to live side by side with the Arabs as peaceable neighbours. Most of the Western powers find it suits them to agree with this theme, and their Press is all too ready to show Israel as the victim of Arab enmity.

These devotees of Israel neglect that in celebrating its anniversary they are hymning a nation which has no natural boundaries, but which has seized every inch of its territory by violence or chicanery. The Arab world, feeling its mettle after generations of suppression and misery, and ready to give great things to civilization in our time, is at every turn menaced by the presence of Israel. Geographically, the Arabs are divided by Israel, economically hampered by it (the arms which must be provided to defend them against a new Israeli aggression must be bought at the price of new socio-economic development) and their sense of dignity is daily affronted by its presence in their midst. In their camps, the refugees cry out for their homeland—for their lost homes, their small property, their fruit trees—whose theft, in 1948, has just been joyfully commemorated by the Zionist *internationale*. The United Nations resolu-

tions that these people must return to their homes and regain their property are ignored, and the fact that the same body has categorically declared that there can be no security in the Middle East till these resolutions are complied with is likewise ignored by the Israelis, who know what they want, and count on the western powers to help them get it.

In the cities of the world, it is possible to meet Palestinians of all ages whose lives and hopes have been shattered by the Zionist-imperialist combine, and whose courage and determination are summed up in their catch-phrase "We Shall Return".

Every Arab, who can look his fellow men in the face, echoes this phrase. It is of cardinal importance to all, workers, intellectuals, statesmen, and those who live on the land. It is not only the sense of indignation at a specific wrong, at a crime daily excused with polished blandness by those whom it does not touch; it sums up Arabs' anger at a total situation which those who could have changed it have done nothing to rectify and everything to aggravate. The Arabs are not suffering from persecution mania when they say that they are the victims of conspiracy and perfidy emanating from the West: it is the simple truth.

Thank God, the Arabs have friends. There are many nations, many leaders, whose hearts are with them. But the solution, as President Nasser has said in grave and noble words, lies in their own hands. They are ready: for greater austerities, harder work, and more sacrifice.

PEACE ON ZIONIST TERMS

Abba Eban, Israeli Deputy Premier, spoke of a possible settlement between Israel and the Arabs in the *Jewish Observer* of 16th April, 1965. Favouring a pluralistic and polysentric view of Arab destiny, he linked the permanent presence of Israel with the separate independence of Arab "nations" and described the Arab East as not being entirely Arab in character. Furthermore, he stressed his conviction that the only peace available in the Middle East is a peace founded on the existing territorial and political structure. All these linguistic acrobatics by Zionists double-dealers cannot hide their real subversive intentions. Their supreme

Front cover picture:

Presidents Nasser of the U.A.R. and Arif of Iraq during the recent meetings of the Unified Political Council in Cairo

Embassy of the Republic of Iraq,

21 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

and grand strategic objectives remain: The preservation of Arab fragmentation, the prolongation of Arab backwardness and the destruction of Arab will to resistance and victory. Arab nationalism and Arab social justice on the one hand, and Zionist racialism and Israeli expansionism on the other, are mutually exclusive and diametrically opposed. His kind of peace confirms a death sentence on the Arabs as a single nation engaged in the battle of achieving freedom, social justice, and unity.

PEACE WITH THE ZULUS

In the April, 1964, issue of the Chatham House publication *International Affairs* there is an article entitled "The Arab-Israeli conflict: Some suggested solutions" by Yigal Allon, offering peace to the Arabs. In the article he says: "If the Arab states are really afraid that Israel is too small to absorb the many immigrants who are without homes and without any future to look forward to in the countries from where they come, why do they seek to limit her even more by hinting at territorial concessions Israel's expense?" This is sheer play on words. And General Allon proves not only that he is a qualified soldier but also a fine acrobat, juggling with words. He knows but he does not say that what the Arabs oppose first and foremost is the open door immigration itself. In that masterpiece of humour and irony "1006 and All That" there is a chapter entitled "The Zulu War" which goes like this: "War with Zulul: Zulul exterminated; Peace with Zulul." This is exactly the peace that General Allon offers to the Arabs on behalf of the Zionists. "War with Arabs: Arabs exterminated; Peace with Arabs."

IS PEACE WITH ISRAEL GOOD TO THE ARABS?

Some misguided or misinformed voices are now and then raised claiming that it is beneficial to the Arabs to make peace with Israel. They argue that there are many benefits which will be to the good of the Arabs. These benefits can be either long term or immediate. The immediate benefits that Israel offers to the Arabs in return for peace are as follows: she will concede only minor frontier rectifications and this on a reciprocal basis; she will take back only a token number of refugees, and she will pay symbolic compensation. The minimum she will want in return will be a *de facto* recognition and the lifting of the blockade and the boycott. It does not need much imagination to see who will actually benefit most from such an arrangement. What are the long-term benefits?

(1) The argument claims that the Arabs will benefit from Israeli capital and technique. Assuming Arab receptivity (which is absent) the Arabs do not need Israeli capital. The Arabs are less in need for attracting

capital from outside than for distributing properly the huge capital that they already possess. But even if the Arabs needed capital from outside, there are other sources than Israel from which they can get the capital. It is also doubtful that Israel which lives on foreign and Western generosity, has surplus capital to invest in large quantities. As for techniques, the same can be said. The Arabs can get it from anybody in the world. Moreover, the Arabs are seriously training their own technicians everywhere in increasing numbers.

(2) The argument also claims that peace with Israel will protect the Arabs from Israeli aggressive acts and particularly from her massive reprisal raids. The Arabs think that the best protection against Israeli aggressiveness is greater political unity, combined with greater military vigilance and greater diplomatic initiative. Moreover, successive experiences have proved beyond any doubt that peace is nothing to Israel but a breathing space in which this Zionist institute prepares to launch a still greater offensive against the Arabs when the opportunity arises.

In the last analysis this argument is based on two principal assumptions: That Zionism is ultimately compatible with Arab nationalism, and that Israel in fact has realized itself within its present territorial limits. Their attitude in this regard is not based upon fears or suspicions. They have been at the receiving end of Zionism for forty years. They have suffered from it at first hand. They are entitled to tell the whole world: "We know what we are talking about and you don't. We carry the wounds of Zionism in our soil and our homes, in our limbs, and in our heart." These Zionists gentlemen are no poets. Their aggressive intentions took not only a verbal form but were translated repeatedly into actual deeds of horror, ruthlessness, and inhumanity. Are the Arabs not entitled to ask what political tool will peace form in the new Zionist aggressive strategy which is now being forged in the Israeli workshop?

Iraq Oil— May Production Figures

The Iraq, Basrah and Mosul Petroleum Companies' crude oil production figures for May, 1965, and the totals for the first five months of 1965, are as follows:

	Production, May, 1965, Long tons.	Production, Jan.-May, 1965, Long tons.
Iraq Petroleum Co., Ltd.	2,747,000	18,237,000
Basrah Petroleum Co., Ltd.	1,635,000	7,807,000
Mosul Petroleum Co., Ltd.	117,000	525,000
	4,519,000	26,719,000

Press Conference by Professor al-Bazzaz on Kurds in Iraq

PROFESSOR Abdul Rahman al-Bazzaz, Ambassador of the Republic of Iraq to the Court of St. James's, gave a Press Conference on 26th May, 1965, at the Embassy. Invitations were previously sent by the Press Attaché at the Iraqi Embassy in London, Mr. Hazim T. Mushtak, explaining that Professor al-Bazzaz will speak on certain distortions of facts concerning Kurds in Iraq by some sections of British information media, and their effects on relations between the United Kingdom and the Republic of Iraq. The conference was attended by many diplomatic correspondents of British national papers as well as representatives of British and Foreign News Agencies. Mr. Mushtak opened the conference by expressing his hope that the attendants will co-operate in attaining the truth which is in the best interests of both the Republic of Iraq and the United Kingdom.

Professor al-Bazzaz welcomed the gentlemen of the Press, expressed his pleasure at meeting them and appealed to the Press for fairness and accuracy in reporting Iraqi and other Arab news. For his part, he promised to be frank and truthful with the Press. He was not a professional diplomat, he explained, but a teacher and a university professor, and the duty of the teacher was to tell and defend the truth.

Professor al-Bazzaz accused Britain of "an unfriendly act" towards Iraq by allowing an Iraqi Kurd, Jalal Talabani, to come here, speak to Members of Parliament, appear on television, address the Press, and conduct an anti-Iraqi campaign of misrepresentation and slander.

Professor al-Bazzaz said he was going to the Foreign Office that same day to register his protest, granting the visa was contrary to Britain's declared policy not to intervene in the dispute over the situation of the Kurds in Iraq.

The Ambassador also objected to Jalal Talabani being allowed to appear on television, and said: "It is the non-conformists who are entitled to speak, those who are orthodox are not. Neither the Iraqi Ambassador nor any members of the Embassy were allowed to appear on television to reply."

Professor al-Bazzaz added: "There is a moral duty on the part of the B.B.C. and all media of public information not to allow a small minority to enforce its ideas and leave the people in complete darkness."

He wrote a letter of protest to the B.B.C. but said at the conference that he had not had a reply. Professor al-Bazzaz said he sincerely hoped the British government would be aware of the importance of this matter, would reconsider the situation and try to work for understanding between Iraq and Britain. He believed this was an essential element for both countries.

Professor al-Bazzaz said Mulla Mustapha al-Barazani

and his "tiny clique of outlaws" were in rebellion in the North of Iraq, and represented only one-third of the Iraqi-Kurdish population which again was between one-seventh and one-eighth of Iraq's population.

What the Iraqi Government was doing was "just and fair"—any other government would act similarly if faced with the same situation, Professor al-Bazzaz continued.

The Ambassador said the Kurds were "a hard working, sincere people, pious—deeply religious, probably more religious than most of the Arabs". He had the greatest admiration for them.

"I would like to see them united and happy in their Kurdistan, capable of developing their ideals, and culture like any other nation in the world." "But for Barazani to say he speaks for the Kurds is fallacious. He is preparing the way for a separatist movement by force—no government could ever be party to that."

The *Scotsman* of 26th May, 1965, as well as the *Financial Times*, *The Times*, the *Daily Telegraph*, and the *Guardian* of 27th May, 1965, have published accounts of the Press Conference. We reproduce below, with grateful acknowledgments, the account of *The Times* which was the most objective, detailed, and fair:

Abdul Rahman al-Bazzaz, the Iraq Ambassador in London, yesterday gave one of those Press Conferences that are in fact a public protest. He was concerned about recent publicity given to the Kurdish rebellion in Iraq by Jalal Talabani, a leader of the Kurdish Democratic Party, who stated in London on Thursday that the Iraqi Army in recent fighting against the Kurds had used gas and napalm. The Ambassador also alleged that the British government's action in allowing Talabani to enter Britain and conduct political propaganda here had not been that of a friendly government.

The Ambassador said that the Kurdish question had been treated as a purely Iraq problem, but in fact the Kurds were spread over five countries, Turkey, Russia, Iran, and Syria, as well as Iraq. The leader of the rebellion, Mustapha al-Barazani, was often regarded as representing the Kurds in Iraq, but in fact, the Ambassador claimed, he represented not more than a small minority of them, as about two-thirds were quiet and peaceful, and many were siding with the Iraqi government.

Special Army

The idea that the Iraq government was dictating a policy of genocide was therefore a wholly corrupt view. Al-Barazani's rebel movement had started many years ago against another Kurdish tribe, but after he had spent ten years in exile in the Soviet Union he had been invited back by the former dictator, General Qassim,



Professor al-Bazzaz, Ambassador of Iraq to Britain at his Press Conference: To his right in the picture His Excellency Hasan al-Dujaili, Ambassador of Iraq to Morocco, to his left Mr. Hazim Mushtak, Press Attaché at the Embassy of Iraq in London, to the right of the picture in the background appears Mr. Ahmad Anis, Press Councillor at the U.A.R. Embassy in London, and Director of the U.A.R. Information Centre in London

who wished to balance the different factions within Iraq. Al-Barazani and his more extreme supporters had demanded that the Kurds should have a special army and control a large area in which were many non-Kurds and including Kirkuk on the plain, where the inhabitants were Turkmen and Arabs as well as some Kurds.

The Ambassador said that the claim to a separate army vitiated Jelal Talabani's statement that the Kurds were seeking a federal system, such as operated in Switzerland and Yugoslavia.

Revenge Alleged

He then argued that the British government's declared view was that the situation in Kurdish Iraq was an internal affair: Jelal Talabani should not, therefore, have been given a visa to make propaganda against the Iraq government (by meeting M.P.s at the House of Commons and speaking in a B.B.C. programme).

The fact was, he maintained, that British representatives wished to 'avenge' themselves for Iraq support of Oman, Aden, and other Arab propaganda permitted from Baghdad but this was a different matter, as the Iraq government had never concealed that its policy was anti-imperialist.

Abdul Rahman al-Bazzaz strongly denied that poison gas had been used in fighting against the Kurds. The Iraqi troops were certainly not pursuing a policy of genocide. They had been operating in northern Iraq, to restrain the rebels and protect the loyal tribes whom the rebels would otherwise have forced into the rebellion."

Elsewhere in this issue of the *Bulletin*, we have published a release by the Press Office of the Iraqi Embassy on Kurds in Iraq, as well as a detailed statement by the Embassy on the background to the Kurdish question.

Press Statement on Kurds in Iraq

On 26th May, 1965

SOME sections of British information media have recently circulated distortions of facts on Kurds in Iraq.

The number of Kurds in Iraq and their percentage to the whole population has been grossly exaggerated. The latest statistics show the population of Iraq as being little more than seven million, of which Kurds do not exceed one million, constituting barely one-seventh of the entire population.

Some newspapers have alleged that Kurds are being subjected to a policy of extermination in Iraq. These allegations are totally unfounded. Kurdish language, culture, and national heritage are preserved and respected. Arabs and Kurds live happily as brethren in national unity. Many Kurds have occupied, and still do so,

positions of great responsibility in the government without discrimination.

By claiming verbally that they seek autonomy, the mutineers actually intend to achieve secession, a situation which no responsible government could tolerate.

A tiny clique of outlaws does not represent the Kurdish community of Iraq. It is this clique, and not the majority of the Kurds in Iraq, that stir up trouble and spread mischief. The Iraqi Government is maintaining law and order as a normal function. The government desires only to isolate chauvinistic elements and curb their egotistic aims. This is a prerequisite condition to achieve progress and prosperity in the interests of the whole population of Iraq including the Kurds themselves.

The "Observer" and the Kurds in Iraq

THE Sunday *Observer* published a leading article entitled "Helping the Weak" on 23rd May, 1965. The paper recognized that Britain cannot directly intervene to help the Kurds, but advocated a favourable reception of the demand to suspend shipments of arms to Iraq. Furthermore, the paper compared the situation in Iraq to the situation in South Africa where apartheid is imposed by the minority on the majority.

Professor al-Bazzaz, Ambassador of Iraq to Britain, sent a letter to the Editor of the *Observer*. We reprint below the letter of Professor al-Bazzaz as it appeared in the *Observer* of 6th June, 1965:

Sir,

I read with great surprise your comments, in your issue dated 23rd May, about the Kurds in Iraq under the heading "Helping the Weak".

The trouble in north Iraq is essentially between a band of mutineers, who happen to be of Kurdish origin and who are supported mostly through fear and terror by a fraction of the Iraqi Kurds, and the legitimate government of the Republic of Iraq.

Whereas the government of South Africa has created a policy of apartheid and thus deprived the vast

majority of the indigenous population of their basic human rights, in contrast the Kurds in Iraq, who constitute barely one-seventh of the total population, play a great part in the Iraqi government, both as Ambassadors, Ministers, and Army officials, as well as in all aspects of political life. Their participation in the government of the country is high in relation to their numbers and they are, in fact, fully integrated, through inter-marriage in all parts of the country, with the political, economic, social, and public life of the country in all its phases. It is apparent, therefore, that to suggest an analogy as between South Africa and Iraq is quite out of place.

The suggestion that an embargo should be placed on the shipment of arms to Iraq is very astonishing, since it overtly advocates British interference in the internal affairs of any country with which a deal is concluded—a situation which would lead other countries to look to other sources than British with which to conclude their commercial deals, where unconditional transactions are obtainable.

ABDUL RAHMAN AL-BAZZAZ.

Background on the Kurdish Question

THE Kurds are divided between Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and the Soviet Union. So their boundaries do not coincide with any international frontiers. In the areas they inhabit, other ethnic groups live, so it cannot be said that what is called Kurdistan is exclusively inhabited by Kurds. There are ancient colonies called Turkomans along with Arabs and other ethnic groups.

Arab nationalism has lived since time immemorial in complete brotherhood with the Kurds. The Arabs have respected the Kurdish language, culture, and national being. The Kurds in Iraq have used their own language in their schools, in courts, and in dealings with governmental affairs in their part of the country. The Iraqis have never thought of their origin as a reason for division. The Islamic religion constitutes a brotherhood which showed a great solidarity for a people who lived in the same country since history began. The Kurds in Iraq were given such toleration that they have been the envy of Kurds from other countries.

The number of Kurds in Iraq is around one million. Their language, heritage, and culture have always been respected by the Iraqi state and Iraqi community. Before and after the revolution of 1958 Iraqis of Kurdish origin, like the Iraqis of all other origins, have reached the highest posts in the government including Premiers, Ministers, Governors, Commanders of General Staff, and high-ranking officers in the army. No cabinet has ever been formed in Iraq before or after the revolution without including in it members of Kurdish origin.

The complaint of some of the Kurds that their part of the country has been neglected can hardly be justified. Any objective visitor to Iraq who could survey the country from the south to the north would see for himself that other parts of Iraq inhabited by Arabs are not more developed than the part inhabited by Kurds.

But a section of the Kurdish population has always been rebellious against the government on a tribal basis. The nature of their land which is mountainous and the rivalry between leaders of different tribes have contributed to the unruliness of this section which has been led by Barzani for his own personal mischievous ambitions. In 1944 he was forced into Iran and from

there he went to Russia where he stayed for over ten years. Then he was brought back by General Qasim with about a thousand people fully armed and they were allowed to return to their own villages. A move which served Qasim's aim in creating an uneasy and unstable situation in the country to allow him to keep on governing it. Besides that, his intentions was to use Barzani against the pan-Arab movement in Iraq which is the aim of the vast majority of the population. Barzani's men became unruly and took the law into their own hands to satisfy their own personal aims. They terrorized the entire region and attacked their brother Kurds who would not follow their path; their viciousness reached its climax in their participation in the massacres of Musul and Kirkuk.

The present demands of Barzani, who does not represent by any means the majority of the Kurdish people in Iraq, are those of a secessionist using his apparent demands for autonomy to hide his real secessionist motives. These were made clear in the television interview (Cliff Michelmore's "Tonight", B.B.C. 1, 19th May, 1962), and the press conference of his collaborator Talabani who, in both of which, demanded for the Kurds in Iraq a system equivalent to the states of India, Switzerland, and Yugoslavia which are obviously federal states—in the case of Switzerland, more of a confederation—and hardly fit in with his statements on autonomy. Barzani demanded the creation of a special army for the Kurds, a thing that has never existed in a federal state and is obviously outside of autonomous rule but is a move of complete secession. He also demanded that the movement of the regular Iraqi army in the area inhabited by the Kurds be controlled by the Kurdish authorities, which reveals his intention to create a Kurdish state from the Arabian Gulf to the Caspian Sea. In that state, he wants to include the province of oil-rich Kirkuk, a non-Kurdish area inhabited by Arabs, Turkomans—who oppose any secession from Iraq—as well as the Kurds. In such a state, the non-Kurds would number one-quarter of the entire population. It causes one to wonder whether they would also demand an independent federal state inside such a Kurdish state.

Facts on Political Prisoners in Iraq

THE Executive Committee is impelled to discharge a sacred duty in informing the British public of the real facts of the situation in Iraq in relation to the position and treatment of political prisoners. Unfounded representations and false rumours have recently been circulated in this country claiming that the Iraqi government has committed "atrocities" against its own citizens by arresting and torturing them on political grounds. We wish first and foremost to assert our wholehearted support in relation to all the noble attempts aiming at the preservation and protection of human rights throughout the world. However, it is our sacred duty to bring to the notice of the fair minded and peace loving British people the reality of the situation in Iraq. We wish to unmask the falsehood that hides behind the noble mantle of humanitarianism.

The claim that the Iraqi government is killing, imprisoning, and torturing thousands of Iraqis, is to-day strangely irrelevant, unwarranted, and out of date, as far as the political situation and the present régime in Iraq are concerned. Misguided efforts in this respect refer entirely to the actions of the former governments of Iraq.

In the past few years, Iraq has passed through dark times and bitter experiences. During the Qasim dictatorship, local communists had a free hand in violating the human rights and personal liberties of the Iraqi citizens. Thousands of Iraqis were unjustly and arbitrarily arrested and tortured, including civilians and military dignitaries, professional persons like doctors, lawyers, teachers, and students were the victims of unwarranted and inhuman massacres. Women and children as well as men were ruthlessly killed and had their bodies dragged in the streets and hung on lamposts. Some were even burnt or buried alive. These unhappy events took place in Mosul, Kirkuk, and in many other parts of Iraq. Qasim was overthrown by the revolution of 8th February, 1963. A small clique of fanatical party

followers deviated, arresting a great many people in their turn and violating again the human rights and personal liberties. The present misrepresentations about political prisoners in Iraq are true entirely of the actions of the para-military organization, the National Guards of the former government. It was precisely in order to put an end to the arbitrary rule of that government and the evil deeds committed by its henchmen against Iraqi citizens, that the army, supported by the whole people, stepped in on 18th November, 1962, and restored law and order. In his speech marking the first anniversary of the Ramadan revolution of 1963, President Arif in fact denounced the crimes against "human rights" committed by the former régime in terms that concede nothing to the indignation expressed now in this country by some quarters.

The Iraqi Minister of the Interior has recently stated that a great number of prisoners and political detainees have actually been released. He asserted also that a few were left, and those are guilty of committing crimes of murder. On these grounds, and only on these grounds, they are still being held, not because of their political ideas and affiliations but because of ordinary crimes.

It is the declared policy of the present Iraqi régime, which restored law and order, to respect the dignity of its own citizens. This same régime has already released most political prisoners and detainees and commuted death sentences that had been passed on some individuals on political grounds in previous régimes. The present Iraqi régime upholds a policy of commuting sentences, preserving the human dignity and liberty of its citizens, giving equal chances and opportunities to all its citizens in building their country and serving their people.

The Executive Committee,
Arab Students Union in the
U.K. and Ireland,
London.

5th February 1965.

Palestine Day in London

THE Arab Students' Union in the United Kingdom and Ireland commemorated Palestine Day by holding a meeting on 15th May, 1965, at the Mayfair Hall in London. The conference was attended by an audience of about 500, which included diplomatic representatives of Arab countries, British writers, journalists, and experts on Middle Eastern affairs, Asians, Africans as well as Arab workers and students. If the audience was impressive in size, 80 was the platform in quality, the speakers being Professor al-Bazzaz, the Ambassador of Iraq to the Court of St. James's; Miss Ethel Mannin, the well known author; Mr. Hazim Mushtak, Press Attaché at the Embassy of Iraq in London, and Mr. Erskine Childers, the well-known writer and broad-

caster, and one of the foremost authorities in Britain on Arab affairs in general and the Palestine question in particular. Mr. Samih Anwar, Minister Plenipotentiary at the U.A.R. Embassy in London, read a letter from President Nasser which was warmly and enthusiastically received and heard. Mr. Edward Rizk, Director of the Arab League Information Office in London, read a letter on behalf of the Secretary-General of the League.

As on previous occasions, the object of the meeting was to demonstrate as eloquently and effectively as possible that the Arabs had not forgotten and would not forget that Palestine was their country, no matter how many years might pass since they lost it, no matter how many Palestine Days might come and go before they



Standing ovation for Mr. Childers



Professor A. al-Bazzaz

regained it. Those who may hope that the Arabs will forget Palestine or ultimately accept its loss would do well to ponder the fact that many of the Palestinian and other Arab students who organized this year's Palestine Day Meeting were children of ten or less when Palestine was lost, but are as determined to pursue the struggle for its liberation as the students who at the time were politically conscious young men.

AL-BAZZAZ

Professor al-Bazzaz concentrated in his speech on two main points in relation to the Palestine question: peace and realism. He explained that some people demand or expect the Arabs to reach a peaceful settlement of the conflict. Insisting that real and lasting peace is impossible without justice, he inquired whether society can condone criminal acts by adopting a peaceful attitude to thieves and murderers. He went on to explain that society will be plunged into chaos and confusion if law is not pre-

served and justice is not implemented in punishing the murderer or the thief. This is the case in relations between individuals in any single society. The same applies to relations between states in the international community. Professor al-Bazzaz spoke also of some people who remind the Arabs that Israel exists and that it is here to stay, and advise them to recognize Israel as an accomplished fact. He explained that sometimes an accomplished fact constitutes a gross violation of justice. He asked those western circles who advise the Arabs to adopt a realistic policy why they themselves do not adopt a similar policy by recognizing the division of Germany into two states and why they themselves consider the Berlin Wall a symbol of a usurped right and gross injustice? Professor al-Bazzaz went on to insist that Arab nationalism distinguishes clearly between Judaism as a religion and the Jews as individual human beings on the one hand, and Zionism as a reactionary movement based on religious persecution and racial discrimination

on the other hand. He asserted that Zionism is actually a new expression of Nazism which brought to the Jews of the world untold misery and inhuman suffering.

Professor al-Bazzaz explained further that Arab Nationalism is a humanitarian movement that respects all world-religions and upholds the equality of all men. Arab Nationalism reveres and respects the religious beliefs of the Jews, their heritage and their social being, but resists unreservedly the racial fanaticism, aggression, and colonization all of which Israel embodies and represents. The Arabs are not hostile to the indigenous Jews who are inhabitants of their area. But they are against the Zionist invaders who emigrated from European countries, occupied unjustly part of the Arab homeland, and expelled forcibly more than a million indigenous Arabs from Palestine. He concluded his speech by asserting that the Arabs will always and forever resist and oppose the Zionist invaders, foreign settlers, and alien colonizers in Arab Palestine.

ETHEL MANNIN

Miss Ethel Mannin spoke of her participation in the international seminar on Palestine which took place recently in Cairo. She described her visits with other members of the seminar to the border areas and the refugee camps where Arab Palestinians shouted in one voice: "Palestine is Arab." Palestine, she stated, is essentially a simple problem: an Arab land which the Zionist foreign invaders unjustly occupied and from which they inhumanly expelled the indigenous Arab population. She was tired of liberating Palestine by words and looked forward to liberating Palestine by force of arms. She proclaimed that no one has any right in demanding from the Palestinian Arabs to be patient or wait any longer. The Arabs should not expect any support from the Western powers for the Arab rights in Palestine. The only real and final solution to the question of Arab Palestine is a military solution that will lead to the restoration of the Arab rights and the return



Miss E. Mannin



Mr. Erskine Childers

of the indigenous Arab inhabitants to their homeland, Palestine. She inquired whether there are some people who believe that the Palestine question could be solved peacefully, and if so, she asked them to come forward and explain how. Concluding her speech, she expressed her conviction that peace is impossible between the Zionist invaders and aggressors and their Arab victims. This does not mean that she is a warmonger. But there are times in history when a war of liberation becomes a necessary and pre-requisite condition of justice and peace.

ERSKINE CHILDERS

Mr. Erskine Childers began his speech—as he rightly does on all such occasions—by making his position and explain how. Concluding her speech, she expressed her conviction that peace is impossible between the Zionist invaders and aggressors and their Arab victims. This does not mean that she is a warmonger. But there are times in history when a war of liberation becomes a necessary and pre-requisite condition of justice and peace.

a two-fold shame—shame for the abominable persecution of the Jews under Nazi Germany, and shame for the wrong done to the Arabs in Palestine, for the attempt by the West to make amends to the Jews of Europe by inflicting a grievous injustice on the Arabs who have never wronged the Jews, as well as shame, being a British socialist, for the one-sided, partial, and unfair attitude of the British Labour Government *vis-à-vis* Arab Palestine in total violation of their socialist ethics and declared principles opposing racial discrimination and supporting human dignity and equality. He spoke of an article which appeared in a Zionist paper in Israel and dealt with him, his support for Arab Palestine and opposition to Israel and Zionism. The paper had asserted that one of his ancestors was a prominent Jew. The Zionists have made long, careful, and painstaking research on his racial ancestry. Mr. Childers declared that the only other case of which he knows and in which

(Continued on page 12)

Mr. Mushtak's Lecture on Palestine Day

When will the West awake?

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD ATIYAH

SIXTEEN years have passed since the crime was committed of imposing the State of Israel by force of arms on Arabia, at the expense of inhumanly expelling more than a million indigenous Palestinian Arabs from their homeland, Arab Palestine, and dispossessing them of all their worldly belongings. Year after year, a dear friend of ours stood on this platform and appealed to the British sense of justice and fairness on behalf of Arab Palestine. I am speaking of Edward Atiyah who passed away on the evening of Thursday, 22nd October, 1964, while speaking in support of a motion, "That this House supports Arab interference with Israeli trade," at the Oxford Union Society debate. I would like on this occasion to pay tribute to his personal integrity, moral courage, and intellectual fortitude. Ancient Arab warriors were never congratulated on their living or consoled on their dead. A man was, or was not, a credit

to his nation and to mankind. Let Arabs and their friends rejoice that one of their kind was a man like Edward Atiyah. Ancient Greek warriors preserved their military honour only when they returned from the battlefield carrying their shields in their hands, or when their dead bodies were returned home carried on their shields. Their greatest disgrace was to surrender the shield to the enemy and return home alive. Edward Atiyah did not surrender his shield to the enemy. He returned home from his last battle carried on his shield in full honour. He lived, worked, and died so that justice may prevail, truth may triumph, Arabia may live in freedom, socialism, and unity, and the West may come to preserve its own moral integrity and material interest by adopting a fair and impartial attitude in the Arab-Israeli conflict. I find no better way to commemorate him than unmasking the ugly reality of Israel and the false pretences of Zionism.

(Continued from page 11)

such a thing was possible in the case of Nazi Germany which the Zionists claim to have opposed and resisted. Mr. Childers further reminded the audience that all his conclusions are not based on a single Arab or even neutral source, but entirely on Zionist and Israeli sources. He stressed that unfortunately the Western states no longer take heed of moral values and humanitarian principles. The freedom of the Arabs in general and the liberation of Palestine in particular depends on the development and consolidation of the Arabs national power in the political, economic, and military spheres. He criticized the policy of the British Labour Government which opposes racial discrimination in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa but condones the very same situation in Zionism and Israel. The only hope for a reconsideration and reappraisal by the Western countries of their attitude to Palestine and the Arabs depends on the emergence of a united Arab power. The U.S. government reversed a Congressional decision to discontinue American aid to the United Arab Republic, not out of respect for moral values not out of love for the

Arabs, but out of their recognition of the rising tide and increasing influence of Arab Nationalism in international politics and world affairs. They also did so to preserve vital Western interests. If the Western countries do not respect justice on the moral level, they surely respect power on the pragmatic level. The Arabs have right on their side, and they are going increasingly to have might as well.

The Western countries may not respect moral values and humanitarian principles. But they have vital interests in the Arab homeland, which, if threatened, may expose the very life and existence of the Western countries to grave dangers and dire consequences. There lies hope for the Arabs in a Western change of attitude. Arabia can achieve power, progress, and prosperity by work, unity, and determination.

Elsewhere in this issue of the *Bulletin*, we have published the letter of President Nasser and the speech of Mr. Hazim Mushtak. The conference was concluded by adopting unanimously resolutions supporting Arab Palestine and condemning Zionism and Israel.

GRATEFUL ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want also to acknowledge gratefully and proudly my great debt to two prominent scholars on the various aspects of the Arab Palestine cause: Erskine Childers, a Western scholar of outstanding integrity and sincerity, and Walid Khalidi, an Arab scholar of unquestionable objectivity and authority.

"ARABIA": YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY

When I use the term "Arabia", I do not have in mind the meaning which ancient Greek and Roman historians and geographers had in mind when they used the term "*Arabia Felix*" and "*Arabia Deserta*". Nor am I using this term in the sense used by the more recent western romantics like Stan Hope, Doughty, and Lawrence. But I have in mind the Arabia of the present generation of young Arabs—who are dedicated to the ideals of freedom, social justice, and unity—extending

from Tangier to Aden, bound together by ties of language and history, forming a single community of historic culture and national interest.

ISRAEL: FAIT ACCOMPLI AND STATUS QUO

Let Israel, Zionism and their friends remember that 1945 is not 1936 or 1948 and that the Arabs are determined and resolved to defend their legitimate rights and vital interests with every and all the means at their disposal. Some misguided or misinformed Western voices are raised advising the Arabs to accept the *fait accompli*, the *status quo* and the existence of Israel. We are told that Israel is here and that Israel is here to stay either as a matter of fact, or as a prophecy or as a threat. In each case, we are asked to make peace with Israel on Zionist terms.



Mr. Hazim Mushtak

FAITH AND CONCLUSION

No one disputes the factual statement that Israel is here now. I dispute not the fact but the conclusion that we Arabs are asked to derive from this fact. The conclusion that we must make peace with Israel follows from the fact of Israel's existence only if one or more of the following assumptions is made: Peace with Israel follows if we assume that facts as facts have a sanctity of their own and must in practice always be welcomed and embraced. Cognizance of facts is one thing. Welcoming and embracing them is another entirely different thing. The whole course of human history would become reduced to nonsense if facts are accepted regardless of their nature and antecedents. History means nothing if human beings are not free in refusing to accept unpleasant or superfluous facts. This rebellion against unpleasant facts or unjust realities explains the American revolution, the French revolution and every great, momentous, and decisive event in human history. There is no fact more unpleasant from the Arab point of view than the fact of Israel's existence. Why did Britain never accept the German hand of friendship after Dunkirk? Why did America never accept the Japanese hand of friendship after Pearl Harbour? Palestine is to the Arabs more than what Dunkirk and Pearl Harbour were to the British and Americans respectively. Was there a greater accomplished fact as far as this country was concerned than the German presence on the shores of France and the German occupation of the whole of Europe? Why did Britain not accept the European *status quo* in 1940 when she was alone and single-handed in her finest hour resisting German expansionism and Nazi tyranny? Why should the Arabs accept Israel merely because it is a *fait accompli* of only fifteen years standing, when the Zionists had refused to accept the *fait accompli* of 2,000 years of Arab history and geography in Palestine? We shall never falter, flag, or fail. We shall never submit to the logic of force. We shall defend the cause of freedom, right, and justice to the end. History proves that the cause of justice, supported by the united strength of a determined nation, can, must, and will win.

PROPHECY

There are again, those who say that Israel is here and that Israel is here to stay as a statement of prophecy, meaning that Israel exists now and will surely continue to exist in the future. Who are we to say which of the seeds of time shall go and which shall stay, which shall live, and which shall die? The Near East is the best vantage point from which to observe the vanity of worldly power and the shifting sands of human fortune. Stand on the ruined battlements of crusader castles in Arab villages, and glance at the concrete towers of Zionist colonies in occupied Palestine, and, being an Arab, you will have not a feeling of fear or hate but a feeling of hope. No fact is eternal or irremovable in politics and in human affairs. Many facts and many

institutions which had seemed at one time tremendous and unquestionable realities have passed away. The British Empire was once upon a time regarded as a secure and permanent feature of this world. But where is the British Empire now? It has disappeared in less than two decades. Israel is far less firmly established, is far less secure, far less powerful than the British Empire had ever been. Arabs think of such parallels and are not dismayed but encouraged. Surely, if anything has come to stay in the Middle East it is not Israel but Arabia.

THREAT

There are those, finally, who say that Israel is here and that Israel is here to stay as a statement of threat. Western governments who mean this phrase to have this connotation are fully entitled to say: "Israel is here to stay because we want her to stay and we will fight for her against you." But having done that, they are not entitled to seek Arab friendship and alliance and exert hopeless efforts in trying to convince the Arabs of the excellence of Western ideas and ideals. History has rarely recorded instances of utter helplessness, outrageous hypocrisy, and disastrous lack of realistic if agonizing reappraisal as in the case of British and Western policies in Arabia following the Suez fiasco of 1956 and the Iraqi Revolution of 1958.

WILL THE WEST EVER AWAKE?

Let me ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen; Why do I say all this?

Zionists cannot continue to live, facing the ever-rising tide of Arab nationalism, without the persistent and unreserved support of the Western countries. The moods, reactions, and fluctuations of public opinion are often important and sometimes decisive in shaping the policies of these countries. To win the sympathy and the support of these countries, Zionists are forced to keep the Western peoples in utter ignorance of the facts of the situation in the Arab homeland. Zionists thrive on the ignorance of the Western peoples. Zionists deliberately falsify facts and keep Western peoples in ignorance, Zionist vested interests, pressure groups, and propaganda organs in Britain and throughout the West, surround the Arab Palestine cause with thick clouds of planned distortion and deliberate ambiguity. In doing so, they do not hesitate to endanger the security requirements and the vital interests of these very same Western countries, the citizenship and prosperity of which they continue to enjoy fully and freely, though ungratefully and thanklessly.

The Arabs deduce their own conclusions and take the necessary consequent measures, when they find all kinds of West German, American, British, and French arms paraded through the streets of occupied Palestine on Zionist official occasions. Arab-Western relations are deteriorating rapidly and moving quickly down the slope to frontal confrontation. When will the West awake?

If falsehood is the constant ally of the Zionists, truth is the best friend of the Arabs. Let the Western peoples take heed before it is too late of the grave dangers and the dire consequences involved in the policies pursued by their governments in Arabia. Let the fair-minded and peace-loving British and Western peoples ask themselves the following questions: What price Israel? Shall we submit passively and endlessly to the reign of terror and deceit exercised by Zionist vested interests, pressure groups, and propaganda organs? Is it wise or right to endanger or violate our global security, moral principles, and vital interests by adopting a partial, one-sided and unfair attitude in the Arab-Israeli conflict? How far and for how long are we going to continue to support this artificial state of Israel? What kind of a state is Israel? Is it a special kind of state? A super-state? A state above other states and beyond reproach and criticism? The Western governments and peoples can afford to ignore these vital problems and questions and indulge in wishful-thinking and day-dreaming only at their own expense and risk.

PRESIDENT NASSER AND ARAB NATIONALISM

Some British and Western circles harbour a grave fallacy, i.e. that the present intense hostility of the Arabs towards Israel and Zionism is the result of the uncompromising fanaticism of one man; President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. This is a great Nasser is strong simply because he is doing and saying what the Arabs want him to do and say exactly. His prestige is at peak, because his voice is the voice of millions of Arabs. No government or ruler in any Arab country can hope to continue in power or to enjoy the confidence and the support of the overwhelming majority of the Arabs without first and foremost responding faithfully to their basic demands and vital interests. It is not one man that opposes Israel and Zionism but the entire Arab nation. Governments and rulers come and go. But Arab nationalism is a permanent fact in the Middle East.

Great and decisive are the political and social victories that have been achieved by Arab nationalism in the second-half of the twentieth century: In Algeria, Yemen, and Iraq. But the greatest of them all is the creation of the United Arab Republic as the staunch vanguard and the firm base of Arab nationalism, Arab hope in a better life, and Arab comprehensive unity. Without this, we parts of the Arab homeland. Without this, all our efforts would not have been in vain. In the darkest moments of our contemporary history, the United Arab Republic gleamed before our glittering eyes like a guiding star in

the desert, inspiring us with confidence, hope, resolve, determination, and faith. This is why we take it as our sacred duty to defend and consolidate the United Arab Republic.

PAX ARABICA AND STATUS QUO ANTE:

Arabia serves notice to the whole world: It is a waste of time and energy to attempt to isolate or contain any part of the Arab homeland from the main stream of Arab nationalism by any sort of a *Cordon Sanitaire*. This is a fact which Britain and the West have to face whether they like it or not. Palestine did not, and does not, belong to Britain, the U.N., or the World Zionist Movement. It belongs to its rightful owners, its indigenous inhabitants. They have never been consulted. They have persistently shown their active opposition and continuous resistance to the Zionist immigration and the partition scheme. They have refused vehemently all suggestions and all projects which aim at rehabilitating them, absorbing them, or resettling them anywhere in the world except in their own country, Palestine. Their right to self-determination is inalienable and unchallengeable. Israel shall never enjoy a normal life of peaceful existence. Surrounded by a sea of uncompromising hostility it has created by its own criminal deeds, it lives temporarily under the dark shadow of oppressive fear and permanent danger. Is this the promised land of peace, milk and honey by which the Zionist spidder has enticed into its web so many innocent Jews?

No power, big or small, no institution, national or international has any right to determine the fate of Arab Palestine. The Palestinian Arab people alone possess this right. Arab Nationalist grand strategy does not aim at the preservation of the *status quo* in Palestine and Arabia, or the permanent prolongation of the present situation there and elsewhere in the region. It most certainly aims at the return to the *status quo ante*, to the situation which existed in Palestine before this evil crime of establishing Israel was committed. Oppression, injustice, and the total violation of elementary human rights have never and can never secure peace. Permanent, real, and lasting peace is never achieved unless based on justice. World history has recorded many kinds of peace. Roman Peace "Pax Romana" and British Peace "Pax Britannica". Arabia now and ever accepts only one kind of peace. Not Russian peace, not American peace, not Israeli peace, but Arab peace, "Pax Arabica" based on Arab legitimate rights, Arab vital interests, Arab principles of justice and Arab force of arms. No power on the face of earth can deny the Arabs their rights to self-determination and self-defence. This is food for thought at the disposal of the better brains in Britain and the West.

Text of President Gamal Abdel Nasser's Message to the Arab Students' Union in the United Kingdom on the Occasion of Palestine Day, 1965

BRETHREN,

Let me convey my cordial greetings to all those attending the Palestine Day Conference which stands as a true expression of the fact that, although you stay outside the boundaries of your homeland, you still form a living part of it. You are drawn to its affairs, you live its hourly problems, and you shoulder your share of its responsibilities.

The Palestine Question ranks on top of all the topical problems of our nation. It is the question of the alien body which must be ejected in the face of those who created it so that the Arab World may be cleansed and become safe and sound again.

Therefore, it would be a folly to accept the illusion which our enemies propagated about the Palestine Question. It is not merely the case of a million refugees who want to return to their homes and be compensated. The Palestine Question is the problem of one hundred million Arabs who do not want to become refugees, who cannot tolerate the idea of being deprived of a precious piece of their homeland to accommodate a diversified bunch of wanderers and adventurers from all parts of the world who create trouble in our Arab homeland, and make of it a target for their adventures and expansive ambitions dreaming of a promised land that extends from the Euphrates to the Nile.

The one million Arabs who were expelled from Palestine and were made to live for years in tents and feed on the United Nations scant supplies are the tragedy of the international conscience in the twentieth century which watched it take place but closed their eyes until the episodes were completed to make it more tragic, more dangerous.

The Palestine Question is the tragedy of a peace-loving Arab country which was occupied and turned into a base for further aggression. It is the thorn in the bosom of the Arabs that never gives them rest. It divides their country into two parts and obstructs their move towards unity. It exhausts their energy and strains their efforts to repel any attack launched from this base of aggression. It diverts the efforts of the Arabs from the national course of human progress.

Our nation will never yield to the fate they tried to impose on it. Sometimes with craft, other times through the control Zionism has over certain countries, Israel has succeeded in getting them to side with her. They so strengthened her that it defied the United Nations, whose resolutions were never implemented, when time

and again she attacks Arab countries nobody checks her. On the contrary they comply with her request, supply her with money and arms and encourage her to pursue her continuous policy of aggression and violation of the rights of the Arabs.

When Israel started her scheme for the diversion of the waters of the River Jordan not a voice was raised to stop her. To-day, when the Arabs start working on a similar scheme which enables them to make use of the waters of their river, voices were heard: warning, threatening, and talking about the maintenance of peace in the Middle East. They talked about impressing peace in the Middle East in a manner completely divorced from what is right and just. Talk about maintaining the balance of power in the Middle East was reiterated. They so frequently repeated this fallacy that they came to believe it themselves. They want to maintain a balance between eight million Arabs and two million aggressors.

Aids and supplies of arms pour into Israel encouraging her to launch yet another aggression on the Arabs. Secret deals which supplied the enemies of the Arabs with more arms of destruction and plots against Arab lives were uncovered while the providers of these weapons of destruction publicly insisted that they were the friends of the Arabs and they wished to co-operate with them.

You must have noted by now, brethren, how the unity of the Arabs demonstrated itself through the decisions which were announced yesterday putting Western Germany in its right place within the camp of the aggressors who plot against the lives of the Arabs and threaten their very existence. The Arabs have asserted themselves they now stand on the threshold. If a feeble, lost voice calls for the so called realistic approach, such voice will soon be drowned in the "sacred march" towards a brighter future through a unified and uninterupted Arab territory cleared of Israel.

We shall not compromise. We shall never allow Israel to continue to be a thorn in our bosom nor shall we allow her to dissipate our energies in repelling her continuous aggressions but perpetually staying unadvanced.

We shall utilize all our resources, both spiritual and human to face this danger until our land is cleared of intruders while at the same time we continue battling with the utmost vigour for progress. We shall construct. We shall establish prosperity. We shall support peace, a peace based on justice playing fully our role for the cause of humanity, civilization, and progress.

Communiqué on Arab Socialist Union Meetings in Cairo

(a) U.A.R.-IRAQI MEETING: Text (with summarized opening passage) of communiqué issued on 10th March, 1965:

[Opening passage: A seven-man delegation representing the Iraqi Arab Union headed by its Secretary-General, Abd al-Karim Farhan, and an eight-man delegation representing the U.A.R. Arab Socialist Union headed by a member of its higher executive committee met in Cairo from 4th to 10th April, during which the two delegations studied the following subjects:]

(1) The reality of the two popular organizations and the ideological and organizational level they have reached so far, as well as their positive achievements on the level of popular action.

(2) The socialist transformation in the two countries and the problems confronting the operation of socialist application, and possible solutions for these problems.

(3) The imperialist, Zionist, and reactionary challenges facing the Arab nation in the present phase and the plots and the deviations through which it is intended to obstruct the march of the Arab revolution along the road of freedom, socialism, and unity.

(4) The delicate phase through which the Palestine cause is passing, and the full vigilance the Arab people should exercise during this phase in regard to plots and bargains together with decisive firmness in the face of defeatist calls and doubting voices.

(5) The role that should be played by the two popular organizations, such as the ideological activities within and outside Arab boundaries and the unmasking of the hostile propaganda which is seeking to obliterate the true face of the Arab revolutionary movement—the progressive humanitarian face which believes in world peace based on justice.

During the discussion of these questions, it was confirmed that the opinion of the Arab Socialist Unions in the two countries was the same, that their analysis derived from unity of thought and experience was the same, and that the outcome of the Charter of National Action in the two countries would be the same. In their desire to consolidate and broaden this unity, and to provide positive follow-up of all developments that may take place in the liberated Arab situation, the two delegations have agreed on the following:

(1) To form a follow-up committee of the two Arab Socialist Unions to meet once every two months to co-ordinate, organize, and motivate interaction between the two popular organizations. The headquarters of the committee will be in Cairo.

(2) This committee should organize other meetings at all the levels of the Arab Socialist Union and its branches in the two countries as well as on the level of other popular organizations.

(b) U.A.R.-ALGERIAN MEETING: Précis, with excerpts, of communiqué issued on 11th April, 1965:

In accordance with the agreement reached between President Ahmad Bin Billah, Secretary-General of the Algerian Liberation Front Party, and the President of the U.A.R. Arab Socialist Union, President Jamal Abd an-Nasser, regarding the holding of periodic meetings between the U.A.R. and Algerian organizations, and on the Arab Socialist Union's invitation to the F.L.N. which was made at their first meeting in Algeria on 17th to 26th June, 1964, a delegation representing the Algerian F.L.N. led by Husayn Jahwani, a member of the F.L.N. Political Bureau, arrived in Cairo on 2nd April, 1965. During the period between 3rd and 11th April, the F.L.N. delegation met a delegation representing the U.A.R. Arab Socialist Union led by Kamal ad-Din Ri'at, a member of the Higher Executive Committee and secretary of the Socialist Call and Thought.

Members of the Algerian delegation inspected the great development projects in the U.A.R., such as the High Dam, the Kima Company at Aswan, the textile factories at Al-Mahallah al-Kubra, the war factories at Hulwan, ship-building yards at Port Said, and the atomic energy establishment at Inshas. The leader of the Algerian delegation made a speech to workers at the High Dam project and the Kima Company on the socialist experiment in Algeria. The delegation felt that the workers had a clear understanding of the socialist development movement in Algeria.

On Friday, 9th April, President Jamal Abd an-Nasser received members of the Algerian delegation at his residence, when the good relations between the two countries were discussed. The delegation conveyed to

President Abd an-Nasser the greetings of President Bin Billah and the Algerian people.

³⁴ The discussions which took place between the two delegations during their numerous meetings were characterized by full frankness, Arab fraternity, and the determination and sincere intention of both sides to strengthen and consolidate the ideological and the combative (Arabic: *nidal*) relations between the Arab revolutionary vanguards in Algeria and the U.A.R., so that these vanguards, backed by the struggling masses, might play their decisive historical role and bear their share of responsibility in serving the causes of Arabism, socialism, and human civilization.

³⁵ The clear unified attitude of the two organizations towards certain basic questions, apparent at their first contact, was confirmed at this second contact between them. The most important of these questions are connected with socialism, the method of its application and its absolute non-contradiction with the fundamentals and teaching of true Islam and also the idea that Arab unity emanating from a national unity in its progressive purport would be an effective weapon in the hands of the Arab masses to reinforce national independence and achieve social progress.

³⁶ The two sides reviewed the steps taken in their countries since their first contact, and the solutions arrived at on the course of socialism in the various political, economic, and social fields. The two sides announced their satisfaction in general with the good outcome and the practical effect of those steps in raising the standard of our struggling masses. Such steps have intensified the belief of those masses in the march forward on the socialist road as being the only road to freedom and progress. In accordance with this, the two sides noted the identical timing of efforts now being made in their countries to complete the new reorganization of the revolutionary vanguards—the Algerian Liberation Front Party, the political machinery of the Arab Socialist Union, and the other organizations which always aim at the achievement of more democracy and popular control. In this regard, agreement was reached on the necessity to exchange experience about the criteria for the selection of strugglers, the fields of action (Arabic: *itarat*) on the development of the ideological and the combative concept between them, and the consolidation of internal democracy in each organization.

³⁷ The two sides also discussed in particular relations between the Algerian Liberation Front Party and the Arab Socialist Union, with the organization of workers, peasants, youth, students, women, etc. The two sides analysed these relations in their ideological and applicable aspects. It was confirmed that the basic attitude of the political groups in each of the two countries toward these organizations was to guide them, reactivate them and safeguard their trends. All this was taking place without the exercise of any bureaucratic pressure in any

circumstances. Thus it can be confirmed that the protection of the entity of these organizations does not conflict with the necessity to expand their revolutionary leading role and increase their efficiency. By this alone these organizations will achieve their correct position. They will become a leading base in support of the political system, a permanent free support for the formation of new fields of activity and a strong means for the spreading and broadening of the socialist idea among the working masses.

³⁸ The two sides also studied other organizational aspects of the socialist experience in their countries, particularly the political, trade unionist, and administrative organizations in the productive units, and the relations of these units with each other, as well as their relations with the state. It was agreed that these discussions had been useful from both the theoretical and the practical sides and that these studies would be continued for comparison at the next meeting of the two sides.

³⁹ The two sides noted with great satisfaction the strength of the relations between the Algerian People's Democratic Republic and the U.A.R. and affirmed the necessity to strengthen these relations in all fields.

⁴⁰ The two sides discussed the current international situation and the overt and covert imperialist movements of which evidence has been seen lately. These movements and provocations emanate from firm imperialist designs which constitute real dangers to the liberation battle throughout the world. They also threaten the peace and security of the Arab countries and their progress towards unity and socialism. The two sides asserted the need for the continuation of the two organizations' efforts in their countries to enlighten the working masses steadily and fully about these dangers and to alert them to meet all these possibilities. They asserted the need for the full consolidation of their countries in the face of these dangers.

⁴¹ After the exchange of views on the Arab situation, and particularly in regard to the movement of neo-imperialism and its reactionary allies, the two sides asserted their support of the Yemeni people's struggle for the consolidation of the republican régime in their country.

⁴² They declared their support for the struggle of the Arab people in the occupied Arab south and Oman until these peoples attain their freedom and independence. They also expressed their full support for the unity of the Sudanese people and denounced the imperialist secessionist movements against Sudanese soil.

⁴³ The two delegations discussed the Palestine problem within the framework of the historical development of this problem, on the ground that Israel is an imperialist agent and a tool of aggression directed against the Arab people of Palestine and the Arab liberation movement forming part of the anticipated aggressive movements concerning the Jordan river waters, which Arab action

has recently unmasked, and the new change in Western imperialist aid to Israel.

⁴⁴ The two sides followed with interest the discussions of the Palestine world seminar. They support the resolutions adopted by the said seminar and call upon all progressive forces in the world effectively to support the Palestinian Arab people and their revolutionary structure in their glorious liberation struggle for the recovery of the usurped homeland.

⁴⁵ The two sides discussed the issues of African liberation and the growing activity of neo-imperialism against the people of the Congo, and the progress of revolutionary liberation work in the Portuguese colonies. The two sides declared their full support for the struggle of all the peoples in the Congo, Mozambique, Angola, so-called Portuguese Guinea, and South Africa for national liberation.

⁴⁶ The two sides also reviewed the international situation and agreed that it was fraught with signs of great danger as a result of the widening of the aggressive military action in the Far East and particularly in Vietnam. The two sides declared their denunciation of

American aggression against the people of Vietnam and the threat to world peace inherent in that aggression.

⁴⁷ The two sides greeted the efforts being made for the convocation of the conference of the Heads of Asian and African states and the World Youth Festival in Algeria.⁴⁸

To strengthen relations between the Arab Socialist Union and the F.L.N. and the popular organizations in the two countries, the two sides decided to define the powers of the joint committee, the formation of which was decided on at the first meeting, in regard to the following matters:

- (1) The study of problems facing the two organizations in their revolutionary work.
- (2) The determination of the joint stands of both organizations towards national and international problems.
- (3) The explanation and deepening of the attitude of the two organizations.
- (4) The explanation of the various developments in relations between the organizations and their relations with the state.

Joint U.A.R.-Iraqi Unified Political Command

TEXT of joint statement by U.A.R.-Iraqi unified political command issued on 25th May, 1965 :

In the belief in the unity of the socialist unionist Arab revolution and taking as a starting point the decision of the Iraqi Republic and the U.A.R. to follow the path of unity chosen by the popular will of the two countries ; in consolidation of the ties of struggle between the two peoples ; in confirmation of the joint struggle of the two countries on the road of freedom, socialism, and unity ; and in implementation of the agreement of 26th May, 1964, and the agreement setting up the unified political command between the Iraqi Republic and the U.A.R. on 16th October, 1964, the unified political command held its first meeting in Cairo in the period from 19th to 25th May, 1965.

The meeting was attended on the Iraqi side by Iraqi President Abd as-Salam Muhammad Arif, Foreign Minister Najj Talib, Defence Minister Muhsin Husayn al-Habib, Minister of the Interior Subhi Abd al-Majid, Justice Minister Abd as-Sattar Ali al-Husayn, Education Minister Shukri Salih Zaki, Culture and Guidance Minister Abd al-Karim Farhan, Planning Minister Abd al-Muhsin Zalzal, Industry Minister Adib al-Jadiri, Unity Affairs Minister Abd ar-Raziq Muhvi ad-Din, and the Iraqi Ambassador to the U.A.R. Rajab Abd al-Majid.

On the U.A.R. side the meeting was attended by U.A.R. President Jamal Abd an-Nasser, First Vice-President and Deputy Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces F-M Abd al-Hakim Amir, Vice-President Zakariya Mhuvi ad-Din, President of the National Assembly Anwar as-Sadat, Vice-President Husayn ash-Shafiq, Vice-President Hasan Ibrahim, Premier Ali Sabri, Deputy Premier Nur ad-Din Tarrat, Deputy Premier Ahmad Abd ash-Sharabi, Deputy Premier Kamal ad-Din Rif'at, Deputy Premier Abbas Radwan, Deputy Premier Muhammad Abd al-Qadir Hatim, member of the Arab Socialist Union's general secretariat Muhammad Fathi Ibrahim ad-Dib, and the U.A.R. Ambassador to Iraq Amin Hamid Huwaydi.

Discussions revealed that views were identical on the following :

(1) The circumstances and date of the meeting are significant and critically important, since the Arab nation's struggle against imperialism and Zionism is passing through its most serious and critical stages. This entails the mobilization of all material and moral potentials and powers to face them.

(2) The unified political command has reviewed the steps taken in the two countries and the solution adopted on the way to socialism and unity ; in the different political, economic, social, and cultural fields. It has also examined the application of socialism in the two countries and the achievements made in this respect. It has studied positive solutions to consolidate these steps in all the fields and has decided to adopt effective measures to increase and intensify them since they constitute a sound basis on the way to complete unity.

(3) The unified political command asserts that the Charter of National Action in the Iraqi Republic and the U.A.R. is the way to achieve liberty, socialism, and unity, and constitutes the basis of political action, guaranteeing the gains of the working classes of the people and their upsurge towards the achievement of political and social freedom. It adopts the spiritual values of Islam and other faiths as an incentive for popular struggle to assert itself and fulfil its aims.

(4) The national unity formed by the alliance of the people's working classes is the force on which the people rely to consolidate their social and political gains and is the main foundation of pan-Arab unity.

(5) The Arab Socialist Union which comprises the people's working classes is the live embodiment of the people's authority, which is above all other authorities and directs them in all fields and levels. It creates the best democratic structures for those willing to carry out political and social activities. It is the popular organization within which the people's working forces eliminate their contradictions in order to make great strides in national and unionist action. Consolidation of the Arab Socialist Union and the creation of a political machine bound to increase its effectiveness and exercise of political and social action among the masses is the only weapon by which these masses can impose progress, socialist construction and democracy, and face the challenges presented by imperialism and reactionary elements.

(6) The stage of revolutionary surge forward to build a sound socialist society calls for the participation and belief of the masses in this action because it is only through their participation and belief that development will take place without any sense of arrogance, domination, or custodianship from any party or group to monopolize political action.

(7) It has become the national duty of all nationalistic

forces to unite within the Arab Socialist Union to face continued challenges to their national aspirations.

(8) It is necessary to expand meetings between the popular organizations so that they may exchange views and reach rational solutions in a bid to increase their effectiveness and ideological unity before the unity of these organizations.

(9) The unified political command reviewed the international situation and world events and the impact of these events on the Arab area. The unified command further studied in detail imperialist schemes in the Middle East which threaten the peace and security of the Arab states and their progress towards socialism and unity. These imperialist schemes, moreover, constitute grave dangers to freedom movements throughout the world.

(10) The unified political command reviewed the Palestine issue, which is the cause of the entire Arab people. Imperialist attempts to destroy the Arab front fighting for Palestine have been defeated as a result of the faith of the Arab people in their cause and their firm stand against the deviators. While the unified command hails the attitude of non-aligned states and other peoples of the world who have supported the rights and just cause of the Palestinians, it condemns the stand of Tunisian President Habib Bourguiba, which only serves imperialism and Zionism. The unified political command reaffirms its support for the resolutions of the second Arab summit conference concerning a unified Arab plan of action for the liberation of Palestine. These resolutions stated that the Arab national aim is the destruction of Israel, while the immediate aim is the strengthening of Arab defences to secure the safety of states in which the tributaries of the River Jordan flow so as to guarantee Arab action in Arab territory. The command is also of the opinion that the Palestinian people are the vanguard of the struggle for the restoration of the usurped homeland, hence the need to consolidate their revolutionary entity embodied in the Palestine Liberation Organization and to supply this with all moral and material potentialities.

(11) The unified political command also believes that the danger of military bases continues to threaten the freedom and security of peoples. Foreign bases continue to exist in Aden, Libya, Bahrain, and Cyprus, in addition

to the main aggressive base in Arab homeland represented in Israel. Therefore the political leadership deems it necessary to resume struggle for the liquidation of these bases.

(12) The link between foreign imperialist interests and reactionary forces stands in the face of the national, progressive revolutionary tide, as demonstrated by the present situation in occupied South Arabia and Oman and the aggression being launched on the national progressive revolution in Yemen in an attempt to drive it back to the era of backwardness and feudalism. This underlines the need to consolidate the republican régime in Yemen and the national struggle in South Arabia and Oman.

(13) Attempts are being made to efface the Arabism of the Arabian Gulf region and change its nature by opening the door to foreign immigration with a view to making Arab inhabitants strangers in their own land. All such plots aim at creating a new Israel capable of safeguarding imperialist interests in the area, hence the need for concerted efforts to repel this danger.

(14) The unified political command stresses unity of Arab land and soil and stands against any attempt to separate or tear off any part of the Arab homeland.

(15) The unified political command denounces the policy of force, military action, and interference in the internal affairs of other countries which is evident in Vietnam, the Congo, and the Dominican Republic. It advocates solution of international problems by peaceful means. It also notes with concern that the U.N. is in these circumstances suffering from inaction and restriction of movement despite firm faith in the indispensability of the world organization. Admitting the inadequacy of the organization in handling present world crimes, the political command finds that the amendment of the U.N. Charter has become a necessity so as to deal with the changes which have occurred during the past twenty years. It also demands admission of People's China into the organization so that it may take its natural and legitimate place beside other states and thus increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the world body.

(16) It has been agreed that the second meeting of the unified political command will take place in Cairo early next July following the conclusion of the Afro-Asian conference due to open in Algiers on 29th June.

The Arab Information Ministers' Conference in Amman

THE Second Arab Information Ministers' conference completed discussions of all items on its agenda at a session held on 20th April, 1965, in Amman. The conference held its final session on the same day to read the final text of its resolutions.

The conference has issued a number of resolutions. The following are the most significant:

(1) To hold the next conference of Arab Information Ministers in Damascus within a year, on the Syrian delegation's proposal.

(2) To approve the Jordanian delegation's proposal that Amman should be the headquarters of the Arab tourist offices should be referred to the general meeting of the International Arab Tourist Union.

(3) To approve the establishment of an Arab News Agencies Union with headquarters in Beirut and to refer to the union's board for study of the question of establishing a central Arab news agency within the framework of the Arab League.

(4) To approve the system of Arab League offices abroad prepared by the Arab League Secretariat. The conference asked Arab League member-states to supply these offices with all information and bulletins published in each Arab state.

The Conference chairman, Dr. Abd al-Qadir Hatim, made a speech at the end of to-day's session in which he expressed the gratitude of the conference to Jordan—the King, Government, and people—for the facilities extended to the conference. He said: I feel that the Arab fraternity manifested at this conference has achieved the aims which we hoped to fulfil on the very first day of our meeting. The resolutions we have adopted are very important. It is our duty as Information Ministers to propagate these resolutions so that the Arab nation adopts and reacts to them to assure us of success in achieving the ambitions of this conference.

The conference adopted the following two resolutions at its session this morning after the Arab League Secretary-General Abd al-Khaliq Hassunah had read two memoranda by the C-in-C of the joint Arab military command:

(1) Non-publication of any military information connected with the activities of the joint Arab command other than that issued by the office of the command's C-in-C, in order to preserve the safety and security of the Arab countries.

(2) Any danger threatening any Arab state shall be considered a danger threatening all other Arab states. The Arab Information Ministers' conference also

decided not to publish or broadcast any information connected with the Jordan river exploitation projects in Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan if such information is not made public by the chairman of the authority for the exploitation of the Arab waters, who is the Arab League Secretary-General.

The second Arab Information Ministers' conference ended its meetings in Amman issued the following official statement:

The Arab Information Ministers' Council, meeting in the form of an Arab League Council, held its second meeting in Amman in the period between 19th and 20th April, 1965, at the invitation of the Jordanian Hashimite Kingdom under the chairmanship of Dr. Muhammad Abd al-Qadir Hatim, U.A.R. Deputy Premier for Culture and National Guidance. The meeting was attended by the Information Ministers of Arab League member-states, as well as the League's Secretary-General. The meeting was held under the auspices of King Husayn, King of the Jordanian Hashimite Kingdom, who delivered a great speech which laid down the course of Arab action for the Council.

The conference adopted a number of resolutions, which included one approving the establishment of the "Arab Call Fund". Another resolution approved the agreement on Arab radios. The conference was notified with satisfaction of the declaration by the delegations of Tunisia, Lebanon, Kuwait, Iraq, and Yemen about their joining the agreement.

The Council discussed the Arab reunion project and laid down the principles to ensure its success, and approved the establishment of the Arab Folklore Council, the mediation centre which falls under its jurisdiction, and the joint Arab folklore troupe in Tunisia. The Council also approved the by-laws of the Arab fair organization in Damascus, and the measures taken in regard to the joint Arab pavilion at the Montreal fair. The Council approved the recommendations of the executive committee of the International Arab Tourist Federation concerning joint tourist propaganda for the Arab states.

The Council approved the establishment of the Arab News Agencies Union and adopted a number of resolutions concerning the operating procedure of Arab information media.

At the end of their conference the Ministers expressed their profound thanks and gratitude to the Jordanian King, Government, and people for their interest in the conference. The Council gratefully accepted the Syrian Arab Government's invitation to hold the next meeting in Damascus in February, 1966.

Lest We Forget

On 15th May, 1948, three events took place which marked a turning-point in the history of Palestine and the Middle East. On that day the British Mandate in Palestine came to an end and the last British soldier withdrew from the country after having left it to its wretched lot. In the evening of that day, the establishment of Israel as an independent state was announced, and on that day too, small-sized Arab forces marched into Palestine, carrying the name of Arab armies, to maintain order.

What did the situation in Palestine look like at the time? All the Arab states were under the sway of imperialism, politically, economically, and militarily. British officers and others were supervising the Arab armies, and in fact each Western envoy controlled and dictated his conditions on the Arab state in which he was residing.

During the British Mandate, the Palestinian Arabs were subjected to terrorism and persecutions. For example, any Arab who was caught carrying a weapon was liable to the death penalty. Palestine during the Second World War was an arsenal for supplying the Middle Eastern fronts. When the war ended in 1945 and Britain began to pull her troops out of the country, she handed these armories over to Zionist elements which were serving with the British Army. Most of these weapons were gradually carried from the British Army depots to secret Zionist stores. As weapons were being smuggled to the Zionists, tens of thousands of militants and mercenaries infiltrated Palestine from all over the world, the majority from Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and Hawaii.

On 15th May, 1948, when Britain resolved to end her mandate on Palestine, the position was thus:

(1) Israel had about 200,000 fighting men, equipped with aircraft, tanks, scarships, and heavy artillery, led by American, British, and other officers.

(2) These forces were able, before May, 1948, to dominate almost all of Palestine, and were capable of confronting Arab armies.

(3) The Arab forces which Britain had advised to be dispatched totalled 32,000 men, composed of 15,000 Egyptians, 5,000 Iraqis, 5,000 Syrians, 3,000 Jordanians, 1,000 Lebanese, and a few hundreds from each of the other Arab countries.

(4) When the Arab armies went forward, they were confronted by thousands of refugees who were driven into the areas from which the Arabs were advancing. This brought about a confusion in the military operations and the Arab armies were obliged to look after these refugees.

(5) The Western countries had imposed an embargo on the Middle East on account of the state of war, thereby depriving the Arab states of arms, while Israel was smuggling in large quantities of arms and ammunitions.

(6) The Western countries had given the Arabs misleading information about the strength of the Zionists, so much so that the Arab Army Command was under the impression that its forces would occupy the country in a few days.

* * *

Such was the situation which prevailed on 15th May, the day of the big conspiracy. For Britain did not end her mandate and withdrew her troops on 15th May until after the Zionist forces had effectively captured Palestine and expelled its Arab population. During March, April, and early May, 1948, all the Arab towns had fallen into the hands of Zionists and their inhabitants driven out across the borders. In different massacres more than 12,000 Palestinians lost their lives.

International politics at the time differed from those of to-day. The Western allies then dominated the entire Middle East, yet they feared the resuscitation of Arab nationalism. They thus spread their influence overtly in the Arab capitals, assisted by reactionary governments in their attempts to suppress the nationalist elements. All the Arab states at the time knew that the Western countries supported the creation of Israel. These Western countries were subject to Zionist influence which was so powerful that it even dominated the White House. Within one year, World Zionism set to Palestine about 80,000 Jewish volunteers, 27,000 non-Jewish mercenaries, 300 million dollars worth of arms, and currency worth 230 million dollars, to finance the war. It also spent more than 150 million dollars on international propaganda, whereas the Arab States League was only able to collect three million pounds. All the Arab states together had appropriated only 16 million pounds for the Palestine war.

The Jordan Waters

What Does Israel Want?

THE Arab League welcomed the appearance on B.B.C. T.V.'s "Panorama" of Mr. Levi Eshkol on 29th March, 1965. This programme, which was an occasion to put forward the Israeli case before millions of British viewers, in fact exposed Israel's real intentions as regards the diversion of the headwaters of the Jordan and other Arab rivers.

Commenting in London on 30th March, 1965, Mr. Edward Rizk, Arab League Representative said:

"Mr. Eshkol has disclosed that Israel is not so much concerned with water for normal consumption as with its use as a political weapon to try to force the Arabs to co-operate with Israel and, by implication, extend to it recognition."

When asked if Israel received the share proposed for her in the Johnston recommendations (the late Mr. Eric Johnston was president Eisenhower's special envoy who made unsuccessful recommendations regarding this problem in 1953-54) she would still object to Arab irrigation schemes of their own, Mr. Eshkol replied:

"Yes. We have an objection, we have an objection. We want that the agreement shall be fulfilled to the word and in the main spirit. The spirit was, everybody knew that Israel needs more water."

The Arab League points out:

(1) There was no such agreement because the Johnston recommendations were never accepted by the Arab States, or by Israel for that matter.

(2) Diversion of Arab waters inside Arab territory, even from one Arab State to another, for irrigating Arab lands, is no concern, we suggest, of Mr. Eshkol or any other non-Arab.

(3) During the interview, Mr. Eshkol took upon himself to decide how much water Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria required for their own use.

"Surely, Mr. Eshkol would concede," commented Mr. Rizk, "the Arabs are better judges of their requirements than the Israeli authorities or Zionist propagandists."

(4) Mr. Eshkol alleged that the Arabs have no right to divert tributaries which have flowed for thousands of years to the Jordan and the Sea of Galilee.

"Has he ever stopped to think," explained Mr. Rizk, "that the Israeli diversion scheme has done just that? To take the Jordan waters from the Sea of Galilee and pump them to the remote desert area of the Negev instead of allowing them to irrigate the Arab valley of the Jordan, is altering the course of history."

"In any case the demand for water in Israel is artificial and has been created by the unrestricted immigration of a million and a half people who were brought to occupied Palestine and settled on lands owned by Arabs. The Israeli policy of continued wholesale immigration can only cause a population explosion with all the political and military dangers inherent in an already tense situation."

Palestine National Congress

AHMED ASH-SHUQAYRI'S SPEECH :
(EXCERPTS)

AT its meeting held on 4th June, 1965, at the Arab League headquarters, the Palestine National Congress unanimously agreed to re-elect Ahmad ash-Shuqayri as Head of the Palestine Liberation Organization and President of the Organization's Executive Committee and to grant him the right to reorganize the Executive Committee as regards the size and composition.

Upon his re-election, Ahmad ash-Shuqayri delivered a speech thanking the Congress for the great confidence

placed in him. He then announced that Palestine women will be represented in the Organization's Executive Committee because the time has come for the Palestine women to participate with the other Arab women in the struggle for Palestine.

Ahmad ash-Shuqayri said he would leave the question of changing the statute of the Palestine Liberation Organization to the next National Congress which will be freely elected by the Palestine people.

On behalf of the National Congress, Ahmad ash-Shuqayri appealed to all the Arab states, with Palestine communities, to grant the Palestine people complete freedom to carry out free elections in which the people

may choose the various establishments of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestine National Congress which will lay down new foundations for the system of work in the organization and the functions of its President.

Shuqayri also announced that the Organization will make the necessary approaches to the Arab states with a view to let Palestinians elect the Palestine National Congress by secret ballot. He added that several members of the Organization's Executive Committee will be appointed to prepare the forthcoming electoral campaign...

Ahmad ash-Shuqayri said that he would complete his consultations on the appointment of the members of the new Executive Committee within a month, and added that the Palestine National Congress is expected to hold its third session in Gaza in May, 1966.

CONGRESS RECOMMENDATIONS : (TEXT)

At its meeting which was held this morning at the Arab League headquarters under the chairmanship of Ahmad ash-Shuqayri, the Palestine National Congress approved the recommendations of its committees dealing

respectively with political affairs, military affairs, information, finance, and national organization.

The Congress called for increased efforts to combat Israeli penetration in some Afro-Asian states through all means, including the preparation of a scheme for inviting delegations from the various countries to visit Palestine to enable them to observe the realities of the Palestine question at first hand. The Congress called for the preparation of a programme for the participation of delegations from the Organization in all international conferences so that [Palestine] women, students, and trade unionist workers should be present at those conferences.

The Congress also recommended efforts to strengthen relations between the Organization and all Islamic peoples and gaining their support for the Palestine cause irrespective of their governments' official attitudes to that question.

In its recommendations, the Congress affirmed that the provision of relief for those who will return (Arabic: al-a'idun) is the responsibility of the U.N. until the liberation of the stolen homeland. It condemned the successive imperialist plots designed to turn the relief



Demonstration against Levi Eshkol, when he visited London, by the Arab Students' Union and Arab Workers' Union, on 27th March, 1965



Another scene of the same demonstration

measures for those who will return into an instrument to liquidate the Palestine question. The Congress expressed its confidence that the Arab host states of those who will return and the Arab states as a whole will continue their efforts to foil these plots.

The Congress expressed thanks to the Arab states which enabled the Palestine Liberation Organization to engage in various activities.

The Congress issued a special recommendation regarding the Organization's plan for Arab political action, in which it affirmed that the liberation of Palestine is the primary aim of Arab revolutionary action and that the Palestine people have the primary part to play in the liberation battle. The Congress called on the Arab states to use all means, and especially oil, as an effective weapon for the support of the Palestine cause.

The Congress declared the Organization's demand for the need to liquidate the imperialist bases in the Arab world and to restore peace in Yemen. The Congress also declared its support for the struggle of the occupied south, Oman and Bahrain, and its stand against foreign infiltration in the gulf.

In its recommendations, the Congress declared that western imperialism was responsible for the Palestine tragedy. The Congress denounced the imperialist policy

which supports Israel. The Congress stated that the Palestine Liberation Organization will define its foreign policy and its relations with foreign countries in the light of their stand in the Palestine question. The Congress condemned the military aid currently given to Israel by the West German government as a direct aggression against the Palestine people in particular and the Arab nation in general. It also denounced the Bonn government's recognition of Israel.

In its recommendations, the Congress laid down a plan for the work of the Palestine Liberation Organization's offices in the Arab and foreign countries. The Congress expressed the hope that the Organization's offices, buildings, and mail would be granted diplomatic immunity.

The Congress voted unanimously in favour of extending the operation of the conscription law first applied in Gaza last month, to all Palestinians.

As regards information, the Congress recommended the establishment of more public libraries with materials on the Palestine question in areas inhabited by Palestinians, the formation of Palestine women's delegations to attend international women's conferences, and the appointment of information officers in the Organization's offices abroad.

The Palestinian Diaspora

Ethel Mannin

THE whole world knows about the Jewish diaspora—the dispersion of the Jews, popularly assumed to be a nation in exile, scattered to the four corners of the earth; and in recent years, thanks to the extent and persistence of Zionist propaganda, it has heard a good deal about the Return, the great “ingathering” of Jews to their “home” in Palestine. It is a dramatic and moving story—as fiction; and indeed, is there not a famous million-sale novel entirely devoted to this theme? It made, by all accounts, a very moving film; all over the world people who saw it wept.

But few—anyhow in the Western world—have wept for the million and a quarter displaced and dispossessed Palestinian Arabs who are the tragic reality behind this romance. Few have heard of the Palestinian diaspora—half a million Palestinians dispersed in exile to the four corners of the earth, and another three quarter million and more rotting in camps in the Arab countries of the Middle East, though all have homes and lands in the country that once was Palestine but which since 1948 has become “Israel”, occupied by aliens from all over the world, with not even a common language, with nothing in common except that they inherited the Jewish faith.

The myth of the Jewish “return” is rooted in the myth—fostered by Hitler—of Jews as a race. The Jews were never a race, any more than the Christians or Moslems were; two thousand or so years ago they were a people wandering in the deserts and aspiring to the Land of Canaan, flowing with milk and honey, the ancient *Philistia*, whose people were the Philistines—the descendants of whom are the Palestinian Arabs. Even when the Children of Israel of Biblical times had crossed the River Jordan and occupied the Land of Canaan, the Canaanites fleeing before them (the parallel with what happened in 1948 is a remarkable repetition of history after two thousand years) the country was still not entirely populated by Jews, and Joshua, “old and stricken in years,” sternly reminded them: “I have given you a land for which ye did not labour, and cities which ye built not, and ye dwell in them; of the vineyards and oliveyards which ye planted not ye do eat.”

In 1948 the tragedy of the displaced and dispossessed people of Canaan, the lovely land of Palestine, was re-enacted; once again the people fled before the

invading Jews, in terror following massacres and other acts of terrorism, or forcibly expelled—as at Lydda in July, 1948—at a moment's notice by Israeli troops, sometimes at machine-gun point. The cities which they built fell into the hands of conquering aliens from all over the world, and the vineyards and olive-groves they planted fell into their hands—where they remain to this day, and for which not one penny compensation has been paid to their lawful owners—the Palestinians of the diaspora. . . though it was laid down at the U.N. in November, 1947, when Palestine was carved up for the creation of the Jewish state, that those Palestinians who wished to return should be permitted to do so, and those who did not should be compensated for the loss of their property, and this resolution is annually reaffirmed at the General Assembly. Reaffirmed, year in and year out, but never implemented, so powerful are the Zionist pressures in all countries, but particularly in America, which could, if it were so determined, enforce that implementation.

It is worth recalling that at the time of the Balfour Declaration, 1917, only 7 per cent of the inhabitants of Palestine were Jews; that the rest were Moslems and Christians, and that even as late as November, 1947, when Palestine was partitioned, only a third of the population was of the Jewish faith. Nevertheless, to that third was given two-thirds of the country, and that the most fertile area, and almost all the coast, with the important ports of Haifa and Jaffa, all the coastline left to the Palestinians being what is now known as the Gaza strip, 25 miles long and 5 miles wide, half encircled by Occupied Territory, and administered by Egypt until 1962, when it was given its own Constitution. With the remaining third of Palestine absorbed into the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, this strip, an enclave in Occupied Territory, is not only all that is left of free Palestine, but with its tremendous concentration of refugees is the most overcrowded area in the world.

Again, it has to be remembered that the huge population of Palestinians living in overcrowded conditions in huts in the camps in Jordan are refugees in their own country, the camps being on the West Bank, which is the rump of Palestine. But the people here, and in the camps in Syria, Lebanon, the Gaza strip, the country people whose lands have been usurped, are not in the real sense



Arab Refugee Mother and Child

28



The barbed wire between her and Home

29

the Palestinians of the diaspora, since they are not scattered and, though uprooted from their homes, are still on Arab soil. It is the educated Palestinians scattered throughout the Middle East, in Kuwait, Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, and in the West in England and America and even farther afield, who represent the Palestinian diaspora. For the most part, educated men and women who have passed through universities and have professions at their finger-tips, they are doing well and leading comfortable, or reasonably comfortable, lives. But you can talk to them, as I have done, in Washington, New York, Chicago, London, and they will be found as passionately dedicated to the idea of return to their own land, Palestine, as the humble, uneducated people in the camps.

As inseparable in relationship as darkness and light is diaspora and return. There has therefore grown up since 1948, as the correlative of the Palestinian diaspora, an impassioned devotion to the idea of return. To this the recently revived campaign for the re-establishment of the Palestinian Entity has given a powerful impetus. Occupied Palestine has to be liberated and regained for its rightful owners; both justice and nostalgia for a lost heritage demand it. There has thus developed what A. L. Tibawi, in an admirable paper entitled "Visions of the Return", published in the *Middle East Journal* (Autumn, 1965), has called a "new Zionism . . . an Arab Zionism with the aim of returning to the homeland". He points out that "there is already a striking similarity between present Arab aspirations and emotions concerning 'the return' and those from which Zionism was born". Mr. Tibawi is writing on the Palestine Arab refugees in Arabic poetry and art, and he quotes from a number of poems of Palestinian refugees expressing the nostalgia of the longing to return and the determination to effect it. Mr. Tibawi, himself a Palestinian refugee, knows of what he writes from the emotional angle, therefore, apart from the evidence of his researches into the matter.

The Palestinian diaspora is a contemporary reality, and direct result of a political situation, not a romantic notion rooted in something that happened millennia ago. Political Zionism is by no means a romantic notion, but a very powerful political reality, yet long before Herzl formulated his ideas of political Zionism at the end of the nineteenth century, there was a dream of the restoration of the Jews to Palestine, the promised Land, the Canaan—the restoration of an identity lost in a dispersion of some two thousand years. Herzl was looking for a solution to the problem of so-called "anti-Semitism" (a false term, since Arabs are also Semites, though unaccepted by the term) not with any religious-romantic fulfillment of Old Testament prophecies.

In his excellent little book, *Prelude to Israel*,* Professor Alan B. Taylor, points out that political

Zionism in its early stages was an essentially secular movement," and its basic character has always remained secular. The later allusion of the Zionists to the romantic idea of the 'return' was injected into the movement largely because of its emotional appeal. But this," he adds, "does not alter the fact that political Zionism has always been a rational rather than an ideological movement. It has sought a specific solution to a specific problem, not the glorification of an ethno-religious ideal."

This is so, but the romantic, emotional appeal of the return remains a telling factor in the idea of the "ingathering". The population of "Israel" is not made up of Jewish refugees from persecution all over the world; it is not even largely made up of German Jewish refugees from the Nazis—indeed, Ben Gurion, not long ago, was complaining that there were not enough European Jews in the country, and too many Eastern Jews . . . who are treated as second class citizens, along with the remaining Arabs. The mass immigration of Jews into Palestine, from all over the world, at the instigation of Zionist organizations, was going on long before Hitler came to power—though the Nazi persecution admittedly gave it impetus. Fundamentally the Zionist objective is the recreation of Jewish national identity—to which end Hebrew is being taught in the schools, in an attempt to give these people of diverse nationalities, bound together only by a common religious faith, a common tongue.

The "new Zionism" evoked by the Palestinian diaspora is something quite different; it is the desire of an ancient people who have never lost their national identity, of an Arab people, part of the wider Arab nation, to return home to their own part of the Arab homeland—the usurped part, which is Palestine. It is not a romantic notion, ethno-religious, and the problem it presents is not basically a refugee problem but a question of human rights. *It is an anti-imperialist struggle.* It used to be said of Zionism, before 1948, that it survived only because it was protected by British bayonets; now it could be said that it survives only because of American dollars.

Dr. John Davies, for five years and until recently, the Director-General of U.N.R.W.A., pointed out in an address to the anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism (at their annual dinner, 6th May, 1964, New York City) that "even a full solution of the Palestine refugee problem . . . would not solve the Arab-Israeli conflict. . . . It seems to me the Western world has never really understood either the nature of Arab thinking or the depth and universality of Arab feelings on the issue. . . . It is the existence of the state of Israel in the Middle East far more than the existence of a refugee problem which engenders Arab bitterness. In their minds the latter is but a by-product of the former." He then added what is the real heart of the matter: "It is my considered judgment that if now by some magic the

refugee problem could be suddenly resolved in total, the resistance and opposition of Arab peoples to Israel would continue virtually unabated."

In the Palestinian diaspora you have an entire nation dispossessed and displaced, of different religions, both Moslem and Christian, but of one ancient mother tongue, Arabic, of one national identity, Palestinian Arab, and who right up to the dismemberment of their country were the majority of its inhabitants, and had been for two thousand years; you have, scattered in

exile, in both East and West, a nation with a continuous history and an unbroken identity; their return is a basic human right, no romantic notion, no political manoeuvre, no attempt at the recreations of a nation. The nation exists; integrated, whole, and whether living in comfort in New York, London, Beirut, or any town or city of the world, or living wretchedly in a one-room hut in a refugee camp in the Middle East, is united in the one unwavering and in tense desire; to return. To go home.

Palestine: The Broken Triangle*

Erskine B. Childers †

A small State, precariously perched on a coastal shelf, with its back to the sea and defiantly facing on three sides a hostile Arab world.

COUNT BERNADOTTE, 1948.¹

THE Arab-Israeli conflict remains one of total deadlock. In face of this, the prevailing Western tendency, both at government and non-government levels, is to reiterate the following formula: the existence of Israel is a fact that must be accepted; we do not wish to take sides in this conflict; we seek close and friendly relations with the Arab world; we stand ready to use our good offices for mediation whenever an opportunity occurs; but until then, the *status quo* must be maintained, aggression from any source must be halted, and an arms equilibrium must be ensured.

Behind this formula, there appears to be a general thesis about the likely future of the Arab-Israeli conflict, provided the West ensures the arms equilibrium and the

status quo. I will call this the thesis of attrition by Arab social reform. Like most other notions and assumptions about Palestine, its origins may be traced far back before the establishment of the State of Israel. From 1918 onwards, it was a persistent theme of Zionist publicity in the West that Arab hostility to Zionism was artificial. The "ordinary Arab" was not really interested in politics, but was being whipped up and deliberately made uneasy by "a handful of agitators" using Zionism as a diversion for their own feudal interests and rival ambitions.²

This Zionist theme was very widely accepted in the West, and its effects were by no means only negative. It not only appeared to explain all reports of Arab unrest and violence; it had the quite positive implication that "firmness" by the British in fulfilling the pledges to Zionism would be morally justified and politically successful. Once Zionism was irrevocably entrenched, the Arabs would "accept Zionism's existence".³ But at its most positive the theme became a moral argument for Zionism itself, for it was widely argued that the Zionists, bringing their dynamic "socialism" into Palestine,

* Reprinted, with grateful acknowledgments, from the *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol XIX, No. 1, 1965.

† Erskine Childers is an author and broadcaster on international, especially Arab and Afro-Asian affairs. The author of *Common Sense About the Arab World* (1960); and *The Road to Suez—A Study in Western-Arab Relations* (1962), he is currently completing a major book on the Palestine conflict, to be published in early 1966.

¹ In his U.N. Mediator report to the Security Council, 12th July, 1948.

² *Viz.* the Israeli State propaganda booklet, *Facts About Israel*, p. 15 annually; Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error for the whole Mandate period*; Weizmann's, Samuel's, Meinerzhagen's letters, in *Documents on British Foreign Policy*, Series 1, Vols. IV and XIII for the theme in 1919-20.

³ *Documents*, IV, *passim*; Zionist proposals for specialists in "firmness" for the Black and Tans to be transferred from Ireland, Meinerzhagen, *Middle East Diary*, pp. 112-16, 116.

* Darton, Longman and Todd (London), 1961.

would themselves free the ordinary Arab from the clutches of the "agitating feudalist" leaders. Much of what concern there was among liberal Westerners for the Arabs was thus canalized into sympathy for them, not *vis-à-vis* Zionism, but *vis-à-vis* their own leaders.

Each of these adopted notions is now embodied in the present thesis of attrition. The Palestine Arab refugees are seen as being "caged like animals in suffering as a deliberate political weapon".⁴ But in time, it is believed, the refugees will refuse to go on being "caged" and will demand resettlement—especially if they are made to see that the occupation of their former lands and homes by Israeli settlers is irrevocable. As to the wider Arab world, it is believed that the social revolution now accelerating will make it less and less possible for "self-seeking rival autocrats or dictators" to use Israel as a diversion. An ever-growing new Arab intelligentsia will see the reality of Israel, oppose the social cost of heavy armaments, and even, perhaps, see the justice of the Israeli case. Furthermore, the more newly independent Arab countries, remote from Palestine and the memory of 1948, will refuse to be drawn into the conflict and will press Egypt and the others to abandon it. This has been a widespread assumption about Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia.

These, it appears, are the prevailing assumptions about the likely future course of the conflict—assumptions held both in the West and in Israeli general opinion. They are undoubtedly the most comforting available, and like the original theme begun in 1918, involve no searching questions for the West. But suppose this whole social-reform thesis of attrition proves to be wrong? The consequences will be very grave indeed. More years will have been lost without tackling any of the roots of the conflict itself. The arms confrontation will have become more lethal, even if in supposed equilibrium. Continued blanket Western support of the Israeli *status quo* will have jeopardized Western relations, not with a weak and unstable Arab world, but a dynamic new Arab society of one hundred million people, astride one of the great strategic and commercial axes of the world. And for the three million odd Israelis, inside their tiny beach-head, the future will contain no greater prospect of peace, to put it at the happiest estimate.

What, then, are the indications for the future of the dispute as of to-day? In this writer's judgment, the attrition thesis has no foundation in discernible fact or trend anywhere in the Arab world. Perhaps such trends may appear in the future; but there are very sound reasons for doubting it. The evidence that is currently available suggests the reverse. The Arab social revolution does not appear to be "softening" hostility towards Israel; it does appear to be adding a whole new dimension of strength and determination to that hostility.

⁴ Leon Uris, *Exodus*, as an instance of the theme reaching millions of Westerners.

No one who is familiar with either the leading, or the little-known, exponents of to-day's Arab social revolution can fail to be struck by the approach they take to the Palestine issue. It has a moral and emotional scope very considerably larger than was evident in the early years following Israel's establishment. In the era of the *ancien régime* generation of Arab politics, the primary grievances of that generation against Israel were diplomatic, political, and cultural. An Arab people had been forcibly denied political self-determination by Britain with the approval of other Western powers, in order to introduce into their land an alien statist force. That statist force had succeeded in gaining recognition, and in occupying and emptying most of Palestine of its Arabs. The existence of the Israeli State was regarded by *ancien régime* Arab politicians primarily as a diplomatic affront, a political injustice and a military danger. But for the new, revolutionary generation there is an added dimension of grievance and revulsion—the social dimension.

This is evident in the speeches and writing, not only of the top revolutionary leaders like Nasser, but in the very currency of talk about Palestine among Arabs of the new generation. The fact that Nasser speaks of Zionism and Israel as a race-supremacist statist force, and not simply an enemy state, has been little noted in the West—and where noted, has been derisively dismissed as mere polemic addressed to the new African states. But it is not only Nasser and other Eastern-Arab leaders of his outlook who are making such statements. President Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia is using the same terms, describing Israel, with deep feeling, as "the policy of colonial settlement pushed to the degree of paroxysm . . . the problem of Palestine is the same as South Africa."⁵ Directly contrary to the assumption about the Maghreb that has circulated in the West, more and more Western Arabs, who are now in free contact with the East and able to consider other Arab issues than their own, are reacting to the history of Palestine with feelings stemming from their experience of French settler domination.

This massive, additional sense of social injustice in Palestine is no mere matter of polemic of Africa-directed propaganda. In every private talk this writer has had with little-known and unknown Arabs of the new generation, it is an integral part of their view of the Arab world. They see the recent history of their region as one of social injustice and exploitation, as well as of a more formally political nationalist-struggle against Western pressure. Allusion to the conduct of Zionist settlers and the social and economic impact upon, and eventual removal of, the mass of Palestine Arabs, has become part of our comprehensive retrospect that embraces landlord-domination in Egypt or Iraq and *colon*-domination in the Maghreb.

⁵ Interview with the correspondent of *Le Monde* in late July, 1964; the correspondent expressed surprise over the vehemence with which Bourguiba spoke of Palestine.

Behind this deeper and far more intensely angry perspective on Palestine there lies another of the influences which, in the Western attrition thesis, is supposed to produce moderation towards Israel, namely, education and the sheer tide of information about events in the rest of the world. And in taking note of this factor, the attitudes of Palestine-Arab refugees themselves must be included. The majority of the nearly three-quarters of a million refugees were peasants, without much education; their feeling for their fields and towns is built on the primeval human emotion of longing to go back to everything that was familiar and loved. But a whole new generation of Palestinians has now grown up in exile—and they have received education. It has in no way made them "realistic".

For these new generation refugees, as for all young Arabs, the story of Palestine is one of moral contradiction on so great a scale as to make them burn with anger. To assume that this could be the product of sheer "hate-indoctrination", as alleged by Zionists, is undoubtedly convenient, but in no way helpful for us in the West or ultimately, I am convinced, for Israelis. The point is of such commanding importance that it must be elaborated all the way back to the beginning. For the contradiction that the new Palestine and other Arab generation now sees even more sharply than their parents involves the whole question of what I call the Palestine triangle.

The Palestine conflict is, and always has been, a triangular confrontation of the West, the Zionists and the Arabs; but one in which the only real, or "two-way" dialogue has been on the Western-Zionist side. It began, however, on a single axis entirely within the Western world—the axis of dialogue between Western Gentiles and Western Zionists.

A tiny group of Jews concluded from all the centuries of vicious Gentile persecution that all Gentiles, for all time and irremediably, were racially anti-Semitic. Chaim Weizmann frequently described it as a "bacillus" which every Gentile carried within him, whether he knew or admitted it, or not.⁶ The corollary for this tiny group of Jews involved a categorical assumption "on behalf of" all Jews, everywhere, that they were for all time a "people" or a "race" who could never be safe from the Gentile bacillus except in a return to a Jewish state. Setting out to obtain international recognition of this race-people doctrine, and of a millennial title to Palestine, Zionist leaders used highly selective arguments among Western statesmen and influential figures,

⁶ Cf. R. H. S. Crossman, *A Nation Reborn*, 1960.

⁷ Weizmann's classic admission at Czernowitz in 1927, that ever since 1917 he had "trembled lest the British Government would call me to ask": ". . . Where are they, your Zionists? . . . The Jews, they knew, were against us; we stood alone on a little island, a tiny group"; ed. P. Goodman, *Chaim Weizmann*, Ch. XIV, 1945.

according to their susceptibilities.⁸ But running through all these persuasions, and above all among Western liberals who later led the support of Zionism through to statehood, there was an appeal to the Western-Gentile conscience—the debt of shame over treatment of the Jews.

By definition, both this appeal and the ultimately massive response to it under the horror of Nazism had nothing at all to do with Palestine, save in one particularly hideous historical paradox. One of the first Western-Gentile burnings-alive of Jews did take place in Palestine—by the Crusaders⁹ when they seized Jerusalem from the Arabs, under whom Jews had enjoyed freedom of worship and autonomy.¹⁰ But the legacy of this Western anti-Semitism now developed upon Arab Palestine: the axis of the Gentile-Jewish dialogue was shifted, and the Zionist end of it was pegged into that land, the site demanded for Western redemption of Western crimes. This transferred dialogue became one side of the triangle that is now inaccurately called a "local" or "regional" dispute in the Near East.

Palestine in 1917 had an over 90 per cent indigenous, rooted, and homogeneously Arab population. In all Zionist drafts for the Balfour Declaration, these Arabs were not even mentioned. In the final document, they were politically evaporated into the phase, "existing non-Jewish communities" by a tactical British insertion which the Zionists thoroughly disliked.¹¹ The phrase was never intended to impair the substance¹² of the British-Zionist compact. This was that Britain, endorsed by the U.S.A. and other Western governments, would temporarily control Palestine "in trust for the Jews",¹³ withhold majority self-rule from the Arabs¹⁴ and suppress any rebellion by them, while allowing mass Zionist immigration to produce a Zionist state. The Arabs were not to be consulted about any of this;¹⁵ it was the underlying intention actually to remove them clear out of Palestine.¹⁶ But they were to be assured, both by Britain and by the Zionists, that no Zionist state was envisaged, only partnership in a "joint autonomy"; and they were so assured.¹⁷

⁸ Well summarized in Alan R. Taylor, *Prelude to Israel, 1959*. Cf. Runciman's documentary history, *The Crusades, 1951*. M. de Goeje, *Le Complot de Lybie, 1920*.

⁹ Chaim Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, p. 260.

¹⁰ L. S. Amery, who drafted it, *My Political Life*, Vol. II, p. 116.

¹¹ Weizmann to Cecil of the Foreign Office, 23rd April, 1917, *df.* Leonard Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, p. 422.

¹² David Lloyd George, *Speeches*, Vol. II, p. 1138; Meinerzhagen, p. 104; Ben Halpern, *The Idea of the Jewish State*, pp. 295-309.

¹³ Foreign Secretary Balfour's secret memo, 11th August, 1919, *Documents*.

¹⁴ A Weizmann Archives acknowledgment, see *Jewish Observer*, 6th March, 1964.

¹⁵ Weizmann to Arabs in Jerusalem, 1918; 1921 Zionist Congress resolution; 1922 "Churchill" White Paper, etc.

British control, and the general Western pledge to Zionism in Palestine, at once set up another side of to-day's triangle—that of a Western-Arab dialogue. But at no time, from the first fearful rumours of the Balfour Declaration in 1917, was this a viable or "two-way" dialogue. At no time was Arab opposition to Zionism artificial and agitator-induced.¹⁸ The reasons why the Western-Arab side of the triangle was at all time sterile were two-fold. The Arabs simply did not believe the British-Zionist assurances; they saw the real intention behind the camouflage, both because of the experience they had already had of early militant-Zionist pioneers before 1917, and because of actual Zionist behaviour under British auspices after 1917. The facts about this really cannot be disputed: they are in Zionist documentary record and the Jewish testimony of writers like Ahad Ha'am.

Whatever the moral justifications held by Zionists, and pressed on Westerners by them, in terms of Palestine and its overwhelming indigenous Arab majority, Zionism was a race-supremacist settler movement. In his novel *Altneuland* for Western consumption, Theodor Herzl depicted happy Arabs, *in situ*, in a future Jewish state; in his secret diary, he had already set down a plan to "spirit the penniless population across the frontier by denying it employment."¹⁹ By 1914, Zionists had already launched the complete strategy for Zionist supremacy, in a network of basic policies that were accelerated under the British Mandate through the Jewish Agency, the various Zionist funds and the "socialist"²⁰ Histadruth.

All lands bought by the Jewish National Fund became legally, racially "Jewish" and could never be re-purchased by a non-Jew.²¹ Arab tenant-farmers and labourers were evicted, or driven away by the Zionist racial boycott of Arab labour which was extended to all possible Zionist enterprise, urban as well as rural.²² If Arabs had to be employed under British directives, they received lower wages than Jews for the same work.²³ It was laid down as early as 1913 that the objective was "a closed Jewish economy."²⁴ To establish this, there also had to be a racial boycott of the produce of Arabs, if

necessary imposed on urban Jews by force.²⁴ Mixed government schools were boycotted; Zionist schools taught Zionist exclusivism.²⁵ An underground Zionist army was formed; Arab arms were severely prohibited.

We have to-day voluminous evidence of the pattern of responses by other indigenous majorities to all other settler minority groups employing precisely these practices. The Arab response was identical. It is equally to be noted that all other settler groups have sought Western support through the same themes as are propagated by the Zionist movement. No one who has studied Algeria, Kenya, Rhodesia, or South Africa can possibly ignore the parallels. The Zionist themes included: bringing "civilization" to the native; native neglect or non-use of land; discriminatory acts being only "temporary" until Zionism was really established, so that it could really begin "partnership";²⁶ the "ordinary" native not being interested in politics; all native unrest being purely artificially agitated; the native in any case having no innate rights in the territory; the "crude arithmetic" concept of democracy by majority being dangerous, and so on.²⁸

It should be emphasized that to cite these documented facts and to note these parallels should not be held to be "anti-Jewish". They concern the actions of only one particular group within world Jewry; and not within the Western cultural context of anti-Semitism, but in Palestine. So far as this writer can perceive, the sense of collective shame and guilt that he shares with every liberal non-Jewish Westerner for the crimes of his society against Jews in that society, cannot obscure these realities.

Indeed, to note this is to return to the Western-Arab side of the Palestine triangle. It was because of the concrete and increasingly grim facts of the actual Arab experience of Zionism that there never could be any meaningful Western-Arab dialogue. But it was also because there was no common basis of morality on which the West could discuss Zionism with the Arabs. The only morality available was the one in which the Arabs, by definition, could not be expected to share. The West was, in effect, asking this indigenous people to acquiesce in their own political extermination and physical eviction, in order to enable the West to pay for crimes of which the Arabs were innocent; crimes committed by the West, in the West, against Western Jews. No other

¹⁸ Hoffen's 1953 address, Bank Leumi, in A Rubner, *The Economy of Israel*, 1960, p. 99.

¹⁹ Peel Commission Report, H.M.G. Cmd., 5479 of 1937, p. 250.

²⁰ de Haas, the American Zionist, laid down the argument of no Arab political rights in Palestine; a similar thesis is advanced against the Africans by *apartheid* exponents in South Africa. The rejection of "crude arithmetic" democracy, interestingly enough in an argument against America assuming a Palestine mandate, was made in an official Zionist pamphlet in 1919, cf. Stein *op. cit.*, p. 612, because it was feared the U.S. might give the Arabs majority self-government.

indigenous people has ever been asked to make such third-party payment by obliteration. It can scarcely be held surprising, or immoral, or "unrealistic", that the Arabs have been refusing to accept such a fate ever since.

And this in turn leads back to the even wider moral contradiction that has been an inevitable feature of the education of the new social-revolutionary Arab generation to-day. It is not simply that these millions of rising young Arabs, imbued with a dynamic sense of social justice, see the history of Zionism as that of a race-supremacist settler force. The contrast between the fate of Palestine's indigenous Arab population and that of all other indigenous populations in former colonial territories is now a hundred times sharper and more provocative than it could be for earlier Arabs. To the young educated Arab, it is a kind of giant nightmare—in which everything that the West and the United Nations has said and done everywhere else in the former colonial regions, must not be applied to his fellow Arabs of Palestine. He sees the issue of minority settler-supremacism already resolved in Kenya, Zambia, Malawi, Algeria, and Tunisia—with overwhelming Western and U.N. support for those indigenous peoples. And he sees the same clear support fully committed in the remaining conflicts in southern Africa. But not for Palestine.

To call such an outlook the product of "hate-indoctrination" must surely have very sinister implications. It implies that the new generation of Palestine Arab refugees and all other Arabs should in some Orwellian fashion have been taught a separate morality, and have been isolated morally and mentally from the whole outside world. To postulate that they ought not to have acquired this view of the Palestine contradiction is to suggest that they should have had specially expurgated editions of the U.N. Charter, U.N. debates and resolutions, of world history textbooks without the Wilsonian precepts, the Atlantic Charter, the history of modern Afro-Asia and the very history of their own fellow Arabs in Algeria. I submit this, not in sarcasm but in plain logic, and it is of such importance that it needs elaboration.

How else, for example, was any one of the young Palestinians of this generation to be educated? It is a sobering and an instructive exercise to imagine the role of a teacher in an U.N.R.W.A. refugee school, under some hypothetical order to produce at graduation a young man or woman meeting the requirement involved in the attrition-thesis, and not open to the Zionist charge of "hate-indoctrination". Consider what such a young graduate must be educated to think of himself and the world around him.

His education must have omitted the history of Arab civilization, and of Palestine as an Arab-inhabited and Arab-cultured country over more than a thousand years. His retrospect must be as a human digit in an "existing

non-Jewish community", in a territory that had really always been "Jewish" because it had contained Hebrew kingdoms for very brief periods some two to three thousand years ago. He must emerge from school believing that, although the rooted people speaking his language and living in his culture were an overwhelming majority in 1917 and still a majority in 1947, they had no right to oppose the transformation of Palestine into a Zionist state for alien settlers. His "non-Jewish community" had no innate rights in Palestine at all.

Watching the Western world exerting increasing pressure on a settler-supremacist minority in South Africa, this hypothetical young Arab must see no contradiction. His teacher either censored from his mind any suggestion that there had been race boycotts and evictions of his own people, and, finally, terrorization and expulsion of them—or all of this was convincingly explained to him as necessary to redeem the distant West for its crimes against Jews in the West. He must have been instructed that when his own people and their kindfolk neighbours, tried to resist settler-supremacy in 1948, they were wrong to do so and guilty of "aggression". But when Africans in South Africa, and their kindfolk neighbours in liberated states, resort to arms, this is right, and is supported by the liberal West. He has necessarily been taught that the 1949 Armistice lines around Palestine are sovereign, *de facto* frontiers of a peace-loving U.N. member-state; and that this state did not terrorize and drive out his own family and some 650,000 other people; their memories were all faulty; they left on "their own leaders' evacuation orders"; Israelis all wanted them to stay.

The "Bantustans" being created by the Verwoerd Government in South Africa would strike no parallels in this specially conditioned young Arab mind. He would expect that, when his own political leaders are asked by Africans and Westerners to vote at the U.N. to condemn South Africa *apartheid*, they will never suggest that the same code be applied to Palestine history—because it was quite different.

And so on . . . the range of mental and emotional conditioning required will perhaps be obvious from the above. That none of this has happened, but indeed the very reverse, ought not, surely, to be surprising. I am deeply aware that the above analysis will be offensive to very many liberal Westerners, non-Jewish and Jewish alike. But the problem that such reaction poses is not one of some vacuum of jurisprudence, political ethics, and practical reality. It is *the* problem of the Israeli-Arab conflict to-day, and of the broken triangle of dialogue that pins the West into that conflict in a manner that robs us of any chance of "mediation".

Let me try to summarize this problem as bluntly, but as realistically, as I can. The Israeli, or devoted Western pro-Israeli reader of this article may be outraged. Many Western readers not necessarily deeply committed to Israel may be surprised and even shocked by the facts

¹⁸ As reported by every responsible British official, *Documents*, and by the American King-Crane Commission, which was wholly ignored.

¹⁹ Entry of 12th June, 1895, *Complete Diaries*, Vol. I, 1960, p. 29.

²⁰ Jewish Agency Constitution Article 3 (d); see Hope-Simpson's description of the displacement effect on Arabs, H.M.G. Cmd. 3086.

²¹ Jewish Agency 3 (e); J.N.F. lease-form Article 23; Palestine Foundation Fund Article 7; "only Jewish labour . . . Jewish workmen only," etc.

²² As late as 1946, Crossman noted this continued Zionist practice, *Palestine Mission*, p. 47; cf. also Nevill Barbour, *Nisi Dominus*, 1946, pp. 135-6; Hope-Simpson, *op. cit.*

²³ Zionist leader Arthur Ruppin to the 1913 Zionist Congress.

and submissions in it. But unless those facts and submissions can be shown to be wrong both in themselves and in the view of the Arab world, none of this reaction will have the slightest bearing on the future of the Palestine conflict itself.

This is another way of defining the very essence of the broken triangle. It is natural that the Israeli Government, and its Zionist predecessors all the way back to 1917, should have sought to produce a given Western view of the facts and ethics of the Palestine problem. Zionism and Israel were created in the West, and—to quote a perceptive comment by the traditionally Zionist *Guardian* newspaper—“Zionism was, in fact, the last successful surge of European colonialism into alien territory.”²⁷ In turn, predominant Western policy and opinion may try to present, along the Western-Arab side of the triangle, the received Zionist and Israeli view of the facts and ethic of Palestine history. But his has not worked; it did not produce Arab acquiescence through all the years of trying up to 1947; and it has not produced an iota of yielding in all the years since. So far as this writer can see, the modern version of the post-1918 thesis of “artificial agitation”, to be eliminated by “firmness” and social reform, is as hollow to-day as it was proven to be when it was first launched.

At the outset of this article, I quoted a warning prophecy by the late Count Bernadotte, the U.N. Mediator, about Israel's future. He was in essence describing a beach-head community. In the nature of such a situation, logistical support from the home base is vital: Zionism and Israeli existence in Palestine is based only upon such logistics—diplomatic, military, and financial. Just as a commander on a beleaguered beach-head has often had very faulty intelligence about the morale of the forces surrounding him, so it has been a marked characteristic not only of the Israelis but other settler communities, that they are dangerously ignorant of the thought and feelings of the surrounding native communities. As long ago as 1891, the great Jewish writer Ahad Ha'am observed this of Zionists in Palestine—and again in 1911, 1914, and 1920.²⁸ Other Jewish figures have noted it ever since,²⁹ and this writer

has been struck by the self-insulated, dream-world of Israeli leaders over and over again in their analysis of Arab affairs.

The deeper the beach-head commanders feel their commitment, the more strenuously they are liable to send back faulty estimates of their situation to the home base. In turn, if they detect the least faltering in determination among those furnishing the logistical support, they are inexorably driven to counter-propaganda in the home base to prevent any re-thinking of the whole conflict. That all of these patterns have been marked in the Zionist-Western dialogue since the beginning is not a matter of polemic but of sober analysis. It has always had to be that way.

But it has not helped either ordinary Israelis, in the beach-head, or the West to help them. To cite one concrete and extremely pertinent example: from late 1949 onwards, Israel mounted a very strenuous global campaign to explain the Arab exodus of 1948 as being the result of “Arab evacuation orders”. The campaign was brilliant, and very largely successful. In the West, but far from making it more likely that the victims of the exodus would resignedly seek resettlement and the Arab states “realistically” undertake that (economically impossible) task, the actual consequence for the conflict has been an even greater sense of Arab outrage.

To demand that the victims make peace, while telling the rest of the world—in their hearing—that what was actually done to them simply never happened, is not normally recognized as sound peace-making. In a very real sense, Israel's “peace offers” are not, by their very nature, directed to the Arabs at all. They are addressed Westwards, to a kind of caricature of the Arabs and of their experience in Palestine; a caricature which Zionism first began developing in the West with the assertion that Arab hostility was “artificial”.

This self-defeating mechanism extends far outside the issues and realities of the Israel-Arab conflict itself, and always has. At least as early as 1921, Zionist leaders began actively denigrating Arab nationalism in the West. To-day, while declaring its readiness to “negotiate to-morrow with President Nasser”, the Israeli Government is engaged in a continuous campaign to portray the selfsame Nasser to the world as a second Hitler and a menace to international peace. And most significantly, this campaign is not limited to Nasser's hostility to Israel: it is extended to denigrating domestic reform in Egypt and to every other facet of Cairo's role in the Arab world, however far from Palestine. This is not a matter of judgment but of official Israeli record. Once again, this would not normally be recognized as peace-making.

In these conditions—the realities of the conflict itself as distinct from the caricature of it—any attempt at a blueprint for a settlement would be a mere paper exercise. I have attempted only to submit that the Western-Israeli thesis for the future, of some sort of attrition by reform on the Arab side, is on all available

evidence as fantasy-founded as most past notions. We are beginning to see a new Arab world, dynamic and modernizing, confident in its own slowly evolving new ideology and institutions, and conscious of its ancient heritage. It is going to be a world of one hundred million human beings, and its very size and location will make it less and less possible for Western governments to risk all basic interests there in order to maintain a beach-head *status quo* for perhaps three million Israelis. It is going to be a world in which the revolutionary leadership, far from “giving up” its defences against Israel and for Palestinians, will feel more strongly and deeply than ever that if the United Nations will not act, the united Arab nations must do so alone.

These, I submit, are the indications. It may be

Zionism's Impact on Canadian Jews

Bill Gottlieb *

HAVE you ever thrown a rock into a quiet lake and watched as it created an ever-widening circle of waves? An eleven-day meeting of the twenty-sixth World Zionist Congress in Jerusalem in January had similar waves of reaction built into it, which will be felt in Canada and the United States.

This congress is the highest authority of the World Zionist Organization, and its decisions dictate the programmes and activities of Canadian Zionists, and all other Zionists, for the years ahead. The implementation of its resolutions is a source of concern to all Canadians because they affect problems at home and in the troublesome Middle East.

The W.Z.O., operating under legislation of the Israeli Knesset (Parliament), is an integral part of the Zionist-Israeli sovereignty. This sovereignty employs a highly-organized and well-financed programme to advance “the Jewish people” concept in international law. Though most Jews live outside the State of Israel, “the Jewish people” concept regards Jews as a national group linked to that state. Implementation of the concept, particularly in the United States and Canada, was a major subject for discussion at the eleven-day congress in Jerusalem.

This was presented in a joint communiqué issued 15th March, 1964, by the W.Z.O. and the State of Israel. That communiqué called for increased joint action by the state and the W.Z.O.—in the words of Prime Minister Levi Eshkol—to “conquer the communities”

* The author, American Council for Judaism's publicity director, questions the idea that Israel is home to *all* Jews, prefers religion and nationality kept separate.

tempting to believe this picture false; but I would urge that if this is believed, then in prudence it must be upon some new body of fact and assumption, because every such assumption applied by the West and the Zionists in the past to the future of Palestine has been proved false.

It might be pleasing to hope that the Arabs will one day see the fate of Palestine, as Israelis have to, and as Israelis want the West to. But to hold this hope seems to me to postulate that the Arabs are not human beings.

It is surely at least possible that the real and vital roots of this conflict lie deeper than the redeeming body of myth and emotion from which we in the West have proceeded, and from which we have created a conflict which we now try to suggest is one in which we “do not take sides”.

of Jews in the Diaspora (lands outside Israel). The Congress sought to augment such programmes operating in the United States and Canada in political, cultural, religious, and related fields. Scores of organizations, inter-related and controlled directly or indirectly by the W.Z.O., affect the daily programmes of many Jewish institutions through English-speaking North America.

Much of what will be reported here about the congress is negative and will reflect a history of Jews written and spoken with a whine and whimper. It is important to establish quickly, therefore, how Jews are faring in Canada.

With some isolated exceptions it can be said that Canadian Jews are accepted as free and equal citizens of Canada. They can be found in Parliament; as heads of universities and faculty members; and among the leadership in Canada's industrial, social, religious, political, and cultural institutions. There are pockets of anti-Semitism in Canada, and there still are golf clubs and firms which will not accept Jews. But the thrust of the nation is toward religious tolerance, and an increasing acceptance of Jews as normal members of the community.

Let us keep this reality in mind as we examine the philosophy and programmes which emerged from the twenty-sixth World Zionist Congress. The congress stressed these goals and themes:

“The centrality of Israel for Jews everywhere, who constitute a national entity, “the Jewish people”;

“American and Canadian Jews should cut home charities to the bone, double their gifts to Israel, and regard such aid as a tax paid to their national state;

²⁷ *Guardian* editorial, 1st August, 1964.

²⁸ In 1891: “They treat the Arabs with hostility and cruelty and deprive them of their rights... think that the Arabs are all savages and do not understand what is happening around them. But this is a great mistake.”

²⁹ In 1911: “... the want of insight and understanding shown on our side to an extreme degree.”

³⁰ In 1914: “... they [militant Zionists] wax angry towards those who remind them that there is still another people in Eretz Israel that has been living there and does not at all intend to leave.”

³¹ In 1920: “... we have regarded the Arabs as non-existent ever since the beginning of colonization.”

³² *Inter alia*, Reb Binyamin, Judah Magnes, Nathan Chofshi, T. R. Feiwel, Leon Roth.

The idea that freedom is a menace to Jewish survival; The need and duty of Jews to go on *aliyah* (to migrate to Israel) because Israel needs their man-power and skill for its upbuilding.

These are not the visions of dreamy-eyed Zionist idealists. You can find these views articulated by United States and Israeli leaders from Israel, Canada, the United States, and other free countries, by reading more than 1,000 pages of official Zionist news releases, reports, and resolutions, as well as newspaper reports in the U.S. and Canada. The blueprints are there, the organizations exist and are functioning, and there is plenty of money for the whole plan.

Briefly, here is the programme:
The new Zionist fear word is "assimilation". Free societies, said Dr. Goldmann, head of the World Zionist Organization and the World Jewish Congress, "threaten Jewish survival more than persecution, inquisition, pogroms, and mass murder." The Zionist answer, to cite the congress resolution, is to emphasize "the centrality of Israel in Jewish life" and through intensification of Zionist participation in the "Jewish communities". The unanimously passed resolutions also spell out co-ordination between the World Zionist Organization and other World Jewish organizations, particularly the World Jewish Congress, of which the Canadian Jewish Congress is an affiliate. Thus in the absence of any disclaimers, the C.J.C., recognized as the national representative body of Canadian Jewry, is committed to support the entire Zionist programme.

The urgency for Jews in the U.S. and Canada to settle in Israel was repeated monotonously by Zionists and Israeli officials. A typical appeal for *aliyah* was voiced by Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol. He told the Zionist congress that Israel's future depended on the size of its military and industrial man-power, requiring 30,000 to 40,000 Jews a year from the U.S., Canada, and other "prosperous countries". To insure future *aliyah* to Israel, Eshkol added, *Diapora* Jews must develop a separate "Jewish national consciousness". The Zionist Organization of Canada, at its biennial national convention last October, gave advance support by adopting a resolution on *aliyah* which recommended a joint Zionist-Israeli "massive attack on the problem of Canadian *aliyah*".

Throughout eleven days of planning, the Zionist Congress discussed "links", "unity", "partnership", "one people", "national consciousness", and the "centrality of Israel"—all in political, military, and financial terms. Nevertheless, Dr. Goldmann urged the congress "to fight for the right to be an international people... attached to Israel (*without being*) afraid of the demagogic slogans of double loyalty." Some years ago, on the same question, Goldmann "challenged the Jews of America and of other countries to gather courage and declare openly that they entertain a double loyalty, one to the land in which they live and one to Israel".

This national-loyalty question is an important and tricky one. It would be ludicrous, for example, to question the loyalty of French-Canadians who have cultural and ancestral ties to France, or of Canadians of Catholic faith for their feelings about the Vatican and Rome. In neither case are there calls for *aliyah* to the "motherland" or for political support of national interests. The Zionist-Israeli structure, on the other hand, seeks to transform an age-old religion of universal centre of power in the modern State of Israel.

Zionists arriving for the congress were told by the authoritative *Jerusalem Post* that "a Jew who contributes to Israel's upbuilding is doing no more than paying his full taxes to the Jewish nation to which he belongs". What does this mean for Canadian Jewish charities?

United Jewish Appeal funds, to cite one finding, sent to Israel more than \$5,000,000 from 1955 to 1962. These funds were then returned to the United States for political and other activities on behalf of Israel. This was disturbing news to unsuspecting contributors to the U.J.A.

The relevancy for Canada is that United Israel Appeal funds are turned over to the Jewish agency for distribution fully at the discretion of Israeli and Zionist leaders. The editor of the *Canadian Jewish News* in a recent editorial asked if the U.J.A. "has the right to distribute funds to institutions not belonging in the area of asked whether a political organization should be "subsidized from charity funds, or should its expenses be paid by the members who want such an organization?" This was an oblique reference to the fact that every contributor to the U.J.A., directly or through a combined campaign, is automatically deemed a member of the Zionist Organization of Canada. The twenty-sixth World Zionist Congress urged that such charity (tax-exempt) be considered a tax paid to their "national state" rather than a voluntary gift.

Thus Zionists control the major philanthropic funds which are supported by well-meaning Canadian Jews, who are largely non-Zionist. There is sharp competition for funds to support Canadian Jewish charities as against Israeli and Zionist needs overseas—often to the disadvantages of domestic charities. Obviously the need is great to separate Jewish philanthropic funds raised in Canada from the political and nationalist needs of the Zionist-Israeli operation.

The congress' frequent reference to the "Jewish people" in terms of a single national body calls for clarification. Some interpretations of Judaism recognize a religious "peopleness", emphasizing such biblical terminology as "children of Israel", "people of Israel", "a kingdom of priests and a holy people". This is certainly acceptable in an exclusively religious and spiritual sense. But the Zionist-Israeli sovereignty has perverted the idea of a religious "peopleness" into

a political-national entity which it misleadingly calls "the Jewish people", and for which it claims, in international law, recognition of a legal system of national rights and responsibilities.

The Canadian government recognizes dual citizenship for Canadian Jews living in Israel, under certain circumstances, but Canadian Jews would be well advised to press their government for a clear-cut decision regarding Zionist-Israeli sovereignty claims upon them.

The Zionist Congress actions have considerable bearing on Canada's Middle East policy, since a major goal is "conquering the communities" of Jews outside Israel in support of Israel's various national interests.

In summary, certain facts should be borne in mind: most people, both Jews and non-Jews, have almost no idea of the nature of Zionism. They conceive it as a religious humanitarian, or spiritual movement, seeking

to help needy Jews. Zionism is first and foremost a political "Jewish" nationalist movement with programmes designed to persuade Jews that their homeland is in Israel.

The vast majority of North American Jews consider the United States or Canada to be their one and only homeland. The fact that only a handful of Jews leave Canada to settle in Israel, despite strenuous Zionist propaganda efforts, is witness to this truth.

Moreover most Canadian Jews, like U.S. Jews, do not feel that the freedom they enjoy here represents a threat to their survival as Jews. Goldmann and the Zionists notwithstanding. Nor do they require the Zionist movement to safeguard their future as Jews living outside Israel. They gladly and confidently entrust their future—the freedom of religion and the integrity of their citizenship—to the people, the ideals, and the democratic institutions of the United States and Canada.

The Keepers of the Rings

Qishtaini

CALADIN once asked a Jew, so the fable says, which of the three monotheistic religions did he value most. To get out of the predicament the Jew told the renowned ruler a story. The story tells of a man who had a special ring which he handed over to his son on his death. The ring was to be passed from father to son. It reached in the end one who had three sons so equally good and loving that the father could not decide which one should be singled out for the ring so he had two replicas of it made and gave a ring to each of his three sons. The children, however, discovered what their father had done and sought out a judge to establish which one of them had the real ring. The judge's verdict was simple. He declared that their father had obviously loved all three of them equally, and that they should show their worthiness to the rings by their good deeds.

This story of the three rings, Judaism, Christianity, and Islam was made the theme of a history of the Spanish Jews by the Danish writer, Paul Borchsenius. The book *The Three Rings*, was translated into English by Michael Heron. It was in Andalusia that the three religions intermingled so closely and co-operated so effectively, however, Mr. Borchsenius does not attempt to follow the fortunes and contributions of all the three rings, certainly not those of Christianity. His domain is Hispano-Judaism. Islamic and Christian achievements in Spain are well known to most of us, but we hardly know anything about the Jewish contribution. Such a

book is indeed direly needed. But alas, the rarest book in any library is that which gives us an objective account of the Jews. We may still wait for years before we can expect to find one.

Despite the propagandist approach and the author's determination to slight the Arabs, the tolerance extended by the Arab world to the Jews throughout the middle ages shines clearly in the book and reassures that the Arab claim to friendship and brotherhood with non-Zionist, or unhostile Jews, is historic and traditional in the Arab world. Without the tolerance of Islam, the Jews could not have achieved their cultural feats in medieval times. The golden age of Spanish Hebrew literature coincided and, no doubt, reflected the golden age of the Arabs. Here, Mr. Borchsenius, fails to tell us the extent of this influence on Jewish achievements except for a few casual references such as the meeting between the great Jewish scholar, Moses Ibn Maimon and the Arab philosopher, Averroes, while they were both in hiding.

The obvious Arab influence on Jewish thought is reflected in the rationalism and liberalism of oriental Judaism, the Maimonism of Cairo, as against the narrow Judaism of France, where the Rabbi of Montpellier sought Dominican help in burning Maimon's famous book, written in Arabic, *The Guide for the Deluded*. Mr. Borchsenius presents us with a vivid picture of Hebrew Literature during the Andalusian golden age,

though he does not make much of its influence. The Jews' main role was to act as a link between the two great schools of Christianity and Islam.

Jewish cultural activities are punctuated in *The Three Rings*, with an endless series of persecutions, massacres, dispersions, etc. All European States burnt the Jews alive, set fire to their synagogues, and confiscated their properties, but there were some local differences; in Portugal, Jewish children were taken from their parents; in Spain, Jews were prohibited from cutting their hair; in Switzerland, they were broken on the wheel; in Crete, they were only allowed into the public baths with the prostitutes; the English simply drove them out of the country. The book makes no attempt to tackle what real social and economic reasons might lie behind such atrocities. Only once or twice do we get a reference such as—"This was the simplest way of all to lay hands on one's promissory notes and mortgage deeds. . . ." To the author anti-Semitism is just ignorant fanaticism.

Biased minds cannot but breed false notions. Despite the long accounts on how Jews were fairly treated in the Arab world, some of them reaching the rank of ministers and having the affairs of the whole nation in their hands, despite the author's own words "The Moors had created a culture which did not differentiate too sharply between the creeds. The air in Spain was tempered by breezes which breathed mutual esteem, respect, and friendship", despite all this, we find him accusing Islam

of fanaticism. One of the weakest ideas in the book is his claim that Islam is less strict in practice in this regard than in theory. Any informed person knows that the teachings of Islam have nothing, or next to nothing, against "the people of the Book". The protection of their lives and properties was a main function of the State. The second Khalifa, the renowned Ali, found no better story to tell in order to exhort his army than to describe how their adversaries had molested the non-Muslim women. The orders sent to the generals were always the same, i.e. to give the "People of the Book" "the choice of Islam, paying tax or the sword". Borchsenius finds this tax an abomination. The fact is that the tax was taken from Jews and Christians against exempting them from military service and for protecting them against internal and external hostilities. The rule was that the Muslim pays with his blood and the non-Muslim with his cash. Surely, Mr. Borchsenius, as a Jew, should appreciate the Jews' lot in the bargain.

This peaceful arrangement plus the economic potentialities and coherent unity of the Arab world, as the author admits, led to the rise of the Jewish merchant. Zionists are trying to dismiss Arab claims to fraternity with the Arab Jews as sheer propaganda. In fact, this fraternity has been so traditional that it took the Arab leaders a tremendous effort to tamper with it and draw the attention of the masses to the new danger coming from Western Zionists.

Plight of Arabs in Israel

Mashood Olabisi Ajala *

THIS is an eye-witness account of my four-week tour of the restricted villages and reservations of the Arabs in Israel. The tour which I completed before crossing into the Lebanon through the forbidden Israel-Lebanese frontier, was one of fact-finding as to the status and living conditions of the Arabs left there after the Jews overran Palestine and drove away most of the Arab inhabitants.

I found that they are a pathetic and unhappy lot. They live in fear, without freedom and rights, under the constant police surveillance of the Israeli Government, which is extremely depressing, shameful, and inhuman.

One outstanding fact is that it is strictly forbidden for tourists and relatives of the Arabs to go into the Arab villages and reservations without special authority and permission from the military police. In order to gain entrance into some of these villages I had to approach the Israeli Foreign Ministry in Jerusalem, where I met and

obtained permission from Mrs. Golda Meir, the Foreign Minister.

The first place of call was Beersheba, a city which is completely inhabited by Jewish immigrants from Europe and North Africa. All the Arabs formerly resident there were driven out of the city into deserts and mountains. Their houses, mosques, and plantation farms were taken away from them and given to Jewish immigrants.

POLICE SURVEILLANCE

In most of the villages where the Arabs are compelled to live to-day they are under strict orders not to leave their villages. They are forbidden to go to the modern and industrial cities of Tel Aviv, Haifa, and Jerusalem. When necessity compels any one of them to go from one village to another to see a friend or relative or go into the city to buy agricultural equipment or food, he must obtain special police permission and military security clearance

weeks in advance. Even after obtaining the permit he is escorted by a police officer from and back to the village.

Most of the Arabs who were removed from their original cities, villages, houses, and farms and had these and their other personal valuables confiscated, were shipped to isolated and non-fertile parts of Israel, where their movements are controlled by police and military.

Their schools and dilapidated houses are under-furnished, unhygienic, and depressing. They present a shameful sight. Most of the Arabs of Israel who are employed on the government farms and on private Jewish plantations work for little or virtually no pay. I have seen them labour from dawn to dusk under pressing conditions.

In the course of my interviews with the Arabs in Taiba village, located on the north of Israel, I gathered that no Arab can get a job of any kind in the city or government offices. Most of the Arab high-school students in the villages are deliberately failed in their last year of schooling. I noticed that in the Arab section of Israeli Radio Station, there was not a single Arab employed either as an announcer or as a producer. All the positions in the Arabic section are held by North African and Egyptian Jews who had immigrated to Israel.

In order to compare the conditions of the Jews and the Arabs of Israel one has to examine the system of life, social conditions, and facilities of two cities in Israel, the cities of Elath and Taiba. Elath which is the city next to Jordan's Aquaba, on the Red Sea, has a population of less than 6,000 new Jewish immigrants.

INHUMAN CONDITIONS

Now to the village of Taiba, with a population of 7,000 Arab inhabitants. The first impression of a visitor to the village gives one a sense of guilt; the general environment is shocking, disgraceful, and inhuman. There is not a single decent apartment or building in sight. One sees only dilapidated houses with no electricity. Streets are not tarred nor the houses numbered. I found unclothed children running about in bare feet. There are no playing-grounds, the streets and alleys are muddy, and the general environment is unhygienic. The only modern building on the location is the newly-built military police station, where I found a number of Arabs lingering on the pavements and the steps, no doubt waiting for their turns to be interrogated on trumped-up charges.

The plight of the Arabs in Israel is one that needs to be looked into and thoroughly examined by the authorities of the United Nations. There is a lack of medical facilities, a shortage of water, and no electricity in most of the villages, where they are forced to live against their wishes like domestic animals. There is also no freedom of movement and association. In a sentence,

there are no human rights for the Arabs of Israel as guaranteed by the United Nations Charter.

I recollect an incident in Jerusalem involving myself, an Arab, and three Jewish military policemen. It was about midnight.

I was seated in a café, "Alaska". I noticed an Arab Bedouin standing outside the café, peeping through the glass window. It was a cold night. Rightly, the Arab Bedouin wanted to come into the café, but the fear that he might be a subject of abuse and indignant embarrassment by the Jewish customers once he entered the place scared him; the people in it and the owner were all Jews. I went to him and asked him if he would not mind being my guest to a cup of tea. I could see that he was afraid and timid.

HATRED

Shyly and reluctantly he agreed and followed me into the place. On his entering the café with me, all eyes then turned on us, with signs of disgust and amazement on every face. I assured him that he need not be afraid and he should not pay any attention to the gazing eyes. Soon enough I found out that I was wrong, as three military policemen walked into the café and ordered him out. Before they came, he told me he had come to Jerusalem with special permission in order to purchase some agricultural equipment and food for his tribe near Beersheba. As it was too late for him to get a conveyance back to his village and had lost his police escort, he was seeking a place to pass the night. He had been refused accommodation by several hotels and had no choice but to walk the streets for the night or stay put all night at the bus station. As I interrupted his conversation, to invite him to share my small room with me, the three military policemen walked into the café and asked him to come along with them into the street. At this stage I pointed out to the policemen that he was with me and that any question they wanted to ask him must be directed to me.

The Arab told them that he was in Jerusalem on a valid permit, which he presented to them for examination. They were not satisfied and insisted that he should leave the café and come with them to the police station. I was furious. I took out my camera to photograph the scene. As soon as one of them saw me taking photographs, he shouted out to the others: "Look out." Jointly they all ran out of the café leaving the Arab and myself behind, and from there we went back to my room and passed the night.

That the Arabs of Israel are being persecuted like the black Africans in South Africa remains an indisputable fact. The writer only hopes that the United Nations, which preaches the principle of human rights, will soon investigate the terrible ordeals, conditions, and the travails of Arabs in Israel who are completely at the mercy of their Jewish overlords.

* A Nigerian Journalist.

The Arab Representatives' Resolution on Palestine

REPORT issued on 29th April, 1965:
The personal representatives of the Arab Kings and Presidents resumed their meetings at 11.10 to-day at the premises of the Arab League Secretariat-General to discuss the draft resolution to be unanimously adopted in connection with Bourguiba's recent statements on the Palestine question. The meeting ended at 13.45 with the adoption of the following resolution (précis):

The committee of the personal representatives of the Arab Kings and Presidents has held a meeting attended by all its members with the exception of the personal representative of the Tunisian President. The committee held that, even since the start of the Zionist imperialist designs on Palestine, the Arab nation resolved by a unanimous decision to wage a sacred struggle against these designs and the threat they pose to the Arab homeland. It also reviewed the basis of the Arab League charter drawn up twenty years ago, under which all Arab states were to stand by the Arab character and independence of Palestine, and to undertake to follow a common course for the realization of this independence. The committee also reviewed the continued Arab struggle over the long years against the Zionist and imperialist attempts to liquidate the Palestine question and to secure the Arab recognition of Israel. The committee also reviewed the resolutions unanimously adopted by the Arab Kings and Presidents twice during the past year and the unanimous decisions of the Arab Heads of Government all of which provide for the following:

- (1) Israel is an imperialist occupation force in an Arab land, and its existence constitutes a basic threat to the entire Arab nation. It was for this reason that the Arab nation was unanimous in working to get rid of it.
- (2) The assertion of the belief that the Palestine Arab people have a sacred right to the liberation of their homeland from Zionist colonization, and that they must have the first and last say in determining their own fate.
- (3) All Arab potentialities must be used and all powers and resources must be concentrated to face the challenge of imperialism and Zionism and foil the attempts and plots to preserve their aggressive stronghold in Palestine.
- (4) The determination of the unanimous Arab plan of action for the liberation of Palestine on the basis of well-defined premises and undertakings.
- (5) The complete and unanimous agreement on the means for the implementation of the adopted Arab plans for the attainment of this national goal.
- (6) The unanimous support extended to the Palestine Liberation Organization and the undertaking to support it by all means to carry out its national mission of preparing the Palestine Arab people for the liberation battle and the post-independence responsibilities.

(7) The establishment of the Arab unified command and the Palestine Liberation Army, the implementation of the Arab project for the exploitation of the Jordan waters, and the political, economic, and social support of the Arab struggle to help the Arabs in their fight for the liberation of Palestine from Zionist colonization, and in their legitimate defence against the Zionist aggression upon the Arab land and water.

The committee reviewed the gains recorded by the Arab cause in the national and international fields as a result of this new policy of unified Arab action for the liberation of Palestine. It also reviewed the Zionist imperialist plots which are being hatched against this national policy. The committee has unanimously decided the following:

- (1) The committee once more, in the name of the Arab Kings and Presidents and their Heads of Governments, fully endorses the resolutions of the two Arab summit conferences and the conference of the Arab Heads of Government, and reaffirms their full acceptance of the responsibilities and duties they impose. The committee also asserts that, in expressing the will of their peoples, the Arab governments are steadily going ahead on the road of supporting the Arab unified command, the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestine Liberation Army and implementing the Arab plan for the exploitation of the water of the Jordan river and its tributaries, and that the Arab governments are fully prepared to face all contingencies and to offer any sacrifice for the sake of the complete liberation of Palestine.
- (2) In the name of their Kings and Presidents, the personal representatives reject any call for recognition, peace or coexistence with regard to Israel which, with the help of imperialism, has seized a part of the Arab homeland and expelled its people, and which has been established by imperialism and the aggressive foreign interests in the Arab world as a base from which to threaten all Arab states and prevent them from making progress and growing in power. They consider any such call as a departure from the Arab unanimity in the Palestine question and from the Arab League charter, and a violation of the plans unanimously approved by the Arab Kings and Presidents and Heads of Government and blessed by the Arab nation.
- (3) [The committee has decided] to call for a meeting of the Council of the Arab Heads of Government on 24th May, 1965, to consider the developments in the Arab situation and the adoption of the appropriate resolutions so as to strengthen the Arab cause in Palestine, frustrate the aggressive plots against it, and guarantee the continued progress of the Arabs in the national and international fields.

Al-Bazzaz Visits the U.A.R. Tourist and Information Centre

EGYPT is becoming a very popular holiday centre and the new Tourist Information Centre opened in Piccadilly in February, 1964, has already become an extremely busy place. Piccadilly is indeed becoming a little Middle East on its own. Nearby are to be found the offices of the Syrian Arab Airlines, the Kuwait Airlines, the United Arab Airlines, and Sudan Airlines.

The Centre itself, which has been designed by Dr. Sayed Karim, the Egyptian architect of international repute, is an admirable blend of Islamic and ancient Egyptian decor, representing the two great roots of Egyptian culture.

The progress of the present-day U.A.R. is skillfully introduced with the modern furniture and fittings, made



A cordial visit by Professor al-Bazzaz, Ambassador of Iraq, to the U.A.R. Information Centre in London. From left to right: Mr. Ahmad Anis, Press Councillor at the U.A.R. Embassy, Mr. Hazim T. Mushtak, Press Attaché at the Embassy of Iraq, Professor al-Bazzaz, Mr. Samih Anwar, Minister Plenipotentiary at the U.A.R. Embassy, and Mr. A. al-Bashir, Press Attaché at the U.A.R. Embassy



Another scene of the visit by Professor al-Bazzaz to the U.A.R. Information Centre in London. From left to right : Mr. Mushtak, Professor al-Bazzaz, Mr. Anis, Mr. Anwar, and M. Saglul al-Sayed, European Correspondent of the Cairo *Daily Akhbar al-Yum*

in Cairo, and which fit in harmony with the "mush-rabiya's" and Arabic chandeliers and lanterns, against a background of ancient Egyptian photo-enlargements.

The staff on the ground floor of the Tourist and Information Centre of the United Arab Republic at 62a Piccadilly, deal with day-to-day inquiries about travel and sightseeing facilities in Egypt. On the lower ground floor there is a well-equipped library and reading room staffed by experts who are ready to answer questions about the present or past history, geography, culture, and economy of Egypt.

The number of British visitors to Egypt has grown from 1,436 in 1952 to 12,425 in 1959, 31,000 in 1963, and 42,000 in 1964.

In addition to supplying tourist information and rendering assistance to the multitude of British travel agents in Britain and even in the commonwealth and elsewhere, the centre fulfills a need greatly felt in this country for up-to-date information on the modern development of the U.A.R. and the Arab world.

Recently the Centre has started a series of lectures to

be given by noted Western and Arab thinkers and writers on matters pertaining to the Arab world and its relations with the West. H.E. The Iraqi Ambassador, Dr. Abdul Rahman al-Bazzaz, has kindly consented to participate in the series with a lecture to be given round mid-June on "Arab Nationalism and the West". Professor al-Bazzaz, a reputable authority on Arab nationalism, has recently returned to London from Geneva. He has been loaned by his government to the Organization of the Oil Producing and Exporting Countries (OPEC) for a period of one year which began 1st May, 1964, and ended 30th April, 1965, filling the post of Secretary-General and Chairman of the Board of Governors, but retaining his post as Ambassador in London, where temporarily a Chargé d'Affaires has been acting for him. He paid a courtesy visit to the U.A.R. Information Centre on 11th May, 1965, where he was warmly received by the U.A.R. Minister Plenipotentiary, Mr. Samih Anwar, and U.A.R. Press Councillor, Mr. Ahmad Anis. Views were exchanged in a cordial and friendly atmosphere.

