



ARAB PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE

6

1973

Monthly
Magazine

PALESTINE LIBERATION ARMY - PEOPLE'S LIBERATION FORCES

Arab Palestinian **RESISTANCE**

Volume V No. 6

June 1973

CONTENTS

- | | |
|--|----|
| ■ From the record | 3 |
| ■ Editorial | 4 |
| ■ Political scene By: M. T. Bujairami | 6 |
| ■ The Palestinian People: Victims of Violence
By Joseph L. Ryan | 14 |
| ■ Israel and the Imperialist Camp | 31 |
| ■ Israel: The settler state | 35 |
| ■ Special study: The question of human
rights to nationality.
By: Anis F. Kassim | 41 |
| ■ A book review: The Palestinian experience.
Reviewed by George S. Hishmeh | 65 |
| ■ Documents : The political program of the
Palestine Liberation Organization. | 73 |



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

Price per copy
Syrian piasters 100
4/-
\$ 0.50
Editor: **M. KHURI**

FROM THE RECORD

With the approach of the 25th anniversary of the establishment of the state of Israel and the dispossession of the Palestinian people, we, as Jews, condemn Zionist racialism which has caused, among other violations of Human Rights, the expulsion of the majority of the Palestinian people from their country and the expropriation of their lands, homes and possessions.

We also condemn the Zionist persecution of those Palestinians who remained in their homeland; we totally reject the so-called «Law of Return» which enables Jews everywhere to settle in Palestine but denies this right to Palestinians who were born, like generations of their ancestors before them, in Palestine.

■ **Rabbi Dr. Elmer Berger**
and **34 other non-Zionist**
Jewish leaders.

Editorial

Early in the Spring of 1973 there were rumours that the United States government, prompted by the incipient fuel crisis, might adjust its Middle East policy to a more «even-handed» attitude towards the Arabs and Israel. The rumours had been circulated by Americans with official standing claiming to be «friendly» to the Arabs.

Progressive Arabs, however, fully aware of the true nature of the U.S.-Israel alliance and of the «watchdog» role assigned to Israel by world imperialism in the Middle East region, never took those rumours seriously, but assessing them as they should be, regarded them as a maneuver, a ruse and a subterfuge intended to influence the Arab masses and make them less violently hostile to American policies and interests.

Recent developments have borne out the accuracy of this assessment. In a series of statements and declarations, Secretary of State William Rogers and his assistant Joseph Sisco have both repeatedly stressed the point that no change has taken place, or is likely to take place, in the American stand in the Middle East as a result of the constantly-

expanding world fuel crisis, and that U.S. backing for Israel will continue - a point that was emphatically repeated in statements made by Rogers at the recent meeting of CENTO members at Teheran.

Moreover, the American representative at the U.N. Security Council, in the course of the debate on the Middle East question which was temporarily interrupted by the Nixon-Breznev summit meeting, made it clear that the U.S. which does not accept the Israeli-inspired American claim that negotiations - direct or indirect - is the only way out of the Middle East crisis, notwithstanding Israel's obstructionist attitude of rejecting the principle of the inadmissibility of the acquisition of land by force, and its refusal to withdraw from the occupied Arab territories so acquired.

It is high time those gullible Arabs, who still dream of some measure of American justice or even-handedness, woke up to the inhumanity and hard realities of U.S. imperialism so conclusively demonstrated in Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos and Palestine.

Resistance

political scene

Isn't There Another Ellsberg in the Pentagon ?



On the sixth «anniversary» of the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries, the Middle East crisis was back in the U.N. Security Council, still in a state of hybernation, from which it had been aroused whenever Israel launched fresh attacks across the new cease-fire lines, which Israel wants to freeze as her new, normal and «defensible» borders - at least till the new stage of further expansion deeper and deeper into Arab territories.



On the rare occasions when America did not use her «veto» or the threat of resorting to it, as an umbrella to shelter Israel from the decisions of

the Security Council, those decisions, without exception, have remained ink on paper. Any observer interested in getting some information about what Israel has been up to in the occupied territories need not even visit them. All he has to do would be to take a quick glance at what the Council has been telling Israel NOT to do; because that is exactly what is still going on, despite the indignation of the international community, and in defiance of all the Council's decisions—which consist mainly of prohibitions, warnings and appeals to Israel to desist from these policies. These policies include house demolitions, unwarranted detentions, brutal torture, collective punishments, expropriation, deportation, vandalism, concentration camps, massive air-raids on refugee camps, demographic, geographical, ethnological, legal and environmental changes in the status and the very nature of the occupied lands. All such crimes, in Israel's geopolitical dictionary continue to fall under the terms of «security», «defence» and similar items. Facts and figures verifying this can be easily obtained from the records of the United Nations Organization and its affiliated agencies.

Israel wants the Arabs and the whole international community to believe that «peace» and «security» in this part of the world can only be achieved through submitting to the Israeli demands in full. These demands, it is interesting to observe, are no longer confined to perpetuating the status quo. They now include other Israeli stipulations

such as getting rid of the Palestinian people at any cost, by any means and as soon as possible! They also include a «carte blanche» from the Arabs, officially authorising Israel to dispose of the occupied areas as she considers fit, to keep whatever positions she wants and to return whatever lands she deems unworthy of retaining. Any such lands, if ever returned, should be permanently demilitarized, while the lands Israel chooses to keep, would be de-Arabized! The Israeli demands also include the «necessity» to keep Israel in such a position of military might as to be able to strike at any Arab target within the range of a thousand miles, and at any time from now to eternity! Only in such an Israeli «Reich» can the Israeli generals feel «safe!» They even imply that such a «Reich» would be better for the Arabs' safety as well !

In the very rare cases when the Israeli leaders bother to concede the existence of the Palestinian people, they call on the Arab states to «absorb» this people; to have it economically and socially assimilated, while its land, Palestine, is being «absorbed» and «assimilated» into the body of the Israeli «Reich», whose map includes the Euphrates and the Nile! As for the Jews of the world, Israel wants to see to it that none of them is ever assimilated or absorbed in any country. No, sir! They should all come to Eretz Israel in order to fill the demographic vacuum that Israel has created to accommodate them at the expense of the displaced Arabs in and around Palestine. Any Jews who let them-

selves be assimilated in, say, Russia, would be considered as traitors or at least, brain-washed fools. Such qualities would also apply, according to such Israeli criteria, to any Palestinians who prefer to let themselves be assimilated anywhere outside their country Palestine.

This ambivalent policy has become a systematic phenomenon. Israel publicly declares that it wants what it calls «peaceful co-existence» with the Arabs(while in the field of practical implementation she works for a «peaceful» existence AT THE EXPENSE of the Arabs in implementation of a well-prepared plan to tighten her grip on the largest possible area of land with the least possible number of Arabs living on this land. The best illustration of this was the recent statement by Yigal Allon, who said that the Arabs and the Israelis would eventually come to terms and live side by side like the Germans and the French despite the previous wars. The best reply to this came from a European politician who said that although the Germans occupied the whole of France during the Second World War, they did not throw the French out to establish German colonies on French soil!

Another example is the case of King Hussein, who has expressly said that he would never participate in any war in the future. He also keeps open bridges with Israel all the time. He has also offered to conclude peace at the Israeli terms. So far, his offer has had no response at all, despite all the con-

cessions which amount to a «sell out» of the just cause of the Palestinian people.

Why, one may ask, should Israel refuse to talk to the king; and at the same time express its willingness to talk to the Tunisian president Bourguiba? It is not difficult to answer this question. According to Israel Bourguiba is far away from the field of the direct dispute; and thus talking to him would not saddle Israel with any commitments or obligations whatsoever. Yet, when the Tunisian president stipulated that Israel should recognize the existence of the uprooted Palestinians and their rights, Israel immediately dropped the idea of any talks. Israel's refusal to conclude peace with the Jordanian regime indicates, among other things, that it has her designs, not only in relation to Jerusalem and the West Bank of the Jordan, but also in relation to the East Bank as well.

It is not only the Arab world that rejects and condemns these arrogant Israeli attitudes and schemes. Israel now stands condemned by very large sectors of the world community at large. The most recent expression of this was embodied in the decisions and recommendations of the African Summit Conference that was held in Addis Ababa.

Israel has few friends left in the black continent. There are positive signs of growing dissatisfaction with Israel's attitudes in several West European countries, such as France, Italy, Austria, and

to a lesser degree, England and even West Germany. The recent Conference of European Youth held in Tripoli reflected these tendencies.

Meanwhile, the Israeli-occupied areas are far from being pacified, as Israel's propaganda machine wants the world to believe. Deep turmoil is still boiling despite all the Israeli measures of terrorizing and intimidation. The general strike on June 5th was unanimous in both Gaza and the West Bank of Jordan. Again Israel resorted to detention and confiscation of shops.

Who blocks the way towards peace in the Middle East? It is Israel, who has everything to lose in any kind of settlement which is not in accordance with the Israeli terms and conditions; because these terms and conditions exclude Gaza, Jerusalem, Sharm el-Sheikh and the Golan Heights as territory not negotiable under any circumstances; Israel wants to stay in the areas «forever and ever and ever», to use Moshe Dayan's own words in a recent interview with a correspondent of the British TV. Yet, America's Secretary of State, William Rogers, who has swallowed his own initiative several times still insists that there should be Arab-Israeli negotiations, direct or indirect. This shows the extent of America's commitment to, and collusion with, Israel's arrogant attitude and its full contempt for the U.N. Security Council, which stands for the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force.

The Palestinians have not been annihilated in Lebanon, despite the recent bloodbath; and this means that Israel may yet launch another series of treacherous attacks to finish them.

Israel's leaders, from Eban to Dayan, have been expressing anxiety over the possibility of Arab purchases of American weapons, although these weapons, if ever delivered to Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, will not reach the Middle East before 1973. Dayan already talks about «oil and sympathy» between America and these two Arab countries. Notwithstanding that Israel continues to boast of her military superiority, Israeli leaders pretend to be afraid of a few fighter planes that «may» be transferred to Egypt in the late seventies! This, of course, would serve as another pretext for demanding even more weapons from the arsenal of Uncle Sam, whose «generosity» keeps this arsenal always open for Israel's little Hitlers to pick and choose.

As for Arab oil, to which America will soon be hooked, due to the current fuel crisis, it seems that Uncle Sam is searching for ways and means to guarantee the continuous flow of this strategically important commodity. These «ways and means» include every trick in the book, even the possibility of another Vietnam in this part of the world. There is every reason to believe that the same tricks and pretexts that were used to «justify» the American involvement in Indo-China will be used for a similar bloody adventure in the Middle East.

There is already talk about «Soviet influence» and «communist subversion» in the Arab Gulf Zone. The stage is being prepared for American intervention. Already, Senator William Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Congress, has warned against such an imminent possibility.

Fulbright must have smelt something which prompted him to speak up. The scandalous crimes which are being revealed by the Watergate affair show how deceptive and secretive Nixon can be in manipulative double-dealings. Besides, Nixon is a beleaguered man now. This is all the more reason for him to create another major crisis outside America to divert the attention away from the Watergate headlines. Conditions are ripe in the Middle East in particular, to provide the type of outlet from such a tight corner.

In this projected adventure, however, America will not be alone; she has allies who are even more efficient than the Saigon regime; allies like Israel, Iran, Ethiopia, the Jordan regime and other pro-West forces of reaction in the Middle East. But of course America will continue to preach peace as usual. However, Watergate tells us that «law and order» was breached by none other than those who professed to uphold law and order. Isn't there, somewhere in the American administration, another honest Ellsberg to leak out the Pentagon papers about the Middle East? ■

■ by Joseph L. Ryan

THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE : VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE

Two thousand four hundred people of all nationalities and faiths joined in a service of dedication and prayer at the 13th century Crusader Castle in Sidon (Lebanon) on Easter morning April 22, 1973 following a two day, 28 mile walk from Beirut and an enthusiastic welcome by 8,000 people of the ancient city of Sidon. In support of the right of Palestinians to return to their homes a group of Americans in Beirut, Lebanon organized the Easter weekend walk to make the international community and political leaders aware of the fundamental human issue obstructing peace in the Middle East.

Below are excerpts from an address by Rev. Joseph L. Ryan, S. J. given at the religious service on Easter Sunday morning, at the Castle in Sidon at the conclusion of the Beirut-to-Sidon Peace March. The ecumenical service and the Peace March were organized by Americans on behalf of the rights of the Palestinian people. Father Ryan is a professor at St. Joseph University in Beirut.



1. Palestinians? Victims of Violence

Today many in the West tend to think of Palestinians -- and of Arabs generally -- as a people of violence. The image is unjust, for the reality is exactly the opposite. The Palestinian people have been overwhelmingly the victims of violence, not agents of it. Against the instances of armed struggle by Palestinians which the West is intimately aware of recently, we must contrast the enormous accumulation of suffering inflicted unjustly on them, suffering borne silently over more than 25 years, suffering of which most of the world has little or

no comprehension. If we were to concede, for the sake of argument, that not one single act of violence by Palestinians since the rise of the Resistance can be justified in a way, even then there would be no comparison whatever between the injury suffered and the harm inflicted.

Why does the hijacking of a plane by a desperate group cause greater moral indignation than the plundering and degradation, carried out officially by a government, of a whole people? Why does the world, which responds with horror at words, the so-called threats of «driving a people into the sea», remain indifferent at deeds, the actual driving of a people out of their homes and country into the desert?

Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians have been dispossessed of their native land and are refugees outside its borders unable to return, while of those who have remained within, some are «refugees» on their own soil, and all are inferior citizens in law and in fact. These are no rash claims but sober conclusions documented for Arabs within Israel by (among others) Sabri Jiryis in his writings(1), and, for the occupied territories, by numerous other studies. Furthermore, the assault is not only against Palestinians involved in military resistance but against millions of civilians, and not against them as individuals merely, but precisely as a people.

2. Spoliation by the State

If the first point is clear, namely that Pales-



tinians are victims of violence, the second is even more important, namely that this violence has been deliberately directed against them by a system, a state, an ideology.

The ravaging of the Palestinians has been accomplished continuously, of set purpose, with steadfast will, in some cases carried out with such a sophistication of procedure or apparent reasonableness of explanation that the injustice has remained unrecognized even to Jewish neighbors, while in other cases the action has been brazen, in open defiance of world opinion and with incessant, urbane but specious justifications.

Moreover, these violations of the human rights of the Palestinians have been effected at many levels, by a variety of agencies in the state, particularly through legislation and by the Defence Department, and with all the power at a state's command. More than that, with all the power at the command of international auxiliary organizations, to say nothing of the assistance of great world powers.

The spoliation of Palestinians may rightly, then, be called «institutionalized violence», an expression that has been employed by the Catholic bishops of Latin America to describe the misery and exploitation in their own continent. Institutionalized violence violates fundamental human rights so patently, these bishops state, that «We should not be surprised... that the temptation to violence is surfacing in Latin America. One should not abuse the

patience of a people that has borne a situation that would not be acceptable to any one with any degree of awareness of human rights.»(2) A comparison of the oppressed in Latin America with that of the Palestinians, despite the obvious differences in the two situations, is not without value. Those in the West who lend a sympathetic ear to the cries of the oppressed in Latin America (and the able defence of them by outstanding bishops and theologians) but are deaf to the appeals of the Palestinians, may recognize their own inconsistency.

Thus for more than a quarter of a century the Palestinian people have been systematically plundered of their land, their homes, their rights, their dignity. Up until recently, this process has been largely ignored in the West and in Israel as well. And what of today? Today a new awareness has dawned.

Recent Instances

This fact of institutionalized violence cunningly carried out by the system has been called to the attention of the general public in Israel last year -- and in the whole world -- by several shocking acts of pillage, especially one in Gaza and Northern Sinai, where 100,000 dunams of land (or 25,000 acres) were fenced off displacing more than 5,000 Bedouins; their huts and tents were destroyed, their water sources in some cases sealed up.(3) Another incident took place in Akraba on the West Bank where the army of occupation sprayed destructive chemicals on over 200 hectares of wheat (or 500

acres) because the Palestinians had persisted in refusing to sell their lands.(4)

But the most striking example is the renewal of the longstanding affair of Kafr Bir'im and Ikrit in northern Galilee on the Israeli-Lebanese border.(5) In 1948 the inhabitants of these two villages were asked for security reasons to move out for a few weeks with the assurance that they would be back soon. The «Uprooted» -- as they have been called -- whose history is one of mildness and cooperation, have been struggling since that time to return. The story of Bir'im and Ikrit is an account of 25 years of institutionalized violence, a kind of case study of the official discrimination documented in Sabri Jiryis' book **Arabs in Israel**. While there are many other claims as just as that of these villagers, there are few cases as notoriously clear. Who can read Mr. Jiryis's book together with the account of Bir'im and Ikrit and not be appalled?

3. A Cruel Ideology

Today, as never before, the long record of institutionalized violence against the Palestinians is clear in its extent and in its depth. But more important, in its motivation. For now the ideology, the justification for the rapine, the consistent pattern of thinking behind it, are publicly exposed -- and frankly defended.(6)

Grave doubts about Zionist ideology were candidly raised in public in Israel last year over the case of Bir'im and Ikrit, among others, and, this year, over the spy trials involving Israeli Jews.

According to a recent survey by an Israeli journalist, in facing the question as to whether Zionism involves the spoliation of the Arabs, Israeli Jews express a variety of opinions. Some indignantly deny the charge. Others answer frankly and boldly: «Yes, of course.» As one of them put it: «The installation of Jews in the country takes place by the expulsion of Arabs from their lands.»(7) Others, especially among the young, are shocked, haunted by the implications of the answer they know they must give.

An instance of this moral unease among some young Israeli Jews is given in an Israeli newspaper by an Israeli Jewish journalist; he had given a talk to a group of young people and reports the main points raised in the discussion afterwards. The account is a kind of anthology of questions about Zionism.

Not by might alone

The key question was asked by a young girl: «What right did we have to take this country from its Arab owners?»

The journalist asked her what prompted the question.

She replied: «until recently I took it for granted that we had a right to the country and I was unaware of any problems in that respect. But when I read about Pithat Rafiah (the driving out of Bedouins from North Sinai and Gaza), Bir'im and Ikrit (the two villages of the «Uprooted»), and Akraba (where wheat fields were destroyed by

spraying), I was certain no longer. Those are instances of eviction and theft. Was everything like that?»

A young man in the audience admonished her not to be so noble. He assured her that this was the path of Zionism.

She retorted angrily: «If that was the nature of the entire history of Zionism, then it was a crime from the outset and you and I are criminals.»

Some one asked : «What about the holocaust (the destruction of Jews under Hitler)? And what about the right to some corner of our own?»

She replied: «Of course, but not at the expense of the unfortunate fellahin. Settlement does not need to be expulsion and dispossession. There is a different path. It was not the Arabs here who persecuted us. Had we expelled the Cossacks (in Russia) or the Germans who murdered and robbed us, and had we then settled on **their** land, that would have been just. But what crime did these unfortunate (Palestinian) people commit? Did they come to us? We came to them.»

Some one in the audience countered: «But this was our country two thousand years ago.»

The girl answered: «The situation two thousand years ago does not interest any one. According to that logic, the Arabs will return to Spain and the Indians will return to New York tomorrow. We are concerned with a people living on its land.»

A young man in a skull cap argued: «But this is the land that God promised us.» She retorted:

«In order to justify our disgraceful deeds and soothe my conscience, I am not ready to commence believing in something in which I do not believe. To be religious for such reasons is hypocrisy.»

The journalist then asked: «Was all this soul searching caused by the affairs of Bir'im and Ikrit, of Akraba and Pithat Rafiah?»

She answered: «Yes. They were the last straw for me. I stopped believing all the talk about security, persecution and the justice and morality of our cause. Something snapped inside of me.»

The journalist concluded this account by observing: «Many of our best youth, youth who have more highly developed concepts of justice than others, are beginning to doubt our right (to be here) because they are unwilling to live here by virtue of might alone.»(8)

The cry from the heart of this young Israeli Jewish girl, her courageous admission of the deliberate injustice of an oppressive system of which one is a part, issues forth as an echo of the religious faith of the Hebrew prophets and of the deep humanity of the Good Samaritan. It is a cry shared by a small but significant number in Israel, especially among young people and intellectuals. Their moral sensitivity, unfortunately, has little or no effect on the oppressive system. It is a cry that should both humble us and challenge us.

4. WHAT OF US TODAY?

If the Palestinian people are the victims of massive violence, and of institutionalized violence,

and if their oppression flows from the very concept of a Zionist state whose injustice is being clearly revealed today, then what are we to do who witness this oppression today. We ask ourselves and the world: Will we pass by, or respond?

The Palestine problem implies obligations for many groups of persons. It is a problem for Jews, for Jews in Israel and for Jews all over the world. It is a problem for Arabs, for Palestinians, particularly, and for the whole Arab world.

But it is also a problem for us, who are neither Jews nor Arabs, for us as citizens and for our governments, and especially for those groups in our countries of political, religious and intellectual leaders. It is a responsibility also for «ordinary citizens», since public opinion can have an effect on national and international decisions affecting world justice and peace.

In a letter addressed to the Catholic Bishops of the United States in January, 1972, the Catholic Bishops of the Holy Land applied to the Palestine question the theme of Pope Paul's Day of Peace: «If you wish peace, work for justice.» Today we make this theme our own. We appeal to whoever hears our voices, especially in the West. We issue a call to understand, to judge justly, to speak out and to act.

TO UNDERSTAND

A call to understand the oppression of the people of Palestine and of people everywhere.

To deplore violence by the oppressed only

after we have seven times tried to understand and deplore the human wretchedness which may have provoked it.

To recognize the crushing oppression which «respectable» structures and persons may be causing little people everywhere.

To recognize our common human weakness, our proneness to selfishness that destroys brotherhood.

TO JUDGE JUSTLY

A call to judge justly.

Not to pass over with a blind eye, discrimination abroad, and in this case concerning the Palestinians, that we would never tolerate at home.

To give all men the due respect for their human rights and personal dignity. In other words, to demand equal human rights. To avoid the double standard.(9) To raise questions frankly. I ask my countrymen: can a nation that gives massive support to an oppressor be free of guilt of that oppression?

A spokesman of the Israeli government tries to make Lebanon appear responsible for the violence in the Middle East.(10) This «righteous» indignation comes from that same government whose official policies and practices of oppression are the very forces which are causing the reaction. Which is worse, the provocation or the response, the attack or the returned fire, the thrust or the parry?

Even if there were not one Palestinian left in Lebanon, the situation would be basically the same. Oppression is bound to provoke reaction. The con-

tinued affliction by a strong power against the weak inevitably incites violence. Even if a settlement in the Middle East is imposed by Israeli might, if that settlement fails to give justice to the Palestinians, we will have no peace, only pacification. And pacification will not last. As the Latin American bishops pointed out with regard to their own situation, peace «is not the simple absence of violence and bloodshed. Oppression by the power groups may give the impression of maintaining peace and order, but in truth it is nothing but the continuous and inevitable seed of rebellion and war»(11)

TO SPEAK OUT

A call to speak out.

To express one's concern.

To air one's doubts.

To challenge one's prejudices.

To unmask propaganda.

Many people in my country, especially in some religious, intellectual and journalistic circles, who otherwise would be eloquent about questions of peace and justice, fall silent when the issue concerns the Palestinians. Some one put it well: «No subject so chills the meetings of a peace group as the Middle East.»(12)

How can one speak out? Would that my country and groups in it would make a public acknowledgement of the existence and rights of the Palestinian people, an admission of the grievous oppression this people have sustained (and in



which we have a share), and a resolve to right these wrongs as far as we can possibly do so.

How to speak out? Among those who are invited to join in the twenty-fifth celebrations next month, all over the world, and to drink a toast to that brave effort that «made the desert bloom», will some have the courage of the Israeli girl I cited earlier and, instead, raise some simple human questions?

What marvellous gestures these would be! For the Palestinian people, it is terrible enough to fall among robbers, to be beaten and stripped and left half dead. But it is anguish a hundred times more painful to be told by one's attackers and their «friends» and admirers that no damage was ever done.

TO TAKE ACTION

And finally a call to action.

Let each one consider, in his own situation, those things which he can do here and now. What one person can do, another cannot. What a person can do today, he may not have been able to do yesterday. Having listed what is possible today, let us select only those that are most important. Then let us try to do these things of higher priority. Let us do them, in collaboration with others, with joy and perseverance.

If we wish peace, let us work for justice.

-
- (1) Sabri Jiryis, *The Arabs in Israel, 1969*, Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies, and Democratic Freedoms

in Israel, 1972, Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies.

- (2) *The Church in the Present-Day Transformation of Latin America in the light of the Council (Medellin Documents)*, Vol. II, «Peace», 16, p. 78.
- (3) See Simha Plapan, «The Storm Over Gaza», *New Outlook*, March-April, 1972, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 19-22, 26. Plapan reports 60,000 dunams fenced off in Pithat Rafiah (North Sinai) and some 40,000 in the Gaza Strip. (p. 20). Peter Grose reported 5,000 acres fenced off «at the southern edge of the Strip»; *New York Times*, April 25, 1972.
- (4) *Le Nouvel Observateur*, July 3, 1972.
- (5) See Know (11 Fales St., Hartford, Conn, 06105) a newsletter devoted to English translations of articles from the Israeli Jewish press. The entire issue of August 17, 1972, Vol. 1, No. 5 is devoted to Bir'im and Ikrit. Also Amos Elon, «Two Arab towns that plumb Israel's conscience», *New York Times Magazine*, Oct. 22, 1972, pp. 44 ff.
- (6) Amos Elon's book, *The Israelis: Founders and Sons*, explains the psychological differences in attitude toward the treatment of Palestinians on the part of the pioneer generation of Israelis and their children.
- (7) Eliezer Livine, *Haaretz*, April 6, 1972, as cited by Kapeliouk, *Ibid*.
- (8) Boaz Evron, «The Evil Spirit», *Yediot Aharonot*, Aug. 10, 1972, as translated in *New Outlook*, September, 1972, pp. 51-52.
- (9) As I have pointed out elsewhere, «According to the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, «Every one has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country» (Art. 13.12). It is ironic that an overwhelming chorus of ecumenical protest has been orchestrated in support of one part of that Declaration, regarding the right of Jews to leave the Soviet Union, while an almost total silence prevails regarding the other part, as it affects the rights of the Palestinian refugees to return to their homeland -- and this despite the fact that the condition of the refugees is more than two decades old and their rights have been clearly upheld in U.N. documents. How will history judge this silence? If the concern of those who speak out is with human rights themselves, one wonders why the double standard.» Alan R. Taylor and John P. Richardson (eds.), *The Jerusalem Debate*, 1972, Washington, Middle East Affairs Council, p. 19-20.

- (10) Yosef Tekoah, Israeli ambassador to the UN spoke of Beirut as the terrorist capital. *Al-Safa*, April 14, 1973, p. 3.
- (11) *Medellin Documents*, Op. cit., «Peace», 14, p. 76. Their quotation is from Paul VI's Message of January 1, 1968.
- (12) *Committee on New Alternatives in the Middle East*, N. Y. ■

ISRAEL

AND THE IMPERIALIST CAMP

■

That Israel and Zionist are members of the imperialist camp and that the Palestinian struggle against Zionism is an integral part of the world liberation movement, and of the struggle of the peoples of the world against the monster of fascism, is a fact that is being proved by Israeli acts and policies as well as by Israeli reports and declarations.

■

On the 15th of last December (1972) the Israeli newspaper *Ma'ariv* published a report that Israeli advisers were expected to move into South Vietnam to replace the American advisers following the withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam. *Ma'ariv* wrote:

«A government source in Saigon stressed that South Vietnam's military situation—now, and even more in the future— will require help in the form of military advice, if the country is to withstand revolutionary pressure. Saigon will need advice on non-conventional methods in the defence field.»

The report which was written by Ma'ariv's correspondent in Saigon, **Gil Kesari**, added:

«According to the Saigon source, the question of Israeli advice will now be an urgent need, especially since the Americans are planning to disengage work of the cease-fire agreement. Yet the United States is not planning to disengage its troops from the whole of Vietnam and to leave South Vietnam completely. The idea of having American influence continue in the form of Israeli help and advice is not only known to Washington but it was inspired by it. The first step in the new arrangement has been the announcement that diplomatic relations between Israel and South Vietnam would be established.»

Other indications of Israeli involvement in the struggle between world imperialism and revolutionary forces in South-East Asia have included the report that Cambodia planned to establish an embassy in Israel, a move which would be rejected by all progressive countries because of the disputed status of the present Cambodian regime. Commenting on this move, the official spokesman of the **Vietnamese Revolutionary Government in Paris Ly Van Sau** told the Paris correspondent of the Is-

in accordance with these constitutional provisions. It provides (Sec. 66) that Liberian citizenship be acquired by «All persons of Negro descent born» in the Republic whether the parents are Liberian citizens or aliens. It also permits (Sec. 69) the «naturalization only of Negroes, or persons of Negro descent.» In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding, the same article provides that «The naturalization of all persons not Negroes nor of Negro descent,... is unauthorized and void,...».

The question arises as to the definition of «Negro.» No legislation exists to this effect. One may assume that phrases like «African nativity» or «children of Africa» would mean the inclusion of all Africans whether inside or outside the continent. However, the Liberian administrative organs refused to grant citizenship to some North Africans including Moroccan Jews.(22) The amendment of 1907 was enacted for this purpose. Hence, the criterion of racio-color is established.(23) The Liberian Attorney General stated subsequently that the 1907 Act was intended «to facilitate the obtaining of certificates of citizenship by persons of our race the world over.»(24) He also said that the law «is to encourage immigration of Negroes and to facilitate -their naturalization.»(25) In a relatively recent judgement, the Supreme Court of Liberia held that «only persons of Negro descent can be citizens»(26) of Liberia.

The right to nationality in Israel should, on the same plane, be conceived within the framework

of the Zionist-Israel public law objectives. The central issue is an alleged Zionist constituency called the «Jewish people» which the State of Israel claims full responsibility to protect and represent.(27) Israel has set up two laws purporting to «ingather the exiled» «Jewish people.» The Law of Return provides that «Every Jew has the right to come to this country as an oleh.»(28) The second is the Nationality Law which states, in part, that «Every oleh under the Law of Return,... shall become an Israeli national.»(29) An Israeli lawyer accurately indicated the relationship between these laws, as, while the «Law of Return gives a Jew the automatic right to immigrate to Israel,» the Nationality Law «immediately bestows citizenship upon such [a] person.»(30)

The acquisition of Israeli citizenship by «return» is officially described as «without parallel in the legislation of any other country;»(31) A person who immigrated or who was born in Israel, before or after its establishment, is an Israeli citizen, provided that he is a «Jew.» He does not need to apply for Israeli citizenship as it is given automatically and immediately, rather he must declare, if so desired, that he does not wish to become an Israeli citizen. He is not required to take an oath of allegiance, to remain in Israel for a certain period of time, or to renounce his original nationality. Being a «Jew», with very few exceptions, is the only requirement for citizenship under the doctrine of «return.»

As in Liberia, the issue that plagued the Israeli

judiciary was, who is a Jew? According to the Jewish religious law and to the Israeli-Zionist jurisprudence the problem is not who is a Jew in the positive sense, for both largely concur on the definition that a «Jew» is a person who is born to a Jewish mother or a convert to Judaism. The real issue is, who is not a Jew. While the religious law maintains that a Jew who converts to another faith continues to be Jewish, the Zionist public law holds that such a person ceases to be so. This position and the policy reasoning that underlies it are well articulated in the Daniel case and in the reversal of the judgement in the Shalit case.

The issue in the Daniel case(32) was whether a Jew, who voluntarily became a Catholic, could be considered a Jew by nationality and, accordingly, benefit from the Law of Return. The verdict of the Court was no.

Justice Silberg, presiding, wrote the majority opinion. He stated that if the word «Jew» as it occurs in the Law of Return has the same meaning as in the Jewish religious law, the application would be granted. But the Law of Return is a secular legislation and the word «Jew» has to be interpreted in reference to the «normal meaning» of the word «as we Jews understand it,...» Hence, Silberg held that «a Jew who becomes a Christian cannot be called a Jew. » «For experience teaches us that the apostate's end is to be cut off root and

branch from the [Jewish] people,...». Justice Berenson concurred with Silberg and said that «a Jew who has embraced another religion has excluded himself not only from the Jewish religion but also from the Jewish people, and he has no place in the community of Israel.»

Justice Landau, of the majority, in answering the issue, adequately put the law in its proper context. He phrased the question as, «whom did our legislature have in mind when it used the word «Jew» in the Law of Return?» He elaborated that Israel

was established by Zionists on the basis of Zionism, and the Law of Return itself gives expression to one of the fundamental tenets of Zionism. It would therefore be right that for purposes of interpreting it, we should look not only to the average Jew for an answer,... but that we should also examine the philosophy of the founders of Zionism.

Landau, in conclusion, held that the applicant «has dissociated himself from the common fate of the Jewish nation» and that therefore, the Ministry of Interior was right in drawing «the line dividing Jew from non-Jew, within the meaning of the Law of Return, at the point of change of religion.»

In the Shalit case,(33) the issue before the Supreme Court was whether the children of a Jewish father and a Gentile mother can be registered as having Jewish nationality but of no religion. The Court, after a heated deliberation, answered positively. The decision created an upheav-

val within Israel and in the Jewish and Zionist communities abroad. The Cabinet, upon the initiative of Prime Minister Golda Meir, took a decision to reverse the judgement, and the Knesset immediately passed an amendment to the Law of Return. The Amendment defines, for the first time, a Jew as «a person born of a Jewish mother, or having converted to Judaism, not being a person affiliated to some other religion.» The definition is precisely in conformity with the Daniel case ruling.

The ascertainment of the legal definition of a «Jew» in Zionist jurisprudence requires a close reading of the judgement in the Daniel case. The judges emphasized the connection between a «Jew» and the «Jewish people» more than that of a «Jew» with the Jewish religion as such. They consider the desertion of a Jew from Judaism to another faith the cutting off point of his membership in the «nationhood» of the «Jews.» Such a converting Jew is still a Jew, however, in the religious sense. Hence, it is obvious that a Jew is defined as related to the Zionist ethnic group called the «Jewish people.»

IV

The doctrines of international nationality law are intended to safeguard both the individual human right to a nationality, and the interests of nation-states in world public order. An individual cannot arbitrarily choose his nationality in a given state, neither can a state clothe or deprive an individual of his nationality without complying with certain limitations well-established in public law.

The juridical competence of a state to regulate its nationality on discriminatory bases, be they religion, race, color or sex, has been curtailed by international law. The authoritative Harvard Research aptly stated that «if State A should attempt to naturalize all persons in the world holding a particular political or religious faith or belonging to a particular race,» it would appear that such a state had gone beyond the limits set by international law.(34) International and regional conventions and declarations concerning human rights provide, with no exception, that racial discrimination is prohibited. Among the fundamental rights to be protected against any type of discrimination is the right of nationality.(35) Member states of the United Nations, according to Article (56), «pledge» themselves to that end. The inescapable conclusion is that a state is no longer free to regulate its nationality entity and the membership therein on any ground other than the human merits of the individual.

The right to nationality in the Republic of Liberia is officially based on racio-color criteria. Only a Negro or a person of Negro descent can become a Liberian citizen. This statute is consistent with the basic premise of Liberia: that it is a «home» for «Negroes.» In an equal setting, the right of nationality in the State of Israel, as based on the right of «return», is exclusively based on a racio-religious affiliation. Only a «Jew,» who must be a «national» of the «Jewish people,» can become

an Israeli citizen under the Law of Return. This right is in conformity with the official qualification of Israel as the «Jewish State.»

In a society based on one single criterion of race, religion or color, discrimination becomes indispensable, however well-intended the decision-makers of that community purport to be. Liberia, as a state based on an exclusive value of racio-color, necessarily differentiates between «Negroes» and «non Negroes.» Its nationality law is a «legal» expression of this attitude. Likewise, Israel, as a Jewish State, draws a set of rights and privileges accorded its «Jewish people» distinct from those of non «Jewish people.» As a result of the application of its nationality law, the non-Jewish natives of Palestine were «legally» stripped of their original nationality. The Israeli courts, including the Supreme Court, held accordingly.(36)

An obvious «de jure» discrimination exists under the Liberian and Israeli nationality law. A juridical application of the international nationality law criteria will render these laws invalid. They are clearly inconsistent with the legal limitation imposed by public law that regulation of citizenship on any criterion other than the individual's merits is a violation of his human rights. It is not even a juridically accepted defense on the part of Liberia or Israel to claim that their respective laws are domestic legislations and are therefore beyond the sphere of international law. The International Court of Justice held in the Nottebohm case(37)

that a state is not bound to honor domestic laws enacted by another unless such laws are in conformity with international law.

Beyond the inter «de jure» bigotry, there is a striking intra «de facto» discrimination. The Liberian colonizers, known as the «Americo-Liberians,» exercise systematic discrimination against the natives who are also Negroes.(38) When the Liberian constitution and nationality law were first enacted, the settlers did not incorporate the aborigines into their entity. Only in 1904, and then only to prove to other European colonial powers the «effective occupation» of Liberians of their territory, was citizenship extended to these natives. In practice, however, the Americo-Liberians, have not allowed the indigenous population to participate in the shaping and sharing of social values. The rights and privileges remain exclusively those of the Americo-Liberian elite. The relationship between the settlers and the natives was labeled by the late President of Liberia himself as «colonial in character.» The society of Liberia is divided, as has been accurately described, between the «black Yankee upper crust» and their «deluded brethren.»(39) Each social stratum has its respective set of values. An example may be found in the predominant governmental religious institution, Christianity, which the settlers profess. The Liberian church is connected with the political life, and a «younger political leader, attempting to establish an independent base for movement upward on the political scale,

may attempt to become the person of influence in one of the smaller churches in Monrovia.» The current President of Liberia, Mr. William Tolbert, has been at the head of the Baptist World Alliance.(40)

The Americo-Liberians are known for their religious prejudices against the natives whose majority adheres to Islam. The natives resisted the imposition of another religion and this feud became a major cause of continuous hostility. The case of the Black Hebrews who immigrated to Liberia may be placed within this framework of reference. They claimed that they found it difficult to settle in Liberia because of their Jewish faith. Hence, their allegation can be substantiated as a case of religious intolerance.

The «legal» dichotomy in Israel exists between Jews and others. In practice, however, a trichotomy in the Israeli society is distinctly conspicuous. The European Jews occupy the elitist positions in six major social aspects, a situation which adversely affects the status of the Oriental Jews. From the ranks of the European Jews come the Israeli decision-makers who determine the quality and quantity of value distribution in the social processes. More favorable treatment is accorded by these authorities to their fellow European Jews than to their co-religionist Orientals. Inevitably, they will offer black Jews considerably less preference. Black Hebrews were offered visitors visas but not automatic citizenship, as the law dictates. Zionist rabbis and government officials engaged in

a discussion as to whether black persons can be Jews. In simple contrast, there has been no such issue involving European Jews.

The rejection of these immigrants has not been consistently explained. Israeli officials have justified their action on the grounds that «these people are not Jews and thus are not entitled to immigrant rights.»(41) On another occasion, these officials, imbued with the «security» pretext, suspected that some «elements hostile to the State» might have financed this facade.(42) It is semi-officially asserted, however, that «we (Israelis) cannot give a haven here to a group that desires to fight... against the white world.» It is added that «We are generally in sympathy» with that world.(43) Thus it is understandable that the Oriental Jews call Israel the «Police State,»(44) and the Black Hebrews refer to the Israeli elite policies as «intellectual racism.»(45)

Both settlements were intended to normalize the position of the Blacks and Jews as well to bring peace and order to the evacuated countries. In effect, their creation has produced very abnormal situations for the natives of the colonized territories as well as for the colonizers. Furthermore, the deserted countries are not now more peaceful; Black Americans are still struggling for genuine equality, and Diaspora Jews are often accused of dual loyalty. Professor Morris R. Cohn, realized the frustrated expectations of the Liberian enterprise. He contemplated, in 1947, that

The supposition that the Jews of Palestine will necessarily be on a higher spiritual plane and serve as an inspiration to Jews throughout the Diaspora is like the argument that an independent Liberia will elevate the position of Negroes elsewhere.(46)

Twenty-two years after Israel was established, Dr. Nahum Goldmann wrote: «I am beginning to have doubts as to whether the establishment of the State of Israel as it today,..., was the fullest accomplishment of the Zionist idea...»(47)

Responsible decision-makers who advocated and helped to create a «Negro home» or a «Jewish home» did not intellectually anticipate the impact of their decisions on value processes. Their policy expectation was inextricable from the exclusive interest of their respective elites. Yet, a meaningful study of previous decisions should be a useful guide to future verdicts. Some authorities, for example, have recently advanced a solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict. They argue that the creation of a «Palestinian State,» whether in the West Bank or on the Arabian Gulf, might normalize the situation of the Palestinians and bring peace to Israel and to the Arab countries. The lessons learned from the establishment of Liberia and Israel do not, however, substantiate their arguments. They are, in the last analysis, calling for a «Palestine ghetto» with all the complexities of the uneven distribution of values, not the least of which is the value of participation, by determining «who is a Palestinian?» Experience subsumes the premise that

ghetto-states have an inherent tendency to self-segregation, and that the purported havens have become «Orwellian farms» where all peoples are equal. but some more than others.

■ FOOTNOTES ■

* S.J.D. candidate, National Law Center, George Washington University.

1. Franklin, *From Slavery to Freedom*, pp. 214-241 (3rd ed. 1969)! Quarles, *The Negro in the Making of America*, pp. 33-61; 83-108.
2. I Huberich, *The Political and Legislative History of Liberia*, 29 (1947).
3. See «Official Documents» relating to Liberia and the United States in 4 *Am. J. Int' l.L. Supp.* 188 at 191 (1910).
4. Franklin, 240.
5. The continuous native opposition to the settlers is documented in Staudenraus, *The African Colonization Movement 1816-1865*, (1961), 156, 171, 240.
6. Franklin, 240. (Emphasis is in the original).
7. Quarles, 96.

8. *Id.*, 114.

9. This does not exclude another important factor; that is, the Zionist-Imperial powers alliance, which has been profitable. Liberia, on the other hand, was thought of as an extension of the «American Empire» but under the Monroe doctrine, the United States was reluctant to identify Liberia as its colony. See, Staudenraus, Ch. XIII on «Vision of Empire» at 150 and *passim*.
10. Herzl, *First (Zionist) Congress Address (1897)*, in Hertzberg (ed.), *The Zionist Idea (1969)* at 229.
11. *The Complete Diaries of Theodor Herzl*, (Patai ed. 1960), vol. 1, 152.
12. Bein, *Theodor Herzl-A Biography*, 449, (1941).
13. Stein, *The Balfour Declaration*, 143, 154 (1961). See also other examples at 163-165.
14. Hertzberg, 49, 51.
15. Yediot Aharonot, Feb. 9, 1969, quoted from Matzpen's Arie Bober Letter to Commentary, Oct. 1970, at p. 5.
16. Montagu's memorandum entitled *The Anti-Semitism of the Present Government*, United Kingdom Public Record Office, Cab. No. 24/24 (Aug. 23, 1917).
17. Jastrow, *Zionism and the Future of Palestine*, 133 (1919). See also p. 149, 151-159; Taylor, «Zionism and Jewish History», *Journal of Palestine Studies (Beirut)*, I, 2 (1972) 35 at 40-45.

18. Weizmann, *Trial and Error*, 244 (1966).
19. Mallison, «The Balfour Declaration: An Appraisal in International Law,» in Abu-Lughod (ed.) *The Transformation of Palestine*, 61 (1971).
20. The term «colonization» was used by the Zionists from the very early days of their writings and organizations. To cite random examples: The Jewish Colonial Trust, Ltd.; The Colonization Department, The Keren Hayesod, a fund for «immigration and colonization.» Weizmann uses this term quite often, see, p. 191, referring to «Jewish colonizing activities» in Palestine.
21. The citizenship status of the settlers was affected by the U.S. nationality laws. Before the passage of the XIV Amendment, blacks were not considered citizens. See *Scott v. Sanford* 19 How. 393 (1856). For the text of the Liberian Nationality Act, see, *Laws Concerning Nationality*, UN Leg. Ser. 288, (1954).
- 22.2 Huberich, 1018.
23. *Id.*, 1018, 1020.
24. *Reports and Opinions of the Attorney General of the Republic of Liberia*, vol. I, 63 (1947). (emphasis added).
26. «*Koffa v. Republic of Liberia*», 13 Lib. L. Rep. 232 (1958). (emphasis added).
27. For a careful analysis of the «Jewish people» claims, see Mallison, «The Zionist-Israel Juridical Claims to Constitute «The Jewish People» Nationality Entity and to Confer Membership in it: Appraisal in Public Inter-

- national Law», 32 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 983, 1050-1060. (1964).
- 28.4 LSI, 114 (1950). Oleh is a Hebrew word which means «going up» to Zion. As a legal term it means a Jewish immigrant to Israel.
- 29.6 LSI, 50 (1952).
30. Savir, «The Definition of a Jew under Israel's Law of Return,» 17 Sw. L. J. 123, 126 (1963).
31. *How to Become an Israeli Citizen?* (Information Service of the State of Israel, Jerusalem), p. 3 (June, 1952).
32. *The Oswald Rufeisen (Brother Daniel) Case.* (The judgement is summarized and translated into English by Mr. S. Rosenne in reprint from *Midstream*, March, 1963. Emphasis in the text is in the original).
33. The facts and the judgement were summarized by Lankin, *High Court Ruling in «Who is a Jew?» Case.* A reprint from the *Jerusalem Post*, Jan. 25, 1970.
34. *The Harvard Research in International Law*, 23 Am. J. Int' l. L. Supp., *Draft Convention on Nationality* 26 (1929): (emphasis added). It should be emphasized that there are other juridical limitations on the functional conditions that are essential to determine a nationality entity and the procedures that regulate membership in it.
35. *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, Art. 15; *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial*

Discrimination, Art. 5 (d) (iii); The American Convention on Human Rights, Art. 20.

36. I.C.J. Rep. 1, (1955).
37. «Oseri v. Oseri», Int. L. Rep. 17 (1950) 117; «Hussein v. Governor of Acre Prison,» id.
38. See Liebenow, *Liberia - The Evolution of Privilege* (1969).
39. Such descriptions were given by Newsweek, Aug. 2, 1971, p. 33 and by The Times (of London), A Special Report on Liberia, Mar. 19, 1970, p. 2, respectively.
40. Liebenow, 96 and passim.
41. Newsweek, Oct. 18, 1971, p. 61.
42. Jerusalem Post (weekly) Oct. 13, 1971, p. 4, cols. 4-5.
43. The Jerusalem Post (weekly) Dec. 28, 1971, Editorial, p. 16, cols. 1-2; Rabbi Kahane was even less reserved. He called upon the Government of Israel «to expel the blacks and not let others in...» for they are «racists and anti-Semites who came here to bury Israel.» The Evening Star, (Washington, D.C.) Oct. 14, 1971, p. C-2.
44. Newsweek, May 31, 1971, p. 33.
45. Newsweek, Oct. 18, 1971, p. 61.
46. Cohen, *The Faith of a Liberal*, 330-31 (1946).
47. Goldmann, «The Future of Israel,» *Foreign Affairs*, (April, 1970) 443. ■

A book review

The Palestinian Experience

Fawaz Turki. *The Disinherited, Journal of a Palestinian Exile*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972. 156 pp. dollars 5.95.

■ Reviewed by George S. Hishmeh

For a start, it might have been better for the editor to give this book to a non-Palestinian to review. Fawaz Turki warns in his opening paragraphs that this book is not «an objective work.» And, for that matter, neither is this review.

As it turns out, both the author and the reviewer share many of the experiences and incidents mentioned in the book. Hence the reviewer's elation with the narrative and, regrettably, disappointment with some of the «pronunciamientos.»

The Disinherited is arresting from the moment its pulsating lines begin to unfold. Fawaz Turki paints a powerful, moving picture of the tormented, alienated Palestinian living in exile, be it in Beirut, Tallourza or Timbuktu.

From the outset, he sets his theme:

«Mine is an existential problem having to do with the yearning for my homeland, with being part of a culture, with winning the battle to remain myself, as a Palestinian belonging to a people with a distinctly Palestinian consciousness.»

He goes on, asserting:

«If I was not a Palestinian when I left Haifa as a child, I am now.»

But this boast has its price. As was the case with Turki, the Palestinian is still considered «an outsider, an alien, a refugee and a burden» (and more recently a «terrorist»). Which means, as he found out, that the Palestinian has had «to look inward, to draw closer, to be part of a minority that had its own way of doing and seeing and feeling and reacting.»

Many a Palestinian would echo this characterization:

The defeated [Palestinians], like myself, took off to go away from the intolerable pressures of the Arab world to India and Europe and Australia [and America, as with this reviewer] where they wrestled with the problem and hoped to understand. The reduced, like my parents, waited helplessly in a refugee camp for the world, for a miracle or for some deity to come

to their aid. The distorted, like Sirhan, turned into assassins. The alienated, like Leila Khaled, hijacked civilian aircraft.

Fawaz Turki was born in Balad al-Sheikh, a shanty town outside Haifa, eight years before the mass exodus of the Palestinians in 1948 stimulated by the Zionist terrorism of the time. With his family he settled in a refugee camp outside Beirut, where he acquired a «street education» before going, four years later, to a missionary-run school. A scholarship paved the way for higher education in England. His return to the Middle East in the early sixties was tormenting yet uneventful, except for a position with Aramco in Dhahran where he got fired after one week for protesting against the segregation of latrines between Americans and Arabs. He lives in Paris teaching English, and lecturing on the Palestine cause. Simultaneously, he is working on a new book on the 1936-39 Palestinian uprising.

Turki's is an uneven book. His first 100 pages are brilliant and remarkable in articulating the human dimension of the Palestinian grievance. He manages, like no other writer before him, to weave the Palestinian consciousness with skill. Interestingly, his book, written in the no-holds-barred style of Cleaver's *Soul on Ice*, has not been translated into Arabic (except for a small chapter which appeared in the radical Lebanese magazine, *Mawaqif*). It ought to be mandatory reading for anyone interested in seeing the Palestinian Question in a new perspective. In this respect, the publishers are to

be congratulated for bringing Turki to the reader, who has by and large been the victim of an anti-Palestinian informational siege.

The nit-picker will have a field day in this small memoir. Turki unnecessarily mixes his facts and figures. For example, the demonstrations that started at the American University of Beirut (AUB), in which this reviewer took part, never proceeded to the «Foreign Ministry» but to the Grand Sérail or Government House; the school in Haifa Turki attended was St. Luke's (where this reviewer studied) and not St. Lux; George Habash, the founder of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, was not arrested in Syria in 1968 because of the PFLP hijacking of the TWA plane to Damascus (which took place in August 1969); Habash did not acquire his Marxist-Leninist views at AUB but a good number of years later; and the Palestinian guerrilla leader who was assassinated in Jordan was Abu Ali Iyad and not Abu Iyad, who is to the best of my knowledge still alive and well.

All these errata may be inconsequential in Turki's exhilarating contribution to the literature on Palestine. But Turki should not be excused for some of his more irresponsible «pronunciamentos» despite his disclaimer that he is writing from «recollection» and that he is «neither concerned nor qualified in the game of quote and counter-quote.» He has uncritically and unwittingly accepted the much-quoted phrase which has given much ammunition to Zionist propaganda, namely, that the Arabs

have aimed at «driving the Jews into the sea.»

This reviewer recalls a recent remark by George Bush, the former American Ambassador to the United Nations, who said during the course of a recent debate at the Security Council that he had asked his staff to find out the origins of this alleged statement but with no success.

Turki attributes the phrase to Nasser, though the usual theory is that the author may have been the now discredited Ahmad Shuqairy. (Those who propound this theory do not point out, as students of the Arabic language would attest, that it should be taken in its metaphoric rather than its literal sense.)

On this note, it might well be pointed out that Turki's anti-Nasserism because of the late leader's «verbal pyrotechnics» may be rooted in Turki's political upbringing in the ranks of the PPS, the group that talked of a Syrian as opposed to an Arab nation, thus discarding Egypt and the Maghreb among others from its scheme of things. Moreover, Turki's distaste for Nasser—«Mine had become not just a dispassionate»— was atypically Palestinian. Nasser lost face with Palestinian activists only after his acceptance of the Rogers Plan shortly before his death.

At times, Turki's hate knows no boundaries. As much as his anathema to the Zionist and the Western imperialist was obvious, so was his hate of the «bourgeois Arab» and his value structure.

The irony of my plight was that as I grew up,

my bogeyman was not the Jew (despite the incessant propaganda that Radio Cairo subjected us to), nor was he the imperialist or the Western supporters and protectors of the State of Israel, but he was the Arab. The Arab in the street who asked if you'd ever heard the one about the Palestinian who... The Arab at the Aliens Section who wanted you to wait obsequiously for your work permit, the Arab at the police station who felt he possessed a carte blanche to mistreat you, the Arab who rejected you and, most crucially, took away from you your sense of hope and sense of direction. He was the bogeyman you saw every morning and every night and every new year of every decade tormenting you, reducing you, dehumanizing you, and confirming your servitude. To the Palestinian, the young Palestinian, living and growing up in Arab society, the Israeli was the enemy in the mathematical matrix; we never saw him, lived under his yoke, or, for many of us, remembered him. Living in a refugee camp and going hungry, we felt the causes of our problem were abstract, the causes of its perpetuation were real.

Is Turki here really talking of the Arab man in the street as he seems to be doing or of the relic from the ancien regime? More likely the latter who knew no better than to emulate the French or British colonial in carrying on with the hapless Palestinian and even his fellow citizen.

The cultural nationalist in Turki's angry outpouring crystallizes: «Our Palestinian consciousness,

instead of dissipating, was enhanced and acquired a subtle nuance and a new dimension. It was buoyed by two concepts: the preservation of our memory of Palestine and our acquisition of education.»

Turki's views on the Palestine issue, he admits, «are not necessarily always in accord with these held by the representatives of my people.» He sees the problem more as an «existential rather than a politico-economic one.»

The significance of his masterful contribution and abundant, overpowering humanity should not be belittled by his advocacy of accepting «half a Palestinian cake,» which is recognizably anathema to present-day Palestinian thinking. Compassion with his yearning is, however, in order.

As a Palestinian, the prospect of an end to my isolation [by accepting a West Bank Palestinian state] from the mainstream of other men's ordered activities **and purposes exercises an intensely strange fascination on my mind. I am lured by the agony of wanting, now, in my own lifetime, the chance to know what it feels like, how the experience would sense in my brain, to be, for the first time since I was a child, the citizen of a country, a native of a land that is my own, all my own, with hills and mountains, and children in brick houses, where I could sit with my people, no longer menaced, no longer destitute.**

How much more can Palestinians pay, he asks?

If you live a comfortable existence where the problems of life are examined within the matrix of ideology and rationality, your world is a habitable

one. If you give twenty years of your life in a refugee camp, the price becomes intolerable. If you are asked to make your yet unborn child take on your burden, you are committing an injustice.

Turki is not a defeatist. For this same «tired» man felt «exhilarated» by the Palestinian «reawakening» after the Six Day War. He is confident that the outcome of the Palestinian struggle is foretold.

Then it came about that we could not wait to be freed, and we broke out... That we had brothers and sisters fighting in Vietnam, in Africa, in South America, in the United States and elsewhere. That we were together, we were in the same battle. Against the same enemy. For the same cause. The battle, the enemy, and the cause are the same when I fight against an Arab for the Kurdish people's rights; when the Kurd fights against a Zionist for the Palestinian people's rights.

He continues:

I returned from my retreat in the East and went up on the rooftops to shout to the world that I was a Palestinian. I was no longer alone, hiding, shamefaced, embittered. I belonged to a people who shared their travail and their accomplishments with a commonwealth of men and women across the world who like them struggled to remove the leaf covering the nakedness of imperialist oppression. I was a Palestinian and the name had a cadence to it. I was not the bewildered, wretched native of the land; I was the native son. ■

PALESTINE RESEARCH CENTER

(Established 1965)

- First research center on the Palestine question in the Middle East.
- Collects and classifies all available information on the Palestine question for use by researchers.
- Publishes monographs, chronologies, essays and books by well-known authors.
- Over 200 titles in three languages:
English — French.
- For list of publications, apply to: P.O.B. 1691 - Beirut, Lebanon.

June 1973 Arab Palestinian Resistance

P. L. O.

Documents

The political program of the Palestine Liberation Organization



In its meeting last January (1973), the Palestine National Council approved the following political program for the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestine Revolution. The «Prologue» to the program outlines developments of the Palestinian resistance movement from its inception to the present critical phase through which the Palestine Revolution is passing.



■ Prologue

Throughout its struggle for liberation, democracy and unity, our Arab people has been persistently subject to conspiracies from the colonialist and imperialist forces and their lackey local reactionaries. These colonialist and imperialist forces see in our Arab homeland ample opportunity for imperialist plunder of its unlimited natural resources. They regard it, also, as an important stra-

tegic take-off point, owing to its unique central position amidst the three continents of Asia, Africa and Europe, and to its control over vital air and sea routes, especially the Mediterranean Sea, the Suez Canal, the Red Sea, the Arabian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. They also view it as a center of gravity for whoever dominates it in international politics.

In their invasion of our Arab homeland, the colonialist and imperialist powers feared that the rising patriotic and national struggle would stand in the way of their schemes. Neither were they confident of the ability of their local reactionary mainstays to hold out against the rising national tide. Hence, using the world Zionist movement, they plotted the usurpation of Palestine, intending to create therein a colonialist racist entity which would constitute both an outpost for the protection of colonialist and Zionist domination over our Arab homeland and a heavy club to be raised by world imperialism in the face of the ever-growing Arab struggle for liberation.

In collusion with the reactionary forces which ruled the whole area—except Syria where a nationalist regime existed—the colonialist and imperialist forces succeeded in planting the colonialist Zionist entity in Palestine arbitrarily and forcibly. They also succeeded in uprooting the Palestinians from their land. The Palestinian Arab people, however, did not submit. On the basis of its right to defend its homeland and its existence, and in view

of the responsibility it bears as a forward defense line against the imperialist-Zionist assault on the Arab nation, the Palestinian Arab people, for thirty years, put up a heroic and relentless struggle. In each of its revolutionary uprisings, which culminated in the 1936 and 1947 revolts, the reactionary and lackey forces played a role in undermining the Palestinian struggle and bolstering the position of its enemies and the enemies of the Arab nation.

This was the situation on January 1, 1965, when the vanguard of our Palestinian people initiated the contemporary armed national revolution against the Zionist entity, which exists on Palestinian soil through aggression and the force of arms, and which has never desisted from using violence to expel our people and to finalize the realization of its schemes for the usurpation of the whole of our land. In this revolution, which erupted on that glorious first day of 1965, the vanguard of our people embodied the noble revolutionary traditions of our people and of our Arab nation. They also raised anew the flag of the struggle for liberation against imperialism and Zionism, the flag in whose defense tens of thousands of martyrs have fallen everywhere in the Arab homeland.

This vanguard (with it the Palestinian people, the Arab masses and the free of the world) believed that armed struggle is the correct, the inevitable and the main method of liberating Palestine. For such an antagonistic contradiction with the Zionist enemy cannot be resolved except through revolutionary violence.

When the Palestinian revolutionary vanguard resorted to armed struggle, it aroused the Palestinian and Arab masses, filling them with the will to fight. This led to a violent transformation of Arab realities in the direction of insistence upon rejecting the defeat and determination to take the offensive against the Zionist enemy and to defeat the American imperialist plots. Consequently, Jordan became a base for armed struggle and a take-off point for both the escalation of armed struggle and its protection on Palestinian soil. In addition, extended battle fronts were opened against the enemy which included the Suez Canal and the whole of the Palestinian frontier with Transjordan, Lebanon and Syria. Armed popular resistance was escalated in the West Bank and in the Palestinian territory occupied prior to June 1967. The Gaza Strip witnessed heroic deeds of armed struggle to the point where semi-liberated neighbourhoods in Gaza itself were created.

The Palestinian revolution moved from one victory to another and grew quickly, in spite of all the imperialist and Zionist plots and notwithstanding all difficulties. It was able to emerge victorious from all the battles in which it confronted imperialist conspiracies and counter-revolutionary forces in Jordan and Lebanon from November 1968 up to June 1970. The Zionist enemy, too, failed in the extermination campaigns which it conducted against the bases of the revolution. The revolution was able to turn these campaigns of the enemy into

victories, as witnessed at Al-Karamah and Al-Arkoub.

However, the revolution began to face an extremely difficult situation due to the American initiatives and the plans they spawned (such as the Rogers Plan). These initiatives were accompanied by large scale encirclement of the revolution and the spread of the spirit of defeatism. This situation provided the counter-revolutionary forces in Jordan with a valuable opportunity to exploit some of the negative features that characterized the course of the revolution in order to implement the American-Zionist-Hashemite schemes. These schemes aimed at administering a harsh blow to the Palestinian revolution as a preliminary step towards its elimination and towards the liquidation of the Palestine problem. The Palestinian revolution and the Palestinian-Jordanian masses fought gloriously in Jordan in September 1970, in defense of the principle of armed struggle and for the Palestinian and Arab cause. Their battle shall forever remain an epic of incredible heroism and historic resistance under the harshest of conditions. But in July 1971, the lackey Jordanian regime eliminated the public presence of the Palestinian revolution in Jordan and began to follow policies which carried the threat of (a) an official capitulation to the enemy concerning the West Bank and Jerusalem, (b) the liquidation of the unity of the Palestinian presence, (c) the encouragement of dissension among the ranks of the Palestinian people and of

divisions between Palestinian and Jordanian, between soldier and fidai, (d) the conversion of the East Bank into a buffer favoring the Zionist entity and into a military, political and economic sphere of influence for Israel, which means transforming it into an American, West German and British backyard where imperialist influence dominates, (e) the repression, pillage and impoverishment of the Jordanian masses, the suppression of their democratic freedoms, in addition to the wrecking of the national economy. It is no secret that the American schemes aim at rebuilding the Jordanian army so it can be directed against Syria and Iraq also. These circumstances presented the Zionist enemy with the golden opportunity for making its occupation more secure by concentrating its efforts on trying to wipe out the armed resistance in the Gaza Strip and pacify the situation in the occupied territories. Thus the Gaza Strip was subjected to the harshest forms of repression and population expulsions; while in the West Bank local municipal elections were imposed to create favorable conditions for the occupation, divide the Palestinian people and attempt at promoting phony political leaders to substitute for the Palestinian revolutionary leadership. This went simultaneously with King Hussein's plan for the establishment of a so-called United Arab Kingdom with goals identical to those of the Zionist plot.

On the other hand, American imperialism intensified its assault according to a broad plan to

securely contain and liquidate both the Palestinian revolution and the Arab liberation movement. For this purpose, American imperialism resorted to numerous manoeuvres and plots under such signboards as the so-called American initiatives, peace proposals, interim settlements and United Nations Security Council resolutions. In this they were abetted by active defeatist forces, bound by strong economic and political ties to the imperialists.

The blow that was administered to the Palestinian revolution in Amman in mid-1971, the intensification of the American and Zionist imperialist assault against the Palestinian revolution and the Palestinian masses in the occupied territories and outside, and finally the growing deterioration in the official Arab situation in favor of capitulation, have all continued to generate a crisis for the Palestinian revolution and the Palestinian and Arab masses. This general crisis has, on the one hand, captivated the whole Arab nation throughout the greater Arab homeland and, on the other, produced a series of conspiratorial schemes aiming at the liquidation of the Palestinian revolution, of the Palestinian people's unified national existence and of its patriotic cause. These conspiracies have taken such forms as the Allon Plan, the proposed Palestinian state on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, annexation, judaization, as well as the absorption and assimilation of the Palestinians in the societies where they live in the diaspora.

In this atmosphere of crisis, we find our Palestinian Arab people moving with firmness and determination to defend its armed revolution, its unified national existence and its right to liberate its entire homeland. Our people will allow neither the liquidation of its just cause, nor of its revolution, both of which constitute a central point from which militancy and revolution radiate onto an area over which the imperialists and the Zionists want to extend their full domination.

We also find the constituency of the revolution, its fighters and its mass organizations pushing forcefully and decisively in the direction of national unity, the intensification of armed struggle against the Zionist enemy, the liberation of Jordan, the construction of an Arab front to participate in the struggle with Palestinian revolution and the establishment of close ties with the world liberation movement and the progressive anti-imperialist forces in the world.

The strong orientation towards national unity among the ranks of the Palestinian revolution does not in itself mean success in overcoming the crisis, but it means creating the necessary conditions for such a step.

Escalating the armed struggle against the Zionist enemy, mobilizing the masses and organizing them, stimulating the various forms of armed and non-armed mass struggle (military, political, economic and cultural) all lead to recapturing the initiative and assuming the offensive, in readiness for overcoming the crisis.

For the Palestinian revolution and for the cause of the liberation of Palestine, Jordan stands out as something special in comparison to any other Arab country. The Palestinians form a majority in Jordan; this majority has national rights there in addition to its other general rights. It constitutes a principal segment of the Palestinian people without which it is pointless to discuss armed struggle against the enemy. In addition, its struggle has been linked to that of the Transjordanian people and organically linked with contemporary history, especially during the past 25 years. Furthermore the Transjordanian borders with the Zionist enemy are the longest and the closest to its transportation network and to its military, economic and demographic strategic points. From here arise the dangers of the collusion of King Hussein's regime with imperialism and Zionism. This collusion has produced the massacres perpetrated against the Palestinian revolution, the prohibition of its presence in Jordan, the opposition of any activity against either the Zionist enemy or imperialism, and finally the transformation of Jordan into a protective military buffer for the Zionist entity and a route via which Zionist policies and influence in all fields could penetrate. These facts have made the liberation of Jordan (toppling the lackey regime) a decisive factor in overcoming the crisis and a strategic necessity in the process of liberating Palestine.

The creation of an Arab front to participate in the struggle with the Palestinian revolution rests

basically upon the belief that no success for our cause is possible except within the framework of a general victory for the national, patriotic and liberating struggle of our Arab nation. This belief will contribute to the protection of the Palestinian revolution, will ensure the continuation and escalation of the armed struggle, will help also in the struggle to topple the lackey regime in Jordan and will generally aid in overcoming the crisis in question.

Strengthening the ties of solidarity and common struggle between the Palestinian revolution and the Arab militant forces on the one hand, and the world liberation movement and the progressive anti-imperialist forces throughout the world on the other, will contribute to the support of our revolutionary struggle and its intensification, as well as to the common struggle of all peoples against imperialism, Zionism, racism and reaction. This strengthening of ties is based on the belief that the Palestinian revolution and the Arab struggle constitute a part of the world struggle for liberation.

In these new and critical circumstances and in the face of the responsibilities which the Palestinian revolution bears, the Palestine Liberation Organization, with all its groups and forces, has agreed to an interim political program based on four principal strategic axes:

1. The continuation of the mobilization and organization of all our people's potentials, both within and without the homeland, for a protracted

people's war in pursuit of total liberation, and the creation of a democratic state in accordance with the aspirations of the Arab nation for comprehensive unity and national liberation.

2. The tight linking of our people's struggle with that of our brothers the Jordanian people in a Jordanian-Palestinian liberation front to be entrusted (in addition to its tasks in Palestine) with the conduct of the struggle for the liberation of Jordan from the lackey reactionary royalist regime, which acts both to mask actual Zionist domination over the East Bank and to guard fiercely the said Zionist occupation of Palestine.

3. The linking of the Palestinian struggle with the overall Arab struggle via a front of all the national and progressive forces hostile to imperialism, Zionism and neo-colonialism.

4. Solidarity with the world struggle against imperialism, Zionism and reaction, and for national liberation.

The Palestine Liberation Organization defines its tasks as follows:

■ First : On the Palestine Scene

1. To continue the struggle, particularly armed struggle, for the liberation of the entire Palestine national territory and of the establishment of a Palestinian democratic society which guarantees the right to work and to a decent life for all citizens so they can live in equality, justice and fraternity, a democratic society opposed to all forms of prejudice due to race, color or creed.

This society will guarantee the freedoms of thought, expression and assembly, freedom to demonstrate, strike and form national political and labor organizations, freedom of worship for all creeds; such that this democratic Palestinian society will constitute a part of the entire united Arab democratic society.

2. To militate against the compromising mentality and the plans it spawns which are either contrary to our people's cause of national liberation, or aim to liquidate this cause through «proposed Palestinian entities» or through a Palestinian state on part of the Palestinian national soil. Also to oppose these plans through armed struggle and political struggle of the masses connected to it.

3. To reinforce the bonds of national unity and joint struggle between our compatriots in the territory occupied in 1948 and those in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and beyond the occupied homeland.

4. To oppose the policy of clearing the occupied territory of its Arab inhabitants. To confront with violence the erection of colonies and the judaization of parts of the occupied homeland.

5. To mobilize the masses in the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and the entire occupied Palestinian land; also to arm them for the purpose of continuing the struggle and raising their militancy against Zionist settler-colonialism.

6. To direct attention to the organization of our masses in the occupied territory and help mass organizations oppose the Histadrut efforts at drawing

Arab workers into its membership. To reinforce and support the Palestinian and Jordanian labor unions' endeavors in realizing the above aim. To oppose the attempts of Zionist political parties at establishing Arab branches in the occupied territory.

7. To support the peasant masses and develop the national economic and cultural institutions in the occupied homeland, in order to strengthen the attachment of citizens there to the land and put an end to the process of emigration. In addition, to oppose the Zionist economic and cultural invasion.

8. To direct attention to the conditions of our citizens in the territory occupied in 1948. To support their struggle for the retention of their Arab national identity. To adopt their problems and help them participate in the struggle for liberation.

9. To direct attention to the welfare of the working masses of our people in the various parts of the Arab homeland by obtaining for them economic and legal rights equal to those of the citizens of Arab societies, considering that their productive potentials are invested in the service of these societies. Particular attention is to be paid to matters pertaining to their right to work, remunerations and compensations, to freedom of political and cultural Palestinian action, and freedom of travel and movement, all this within a framework preservative of the Palestinian identity.

10. To promote and develop the role of the Palestinian woman, socially, culturally and econo-

mically, in the national struggle and to seek her participation in all aspects of the struggle.

11. To direct attention to the conditions of our citizens in the camps; to seek to raise their level economically, socially and culturally; to train them in the administration of their own affairs.

12. To encourage workers on Arab farmland and in Arab concerns to remain steadfast in their positions; to undertake to guard them from the lures of employment in enemy projects; to encourage and develop local productivity so as to absorb workers employed by the enemy; to oppose enemy attempts at taking over national productive enterprises and ruining them.

13. To consider every collaborator, or person negligent of the historic natural right of the Palestinian people in their homeland, a target of the revolution, be it in his person or his possessions. So, too, every conspirator against any of our people's rights, primarily its right to oppose the occupation and its right to national independence.

14. To direct attention to our emigrant masses in foreign countries and to act to link them to their cause and to the Palestinian revolution.

15. The Palestine Liberation Organization shall use its official Arab relations for the protection of the Palestinian citizens' interests in the Arab homeland and for the expression of the Palestinian people's political will. (The Palestinian revolution shall continue to represent the legitimate political leadership of the Palestinian people and to be its

sole spokesman in all fateful matters.) Hence the organs of leadership of the Palestine Liberation Organization shall be formed from all the organizations of the armed Palestinian revolution, the organizations of the Palestinian masses (trade-union and cultural organizations) and from patriotic groups and personalities who uphold armed struggle as a principal and fundamental means for the liberation of Palestine and are committed to the Palestinian National Charter.

■ **Second: On the Jordanian-Palestinian Scene**

The Jordanian-Palestinian national front is called upon to direct the struggle of the two peoples towards the following strategic aims:

(A) The establishment of a national democratic regime in Jordan which shall:

Create the appropriate atmosphere for the continuation of the struggle for the liberation of the whole of Palestine;

Guarantee the national sovereignty of both Jordanian and Palestinian peoples;

Guarantee the renewal of the union of the two banks on the correct basis of the complete national equality between the two peoples, so that the full historical national rights of the Palestinian people and the present national rights of the two peoples are safeguarded;

Ensure common national development economically, socially and culturally;

Strengthen the ties of brotherhood and equality between the two peoples by means of equal legal.

constitutional, cultural and economic rights and by means of placing the human and economic resources of each people in the service of their common development.

(B) The consolidation of the struggles of both the Palestinian and Jordanian peoples with that of the Arab nation so as to:

Complete national liberation;

Oppose imperialist plans aiming at imposing solutions and conditions in the Arab homeland that mean surrender to the enemy;

Eradicate all forms of Zionist and imperialist presence (economic, military and cultural), as well as all the forces connected with them which act as mediators for neo-colonialism and its policies.

In order for this Jordanian-Palestinian national front to actually emerge on the Jordanian scene, and to grow and gain strength, all forms of day to day mass struggle must be immediately activated, so that the agitation of the masses for both their daily and general demands leads to the rise of an organized leadership and organizations expressive of the interests of the various segments of the masses, i.e. the kind of leadership and organizations that have been absent from the day-to-day fights of the masses over the past years.

The realization of the general goals of the Palestinian-Jordanian national front requires a long and hard struggle. Through day-to-day struggle and partial battles, the masses surmount all social obstacles of a parochial nature and fuse in common struggle showing their militant national features and exposing the lackey royalist regime. The royalist regime depends fundamentally upon the exploitation of tribal relations and upon the provocation of parochial fanaticism in order to hide its collaboration with Zionism and imperialism (also to divert the attention of the masses from their contradiction with the regime.) The Palestine Liberation Organization presents the program of action for Jordan to engage the militant organizations in Jordan in a serious fraternal debate with the purpose of building the Palestinian-Jordanian national front. This front must apply itself to the following tasks:

1. Mobilizing and organizing the masses for the establishment of a national democratic regime in Jordan which believes in the Palestinian revolution, supports it and provides the climate necessary for all modes of mass struggle.

2. Bringing the Jordanians to participate in the armed struggle against the Zionist enemy inasmuch as this is a patriotic and national goal as well as a necessity for the protection of the East Bank of Jordan.

3. Struggling:

to establish the Palestinian revolution's freedom of action in and from Jordan and the formation of bases on its soil,

to expose the conspiracies of the lackey regime and its falsehoods in this respect,

to ensure mass protection of the fighters moving off westward beyond the river.

4. Acting to consolidate the national and anti-imperialist forces throughout the Arab homeland in one militant front and to deepen militant ties between the Palestinian-Jordanian national struggle and the world revolutionary forces.

■ Third: Relations with the Arab Revolutionary Forces

The Arab revolution is now passing through the phase of implementing the democratic national revolution which militates:

(A) To realize complete political and economic independence and eradicate all forms of division and dependence upon colonialism and imperialism.

(B) To liquidate all forms of imperialist presence such as political influence, military bases, eco-

omic investments, cultural institutions, and the defeat of all the local forces connected with it.

(C) To liberate Palestine from the Zionist-imperialist entity which not only usurped the Palestinian land and expelled its indigenous population, but has also proved to be, throughout its existence, a main imperialist tool for undermining the Arab revolution and protecting the imperialist presence in the area. The liberation of Palestine is not only a Palestinian patriotic duty. It is also a national necessity. The struggle for the realization of the Arab national democratic revolution will be neither unified nor deepened, nor will it broaden and succeed in achieving its purposes, except by liquidating the Zionist imperialist base which aims at its very foundations.

(D) To safeguard the freedom of the Arab masses so they can exercise their role in political life and constitute a solid basis for a firmly established democratic Arab unity.

(E) To place the material and human resources of the Arab nation at the service of economic, social and cultural development with the purpose of reinforcing political and economic independence, realizing Arab economic and cultural integration and eradicating all forms of backwardness and division.

The unity of the Palestinian revolution and the Palestinian-Jordanian national struggle constitutes

an integral part of the Arab democratic national revolution and one of its main axes.

Hence, the task of the Palestinian revolution, and its leadership, and that of the Jordanian national front is:

To seek to join with all the militant Arab national democratic organizations wherever they exist;

To prepare, through struggle, a militant atmosphere conducive to the rise of such forces;

To open its ranks to Arab militants, for the struggle in the Palestinian arena against the imperialist Zionist enemy is a main strategic struggle of the entire Arab revolution.

The Arab progressive national forces must combine in an Arab national front with the following demands:

1. To reinforce the positive support of the Palestinian national revolution and of the Jordanian-Palestinian national democratic struggle.

2. To struggle against all liquidationist plans or interim settlements, not only because they consecrate Zionist usurpation and lead to the elimination of the Palestinian national cause, but also because they have proved to be preparations for imperialist and allied reactionary manoeuvres and conspiracies for tearing assunder the unity of the

Arab national forces, for eradicating the Arab national revolution and for imposing complete imperialist domination over the area.

3. To struggle for the elimination of the present forms of imperialist presence in the Arab homeland (political influence, military bases, investments and cultural institutions and activities). To struggle against the domination of an imperialist economy over the Arab national economy. To struggle against the reactionary forces which propagandize for this domination and stimulate it. The continuation of American interests in the Arab homeland and their organic relations requires the confrontation and liquidation of these American-imperialist interests.

4. To encourage and support all institutions and activities which (a) seek to revive or protect the Arab national heritage; (b) diffuse national and revolutionary values and virtues; (c) undertake the task of opposing the Zionist-imperialist cultural invasion and the decadent and base values it propagates.

5. Solidarity with Arab patriotic and progressive militants against any persecution which touches their means of livelihood or touches them either physically, politically or intellectually.

■ Fourth: Relation with the Forces of Liberation in the World

The Palestinian national struggle and the Arab

national democratic struggle are an integral part of the militant movement against imperialism and racism and for national liberation throughout the world. Mutual solidarity and support between the Arab national and the world revolutionary struggle are a necessity and an objective condition for the success of our Arab struggle.

The Arab national and progressive forces base the ties of world solidarity on the following principles:

1. The Arab Palestinian national struggle is decisively and firmly on the side of the unity of all world revolutionary forces.

2. The contribution of the Arab national struggle towards resolving any disagreements within the world revolutionary movement consists in its effective and successful treatment of its own problems and the challenges which it faces.

3. The goals and methods of the Arab struggle, (which take account of the general rules of revolution which, in turn, are the gist of the experiences of the world national liberation movements) concern the Arab national and progressive forces. This does not mean neglect or disregard of the observations and advice of friends. ■

RESISTANCE

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Enclosed please find cheque for

covering a year's subscription

to RESISTANCE (12 issues)

Name

Address

City Country

Mail to :

RESISTANCE (P.L.A.)

P. O. Box 3577

Please send cheques through Syrian Commercial
Bank, Branch 3 (Account No. 18268).

Damascus - Syria

Rates \$ 7.00. £ 3.00, L.S. 25.00

**PUBLISHED BY: The Information
Department of the Palestine
Liberation Army.
Damascus (Syria).**

