

ARAB PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE

MONTHLY MAGAZINE

VOLUME III - No. 2

FEBRUARY 1971



2
1971

PALESTINE LIBERATION ARMY - PEOPLE'S LIBERATION FORCES



ARAB PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE

Volume III - No. 2

February 1971

CONTENTS

- Editorial 4
- The Palestinian Revolution
..... by: Saadat Hasan 6
- Israel's Imperialist Mission
..... Research Center (P.L.O.) 20
- Review of Events 26
- Another Rebel (short story)
..... by: Hakam Bala'awi 37
- Resistance Operations 42
- Misconceptions About The Arab Boycott
of Israel by: Ibrahim Al-Abid 47
- Palestine Question in World Press 58
- Palestine Diary by: Yousef Khatib 65
- Israel's African Ambitions
..... by: V. Sidenko 71
- Documents 80
- Book Reviews 89



Correspondence:

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

Price per copy

Syrian piasters 100
4/—
\$ 0.50

Editor: **M. KHURI**

The Balfour Declaration, the Mandate and all that has been based on them are invalid. The claims of the Jews to Palestine, on the basis of historical or spiritual ties, are contrary to the facts of history and the sound conception of statehood. Judaism is a divine religion and not a nationality of independent existence. Furthermore, the Jews are citizens of the countries to which they belong and do not constitute a distinct people.

Article 20 of the
Palestine National Covenant

Editorial

In the speech in which U.A.R. President, Anwar Al-Sadat, announced his country's acceptance of a one-month extension of the ceasefire after February 5, he made known Egypt's proposal for the re-opening of the Suez Canal.

Israel's reaction to the proposal was typical of Zionist policy at the present stage — a policy of evasion and stalling for time. The Tel-Aviv authorities neither accepted nor rejected the U.A.R. offer. They simply said that although they preferred to deal with the situation as a whole, they were prepared to negotiate. They made no counter-proposals and committed themselves to no specific stand or attitude.

Especially in connection with the proposed limited withdrawal from the eastern bank of the Suez Canal involved in the plan for re-opening it, the Israelis were silent and evasive. And this confirmed that no change in the Israeli attitude to the crux of all plans aimed at seeking a Middle East settlement namely the aggressor's readiness to withdraw from territories occupied through aggression, has taken place or is likely to take place.

Editorial

Indeed, all indications seem to show that Israel is rather bent on consolidating the fruits of its aggressions. Among these indications, is Israel's policy of stalling for time in relation to the so-called American peace plan, notwithstanding that the plan places more stress on Arab concessions to the aggressor than on the need for the aggressor to withdraw from territories occupied through aggression.

Another indication is to be found in recent press reports:

Newsweek has recently described accelerated steps taken by the Israeli authorities to Judaize Arab Jerusalem in the face of Arab and international protest. Another report published in **Time** magazine on January 4 says: «Time Jerusalem Bureau Chief Marsh Clark made a three-day tour along Israel's eastern boundaries. He discovered a frenzy of construction and settlement activity, which suggests that Israel is not about to surrender its occupied territory.»

The Suez Canal re-opening proposal is sure to furnish another proof of Israel's expansionist aims and its obstructionist policy regarding efforts made to reach a settlement of the Middle East situation.

Resistance

THE PALESTINIAN REVOLUTION

by: Saadat Hasan

The following evaluation of the developments of the Palestinian Revolution and the problem of the refugees in 1970 is based on the statement which the author made before the U.N. Special Political Committee on 27 November, 1970. The author was addressing the Committee as delegate of the Palestine Liberation Organization, and the statement was made during the Committee's discussion of the Report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA).

One year has passed since the representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization appeared before the Special Political Committee of the United

Palestinian Revolution

Nations. One year has passed since the United Nations adopted its resolution reaffirming the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. If we wish to re-examine the question of Palestine or any of its ramifications, it would be impossible to ignore certain developments during the past year on both the Arab and the international scenes. **The most significant of these is that the Palestinian people has incontrovertibly proven itself again as a people struggling for the liberation of its homeland and the restoration of its rights.** Throughout the world, it is now recognized that the main party to the Middle East conflict is the Palestinian people, whose existence and inalienable rights cannot continue to be denied by the collusion of Zionism and imperialism, for it is precisely this denial that resulted in the uninterrupted state of tension and turmoil in our part of the world.

Today the vast majority of the peoples of the world acknowledge that we are a people like any other people, entitled to the same rights, the same obligations, the same respect, and that our inalienable rights which have been usurped must be restored. The international community now realizes that it must deal with the Palestinian people if peace and tranquillity are to come to the Middle East. The United Nations concedes that respect for the rights of the Palestinian people is a prerequisite

Resistance

for peace and justice in our area. It admits to the grave injustice inflicted upon the Palestinian people and recognizes its responsibility to it. But between the admission of injustice and its removal, lies a vast gulf that must be bridged. Thus the goal of the international community must be the elimination of the causes of that injustice, and not merely the removal of its consequences.

In the past year, the Palestinian revolution has demonstrated that **it has the unwavering adherence and commitment of every segment of Palestinian society**—the dispossessed refugee, the worker, the peasant, the intellectual, the student, the professional, and the Palestinian woman. In addition, the Palestinian has the unequivocal support of the Arab masses. **The Palestinian revolution has achieved all of this through its determination to assume its responsibilities to bear tremendous sacrifices to face every challenge and to hold steadfastly to its ideals and goals.**

The Palestinian revolution has taken its place as a full partner in the global struggle of man against the forces of discrimination and estrangement, in solidarity with all those peoples struggling for freedom, and who represent man's highest efforts to achieve a progressive, democratic society, and to defeat the forces of exploitation, usurpation,

Palestinian Revolution

racialism, colonialism, imperialism, reaction, Zionism—in short, the forces of dehumanization. The Palestinian revolution is waging a simultaneous sustained struggle against all these ills. Precisely because of this, our revolution has the sympathy, support and solidarity of all revolutionary forces engaged in a similar struggle.

Whether the struggle is in Southeast Asia, South Africa, Palestine or Rhodesia, or in any other part of the world, these revolutionary forces constitute the vanguard of a broad front determined to carry on with their sacrifices until they achieve victory over the common enemy. They are committed to the continuation of the struggle until man has thrown off the yoke of his enslavement and shattered his chains for ever.

During the past year, the Palestinian people has encountered many challenges: it has entered into some armed confrontations and met with attempts and so-called initiatives to liquidate the Palestinian cause and dissolve it as a vital, fundamental issue. **These encounters, in whatever form, have not weakened the Palestinian people; but have steeled its will, strengthened its resolve, crystallized and articulated its political thought.** For revolution is a living involvement and ours is very much alive. Our most serious confrontation came last September

during the «ten black days» in the history of the Hashemite establishment against the special forces unleashed by certain circles to protect the interests of Zionism, imperialism, and Arab reactionary elements—our three deadly enemies.

The 8 October 1970 edition of The New York Times has laid bare the co-ordinated plans of this triple alliance, in their mutual aim to destroy the Palestinian Revolution. This is not something new to us, although it may be to others, for this kind of co-ordination has been going on for a long time, and at times on the highest possible level. Yet in spite of the sacrifices of thousands of our men, women and children—and every one of them is a commando or a potential one—our Revolution, because it is popular and dynamic, because it is needed, **emerged much stronger from this crisis.** True, we sustained casualties and wasted some ammunition against those forces that had been trained and equipped supposedly to protect our national rights and safeguard our homeland but, in spite of that, **we gained as a revolution.** From the devastation in September arose the following realities: **Our ranks have been organically unified. We have shown that our existence in Jordan is not by Hussein's wishes or tolerance but by our right. We have exploded the myth that there can be a solution or a relevant resolution**

which has not the consent of the Palestinian Revolution. Our enemies have been clearly and unmistakably identified. The United States' Rogers plan has been exposed for what it really is... a plot designed to liquidate the Palestine cause through the liquidation of the Palestinian Revolution. The unity of the people on the West Bank and the East Bank of the Jordan has become a reality and a new dimension of the Palestinian Revolution.

Whether the situation we encountered in September resulted from the collusion of our enemies or from the militarism and reactionary doctrines of those who seek to maintain their rule and very existence at the expense of Palestinian lives, the right of the people of Palestine to revolt cannot be the subject of debate or discussion. It is through revolutions such as ours that all mankind slowly and painfully becomes free.

Those who would deny the Palestinian people its right to wage a revolution should realize that between the right to revolution and the acceptance of a «status quo» that demands abject submission, there can be no middle ground. Instead of submissiveness and passivity, we, the Palestinian people, have elected to revolt. If man is to be free, then it is incumbent upon him to struggle against the ills that confront him. The right to revolution is an

indisputable, antecedent right, when conditions are so dire that there is no other alternative; and I know of no situation that demands revolution so urgently as that of the Palestinian people. In fact we waited longer than we should have, hoping that the international community would assume its responsibility, redress a grave injustice and undo the years of suffering and wrongs that it helped perpetrate and perpetuate through indecision and inaction, if indeed there ever was any real decision or action except to eliminate our rights and to disperse our people through the partition of our homeland.

Because of our revolution, because of the support it has among our masses, because every decent, freedom-loving Palestinian has become an integral part of it, because it alone is capable of bridging the gap between old and young, educated and illiterate, man and woman, the Palestine Liberation Organization as the representative of the Palestinian Revolution is the only spokesman for the Arab people of Palestine. This right is not something we allege but was secured by the thousands of our men and women who opted to bear arms in order to liberate our Homeland—every single inch of it—and to restore our rights: national, political, human and individual. Our representation of the Palestinian people is not by sufferance but is an acquired right, for there are

no custodians over the Palestinian people or the Palestinian Revolution.

Our representation is recognized by the vast majority of mankind, except for those who have been blinded by Zionism and imperialism and who wish that the reality we created by our revolution might cease to be. The sufferings of the Palestinian people have inflamed our sense of peoplehood and sharpened our will to victory.

If the United Nations is really interested in having peace and justice restored to our area, then it must embark on a different course. **It must re-evaluate its failures since it first muddled the affairs and destiny of the Palestinian people and seek the causes of the strife that pervades the Middle East in general and the fate of Palestine in particular. It must not seek through endless resolutions to placate those responsible for the tragedy of Palestine,** whose policies pose a continual threat to international peace and security. It must dig deeply into the roots of the problem and arrive at the only real way to bring peace, justice and stability to our part of the world: **it must return the Palestinian people to Palestine and Palestine to its people.** That is the course which the United Nations must follow. If that is achieved, the financial crises of UNRWA will disappear and the people of Palestine will cease

to be a charge of the international community which created their tragedy and must rightly assume full responsibility for their welfare and well-being.

If the United Nations wants to bring a lasting, just peace to the Middle East, **it must come to maturity and opt to support the Palestinian Revolution in its struggle for the eradication of the forces of human alienation**, because those forces act against the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law and justice. Only when the United Nations decides to march with, rather than behind, history and realizes that our revolution exists to undo the mistakes of the United Nations—only then will the United Nations rise to the level of expectation envisaged for it by its architects.

I submit that, in 1947 when the Super-Powers of that era agreed to partition our homeland with no regard for the inalienable rights of our people, with no consideration for our right to determine our own destiny in our own Homeland, it was then, that the United Nations forfeited its status as the embodiment of man's hope for justice and lasting peace. By submitting especially to the whims and wishes of the United States, the United Nations played a key role in the tragedy of Palestine, forming the basis for the continued disruption of peace in the

Middle East and for the constant crises that have faced it ever since. Had it not been for the one-sided policy of the United States that insists on viewing Israel as a privileged child, Israel would not have come into being, and its aggressive, racist and expansionist policies could not have been realized. **The links that exist between Israel and the United States are unique in the history of international relations: the sheriff of the Middle East carries out his master's tasks and then travels the well-worn path between Tel Aviv and Washington to collect his bounty.** That is how Israel was envisioned and that is how it is being maintained.

We hoped that, over the past twenty-three years — with all the setbacks, with all the revolutions and coups d'etat, with all the wars that have not yet ended in our area — the Big Powers and the United Nations would have learned a lesson: that the destinies of people, their right to their homes, their property, their homeland are not determined by resolutions made in the marketplace of compromise and political expedience. But, apparently, our hopes were in vain, for it seems that the Super-Powers in 1970 have engaged in a similar mistake by trying to envision a settlement for the Middle East without respecting the inalienable rights of the people of Palestine. **Until the injustices perpetrated against the Palestinian people have been eliminated,**

until all our inalienable rights are restored and fully respected, there can be no just and lasting peace in the Middle East. Regrettably, the United Nations the Security Council, the Big Four and the Super-Two are still thinking in terms of antiquated resolutions that do not reflect the new reality of the situation in the Middle East. As long as the starting point for any discussion or proposal stems from the spirit of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), or is based on it in any way, it will be nothing more than an exercise in futility. **Any attempt to talk of Palestinians as refugees only is a perversion of history and a perpetuation of injustice.** For between justice and injustice there can be no compromise. A little less injustice is still not justice.

The rights and destinies of people are determined by their struggle, their sufferings, their willingness to endure, their ability to create and to overcome and their readiness to fight for their rights. Certain parties have been telling us that they have been giving help to the refugees, as if they expect us to absolve their guilty consciences. For they are the very ones who created the Palestine question to serve their own imperialist ambitions. **They are the same ones who give our people tents, which barely shelter them from the ravages of nature, and, at the same time, give our adversary, Phantoms and Napalm to destroy the tents and to**

burn our people. They are the same ones who, in September, after the confrontation of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Palestinian Revolution with the special forces of the Hashemite monarch, proclaimed their willingness and readiness to airlift arms and ammunitions to replace that which was consumed in the attempt to destroy us. **It is indeed ironic that King Hussein is still waiting for the replacement of material he lost against the Israeli invasion and aggression in June 1967, while only days after the attempted genocide of the Palestinian people his chief benefactor, the United States, replenished all his supplies.**

To those who are hinting at the establishment and the development of a so-called Palestinian State in the territories occupied in 1967, we can only say that they are adding insult to injury, for the Palestinian people will not accept such a truncated State and forget about the remainder of its homeland. Our people have not taken up arms to wipe out the traces of the 1967 aggression: **they have taken up arms to liberate all of Palestine,** not just a portion of it. Nor can such an envisioned State be politically, militarily or economically viable, because it does not speak to the just, moral and legitimate aspirations and rights of the Palestinian people. Small rivers do not constitute barriers between people who

have solidified their oneness of struggle and aspirations. **Those who suggest such a State would place us under the constant threat of Israeli expansionism.** In effect, it would set us neatly between the Hashemite anvil and the Israeli hammer. There can be no partial solution to the Palestine question; between a West Bank State and liberation, there yawns an abyss; between a West Bank State and the liberation of our entire Homeland and the emancipation of all our people lies the difference between injustice and justice. In fact, the suggestion for a truncated so-called Palestinian State in a part of Palestine bears a remarkable resemblance and similarity to the Bantustan policy of South Africa. Could it be that the political and army personnel, who were born in South Africa and who now occupy top positions in the Israeli establishment, have brought with them the experience of their repugnant cultural background?

There is one way, and only one way, to solve the crisis of UNRWA and of the Middle East. **It lies in the programme and the spirit of the Palestinian Revolution, which aims to destroy the source of tension and injustice and to establish for all the people of Palestine a State where the Jew, the Christian and the Muslim can live in peace and harmony.** We aim to relieve UNRWA of refugee care by transforming the refugee into a normal

citizen in his own ancestral homeland. We aim to restore to him his dignity and his freedom. At the same time, we aim to free the Jew in Palestine from that most odious phenomenon called Zionism, which insists that the Jew cannot live in any society in which he does not constitute a racist, supremacist majority.

The Palestinians want only what every other people wants: the right to be free in their homeland. We have made our position quite clear. We will absolve the international community of its guilt and responsibility for the creation of our tragedy and the dispersion of our people only when our homeland is returned to us and our people returned to their ancestral homeland, only when our rights are fully and completely restored. In fact, I hasten to add that the people of Palestine will be willing to pay — and with interest, if need be — every single cent that has been invested by the donors and the contributors. The people of Palestine are not international supplicants. We wish, like everyone else, only to be free. ■

ISRAEL'S IMPERIALIST MISSION

Prepared by:
Research Center P.L.O.

This is the first of a series of three articles on Israel's imperialist mission, prepared by the Palestine Research Center of the Palestine Liberation Organization. It takes for its subject the stage of «Inception» (1897-1917) of the alliance between Zionism and Imperialism. The stages of «Implementation» (1918-1948) and of «Alliance for Conquest and Containment» (1950-1970), are dealt with in the second and third articles which will be published in the March and April issues of «Resistance.»

I

Introductory

Israel's links with modern world imperialism are not a mere figment of the Arab imagination, nor have they been posited only recently by the theoreticians of world revolution in order to satisfy certain

Israel's Imperialist Mission

ideological demands, and depict the Israeli State as a «tool of imperialism», while proclaiming the Arab States as the «vanguard of a progressive liberation struggle.»

From its inception, during the last decade of the 19th century, the Zionist venture has never tried to conceal its inherent colonialist, racist and expansionist nature. Zionism has consistently and explicitly assumed the role of a fellow-traveller movement proceeding in the wake of imperialism. As a political-nationalist ideology bent on the acquisition of Palestinian land for the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine, by means of a territorially oriented colonialism, Zionism was driven by its own internal logic into the arms of the imperialist camp.

After the establishment of its settler-state, Zionism has continued with the process of consolidating its territorial position on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, while resuming the role of a watchdog for imperialist interests and enterprises in the area.

The State of Israel cannot be dissociated from the self-assumed and self-attributed role played by an outpost for imperialism in the midst of the Arab World. Whether we like it or not, Israel has come to

constitute an integral and essential part of the imperialist camp. Its pro-imperialist conduct and presence, coupled with the legacy of an inherent territorial colonialism, have made Israel into a Spartan «western defence bastion» and a «bridgehead» for the counter-revolutionary movement as championed by the forces of domination and neo-imperialism in the contemporary world.

It is as the culmination of a colonial process sui generis that the establishment of the Israeli settler-state must be viewed. This colonial process, when duly examined and analyzed to its basic constituents and elements, betrays much of the nature pertaining to Israeli links with international imperialism. So much so, that the objective and uncommitted observer of Israel's present situation and its position vis à vis the imperialist camp, becomes called upon to view the Zionist settler-state under the aspect of services rendered to world imperialism.

I. The Inception: 1897 - 1917

The Zionist movement, during those 2 decades that separate the official launching of its Basle Programme in 1897 from the issue of the British Balfour Declaration in 1917, has been correctly designated as a movement «in search of international recognition.»

This search assumed various forms, and underwent numerous shifts in emphasis and orientation. But basically it remained the same: to seek alliance with that Power under whose hegemony and influence Palestine either happens to be, or is expected to fall — in case the partition of the Ottoman Empire becomes an accomplished fact.

In the **Jewish State** (1896) Herzl addresses himself to the general European reader, and appeals to the imperial-mindedness of the masses towards the end of the last century by proclaiming the planned conquest of Palestine as an extension of Europe's policy abroad. Thus he declares in the heyday of imperialism that «we should there form a portion of the rampart of Europe against Asia, an outpost of civilisation as opposed to barbarism.»(1)

He devotes the latter years of his Zionist career to running the scale of all possible and feasible orientations: from the Ottoman Sultan and his imperial German allies to the British government and the rulers of Tzarist Russia. When he switches Zionist orientation towards Britain, he tends to realize very quickly that «the English were the first to recognize the necessity of colonial expansion in the modern world. Therefore the flag of Great Britain

is flying across the seas. And therefore, I believe, **the Zionist idea, which is a colonial idea**, must be understood in England easily and quickly.»(2)

These words were uttered in a London speech delivered by Herzl in 1899. A year later, during the 4th Zionist Congress (London, 1900), Herzl underlines the importance of a Jewish settlement in Palestine as a «station for civilization,» and lays stress on the would-be Zionist contribution to what he calls «The Asiatic problem.» He proclaims:

«... We are those who are ready with our blood and our substance to provide this post for civilization. Any student of politics must perceive, quick as lightning, that Zionism presents a valuable opportunity for providing an easy approach to Asia.»(3)

If the above discussion serves to illustrate the true nature of the Zionist venture as a colonial enterprise seeking international recognition under the guise of a parallelism between Jewish and British interests, then the Balfour Declaration of 1917 should represent the turning-point in the orientation and inherent character of the Zionist colonial process, namely the focusing of attention upon British favor with respect to the establishment of a «Jewish

National Home» in Palestine. The search for international recognition becomes a search, under the aegis of Britain and the mandate, for the Jewish majority within Palestine and for the acquisition of lands in order to accommodate the would-be colonists and Zionist settlers. ■

(To be continued next month)

References

- (1) Theodor Herzl — *The Jewish State: An Attempt at a Modern Solution of the Jewish Question*, 4th ed., trans. by Sylvie D'Avigdor, (London: 1946), p. 30.
- (2) Oskar K. Rabinowicz: «Herzl and England», in *Herzl Yearbook*, Vol. 3, (Herzl Press, New York: 1960), p. 42 - 43.
- (3) *Ibid.*, p. 43.

REVIEW OF EVENTS

(January, 1971)

Dr. Jarring Resumes Mission

Israel chose a suitable time to express her readiness to resume the Jarring talks and announced her belated decision to rejoin the talks held under the auspices of the Special U.N. envoy charged with the mission of helping implement U.N. Security Council's Resolution of Nov. 22, 1967.

Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban sent a letter to Dr. Jarring, informing him that Israel had

agreed to return to the peace talks after an impasse lasting for four months..

By resuming contacts with Dr. Jarring, Israel was careful not to face criticism in the Security Council for her obstructionist policy, when U Thant presented his report concerning peace efforts in the Middle East.

A few days after Dr. Jarring's resumption of his mission, Israel invited him to Tel Aviv for discussions aimed at clarifying the procedure and principles of the Middle East peace talks. During Dr. Jarring's talks with the Israeli leaders, Israel submitted to the U.N. mediator, a 14-point memorandum, saying that peace must be expressed in a binding treaty. The 14-point document calls on the parties to the conflict, to end all discrimination and interference, and economic warfare in all its manifestations, including boycotts. The Israeli terms for a settlement embodied in the memorandum, include, among other things: respect and acknowledgement by the parties concerned, in explicit terms, of each other's sovereignty and political independence, establishment of secure, recognized and agreed boundaries. It refers to withdrawal from certain territories occupied during the June 5 aggression but not to total withdrawal.

The Israeli memorandum ignores the Arab

Palestinian refugees who were forcibly expelled from their homes in 1948.

Dr. Jarring submitted Israel's terms to Egypt and Jordan, and not long after, got the Arab reply to the Israeli memorandum.

Egypt's reply centred on 4 points based on the Security Council's Resolution No. 242, of Nov. 22, 1967. which provides for the total withdrawal of Israeli forces from all occupied Arab territories and safeguarding the rights of the Arab people of Palestine. in return for a peace agreement.

Attempt to Liquidate Palestinian Resistance Resumed

On Jan. 8, the Jordanian authorities launched large-scale military operations against Palestinian commando bases and refugee camps, for three successive days, using tanks, artillery, machine-guns and infantry detachments. Machine-gun bursts and firing of rockets were heard intermittently in Amman.

The new attack launched by the Jordanian authorities against the resistance movement, refugee camps and commando bases was denounced, far and wide throughout the Arab World.

President Sadat called on Arab kings and presidents to hold an urgent meeting to discuss the deteriorating situation in Jordan.

Syria's Premier and Defense Minister, Hafez Assad stressed the fact that the Palestinian resistance movement constituted the spearhead of the Arab battle of liberation.

Syria, further announced that she would not stand idly by, while the conspiracy against the Palestinian resistance movement in Jordan continued.

The Jordanian Ambassador in Damascus was called to the Syrian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and was informed of Syria's concern over the bloody events which were taking place in Jordan. He was told also, that despite official Jordanian denials, information available to the Syrian Government indicated that there was a Jordanian attempt to liquidate the commando movement. The Ambassador was told that Syria would give all possible help to the commandos.

In the Sudan, the government, likewise, deplored the conspiracy aimed at liquidating the commando movement, and considered the Jordanian authorities' move a defiance of the Cairo Agreements concluded between the Jordanian authorities and the leaders of the Palestinian resistance movement.

The Follow-up Committee, in charge of implementing these agreements, issued a statement deploring the shooting and appealed to all parties to adhere to the terms of the Cairo accords. Brig. Ahmad Abdel Hamid Helmi, Acting Chairman of the Follow-up Committee and Chief of the Arab observers team in Jordan, protested to Jordanian Crown Prince Hassan in connection with the Jordanian operations against the Palestinian commandos.

Lebanon Protests Israeli Raid

On Jan. 15, Lebanon submitted a complaint to the U.N. Security Council about the latest Israeli commando naval and air raid into Lebanese territory at Sarafand, and warned that such criminal attacks endanger peace and security in the Middle East.

The Lebanese Delegate to the U.N. told the 15-nation Council that Israel had trumped-up a pretext to justify this unprovoked act of aggression against the territorial integrity of his country.

However, the Lebanese Delegate did not ask for a meeting of the council.

The attack was launched by Israeli helicopters and by three boats, against the Lebanese coastal

village of Sarafand, 11 miles southwest of the port of Sidon, with covering fire from the Israeli boats.

France and the Soviet Union deplored the raid, while the U.S. kept silent. Nevertheless, the U.S. Secretary of State, William Rogers, was reported to have said in a television interview that the latest Israeli action against alleged Arab commando supply lines, did not affect the overall situation in the Middle East. He also added that peace talks under the auspices of Dr. Jarring, the Special U.N. envoy, offered the first hope for a settlement and that Rogers did not believe that the Israeli raid would have much effect on the efforts which are being exerted to achieve a peaceful settlement of the Middle East crisis.

Golda Meir: «Israel Will not Withdraw»

In a television interview broadcast in the U.S., Golda Meir had said: «We want to negotiate for secure boundaries but those boundaries shall in no case be those of 1967.»

In a recent address to 3000 high school students, to be enlisted in the Israeli army by the end of the current scholastic year, Meir stated that Arab reaction to Israeli peace terms submitted to U.N. mediator, was not encouraging. Then she added that there

were several points of agreement between Israel and the U.S., among which was that Israel should not withdraw from the occupied territories before peace is established.

Inauguration of the Aswan High Dam

The U.A.R. officially celebrated the inauguration of the Aswan High Dam. The ceremonies were attended by a Soviet delegation headed by President Nikolai Podgorny. Delegates from Sudan, Libya and other Arab countries attended the ceremony, and the Palestine Liberation Organization (P.L.O.) was also represented.

The Soviet President told a mass rally in Aswan that his country would continue to support the Arabs' just struggle against imperialism and Israel.

In a speech to mark the inauguration of the Aswan Dam built with Soviet aid, the Soviet President pledged his country's full support to the Arabs in their fight for the liquidation of the consequences of the Israeli aggression of June 1967. He also called for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and said: «Peace in the Middle East cannot be reached through the violation of the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples.»



He then blamed Israel's leaders for forgetting this, and for refusing to acknowledge the realities of the Middle East situation.

In the course of the Soviet leader's visit he held talks with the Egyptian government. A joint communique, — in which the Soviet Union renewed its pledge to support the Arab peoples' struggle for independence, territorial integrity and the liberation of the Arab territories occupied by Israel — was issued.

U.A.R. President, Anwar Sadat, expressed his country's deepest gratitude to the Soviet Union's support of the legitimate rights of the Arab countries.

Summit of the Arab Federation

A summit meeting of the quadripartite Arab Federation, of Egypt, Sudan, Libya and Syria was held in Cairo on January 20. In the talks and discussions held by the representatives of these countries during the summit meeting, a comprehensive evaluation of the general situation in the Middle East and the Arab world was made.

At the end of the summit meeting a joint statement was issued. In this statement members of the



Federation made strong reservations concerning the extension of the ceasefire after Feb. 5. The heads of the member states further agreed to mobilize Arab resources to ensure elimination of the consequences of Zionist aggression, liberating occupied Arab territories and maintaining a firm stand against imperialist-Zionist plots.

Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the Central Committee for the Liberation of Palestine, attended the meeting and participated in its deliberations. He gave the participant Arab heads of state a true picture of the position of the Arab Resistance Movement. ■

Another Rebel

(short story)

by: Hakam Bala'awi

In the following short story the author describes the thoughts, feelings and reflections of a Palestinian resistance fighter on his way to cross the Jordan river into the Occupied Territories. Pictures of resistance fighters who die in action are usually posted on the walls of the town in which they used to live.

The bus was going very quickly on the dusty country road. One of the passengers on it was sitting alone in the back seat thinking of the great events of which he was a part. He was overwhelmed with a great sense of satisfaction and felt more and more important every time he thought of the purpose of the trip and of his companions and of the history

they were in the process of making. The bus sped by hills and barren plains and little villages, all of which were familiar places to him, but he did not feel any longing for them. He was pulled by an irresistible force towards the western bank of the river where he felt that his doom had been awaiting him ever since the Day of Creation.

He smiled through the smoke which he was puffing in circles. He had the childish pleasure of knowing that nobody in the dark bus could see him smile and discover his private thought. And yet the thought must have been going on in the minds of all the passengers because inevitably everything this group of people thought of was ended with the refrain: «My Palestine! My land!»

He had never in his life spent prouder and more dignified moments than those during which his companions chose him to be their mentor both for his knowledge of the occupied land and for his sense of devotion. At that very moment and in the darkness, he felt a hand laid on his shoulder bringing to his consciousness all the faith and warmth of his companions. At the same time he heard the others telling jokes and laughing as though they were on a high school picnic. In those laughs he saw an embodiment of the sacrifice and the determination of these young men.

The laughs also reminded him, in contrast, of the senseless chuckles he used to hear in his flat back in the days when he had not yet joined the resistance. He spent wild times in those days, often with people who had no aim in life except the pleasure of the moment. But he also remembered the picture of his father who had died only recently at the age of eighty. He still remembered his small sunken eyes which carried a determined look even into the grave. He had a piercing look and a stubborn determination not to give up the hope of returning home one day. And when he was on his deathbed he asked to be buried with his face looking west to the land of his fathers. On his old desk his children found a scrap of paper on which he had written what became for them their motto in life: «All the riches of this world can not compensate a man for free life and death on his own land. People must make it their aim to restore their land with their blood if their land is taken away from them.»

It was people like his father who encouraged him and the other young men to join the resistance and to sacrifice their lives in order to die free on their own land. Many young men went west of the river, and many of them never returned. But there were always more people joining and taking the oath to free the land of the fathers. For those who never returned no tears were shed and no mourning

Resistance

and wailing. Only a picture with the name inscribed above it; and the walls of the streets were decorated with the names and faces of heroes.

He suddenly heard a companion tell him that they had arrived at the assigned spot. He had been so quiet that they thought he was asleep. He wanted so much to tell them that he was not asleep, and to tell them of all that had passed through his mind. But then he thought they were all thinking of these things, and besides, this was no time for useless talk; for the bullets would be much more eloquent in telling of his feelings.

They walked quietly down towards the river, but every step they took seemed to shatter the veil of silence spread over the area by the dark moonless night. The river was deep, stately and inviting. It looked like an intelligent being which knew those people and the purpose for their crossing back and forth. And they also looked at the river as a friend and companion. They even gave him a nickname just as they did each other. And the land was waiting for them like a deserted lover who was eager to receive the beloved after long absence.

They walked through the night with determined steps. The men had only the feeling of anger and the desire to revenge for the land against the molesting

Another Rebel

intruders. They walked on, these men, their hands clutched on their guns their minds concentrating on one thing only: «there was nothing in this world that could make up for free life and death on one's own land!» Nothing else for them had any meaning. They did not care for this life or for the few possessions which they left behind. They only thought of the pleasant possibility that their mothers or wives or sisters might send a cry of joy and pain when they looked the next day at the walls to see the names and faces of the new heroes. ■

Resistance Operations

(January, 1971)

On January 1, Palestinian commandos set off explosives at a sanitary installations depot at Beit Yam south east of Tel Aviv. The commando-planted incendiary charges destroyed the depot and set the installations on fire.

On the same day, Palestinian commandos set off time bombs at a garage near Beit Shemesh. A number of cars were destroyed and set on fire.

On Jan. 1, an enemy tracked vehicle was destroyed and its occupants were either killed or

Operations

wounded when a mine planted by Palestinian freedom fighters went off along the road to Kashkol in Upper Galilee.

On Jan. 2, Palestinian commandos attacked with rockets, the settlement of Kafr Nafakh in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights, scoring direct hits on the vital installations and causing casualties among the Israelis. The Israelis were seen removing casualties from the scene.

On Jan. 2, Palestinian commandos ambushed an enemy mechanized patrol between the settlements of Metulla and Misgav Am in Upper Galilee, using rockets and fire arms in the attack and destroying a Landrover and a half-tracked vehicle. The attack resulted in damaging the Landrover and setting the half-tracked vehicle on fire, killing or wounding a number of its occupants.

On Jan. 4, Palestinian commandos launched a concentrated attack with rockets and heavy artillery against enemy fortified positions and patrols, in the Turkmaniyah area in the Jordan valley, inflicting severe damage and heavy losses on the enemy.

On Jan. 5, Palestinian fighters attacked the Misgav David settlement in Upper Galilee, using rockets and artillery in their attack, causing heavy

damage to enemy vital installations. The enemy sustained heavy casualties.

On the same day, a bridge on the road leading to the Misgav David settlement was destroyed by charges planted by Palestinian commandos, destroying it and disrupting traffic in the area.

On Jan. 5, Palestinian commandos attacked with rockets, Israeli vehicles along a road in the Golan Heights, leading to Kafr Hareb, setting them on fire. The Israelis were seen removing casualties from the scene of the operation.

On Jan. 6, a Palestinian commando unit planted explosives in a car inside an Israeli garage, in the industrial sector of Tel Aviv, destroyed all the cars there and caused considerable damage to the building and set parts of the garage and the restaurant therein, on fire.

On Jan. 6, Palestinian commandos attacked with rockets and other weapons, the Israeli settlement of Feifa in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights, hitting enemy vital installations.

On Jan. 9, Palestinian freedom fighters attacked the Dhahiriya police station, in the Israel-occupied West Bank, killing or wounding a number

of enemy police. The commandos hoisted the Palestinian flag on the station and returned with a large quantity of captured enemy arms.

On Jan. 11, Palestinian commandos blew up vital installations at the Israeli Mediterranean port of Ashdod, south of Tel Aviv, using time bombs in the operation, destroying the installations and damaging nearby buildings.

On Jan. 11, Palestinian freedom fighters, planted high explosive charges under the Haifa-Tel Aviv railway line, in the Hertzlia area. The charges exploded under the train heading to Haifa, derailing it, and causing considerable material damage. Traffic on the railway line was disrupted for more than twelve hours.

On Jan. 16, Palestinian resistance fighters planted explosives and incendiary charges at a Zionist toys factory in a Tel Aviv suburb. The charges exploded, setting the factory on fire, destroying the machines and a large part of the building, and killing or wounding a number of persons. Fire brigades were rushed to the scene to extinguish the fire which kept blazing for more than five hours.

On Jan. 20, Palestinian commandos shelled occupied Beisan town with heavy rockets and mor-

tars, hitting vital installations in the centre of the town and its suburbs. Fire brigades were seen heading to the scene to fight the blazing fire and evacuate casualties.

On Jan. 23, a commando unit blew up enemy fortifications erected at the entrance of the city of Nablus, in the occupied West Bank. Soon after, the enemy occupation authorities launched a large-scale search and arrest campaign among the local population, under the pretext of conducting investigations.

On Jan. 28, commando rocket-launching units, shelled enemy fortifications and positions in Qunaitira, Jisr el Raqqad and Ruweissah-el Hamra, in the occupied Syrian Golan Heights, inflicting heavy losses on the enemy and causing much damage to enemy fortifications in the area. They also set fire to parts of Qunaitira and put out of action a number of enemy machine-guns. ■

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

**MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT
THE ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL**

by: Ibrahim Al-Abid

The following Questions and Answers, designed to throw light on the Palestine question and its ramifications, are based on the author's «A Handbook to the Palestine Question,» published by the P.L.O. Research Center, Beirut, Lebanon. For further information on the subject, two other publications of the P.L.O. Center may be consulted: Marwan Iskander's «The Arab boycott of Israel» and J. Maghaizel's «Arab Boycott and International law.»

**DOES THE ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL
INCLUDE ALL GOODS PRODUCED BY
JEWS WHEREVER THEY MAY BE?**

There are in the provisions of the Arab boycott of Israel no articles which point to the exclusion of any product simply because the manufacturer is Jewish. The condition which brings about the boycott is the fact that the manufacturer is either an Israeli or a Zionist. The boycott is lifted when the manufacturer adheres to the boycott provisions. The reason for this practice is the prevention of economic and political support, the goods or the manufacturer give to Israel.

The boycott comprises the prohibition of dealing with foreign companies and institutions, private as well as public, in the following circumstances:

1. When they set up in Israel a factory or a branch of a factory (Arab League resolution—March-September, 1952).

2. When they or their agents set up in Israel a factory for assembling parts. (Resolution—March-May, 1953).

The boycott applies also in the case when the

products of a company are used as parts of another product assembled in Israel, unless the said company can prove its non-responsibility in the operation, or unless the parts used constitute less than 50 per cent of the finished product, provided they are not motors. (Convention of Boycott Officers, Jerusalem, June 1961).

3. When they have general agents and main Middle East Offices in Israel. (Resolution—September 1965).

4. When they grant Israeli firms concessions to use their names, labels, etc. (Resolution-October 1952).

6. When they offer advice or technical assistance to Israeli factories. (Resolution—March-April 1956).

7. When they do not submit their answers within the assigned period to the questions posed by the boycott office and aimed at specifying their relationship with Israel. (Resolution—March-September 1956).

Imports from foreign countries which may be used to transit Israeli products to the Arab World are also subject to the boycott regulations. The importer must present to the authorities affidavits from the manufacturer, approved by the Chamber of Commerce or the industrialists' syndicate, certifying that the exported goods are purely local made. (Resolution—March-July 1959).

Finally, people who are known to have pro-Zionist sympathies and who have participated in Zionist activities through donations or otherwise are blacklisted. They are denied entry into any of the signatories' territories. Companies of whose capital such persons own more than 50 per cent are also blacklisted. (Resolution—March 1967).

IS THE ARAB BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL DISADVANTAGEOUS TO THE ARAB COUNTRIES?

With the implementation of the boycott, the Arab countries found themselves cooperating to execute a common economic policy. As a direct by-product of this experience, the Arab Boycott head office in Damascus forwarded a proposal for

the establishment of an Arab Common Market in 1953. The Common Market has not been achieved, but the way has been paved with agreements stipulating preferential treatment for Arab products as between signatories of agreements sponsored by the Arab League...

Progress towards a Common Market between the Arab countries has been very slow in relation to complete elimination of tariffs as between themselves, and the setting up of a common external tariff. But, significantly enough, and in contrast to the slow progress witnessed in the purely customs characteristics of a common market, cooperation between the Arab countries has brought about free mobility of labor and capital between most of them. From an economic point of view, this is more important than the lowering of tariffs and elimination of trade barriers.

Free mobility of capital and labor between most Arab countries could not have preceded less important forms of cooperation, such as elimination of tariffs, had it not been for the experience of cooperation in implementing the Arab Boycott. This is not to say that the Boycott led to free mobility of

labor and capital but it certainly did contribute towards widening and strengthening this trend. The Boycott produced a strong drive for development among the Arabs.

Facing the threat of Israeli expansionism, the Arabs associated in their minds power with economic strength. They implemented the Boycott to limit Israel's power and consequently its capability to expand, but by so doing, created a sense of the need for functional cooperation amongst themselves. The result of this has been wider integration of efforts towards development.

Labor and capital mobility led to greater diffusion of wealth generated by oil discoveries. Human skills travelled freely in the Arab world and educational trends began to reflect a general feeling that the Arab countries provide a natural habitat for any skilled Arab. This trend gained strength from differences in human endowments between Arab League countries. Specialized Arabs who went to work in other Arab countries faced no difficulties like the ones faced today by European migrant labour in other European countries. Consequently, labor mobility in the Arab countries became great and led to substantial mobility of capital. This fact

provides the major explanation for the rapid rates of growth witnessed in most of the Arab countries during the past decade. To the extent that the Arab Boycott fostered this trend, it has been instrumental in pushing ahead the process of economic development in the Arab world.

There are other benefits which have accrued to some Arab countries from the Boycott. In 1948, the port of Haifa had better facilities than that of Beirut, and was more favourably situated for transit trade with Jordan and Saudi Arabia. However, no goods passing through Israel are allowed into the surrounding Arab countries nor are any ships allowed to visit an Arab port and an Israeli port on the same voyage. Planes bound for Israel are not permitted to pass through any Arab countries. In these circumstances, the exporting and importing operations of certain Arab countries which lacked the necessary facilities, have had to be carried out by other Arab countries. Being most favourably situated among the Arab countries, Lebanon virtually inherited the greater part of the Palestine transit trade business...

The boycott brought about similar developments in respect of Beirut and Damascus airports.

Both airports, especially the former, have prospered and expanded rapidly. International air traffic between Asia, Africa and Europe runs through either one of these two airports. Had it not been for the Boycott, the flow of traffic could have run through Tel Aviv.

For similar reasons, pipelines from Saudi Arabia and Iraq to the Mediterranean have been constructed through Syria and Lebanon in order to bypass the Israeli controlled lands. Oil transit royalties, oil export dues, refinery taxes and supplies of petroleum products at prices lower than world market prices are some of the benefits that have accrued to Lebanon and Syria.

Benefits from developments noted, have gone beyond the monetary income they have brought to some Arab states. Principles of modern technology and organization have become more widespread in the Arab countries. Employment opportunities have widened and incentives are now more potent in directing efforts towards improving economic conditions in general.

In part, the Israeli claim referred to at the

beginning of this section, stressed the loss suffered by the Arabs from not utilizing Israeli expertise. Knowledge of the background to the Palestine conflict is sufficient to explain the great resentment Palestinian Arabs feel towards the usurpation of their land. This resentment is no less acutely felt by non-Palestinian Arabs and it is inconceivable to suggest that benefit can come about from reliance by those Arabs on Israeli services. Human motivation has been the source of success or failure of economic development in most countries. In the Arab world the resentment felt towards Israeli aggression has helped to spur efforts. The Boycott, as a concrete manifestation of Arab resentment, and as a psychological drive, has contributed positively to greater welfare. Moreover, the Arabs have utilized every opportunity to draw on foreign expertise from industrialized countries far more advanced than Israel. It is therefore, impossible to accept the Israeli claim that the Arabs have prejudiced their development by rejecting reliance on Israeli technicians.

The following question might arise: is it not possible for the Arabs to benefit from exporting to Israel? The answer is that definitely no such benefit could arise. No more than 10 per cent of Israel's imports at present could be imported profitably (to Israel) from the Arab world. There is demand for

Arab products which Israel could benefit from by other Arab countries. If production of the particular food items and raw materials in question were increased, some Arab countries would absorb this increase by decreasing their imports of the same goods from non-Arab countries. In brief, the potential for inter-Arab trade, exceeds the volume of exchange at present. The problems facing Arab countries in overcoming development obstacles are not essentially represented by lack of export markets.

IS THE ARAB BOYCOTT CONTRARY TO INTERNATIONAL LAW?

On the one hand a boycott may be viewed as a measure taken to impose sanctions on the states which commit an act that threatens peace or which commit an act of aggression, On the other, it may be viewed as a deterrent to such acts.

Furthermore, if the authorities in international law (Charles Rousseau amongst them) find that the arrest in Czechoslovakia of the American journalist William Otis for espionage is reason enough for U.S. Congress to pass a resolution boycotting Czechoslovakia until Otis is released (August 1951), and that

racial discrimination in South Africa and Rhodesia is reason enough for the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity etc., to boycott the two said countries; and if they find that the anti-American policies of Cuba, constitute a threat to the security of the American continent and justify the strict boycott the Organization of American States and the U.S. Congress have imposed on Cuba, if the experts in international law see threats (real, impending, or imaginary) in the acts of the boycotted states which warrant the steps taken against them, then surely they must similarly view the Arab measures against Israel. ■

PALESTINE QUESTION IN WORLD PRESS

Our world press extracts for this month include (1) a report on Israel's schemes for Judaizing Jerusalem, which appeared in the American magazine Newsweek on Jan. 25, 1971. The report stresses objections to changes in Jerusalem's ethnic and urban character, which are pouring «not only from the Arabs... but from otherwise friendly Westerners and even some liberal Israelis as well.» (2) a commentary on the Middle East situation which appeared in the December 1970 issue of the Soviet journal International Affairs. The commentary points out that «the attempts by Israeli ruling circles to hold over the illegally annexed Arab territories are faced with growing opposition from public opinion all over the world.»

1 - Judaizing Jerusalem (Newsweek - Jan. 25, 1971)

Only hours after their paratroopers burst into the old city of Jerusalem during the six-day war of 1967, Israelis began tearing down the walls that had divided the city's Jewish and Arab quarters for the past two decades.

«We have come home,» exulted the army's chief Rabbi, «never to be moved again — never!» within days, hundreds of Arabs had been driven from their homes, and soon urbanologists were drawing up plans to «Judaize» Arab Jerusalem by moving thousands of Israeli settlers into new housing built on expropriated land. Alone, among the conquered Arab territories, East Jerusalem was placed under Israeli law, and the Arab City Council was abolished when it refused to meet with its Israeli counterpart.

Now, however, the Israeli effort to Judaize Jerusalem is meeting increasing resistance. Objections to the changes in Jerusalem's ethnic and urban character are pouring in not only from predictably hostile Arabs, but from otherwise friendly Westerners and even some liberal Israelis as well.

The issue came to a head recently with the introduction before the Jerusalem Municipal Council of proposals to construct more highrise apartments on the rocky hillsides surrounding the Arab

sector of the old city. But there is also bitter controversy over a plan to build a new town in the Nebi Samuil region of northern Jerusalem. Some 100,000 Jews would eventually reside in these and other projected settlements in East Jerusalem, thus cementing Jerusalem all the more firmly into the framework of Israel and changing permanently the architectural, ethnic and political character of the Holy City.

The military advantages of ringing Arab Jerusalem with a vast defensive enclave of Jewish housing projects have not been lost on Israeli strategists. It was partly for this reason that they extended the municipal boundaries of the city to encompass the hills commanding the Arab quarter. Then too, there is the potential political advantage of establishing a permanent and overwhelming majority of Jewish voters in the old city. And many Israelis continue to believe that the more Jews there are in East Jerusalem, the harder it will be for the Arabs to regain control of the city in any future settlement.

Realizing the depth of emotional commitment, some Western critics of Israel's urban development schemes have focused their complaints on the esthetic of Jerusalem's changing face. The «Jerusalem Committee» of world-famous town planners, including Buckminster Fuller, Lewis Mumford and Philip Johnson, objects mostly on the ground that

the Israeli plans would alter the architectural character of the city. Arab residents of the area, however, are motivated more by political and cultural considerations. The unofficial but nonetheless influential Supreme Moslem Council, which probably comes closest to speaking for the Arab community of Jerusalem, accuses the Israelis of tampering with the historic character of the city and the life of its inhabitants,» and offending «the feelings of Moslem and Christian Arabs.»

Even the Israeli mayor of Jerusalem, Teddy Kolleck, shares some of the more esthetic objections to the planned buildings. «The hill of Nebi Samuil is a beautiful landmark,» he says, «and it should not be made to disappear in a vast cluster of houses,»

But the same considerations that have lured Israelis into East Jerusalem add up to anguish for the Arabs they have displaced. Israeli historian Meron Benvenisti, a municipal councilman who is widely respected by both the Arabs and liberal Jews, observes sympathetically: «For the Arabs, too, this ground is much more than real estate. What is involved here — for Arabs and Jews alike — is the expression of more or less identical loves.»

2 - Middle East Situation (International Affairs - December, 1970)

As more time passes since that morning of June



"What do you mean I can't wear both together?"

5, 1967, when the mailed fist of imperialist-Israeli aggression struck at the neighbouring Arab countries, the advocates of that aggression have used ever more refined methods in their attempts to confuse the issue in settling the Middle East crisis, to prolong the illegal Israeli occupation of the Arab territories, and openly to sabotage the attempts by peaceloving forces to find just and mutually acceptable ways of resolving the conflict.

A Middle East settlement would appear to be a clear-cut problem: the aggressor must go home from the occupied territories, and should not be allowed to benefit in any way from his deeds.

After almost three years of their continued policy of aggression and delaying tactics, the Israeli leaders announced, through «clenched teeth», that they were at long last prepared to abide by the Security Council resolution, but have not abandoned their plan of keeping all or at any rate a part of the Arab territories they occupied in June 1967. «We shall never return to the 1967 borders,» Mrs. Golda Meir hysterically declared at an American press conference on September 23, 1970. This obstructionist stand is an expression of the reckless Israeli policy of aggression, which over the last 20 years has thrice plunged the Middle East into war.

It is surprising how recklessly the Israeli leaders risk their people's future by deliberately blocking all political ways to a Middle East settlement.

Nahum Goldmann, President of the World Jewish Congress, who can hardly be suspected of sympathising with the Arab states and the national liberation movement of the Arabs. wrote in the Paris *Le Monde* last May: «I have always said that time is not working for Israel. In this sense I have differed not only with Ben Gurion, but also with many present Israeli leaders. Israel's present superiority is determined by the quality, the character, the talents and the technical skills of its citizens. But it should not be forgotten that the Arabs are a people with a fine past, that they have given mankind one of its most important religions, and that they have known periods of military supremacy and brilliant victories. No one can say how long it will take them to catch up with Israel in technology, armaments, in particular. However, the time is bound to come when the balance of strength will tilt in their favour.»

This warning issued by one of the leaders of international Zionism is symptomatic.

No one with any sense of political reality can fail to realise that time is working against Israel and that the attempts by Israeli ruling circles to disrupt any settlement and to establish their hold over the illegally annexed Arab territories are faced with growing opposition from public opinion all over the world. ■

PALESTINE DIARY

by:Yousef Khatib

The following are selections from the February entries of «Palestine Diary 1971» by Yousef Khatib. The entries recall, with appropriate commentary, important events related to the Palestine question, which occurred in the month of February of past years:

ZIONIST EXPANSIONISM

1919: On 3rd February, 1919, the World Zionist Organization submitted to the Paris Peace Conference its official plan «for the establishment of a

Jewish state in Palestine **and neighbouring Arab countries.**» These are the main points:

The minimum that the Organization would accept for a viable Jewish state includes:

1. The head waters of the Jordan River in Syria and Lebanon.
2. The South of Lebanon, up to the town of Sidon.
3. The Southern Bekaa Valley in Lebanon.
4. The Hauran Plain in Syria.
5. Control over the Hedjaz Railway from Deraa to Amman, to Maan, in Jordan.
6. Control over the gulf of Aqaba.

(As reported by Frieswasser Raanan in **Frontiers of a Nation**, pp. 107-108).

In the light of this, the Arabs could hardly be expected to give Zionism a warm welcome.

CRIMINAL RAID ON ABU ZA'BAL PLANT

1970: On 11th February, 1970, the Israeli Air Force, using American Phantoms, killed 70 Egyptian workers at Abu Za'bal industrial plant.

The savage raid evoked universal condemnation. President Tito of Yugoslavia said of the attack: «It is difficult to find words to denounce this criminal attack on the peaceful civilian population. **This brutal attack as well as the general escalation of the aggressive acts of Israel has much in common with Nazi behaviour in the Second World War.**»

Even the Americans, who had supplied the Phantom planes with which the raid was carried out, could not condone it. The New York Times described it as «**inexcusable**» and «**recklessly ferocious.**»

EISENHOWER CONDEMNS THE 1956 ZIONIST- IMPERIALIST AGGRESSION ON EGYPT

1957: On 20th February, 1957, President Eisenhower criticized Israel for not withdrawing from Sinai and the Gaza Strip after having occupied them through aggression in 1956. Eisenhower's criticism applies equally to the Zionist aggression of 1967, notwithstanding America's change of attitude. Eisenhower said, in a nationwide broadcast:

«... This raises a basic question of principle, **Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval**

be allowed to impose conditions for its own withdrawal?

«If we agree that armed attack can properly achieve the purposes of the assailant, then I fear we will have turned back the clock of international order. We will, in effect, have countenanced the use of force as a means of settling international differences and through this gaining national advantages.

«I do not, myself, see how this could be reconciled with the Charter of the United Nations. The basic pledge of all members of the United Nations is that they will settle their international differences by peaceful means and will not use force against the territorial integrity of another state.

«If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the organization and our best hope of establishing a world of order. That would be disaster for us all.

«I would, I feel, be untrue to the standard, of the high office to which you have chosen me if I were to lend the influence of the United States to the proposition that a nation which invades another

should be permitted to exact conditions for withdrawal.»

A relevant question is: How did the change in U.S. policy come about?

In 1957, President Eisenhower stood firmly against solving international problems through force of arms, and objected to imposing conditions for withdrawal.

In 1967, President Johnson and after him President Nixon stood firmly on the side of the aggressors and accepted their conditions for withdrawal.

Only plausible explanation: In 1956, the Zionists aligned themselves with Britain and France, but not with U.S. But in 1967, the U.S. was the strongest ally of the Zionist aggressors: and hence the change of attitude.

AMERICAN-ISRAELI ARMS DEAL

1965: On 28th February, 1965, «Der Spiegel» published full details of the secret American-Israeli arms deal, which gave Israel, through the Bonn government, 300 million DM, 60 planes, anti-aircraft guns,

Resistance

450 military vehicles, 81 tanks of the M48 type, heavy artillery and other weapons.

Bonn's price for the deal was:

1. That Israel should not use the Eichman trial to defame West Germany.
2. That Adenauer's Secretary, Dr. Hanz Globky, should not be invited to give evidence in the trial.

What a deal between the «heroes» of Auschwitz and Deir Yassin!

ISRAEL'S AFRICAN AMBITIONS

by: V. Sidenko

The following account of Israel's secret role in Africa as the agent of neo-colonialism and world imperialism is based on an article published in 'New Times' magazine issue on January 20, 1971.

Dusk was falling as I drove back to Freetown, the capital of Sierra Leone. The road ran along the slopes of wooded hills bordering the coast. As we approached the outskirts of the city a tall ugly building reared up suddenly out of the darkness. It stood

on a narrow strip of land between the beach and the highway and appeared to be completely deserted.

«You're right. Nobody lives there,» the driver confirmed my conjecture. «That's the famous Cape Sierra Hotel.»

The name of that hotel and its history were already known to me. It had been mentioned in the course of an interview I had been granted just before by Siaka Stevens, the Prime Minister of Sierra Leone. Speaking of the economic problems of this small African state and of the ineffectiveness of Western aid on which the previous government, ousted by the people, had staked its main hopes, Siaka Stevens had cited the example of the Cape Sierra Hotel. It had cost the state a cool million pounds sterling, all of which had been wasted. The hotel proved a total loss, no one wanted to live there. The money the government was still spending on repaying loans contracted to build it would be enough for several more schools, hospitals and workshops, the Prime Minister said.

How had the former rulers of Sierra Leone allowed themselves to be drawn into such a costly venture? People in Freetown lay much of the blame on the Israeli building contractors who started the whole thing. They persuaded the government that

the proposition was a highly profitable one and lined their pockets on the contract. And now the people have to pay for it.

In Nigeria, too, whither my travels took me after Sierra Leone, I had occasion to hear a good many uncomplimentary remarks about Israeli businessmen. At the Federal Palace Hotel in Lagos where I stayed everyone seemed to be talking about the fraudulent practices of Federmann Enterprises, an Israeli company which had undertaken to help the Federal government to run the hotel. After obtaining a loan of a quarter of a million pounds sterling ostensibly for the purpose of modernizing the hotel, Federmann and his friends had absconded. Official representations by the Federal government to the Israeli authorities had remained unanswered, although it was generally known that the swindlers had returned home.

Nor is this an isolated case. The Nigerian press reported several instances of machinations by Israeli building contractors, who pocketed lush profits by inflating construction costs by as much as threefold. **Then there was the scandal connected with the sale in Nigeria of Israeli medicaments which, as a journalist friend of mine remarked, had the effect not so much of curing the patient's ailments as of emptying his pocket.**

In this connection the Nigerian African Statesman journal wrote that similar instances had occurred in other African countries. «Un-tested and un-proven vaccines and other medicines,» the journal said, «have been used by Israelis in the treatment of people all over the continent, and had proved fatal to many in Niger, Congo, Malawi and Ruanda when treating cerebrospinal meningitis epidemics, and the control of trachoma.» Thus the Africans had been treated as guinea-pigs, the journal declares.

BROKERS

But Israel's policy in Africa is, of course, not confined to trying to swindle less astute business partners there. The Zionist movement has always cast covetous eyes on the African continent. It is hardly by chance that according to the original Zionist plan, «the Jewish national home» was to be located not in Palestine but in West Africa, in the area of the Fouta Djallon heights (now the Republic of Guinea). Another plan envisaged the founding of a Jewish state in Uganda, then a British colony. And although these projects were subsequently abandoned, the Zionist leaders have not given up the idea of neo-colonialist expansion on the African continent.

It would seem that Israel's neo-colonialist ambitions are out of all proportion to its financial and economic means. After all, the Israeli economy,

geared as it is to aggression, is strained to the utmost, as are its finances. Yet Tel Aviv's spending on «aid to African countries» is quite considerable. «on «aid to African countries» is quite considerable.

Notwithstanding the seeming incompatibility of Israel's ambitions and its actual possibilities, the Zionists' expansionist plans are by no means built on sand. The fact is that the Israeli rulers are acting as agents for U.S. and international Zionist capitalists. These are the sources whence are derived the means without which Israel's neo-colonialist expansion in Africa would be inconceivable. Of course, Israel's ruling elite gets a fat commission for its services in the form of new military shipments from the United States, stronger positions in Africa, and more opportunities for intriguing against the Arab states.

By acting as brokers for Washington and other Western countries Israel is doing them an enormous service. Israel's status as a «small» country, a fact which in itself has an appeal for the African states most of which are themselves small in size, is artfully exploited by Tel Aviv and its patrons. Israeli propaganda, twisting the facts, claims that Tel Aviv's policy is built on different principles from that of the colonial powers. This propaganda did at first have an effect in some African quarters and this facilitated Washington's penetration into Africa.

How the Washington-Tel Aviv tandem works in the economic sphere may be seen from the following instance. A few years ago Israel signed a contract with Uganda for the delivery of aircraft to that country. What was the surprise of the Ugandans when they discovered that the planes had been consigned to Uganda straight from New York. In other words, Israel had acted as an agent for U.S. business firms. And plenty other instances of this kind could be cited.

ESPIONAGE NETWORK

Tel Aviv has begun to evince a keen interest in the armed forces of certain African states. Developments have shown that the armies in the developing African countries constitute a serious political force. To gain control of these armies would give the U.S. imperialists a powerful lever for intervening in the internal affairs of African states. True, here too the Pentagon, badly compromised in the eyes of the African public, needs an intermediary. And that is where the Israeli military come in.

According to the Johannesburg Star, Israel is rendering «aid» to a dozen or so African armies. It is noteworthy that most of the Israeli ambassadors in Africa are professional soldiers who have temporarily exchanged their uniforms for the diplomatic

mufti. There are Israeli military missions in a number of African countries. Their activities are not confined to rendering military «aid» and indoctrination of the local army officers. Like the Israeli embassies, these missions are centres of subversion and espionage against the African states. The Western press has drawn attention to the activity of the Israeli military missions in countries neighbouring on the Sudan. From reports in the British Sunday Times one gathers that they have become centres of the imperialist-inspired separatist movement in the Southern Sudan which is aimed at undermining the revolutionary democratic regime in that country.

Israeli agents were extremely active during the rebellion in Eastern Nigeria. According to the Nigerian press, Israel supplied the separatists with military equipment. Israel's interest in the secession of the Eastern Region is explained by the fact that the Ojukwu group had promised the Rothschilds, who are closely connected with Israeli ruling circles, oil concessions in Eastern Nigeria in exchange for military and financial support.

There is evidence that the Israeli secret service, Shin Beth, has an extensive spy network in the African countries. Being less conspicuous, it is able to slip in «through the eye of the needle» where its mammoth patron, the U.S. Intelligence community,

finds it harder to do so. The African Statesman believes that four-fifths of the Israeli experts working in the African countries are engaged in espionage and subversion on assignments from Shin Beth. For example, Israeli building contractors are known to have installed bugging devices in government buildings they put up—all for the convenience of Shin Beth agents. Facts of this kind, the journal says, have been revealed in Ghana and the Ivory Coast.

«Among other diplomats and reporters,» the New York Times wrote on November 3, 1970, «the Israelis have a reputation for being especially well informed, and their deployment of diplomats is often more extensive than that of the major powers.» This statement, combined with the numerous known facts testifying to the espionage activities of Israeli agents carrying diplomatic passports and reporters' credentials, affords some idea of the extensive espionage network Israel has spread over Africa. Needless to say, all information of interest to the United States is transmitted to the CIA.

But the Israeli rulers are compromising themselves more and more in the eyes of the Africans. Some African countries, the People's Republic of Congo, for one, severed diplomatic relations with Israel after its aggression against the Arab states in 1967. At the end of April last year the government

of the Central African Republic recalled its Ambassador from Tel Aviv. In June the government of Gabon did likewise. **What particularly disgusts the Africans is the way the Zionist rulers have aligned themselves with racist South Africa, a move that is justly regarded as being spearheaded against Arab and African peoples.**

The common stand of the majority of the African countries with regard to Israel is recorded in the resolutions of the Organization of African Unity which at its assemblies has repeatedly condemned the actions of the Israeli military, called for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from Arab territories and the settlement of the Middle East crisis in accordance with the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967: ■

Documents

World Conferences on Palestine

The General Union of Palestinian Students (GUPS) has organized two World Conferences on Palestine. A third Conference, organized by GUPS, is scheduled to be held in Kuwait on February 13, 1971. The first of these conferences — The International Seminar on Palestine, was held in Cairo, March 30 — April 6, 1965. 110 delegations representing 44 countries participated in it. Among the distinguished participants were Krishna Menon of India, Anthony Nutting, and world-famous historian Arnold Toynbee. The Second World Conference was held in Amman, September 2 — 6, 1970. We give below the text of the «Declaration» of the First Conference and the «Message» of the Second Conference.

DECLARATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR

March 30 — April 6, 1965 — Cairo

1 — The Palestine cause is a just cause of liberation — liberation of a homeland from invasion,

Documents

of the human minds from the bondage of planned captivity, liberation from imperialism, from fear and blackmail.

Just as all Arabs, are called upon to take unfalteringly the side of liberation movements everywhere, in Africa, Asia and elsewhere in the world; just as the Arabs have in fact taken a determined and unfaltering stand of support and active help for all causes of liberation, just as the Arabs have identified their own causes with the common causes of freedom, to the extent of having to fight two bitter wars, the war of Algeria, and the war of Suez, all peoples, everywhere, should realize that the struggle for the restoration of Arab Palestine is a decisive struggle for the whole world, and that victory in it will have as far-reaching consequences for a free future to all peoples as were the victories of Suez and Algeria.

2 — The Seminar wishes to stress the point that Imperialism and Zionism were able to achieve their ends in Palestine, because of the fact that the Arab Homeland was divided into different states most of whom were dominated by Pro-Western forces. The Seminar expresses its conviction that Arab Unity which is the ultimate goal of all Arabs is one of the most, if not the most important factor in restoring Arab rights in Palestine.

3 — The International Seminar on Palestine declares its conviction, in consideration of Arab justice, of great dangers to the Arab world stemming from Israel's expansionism, in consideration of Israel's subversion against Afro-Asian Solidarity and its alignment with all forces of imperialism, everywhere, and in consideration of the long sufferings of Palestine refugees, that the territorial integrity of Palestine should be immediately restored, by returning the whole of Palestine to the undisputed sovereign possession of the Arabs of Palestine.

Notes with great satisfaction the establishment of the Palestine Liberation Organization, as an embodiment of the will of the Arabs of Palestine to struggle for the Liberation of their country.

Calls on all upholders of principles, all believers in peace, justice and freedom in the world to lend the Arabs of Palestine their full and determined support.

4 — The Seminar recommends the formation of an International Committee for Information and Solidarity with the Arab people of Palestine from the personalities and Organizations taking part in this conference, for:

a) Co-operation with the General Union of

Palestine Students and the Palestine Liberation Organization for enlightening international public opinion on the facts of the Palestine problem, by holding seminars, organizing lectures and by all the other means of information, and

b) Endeavouring to obtain the support of all the peoples of the world for the struggle of the Palestinian Arab people to restore its homeland.

5 — The Seminar affirms the resolutions of the Afro-Asian and International Organizations declaring May 15 as day of solidarity with the people of Palestine.

The Seminar recommends all Students Organizations to ask the International Union of Students and the International Students Conference to collaborate with the General Union of Palestine Students in organising a periodical International Seminar on the Palestine Problem. It calls on all Student Organisations to adopt a United Stand against all attempts seeking the admission of the Israel Students Union in the I.U.S., and to see to its expulsion from the International Students Conference.

*

**MESSAGE FROM SECOND WORLD
CONFERENCE ON PALESTINE
September 2 - 6, 1970 - AMMAN**

In the course of the Second World Conference on Palestine held in Amman from 2 to 6 September, 1970, about 200 delegates representing nearly 100 national and international organizations, national liberation movements and countries expressed their opinion on the main issues concerning the Palestinian struggle for liberation.

It was clearly recognized by the Conference that the causes of war in the Middle East and threat to world peace are to be seen in the imperialist, colonialist and racist nature of the Zionist settler state of Israel.

The conference declared that Zionism is a racist, colonialist movement set on uprooting a people from its ancestral homeland. The conference denounced the murder of civilian populations through bombardments with napalm, mass arrests, tortures and deportations.

The crimes of Zionism are a necessary tool of imperialism — of the strongest and most aggressive imperialism, namely, US imperialism. The heroic struggle of the Palestinian people is situated among

the historic struggles for liberation of the Arab peoples of the world against the same international policeman: US — imperialism, which is found everywhere with the same ferociousness.

After discussing the nature of Zionism and acquainting themselves with all aspects of the Palestinian Revolution, the conferees proceeded to discuss the Rogers «Peace» fraud and the Palestinian Revolution's avowed objective to establish a «democratic state» in Palestine.

The Conference fully rejected the November 22, 1967 Security Council Resolution in all its forms and manners of application, including the Rogers Plan, for the following reasons:

1. It is a compromise solution between absolute right and absolute usurpation.
2. It represents a retreat in front of a Zionist-imperialist conquest.
3. It attempts to deal with the occupation of 1967 by justifying the usurpation of 1948.
4. It provides recognition of Israel's «sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence» which is irreconcilable with international law and the inalienable rights of Palestinians.

5. It treats the Palestine problem as a problem of «refugees» whereas the Palestine problem is one of conquest and colonization calling for liberation. It is impossible to move from occupation to peace without liberation.

6. It implies the liquidation of the Palestinian Revolution. The conferees themselves lived through such an attempt throughout their stay in Amman during the first week of September.

7. It implies an eventual Zionist-imperialist economic domination of the Arab World.

8. It hinders the prospects of Arab unity.

The conference thus considered the Palestinian popular war for national liberation as one of the most important contributions to the worldwide anti-imperialist struggle for just peace in the world.

The conference strongly upheld the inalienable right of Palestinians to self-determination as a people and their basic rights as individuals.

The conference declared its full solidarity and support to the Palestinian struggle for national liberation and its avowed intention to establish a unitary democratic, non sectarian state in Palestine.

The conference also appealed to the Arab forces which accepted the November 22, 1967 Security Council Resolution and the Rogers Plan to realize the dangers inherent in such acceptance.

That is why, along with the Central Committee of the Palestinian Resistance Movement, the Conference calls upon all peoples to denounce the Rogers plan and to realize that support to the Palestinian Revolution signifies struggle against this plot and the refusal of the pretention of the Big Powers or any other power to decide on the destiny of a people without even hearing its voice.

The Conferees further pledged to endeavor, in their respective countries, to struggle for the aims and objectives of the Palestinian Revolution.

Considering the situation of the revolution and liberation struggle in the world, the Second World Conference on Palestine proclaimed its full support to the peoples of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos who are struggling against US aggressors and their lackeys and demand the immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of the aggression troops of the US and its satellites out of Indochina and request that the peoples of Indochina be left to decide their own destiny.

The Conference declared its firm support to the national liberation movements led by the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America, particularly in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Namibia, Eritrea and the Arabian Gulf. The Conference declared its support also to the progressive forces struggling against fascist regimes in Iran, Greece, Ireland, Portugal and Spain. It declared its complete solidarity with the struggle of the oppressed and exploited classes in Europe, including emigrant workers, and the whole world; and with the Black Movement in the United States. ■

BOOK REVIEWS

From Haven to Conquest – Edited by Walid Khalidi. Published by the Institute for Palestine Studies (P.O.B. 7164), Beirut, Lebanon. Anthology Series No. 2. 914 pages, L.L. 36, \$12.

The Palestine problem now occupies more newspaper space than almost any other in the world. But there is still only a vague idea in the West about the historical background to the problem. The Institute for Palestine Studies, Beirut, has just published a new book which is designed to fill this gap. The book is «From Haven to Conquest.»

«From Haven to Conquest,» is an anthology of reading in the history of Zionism and Palestine from 1897 until the establishment of Israel in 1948. It describes the central theme in the Palestine tragedy, the process by which, the movement to create a

Jewish state succeeded in wresting control of Palestine from its Arab inhabitants.

Explaining the theme of the anthology, the editor writes the following in his introduction to the book:

«The items in this anthology have been selected to illustrate the central theme in the Palestine tragedy, which is the process by which Zionism has sought to wrest control of Palestine and its surroundings from the Arabs. This process passed through two main phases. The first ended in 1948. In this year the Zionists crushed Palestinian resistance, and created both the Palestinian Arab Diaspora and the State of Israel. The latter in the greater part of Palestine.

«The second phase is still with us. It has been characterized respectively by the consolidation of the territorial conquests of 1948 through the systematic expropriation of Arab homes and farms and the pouring into them of the Jewish Diaspora, the steady and successful probing into adjoining Arab territory beyond the Armistice lines in the years 1949-56, the abortive military bid for the vast Egyptian territory in 1956-57, and the trebling of Israeli-occupied territory by the three-pronged invasion of Egypt Syria and Jordan in 1967.

«This volume covers the first phase only... The title of the present volume encapsulates the spectrum of modes resorted to by the Zionists on the verbal and implementational levels of action. At one end, the note is low-keyed, ingratiating, almost plaintive, as in the message sent in 1899 by Theodor Herzl, the founder of the World Zionist Organization, to the Palestinian Arab mayor of Jerusalem (Chapter 9). At the other, can be heard the arrogant accents of the military conqueror in 1948 (Chapter 71).»

The majority of items selected are written by men distinguished for their specialized knowledge or first-hand experience of the subject — cabinet ministers and colonial administrators of the time, university professors, missionaries, journalists, Zionist leaders and diplomats, — many of whom played a leading role in the events they describe.

The Introduction to the book explains the nature of the items chosen and the principles of selection. The editor explains:

«First, this is not a documentary collection. Only a few items are documents in the strict sense. The bulk are chapters from books and memoirs or articles from periodical literature. Secondly, with one exception all the items have a non-Arab author-

ship. They are by Britishers, Americans, Israelis, as well as by a Spaniard, a Dutch authoress, an Indian, a Pakistani, a Philippino, a Frenchman and a Swede.

«At least 30 of the 80 items which make up this anthology are by Jews. Of these, 30 items by Jewish authorship, only two are by avowed anti-Zionist Jews. With perhaps one exception: the other items of Jewish authorship are not even critical of Zionism. They are, indeed, by avowed Zionist Jews.

«Thirdly, the authors have been selected with an eye to the authority and experience from which they speak. They do not include lunatic-fringe apologists but expert people speaking from first hand or eye-witness knowledge.»

Selections from books, memoirs or articles, which constitute the basis of the anthology are supplemented by useful and enlightening historical documents. All nationalities and beliefs involved are presented among the authors of items selected, but the largest single number of contributions is drawn from the writings of the Zionists themselves.

The anthology is chronologically divided into four parts, climaxing in descriptions of the 1948 war. Part I portrays the background of the Palestine problem. Part II covers the period from 1919 to 1939,

when the Zionists established themselves firmly in Palestine under British protection. In Part III, the subsequent shift of the Zionists from Britain to America as chief ally is outlined, while Part IV deals with the American-sponsored United recommendation to partition Palestine and the ensuing Zionist attempt to incorporate the entire country into a Jewish state during 1948.

The book has an excellent 60-pages introduction which does not limit the scope of its discussion to introducing the contents of the anthology but also presents a penetrative analysis of the Palestine problem. There are also several appendices on selected topics. ■

Resistance



Negotiations - Israel Style

RESISTANCE

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Enclosed please find cheque for

covering a year's subscription

to RESISTANCE (12 issues)

Name

Address

City Country

Mail to :

**RESISTANCE (P.L.A.)
P. O. Box 3577**

Please send cheques through Central Bank of
Syria - Damascus

Rates : \$ 7.00, £ 3.00, L.S. 25.00

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



EAST OF THE RIVER

Original painting by:
Naseer Chaura

In the Jordan River, Christ was baptized 2000 years ago. The place in which the Son of Bethlehem was baptized has now become the ford through which Palestinians, fleeing Zionist terror, cross to the east, chased by volleys of fire from the hills from which Christ spread peace and love to the whole world.

(Courtesy of:
Palestine Publications House - Damascus).



J.M.W. TURNER
1844

See inside cover