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THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE ARAB-ISRAELI CONFRONTATION

INTRODUCTION

This study proposes to examine the factors and elements which were responsible for the Arab Israeli conflict with the aid of authentic records and to explain and examine the position of the two contending parties, i.e. Israel and the Arabs in the United Nations, particularly with reference to the attempts of the world body to solve the Palestine problem, which threatens peace and stability of the Middle East.

The response of people towards various problems should result from a study of the genesis and an understanding of the true nature of these problems. It should follow moral principles and support legal issues with a deep consideration for justice, truth and peace.

Even though it is almost impossible to be objective yet this work essentially aims to ascertain the facts dispassionately regarding the rival claims of the Arabs and the Israelis concerning the Palestine question. It is assumed that the solution of this problem would satisfy all the peace-loving people, who confirm their faith in solving world problems through peaceful means in accordance with the United Nations Charter. Such an endeavour would further strengthen their belief in the principle of peaceful coexistence among nations and their desire to achieve dignity and prosperity for the human family.

The motivating forces behind the Arab Israeli antagonism
which caused the West Asian crisis would best be understood if the historical background is kept in mind.

The distant past is related with both the recent past and the present. Since time immemorial the two communities - the Arabs and the Israelis - regard Palestine as their homeland. The Zionists call it Israel, but to the Arabs it is Palestine.

The Arabs have no quarrel with the Jews, as members of a religious faith, or as members of a particular race. As for religion, the Arabs consider Jews to be members of the Monotheistic Community of the "People of the Book", and as such they are accorded reverence. Both religions have many patriarchs and prophets in common. As for race, both Arabs and Jews are semitic in origin.

But when the Zionists intended to create and then succeeded in establishing a state of their own in Palestine by driving out about one million Arabs who had been living peacefully in their own homes and their own land, that they had inherited from their forefathers, the Arab-Israeli conflict started. It is a conflict between two nationalist forces, i.e. Arab nationalism and Zionism, it is essentially a political and ideological conflict caused by the damage done by the Zionist movement to the indigenous population of Palestine, also to the Jews and to Judaism. Professor Toynbee was subscribing to this point of view, when he spoke at the Annual meeting of the American Council for Judaism held at Philadelphia in May 1961. The world renowned historian warned: (1)

"The watchword of anti-Semitism is "Back to Medieval apartheid", the watchword of Zionism is "Back to the Medieval ghetto". Commenting on the establishment of Israel and its possible repercussions on Judaism, he said: "All the far-flung ghettos in the world are to be gathered into one patch of soil in Palestine to create a single consolidated ghetto there".

A new organization, Jewish Alternatives to Zionism Inc. (JA2), has recently been formed by several prominent American Jews, which is opposing Zionists who, in the opinion of its members, are degenerating Judaism. The main purpose of this organization is to conduct an educational programme revealing the real issues involved in Arab Israeli conflict and thereby promote the cause of peace in the Middle East by rejecting the nationality claims propounded by the Zionist Israel's "Jewish People" group. Elmer Berger, a distinguished Rabbi (high priest) and one of the most eminent Jewish leaders in the United States, acting executive of JA2, who has been crusading in Europe, against the Zionist attempts to degenerate Judaism into a fanatic and expansionist ideology, says: (2) "Our goal is to destroy this dangerous idea that the Jewish religion should be linked up with Israel and consequently with Zionism. Judaism is a religion, while Zionism is a political idea, initiated by Herzl to solve a certain problem under specific circumstances".

There is a vast difference between a Jew and a Zionist.

2. He was interviewed in Europe by the correspondent of the Egyptian weekly magazine Al-Musawar. Translated into English in Al-Arab, vol. 7, No. 8, August 1968, New Delhi.
A Jew is one who believes in Judaism, which Arabs regard as a noble religion, whereas Zionism seeks to provide Jews with a political and national orientation extrinsic to their normal sense of belonging which seeks to demolish the organic nationhood of Arabs. Israel was supposed to "constitute a British imperialist beachhead to the north of the Suez Canal" says Taylor. (3) It professes and preaches the doctrine of a superior race and political supremacy of the chosen few, which is against the principles of love and egalitarianism preached by the Prophets. As observed by the British M.P. Ian Gilmour: (4) "The Zionist difficulty was that the country which they aspired to appropriate was already occupied by another people. Hence the setting up of a Zionist state entailed two things; the moving in of Jews and the moving out of Arabs. The second was not an after thought, still less a fortunate coincidence. It was long intended and ruthlessly carried out...." Gilmour adds: "Apartheid was the ideal. Land bought by the Jewish National Fund became legally, racially "Jewish"; and had always to remain so, while Arab tenants and labourers were evicted in large number...."

He had already given an analysis of the problem (5) in an

article to the *Spectator Magazine* (June 24, 1960), wherein he said: "Since the basis of Zionism is that Jewish assimilation in other countries is in the long run impossible and that anti-Semitism and persecution are bound to break out sooner or later, Zionism has almost a vested interest in racial discrimination. The Israelis mount 'rescue operations' to save allegedly threatened Jews in other countries...." He added: "In the Arab countries, Jewish difficulties and immigration to Israel were the result not of anti-Semitism but of Zionist activities and the existence of the State of Israel. Zionism aggravated the disease that it professed to cure."

The quarrel of the Arabs, therefore, is only with Zionism, which rests squarely on intolerance, bigotry and obscurantism. (6)

Erskine H. Childers, the noted author wrote: (7) "The very basis of the post-war Palestine struggle was an appeal to the world's humanitarianism over a situation deliberately designed to canalize that human instinct into one premise: Jewish statehood in Palestine." "None of us who remember the emotional atmosphere of the time can dismiss the role this Zionist campaign played in all that followed. The evidence of the campaign, though suppressed by Zionists and conveniently forgotten by Western liberals who


knew about it, is overwhelming. It is detailed in White House conversation which was publicly acknowledged, for example, by Sulzberger of the New York Times, who asked in 1946, "In God's name why should the fate of all these unhappy people be subordinated to the single cry of statehood."

The Arab-Israeli confrontation is now, in essence, the revolt and resistance by the children of Palestine for the liberation of their homeland, to vindicate their past and nationhood, and secondarily an Arab-Israeli conflict. "In fact", says an Israeli lecturer, London University Professor Machower, "The conflict was always primarily concerned with the Arabs of Palestine stripped off their national rights and driven from their lands". (8) The Palestine-Arabs struggle to lead both Arabs and Jews in Palestine to usher in another era of peace, cooperation, goodwill and prosperity for all the inhabitants of the unhappy land. The Jewish community had previously lived in the different Arab countries in harmony and had flourished throughout the centuries of Medieval Arab rule. Moshe Menuhin says (9): "In Moslem countries (sometimes in Egypt, sometimes in Baghdad and most of all in the caliphate of Corodoba), Jews were accorded decent treatment. In the history of the Jews such periods stand out as "golden ages"."

Ceraetz, the author of a ten-volume classic history of the Jews, has "pointed out most emphatically, that the legal and

actual position of the Jews during the Middle Ages was much better in the Muslim - Arab countries than in Christian Europe; and the 'Golden Age' of Judaism in Muslim Spain has become a phrase which has found its way even into the most popular accounts of Jewish history." (10)

There has been, in fact, no anti-Jewish feeling among the Arabs. They had full sympathy for the Jews and condemned Nazi Germany and its policy of persecution.

The Arabs received the Jews with open arms and extended to them hearty welcome by granting them places of refuge in their lands. Herzl had taken note of "the friendly attitude of the population" (11) of Palestine. Then at that time the Arabs could not comprehend the Zionist design of establishing a Jewish state by expelling the indigenous people of Palestine. The Zionists had a definite plan of installing a Jewish state. Moshe Menuhin, a prominent American Jew observed: (12) "Dr Herzl badly wanted to secure Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people. But he made up his mind, in spite of the stubborn and "benighted" Russian-Polish Jews, that in case he could not possibly secure Palestine for them, they would simply have to accept, at least temporarily,


12. Menuhin, Moshe, op. cit., p. 43.
some sort of Jewish homeland, be it in Syria, Sinai, El-Arish
Cyprus, Tripoli, Portuguese Mozambique, the Belgian Congo, Uganda -
in any one of these territories for which he was always "negot-
tiating".

However, to the Palestine Arabs, the rehabilitation of the
Jews in their country appears as a gross betrayal and denial of
their birth-right. When they were being driven away from their
hearth and homes, how could they accept or can accept expulsion,
expropriation and tidal waves of Zionist expansionism?

R. K. Nehru (India) former Secretary-General, Ministry of
External Affairs, also said: (13) "Is it surprising that the Arabs
have reacted strongly to their displacement by a foreign community
which is largely of European origin? Would any other country have
reacted differently if it had been exposed to a similar experience?"

Up to the Balfour Declaration in 1917, the Jews in Palestine,
"who were one twelfth of the population and owned 24% of the total
area of Palestine", (14) had always lived quietly and at peace and
harmony in Palestine and the wider Arab World.

It is established by the official statistics of the mandat-
dory Government of Palestine, which were submitted to the United
Nations in 1947 that Jewish property in Palestine was a meagre 5.66%

13. R. K. Nehru, Al Arab, New Delhi, vol. 6, No. 5, July 1967,
p. 3.

14. Appendix VI to the Report of Sub-Committee 2 to the Ad Hoc
Committee on the Palestine Question, Document A/AC 14/32
of November 11, 1947, p. 278. Also Government of Palestine,
A Survey of Palestine 1945-1946, p. 144. Ibid., Table 7c,
p. 149, Ibid., p. 143. See Appendix 1.
out of the total area of the country. (See Appendix I) The fact that the Jews were never discriminated against by the Arabs is well borne out by Dr Elmer Berger, who quoted in his book *Who Know Better Must Say So*, a letter written to him by a well-known Jew, Elias Cohen, wherein he said (15) that "Arabs and Jews have always enjoyed in this country complete freedom, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of trade and freedom of commerce ...... as a matter of fact, Jews here have never felt anti-Semitism or discrimination*.

The political challenge to Palestine did not come from the Jewish community within it, but from the Zionist Movement which was nourished and fostered from without, always with motives of expansion and aggrandizement at the cost of Arabs. The expansionist design of political Zionist movement was fully supported by British Imperialism which was in an alliance with the Zionist Movement for its own vested interest.

Sir Winston Churchill is reported to have said: (16) "A State under the protection of the British Crown, which might comprise three or four million Jews, an event will have occurred which would especially be in harmony with the truest interests of the British Empire." As a matter of fact the British War Cabinet had received


16. First statement made by Ahmad Shukairy (Chairman of the Executive Committee to Palestine Liberation Organisation) before the Special Committee of the General Assembly at its 399th meeting held on 5 November 1963, at 10.30 a.m. U.N. Doc. A/SPC/PV. 399.
a note from no less important a Zionist than Weizman (17) saying: "In submitting our resolution we have entrusted our national and Zionist destiny to the Foreign Office and the Imperial War Cabinet, in the hope that the problem would be considered in the light of imperial interests and the principles for which the Entente stands."

Palestine, due to its strategic position, was of vital importance to the future of British imperialism, which aimed at the consolidation of its presence in India, Egypt and other parts of Asia and Africa. The strategic importance of the Middle East was well described by Secretary Acheson of America when he said: (18) "Middle East is a region of great importance to us because of its people, its resources, strategic position, and vital communication arteries". Anthony Nutting also observed that Palestine was, to Britain, (19) "a base from which to exercise a dominant influence in and around the Arab world". The transplantation of alien people on to the soil of Palestine would, it was thought, serve as the watch-dog of imperial interests in the area; besides the inclusion of Palestine within its sphere of influence. The Zionist enclave would help to control the nascent Arab struggle for freedom.


"But before one is driven to accept the fact of Israel," says one of the few elder statesmen of India, Jaya Prakash Narayan (20): "let it be stated clearly that the transplantation of a foreign people on to a soil to which they had no right, and at the cost of dispossessing the indigenous population was an act of high international immorality. That this operation helped to establish a bridge-head of Western imperialism in a sensitive and strategic area that had risen to throw off the shackles of the self-same imperialism, further compounds that immorality".

Israel in portraying itself as synonymous to Judaism and inclusive of all the Jews bases its claim to Palestine on the following premises:

1. Religious Feeling and Historical Rights

It is claimed that the Bible promised Abraham that Palestine would belong to his seed, namely, to the Jews. They argue, therefore, that the setting up of a Jewish state in Palestine is a fulfilment of God's promise and the attainment of the "Divine Right" of Jews to Palestine.

A number of distinguished scholars and authorities in religion have carefully studied the Bible and analyzed its contents and their labours have enabled the laymen to understand the deeper meanings of the Bible and to make their goodwill count towards the

truth and "infuse good blood salutarily into a sickening situation." (21)

They agree on the following: (22)

a) The Biblical prophecy applies to the Arabs, who claim descent through Ishmael, as well as the Jews, who claim descent through Israel.

b) When Abraham made a covenant with God through circumcision, (Genesis XVII, 8) and was promised all the land of Canaan to be his for ever-lasting possession, Isaac the ancestor of the Jews, not born at that time; it was Ishmael the ancestor of the


22. See Dr Alfred Guillaume, Professor of Old Testament Studies at the University of London, Israel According to Holy Scriptures (Cedar Rapid, Ingram Press), pp. 11-15.

Dr William H. Stinespring, Professor of New Testament and Semitics at Duke University, North Carolina and a Minister in the Presbyterian Church, Ibid., pp. 6-9.

Dr Ovid a* Sellers, former Professor of Old Testament and Dean of McCormick Theological Seminary and Minister in the United Presbyterian Church, Ibid., pp. 29-31.

Dr Frank Stagg, Professor of New Testament at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in New Orleans, Ibid., p. 28.


Dr Elmer Berger, a distinguished Jewish Rabbi, Ibid., pp. 19-25.
Arabs who was circumcised. Thus Palestine was "promised" by God, if at all, to the Arabs.

c) Many non-Jews are descendants of Abraham, and a sizeable proportion of Jews are not descendants of Abraham.

d) The divine promises to the patriarchs have been annulled by the apostasy of the Jews.

e) Prophecies once fulfilled need not and cannot be fulfilled again literally, especially in modern times, since the prophecy of the "return" was fulfilled when the Jews returned to Judea after their captivity, re-erected the walls of Jerusalem and rebuilt the Temple. And there is no "Second Return" mentioned in the Holy Scriptures.

f) Trying to make an ancient text fit literally to the geographical, historical and political conditions of today, some three thousand years later, is to deny the processes of change which God has so obviously decreed for human history.

Distinguished scholars have also similarly refuted or rejected the theory of "historical rights" (23) on the ground that Palestine has been an Arab land.


Khoury, Fred J. (Villanova University), The Arab-Israeli Dilemma, Syracuse University Press, pp. 1-2; Also A.S.A. Chari, Historical Background of the West Asian Crisis,

(footnote contd. on next page)
2. **Persecution**

Do Nazi and European atrocities confer on Jews the right to have a separate state of their own in a territory which does not belong to them? Can European or world conscience be salved by the forcible dispossession of the Arabs and rehabilitation of the Jews at the expense of the Arabs?

The *Ceylon Observer* expressed sympathy for the Jews and condemned Nazi atrocities but criticized the Jewish infiltration in Palestine. The Ceylonese newspaper commented that if the Jews were discriminated against "that does not mean that the Jews who made the new State of Israel have a right to deny the Arabs their homes and make them a new persecuted inferior people. This aspect of the problem has been forgotten in the crisis which frequently torment the Middle East." (24)

Moshe Menuhin says: (25) "It would be an offence against the principles of elementary justice if these innocent victims of the

---

(Previous footnote contd.)

published by The Indian Preparatory Committee, International Conference in support of the Arab peoples, New Delhi, Nov. 11 to 14, 1967, p. 2.

Shapiro, Harry L., Chairman of the Department of Anthropology at the American Museum of Natural History States that the Jews are not a clan, a tribe or in a strict sense a nation. See Shapiro, Harry L. *The Jewish People: A Biographical History*, UNESCO, 1960. pp. 74-75.


conflict were denied the right to return to their homes while Jewish immigrants flow into Palestine."

3. The Balfour Declaration

The most serious claim to Palestine by Zionists is based on this Declaration. (26)

On November 2, 1917 the British Government published a statement of policy (later known as the 'Balfour Declaration') in the form of a letter from Mr Arthur James Balfour, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to Lord Rothschild, a leader of the Zionist Movement. The letter reads:

Foreign Office
November 2nd, 1917

Dear Lord Rothschild,

I have much pleasure in conveying to you on behalf of His Majesty's Government the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations which has been submitted to and approved by the cabinet:

'His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.'

I should be grateful if you would bring this declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

Yours sincerely,

Sd: ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR

According to the Arabs (as well as a number of world famous jurists, authors and politicians), the Balfour Declaration was illegal and immoral as it was made without the consent or knowledge of the inhabitants of Palestine. It was contrary to the principles of national self-determination and democracy and was inconsistent with the pledges given to the Arabs before and after the date it was made. (27)

Anthony Nutting, who was a minister in the Eden Cabinet was both frank and forthright when he observed: (28)

"Today, after the lapse of five bitter decades the national home for the Jewish people has become the national state of Israel and the civil rights of the Arabs of Palestine lie trampled under the heel of an Israeli army of occupation. How has this seemingly great humanitarian gesture, the Balfour Declaration, turned so sour and left such a trail of bitterness and agony in its wake?

...The national home, the Arabs were assured would not be allowed to become a national state and the civil and religious rights of the non-Jewish communities - which was quaint, if not rather sinister, description of a 92 per cent Arab majority - would be safeguarded...."


The Times (London), April 17, 1964 - Light on Britain's Palestine Promise, and ensuing correspondence.


Others also wrote about this Declaration:

"The Balfour Declaration must, therefore, not be regarded as a promise given from sentimental motives; it was a practical measure taken in the interests of a common cause at a moment when that cause could afford to neglect no factor of material or moral assistance". (29)

By sponsoring the programme of Zionist colonisation, Britain intended to further reciprocal interests, especially when Sultan Abdul-Hamid of Ottoman Empire refused Herzl's offer: (30) "If His Majesty the Sultan gave us Palestine we could undertake to put the finances of Turkey in order. For Europe, we should form part of its bulwark against Asia; we should be the advance guard of civilisations against barbarism. As a neutral State, we should keep in constant touch with all Europe, which would have to guarantee our existence."

The Sultan's answer was unequivocally firm and definite. (31) "The Turkish Empire does not belong to me but to the Turkish people. I cannot give away any part of it. Let the Jews spare their millions. When my Empire is divided up they can have Palestine for nothing. But it will only be our dead body which is cut up; I shall never agree to vivisection".

The Zionist leaders followed a policy of shifting the emphasis of their aims from a 'home' for persecuted Jews to a full-fledged

political state.

During the British Mandate, the aims and ends of Zionism were furthered gradually and piecemeal, despite unrelenting opposition by the Arabs. Arab appeals, protests, arguments and demonstrations failed to make the British Government respect their pledges to protect Arab rights and stop the ever-increasing flow of Jewish immigrants. The British Government went back on its words given to the Arabs. The White Paper of June 1922 gave an assurance that the creation of a Jewish state was 'impracticable' and Britain "have no such aim in view". The White Paper of 1922 further promised not to allow the disappearance or the subordination of the Arabic population, language or culture in Palestine.

The White Paper of 1939 promised to establish "within a period of ten years, an independent Palestinian state in which no more than one third of the population would be Jews". The White Paper further stipulated that 'no further immigration was to be allowed unless the Arabs of Palestine are prepared to acquiesce in it". Great Britain flouted all these promises with impunity and included an alliance with Zionism encouraging in its design of creation a Jewish State in Palestine.

Britain was trying to stand on two stools and following a policy of duplicity. Ramsay Macdonald attacked the British policy of making both the Arabs and the Jews happy. Referring to promises made by Britain to the Arabs and the Jews, he warned (32) the British Government in 1922: "The story is one of crude duplicity, and we

32. The Daily Star (Beirut), June 29, 1969.
cannot expect to escape the reprobation which is bound to follow as a sequel".

"It is not the Arabs who will choose to colonise Palestine, it is us," (33) said Golda Meir.

"The Basle Programme" wrote Davis Triestch (34) to Theodore Herzl "must contain the words 'Great Palestine' or 'Palestine and its neighbouring lands' - otherwise it's nonsense. You do not get the ten million Jews into a land of 25,000 km."

From the very beginning thus their aim was the Zionisation and de-Arabisation of Palestine.

To enlist general support and wide sympathy the Zionists initially demanded a 'national Home' and denied in public any intention of establishing a political state. In 1942, however, they openly admitted in a Zionist conference held at Biltmore Hotel, New York, known as 'biltmore Program' in which, as General Patrick J. Hurley, personal representative of President Roosevelt, reported to the President: (35)

"The Zionist Organisation in Palestine has indicated its commitment to an enlarged program for:

1. a sovereign Jewish State which could embrace Palestine and probably eventually Transjordan;


2. an eventual transfer of the Arab population from Palestine to Iraq;

3. Jewish leadership for the whole Middle East in the fields of economic development and control.

"Some people tend to think and react as if it were a religious conflict between the Muslims and the Jews and/or a racial one between the Jews and the Arabs"; says Professor S. A. Haqqi in his detached and analytical article "India, Israel and the West Asian Crisis". (36) He continues: "it is neither the one, nor the other."

"It is, on the other hand, a politico-economic struggle between the Arabs who have lived there for centuries and want to live there in peace and with dignity, and the aggressive militant Zionists, who want to colonise Palestine with Jews drawn from all over the world, particularly with Western Jewry, to dominate and exploit West Asia.

The great apostle of peace and justice Mahatma Gandhi said: (37) "I have all my sympathies with Jews. But sympathy does not blind me to the requirements of justice. The cry for the national home for Jews does not make much appeal to me. Palestine belongs to the Arabs in the same sense that England belongs to the English or France to the French. It is wrong to impose the Jews on the Arabs.... nothing can be said against the Arab resistance in the face of overwhelming odds."

"Palestine was an Arab country and Arab interests must prevail there," said Jawaharlal Nehru. (38)

37. The Harijan, November 26, 1938.
38. The Hindu (Madras), December 17, 1938.
After the Allied victory, the Jewish immigration increased rapidly through waves of immigrants which made for a phenomenal increase of the Jewish population in Palestine. Whereas the Jewish population had numbered only 194,610 and of a total population of 1,035,821, in 1931, rose to 554,000 out of 1,764,000 in 1944, it later jumped to 650,000 Jews out of 2,065,000.

Jews built up their military strength through para-military organizations, the Haganah, the Irgun, and the Stern Gang, to use violence and terrorism. They killed many Arabs as well as English personnel in Palestine. (42) The facts were clear - terrorism and expansionism, pure and simple. Even Sir Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister had to say in the House of Commons on November 17, 1944: (43)

"If our dreams for Zionism are to end in the smoke of assassins' pistols and our labours for its future are to produce a new set of gangsters worthy of Nazi Germany, many like myself will have to reconsider the position we have maintained so consistently and so long in the past. If there is to be any hope of a peaceful and successful future of Zionism, these wicked activities must cease and those responsible for them must be destroyed, root and branch."

40. Ibid., p. 143.
42. Government of Palestine, Supplementary Memorandum to UNSCOP, p. 14.
But the Zionist lobby was too strong both in U.S.A. and Britain, and the establishment of a pro-West enclave in Palestine too alluring for Western interests for anything positive to come out of such a scathing appraisal of Zionist activities in the Holy Land. Besides the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. emerged after the war as two Super Powers while Britain was weakened and exhausted and was in no position to carry on the White Man's Burden.

The British Foreign Secretary announced in the House of Commons on February 18, 1947, that His Majesty's Government had found (44) that "the Mandate has proved to be unworkable in practice, that the obligations undertaken to the two communities had been shown to be irreconcilable."

The reason given was that Jews and Arabs "were unable to agree on the solution desired by it." Britain admitted its inability to solve the problem and to administer Palestine indefinitely. The United Kingdom requested the U.N. Secretary-General (45) "to place the question of Palestine on the Agenda of the General Assembly at its next regular session."

---

44. *Palestine, Supplementary Memorandum to UNSCOP*, p. 27.
Britain, after the First World War, was compelled by considerations of strategy and power politics, to support Arab nationalism to dismember Ottoman Empire - an ally of the central powers.

The Middle East was of immense significance for British Imperial interest since it served as an "overland route" to India. Britain's imperial interests in the area, which included control over the Suez Canal and keeping the area immuned from Big Power rivalry, were now better served by supporting the Arab's revolt against Turkey. Britain could not maintain her sole and exclusive authority over the area and had to share it with other powers, especially France.

Anglo-French rivalry over Middle East was a serious threat to British hegemony and Britain wanted to ensure her supremacy over the Suez Canal by controlling the Sinai Peninsula and Palestine. The Cold War between Britain and France was intensified in 1916, Palestine was internationalized. British imperialism was now being challenged more than ever and the British statesmen in their last bid to save it, concluded an alliance with Zionist colonialism. The Zionists had secured British support for a Zionist dominated Palestine. The Zionists had a coveted eye on Palestine and were planning to carve out a homeland for the Jews. They preferred Britain over France for the realization of their long cherished dream. Dr Chaim Weizmann gave reason for such a preference when he wrote: (1)

"As colonizers and colonial administrators the British were superior to the French. It was the Jews who gave substance and reality to the idea of a British protectorate - which afterwards took the form of a mandate over Palestine."

The reciprocal interests of Britain and Zionism have been clearly described by an Arab scholar: (2)

"On the one hand, Britain, by utilizing Zionist influence in the United States and in France, would avert international rule in Palestine, on the pretext that a British sponsored program of Zionist colonization required British rule in Palestine. On the other hand, by playing a catalytic role in bringing about the designation of Britain as the ruling power in Palestine, Zionism would at last be able to embark upon the long awaited program of large scale colonization in the coveted territory under the auspices and protection of a Great Power."

This alliance between British Imperialism and Zionist colonialism found its expression in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 proclaiming its support for the establishment of a "Jewish National Home" in Palestine. At Peace Conference the Zionists recommended British mandatory rule in Palestine.

Britain, during her thirty years' rule, sucked the blood of Palestinian Arabs and rendered them impotent to face organized and planned assault of Zionist terrorists. Britain encouraged Jewish immigration into Palestine because she was committed to help the Jews in carving out a "Jewish National Home". The price for British support to the idea of National Home was Jewish support to the Allied cause. Lloyd George has admitted: (3)

"The Zionist leaders gave us definite promise that if the Allies committed themselves to giving facilities for the establishment of national home for the Jews in Palestine, they would do their best to rally Jewish sentiment and support throughout the world to the Allied cause. They kept their word".

It was Britain's turn to keep her word which she did at the cost of Arab lives and properties. Britain encouraged Jewish immigration into Palestine. In 1882, the Jewish population in Palestine was 24,000 only. Between 1904 and 1914, another 40,000 Jews came and settled down. By 1918, the Jews in Palestine were 56,671 in number.

From 1919 to 1923 the average of the Jews coming to Palestine was 9,000 per year.

Between 1924 and 1931, 84,000 Jews came from Poland. Between 1931 and 1939, 265,000 immigrants came from Central Europe. The British Government tried to restrict immigration but illegal immigration was encouraged by powerful Jewish agencies like Haganah and other para military organizations.

On 15 May 1948, the number of Jews in Palestine was 649,633.

The Arab people of Palestine were not only deprived of the political control of their own country but also of their country as well. The Jewish immigration posed a grave danger to local Moslem and Christian population of Palestine. The Palestinian Arabs were forced to leave their homes under terror and threat to their lives by the Zionists. Britain failed to fulfil her responsibility as a
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mandatory power to protect the life and property of peoples of Palestine. Britain had her own interest in the establishment of a Jewish State. According to Nutting: (6)

"World War II had exhausted Britain's resources and she was no longer able to sustain such a base for herself. So, she and her western allies had introduced this alien European State of Israel to do for her and for them what she could no longer do for herself, to take over the garrison role which Britain could no longer sustain and to act as beach head for Britain and western designs upon the Arab world."

The Anglo-Zionist alliance cracked under Zionist pressure during the World War II. Whenever Zionists accelerated and intensified Jewish immigration into Palestine, Britain resisted because it was a threat to her presence in Palestine. The Second World War struck the last nail in Anglo-Zionist alliance coffin.

After the Second World War, Britain was rendered very weak militarily and economically and her withdrawal from India diminished her interest in the Zionist cause. The emergence of sovereign Arab States and their opposition to political Zionism forced Britain to exercise a certain amount of restraint in her support for Jewish National Home in Palestine.

The emergence of the United States of America was the most important post-world war phenomenon. Political Zionism found in the USA a new but very powerful ally. The United States of America wanted to support Zionism because she had her own vested interest in it. Israel could have been the safest bet to counter Arab radicalism which might threaten American oil interests in the Middle East. The

United States of America was supporting Jewish state to contain expanding Soviet communism in West Asia. Winston Churchill showed his concern in his famous "Iron Curtain" speech delivered at Fulton in March 1946. He told his audience that the Soviet Union had succeeded in establishing "in a greater number of countries far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world communist fifth column". He was well aware of Britain's inability to fight Russian Communism, so he wanted the USA to take up the job. He made an appeal to the USA: (7)

"The United States at this time is at the pinnacle of world power. If you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done but also you must feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. Opportunity is here now, clear and shining for both our countries".

Secretary Dulles expressed the same feelings when he told the American Senate: (8) "It would be abhorrent and dangerous if that area (the Middle East) were ruled by International Communism; yet that is the present danger".

The Soviet Union was conducting its battle of carving out areas of influence in the Middle East with utmost strategy and caution. It chose to support Jewish claim of a state not because it loved the zionist cause. Its reason to support the Zionist cause was related to Russia's efforts not to allow Zionist activity within its borders. The Zionist leaders were generally 'progressives' or leftists, and the Kremlin could very well expect the new state to be the advance ground of socialism in an underdeveloped and backward area.


The Soviet leaders could also perhaps believe that the installation of an alien state on Arab soil would disturb the status quo and create trouble and turmoil in the area. The Russian design was to fish in troubled waters and gain a footing in a strategically important area. The Russian support for the Zionist cause was also aimed at strengthening the hands of the Communist Party in Palestine.

Palestine became a hot bed of big power intrigues and Zionist terrorist activities. Great Britain had always supported and cooperated with Jewish para-military organizations. The Arab population of Palestine became the victims of Zionist terror. Britain as a mandatory power failed to fulfil its obligations under the Covenant of the League of Nations. It became victim of its own misdeeds. The monster it created was threatening its own existence in Palestine and its best efforts to bring normalcy in the area and find a solution agreeable to both parties did not bear any fruit. Britain’s mandatory government realized its impotency and on February 18, 1947 the British Foreign Secretary announced in the House of Commons that His Majesty’s Government had intentions of giving up mandate because it “has proved to be unworkable in practice, that the obligations undertaken to the two communities had been shown to be irreconcilable”. (9)

Britain, then, coined with the idea of bringing the issue of Palestine before the United Nations. On April 2, 1947 Alexander Cadogan, the Head of the UK delegation in the United Nations, wrote

9. Palestine: Supplementary Memorandum to UNSCOP, p. 27.
a letter to the Secretary-General of the world body requesting him to convene a special session of the General Assembly on Palestine. He wrote that a "special session of the General Assembly" should be summoned "for the purpose of constituting and instructing a special committee" (10) to consider the question of Palestine.

The special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations was called on April 28, 1947 at Flushing Meadows in New York. The first important point before the General Assembly was that of agenda.

The United Kingdom wanted to restrict the agenda to the items submitted earlier by her. The Arab states wanted to broaden it and on April 21 and 22, 1947 five Arab states (Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia) communicated to the Secretary General the request that the following items be placed on the Agenda of the Special Session of the General Assembly: "The termination of the Mandate over Palestine and the declaration of its independence". (11) At the 70th meeting held on May 1, 1947 the General Assembly approved the inclusion in the agenda of items submitted by the Government of the United Kingdom. The additional item proposed by five Arab states was denied the inclusion in the agenda of the special session. The agenda accepted and approved by the General Assembly was that submitted by the United Kingdom and it was one of "constituting and instructing a special committee to prepare for the consideration of the question of Palestine at the second regular session". Though

the additional item proposed by five member Arab states was rejected yet it was included for discussion by the General Assembly under Rule 18 of the procedural rules of the Assembly.

The Arab states were not satisfied with the manner in which Britain had referred the issue of Palestine to the United Nations. "The Arabs feel", as observed by Hadawi, "that both the British action and that of the United Nations were not in conformity with the provisions on self-determination prescribed in the United Nations Charter". (12)

The Arab states had understood the game of Imperial powers backed up by the United States and the Soviet Union. The issue of Palestine was being discussed by the United Nations at a time when the Western bloc had a majority among fifty-five members of the world body. The strength of the western bloc had been proved many a time in the United Nations. Every resolution sponsored by the United States and her allies was passed. The United States of America was under enormous pressure from the Zionist lobby. The Zionists wanted the Government of the USA to support large scale immigration of displaced Jews from Europe to Palestine. Senator Robert F. Wagner, Democrat of New York and Senator James E. Murray, Democrat of Montana urged President Truman to use his country's influence to gain "unlimited immigration for Jews into Palestine and hearing for the Jewish Agency for Palestine in the United Nations General Assembly. They also sent a telegram to Warren Austin, US representative to the United Nations urging him to take up both the issues in

the world body. (13) The United States of America had lent the Zionists in their expansionist designs against the Arabs not only political and diplomatic support but she had given them financial support as well. The United States contribution to Zionist national fund in 1939-44 was £1,537,000, in Jewish year 1944-45 it rose to £3,989,000 and in 1945-46 it rose further to £5,768,000. (14)

On April 23, 1947 Lord Hall told the House of Lords that the American contribution to the Zionist national fund for illegal Zionist purpose was about £7,000,000. (15) The United States formally opposed the proposal aimed at granting a hearing to the Jewish Agency for Palestine yet gave it her blessings and on May 5, 1947 the Zionists scored a tactical victory when the General Assembly adopted a resolution that the First Committee should grant a hearing to the Jewish Agency. The resolution was moved by Poland and Czechoslovakia. It said "that the first committee grant a hearing to the Jewish Agency for Palestine on the question before the committee". (16) The resolution was adopted with 44 votes in favour, 7 against and 3 abstaining while Costa Rica was absent. (17)
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17. Those states which voted against the resolution included Afghanistan, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Turkey and those which abstained from voting were India, Iran and Siam (now called Thailand).
The Arab member states reacted very sharply against preferential treatment granted to the Jewish Agency. Faris El Khouri of Syria was betraying the Arab's feeling of resentment when he said that he did not know whether the United Nations was a proper agency to solve the Palestine question. Many members of the United Nations wanted the Arab Higher Committee to appear before the Political and Security Committee and present Arabs case on Palestine. India prepared a draft and submitted the following resolution:

"The First Committee (the Political and Security Committee) resolves that it be proposed to the President of the General Assembly that a plenary meeting be called at once to consider the following resolution that the First Committee grant a hearing to the Arab Higher Committee on the question before the Committee". (19)

The resolution had the support of the Soviet Union but Alexander Codogan of Great Britain redrafted it. According to redrafted resolution "the General Assembly affirms that the decision of the First Committee (the Political and Security Committee) to grant a hearing to the Arab Higher Committee gives a correct interpretation of the Assembly's intentions". (20) The resolution was introduced by Dr Oswald Aranha, the President of the General Assembly and it secured 39 votes in favour, one against while eleven members abstained.

The resolution of the Political and Security Committee granting a hearing to the Arab Higher Committee accorded unequal treat-
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ment to the Arab Higher Committee. Mahmud Hasan Pasha, Egyptian Ambassador to Washington, threatened to boycott future meetings of the UN as a protest against the resolution passed by the General Assembly. Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon insisted before the final vote was taken that the General Assembly had discriminated against the Arab Higher Committee and urged that the General Assembly be called back into session to vote a resolution "whereby the Arabs of Palestine will be given their just due." (21) Faced with the threat of an Arab boycott of its proceedings regarding the Palestine question, the United Nations General Assembly held an emergency session on May 7, 1947 and gave recognition to the Arab Higher Committee granting it equal status with the Jewish Agency for Palestine.

On May 9, 1947 the Jewish Agency's spokesman Dr Silver presented his case before the Committee. He emphasized and elaborated the terms "Jewish people" and "the Jewish national home" which were according to him, "the key terms and basic concepts of the Balfour Declaration and of the Mandate". "To proceed without relation to them would be to detour into a political wilderness as far as Palestine is concerned." He asked the world body to allow Jewish immigration to Palestine because "A generation ago, the international community of the world decreed that the Jewish people should be given the right, long denied, and the opportunity to reconstitute their national home in Palestine. The national home is in the making, it has not yet been fully established." (22) Dr Silver was asked


many questions. The most important question of them all was asked by Asaf Ali, the Indian Delegation. He asked: "The Nazi Government in Europe has been completely suppressed and Nazi Germany is now under the control of the Security Council or, at any rate, the United Nations. If that is so, is there any reason why these refugees cannot be resettled in their natural German home?"

The representative of the Jewish Agency could not confidently answer this question. On May 12, 1947 Mr. Shertok tried to reply it and said "you cannot settle in a graveyard, nor can you build a dwelling out of heaps of rubble". He said that the Jews were perfectly assimilable in Palestine only. He betrayed Jewish stubbornness when he said: "No one has offered an alternative to Palestine. But even if there were an alternative, they refused to be treated as mere chattels". He insisted that the issue of displaced Jews from Europe was a part of the Palestine question and "to treat the issue of Palestine in isolation from the immigration issue would make as much sense as to study the beating of a heart in disregard of blood circulation". (24)

The case of Palestinians was very ably presented by Henry Cattan of Arab Higher Committee. He emphasized the independence of Palestine which the Arabs were not claiming on the basis of assurances, "they are entitled to such independence as being their natural and inalienable right". According to him the "Balfour Declaration

was made without the consent, not to say the knowledge, of the people most directly affected. It was "contrary to the principles of national self-determination and democracy, as also to the principles enunciated in the Charter of the United Nations".

He told the United Nations that: (25)

"It is high time that Palestine's right to independence be recognised and that this tormented country enjoy the blessings of a democratic government. It is high time also that a policy which has been impairing the ethnological and political structure of the country be brought to an end by the highest body in the world."

The United Nations Political and Security Committee, after hearing the Jewish and Arab agencies got bogged down over procedural matters; The most serious conflict arose over the question of terms of reference of the proposed Inquiry Committee on Palestine. The positions of the Jews and the Arabs were irreconcilable. The Jews wanted that the question of displaced Jews from Europe should be linked up with the question of Palestine's independence. Moshe Shertok told the Committee: "The crux of the matter is the problem of Jewish immigration to Palestine". He suggested that the terms of reference should allow the committee of inquiry to keep in mind not only the independence question but also "various other issues connected with the problem of Palestine". (26) The Arabs' point of view was expressed by Paris El Khoury of Syria when he argued that there was no connection between displaced persons and the Palestine problem and that the United Nations had already created the International Refugee Organization to look after the refugees. Mahmud Hasan Pasha

of Egypt said that the Arabs would not agree tying in the European problem with the Palestine controversy. "We cannot", he said, "allow an invasion of Palestine by an alien racial group". (27) The sub-committee was unable to agree on the scope of the proposed United Nations Inquiry Committee on Palestine. The crux of the disagreement in the sub-committee was whether the suggested committee of inquiry shall consider independence for the holy land, where the Arab population was double that of the Jews. The sub-committee in its report, made public on May 11, 1947 presented four alternative proposals on the general question, each concluded in slightly different language:

A) "The Special Committee shall bear in mind the principle that independence for the population of Palestine should be the purpose of any plan for the future of that country".

B) "The Special Committee shall be guided by the principle that independence for the people of Palestine shall be the purpose of any plan for the future of that country".

C) "The Special Committee shall bear in mind the principle that independence for the population of Palestine shall be the ultimate purpose of any plan for the future of that country".

D) "The Special Committee shall be guided by the principle that the independence of Palestine should be the purpose of any plan for the future of that country". (28)

The role of the Big Powers regarding the issue of scope of the Inquiry Committee was pro-Zionist. The USSR had mostly supported Zionist proposals in the procedural battles and also supported the
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zionist case regarding the question of European Jews. On the question of independence the attitude of the Soviet Union was far from being unambiguous. She took the Arab side on the issue of independence but it was a mere eye-wash because the wording of her amendment regarding the scope of Inquiry Committee was almost identical to that of the Jewish Agency's proposals. It said that the Inquiry Committee would be directed to study not only conditions in Palestine but also "various other issues connected with the problem of Palestine". It also provided that the Inquiry Committee submits to the General Assembly a proposal "on the question of establishing without delay the independent state of Palestine". (29) The US deputy representative Harschel V. Johnson told the Political and Security Committee of the General Assembly that inclusion of independence in the terms of reference for the suggested inquiry committee would tend to "prejudge" the case and would do "a moral injustice" to zionist opinion. (30)

The second point of serious friction was regarding the composition of the inquiry committee. The USA wanted big powers to be excluded from the Inquiry Committee while the USSR wanted the Big Five to become members of it. The US representative recommended a neutral committee consisting of Canada, Czechoslovakia, Iran, Peru, Uruguay, Sweden and the Netherlands. The US representative explained his Government's stand: "One fear is that opposing views and debate among the permanent members (the Big Five) if they were on the Special Committee - over details, would cause delay by the

The intrusion of other interests which are perfectly obvious here. The attitude of Great Britain was similar to that of the USA but her reasons were different. Alexander Cadogan of the United Kingdom explained the reasons: "My Government are in rather a peculiar position. They would find themselves, if they were members of that committee, at times in the witness stand, and then after that, a moment or two later, would resume their seat with the jury." (31)

The Soviet Union thought that the inclusion of Five Big Powers was necessary because the United Nations would have a better chance of reaching agreement if the Big Five participated in all stages of the work, "from the fact finding of the United Nations Inquiry Committee to the rendering of a judgement by the United Nations General Assembly". (32).

There were three main proposals regarding the composition of the inquiry committee. The USA recommended a neutral committee while Argentina had recommended a committee composing of the Five Big Powers, an Arab state, three American states other than the United States, a pacific state, an African state and an Asiatic state. The third proposal was that of Poland's which included the Big Five, one Arab state preferably Syria, two Latin American states, one African and or Asiatic state, one western European state and one Eastern European state preferably Czechoslovakia. A careful analysis of these proposals will prove one
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point that the USA and the USSR were conducting their own battles even on the question of the composition of Inquiry Committee. The USSR favoured the Polish proposal for it provided better representation to the Communist bloc. At its 57th meeting on May 13, 1947, the General Assembly's Political and Security Committee adopted an Australian resolution creating United Nations Special Committee on Palestine. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 13 to 11, with 29 abstentions. The recommendation of the First Committee was approved by the General Assembly on May 15, 1947 by a final vote of 45 to 7 with 1 abstention and 2 absent.

The resolution of May 15, 1947 laid down the following provisions:

1. "A Special Committee be created for the above mentioned purpose consisting of the representatives of Australia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, India, Iran, Netherlands, Peru, Sweden, Uruguay and Yugoslavia;"

2. "The Special Committee shall have the widest powers to ascertain and record facts and to investigate all questions and issues relevant to the problem of Palestine;"

3. "The Special Committee shall determine its own procedure;"

4. "The Special Committee shall conduct investigations in Palestine and wherever it may deem useful, receive and examine written or oral testimony, whichever it may consider appropriate in each case, from mandatory power, from representatives of the population of Palestine, from Governments and from such organisations and individuals as it may deem necessary;"

5. "The Special Committee shall give most careful consideration to the religious interests in Palestine of Islam, Judaism and Christianity;"

6. "The Special Committee shall prepare a report for the General Assembly and shall submit such pro-
posals as it may consider appropriate for the solution of the problem of Palestine;"

7. "The Special Committee's report shall be communicated to the Secretary-General not later than September 1, 1947, in order that it may be circulated to the Members of the United Nations in time for consideration by the second regular session of the General Assembly".

The General Assembly

8. "Requests the Secretary-General to enter into suitable arrangements with the proper authorities of any State in whose territory the Special Committee may wish to sit or to travel, to provide the necessary facilities, and to assign appropriate staff to the Special Committee;"

The resolution also

9. "Authorizes the Secretary-General to reimburse travel and subsistence expenses of a representatives and an alternate representative from each Government represented on the Special Committee on such basis and in such form as he may determine most appropriate in the circumstances". (33)

The Palestinian Arab strongly objected to the forming of the Inquiry Committee on the Palestine question. The Arab states voted against the resolution and their chief reason for such an attitude were the terms of reference of the inquiry committee. Dr Charles Malik of Lebanon showed "the deepest concern" that was felt over the fact that the committee had broadened the inquiry to provide for the "socalled consideration of the problem of Palestine" instead of its future Government. To him, the Committee's draft was "highly unsatisfactory and unacceptable". (34)

The General Assembly adopted another resolution on May 15, 1947. The resolution for Truce as it is called was proposed by Norway. The chief motivating reason behind Norway's resolution was

---


the fear that the two contending parties might resort to threat of use of force. The resolution was adopted unanimously with Arab States abstaining. It read: (35)

The General Assembly "calls upon all Governments and people and particularly upon the inhabitants of Palestine, to refrain, pending action by the General Assembly on the report of the Special Committee on Palestine, from the threat or use of force or any other action which might create an atmosphere prejudicial to an early settlement of the question of Palestine".

The outcome of the first special session of the United Nations Organization had been disappointing as far as the Arabs were concerned. The Zionists had many strong supporters among forty-five members of the United Nations. The Zionists scored a victory in the United Nations. Their stand was supported and endorsed in the General Assembly. The Big Powers, including the Soviet Union, were supporting the Zionist line. The terms of reference and the composition of UNSCOP, was almost a total victory for Zionists. The United Nations Special Committee would not consider the issue of independence for Palestine; it would visit refugee camps in Europe as well. The Arab States, in spite of their tactical defeat in the United Nations, did not lose their confidence in world organization. Some of the Arab representatives expressed satisfaction with the outcome of the General Assembly's special session. Nehman A. Pasha, Secretary General of Arab League remarked about the special session: "On the whole we feel we are departing from the special session in a better position than when we arrived". According to Syria's representative Faris El Khoury: (36) "This is just the end of the beginning. What is past is nothing".

35. UN Document A/310, p. 7.
The Arabs were in an accommodating mood but not at the cost of self-respect and freedom. They were willing to solve the problem of Palestine with an open heart and open mind but the Zionists in league with their supporters were stubborn. They wanted uncontrolled Jewish settlement in Palestine at the cost of the local Arab population. The United Nations Committee on Palestine was boycotted by the Arab Higher Committee when it visited Palestine on June 14, 15, 1947.

The Arab Higher Committee was requested by the chairman of the committee to co-operate with it in conducting investigations. It was impossible because had the Arabs given cooperation to the committee, it would have meant total negation of their earlier attitude. The Arab Higher Committee wanted to disassociate itself with the investigations of UNSCOP because of the following reasons as laid down in a telegram sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations:

1 - The legal basis for the Mandate has disappeared since the dissolution of the League of Nations. Thus the Mandatory Power is a de facto authority in Palestine. Independence is the real issue and it is of vital importance to apply the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and to declare Palestine as independent. The United Nations refused to include the termination of mandate in the agenda.

2 - The Jewish refugee problem could not be linked with Palestine question since Palestine could not by itself solve the Jewish problem. The World Organization failed to detach the Jewish world refugee question from the Palestine problem.

3 - The transgression of the wishes and interests of the great
majority of the people of Palestine in the name of religious interests.

The Arab Higher Committee then pointed out that the Palestine Arabs' natural rights to their country were self-evident and could not continue to be subject to investigation but deserved to be recognized on the basis of the principles of the United Nations Charter. Throughout the period of the committee's inquiry, the Zionists carried out terrorist activities with the sole motive of discrediting and sabotaging British power in Palestine. After the Committee's tour of Haifa on June 19 a dynamite laden truck had exploded, and the Committee had to pass a resolution condemning, though mildly, the activities of Zionists. The resolution said:

"The members of the committee, taking note of the public reports of acts of violence committed in Palestine since their arrival in the country, record their sense that such acts constitute a flagrant disregard of the appeal made in the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations of May 15, 1947".

The reign of terror entered a new phase when on August 10, 1947 members of an armed band disguising in Arab dress killed 4 Jews and wounded many Jews and Arabs in a cafe in Tel-Aviv. It was a well calculated plan of the Zionists to rouse world public opinion against the Arabs. The Arab Higher Committee Secretary denied the charge of the Arabs being involved in killing the Jews.

Sometimes later the terrorists in their own writings had confessed that they used to wear Arab dresses and sometimes British service dress. (41) On August 15, the Haganah killed 11 Arabs in a raid on what the Zionists called the headquarters of the Arab attackers. The Zionists had adopted the strategy of attacking Arabs in order to stir up the Arabs against the Jews. They knew that militant Arab reaction had to be met by British forces as a result of which pressure on Haganah would be relieved. On July 29, 1947 the special committee went to Geneva in order to start drafting its report. The committee decided by a vote of 6 to 4 with one abstention to set up a sub-committee to visit the Centres of Jewish refugees and displaced persons in Germany and Austria.

During the visit to refugee centres the sub-committee interviewed at least 100 Jewish inmates of the Centre who were, presumably, selected by the Jewish Agency. The committee reached the conclusion that the majority of Jewish refugees in the Centres wanted to go to Palestine. At one particular centre a poster was found which had the inscription "Palestine - a Jewish State for the Jewish people". The poster had a pictorial design 'showing Jews from Eastern Europe on the march towards Palestine shown as much larger area than the present geographical limits". The report further said: "In the schools in the various centres children are being taught Hebrew and given an intimate historical and geographical knowledge of Palestine". Many organizations like the "Central Committee of the Liberated Jews, the Jewish Agency, the American Joint Distri-

---
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bution Committee and many other Jewish voluntary organizations" were found in existence which gave "every opportunity for general indoctrination of the idea of settlement in Palestine if such were desired". (42) An objective but careful analysis of the committee's report would not leave anybody in doubt that the Zionists had a definite and organized plan to drive Palestinian Arabs out and replace them with the Jewish immigrants from Europe and other parts of the world.

The Special Committee completed its report on August 31, 1947 and submitted it to the General Assembly which embodied twelve general recommendations, out of them eleven were approved unanimously and the twelfth (with two members, i.e., Uruguay and Guatemala dissenting, and one recording no opinion) provided that "in the appraisal of the Palestine question, it be accepted as incontrovertible that any solution for Palestine cannot be considered as a solution of the Jewish problem in general." (43) The eleven recommendations which were approved unanimously provided for the termination of the Mandate, independence for Palestine after a transitional period during which administration of the country would be the responsibility of the United Nations and for the preservation of the Holy Places. The General Assembly was to undertake immediately the initiation and execution of an international arrangement whereby the problem of the distressed European Jews, of whom approximately 250,000 were in assembly centres, should be dealt
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with as a matter of extreme urgency for the alleviation of their plight and of the Palestine problem. Minority rights were to be protected, peaceful relations were to be a prerequisite to independence, provision was to be made for economic unity, and the abolition of the capitulations, and lastly, an appeal was to be made to both parties to end acts of violence.

The Committee then presented two alternatives:

1. A Plan of Partition with Economic Union supported by seven members of the Committee: Canada, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, Netherlands, Peru, Sweden and Uruguay. This plan came to be known as the 'Majority Plan', which recommended partition of Palestine into Arab and Jewish States after a transitional two-year period of trusteeship under the United Nations with economic union and an international city of Jerusalem and its environs under the United Nations jurisdiction. The transitional period was recommended to begin on September 1, 1947, and the United Kingdom was to be appointed as the Trustee for the purposes of interim administration. The Arab State was to comprise 4,476 square miles or 42.88 per cent of the total; the Jewish State 5,893 square miles or 56.47 per cent; and the Jerusalem International Zone 68 square miles or 0.65 per cent. As regards population, the Jewish State was to contain 498,000 Jews and 407,000 Arabs. The Arab State was to contain 725,000 Arabs and 10,000 Jews. The Jerusalem International Zone was to contain 105,000 Arabs and 100,000 Jews. In addition there were to be 90,000 Bedounis, cultivators and stock owners, within the Jewish State. (44)
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The Jews, according to the Report submitted by the Mandatory power to the United Nations, were holding 1,491,699 dunoms out of a total of 26,323,023 dunoms in Palestine. (45) The Jewish landownership within the frontiers of the Jewish State was less than 10 per cent while in the whole of Palestine it was less than 6 per cent. (46)

2. There was a Federal State Plan supported by three members: India, Iran and Yugoslavia. It came to be known as the 'Minority Plan' which provided, inter alia, that an independent federal state of Palestine with Jerusalem as its capital be established after a transitional period not exceeding three years. The federal state would comprise a federal government and governments of the Arab and Jewish state respectively. The federal government would exercise full powers over such matters as national defence, foreign relations, immigration, currency, inter-state waterways, transport and communications. The Arab and Jewish States would enjoy full powers over local self-government in its various aspects. There was to be a single Palestinian nationality and citizenship, with guaranteed equal rights for all minorities and fundamental human rights and freedoms, as well as free access to the Holy Places. (47)

The Second Annual Session of the General Assembly on September 23, 1947 set up an Ad Hoc Committee to consider "Question of Palestine; Report of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine", as proposed by U.K., and "Termination of Mandate over Palestine and
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recognition of its independence as one State", (48) as proposed by Saudi Arabia and Iraq.

On September 25, 1947, the Ad Hoc Committee at its first meeting began its deliberations and decided to invite the Representative of Palestine Arab Higher Committee and the Jewish Agency to present their views on this question.

On September 29, 1947, Palestine Arab Higher Committee's spokesman Rajai el Husseini, stated that it was the sacred duty of the Palestine Arabs to defend their country against all aggression. They were firmly opposed to dissection and partition of Palestine or to give special and preferential rights to the minority. There was no legal or moral basis for Jewish claims on Palestine. The raison d'être of the United Nations was, he said, to assist self-defence against aggression.

The rights and patrimony of the Arabs of Palestine had been the subject of no fewer than eighteen investigations within 25 years and all to no purpose. The Commissions of inquiry had either reduced the national and legal rights of the Palestine Arabs or had glossed them over. The few recommendations, he said, favourable to the Arabs had been ignored by the Mandatory Power. For these and for other reasons already communicated to the United Nations it was surprising that the Arab Higher Committee should have abstained from co-operating with the investigation, of the UNSCOP and refused to appear before it. He accused the Mandatory Power of having overstepped the provisions of Article 6 of the Mandate by permitting

Jewish immigration into Palestine threatening the social, political and economic rights of the Palestine Arabs. The representative of the Arab Higher Committee had refrained from making any direct comments upon the UNSCOP report because the Arab Higher Committee considered its recommendations inconsistent with the United Nations Charter and the covenant of the League of Nations. (49)

The most important reason which made the report totally unacceptable to the Arabs was that it did not consider the validity of the Balfour Declaration. It did not consider the meaning of the term "Jewish National Home", nor it took any account of the validity and scope of the provisions of the Mandate for Palestine thereto. The report of the Special Committee completely ignored the promises made to the Arabs and it lent credence to the Jewish claims on Palestine.

The Arabs were not prepared to accept any proposal based on the Balfour Declaration. The Balfour Declaration had been rejected by the Arabs on various grounds, that it was made without their consent and even knowledge, it was contrary to the principles of self-determination and democracy and furthermore it was morally untenable for it was inconsistent with the pledges made to the Arabs. Although the question of the legality, validity and ethics of the Balfour Declaration was raised in the General Assembly but the special committee neither inquired into it nor expressed any opinion on it. In the general debate of the Ad Hoc Committee's fifth meeting on October 4, 1947, Camille Chamoun of Lebanon warned the Committee that the majority plan, far from supplying a solution would create a new source of friction between the two peoples. According to him "the Arabs

had occupied and possessed Palestine for at least thirteen centuries. The argument concerning the historical association of the Jews with Palestine, was devoid of foundation." (50)

Jamali of Iraq declared that the partition scheme was totally unacceptable and the key to the problem lay in the formula "Palestine for the Palestinians and the Palestinians alone." He also referred to the use of American money in Palestine where "Zionists were relying on dollar diplomacy and extra-territorial rights." He declared that "economic development of another peoples' country did not entitle a foreigner to political rights there. In the modern world technical and economic superiority should not lead to political domination." (51) El Khoury of Syria also made a reference to American economic help to the Zionists in their design on Palestine when he said: "the choice of Palestine to satisfy Zionist aspirations was not based on humanitarian sympathy but on the intention of the Zionists in the United States to launch an economic invasion of the whole Eastern world and to achieve that end by creating a bridgehead in Palestine, to be the headquarters of their activities." (52) Zeinuddin of Syria told the committee that "the United States had declared itself ready to pay for a volunteer force". "Such a force", he claimed, "although established under the United Nations, would be composed of mercenaries in the Zionist cause paid with American money. It would be called a force for the maintenance of order, but it would be used to destroy the very foundations of order.
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in the Holy Land." (53) The Partition resolution was rejected by the Arabs because it was in violation of the Atlantic Charter's spirit where Roosevelt and Churchill expressed that "they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned." (54) The Partition Plan envisaged territorial changes which Palestinian Arabs were opposed to but western powers were pressing it hard upon unwilling majority of the Arabs. A few honest and objective Jews were also opposed to the partition plan but they were in a hopeless minority. One of such objective and conscientious Jews was Moshe Menuhin who left Palestine because he was completely "disenchanted with political Zionism" which according to him "implied wars of injustice and degeneration of Judaism". To him the "partition plan was merely a foothold for the full realization of Eretz Israel". (55)

The Jewish Agency's representatives supported the Partition Plan with reservations.

Rabbi Abba Hillal Silver addressing the Ad Hoc Committee at the fourth meeting on October 2, 1947, praised the Special Committee for its conscientious labours and good faith. He supported ten of the eleven recommendations unanimously adopted by UNSCOP. The exception was number VI dealing with Jewish Displaced persons. He called the committee's attention to the 'intense urge' of the overwhelming majority of Jewish displaced persons to proceed to
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Palestine.

He told the committee that the Minority plan was unacceptable to the Jewish Agency for it made provision only for semi-autonomous centres or provinces. Palestine would, if the plan was accepted, become an Arab State with two Jewish enclaves. The Majority Plan was also not really satisfactory to the Jewish people, he said. He wanted that "the whole of Palestine, including Trans-Jordan" as implied in the Balfour Declaration, "should become a Jewish State". Silver termed the "proposal for an economic union as promising and statesmanlike". According to him "a Jewish state must have in its own hands those instruments of financing and economic control necessary to carry out large scale Jewish immigration and the related economic development". (56)

Shertok of Jewish Agency for Palestine told the committee on October 17, 1947 that "had the Government of the United Kingdom carried out its obligations under the mandate, the whole area of Palestine might have become, in the not too far distant future, through large scale immigration and settlement, an independent Jewish state with a Jewish majority. (57) The last spokesman of Jewish Agency though he no longer held any office, to address the Ad Hoc Committee was Dr Weizmann. "His appearance," according to some writers, "was without precedence and United Nations' documents gave no reason why it was allowed". (58) Weizmann appealed to the

---

56. Ibid.
United Nations that "the majority plan of the special committee should be endorsed and appealed to the bar of the world's conscience". (59) On October 22, 1947, after long deliberations, the Ad Hoc Committee appointed two sub-committees to report on the findings of UMS COP Sub-Committee I comprised of Canada, Czechoslovakia, Guatemala, Poland, South Africa, United States, Uruguay, USSR and Venezuela. Sub-Committee I was supposed to study carefully the possibility of reducing Arab minority to smallest fraction that would be included in the Jewish state. According to U.S. representative "it should also consider ways of making the territories of the proposed Jewish and Arab states, to which were now allotted roughly 60 per cent and 40 per cent respectively of the land area of Palestine, more nearly equal." (60)

Sub-Committee 2 comprised of Afghanistan, Columbia, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yemen. It was entrusted with the task of drafting a detailed plan for the termination of the Mandate over Palestine and its establishment as an independent unitary state. The Sub-Committee 2 felt that the composition of both sub-committees did not do full justice to neutral countries. The chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee was approached in that connection but he could not see his way to accepting that recommendation. The representative of Columbia who was the chairman of Sub-Committee 2 resigned and was succeeded by Sir Mohammad Zafarullah Khan of Pakistan.

The composition of the sub-committees and the uncompromising attitude of the chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee had made the Arabs believe that the Great Powers agreed upon the Partition Plan. The Great Powers wanted to present the Partition Plan before the General Assembly as a fait accompli.

The Sub-Committee 2 proceeded with its work and decided to concentrate on three items, i.e. legal problems, refugee problem and constitutional proposals. Working Groups were established to look into each problem and they were as follows:

A) Legal Problems : Pakistan, Syria and Saudi Arabia
B) Refugee Problems : Afghanistan, Columbia and Lebanon
C) Constitutional Proposals : Egypt, Iraq and Yemen.

After considering the reports of the three Working Groups, the Sub-Committee presented its recommendations to the Ad Hoc Committee in the form of three draft resolutions. According to the first, the General Assembly, before recommending a solution of the Palestine problem, would request the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion on certain legal questions connected with or arising from that problem, including questions concerning the competence of the United Nations to recommend or enforce any solution contrary to the wishes of the majority of the people of Palestine. The second resolution recommended an international settlement of the problem of the Jewish refugees and displaced persons and stated principles and proposed machinery for the cooperation of Member States in such a settlement. The third resolution provided for the creation of a provisional government of the people of Palestine.
On November 19, 1947 the Ad Hoc Committee met to consider the reports of its two sub-committees. Sir Alexander Cadogan admitted the United Nations' failure to forge conciliation between "the two peoples most directly connected with the future of Palestine". He further stated: "If a scheme of partition were approved and a United Nations Commission set up, the Palestine Government would hand over its authority to that commission". (61)

According to Ninkic of Yugoslavia the minority plan was "the only just democratic and realistic solution of the problem". (62)

The American representative Mr Johnson spoke in a threatening manner saying "the matter could wait no longer. The hour of decision had struck. If there were hesitation, the situation would be worse in a year's time. If actions were decided upon, the United Nations would be equal to the task." (63)

Sir Mohammad Zafrullah Khan of Pakistan said that "since the United Kingdom was relinquishing the Mandate, Palestine, in accordance with Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, had the right to become independent. The people of Palestine should become free and determine their own future". (64)

The most devastating attack on the Great Powers was launched by Mr Husseini of Arab Higher Committee. He said that "the two great champions of freedom, the USSR and the United States, had joined hands to support the monstrous perversion of the principle
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of self-determination in Palestine. They had disagreed on everything constructive in the United Nations and had agreed on only one thing - the partition of Palestine". He appealed to the United Nations to "participate in establishing a democratic state as proposed by the Arabs, nothing would come out of it but prosperity and peace for all". (65)

The recommendations of the Sub-Committee were put to voting on November 24, 1947. First to be put to the vote were the three draft resolutions submitted by Sub-Committee 2: The first part providing for the reference to the International Court of Justice, was rejected by a vote of 25 to 18 with all abstentions. The second part, dealing with the question of the competence of the United Nations was rejected by a bare vote of 21 to 20 with 13 abstentions. (66)

The General Assembly met on November 26, 1947 to consider the report of the Ad Hoc Committee. On November 29, 1947, Chamoun of Lebanon submitted on behalf of the Arab States, the general principles which ought to serve as a basis for a compromise. The six principles were namely:

1) A federal independent state shall be set up in Palestine not later than August 1, 1948.

2) The Government of Palestine shall be federal comprising the federal government and central governments of Jewish and Arab cantons.

3) Very few Arabs or Jewish minorities should be left in each canton.

4) The establishment of the Constituent Assembly elected on the principle of direct universal suffrage.
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5) The Constituent Assembly shall be guided by the constitution of the United States of America in its task of defining powers of various government organs.

6) The constitution shall protect Holy Places and safeguard the rights of all religious establishments. (67)

The representative of Iran asked for an adjournment until January 15, 1948 enabling the Ad Hoc Committee to give serious considerations to Chamoun's proposal. The USA and the USSR opposed it. The report was taken up and adopted by 33 votes to 13, with 10 abstentions.

The Partition Resolution divided Palestine into six principal parts, three of which (about 56 per cent of the total area) were reserved for a "Jewish State" and the other three with the enclave of Jaffa for an Arab State (It was 43 per cent of total area). About 0.65 per cent area which included Jerusalem and environs was declared an "international zone" administered by the United Nations.

According to Resolution No. 181 of November 29, 1947 (68)

"The General Assembly:

"Having met in special session at the request of the mandatory power to constitute and instruct a Special Committee to prepare for the consideration of the question of the future Government of Palestine at the second regular session;

"Having constituted a Special Committee and instruct it to investigate all questions and issues relevant to the problem of Palestine, and to prepare proposals for the solution of the problem, and

"Having received and examined the report of the Special Commi-


Committee (Document A/364) including a number of unanimous recommendations and a plan of partition with economic union approved by the majority of the Special Committee,

"Considers that the present situation in Palestine is one which is likely to impair the general welfare and friendly relations among nations;

Takes note of the declaration by the mandatory power that it plans to complete its evacuation of Palestine by August 1, 1948.

"Recommends to the United Kingdom, as the mandatory power for Palestine and to all other Members of the United Nations the adoption and implementation, with regard to the future Government of Palestine, of the Plan of Partition with Economic Union set out below;

"Requests that:

"(a) The Security Council take the necessary measures as provided for in the plan for its implementation;

"(b) The Security Council consider, if circumstances during the transitional period require such consideration, whether the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace. If it decides that such a threat exists and in order to maintain international peace and security, the Security Council should supplement the authorisation of the General Assembly by taking measures under Articles 39 and 41 of the Charter, to empower the United Nations Commission, 69 as provided in this resolution, to exercise

69. At its hundred and twenty-eighth plenary meeting on November 29, 1947, the General Assembly, in accordance with the terms of the above resolution, elected the following members of the United Nations Commission on Palestine: Bolivia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Panama and the Philippines.
in Palestine the functions which are assigned to it by this resolution.

"(c) The Security Council determine as a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression, in accordance with Article 39 of the Charter, any attempt to alter by force the settlement envisaged by this resolution;

"(d) The Trusteeship Council be informed of the responsibilities envisaged for it in this plan;

"Calls upon the inhabitants of Palestine to take such steps as may be necessary on their part to put this plan into effect;

"Appeals to all Governments and all peoples to refrain from taking any action which might hamper or delay the carrying out of these recommendations, and

"Authorizes the Secretary-General to reimburse travel and subsistence expenses of the members of the Commission referred to in Part I, Section B; Paragraph 1 below, on such basis and in such form as he may determine most appropriate in the circumstances, and to provide the Commission with the necessary staff assist in carrying out the functions assigned to the Commission by the General Assembly. The Resolution also provided the following safeguards for both Arabs and Jews in their areas:

"(a) Establishing in each State a legislative body elected by universal suffrage and by secret ballot on the basis of proportional representation, and an executive body responsible to the legislature;

"(b) Settling all international disputes in which the State may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered;

"(c) Accepting the obligation of the State to refrain in its
international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations;

"(d) Guaranteeing to all persons equal and non-discriminatory rights in civil, political, economic and religious matters and the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of religion, language, speech and publication, education, assembly and association".

The Resolution also took note of the Holy Places and contained the following provisions for their preservation:

"1. Existing rights in respect of Holy Places and religious buildings or sites shall not be denied or impaired.

2. The liberty of access, visit, and transit shall be guaranteed, in conformity with existing rights, to all residents and citizens of the other State and of the City of Jerusalem. Similarly, freedom of worship shall be guaranteed in conformity with existing rights, subject to the maintenance of public order and decorum.

3. Holy Places and religious buildings or sites shall be preserved. No act shall be permitted which may in any way impair their sacred character."

Religion and minority rights were granted and safeguarded in the following manner:

"1. Freedom of conscience and the free exercise of all forms of worship, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, shall be ensured to all."
"2. No discrimination of any kind shall be made between the inhabitants on the ground of race, religion, language, or sex.

"3. The family law and personal status of the various minorities and their religious interests, including endowments, shall be respected.

"4. No restriction shall be imposed on the free use by any citizen of the State of any language in private intercourse, in commerce, in religion, in the Press or in publications of any kind, or at public meetings."

About citizenship and financial obligations the Resolution provided that "Palestinian citizens residing in Palestine outside the City of Jerusalem, as well as Arabs and Jews who, not holding Palestinian citizenship, reside in Palestine outside the City of Jerusalem shall, upon the recognition of the independence, become citizens of the State in which they are resident and enjoy full civil and political rights." The Partition Resolution was adopted by the General Assembly by a thin margin of vote. The members had criticized the plan, even those who had voted for it had their own reservations.

The Representative of Philippines while commenting on partition plan said: (70) "My delegation takes part in this final stage in the consideration of the Palestine problem with profound misgivings;"

The Swedish delegate admitted (71) that the Plan "has its weak side and dangerous omissions".

The delegate of Canada said: (72) "We support the Plan with heavy hearts and many misgivings".

The delegate of New Zealand also talked (73) of "grave in-
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adequacies of the present proposals".

The Foreign Minister of Belgium also offered comments on the Partition proposal and said: (74) "we are not certain it is completely just; we doubt whether it is practical; and we are afraid that it involves great risks."

The representative of Cuba, Dihigo opposed the Partition resolution and defended his country's opposition by making the following observation: (75)

"The partition of Palestine is neither legal nor just...the Balfour Declaration, in our opinion is not legally valid because in it the British Government was offering something which did not belong to it and which it had no right to give."

"The partition contravenes the terms of the Mandate, Article 6 of which provides that the rights and position of the non-Jewish population of Palestine shall not be prejudiced when the indigenous population is to be deprived of more than half of its territory and hundreds of thousands of Arabs are to be placed under a Jewish Government, and forced to become a subject people in a land where they were once the rulers."

The Ethiopian representative commented: (76)

"It is my duty to state that the Ethiopian delegation finds itself unable to subscribe to the principle of partition involved. We cannot agree that a solution to the problem of that geographical, historical and economic unity known as Palestine should be sought through a partition drawn along religions or other lines."

On October 11, 1947, Mrs Pandit, the Indian representative to the United Nations said: (77) "Palestine was a predominantly
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Arab country and in any solution that predominance should not be altered to the disadvantage of the Arabs. There should also be recognized the existence in Palestine of a vigorous, active and political conscious Jewish community which, within the framework of the state, should be entitled not only to citizenship rights but also to a life of its own. It was clear, therefore, that a solution could be reached only on the basis of an Arab State in which the Jews in the areas where they were in a majority, would enjoy wide powers of autonomy.

Many writers have written about pressure the USA brought to bear upon member states in order to win their consent for the Partition resolution. Alfred Lilinthal calls the scheme of Partition 'unholy' and discusses pressure used in the United Nations. The final vote was to be recorded on November 26 but it was delayed by 48 hours because "the Zionists had ascertained that they lacked positive assurance of the necessary two-thirds". (78) Many members like Philippines, Haiti, etc. were opposed to Partition. The representative of Philippines, Romulo observed that "we cannot believe" that Partition Resolution, "would sanction a solution to the problem of Palestine that would turn us back on the road to the dangerous principles of racial exclusiveness and to the archaic document of theocratic governments... The problem of the displaced European Jews is susceptible of a solution other than through the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine". (79)

the result was that Philippines, Haiti, Paraguay and Luxumburg cast their affirmative vote on the Partition Resolution. Liberia was also pressurized to vote in favour of the Partition Resolution. (80)

"The Firestone Tire and Rubber Company made use of its concessions on Liberia and had transmitted a message to their representative directing him to bring pressure on Liberian Government to vote in favour of partition".

Richard Stevens has observed (81) that had Partition Resolution "been put to the vote" on November 26, "it would have failed to secure the two-thirds majority necessary". The fact of American pressure is well established when Stevens talks of Haiti and how she changed her position. "The vote of Haiti was reportedly secured through Adolph Berle, who used the promise of American economic assistance".

"Robert Nathan gave various Latin American delegates to understand that their vote for partition would greatly increase the chances of a Pan-American road project. Nathan went so far as to use the name of the State Department and even of the President in making these promises". (82)

David Horowitz made a self-confession about pressurizing the members of the General Assembly when he wrote: (83)

"The fighting spirit rose in us again. We met at the Agency offices and consulted on ways and means to turn the wheel of events once more. The struggle began again. The telephones rang madly. Cablegrams sped to all parts of the

82. Ibid., p. 179.
world. People were dragged from their bed at midnight and sent on peculiar errands. And, wonder of it all, not an influential jew, zionist or non-zionist, refused to give us his assistance at any time. Everyone pulled his weight, little or great, in the despairing effort to balance the scales in our favour."

Kermit Roosevelt also discusses American pressure in securing votes for the Partition Resolution. According to him the Zionist "rallying a group of influential Americans and selecting their targets with care, they exerted all possible influence - personal suasion, floods of telegrams and letters, and political and economic pressure". (84) on unwilling members of the General Assembly to secure their support in favour of the Partition Resolution.

The Zionists and their supporters celebrated Palestine Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. The American pressure on various members of the General Assembly to secure their support for partition resolution has become a fact of history.

The Arabs felt humiliated and reacted very sharply. The Arab delegates in the United Nations, after the adoption of Partition Resolution, made it clear that they and their countries were not bound by the decision of the General Assembly regarding the Partition of Palestine for such a decision was contrary to the spirit of the United Nations' Charter. The Arabs protested against the partition of Palestine. "An Arab crowd set on fire two petrol lorries of the American Arabian Oil Company in Amman." A three day "protest strike throughout Trans-Jordan began" on December 1, 1947 in solidarity with the Palestine Arabs." (85)

(85) The Hindu (Madras), December 3, 1947.
Ivory Pasha, the Egyptian Prime Minister told the
Chamber of Deputies on December 1, 1947 that the "decision (of part-
tition) taken by an unauthorized organisation is valueless" and
he emphasized his country's "refusal to recognize it". (86)

The Arab Higher Committee ordered a countrywide three days' 
strike and in its resolution rejected outright the decision of the 
United Nations to partition Palestine. The committee also directed 
a complete boycott of all Jews and resolved "to adopt necessary pre-
liminary measures for implementing a non-cooperation policy in 
preparation for declaring a state of emergency in Palestine". (87)
On the second day of general strike Arab demonstrators in Jerusalem 
burnt and looted some Jewish properties and the Zionists also 
began attacking buildings on the pretext that they were being used 
by the Arabs as centres of anti-Jewish activities.

The Haganah blew up a flour mill in the village of Beit Safafa 
a soda water factory at Kema Quarter and also the Supreme Moslem 
Council headquarters near the American colony. They also burnt 
down an Arab cinema. (88)

Jaffa and Tel Aviv were in the trip of fierce fighting and 
Haganah played an active role. The Haganah also requested the 
United States of America to send arms to the Jews in Palestine to 
fight against the Arabs. (89) The Zionist agents were spread all 
over the globe and were busy collecting money and arms. The Ameri-
can Jews had raised several million dollars and helped the Zionists
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in acquiring necessary heavy machinery. In France the members of Haganah bought six pieces of artillery. The first arms purchase with the communist countries was completed by the end of January 1948 "after protracted discussions between Moshe Shertok and Andrei Gromyko in New York had been concluded in January 1948 and after the Russians had given their approval. Finally Czechoslovakia agreed to sell arms to the Zionists on February 24, 1948. (90) The military strength of the Jews in Palestine by December 1947 was assessed by one writer in the following manner: (91)

"At the beginning of December 1947, the 3,000 permanently mobilised special command groups of the Hagna and the Palmack, were brought up to a strength of five battalions, about 5,000 including 1,200 women. The Haganah also commenced to mobilise its largest battalions - the Hich*, or Field Army, as well as units of HIM**second-line troops used for the static defense of settlements and towns".

The Zionists were planning and preparing well in advance and it became evident with bloodshed and violence initiated by Zionist underground terrorist groups immediately after the adoption of the Partition Resolution. The scheme of well planned massacre of Arab population by the Jewish terrorist groups became a known fact when a Jewish official told a British officer of the Jordan Arab Legion that Arab majority would not be allowed to create internal troubles because "that will be fixed. A few calculated massacres will soon get rid of them". (92)
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The method of calculated massacres of Arab population was logically consistent with Ben Gurion's thesis that "Force of arms, not formal resolutions, will determine the issue". (93) The most shockingly inhuman incident was the massacre of Deir Yasin on April 9, 1948 in which the entire village population consisting of 250 men, women and children was wiped out. The "evil deeds" of Deir Yasin have been described by Toynbee as "comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis and it "precipitated a flight of Arab population, in large numbers, from districts within the range of the Jewish armed forces and the subsequent deliberate expulsion of the Arab population from districts conquered by the Jewish armed forces". (94)

The Arab villages like Qazaza, Salamah, Sara's, Qastal, Biyar and towns of Jaffa and Acre together with many other villages were attacked and occupied by the Jewish terrorist groups. By the end of March, the situation in Palestine had further deteriorated. The Zionist lobby was very active in the United Nations. They were making hectic efforts to thwart any likely attempt in the Security Council to undo the partition of Palestine. The Zionists were preparing for any eventuality and by accelerating pace and direction of their attack on Palestinian Arabs they wanted to control and occupy as large an area as possible before the meeting of the United Nations in order to present the world body with a fait accompli. The Jews in their expansionist drive attacked and occupied many

Arab areas. A full chronology of events has been presented by a few writers. On May 15, 1948, the date for the termination of British Mandate, many cities, allotted to the Arabs under the Partition Plan, were occupied. On April 19, 1948 Tiberias was occupied, Haifa was occupied on April 22, Jaffa was occupied on April 28 and the Arab quarters in the New City of Jerusalem on April 30, Beisan was occupied on May 10 and Acre on May 14. Rabbi Abba Silver wanted that the Jewish Agency should proclaim that it had ended its existence and handed over all its prerogatives to the provisional "Hebrew" Government of Palestine. He was hopeful that "confronted by a fait accompli, the United Nations will give the government at least the same measure of recognition it was given to the Jewish Agency". (96) The United States of America in particular and other members of the United Nations in general showed great concern over rapidly worsening situation in Palestine and asked for the session of the Security Council which met on March 30, 1948. At the 275th meeting of the Security Council, the United States representative introduced two resolutions. The first resolution adopted unanimously noted "with grave concern the increasing violence and disorder in Palestine". The resolution called for a truce. The second resolution requested the Secretary General of the United Nations "to convene a special session of the General Assembly to consider further the question of the future government of Palestine". (97)
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The resolution was adopted by nine votes in favour, with two abstentions (Ukrainian SSt and the Soviet Union). The USSR representative opposed the US second resolution because it was to wreck the decision of the partition of Palestine. He said that "the United States had not only refused to support" the decision of Partition "but had raised the question of rescinding it, and, for that purpose, had submitted entirely new proposals". (98) The American policy of trusteeship for Palestine generated a wave of resentment at home. About 250,000 workers threatened to quit work "to demand that the United Nations carry out its original decision for the partition of Palestine". (99) The Secretary General of the United Nations, acting under the provisions of rules 7 and 9 of the rules of procedure of the General Assembly, called the second special session of the General Assembly on April 16, 1948 "to consider further the question of the future government of Palestine".

The General Assembly had referred the matter to the First Committee for consideration and report. Austin of the United States of America opened the debate on April 19, 1948. He told the Committee that acts of violence and threats by the Arabs and the Jews had made it "difficult for the United Nations to find a peaceful solution to the Palestine problem". He suggested trusteeship but "stressed that the temporary trusteeship should not be considered as a substitute for the plan of partition with economic union". (100)
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According to Rabbi A. H. Silver of the Jewish Agency for Palestine, "The Security Council faltered, retreated and capitulated when confronted by defiance" by the Arabs. He warned the United Nations not to take up any new proposal because the Jews "having won statehood after centuries of struggle, they would not surrender their freedom, nor suspend their activities on behalf of a Jewish state". (101)

The Jewish terrorist groups did not suspend their activities, they intensified and increased their pressure on Arab population forcing them to flee from their homes. The massacre of the Arabs of Palestine was not a spontaneous act. It was rather a "coldly calculated plan executed by the Irgun but with the knowledge of the Haganah and the Jewish Agency". (102)

On May 14, 1948, the General Assembly adopted the following resolution by thirty-one vote in favour to seven against with six abstentions:

"The General Assembly

"Taking account of the present situation in regard to Palestine strongly affirms its support of the efforts of the Security Council to secure a truce in Palestine and calls upon all Governments, organizations and persons to co-operate in making effective such a truce;

"1. Empowers a United Nations Mediator in Palestine, to be chosen by a committee of the General Assembly composed of representatives of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, to exercise the following functions:
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"(a) To use his good offices with the local and community authorities in Palestine to:

"(i) Arrange for the operation of common services necessary to the safety and wellbeing of the population of Palestine;

"(ii) Assure the protection of the Holy Places, religious buildings and sites in Palestine;

"(iii) promote a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine....

The resolution also directed "the United Nations Mediator to conform in his activities with the provisions of this resolution, and with such instructions as the General Assembly or the Security Council may issue;"...

It also "relieves the Palestine Commission from the further exercise of responsibilities under resolution 181 (11) of November 29, 1947". (103)

The Zionists were active both in the United Nations and outside. The terrorist groups like Irgun, Stern, the Haganah and the Palmach were conducting their reign of terror with no less effectiveness even during the session of the United Nations. It was always their strategy to come to the United Nations with a fait accompli. The Zionists were in full control of the situation in Palestine and, during the period from November 29, 1947 to May 15, 1948 they took matters into their own hands and attacked and occupied major cities and towns in Palestine before the termination of the British mandatory rule of Palestine on May 15, 1948. Ben-Gurion was honest enough to have accepted the Jewish forceful infiltration in the following words: (104)
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"As April began, our war of independence swung decisively from defence to attack. Operation 'Nach-Shon'... was launched with the capture of Arab Hulda and of Deir Muheisin and culminated in the storming of Qastel".

Further

"Until the British left, the Haganah captured many Arab positions and liberated Tiberias and Haifa, Jaffa and Safad... so, on the day of destiny, that part of Palestine where the Haganah could operate was almost clear of Arabs".

The Zionist forces equipped with modern weapons had not only occupied parts of the territory awarded to the "Jewish" state but had also invaded and occupied those parts like Jaffa and Acre which were assigned to the 'Arab' state and parts of international zone of Jerusalem. The withdrawal of the British forces had rendered Palestinian Arabs defenseless and at the mercy of the Jewish terrorists. The Arab States did not intervene in Palestine so long the British Government was responsible for the maintenance of peace and security in Palestine. The Arabs had exhibited remarkable control over their emotions by refraining from intervening in Palestine to save their brothers' lives and properties. They had always respected the United Nations and its resolutions while the Zionists had violated the principle enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations. They had always complied with the United Nations resolutions provided they were not in contravention of the principles of the Charter. The Arab States were accommodating and willing to carry out the decisions of the world body but not at the cost of self-respect and territorial integrity which every state is supposed to maintain. The Zionists had crucified the United Nations and the principles it stood for by their unilateral proclamation of the Jewish State on May 15, 1948. The establishment of Israel on May 15,
1948 was a flagrant violation of the United Nations resolution. The status of Palestine, after the termination of the Mandate, was to be determined by the majority of its population and not by the minority. The provisions of the Partition were to become effective two months after the withdrawal of British forces, i.e. not before July 15, 1948. The United Nations' Mediator was supposed to take over the administration of Palestine from the British authorities. "The establishment of Israel on May 15, 1948 was therefore invalid juridically, and non-binding." (105)

According to one writer "the new 'state of Israel' was the product of brute force, created in violation of the principles of the United Nations Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the very resolution under which the Israelis now claim sovereignty". (106)

On May 15, 1948, the armies of the Arab States entered into Palestine. They had not gone to Palestine to liquidate Israel, their purpose was to protect the lives and properties of their Arab brothers living in Palestine. They wanted to contain Zionist expansionism which was threatening the territorial integrity of neighbouring Arab States. The Arab armies were in Palestine not in defiance of the United Nations resolutions but to "prevent the forcible nullification of parts of that resolution by a State which had been summoned into being by that self-same Resolution." (107) The purpose of the Arab


Governments in dispatching their forces was clearly communicated to the United Nations Secretary General in a cable sent by the Secretary General of the League of Arab States. He informed him that "The recent disturbances in Palestine further constitute a serious and direct threat to peace and security within the territories of the Arab states themselves. For these reasons, and considering that the security of Palestine is a sacred trust for them, and out of anxiousness to check the further deterioration of the prevailing conditions and to prevent the spread of disorder and lawlessness into the neighbouring Arab lands, and in order to fill the vacuum created by the termination of the Mandate and the failure to replace it by any legally constituted authority, the Arab Governments find themselves compelled to intervene for the sole purpose of restoring peace and security and of establishing law and order in Palestine". (108) Glubb Pasha of the Arab Legion confirmed it when he wrote (109) about the intervention by Trans-Jordan: "In 1948, Trans-Jordan became involved in hostilities with Israel. She did not want to do this. She intended only to occupy that part of Palestine awarded to the Arabs, but the Jews were already in the Arab area when the Arab Legions arrived".

The situation in Palestine became very explosive and capable of engulfing the entire Middle East area. The United Nations moved swiftly and on May 22, 1948 the Security Council adopted a resolution calling upon "all Governments and authorities, without prejudice to


the rights, claims or position of the parties concerned, to
abstain from any hostile military action in Palestine, and to that
end to issue a ceasefire order to their military and para-military
forces". (110)

The Security Council resolution of May 22, failed to
bring peace to Palestine. On May 29, the Security Council adopted
another resolution:

"Desiring to bring about a cessation of hostilities
in Palestine without prejudice to the rights, claims and
position of either Arabs or Jews,

"Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned
to order a cessation of all acts of armed force for a
period of four weeks".

The resolution also called on the parties "to undertake that they
will not introduce fighting personnel" into the area "during the
ceasefire". (111)

Israel accepted the truce with reservations. She violated
every provision of the cease-fire orders and used it as a pretext
to strengthen her military power for another strike. Israel accept-
ed the truce to gain time and it was evident from Ben Gurion's
statement of June 10, 1948: (112)

"Our bounds are set wider, our forces multiply
we are administering public services, and daily new
multitude arrive... All that we have taken we shall
hold. During the ceasefire, we shall organize adminis-
tration with fierce energy, strengthen our footing in
towns and country, speed up colonization and Aliyah
(immigration), and look to the army".

The hostilities resumed after four weeks when the ceasefire
was over. On July 7, 1948, the Security Council addressed (113) "an
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urgent appeal to accept in principle the prolongation of the truce for such period as may be decided upon in consultation with the Mediator". On July 15, 1948, the Security Council ordered for an indefinite ceasefire declaring that: (114)

"Subject to further decision by the Security Council or the General Assembly, the truce shall remain in force, in accordance with the present resolution and with that of May 29, 1948, until a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine is reached".

Israel remained adamant and kept violating the resolutions and pursued her expansionist designs against the Arab world. On August 19, 1948, a new resolution was adopted which introduced new provisions in addition to those embodied in the resolution of May 29, 1948. According to new resolution "each party is responsible for the actions of both regular and irregular forces operating under its authority or in territory under its control". It also stipulated (115) that "no party is permitted to violate the truce on the ground that it is undertaking reprisals or relations against the other party; no party is entitled to gain military or political advantage through violation of the truce".

Israel was not observing any moral scruples and was gaining military strength and advantages to expand its frontiers at the cost of Arab world. According to one Zionist journalist, Jon Kimche: (116)

"When the truce ended, a coherent Jewish army with a tiny but effective air force and a small and daring navy was ready to give battle."

The Mediator appointed by the General Assembly submitted his report

on September 16, 1948. He had recommended in his report few revisi-
\[\text{on the Partition Plan, } "\text{according to which the } \text{Jageb would}
\]\[\text{become part of the Arab state in exchange for Galilee}." \(117\)

Count Folk Bernadotte was assassinated on September 17, 1948, one
day after he had submitted his report to the UN.

The assassination was engineered by Israel and the United
Nations asked the provisional government of Israel to submit a
report to the Security Council about the tragedy. Israel failed to
submit any report and the Security Council in its resolution of
October 19, 1948 noted \(118\) "with concern that the Provisional
Government of Israel has to date submitted no report to the Security
Council or to the "Acting Mediator regarding the progress of the
investigation into the assassination".

The truce proved too ineffective to disengage warring par-
ties. The United Nations was very anxious to bring peace to Palestine.
On November 10, 1948 the Security Council adopted a resolution which
provided more plausible and effective measures to restore peace in
Palestine. The resolution gave a new line of action which fell
within the jurisdiction of the Security Council. The resolution de-
clared that "the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to
the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter. The
Security Council "decides that, in order to eliminate the threat
to the peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from
the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine, an armistice shall
be established in all sectors of Palestine;"

"Calls upon the parties directly involved in the conflict in Palestine ... to seek agreement forthwith, by negotiations conducted either directly or through the Acting Mediator on Palestine, with a view to the immediate establishment of the armistice, including:

(a) "The delineation of permanent armistice demarcation lines beyond the armed forces of the respective parties shall not move;

(b) such withdrawal and reduction of their armed forces as will ensure the maintenance of the armistice during the transition to permanent peace in Palestine". (119)

Before proceeding further it may not be out of place to say a few words about the 'competence' of the United Nations. The question of the competence of the United Nations was raised during the discussion on the Partition Resolution. Entezam of Iran wanted to know whether "it lies within the competence of the General Assembly to recommend either of the two solutions proposed by the majority or by the minority of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine; or whether it lies within the rights of any member state or group of member states to implement any of the proposed solutions without the consent of the people of Palestine." (120) The Syrian representative El Khouri proposed "the establishment of a further Sub-Committee to be composed of Jurists to advise on the competence of the General Assembly to take and enforce a decision". (121)

The United Nations as an international organization had every right to consider Palestine question but its competence to propose any solution and enforce any decision it fancied was not beyond doubt.

120. Ad Hoc Committee on Palestine question, p. 128.
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The Palestine question was brought before the United Nations by the United Kingdom. The main reason given for such a step was that the two contending parties i.e. Arabs and Jews were unable to agree on the solution. The United Kingdom, after having failed to bring about a compromise between the Arabs and the Jews, requested for the inclusion of Palestine question on the agenda of the General Assembly's Special Session. Article 10 of the United Nations Charter had given the General Assembly the power to "discuss any question or any matter within the scope of the present Charter" and make recommendations regarding it.

The General Assembly created a special committee on Palestine consisting of eleven nations and its job was to "ascertain" and record facts, and to investigate all questions and issues relevant to the problem of Palestine".

The UNSCOP drew up 'Partition Plan' and the General Assembly set up an Ad Hoc Committee to consider the proposal. Two sub-committees came into existence to accomplish the job of studying UNSCOP proposals. The sub-committee 1 supported Majority Plan of Partitioning Palestine with economic union. The sub-committee 2 submitted three proposals and one of which suggested that the General Assembly should ask the International Court of Justice:

(a) "Whether the United Nations is competent to recommend either of the two plans and recommendations of the majority or minority of the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine, or any other solution involving partition of the territory of Palestine or a permanent trusteeship over any or part of Palestine, without the consent of the majority of the people of Palestine;

(b) Whether the United Nations or any of its member states, is competent to enforce or recommend the enforcement of any proposal concerning the Constitution and future Government of Palestine, in particular any plan of partition which is contrary to the wishes or adopted without the consent of the inhabitants of Palestine". (122)

The resolution requesting the General Assembly to seek the advice of the International Court of Justice was rejected.

The Partition Resolution of the United Nations did not express free opinion of its member states. The United States of America had used enormous financial and diplomatic pressure on members of the United Nations to win their support for creating a Jewish state in Palestine. Weizmann had accepted the fact of American pressure being used on various member states in order to get their support for the Partition Plan. He also accepted that the Partition Resolution was passed because of President Truman's intervention and pressure. Le Monde, the French newspaper also refers (123) to "the weight of twenty billion dollars of credits which the United States granted to certain countries at that time".

The Partition Resolution adopted by the General Assembly was *ultra vires* for it violated the principles laid down in the Mandate and the United Nations Charter. The people of Palestine were, under the Partition Plan, deprived not only of political control over their territory but also of their state itself. The Covenant of the League of Nations had recognized the independent existence of the people of Palestine. The Mandatory power was responsible for looking after the interest of the people of Palestine and was expected to help them towards the goal of complete independence. The United Nations Partition Plan had violated another mandate provision whereby it was provided that at the termination of the mandate the territory of Palestine would be placed under the control of the "Government of Palestine". The United Nations was competent to

deal with the question of Palestine only to the extent it constituted threat to peace and security. Apart from situation involving a threat to peace, the United Nations had no power under the Charter to impair the integrity of Palestine against the wishes of the majority of Palestinians.

The question of the United Nations competence is linked up with the question whether the United Nations was a continuation of the League of Nations as regards the mandate over Palestine.

Many reputed jurists of International Law hold the view that there exists no legal continuity between the Mandate system of the League and trusteeship system of the United Nations. According to Hans Kelson (124) "The United Nations did not succeed to the rights of the League of Nations as regards the former Mandated Territories". Kelson's point of view cannot be accepted because the Charter of the United Nations under Article 80(1) very clearly stipulated that mandates which create rights and obligations for states and peoples would remain in force until they were replaced by an alternate system. The International Court of Justice upheld article 80 when it affirmed: (125)

"From all aspects, the raison d'etre of obligations resulting from mandates and their first objective remains. As the fulfilment of these obligations did not depend on the existence of the League of Nations they could not become obsolete simply because this organ of supervision had ceased to exist, nor could the right of the population to see the territory administered according to three rules be conditional on the existence of the League".

A. McNair, an authority on international legal order said: (126) "The
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dissolution of the League of Nations has not put an end to Mandates". The competence of the United Nations regarding Palestine is well established and substantiated by well reputed jurists and verdicts of International Court of Justice. The United Nations Charter under Articles 10 and 14 had empowered the General Assembly to step in wherever peace and security were threatened but the United Nations cannot go beyond a limit and such limits are well set by the provisions of the Charter. Article 1, Para 2 sets some limits on the competence of the United Nations. It sanctions the right of self-determination to the peoples and Palestinians were not and should not have been exceptions. Article 1 Para 2 asks the United Nations to work "in conformity with the principles of justice and international law" and to respect "the principles of equal rights and self-determination of the peoples". The United Nations cannot act as a super state empowered to impose its will and decisions on unwilling peoples. According to Brownlie: (127)

"It is doubtful if the United Nations has a capacity to convey title inter alia because the organization cannot assume the role of territorial sovereign... Thus the resolution of 1947 containing a partition plan for Palestine was probably ultra vires (outside the competence of the United Nations) and, if it was not, was not binding on member states in any case".

The General Assembly violated Articles 10 and 14 because there was a distinction between recommending some proposals as a solution and adopting a plan which was against the wishes of the majority of the people. The Partition Plan was a decision which was not mere recommendation but also implied some amount of coercion because it was

provided in the plan that any effort to alter by force the settlement embodied in the Partition Resolution would mean breach of the peace or act of aggression.

The General Assembly would have been acting within its area of jurisdiction had it made recommendations to the United Kingdom. It violated the provisions of the United Nations Charter by creating a Committee to administer Palestine on behalf of the United Nations.

Kelson is of the view that (128) "the decision of the United Nations to administer a territory for the purpose of establishing two states therein cannot be within the competence of the United Nations".

The General Assembly has no competence to implement a decision nor it is empowered to request the Security Council to take enforcement measures by virtue of Article 14. In fact the Council is not competent to implement the recommendations made by the General Assembly.

The General Assembly was expected to have ordered for a plebiscite in Palestine to secure the consent of the peoples of that country. The Assembly did not do it, instead it partitioned Palestine into Jew and Arab States without bothering about the right of self-determination of the peoples of Palestine.

The Charter of the United Nations does not confer any power on the General Assembly to uproot people from their areas and deny people the right of self-determination and the right to exercise power within a political entity. The United Nations failed to act

impartially and its unfortunate decision of partitioning Palestine into Arab and Jew State brought nothing but miseries and sorrows for the people of the area. The people of Palestine in particular and the people of Middle East in general are still paying the price for the folly of the United Nations committed at the bid of the Zionists and their masters, i.e. the USA and the USSR.
Chapter II

THE ARMISTICE AND THE UNEASY PEACE

The situation in Palestine, after the withdrawal of British administration, had further deteriorated. The Zionists were now free to conduct their terrorist activities against local Arab population of Palestine. Israel, a Jewish State, was proclaimed on May 15, 1948. The Zionists had stepped up their systematic and well planned attacks on Arab life and property. The armed forces of Arab States had gone to Palestine to save the world from another war. Their aim was to prevent the local conflagration from proliferating to neighbouring areas. While Arab Israeli forces were engaged in fighting, the United Nations stepped in and the Security Council adopted a resolution on May 22, 1948 calling upon all parties to abstain from any hostile military action in Palestine and ordered ceasefire. Israel did not observe the truce and stubbornly stuck to its policy of expansion in Arab Land at the cost of indigenous people. The truce was flagrantly violated and Arab territory was annexed by Israel. The United Nations was kept informed of Israeli violations of the truce but the world organization proved to be too ineffective to prevent Israel from adopting reckless and expansionist attitude. The Arab States were still hopeful of the United Nations delivering good and justice to them.

On October 23, 1948, the Egyptian representative addressed a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations informing him about Israel's violations of the truce and recording deep concern of his Government at the deteriorating situation. The representative wrote: "the Zionist forces in Palestine are constantly violating the
truce and defying the ceasefire orders given by the Council". The representative told the United Nations Secretary General of the dangers inherent in Israeli violations of the Council's directives. He stated (1) that the violations were not ordinary to be overlooked, they were "being done to such an extent as to endanger the safety of our troops and to render it imminently inevitable for them to take the necessary counter-measures, unless the Security Council acts in proper time". The Security Council met to consider the situation in Palestine but it failed to act as an instrument of restoring peace. The Security Council was trapped in a marathon debate on technicalities and procedural questions. The time was slipping off and Israel conscious of the United Nations ineffectiveness, refused to see reason and kept its policy of expansionism in full gear. Israel's invasion of the Negeb came as a shock and it posed a serious threat to the territorial integrity of the Middle Eastern states. The Negeb invasion was deliberate, meticulously planned, ruthlessly and unscrupulously executed. The Acting Mediator condemned Israel for "serious breach of the truce". In his report submitted to the Security Council he wrote: "A serious breach of the truce is involved in the Negeb outbreak as defined in the resolutions of the Security Council on May 29, July 15 and August 19. The resolution of July 15 ordered an indefinite ceasefire, while the resolution of August 19 specifically precludes acts of reprisals and retaliation".

The Zionists' attack on the Negeb was preplanned and unprovoked. It was launched in order to gain administrative and political control over the territory of which assassinated Mediator,

Count Bernadotte, had deprived them and which they wanted to conquer to present the United Nations with a fait accompli. The Zionist attack was well-planned and the Acting Mediator in his report said: (2)

"It would seem clear that the military action of the last few days on a large scale which could only be undertaken after considerable preparation and could scarcely be explained as simple retaliatory action for an attack on a convoy".

The Acting Mediator also referred to "widespread attack on the Egyptian positions by Israeli Land and air forces in the Negeb and heavy shelling and ariel bombing of Gaza." The Security Council heard the report but could not take any action because the Big Powers supported and appeased Israel. They ignored its violations of the United Nations resolutions. The situation in the Middle East further deteriorated and the Acting Mediator submitted another Report on October 28 to the Security Council.

He presented a grim but real picture of the Middle Eastern situation and told (3) the Security Council:

"In my view, a critical stage has now been reached where bolder and broader action is required. Such action as an indispensable condition to an eventual peaceful settlement of the political issues might well take the form of a clear and forceful declaration by the Security Council that the parties be required to negotiate either directly or through the Truce supervision organization a settlement of all outstanding problems of the truce in all sectors of Palestine, with a view to achieving a permanent condition of peace in place of the existing truce".

The Acting Mediator then proposed before the Council that an armistice was the only way out to bring peace to the trouble land. He said: (4)
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Such negotiations would necessarily aim at a formal peace, or at the minimum, an armistice which would involve either complete withdrawal and demobilization of armed forces or their wide separation by the creation of broad demilitarized zones under the United Nations supervision.

Alexander Cadogan of the United Kingdom supported the Acting Mediator, Ralph Bunch in his plea that the Security Council should take bolder and broader actions. Cadogan in his speech said: (5)

"The best hope, pending a political settlement of the whole question is to arrive at a more comprehensive and stable state of armistice, or even peace, rather than seek to prolong and enforce the truce".

The United Kingdom and China prepared and presented a draft resolution before the Security Council on October 28, 1948. The draft resolution (S/1059) embodied the suggestions made by the Acting Mediator.

The draft resolution asked (6) both the parties to "withdraw military forces to the positions they occupied on October 14".

The Soviet Union opposed (7) the draft resolution on the ground that "the Acting Mediator has not exhausted all possible ways and means under the previous resolution". According to Malik, the USSR representative, the Acting Mediator should be given a fair chance "to use all possible means for the settlement of the questions that have arisen between the two parties".

Abba Eban of Israel also objected to the draft resolution.
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According to him, "It corresponds less and less to the realities of the situation in the Negeb and to the prospects of a peaceful settlement. It is likely to provoke a grave and unnecessary crisis in a matter clearly susceptible of peaceful negotiations". (8)

The United Kingdom and China tried their utmost and started lobbying to get the resolution passed but with no success. Many amendments were offered and finally the United Kingdom withdrew its draft resolution. On November 16, 1948, Canada, Belgium, France trio presented a new draft resolution (S/1079) which embodied the suggestions of the Acting Mediator and provisions of UK-China draft resolution. The draft resolution presented by Canada, Belgium and France stipulated; (9)

"The Security Council,

"Reaffirming its previous resolutions concerning the establishment and implementation of the truce in Palestine, and recalling particularly its resolution of July 15 1948 which determined that the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace within the meaning of Article 39 of the Charter;

"Taking a note that the General Assembly is continuing its consideration of the future Government of Palestine in response to the request of the Security Council of April 1, 1948 (S/714);

"Without prejudice to the actions of the Acting Mediator regarding the implementation of the resolution of the Security Council of November 4, 1948,

"Decides that, in order to eliminate the threat to the peace in Palestine and to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine, an armistice shall be established in all sectors of Palestine;

"Calls upon the Parties directly involved in the conflict in Palestine, as a further provisional measure under Article 40 of the Charter, to seek agreement forthwith, by negotiations con-
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ducted either directly or through the Acting Mediator on Palestine, with a view to the immediate establishment of the armistice including:

"(a) The delimitation of permanent armistice demarcation lines beyond which the armed forces of the respective parties shall not move;

"(b) Such withdrawal and reduction of their armed forces as will ensure the maintenance of the armistice during the transition to permanent peace in Palestine".

Alexander Cadogan in his comments said: (10) "By adopting the Canadian, Belgian French draft resolution the Security Council will thus be consolidating the ground already gained and...making a further definite step forward".

Eban of Israel was not very happy with the draft resolution because he believed it (11) "to be incompatible in principle and effect with the purpose of a peace settlement and with the conditions of an unprejudiced negotiations". The Arab States were a bit skeptical about the Security Council's resolution being implemented. They had not lost all hopes in the effectiveness of the United Nations but they were certainly in a self-searching mood for putting all their eggs in one basket. Fawzi Bey of Egypt was betraying Arab's dwindling hope in the United Nations when he said: (12) "We have", previous decisions of the Council, "unimplemented and seek yet another decision". Elkhouri of Syria was more outspoken and straightforward when he added: (13)
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If the Security Council fails to execute the truce, as it decided to do in previous resolution, with what right and with what possibility can it take a step forward and decide on an armistice."

The Canadian, Belgian, French resolution was adopted by the Security Council on November 16, 1948.

To implement the Security Council's resolution of November 16, 1948, bilateral negotiations between Israel and Arab States were held at Rhodes. The negotiations were conducted by Ralph Bunch, the Acting Mediator. Four Armistice Agreements were concluded and signed at Rhodes in 1949. Egypt-Israel Armistice Agreement was signed on February 24, 1949, with Lebanon it came on March 23, 1949. Jordan Israel Armistice Agreement came on April 3, 1949 and the last country to have signed armistice with Israel was Syria. The Security Council resolution of November 16, 1948 was written large on all armistice agreements. The preamble attached with every agreement clearly established (14) that the parties were "responding to the Security Council resolution of November 16, 1948... calling upon them to facilitate the transition from the present truce to permanent peace in Palestine, to negotiate an armistice".

The conclusion of armistice agreements between Arab States and Israel did not mean that there was no state of "belligerency" between two warring parties. According to the interpretation of Israel, Armistice meant end of war and it paved the way for permanent peace on the basis of accomplished fact. The Arab States thought of armistice agreements as instruments of temporary and uneasy peace. The armistice agreements, according to the Arab States, did not mean termination of "state of war". The interpretation given by the Arab

States was in conformity with the principles of international law.

According to Oppenheim (15) "Armistices or truces, in the
wider sense of the term, are all agreements between belligerent forces
for a temporary cessation of hostilities. They are in no wise to be
called temporary peace, because the conditions of war remains between
the belligerents themselves, and between the belligerents and neutrals,
on all points beyond the mere cessation of hostilities".

The Security Council resolution of November 16, 1948 also
stipulated that the armistice was a "provisional measure under Article
40 of the Charter" of the United Nations pending consideration by
the General Assembly of the question of "the future government of
Palestine".

Demilitarized Zones

The chief purpose of armistice agreements was to disengage
warring parties and create as large an area as possible between the
two fighting forces. The establishment of four demilitarized zones
along the armistice demilitarized zone in the area of El-Auja and its
vicinity. Article VIII, para 1 read: "The area comprising the
village of El Auja and vicinity shall be demilitarized, and both
Egyptian and Israeli armed forces shall be totally excluded there-
from". Article X para 1 said: "The execution of the provisions of
this Agreement shall be supervised by a Mixed Armistice Commission
composed of seven members, of whom each party to this Agreement shall
designate three, and whose chairman shall be the United Nations Chief
of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization or a senior officer
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from the observer personnel of that organization designated by him following consultation with both parties to this Agreement". Under the same Article para 2 it was provided (16) that "the Mixed Armistice Commission shall maintain its headquarters at El-Auja".

A demilitarized zone was also created along the Syrian border. The Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement on July 20, 1949 provided for the demilitarized zone would be created, Article V, para 1 stated:

"It is emphasized that the following arrangements for the Armistice Demarcation Line between the Israeli and Syrian armed forces and for the Demilitarized zone are not to be interpreted as having any relation whatever to ultimate territorial arrangement affecting the two parties to this Agreement".

The Demilitarized zone was defined in such a manner that the possibility of friction was reduced. Para 2 of Article V stated:

"In pursuance of the spirit of the Security Council resolution of 16 November 1948, the Armistice Demarcation Line and the Demilitarized zone have been defined with a view towards separating the armed forces of the two parties in such a manner as to minimize the possibility of friction and incident, while providing for the gradual restoration of normal civilian life in the area of the Demilitarized Zone, without prejudice to the ultimate settlement".

Under the same Article para 5(a) it was stipulated: (17)

"Where the Armistice Demarcation Line does not correspond to the international boundary between Syria and Palestine, the area between the Armistice Demarcation Line and the boundary, pending final territorial settlement between the parties shall be established as a Demilitarized zone from which the armed forces of both parties shall be totally excluded, and in which no activities by military or para-military forces shall be permitted. This provision applies to the Ein Gev and Bardara sectors which share form part of the Demilitarized zone".


The Syrian forces were present in areas declared as the Demilitarized zone and after signing the Armistice Agreement, the Syrian army withdrew from the areas in pursuance with the Agreement.

The Mount Scopus Demilitarized zone was created in Jordan Sector and comprised of the Hebrew University and Hadassa Hospital compound along with Augusta Victoria building. On July 7, 1948, Jordan signed an agreement with Israel and agreed to treat the area as demilitarized and it was to be placed under the protection of the United Nations. Israel-Jordan Armistice Agreement had a map which showed the Demilitarized zone on the side of Jordan where Israel had no jurisdiction.

Another Demilitarized zone was Jabal-el Mukabbir area. It comprised the Old Government House, the Arab College, a Jewish Agricultural School. Apart from the Demilitarized zone there was no man's land between the Arab and Israeli part of Jerusalem. The Latrun area was also a No Man's Land.

The most important principles enshrined in all Armistice Agreements were (1) No party should try to make use of truce as instrument of gaining military or political advantage. Article IV, para 1 of the Egyptian Israeli Armistice Agreement stated: (18) "The principle that no military or political advantage should be gained under the truce ordered by the Security Council is recognized." Article II, para 1 of the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement reaffirmed the same principle.
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Jordan-Israeli and Syria-Israeli Armistice Agreements contained the same provisions too. Another significant point to keep in mind and underlined by all Armistice Agreement was that its purpose was not to draw a boundary line between Israel and Arab states. Its basic purpose was purely military rather than political. The armistice demarcation line was to delineate the line beyond which the armed forces of their respective parties would not move. The armistice line was delineated without prejudice to rights, claims and positions of either party to the armistice as regards the ultimate settlement of the Palestine question.

**Truce Supervision**

The Armistice Agreements were intended to disengage both warring parties and keep a vigil on their military activities against each other. The Security Council created Mixed Armistice Commissions for truce supervision. The Acting Mediator who was in charge of all UN peacekeeping activities in Palestine was relieved of his responsibilities. On August 18, 1949 General McNaughton of Canada and Chauvel of France submitted a revised draft resolution before the Security Council. According to the Resolution (19)

"The Security Council

"Having noted with satisfaction the several Armistice Agreements concluded by means of negotiations between the parties involved in the conflict in Palestine in pursuance of its resolution of 16 November 1948;

"Decides that all functions assigned to the United Nations Mediator on Palestine having been discharged, the Acting Mediator is relieved of any further responsibility under Security Council resolutions".
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The Resolution further

"Notes that the Armistice Agreements provide that the execution of these agreements shall be supervised by Mixed Armistice Commissions whose chairman in each case shall be the United Nations Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization or a senior officer from the observer personnel of that organization designated by him following consultation with the parties to the Agreements".

The Resolution was adopted on August 11, 1949 by 9 votes to none with two abstentions namely Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. All members of the Security Council were unanimous in asking that the Armistice Agreement should meticulously be observed, but some of them at the same time demanded a sizeable reduction in truce supervision personnel. Eban of Israel was one of those who insisted that Truce Supervision Organization should be dissolved and all UN personnel, with the exception of certain specified personnel, should be withdrawn. Eban said: (20)

"I believe that the Security Council would meet the situation if it did call for the withdrawal of all observer personnel except those specified as being required by the text of the Armistice agreement themselves".

Mahmoud Fawzi Bey of Egypt was in agreement with Eban of Israel when he too demanded for the withdrawal of UN observers. He said: (21)

"The principle of withdrawing all supervision is a very sound one indeed. I unhesitatingly subscribe to it as a principle. No one wants outside supervision if it can be helped".

Rafik Asha of Syria supported the views of Egypt and said (22)"My delegation is in favour - in complete favour of the withdrawal of all personnel, provided that the terms of the Armistice Agreements are fully complied with".
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The Armistice Agreements had provided for the supervision of the ceasefire and Mixed Armistice Commission were created under the chairmanship of the Chief of Staff. The Powers and functions of the Mixed Armistice Commissions were clearly defined in all the General Armistice Agreements.

Article X, para 1 of the Egyptian Israeli Armistice Agreement stated that "the execution of the provisions of this Agreement shall be supervised by a Mixed Armistice Commission composed of seven members of whom each party to this Agreement shall designate them". Para 4 of the same Article provided: "Decisions of the Mixed Armistice Commission, to the extent possible, shall be based on the principle of unanimity. In the absence of unanimity, decisions shall be taken by a majority vote of the members of the Commission present and voting". Para 4 also provided for the establishment of a Special Committee which would consider appeal. The Special Committee was to be composed of the United Nations Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization and one member each of the Egyptian and Israeli Delegations to the Armistice Conference at Rhodes.

The Mixed Armistice Commission would formulate its own rules of procedure and would be empowered to employ Observers in such numbers as may be considered essential to the performance of its functions. As to the interpretation of the meaning of a particular provision of the Armistice Agreement, the Commission's interpretation was to prevail subject to the right of appeal as provided in paragraph 4.

The Observers and other personnel of the Mixed Armistice Commission were free to visit any area. They would be accorded
such freedom of movement and access in the areas covered by this Agreement as the Commission may determine to be necessary.

Jordan-Israel General Armistice Agreement of April 3, 1949 created a Special Committee for the purpose of "formulating agreed plans and arrangements designed to enlarge the scope of this Agreement and to effect improvement in its application."

The Special Committee was to formulate agreed plans regarding "free movement of traffic on vital roads, including the Bethlehem and Latrun Jerusalem roads; resumption of cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus", etc.

Para 3 of Article VII stated (23) "The Special Committee shall have exclusive competence over such matters as may be referred to it. Agreed plans and arrangements formulated by it may provide for the exercise of supervisory functions by the Mixed Armistice Commission."

The Security Council was acting under Articles 39 and 40 in order to bring peace to the troubled land of Palestine. Its orders of ceasefire, truce and armistice were directed to restoring normal peaceful conditions in Palestine and pave the way for mutual negotiations between two parties at loggerhead.

All pious hopes were shattered and Israel refused to listen to all voices of reason. The Security Council resolutions were flouted with impunity and Israel followed the policy of expediency and did not care to renounce her expansionist postures.

The Security Council Resolution of November 16, 1948 was an improvement on its previous resolutions. It had provided for an
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effective Truce Supervision Organization but Israel was bent on wrecking all efforts of the United Nations to maintain peace. She concluded General Armistice Agreements with four Arab States, i.e. Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria.

Israel under the Armistice Agreements was bound to respect the "injunction of the Security Council against resort to military force in the settlement of the Palestine question". (24) She was also bound by the principle that "no military or political advantage should be gained under the truce ordered by the Security Council." (25)

Israel flouted both the obligations it voluntarily assumed under the Armistice Agreements. She invaded Arab territories and annexed them. Her policy of expanding frontiers was in violations of the United Nations Charter and its resolutions. The Security Council in its resolution No. 61 dated November 4, 1948 asked Israel to withdraw her armed forces from those areas which it occupied after October 14, 1948.

The Security Council Resolution of November 16, 1948 and subsequent General Armistice Agreements of 1949 established permanent truce lines and demilitarized zones. Israel, as a party to the resolutions and Armistice Agreements, was supposed to carry out her obligations and refrain from the use of force. She chose the path of delinquency and flagrantly violated the Armistice Agreements. The demilitarized zones, which were created to keep the armed forces at a distance, were forcefully occupied by Israel. El-Auja, a demilitarized zone near Egyptian border and the Headquarter of the Mixed
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Armistice Commission, was overrun by Israeli armed forces and occupied. Many times Israel was found as having committed aggression and was subsequently asked to vacate the occupied area but Israel had always refused to oblige the United Nations. It showed scant respect for the Mixed Armistice Commission or Special Committee. On March 20, 1950 Israel committed a serious violation by occupying Bir Qattar area. The Mixed Armistice Commission asked Israel to vacate the area; the Special Committee confirmed the decision of the Commission and asked Israel to leave Bir Qattar, but Israel remained adamant and its armed forces continued to occupy the area. (26)

The matter was referred to the Security Council and on November 17, 1950 a resolution was passed asking Israel to withdraw its forces from the zone.

The most serious violation of the Armistice Agreement was committed in September 1950 when Israeli armed forces occupied El-Auja demilitarized zone. On September 2, 1950 Israeli military personnel rounded up about 4,000 Bedouins living in the Negeb and around the demilitarized zone of El-Auja. The Arab Bedouins were driven out of the territory occupied Israel. According to the reports the Israelis burnt tents, crops and other possessions of Bedouins.

Israel had violated the sanctity of the demilitarized zone of El-Auja. It established a military camp under the guise of a "kibbutz". They expelled Bedouins from the area to station their armed forces at a point which was strategically very important. On September 9, 1950 the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt
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wrote a letter to the Secretary General of the United Nations. He charged (27) "the Israeli authorities" of undertaking a "large scale military operation, using troops, automatic weapons and armoured vehicles, in order to drive out of the El-Auja area of Palestine all the Bedouins settled in that demilitarized zone and its surrounding areas. After being driven as far as the Egyptian frontier by the Israeli forces, which were guided by an Israeli reconnaissance aeroplane, those Bedouins were compelled on September 2 to cross frontier between Egypt and Palestine to seek refuge in the Egyptian territory of Sinai". The letter pointed out that it was not the first case of expulsion of local Arabs, many more had occurred: "Between June 26, 1949 and September 4, 1950, more than a thousand Arabs men, women and children living in the areas of Haifa, Acre, Galilee, Jerusalem, Ramle and El-Majdal, and in other districts under Jewish control, were forcibly removed from their homes and constrained to take refuge in the narrow Gaza Rafah sector under Egyptian occupation in southern Palestine". The United Nations was requested to intervene "in the events reported above and, while there is yet time, stop the expulsion of the remnants of the Arab population in Palestinian territory now under Jewish control".

On September 18, 1950 General Riley, Chief of Staff after making a thorough investigation ascertained the fact and confirmed Israeli violation of the Armistice Agreement. In his Report submitted to the Security Council General Riley confirmed (28) that "Israeli military rounded up some 4,000 Bedouins and after driving the Bedouins
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across the border the Israelis burnt tents, crops and possessions, and that thirteen Bedouins were killed by Israelis during those operations". The question of the Arabs expulsion and Israel's occupation of Bir Qattar and El-Auja was brought before the Security Council by Egypt. Mahmud Fawzi Bey of Egypt told the Security Council on October 16, 1950 that Israeli violations were (29) "not a slight mistake here and there in the application of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement; nor is it an unintentional trespassing on the rights of a few Palestinian Arabs". "What we are facing now", told the Egyptian representative, "is much bigger and much more serious than all that. We are facing a continuation and an intensification of premeditated, systematic and ruthless aggression by world political zionism against the rights of the lawful Arab inhabitants of Palestine..."

Fawzi referred to Israel's policy of "relentless chasing out of the Arabs and their possessions to the motley hordes of invaders from abroad". He told the Council that the Israelis compelled Arabs to sign a document before being driven out. He quoted from the report of the Chief of Staff dated September 18, 1950 where he observed that the Arabs expelled were "required to sign a statement agreeing to go to Gaza, never return to Israel, and abandoning all property rights". (30)

Israel was declared in illegal occupation of Bir Qattar and other areas of the demilitarized zone along the Egyptian border.
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The Armistice Commission came to the conclusion that occupation of Bir Qattar was a violation of Article IV para 1 and 2, of the Egyptian Israeli General Armistice Agreement. Israel filed an appeal with the Special Committee which upheld the decision of the Mixed Armistice Commission. Israel did not comply with the verdict of the Commission confirmed by the Special Committee and refused to evacuate areas she occupied. The matter then was brought before the Security Council. On October 16, 1950 Eban of Israel denied all charges levelled against it by Egypt. He said: "I categorically state that Israeli forces have not violated either Egyptian territory or the demilitarized zone of El Auja". He further denied the charge of expelling the Bedouins from El-Auja. He declared that the bedouins expelled were not the residents of El-Auja, they were infiltrators who had crossed into Israeli territory without permission. He admitted that "the number of Azizmeh tribesmen sent back after illegally crossing the frontier and committing violence is approximately 200 families, and not 4,000 persons as alleged". He also declared with stubbornness "the immigration policies of my government are not the business or the concern of Egypt or its representative". "The immigration policy was the chief pride and achievement of Israel in the world" (31) and it was Israel's internal matter.

Mahmud Fawzi did not allow Eban score a point and refuted him and his statement presented before the Security Council. On October 20, 1950 Fawzi called Eban's bluff and refuted Israel's claim that the Bedouins expelled were infiltrators. He told the Council that such a theory if accepted "would mean that Israel

could deprive all the remainder of the lawful Arab population of Palestine of their identity papers, and throw them out across the frontier into Egypt or into any other surrounding country. He further informed the Council that "we have ample proof of the forced expulsion of Arabs from Palestine". He quoted the report of the Acting Chairman of the Egyptian Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission of September 6, 1950. The Acting Chairman confirmed: (32) "Up to September 3, the number of expelled Bedouins totalled 4,071 people (1,791 are in Sabha and 2,281 are in Ain-Qudaisa and in Gabil-el Daghra, east of Ain-el-Qiderrat)." The chairman also confirmed that those Bedouins were living "in Beersheba area, where, during the Mandate, they had received their rations from the British."

The Security Council also heard Jordan's complaint against Israeli violations of international frontier. Haikal of Jordan informed the Security Council on October 20, 1950 about Israeli aggression and occupation of Jordanian territory. He told (33) the Council that "the Israelis committed a flagrant act of aggression upon Jordan when they occupied a part of Jordanian territory on August 28, 1950". "This aggression", declared Haikal, "gives material form to the permanent fear of the Arab States that the Israelis have embarked upon a policy of expansion at their expense". The Council at that juncture got involved in a debate of procedural importance. The issue was whether the Council was competent to hear and entertain complaint from both the parties over and above the Mixed Armistice Commissions which were directly responsible
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for looking into such complaints. General Ailey and Ralph Bunch appeared before the Security Council to record their views over the issue. The United States representative expressed (34) his Government's opinion in the Security Council regarding the jurisdiction of the Mixed Armistice Commission. "It is the opinion of my Government that all but one of the complaints should be handled in the Mixed Armistice Commissions. We do not believe that the remedies available to the parties have been exhausted. This is not to imply that this Council should slight these complaints, but in the interests of ensuring the continued effective operation of the Mixed Armistice Commissions and the various other special negotiating bodies, the Council should not intervene until it has been clearly established that complaints exist which cannot be handled by the established machinery". Austin of America presented before the Security Council a draft resolution (S/1899) jointly sponsored by France, UK and USA. (35) The resolution stated that the Security Council "takes note of the statement of the Government of Israel that Israel armed forces will evacuate Bir Qattar". It implied an order to Israel to evacuate Bir Qattar area forcibly occupied by it in violation of the Armistice Agreement. Israel did not yield and remained adamant. Eban of Israel while commenting on the draft resolution stated: (36)

"There is absolutely no question of the evacuation of Bir Qattar. The question related to the removal of a certain military force at Bir Qattar, in accordance with the Mixed Armistice Commission's decision of 20 March 1950. The Armistice decision related to that military circumstances".
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The Resolution asking Israel to withdraw from Bir Qattar was adopted on November 17, 1950, by a vote of 9 in favour with 2 abstentions. (37)

Israel ignored all the Security Council resolutions and chose to continue acting like an unbridled horse. The forceful occupation of El-Auja by Israel was a part of its scheme to bring Jewish immigrants to settle them down in Arab land. The occupation of El-Auja was of immense significance from the military point of view. General Burns has pointed out El-Auja's importance: (38) "It lay across the second principal route for the invasion of Palestine from Egypt (or vice versa). It was from this general area that the decisive attack by the Israeli forces on the Egyptian forces had been launched in December 1948, and that another was to erupt again in October-November 1956". According to Burns El-Auja's occupation by either party was enough to have disturbed the military balance in its favour. "If, indeed, the zone had remained", wrote Burns, "demilitarized - that is to say, if it could not have been traversed or occupied by the armed forces of either side - it would have been almost impossible for either to have carried out an offensive successfully, the balance of forces as they were".

The Israelis did not want to withdraw from El-Auja and on September 28, 1953 they established in the area settlement called Ketsiot. The Israeli contention was that the settlement was for the purposes of farming and agriculture and they claimed that the demilitarized zone was part of Israeli territory. The Egyptian con-
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tention was that the settlement was a military organization and not an agricultural centre. It was proved on October 6, 1954 when one captured Israeli 'Kibbutz' member told the United Nations Military observer that 'he was a private in a certain company of a certain battalion of the Israel Army. He also said all the inhabitants of the Kibbutz were soldiers in their unit, and consisted of one Captain, four NCOs, sixty-five men soldiers, and fifteen women soldiers. They had the usual armament of an infantry company, rifles, sub-machine guns, light machine-guns, mortars, and anti-tank weapons". Burns further testified (39) "The Israeli carried identification papers proving he was a member of the Army, and his story sounded truthful".

The Mixed Armistice Commission in its meeting on October 2, 1953 was seized of the matter and decided that (40) "the existence of an Israeli Police in the new Kibbutz established in the demilitarized zone is a violation of Article IV, paragraph I, and Article VIII of the General Armistice Agreement".

General Bennike told the Security Council on November 9, 1953 that Israel regarded (41) "the demilitarized zone being an integral part of Israel" and "any Israeli activity in the demilitarized zone is an internal Israeli affair and of no concern of anybody". Israel kept up its pressure on and penetration into Arab territory. On February 28, 1955 "two platoons of Israeli paratroopers crossed the Armistice Demarcation Line east of Gaza, advanced more than
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three kilometers into the Egyptian controlled strip, and attacked a military camp near the railway station", killed fourteen Egyptian soldiers and wounded sixteen soldiers. "Another group of Israeli soldiers entered the strip six kilometres south of Gaza and laid an ambush on the main road from Rafah". (42) Egypt brought the matter to the Security Council on March 4, 1955. The Security Council meeting of March 9, 1955 was important from the point of view that all members of the Council showed deep concern at the deteriorating conditions in the Middle East and held Israel responsible for such a condition.

Wadsworth of the USA told the Council that (43) "the incident which has occurred in the Gaza district is indefensible from any standpoint". He warned Israel against latter's policy of retaliation and made it clear that his country would not stand by Israel if she pursued her policy of reprisal because he stated: "We oppose any policy of reprisal and retaliation".

Hoppenot of France recorded his country's disapproval of Israel's policy of expansion and reprisals and expressed "anxiety on the events that took place at Gaza on the night of February 28, 1955". He told the Council that (44) "we cannot remain indifferent to the fact that about sixty soldiers and civilians, most of them Egyptians, died during the attack by Israel forces". He congratulated the Egyptian Government and nation "on the calmness and self-control
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that they have preserved in the face of these lamentable events".

Sobolov of the USSR accused Israel of being 'responsible' for the "Gaza incident". He said that (45) "these acts by the Israel armed forces are a serious violation of the United Nations Charter and are increasing tension in the area".

On March 17, 1955 Egypt's complaint of "violent and premeditated aggression committed on February 28, 1955 by Israel armed forces against Egyptian armed forces inside Egyptian controlled territory near Gaza, causing many casualties, including 39 dead and 32 wounded" was submitted to the Security Council.

Eban of Israel tried to justify the Gaza incident in terms of self-defence. He told the Council; (47) "the armed clash on February 28, 1955" was the result of "a series of long standing antagonism and immediate provocations exploded into a conflict". He tried to tell the Council that Israeli aggression in Gaza was aimed at wiping out "the centre from which the violence is organized and directed". Gaza was the "Egyptian Military headquarters" from where military activities were being conducted against Israel and her people".

Hoppenot of France rejected Eban's explanation and stated (48) "The Security Council cannot allow Israel to seek satisfaction for its grievances against Egypt, even if legitimate, through a policy of reprisals and revenge. If the Gaza incident, coming on top of the
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Qibya incident, were the expression of such a policy, Israel would have to be prepared to bear alone the consequences of the censure of that policy".

France, United Kingdom and the United States jointly sponsored a draft resolution (S/3378) in the Security Council. The resolution declared Israel as having violated the Armistice Agreement and the Security Council resolutions. Peerson Dixon of the United Kingdom told the Security Council that (49) "it was established in the Mixed Armistice Commission that units of the Israel army had crossed the demarcation line, attacked an outpost in the Gaza strip manned by the Egyptian army. "This was a deliberate and planned military operation".

Lodge of USA charged Israel of being guilty of violating its United Nations Charter obligations. "The United States believes", he said, (50) "that, whatever the provocation might have been, there was no justification for the Israeli military action at Gaza. Israel's retaliatory actions are inconsistent with its Charter obligations". The draft resolution was unanimously adopted by the Security Council on March 30, 1955. The resolution condemned Israel for violating the Armistice Agreements and the resolutions of the Security Council particularly the ceasefire resolution of July 15, 1948. The Security Council Resolution also called upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent the recurrence of such military actions.

Israel disregard the Security Council resolution and on
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September 21, 1955 the Chief of Staff reported to the Security Council that Israel was not willing to abide by the resolutions of the Security Council and the Israeli army had occupied the demilitarized zone. (51)

The Israelis launched a full-fledged attack on El Auja again on November 2, 1955 when "Israeli soldiers confined the UN military observers to their rooms in the United Nations building at El Auja and then moved in force against the Egyptian position. Fifty Egyptians were killed and over forty were taken prisoners in the attack." (52)

On September 5, 1956, the Chief of Staff lodged a complaint with the Security Council: (53) "the Israeli army continue to occupy the El Auja zone and because of her military occupation of the demilitarized zone, Israel refuses access to El Auja to the Egyptian members of the Mixed Armistice Commission". Such refusal was a flagrant violation of Article X para 2 of the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel under which El Auja was declared not only the demilitarized zone but also the Headquarters of the Mixed Armistice Commission.

Israel did not stop there, it continued expanding despite severe warning from the United Nations. The situation in the Middle East in 1956 was very explosive and Nasser's 26 July's announcement of nationalizing the Suez Canal proved a catalyst. England and France suffered the severest blow by Nasser's announcement. France, Britain
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and other European countries were dependent on Middle Eastern oil and now Egypt was in a position to cut off supply of oil to those countries. They were planning measures to face the challenge thrown in their face by Nasser. By September the situation had further deteriorated and General Burns wrote a memorandum to September 14, to the Secretary General acquainting him with his own assessment of the situation. Burns wrote to Dag Hammarskjold: (54) "I think that if hostilities between the disputants in the Suez canal question should break out, Israel might try to settle some accounts with the Egyptians. She might provoke a situation where she could attack - with self-justification, at any rate - the Egyptian forces remaining in the El-Arish. El Quseima - Rafah area". General Burns continued with his assessment and told the Secretary General:

"It appears highly probable to me that the Egyptians have withdrawn two of the three Divisions they had in this area, using the troops withdrawn for defence against possible attempt to occupy key points on the Suez Canal. The Israelis, therefore, might find this a good opportunity to deal with the remainder of the El Arish concentration thus securing hostages to force a peace settlement".

The Israelis found it a good opportunity to settle its accounts with Egypt. The Sinai Peninsula was overrun by the Israeli armed forces on October 29, 1956. The Egyptian positions in this region were attacked by full military strength of Israel. The invasion of Sinai was an invasion of Egypt and it was the most flagrant violation of the Armistice Agreement and of the principles of territorial integrity and sovereignty of a state upheld by the United Nations Charter.

It was an undeclared war of aggression against Egypt which

flouted all civilized norms and established principles of international law. On October 29, 1956, the Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement was unilaterally abrogated.

Ben Gurion was commenting on the question of the Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel when he stated: (55) "The Armistice with Egypt is dead, as are the armistice lines, and no wizards or magicians can resurrect these lines".

Lieutenant-Colonel Mursella asked for the withdrawal of the UN personnel of the Mixed Armistice Commission from Gaza on the ground that the Armistice no longer existed. General Burns was initially agreeable to the proposal but when he reported the matter "to the Secretary General he took very strong stand against any withdrawal, pointing out that since the duties of UNTSO under General Armistice Agreement were not suspended by the "present state of affairs", the personnel of UNTSO were required to remain at their posts". (56) The Israeli military officers were accordingly informed that the United Nations personnel belonging to the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization would stay in Gaza.

The Security Council met on October 30, 1956 to examine the grave situation arisen as a result of Israeli aggression on Egypt. The Egyptian representative Loutfi informed the Council about the invasion of Egypt by Israel in collaboration with France and Great Britain. He called "upon the Security Council, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security, to face its responsibilities toward maintaining peace and security in

The draft resolution calling upon all the parties concerned immediately to cease-fire was vetoed by France and United Kingdom, two permanent members of the Security Council.

Brilej of Yugoslavia commented on the draft resolution (57): "A draft resolution, the purpose of which was to stop the fighting in the Sinai Peninsula and to avoid a major conflagration, has been vetoed by two permanent members of the Security Council. This veto is a blow to the resolution of peace in the Middle East. It is a blow to the United Nations". The Yugoslav representative suggested the "possibility of calling an emergency session of the General Assembly under the terms of General Assembly resolution (377/V) entitled "Uniting For Peace", since "the Security Council, through the use of the veto, has been rendered powerless". (58)

The first emergency session of the General Assembly was held from November 1 to November 10. At the first meeting the representative of the United States of America presented before the General Assembly a draft resolution (A/3256) according to which the General Assembly would: (59)

1. Urge "as a matter of priority that all parties now involved in hostilities in the area agree to an immediate ceasefire";

2. Urge the parties to "promptly withdraw all forces behind the Armistice line" and observe "scrupulously the provisions of the Armistice Agreements";

3. All members should refrain from "introducing military goods in the area of hostilities;
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4. "Upon the cease-fire being effective, steps should be taken to reopen the Suez Canal and restore, secure freedom of navigation;"

5. Request the Secretary General "to observe and promptly report on compliance with the resolution to the Security Council and to the General Assembly, for such further action as they might deem appropriate in accordance with the Charter".

The representatives of various nations showed great concern about the situation developing in the Middle East as a result of Israeli invasion of Egypt.

Rifai of Jordan asked the members of the General Assembly: (60)

"Will the international community leave the victim at the mercy of aggression? Will the elements of virtue of righteousness throughout the world retreat in the face of violence and destruction?"

He made a sincere appeal to all the members of the General Assembly "to hasten to join in a collective effort to stop this invasion of Egypt".

Sobolov of the USSR described the Middle Eastern situation as "extremely serious". He told the General Assembly that "on 29 October 1956 Israel, in violation of the General Armistice Agreement, of decisions of the Security Council and of the United Nations Charter, began aggressive military operations against Egypt". Israel's aggression was planned with the purpose of creating a pretext for the seizure of the Suez canal by British and French armed forces."

The Russian delegate urged the General Assembly "to condemn the armed attack by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt as an act of aggression incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations". (61)
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Eban of Israel was exhibiting his usual eloquence and making efforts to sidetrack the fact of Israel aggression against Egypt by coating it with much abused theory of self-defence. He stated: (62)

"On Monday, 29 October 1956, the Israel defence forces took security measures in the Sinai Peninsula in the exercise of Israel's inherent right of self-defence. The object of these operations is to eliminate the bases from which armed Egyptian units... invade Israel's territory for purposes of murder, sabotage and the creation of permanent insecurity to peaceful life".

Lall of India condemned the "triple invasion" on Egypt. He termed the invasion on Egypt as "brutal facts of war". He told the Assembly that Egypt's "sovereignty is being violently curtailed and territory is being occupied by the armed might of a neighbour and of two powerful countries. There has been released over Egypt a manifestation of the law of the jungle. Thus on the territory of Egypt, is mockery being made of the Charter of the United Nations, and there the organs of the United Nations are being affronted by aggression and invasion". The Indian representative was of the opinion that "the horror which is upon us can be arrested, and a major catastrophe averted, if immediate and effective action is taken by this emergency special sessions of the General Assembly." (63)

Palamas of Greece charged that (64) "Israel, the United Kingdom and France have invaded Egyptian territory. They have resorted to force, to war". "Aggression", according to Palama, "in itself is an international crime. Nothing can justify a breach of peace, as defined by the Charter. Even the best reasons lose their validity if such a breach is committed". He extended to Egypt and its people
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his country's "deepest sympathy born of a close and age-old friendship, in this hour, when Egypt is defending itself against aggression."

Ullrich of Czechoslovakia stated that tripartite aggression against Egypt was motivated by "selfish goals above the basic principles of the Charter" and it "calls for a resolute denunciation by all other Member countries. "The Czechoslovak people emphatically condemn these acts of aggression directed against Egypt". (65)

The draft resolution was adopted by a vote of 64 to 5 with 6 abstentions.

On November 3, 1956, Loutfi of Egypt informed the General Assembly that the "Egyptian Government agreed to implement the resolution adopted by the Assembly on the condition that the armed forces attacking Egypt desist from doing so". The Egyptian Government sent a communication A/3270 to the General Assembly stating that in spite of the Assembly resolution of November 2, 1956 "Anglo-French air attack continued and even increased in intensity and frequency. Furthermore, it is also reported that Anglo-French armed forces are taking part in the fight against Egyptian troops on Egyptian territory in the Sinai Peninsula". (66) The Secretary General of the United Nations confirmed the allegations made by the Government of Egypt. In pursuance of para 5 of the General Assembly resolution of November 2, 1956, the Secretary General reported to the Assembly on November 3: "the Gaza strip and the Red Sea islands of Tiran and Sinaifir had been occupied by Israeli military forces, and their air operations over Egyptian territory had continued without interruptions."
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On November 3, two draft resolutions were presented before the Assembly. India along with 18 Afro-Asian countries piloted 2 draft resolutions. Lal of India, before presenting the resolution, expressed "gravest disappointment" over the fact that "the resolution introduced by the leading western power, has not been complied with by the western powers concerned". That was a matter of the "gravest concern because the result of non-compliance has led to a steady worsening situation." (68) India joined hands with other 18 Afro-Asian nations and brought a draft resolution before the Assembly. The draft resolution noted "with regret that not all the parties concerned have yet agreed to comply with the provisions of its resolution of November 2, 1956, reaffirming the said resolution it "calls upon the parties immediately to comply with the provisions of the said resolution". The resolution requested "the Secretary General with the assistance of the Chief of Staff and the members of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization to obtain compliance of the withdrawal of all forces behind the armistice lines". (69) The 19-power draft resolution (A/3275) was adopted by a vote of 59 to 5 with 12 abstentions.

The second draft resolution was presented by Canada. Pearson of Canada was explaining the purpose of his country's draft resolution (A/3276) when he stated that it had the "purpose of facilitating and making effective compliance with the resolution which we have already passed on the part of those whose compliance is absolutely essential.
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It has also the purpose of providing for international supervision of that compliance through the United Nations". (70)

The Canadian draft resolution stated: (71)

"The General Assembly,

"Bearing in mind the urgent necessity of facilitating compliance with the resolution of 2 November 1956, "requests, as a matter of priority, the Secretary General to submit to it within forty-eight hours, a plan for the setting up, with the consent of the nations concerned of an emergency international United Nations force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with the terms of the aforementioned resolution"."

The resolution was adopted by a vote of 57 to none with 19 abstentions.

On November 4, 1956 the Secretary General told the General Assembly that he had received a reply only from Egypt which said it accepted the cease-fire resolution of November 2, 1956. He also submitted his first report on the Plan for an emergency international United Nations force. He pleaded that the General Assembly should decide to establish (72) "an emergency international force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities". The delegations of Canada, Columbia and Norway presented a draft resolution which created the United Nations Emergency Force. The resolution 1000 (ES-1) was as follows: (73)

"The General Assembly

"having requested the Secretary General in its resolution of 4 November 1956 to submit to it a plan for an emergency international United Nations Force, for the purposes stated,

"Nothing with satisfaction the first report of the Secretary General on the plan, and having in mind particularly paragraph 4 of that report,
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1. establishes a United Nations Command for an emergency international force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities...

2. appoints, on an emergency basis, the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, Major General L. M. Burns, as Chief of the Command...

The resolution was adopted on November 5, 1956 by a vote of 57 to none with 19 abstentions.

Israel, the United Kingdom and France did not comply with the Assembly's resolutions. On November 5, 1956 the USSR Foreign Minister requested for an immediate meeting of the Security Council to discuss non-compliance by the UK, France and Israel with the ceasefire orders of the General Assembly of 2 November resolution. Before the Council met, the Governments of France and Britain had informed the Secretary General that they welcomed the establishment of an international force to prevent the continuance of hostilities between Egypt and Israel. The Secretary General in his report to the Security Council told (74) "The Government of Egypt has accepted the resolution of the General Assembly of November 5 and may thus be considered as having accepted the establishment of an international force under the terms fixed by the United Nations. The Government of Egypt has further accepted yesterday the request of the Secretary General for a cease-fire..."

He also informed the Council of Israel's acceptance: "Today I received from the Government of Israel, a statement to the effect that in the light of Egypt's declaration of willingness to cease-fire, Israel wishes to confirm its readiness to agree to a cease-fire".
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The Soviet Union was very critical of Israel, France and Britain's invasion of Egypt. The non-compliance by these powers with the resolutions of the General Assembly was very disturbing. The Soviet Union wanted the Security Council to act under Article 42 of the Charter. Under the draft resolution prepared and presented by Sobolov of the Soviet Union "all states members of the United Nations, especially the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should give military and other assistance to Egypt, which has been the victim of aggression, by sending naval and air forces, military units". (75)

The Council rejected the item of agenda proposed by the USSR by a vote 4 to 3 with 4 abstentions.

The situation in the Middle East was not showing any sign of improvement because Israel was not prepared to withdraw its forces behind the armistice lines as demanded by the General Assembly resolutions.

The General Assembly in its resolution of November 7, 1956 sponsored by seven countries, Brazil, Canada, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Columbia and Norway established (76) "an advisory committee composed of one representative" from each of the sponsoring members "to undertake the development of those aspects of the planning for the force and its operations not already dealt with by the General Assembly".

Another resolution submitted by 19 powers (A/3309) "calls once again upon Israel immediately to withdraw all its forces behind the armistice lines established by the General Armistice Agreement between Egypt and Israel of February 24, 1949". (77)
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The Israelis did not pay any heed to the resolutions of the United Nations and persisted in its expansionist designs. The establishment of the United Nations Emergency Force was accomplished and it was stationed along the line around the Gaza strips and at Sharm El Sheikh after March 6, 1957, when the Israeli armed forces had withdrawn.

Israel, no doubt, withdrew but at what cost? On its retreat from Egyptian territory of Sinai Peninsula it demolished everything and rendered all roads non-negotiable. General Burns, Chief of the United Nations Emergency Force has given a very vivid account of Israeli acts of destruction. He wrote: (78) "As the Israelis withdrew across the Sinai they began a systematic destruction of the surfaced roads, the railway, the telephone lines". According to the General about 70 kilometers of roads" had been "thoroughly demolished" by Israel.

Israel did not grant the United Nations Emergency Force the freedom of movement on its side of the armistice demarcation line. Egypt allowed the United Nations Force to be stationed on its territory and it had the freedom of movement. The United Nations Emergency Force was also stationed at Sharm El-Sheikh and it did not prevent Israeli ships and merchandise from passing through the Straits of Tiran. Israel developed the Eilat port on Arab owned land and hence succeeded in laying pipelines linking the Red Sea with the Mediterranean. After opening of the Gulf of Aqaba in 1957 to Israel ships, Eilat became very important as an oil port. One of the objectives of Israel in invading Egypt in 1956 was to get the Strait of Tiran opened for Israeli ships. Israeli, in her claim over the Strait of Tiran was,

supported by the Maritime Law of 1958. Article 16 of the Maritime Law stipulated: (79) "There shall be no suspension of the innocent passage of foreign ships through straits that are used for international navigation between one part of the high sea and another part of the high seas or territorial sea of a foreign state". Israel interpreted the clause as having conferred on it the right of using the Strait of Tiran. The western powers had always supported and upheld the claim of Israel regarding the Strait of Tiran. The Arab countries especially Egypt, had always taken the stand that the Strait had been Arab territorial waters and there was no international agreement binding Egypt to share it with any other country. The Israelis were excluded from the Gulf of Aqaba. Under the Armistice Agreement of February 24, 1949 Israel was not allowed to make use of the Gulf of Aqaba. The provisions of Annex 11(b) to the General Armistice Agreement drew the Line of demarcation "from point 402 down to the southern most tip of Palestine and Trans-Jordan Palestine frontiers". (80) Under the provision Israel was completely excluded from access to the Gulf of Aqaba.

The Israel armed forces violated this provision also and launched an attack on the southern Negeb which brought them to the Gulf. Israel occupied Umm Rashrash situated within the vicinity of the Gulf and local Arab population of the area were forcibly driven away and their property appropriated.

The Israeli policy was one of expansion. The Armistice Agreements exercised no restraining influence on its expansionist designs. On the Syrian border also violations were flagrant. Article V of the
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Israeli Syrian Armistice Agreement of July 20, 1949 provided for a demilitarized zone para 1 of the said article "emphasized that the following arrangements for the Armistice Demarcation Line between the Israeli and Syrian armed forces and for the Demilitarized zone are not to be integrated as having any relation whatsoever to ultimate territorial arrangements affecting the two parties to this Agreement". "The Armistice Demarcation Line and the Demilitarized zone" according to para 2 of Article V, "have been defined with a view toward separating the armed forces of the two parties in such manner as to minimize the possibility of faction and incident". (81)

Israel was its usual stubborn and unscrupulous self when she violated Article V of the Israeli-Syrian Armistice Agreement. The demilitarized zone along the Syrian border was raided by the Israeli armed forces and the Arab population of the area was thrown out. The matter was referred to the Mixed Armistice Commission but Israel refused to attend the meeting of the Commission on the ground that the demilitarized zone was an Israeli territory and thus was beyond the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Israel's refusal to attend the Commission's meeting was a flagrant violation of the provision of the General Armistice Agreement of 1949. The matter was referred to the Security Council which met on April 17, 1951. Faris al-Khoury of Syria told the Council:

"Early in February 1951, and in violation of the Israeli-Syrian General Armistice Agreement of 20 July 1949, the Israel Government began work along the western bank of the Jordan river and on Land belonging to Arab peasants in

the Mansoura sector, situated within the demilitarized zone. Notwithstanding the repeated warnings of the Chairman of the Israeli-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission, Israelis not only of demilitarized zone origin crossed the bridge of Benat Yakub on 13 March 1951 and began work on a large scale in the demilitarized zone of the Eastern Bank of the Jordan River. On 15 March Israel reinforcements, armed with automatic weapons, Bren Guns and mortars were hurried to the Huleh demilitarized zone, with a view to forcing the local Arab inhabitants to cease resistance and to sell their land to the Palestine Land Development Company".

The Syrian representative further told the Council about the United Nations observers' encounter with a "six-man Israeli patrol armed with rifles and one light machine-gas in the village of Ghanama within the central sector of the demilitarized zone" on March 27, 1951. Another serious violation of the Armistice Agreement committed by Israel was on April 4 when "two Israeli mechanized patrols attacked the Arab police station established under the supervision of the United Nations Mixed Armistice Commission of the El Hamma sector in the demilitarized zone". (82) Referring to the question of jurisdiction over demilitarized zone El Khoury stated: (83) "we never agreed that the demilitarized zones along the line between the two states were taken from Syrian occupation. The Syrian army withdrew from this tract of land only in order to supply the place for the demilitarized zone. For this reason the Syrian Government has always claimed the part where the demilitarized zone now exists to be Syrian territory because this territory was under Syrian occupation up until the time the Armistice Agreement came into force".

Eban of Israel refuted the Syrian claims and insisted that
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Israel had sovereignty over the demilitarized zone. He declared the Syrian claim "unfounded" and told the Council (84) "we reject the Syrian claim. We shall sign no peace involving the cessation of these areas. There can be no Israel without the Huleh and the Ein Gev sectors, without the precious sources of the Jordan and the swamps and marshes of Lake Huleh". He threatened Syria and the United Nations when he said that "to defend its rights and claims in that area Israel will reveal a tenacity no less pronounced than that which warded off similar grave political and military threats to the southern area of Israel".

Major General Riley, Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization appeared before the Council on April 25 1951. General Riley offered his own interpretation of Article V of the Israeli Syrian Armistice Agreement. "The purpose of the demilitarized zone", according to General Riley, (85) "was to separate and to keep separated for the duration of the armistice the armed forces of the two parties, in order to eliminate as fully as possible friction and troublesome incidents between them. This was to be, in effect a sort of "buffer zone" pending final settlement of the dispute". According to General "neither party to the Armistice Agreement therefore enjoys rights of sovereignty within the zone"

General Riley in an answer to a question put by Austin of the United States said: (86) "The Armistice Agreement limits civilian
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control to the local villages plus the land attached to those villages. But at no time do the Israelis have the authority to assume full control over non-military activities within the zone that extends beyond those villages, unless there is an agreement between the Chairman, the Israelis and the refugee Arabs that live in that demilitarized zone.

The Security Council adopted a cease-fire resolution of May 8, 1951. The resolution was presented by the USA, Turkey, France and the United Kingdom and was adopted by 10 votes to 1 abstention. The resolution, noting with concern the fight that had broken out in the demilitarized zone along the Syrian Israeli borders.

"Calls upon the parties or persons in the area concerned to cease fighting...." (87)

Another draft resolution sponsored by the United Kingdom, Turkey, France and the United States was adopted by the Council on May 18, 1961 by a vote of 10 to one abstention.

The resolution asked (88) the Israel delegation to the Mixed Armistice Commission "to insure that the Palestine Land Development Company Limited is instructed to cease all operations in the demilitarized zone until such time as an agreement is arranged through the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission for continuing this project". The resolution took strong exception to Israel's non-compliance with the provisions of the Armistice Agreement and her refusal to attend the meeting of the Mixed Armistice Commission. Without mentioning the name of Israel the resolution said that it
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"considers it inconsistent with the objectives and intent of the Armistice Agreement to refuse to participate in meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission...." Regarding those Arabs who were expelled by Israel the resolution said that "Arab civilians who have been removed from the demilitarized zone by the Government of Israel should be permitted to return forthwith to their homes and that the Mixed Armistice Commission should supervise their return and rehabilitation in a manner to be determined by the Commission...."

Israel did not show any respect for the Security Council resolution and persistently followed her policy of aggrandizement. Israel did not vacate the demilitarized zone nor did she allow the expelled Arabs to return and settle down on their own land. Repeated requests of the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission fell on deaf ears and Israel refused to attend the meetings of the Commission.

The stubborn attitude of Israel and its refusal to abide by the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement was reported by the Chief of Staff in his reports submitted to the Security Council. In four separate reports the Chief of Staff charged Israel of refusing to implement the Council resolution of May 18, 1951 and he also informed the Council through his report that Israel was not prepared to withdraw its control over the demilitarized area. It was also stated in the report that Israeli police was interfering with the freedom of local Arab people of the area and the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission and other observers of the United Nations were not allowed to move freely. (89)
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The activities of Israel in demilitarized zone increased and on October 27, 1953 Chief of Staff General Vagan Bennike confirmed "encroachment on Arab lands", he also charged Israel of placing difficulties in the functioning of the Mixed Armistice Commission and took exceptions to "Israeli Opposition to the fulfilment by the Chairman and United Nations observers of their responsibility for ensuring the implementation of Article V of the General Armistice Agreement". (90)

The condemnation of Israel by the Chief of Staff meant nothing to a country which was bent upon pursuing a deliberate policy of non-compliance with the resolutions of the United Nations and a policy of ruthless expansion. Israel was not spared and duly condemned by the succeeding Chief of Staff General Burns who submitted a report to the Security Council on January 6, 1955 where he brought the fact to the notice of the Council that (91) "Police from the state of Israel, acting under orders from police headquarters outside the demilitarized zone, dominated the zone". He further told the Council that "The Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission was unable to implement the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement". The underlying fact behind General Burn's reference to non-implementation of the Armistice Agreement was Israel's stubbornness and refusal to comply with the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement.

The Israeli policy of deliberate provocation and planned attack was once again in full gear when in December 1955, a Syrian post on Lake Tiberias was attacked killing 56 persons. The Israeli attack on Syrian border was barbarous and was condemned even by the
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Pierson Dixon of the United Kingdom called it "the shocking attack of Israel armed forces on Syrian soil and against Syrian forces and civilians on the North Eastern shores of Lake Tiberias". The representative further said: (92) "We deplore this attack by Israel forces on civilian...and commend the Government of Syria on the attitude of restraint which it had shown in this matter". Lodge of the United States of America also expressed his country's vehement protest against brutal attack on Syria by Israel. He said: (93) "We cannot stand aside and fail to condemn the action of the Government of Israel in that incident of 11 December". He registered his country's protest against Israel utter disregard for the United Nations resolutions. Referring to Israel, repeated violations he observed: "What makes these particular deliberations more serious is the fact that a Member of the United Nations, indeed a Member created by the United Nations, should now be before this Council for the fourth offence of this kind in two years".

It was the harshest criticism and outright condemnation of Israel and its attacks on Arab states by one of its staunchest allies. This change in American policy was due to new developments in the Middle East. The United States of America's reputation in the Arab world at that particular juncture was at its lowest ebb. The Soviet Union was gaining ground by supplying arms and modern weapons strengthening Arab military potential against Israel. The infiltration of the Soviet Union in the Middle East was a potential danger to the American influence because the western bloc could not afford to put all its
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eggs in one Israeli basket. The United States knew the strategic importance of the Middle East and wanted to retrieve the lost ground. Its denunciation of Israel for its brutal attack on Syrian territory was a straw in the wind.

The Israeli attack on Syria in the region of Lake Tiberias was too intense to be ignored. General Burns the Chief of Staff in his report submitted to the Security Council said: (94) "The Israel action on the night of 11 to 12 December was a deliberate violation of the Provisions of the General Armistice Agreement, including those to the demilitarized zone which was crossed by the Israel forces which entered Syria".

The Security Council was gravely concerned with Israeli attack on Syria and a long debate followed wherein every member condemned Israel for its flagrant and repeated violations. A draft resolution sponsored by France, the USA and the United Kingdom was placed before the Council. Shukairy of Syria was not fully satisfied with the draft resolution. He appreciated (95) the resolution to an extent because "such a resolution certainly, such a verdict, would be a great deterrent". According to Syrian representative such verdict would fail because "Israel's policy was deeply embedded in aggression. Verbal measures are no cure. The only remedy is to apply effective measures to cut the evil out at the root". The resolution was not satisfactory because "it has failed to provide for effective measures to deter Israel from committing further aggression".

The draft resolution was adopted unanimously by the Security Council.
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Council on January 19, 1956. The resolution declared that (96) "This Israeli action was a deliberate violation of the provisions of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria, including those relating to the demilitarized zone..." The Security Council "condemn the attack of December 11, 1955 as a flagrant violation of the ceasefire provisions of its resolution/54 (1948), of the terms of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Syria, and of Israel's obligations under the Charter of the United Nations."

The Council also "expresses its grave concern at the failure of the Government of Israel to comply with its obligations".

Israel had always found it a smooth sailing in spite of condemnatory resolutions of the United Nations. She was behaving like a spoilt child of the United Nations. Her flagrant violations did not cease, her policy of planned attack on Arab Land did not suffer any setback and her policy of expansion and naked aggression was not abandoned. She attacked the demilitarized zone at El-Tawafiq. It refused to attend a meeting of the Mixed Armistice Commission called to look into the issue. General von Horn, new Chief of Staff wrote in his report "I was angry. And with reason. The Israelis had broken the Armistice Agreement, broken their word, ignored my ruling of January 20 and were now blatantly disregarding the Security Council's ruling that they should attend meeting called by the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission. (97)

General von Horn came to New York to acquaint the Security Council with the latest situation in the Middle East especially in


According to the account given by the General in his book, Comay tried to pressurise him and even threatened him. Comay's piece of advice to the General was "to forget all about that outdated United Nations idea of running a patrol boat on Lake Tiberia; the idea was still-born, and ought to be abandoned; because the Lake was essentially Israeli sovereign territory". Comay threatened General Horn: "It would be wise to listen to his advice - otherwise my life was bound to become a great deal more uncomfortable". General Horn "appreciated" Comay's "thinly veiled threats" and told him "it was really a waste of breath to attempt to intimidate the Chief of Staff of UNTSO - especially on the United Nations territory". (98) The Security Council met on March 28, 1962 to consider the complaint of Syria against Israel violation of the Armistice Agreement. Israel attacked Syrian territory on March 16-17, 1962. According to Chehlaoui of Syria (99) "Israel armed forces carried out a mortar attack on the Arab village of Nuqueib, forty Israeli armoured launches opened fire with automatic weapons on the Syrian military post of Ed. Douga. The Israel artillery at Bouria launched a violent bombardment of the city and village of Squefiye, Israel military aircraft bombed the Syrian position at E-Al Fiq and Zaki and they bombed the area of El-Hemma".

Israel was again condemned by the Security Council and a draft resolution S/5110 introduced by the United Kingdom and the United
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States was adopted on April 9, 1962 by a vote of 10 with one abstention. According to the resolution the Security Council (100) "reaffirms the Security Council resolution of January 19, 1956 which condemned Israel military action in breach of the General Armistice Agreement, whether or not undertaken by way of retaliation; "Determines that the Israel attack of March 16-17, 1962 constitutes a flagrant violation of that resolution and calls upon Israel scrupulously to refrain from such action in the future".

Israel committed violations against the provisions of the Israeli Hashemite Jordan Kingdom Armistice Agreement of April 3, 1949. Jordan had already signed with Israel an agreement on July 7, 1948 whereby it was provided that UN check posts would be established by the UN Commander and Arab and Jewish Police would be placed on duty under the UN Commander. The General Armistice Agreement did not dispute any provision of the Agreement of 1948. A map showing the demilitarized zone on the side of Jordan was attacked with the General Armistice Agreement. The Mount Scopus was a demilitarized zone and it included places like the Hebrew University and Hadassah Hospital etc. This demilitarized zone was placed under the direct control of the Chief of Staff of the UNTSO. Israel never accepted such a situation because it would have meant a setback in her expansionist design. Israel regarded this area as "an enclave of Israel" where the United Nations or any other body did not have any control.

Article VIII para 1 of the Jordan-Israel Armistice Agreement created "a special committee, composed of two representatives of each party for the purpose of formulating agreed plans and arrange-
ments designed to enlarge the scope of this Agreement and to effect improvements in its application".

The functions of Special Committee were also clearly defined in para 2. The Special Committee was supposed to include matters like (101) "free movement of traffic on vital roads including the Bethlehem and Latrun Jerusalem roads, resumption of the normal functioning of the cultural and humanitarian institutions on Mount Scopus and free access thereto etc."

Israel never respected her Agreement with Jordan and frequently violated the territorial integrity of Jordan. The area of Jerusalem - an international zone and other areas even demilitarized zone and no man's land were raided and placed under control of the Israeli armed forces. The existence of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization was meaningless as far as Israel was concerned.

General Burns has confirmed the hostility of Israel towards the Organization in following words: (102)

"Not long after I took over the duties of Chief of Staff UNTSO, I learnt that the Israeli Defence Forces and the Government looked in the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization with a jealous eye, sometimes with imperfectly concealed hostility".

General Burn further wrote about Israeli leaders attitude towards the United Nations:

"The Israelis", wrote Burns "looked on the UN as an organization to be kept in the dark, and even deceived, as an enemy may be deceived. The result was that one felt the hostility against the UNTSO always latent, and that cooperation from the Israelis only came when it suited their propaganda purposes".

E. H. Hutchison who had acted as the chairman of Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission wrote about Israel hostile attitude towards the
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United Nations. He wrote in an open letter: (103)

"Be assured that the vast majority of these observers from seven different countries feel as I do and openly condemn Israel as an uncooperative, militarily aggressive country still working towards expansion".

On January 6, 1952, the Israeli armed forces raided across the demarcation line near Bethlehem at Beit Jalla. Hutchison found Israel guilty of having raided Beit Jalla and wrote that (104) "Israel was condemned for a serious breach of the General Armistice Agreement for the Beit Jalla attack". According to Hutchison Beit Jalla attack "lost its singular importance among the numerous incidents that were occurring far too frequently. Life was cheap along the border. Many Arabs were killed inside Israel while trying to retrieve items from their former homes or harvests from the lands they once had possessed".

On June 4, 1952 Israel committed another violation of the Armistice Agreement when famous "Barrel incident" took place. The Israelis, in violation of the Armistice Agreement moved soldiers into no man's land. The barrels, which Israel took to Israeli territory bypassing the United Nations check post, were seized by the United Nations Truce Supervision observers since they smelled some foul play in it. The Israelis became desperate to retrieve those barrels from the United Nations custody lest they ran the risk of being exposed. "At 1200 hours on the day scheduled", writes Hutchison, (105) "the door of MAC office burst open and three Israeli officers,
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with pistols drawn and escorted by two enlisted men who were holding Thompson Sub-machine guns at the ready marched into the room" and took over the office of the Mixed Armistice Commission. The Israelis posted their own guards claiming that the building was on their side. They took the keys of the room barrel was locked in and the door was locked each evening by them. "No amount of pressure changed this routine until the barrel was moved from the building".

On September 17, 1962 es-Sanis incident occurred where it was reported that Jordan was being subjected to harassment and terror from Israeli side. Israel had expelled ten families of es-Sanis tribe. The United Nations observers confirmed Jordan's complaint when they found (106) "over 100 families, nearly 1,000 members of this tribe, camped temporarily just inside Jordan".

On October 14, 15, 1953, the village of Qibya became the target of Israeli aggression in which about 53 persons were killed and 15 had been wounded. Hutchison had described it as "wanton destruction" and the case was taken to the United Nations Security Council where Israel was condemned. The Security Council wanted to condemn Israel in harshest language but "Zionist pressure at the Security Council level watered down the wording of the resolution". (107)

Israel was indulging in wanton acts of destruction and mass killing because it had nothing to fear. The United States of America had its own compulsions and Israel was fully aware of it and knew that the United States would never go beyond polite limits of condemning
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its acts of violations. The Qibya incident had shown the world that Israel was bent upon expelling local Arab people from their homes in order to accommodate the Jewish immigrants. There was not one Qibya. According to Hutchison (108) "there were many small Qiybas but they were never publicized."

The Security Council Resolution of November 24, 1953 had condemned Israel and stated that the Security Council (109) finds that retaliation action at Qibya taken by the armed forces of Israel on October 14, 15, 1953 and all such actions constitute a violation of the cease-fire provisions of the Security Council resolution 54(1948) and are inconsistent with the parties obligations under the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan and the Charter of the United Nations. The Security Council also "expresses the strongest censure of that action, which can only prejudice the chances of that peaceful settlement which both parties, in accordance with the Charter, are bound to seek, and calls upon Israel to take effective measures to prevent all such actions in the future."

This Security Council resolution was nothing but a mere addition to the already piling heaps of documents condemning Israeli action of violence. What was the use of such resolutions when the United Nations could not prevent the recurrence of such devastations and loss of human life? Israel was doing what it planned to do, even the United Nations resolutions could not bridle its recklessness. The resolutions were mere "paper tigers" and had no deterrent value to prevent Israel from committing violations of its obligations.
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Israel kept its policy of retaliation and reprisal in full gear.

Israel made El Fateh a scapegoat and tried to tell the United Nations that Israeli attack on Arab land was to destroy the stronghold of El Fateh guerrillas. In a letter to the President of the Security Council Israel Government listed a total of forty-three attacks across the frontier against civilian targets in the Israeli border areas. Of this thirty-three have been from Jordan territory. (110)

The Israeli theory of El Fateh's attack was a lame excuse to conceal its expansionist designs and to implicate Jordan in the matter. It was being done in order to fabricate a pretext to justify Israeli unprovoked aggression against Jordan. El Fateh was an organization which had nothing to do with Jordan or with any Arab Government, it was composed of people expelled by Israel from demilitarized zone rendering them homeless. These homeless people organized themselves in 1968 and started a long struggle to liberate their own home, i.e. Palestine. Israel tried to put blame on Syria also for El-Fateh activities. In a letter dated May 16, 1966 Israel told the UN: (111) "Syria is the source, training ground, principal supplier and main supporter of a vicious terrorist organization, variously known as El-Fateh...". It was a pretext for the coming attack on Syria on July 14, 1966 when Israeli jet bombers attacked Syrian areas, hit mechanized and engineering equipment destroyed bulldozers with napalm bombs wounded nine civilians and killed one woman". (112)


adopted a resolution condemning Israeli attack on Sammu. On November 13, 1966 Sammu was attacked by Israel armed forces. Jordan lodged a complaint against Israel's brutal attack on the village of Sammu in the southern Hebron area. The Security Council heard the representatives of both the countries and adopted a resolution on November 25, 1966. The Security Council resolution observed; (113) "This incident constituted a large-scale and carefully planned military action on the territory of Jordan of the armed forces of Israel". The resolution further reaffirmed "the previous resolutions of the Security Council condemning past incidents of reprisal in breach of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan and of the United Nations Charter". The resolution "censures Israel for the large scale military action in violation of the United Nations Charter and of the General Armistice Agreement between Israel and Jordan". It also emphasized "that actions of military reprisal cannot be tolerated and that if they are repeated, the Security Council will have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against the repetition of such acts..."

The Israelis ignored all Security Council directives and the United Nations took no action to compel stubborn Israel to comply with them. The United Nations failed in its fundamental duty of restoring and maintaining peace in the Middle East. The basic reason for the failure of the United Nations was the attitude of the permanent members of the world body. The United States of America, Great Britain, France, even the Soviet Union in the formative period, had fully supported Israel. They expressed their concern and sympathy

for Arab refugees but refused to take effective measures to compel Israel to abide by the decisions of the United Nations. Had the United Nations shown some courage and taken positive measures, 1967 war would have easily been avoided. The June war of 1967 was a reflection on the effectiveness of the United Nations and exposed its impotency in implementing its own decisions. The General Armistice Agreements were flouted with impunity by Israel and she was, many a time, condemned for her flagrant violations. The Chief of Staff and Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commissions had charged Israel of committing breach against the Armistice Agreement and condemned her for such acts. E. H. Hutchison wrote recently that (114) the "call for peace" given by Israeli leaders becomes 'ridiculous and meaningless' when one looked into "the United Nations mounting record of Israeli military action against the bordering Arab countries". According to Hutchison Israel had always refused cooperation and boycotted the commission established by the United Nations. He cited the example of Negev to establish his contention: "Israeli forces moved into and took over the Negev after the ceasefire and against direct UN orders. Israel refuses UN military observers freedom of movement along the borders, a right guaranteed by the General Armistice Agreement. "Israel refuses to allow the UN to place patrol boats on Lake Tiberias and yet the UN had, according to the G.A.A. jurisdiction over the demilitarized zones..." Writing about Mount Scopus, the highest point on the Jordan side of Jerusalem, Hutchison wrote: "since 1948 Israel has claimed sovereignty over the area and refused to allow the UN Commander to carry out an inspection."

Writing about Israeli violations he asks the world not to forget "that Israel's record of military aggression is staggering and should be listed in detail and widely exposed."

As late as October 1966, the Mixed Armistice Commission condemned Israel for its violations of no man's land's inviolability.

Israel was asked to refrain from repeating its acts of violence but Israel did not pay any heed to the request and its semi-official paper of Israel announced that Israel would challenge the decision of the Mixed Armistice Commission and declared that (115) "the vote taken by the Mixed Armistice Commission is considered an error".

On May 3, 1967 Israel disregarded once again the directives of the Mixed Armistice Commission. The Jordan-Israel Mixed Armistice Commission "condemned the Israeli authorities for crossing the armistice demarcation line into no-man's land ... and for ploughing areas situated in Jordan and in no man's land, in violation of the General Armistice Agreement". (116)

The President of the Security Council was not exaggerating when at one of its meetings in April 1968 he said: (117) "Israel continued to ignore council and Assembly decisions, continued its aggression and violation of international law; and showed the world and the United Nations by its action particularly the intention to hold a military parade in Jerusalem, that it was not thinking of leaving the Arab part of Jerusalem". The President, while condemning

Israeli military activities in Jerusalem, said: "The acts of Israel in Jerusalem were those of an aggressor who did not care to abide by the United Nations decisions or follow a policy of peace in the area."

It becomes a boring exercise if one mentions each and every act of violation by Israel, and the United Nations resolutions condemning it for such acts. Since 1949, Israel has been condemned by the organs of the United Nations for its aggression against the Arab States more than forty-four times. Thirty-two of these condemnations were adopted by the Security Council for "flagrant violations" of the Armistice Agreements with the four neighbouring states. This is in glaring contrast to the fact that none of the Arab States has so far been condemned even once for aggression or action against Israel in breach of the Armistice Agreements.

If Germany and Japan's non-compliance with its directives was responsible for the League of Nations' failure, Israel's utter disregard and contempt can be counted as a factor responsible for the declining prestige of the United Nations.

Israel had, with deliberate plans, violated all the United Nations resolutions even the one which created the 'Jewish State'. Israel also violated the obligations it unreservedly accepted when it was admitted to the world community. Israel continued and still continues to be member of the United Nations in spite of its violations of the United Nations. It disregarded 22nd November 1967 resolution despite repeated warnings of the United Nations and still continue to control areas which it captured during 1967 war. Israel is an expansionist country and consistently pursuing a policy of naked aggression and expansion rendering numerous people homeless in their own states.
Chapter III

LAND WITHOUT FRONTIER

The Basle Congress of 1897 was the first Zionist meeting which outlined a definite programme for world Zionist movement. Theodor Herzl was the founding father of the idea of the Congress which had the aim to unite the Jewish community and "create for the Jewish people a home in Palestine secured by public law". The Basle Congress also outlined the strategy to achieve the Zionists' aim and it was to be done through "the promotion on suitable lines of the colonization of Palestine of Jewish agricultural and industrial workers". (1) Herzl's slogan was "Let the people without a land return to a land without a people". (2)

The Zionist Congress had a definite and ruthless plan to implement. The boundaries of the Jewish Home were not confined to Palestine only, but stretched, according to Herzl, to far beyond Palestine so as to include areas and territories constituting the Arab land. In 1896, Theodor Herzl published a paper wherein he advocated flexibility in the drawing of the frontiers of the Jewish State. In his description of frontiers Herzl said: "The northern frontier is to be the mountains facing Cappadocia (Turkey); the southern, the Suez Canal. Our slogan shall be: "The Palestine of David and Solomon". (3)

The Zionists were definitely thinking in terms of ruthless

expansion in what constituted the Arab world. Palestine was a small chunk of territory and it would not have been sufficient to accommodate ten million Jews. David Tristach sounded a warning and asked the Zionist leadership to accept the "Greater Palestine" programme. He wrote to Herzl in 1899: "The Basle programme must contain the words 'Great Palestine' or Palestine and its neighbouring lands - otherwise it is nonsense. You do not get the ten million Jews into a land of 25,000 km". (4) The only alternative to accommodate ten million Jews was the policy of aggrandizement and expansion. The Zionists decided in its favour and sanctioned all possible means to achieve the goal of a Jewish State. The Zionist organization was set up in 1907 and its purpose was to plan and conduct the struggle for achieving a Jewish State. The Zionist organization was a symbol of Zionist aspirations and gave an organizational shape to the idea propounded at Basle in 1897. To accelerate the process of colonization of Palestine by the Zionists many subsidiary organizations were established. The "Jewish Colonial Trust" in 1898, the "Colonization Commission" in 1898, the "Jewish National Fund" in 1901, the "Palestine Office" in 1908, and the "Palestine Land Development Company" in 1908 were created for this specific purpose, namely, to plan, finance and supervise the process of colonization of Palestine.

In its initial phase, the Zionist movement failed to cut much ice and its progress was extremely slow. At the outbreak of World War I after thirty years of Jewish immigration to Palestine, their strength was 8% of the total population of the country. It encouraged new alignments to emerge. In 1917, Zionist colonialism

---

concluded an alliance with British imperialism. The support of a big European power was the most important requirement for the Zionist movement to succeed in its mission.

After the war was over and the Ottoman Empire was dismembered, Britain had emerged as the most powerful country in the Middle East. British Imperialism required Zionist support for its own selfish ends. Great Britain had already reached an understanding with political Zionism and issued a policy statement on November 2, 1917. The Balfour Declaration of 1917 was the "declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations". (5)

The Balfour Declaration and promises made in it were the result of the policy of expediency. Its purpose was to enlist and ensure the support of the Jewish community for the Allied Powers. According to Churchill, the Declaration "was a practical measure taken in the interests of a common cause at a movement when that cause could afford to neglect no factor of material or moral assistance". (6)

World War I came to an end in 1918 and the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference decided not to restore Palestine to Turkey and instead place it under the control of a Big Power. On September 29, 1923 Britain became officially responsible for Palestine administration. Britain's assumption of the mandatory role was contrary to the wishes of the local Arab peoples.

The Zionists had supported Britain to become mandatory power in Palestine. Britain was a supporter of the Zionists who at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 had circulated an extensive plan des-

5. See the Introduction, pp. 15-16.
Fig. 1  The Israel of Theodore Herzl (1904) from the "Brook of Egypt to the Euphrates" in Iraq is to be found in his "Complete Diaries" Vol. II, P. 711.

Fig. 2  World Zionist Organization Plan to the Paris Peace Conference, 1919.

Fig. 3  Palestine under British Mandate.

Fig. 4  United Nations 1947 Partition Plan ('Jewish State' is the dark portion and 'Arab State' is the white).

Fig. 5  Israel in 1949. (Darker portions are the areas conquered by Israel in addition to the UN Partition Plan).

Fig. 6  Israel in 1956. (Darker portions are the areas occupied by Israeli troops in 1956).

Fig. 7  Israel in 1967. (Darker portions are the areas occupied by Israel in 1967).
cribing the frontiers of a Zionist state: "The boundaries of Palestine were starting on the north at a point on the Mediterranean Sea in the vicinity of Sidon and following the watersheds of the foothills of the Lebanon as far as Jisr-El-Karaon, thence to El-Bire, following the dividing line between the two basins of the Wadi El-Korn and the Wadi El-Teim, thence in a southerly direction following the dividing line between the eastern and western slopes of the Hermon, to the vicinity west of Beit Jenn, thence eastward following the northern watersheds of the Nahr Mughaniye close to and west of the Hedjaz Railway". In the east the line was to terminate "in the Gulf of Aqaba". In the south the boundary "would extend from El-Arish in northern Sinai to Aqaba in the south". "In the west the Mediterranean Sea" was the boundary line. In an appeal to the Peace Conference, the Zionists said "that the geographical area of Palestine should be as large as possible so that it may eventually contain a large and thriving population". (7)

Great Britain helped the Zionists in their scheme of carving out a Jewish State in Palestine. The Jewish immigration was encouraged by Britain and it gave all possible facilities to Zionist organizations operating inside Palestine. In 1918, the total strength of the Jewish community in Palestine was 8 per cent (83,794 Jews). In 1922 the number went up to 83,794 making Jewish percentage twelve. In 1931, it further increased to 17 per cent making Jewish population 174,610. Between 1944 and 1948 the trend was further accelerated. During this period the Jewish population was 650,000 and their per-

percentage in the total population of Palestine was 31 per cent. (8)

The flood of Jewish immigration had swept off Palestinian political stability and plunged the area of holy places into the dark sea of bloodshed and terrorism. The British Government got alarmed, as the monster of its own creation was uprooting its control over Palestine. The Zionists were striving for a Jewish State and were, with terror and massacre of Arab population as their weapons, creating a situation favourable for the realization of their ultimate goal. The British Administration was crippled and the situation became intolerable. In March 1920, General Bols had sent to London an official communique wherein he wrote that the authority of each department of British administration is "claimed or impinged upon by the Zionist Commission". The Zionists were "bent on committing the temporary Military Administration to a partialist policy before the issue of the Mandate". The Report also pointed out that the Zionists' aim was not merely to establish a "National Home" but "in reality they will be satisfied with nothing less than a Jewish State and all that it politically implies". (9)

The terrorist groups, and para-military cells affiliated with the Zionist Organization, were indulging in riots against the Palestinian Arabs. The Zionists combined diplomacy and action in order to achieve their goal of the Jewish State through a long protracted struggle. In its first decade from 1897 to 1907 the Zionist Organization set up financial, administration and propaganda depart-


ments. At the same time important Zionist leaders established and maintained diplomatic contact with their countries to secure wide support for the cause of the Jews. During these initial ten years much ground work was done and in 1907 the Zionist movement undertook a plan of action. The plan was formulated by Dr Weizmann and adopted at the 8th Zionist Congress. The synthetic zionism called for a slow but steady infiltration into Palestine to carve out Jewish enclaves. Such Jewish enclaves were intended to exert pressure on the authorities of Palestine to allow and guarantee to protect Zionist colonization.

The year 1917 marked a new but the most significant era of the Zionist Movement. The Zionists succeeded in obtaining the approval of the British Government for its plan of Jewish immigration. In 1927 the Zionist organizations were granted substantial amount of control over local administration of Palestine. In 1937 the British Government was pressurized to concede the basic demand of the Zionists and a British Royal Commission recommended to set up a Jewish State. The Anglo-Zionist conspiracy temporarily failed because the Palestinian Arabs rose against it and frustrated all attempts to impose such a state on them.

The Zionists intensified their struggle and subsequently their acts of violence increased; Haganah, Palmach and Irgun demonstrated their strength and ferocity. In May 1942, the Zionists reconsidered their plan of strategy to implement it. The "Baltimore Conference" was convened in New York. The leaders of the Zionist Movement met and declared that the gates of Palestine be opened, and that Palestine be established as a Jewish Commonwealth integrated
in the structure of the new democratic world". (10) The British Government was presented in 1945 with the demand that an "immediate decision be announced to establish Palestine "undivided and undiminished" as a Jewish state". Another demand made by the Jewish Agency was that it should be "invested with the control of Jewish immigration into Palestine". (11)

The Zionists did not always use the word "statehood", they camouflaged it with the more polite term of "home". The Zionist demand for a "home" for persecuted Jews was nothing more than a shrewd tactical slogan valid for such time as they could get sufficient manpower to dislodge the population, namely, the Arabs, who constituted the overwhelming majority and owned most of the land. From 1897 to 1942 the leaders of the Zionist Movement tried to show the world that they wanted a Jewish national home not a Jewish State. After 1942 they abandoned their strategy and openly started using the expression Jewish State. It was a mere strategic stunt and the objective of Zionism was to attain "statehood". Theodor Herzl confessed in his diaries that the sum total of the Basle Congress" in a word which I shall guard against pronouncing publicly - it would be this: At Basle I founded the Jewish State. If I were to say this today, I would be met by universal laughter. In five years, perhaps, and certainly in fifty, every one will see it". (12)


The policy of the Zionist Movement in its early programme and action was to systematically change the Arab character and population of Palestine into a Jewish one, through dependent Mandated Palestine then to an independent Jewish State. Jewish immigrants could be settled by forcible eviction of the Arab population of Palestine. The Zionists adopted four important means to achieve their goal of attaining statehood for the Jewish community: diplomatic action, colonization, expulsion and expansion.

Diplomatic action and settlement on Palestine soil was shrewdly combined. The official pronouncements made by Great Britain were not sufficient to attain the target of the Jewish State. Such a state was possible if the Jews in large numbers were brought to be settled in Palestine.

Ben Gurion wrote that such pronouncements "would remain pieces of paper if we did not manage to bring Jews into Palestine and prepare the land for large scale settlement". (13)

The Zionists conducted their war against both the Palestinian Arabs and the British government. Their aim was to establish the "Jewish State". To achieve their goal the Zionists employed the third means, i.e. expulsion of the Arabs as an indispensable part of their strategy to get rid of those 497,000 Arabs who were living within the Jewish state. O'Ballance wrote: (14) "It was the Jewish policy to encourage the Arabs to quit their homes and they ejected those who clung to their villages."

The Zionists had stepped up their terrorism because they sus-

pected that the Security Council might undo the partition of Palestine.

After the acceptance of the Partition Resolution of November 29, 1947 the Zionists adopted an offensive policy. Ben Gurion wrote: (15)

"As April (1948) began, our war of independence swung decisively from defence to attack. Field troops and Palmach in particular were deployed..., and almost all of New Jerusalem occupied, and the guerillas were expelled from Haifa, Jaffa, Tiberiah, Safad while still the Mandatory was present. Arabs started fleeing from the cities almost as soon as disturbances began in the early days of December 1947".

On May 15, 1948, Mandatory rule over Palestine was officially terminated. Between November 29, 1947 and May 15, 1948, the Zionist attacks intensified on Arab towns and villages. During this six months' period about 400,000 Palestinian Arabs living within the "Jewish State" were expelled and forced to take shelter in neighbouring Arab States. Many cities and villages which were assigned to the 'Arab State' under the Partition Plan, were all attacked and occupied by Israeli forces. (16) The Zionists were executing their plan with utmost ruthlessness and trying to expand the frontiers of the Jewish State beyond the area assigned by the Partition Resolution. The Partition Resolution of November 29, 1947 had clearly demarcated areas of the Arab state and the Jewish state.

The Zionists were not content with the boundaries of their proposed state, they annexed Arab areas and launched an all-out attack on Arab villages. To them the Partition Plan was a temporary expedient device which should serve their long term purpose of establishing Great


Israel. To quote Dr Elmer Berger: (17) "In principle all of them (the Zionists) agreed to accept (partition). But in practice, the more militant segments of the movement, tacitly supported by the official Zionist structure, began in 1948 to develop and implement plans with two designs in mind. "The first was to increase the territory of the proposed so-called "Jewish State" and the second was to reduce the size of the Arab population in those territories assigned to the so-called "Jewish State" by the General Assembly recommendation". According to Ben Gurion, (18) the Jewish State "has been established in only a portion of the Land of Israel".

The ceasefire orders of the Security Council were flagrantly violated by Israel. She used it as an interlude to replenish and strengthen her military potentials and it continued attacking Arab villages in defiance of May 22 resolution. The Arab population was expelled to make rooms for the Jewish immigrants.

Large scale looting and massacres of Arab population were confirmed by Count Bernadotte, UN Mediator. In his report in 1948 he said that the Zionists were committing "large scale looting, pillaging and plundering", and there were "instances of destruction of villages without apparent military necessity". (19)

The Security Council directive ordering ceasefire was violated when fighting again broke out on July 9, 1948. Israel was steadily expanding and gaining new areas belonging to the Arab States by the


use of sheer force. The Security Council adopted a resolution on November 16, 1948 calling upon the parties to conclude an armistice.

The Armistice Agreements were concluded between Israel and four Arab States, i.e., Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria. Israel acquired, after the Armistice Agreements were signed, control over nearly 8,000 sq. miles of territory out of a total of 10,435 sq. miles. Under the Partition Resolution the total area allotted to the Jewish State was 56.47% while after the Armistice Agreements it became 77.40%. Israel's expansion beyond the territory given to it under the Partition Resolution thus was illegal and in violation of the United Nations directives.

On December 11, 1948, a Conciliation Commission was set up by the General Assembly. Its chief purpose was to take steps to assist the Governments and authorities concerned to achieve a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them". (21) The Commission met at different places like Lebanon and Lausanne. At Lausanne it presented a "protocol" as the basis of its work which was signed by Israel and the Arab States on May 12, 1949. The working document on the basis of which the commission was supposed to have conducted its deliberations was the map of partition and Israel had agreed to it. Later on Israel went back on its words and told the Commission that she "could not accept a certain proportionate distribution of territory agreed upon in 1947 as a criterion for a territorial settlement in the present circumstances." (22)

21. GAOR, 194 (111) of 11th December 1948.
Israel's acceptance of the Lausanne protocol was just a shrewd ruse, Machiavillian in its duplicity. Israel had applied for the membership of the United Nations and she accepted the protocol in order to show the world body her faith in the Charter and readiness to carry out its international obligations. The Government of Israel confessed it, when it stated: (23) "In a way, Israel's attitude at the Lausanne talks aided its delegation at Lake Success to obtain the majority required for admission".

Israel showed utter disregard not only for the Lausanne Protocol of 1949 but also for the Armistice Agreements concluded with the Arab states. The Armistice Agreements had provided demilitarized zones in each sector and Israel violated each zone's exclusive status granted under the Agreement.

Ever since 1948, Israel has always tried to push its territorial frontiers beyond areas assigned to it under the Partition Plan. Jerusalem was declared international zone but its sanctity was flagrantly violated. Chaim Weizmann was asking the Jews to prepare for an eventual occupation of the holy city when he said: (24)

"Do not worry because part of Jerusalem is not now within the state. Fear not, my friend, the old synagogues will be rebuilt anew and the way to the Wailing Wall will be opened again. Within your blood and sacrifices you have renewed the Covenant of old. Jerusalem is yours by virtue of the blood which your sons shed defending it".

Ben Gurion, the chief architect of Israel, while accepting the invitation to form a cabinet told his party: (25) "I accept to form the Cabinet on one condition and that is, to utilize all possible means

25. Israel Government Year Book 1951-52. p. 64.
to expand towards the South". It was in keeping with the promise of Ben Gurion to expand to the south that Israel attacked Sinai Peninsula in 1956.

Israel has planned its expansionist designs with meticulous details and executed it stage by stage. Israel kept expanding gradually in the demilitarized zone during the Armistice. The El-Auja demilitarized zone was illegally occupied by Israel in 1950. Before the occupation of El-Auja, Israel had violated the territorial integrity of Bir Qattar and occupied it on March 20, 1950. The Mixed Armistice Commission asked Israel to withdraw its armed forces from Bir Qattar but Israel refused to abide by the directive. The Security Council resolution of November 17, 1950 asking Israel to withdraw from the occupied area remained a mere piece of paper because Israel refused to obey the Security Council.

The naked aggression against Bir Qattar and El-Auja was an exercise in brutal aggrandizement and the expulsion of Arab Bedouins from their homes confirmed Israel's plan of ruthless expansion. "It was," to quote Egyptian Representative, "a continuation and intensification of premeditated, systematic and ruthless aggression by world political Zionism against the rights of the lawful Arab inhabitants of Palestine". (26)

The Israelis, instead of withdrawing from El-Auja, established a settlement called "Ketsiob". It was actually a military establishment from where Israel wanted to penetrate deeper into Arab lands. In 1955 further advance was made when the Israeli armed forces attacked and occupied Gaza.

It was another step forward towards the goal of "Greater Israel".

The Israeli armed forces were the main actor in bringing Israel nearer its goal. In 1952 Moshe Dayan said: (27) "It lies upon the peoples' shoulder to prepare for the war, but it lies upon the Israeli army to carry out the fight with the ultimate object of erecting the Israeli Empire".

The occupation of Gaza was till then the most important and serious development in the Middle East since the Armistice. Israel tried to justify its actions and occupation in terms of self-defence. Her contention was that the occupation of some Arab areas was indispensable because they were being used as headquarters of anti-Israeli guerrilla activities. The theory of reprisal and retaliation was vague and it was not accepted by the United Nations nor did it receive support from Israel's staunchest allies like France, the USA, the United Kingdom.

The US representative commenting on the Gaza raid, said (28) that it was "indefensible from any standpoint". "We oppose any policy of reprisal and retaliation".

Israel was not prepared to accept any resolution of the United Nations and vacate the areas occupied by it. It went ahead with its plan and efforts to establish Greater Israel. After Gaza it overran Sinai Peninsula.

During 1955 General Election campaign in Israel, leaders of various political parties were making big promises about extending Israeli frontiers towards south of Israel. Ben Gurion was pitched against Sharett for leadership. The Mapai Party led by Ben Gurion assumed more hawkish postures in order to capture power.

Ben Gurion on July 9, 1955, spoke in Beersheeba where he promised to "bring water and youth from the north to the Negev". (29) The water, he meant, was primarily the water from the Jordan River.

Israel in its expansionist drive now wanted access to Eilat to establish its contacts with Africa and Asia. Sharett, a contestant for power in Israel was reported as warning that "Israel would assure by force the freedom of sea approach to Eilat should our enemies fail to respond to our efforts through international channels and peaceful negotiations to lift their blockade". (30) Israel was bent upon reaching Eilat and developing it as an oil port. Ben Gurion also agreed with his chief rival to use force to open Eilat. He told a correspondent that opening Eilat for Israeli shipping was not difficult because "we can do it by air, by land or by sea." (31)

Nasser had in mind Israeli expansionism and the promises given to the Israeli people to push Israel's frontier further south when he nationalized Suez Canal on July 26, 1956. Israel mobilized its entire military strength and on October 29, 1956 it invaded the Sinai Peninsula. The invasion of the Sinai was invasion of Egypt. Aided by England and France, Israel used its superior military strength to expand deeper in the Arab Land and render many Arabs homeless. The invasion of Egypt had one motive - to expand in the south. A prominent member of the Herut Party observed: (32) "Peace with the Arab countries is impossible with the present boundaries of Israel which leave Israel open to attack. Israel should take the offensive immediately.
and capture strategic points along its border including the Gaza strip and then should take over the British backed kingdom of Jordan."

The Sinai campaign was not the result of a few days planning. It was a well planned and meticulously executed scheme to grab one of the most strategic areas to provide Israel an access to the sea. The reasons given for the invasion of Egypt varied; some said that it was a "preventive war", to some it was a "retaliatory raid". It was more than that. Burns, the Chief of UNTSO has quoted Colonel Kursell, Israel Army Liaison Officer for Armistice Affairs with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as saying that "it was not just a retaliatory raid, but that the Israel forces were going to stay in Sinai". The Security Council followed the same ritual of meeting and wondering over the grave situation. The resolution was vetoed and an emergency session of the General Assembly was called, in which a resolution was adopted under which United Nations Force came into existence and was sent to the Middle East to keep peace but with small success. Israel believes in the policy of speaking softly but without foregoing the use of the big stick.

Israel talks of peace but prepares for war. Whenever an Israeli leader became too enthusiastic in talking about peace, it has generally resulted in an attack on Arab territory. Israel is that way a master of duplicity. El-Bara of Jordan was referring to Israeli duplicity when he challenged Eban's call for peace and doubted his motive. He said that Eban's call for peace "worries me". "I say this because experience has shown that when the Israelis speak of peace and make loud noises about it, we take it as a warning to prepare for Israeli aggression." (33) He cited few instances like Eban's speech of January 9, 1952.

---

emphasizing the need of peace and only nineteen days later two Jordanian villages Falama and亭antis were attacked.

On September 28, 1953, Lebanon again expressed his love for peace and his concern "to heal a wound of aggressive violence". Sixteen days later Qibya became a victim of the most brutal aggression by Israel on October 14, 1953.

Moshe Sharett also spoke in Lebanon's tone on December 11, 1953 declared that Israel was always ready for peace. Three months later the Jordanian village of Nahhalin was attacked on March 28, 1954.

El-Farra cited many other instances of Israel's vague, insincere profession of peace, which actually meant "blood, murder, terror and aggression". (35)

The same story of double talk was repeated in 1967. Levi Eshkol, Israel Premier told the Knesset: (36) "Israel has no aggressive designs against Arab countries. Moshe Dayan also said: (37) "We have no invasion aims. Our only target is to foil the Arab armies aim of invading our country. Soldiers of Israel, we have no aims of territorial conquest".

It is not only Egypt but also Jordan and Syria who have been victims of frequent Israeli attacks. Israel has all along wanted to capture the entire Western Bank of the Jordan River to establish Greater Israel. The Israelis had an armistice agreement with Jordan but frequently and flagrantly violated it. In 1952 the Israeli armed forces attacked Beit Jalla and occupied the area. On September 17, 1952 the Israeli armed forces expelled ten families of Es-Sani tribes
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and occupied their land near Jordan. The biggest attack launched by Israel against Jordan came on October 14, 1953. Qibya, a village on the Jordan side became a victim of Israeli aggression. Lake Tiberias also became target of Israeli aggression. The Israeli Government undertook its work along the western bank of the Jordan River on land belonging to Arab peasants in the Mansoura sector. The Israelis on March 13, 1951, crossed the bridge of Benat Yakub and began work on a large scale in the demilitarized zone of the Eastern bank of the Jordan River. The Palestine Land Development Company Limited was the "Zionists' chief organ of colonization. It was like East India Company which was the chief instrument of British expansionism in India in the 18th century. The Palestine Land Development Company Ltd., was a body invested with powers to deprive the Arabs of their land. The Zionists were deposing the Arabs by purchasing their land, or failing that, they were being frightened and molested. The Arabs who remained in Palestine were also subjected to torture. Their homes were looted and burnt, their lands were grabbed and they were reduced to the status of second class citizen. All inhuman devices were being used in order to grab more and more Arab territory in order to accommodate more and more Jews. The Palestine Land Development Company Limited was, therefore, instructed by the Security Council in its resolution of May 18, 1951, "to cease all operations in the demilitarized zone until such time as an agreement is arranged".

Israel, however, did not abide by the Security Council resolutions asking it to vacate aggression and abandon its policy of expansionism. The Palestine Land Development Company Limited did not
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cease operating in the demilitarized zone as required by May 18, 1951, Security Council resolution. Israel's policy of "encroachment on Arab lands" (39) was confirmed by General Vagan Bennike the Chief of the Staff of UNTSO.

The Israeli expansion in the Syrian sector reached new heights when in 1955, a Syrian post on Lake Tiberias was attacked and occupied. The Israeli attack on Syrian soil was deplored by Great Powers and the Security Council. Israel was severely condemned for its acts of violence against innocent Arabs. No amount of condemnation of Israeli actions has, however, made the Zionists desist from their plans or actions.

Resolutions of the Security Council and of the General Assembly have been treated as mere scraps of paper by Israel. In 1962, Israel with all its military strength, attacked the Arab village of Nuqueib in Syria. Syrian positions at El-Fig and Zaki and El-Hemma were attacked and bombed. The United Nations Truce Supervision Organization was in charge of looking after and preserving the territorial integrity of Arab land.

Israel in making onslaughts on Arab States has shown no inhibitions or respect for world opinion. It disregarded and, at times, defied even the Mixed Armistice Commissions directives. Many Chiefs of Staff of UNTSO are on record in confirming that Israel remained, (40) throughout, indifferent and contemptuous towards the United Nations Supervision Organization. Israel started as a small state comprising small chunk of territory. From 1948 to 1956 till the time of Egypt

invasion, Israel's frontiers expanded. It deliberately, with full and detailed plan, embarked on a policy of wiping out Arab population, and replacing them with the Jewish immigrants.

A look of Israel's map would be enough to convince anybody of Israel's ruthless and shameless expansionist policy.

Israeli leaders had always expressed their expansionist design and whenever they had any opportunity to push Israel's frontier forward they grabbed it discarding all considerations of morality and international obligations. One of Israel's military leaders was provoking his people to acquire more Arab territories. He wrote: (41)

"Let us retaliate not by aggression of personal violence but by giving an additional spurt to our development. For every one of our comrades who falls, let us build a new agricultural settlement. Far from evacuating our villages, let us reclaim more desert and swamps and build new villages".

The Truce and, then, the Armistice Agreements with the Arab States did not mean much as far as Israel and its acts of violence were concerned.

Sayed Nofal has, with much efforts, collected a statistical data about Israeli attacks on the Arab States during the Armistice and after. According to him from 1957 to 1962 at least 2500 attacks were made by Israel on Jordanian frontier. On the Egyptian frontier the number of attacks is not that staggering, nevertheless it helped Israel to expand in the most strategic areas like Gaza strip and Sinai Peninsula. From 1949 to 1961 Israel made 1635 attacks on the Egyptian frontier. On the Lebanese frontier the number 97 while on the Syrian side the number of attacks during 1955 and 1962 was 16,997.

The total number of attacks made by Israel on till the Arab States was 21,240. (42)

Israeli policy of expansion was not spontaneous, it was a well planned and deliberate policy. Its swift penetration in the Sinai campaign of 1956 was the result of many years planning and extremely careful execution. Two Russian authors have succeeded in digging deep into the secret military records of Israel and quoted from secret document showing that Israel had definite plans. In one of the documents it is reported: (43)

"Negev, Tiran and Sanafir, Sinai Peninsula Suez area ... The occupation of these areas will bring us unlimited possibilities for the use of the Gulf of Aqaba and the port of Elath. The occupation of these territories will put at one's disposal oil wells from which we can extract to thousand tons of oil per year, and also trade profits resulting from the possession of the Suez Canal. The Suez Canal will bring us from 10 to 20 million dollars per year. The port of Elath also will bring us 10 million dollars per year".

Wherever Israel had penetrated into Arab territories, militarized agricultural settlements had come into existence. Israel's military strategy was to establish border settlements with strong military guard. Most of these settlements were established on lands which were abandoned by the Arabs. Out of 370 such settlements about 350 were, according to Don Peretz, founded on Arab refugee property. (44)

The fortified settlements on border areas were aimed at defending the State of Israel. Ben Gurion wrote: (45) "Upper Galilee and the

expanses of the South and the Negev are the country's weak points, and no military force can assure us of their continued possession unless we settle them as speedily and closely as possible”.

The whole of the Sinai Peninsula was overrun in 1956 and Israel in return for its withdrawal from the Sinai insisted upon retaining an important strip with it. That strip ran from El-Arish to the Gulf of Aqaba and was of immense strategic importance for Israel's plan to reach the sea and operate shipping through the Strait of Tiran. "Eretz Israel" also included the western bank of the Jordan River and the Golan Heights in Syria. Israel wanted not only an outlet to the sea which she got when Elath was captured, Israel also wanted portions of Lebanese and Syrian territories to include the headwaters of the River Jordan and a portion of the River Litani to ensure Israel economic progress and development. To get ample water supply Israel chalked out a plan to divert the water of the River Jordan. It was the most important chain in the scheme of Israeli expansion. Israeli contention to justify its claim to divert the water of the River Jordan was that Syria and Jordan were utilizing the waters of the Jarmuk River. Such a contention was unpalatable. The Jordan River was of great significance for the Arab States bordering the River since they had to depend on water resources in the absence of oil resources. Lebanon, Jordan and Syria all the main beneficiaries of Jordan River water. Israel was planning to pump out the water from the River Jordan to be utilized by the Jewish immigrants living in Negeb. The "Johnston proposal" was the blueprint which Israel wanted to use in undertaking the project. Johnston came to the Middle East as an Emissary of Eisenhower. His assignment was to study the matter and make suggestions to both the parties. The Israeli policy of diverting the waters of the River
Jordan was aimed at making the return of the Palestinian Arabs impossible by occupying maximum Arab territory. It had another aim of allowing still greater influx of the Jewish immigrants which would help it in realizing the dream of Eretz Israel stretching from the "Nile to the Euphrates".

The Arab states opposed any scheme of diverting the waters of the River Jordan. They refused to cooperate with Israel in any irrigation development plan as proposed by the United States of America because their support would have meant a severe blow to the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. The question of the River Jordan and its division between Israel and the Arab States was not to be taken in isolation of the Palestine problem.

According to the Arab States, the question of repatriation of Palestinian Arabs to their homeland and the division of the waters of the River Jordan were two sides of the same coin and hence were to be tackled simultaneously. The United Nations Economic Survey Mission had accepted this relationship between the repatriation of Arab refugees and agreement on international water rights. The mission visited the Middle East in 1949 and after a long and thorough study of the problem its report said that peace and cooperation were essential pre-requisites for any development scheme. It said: (46)

"In the absence of a peace settlement between Israel and adjoining countries on outstanding issues involving repatriation and compensation of Arab refugees and territorial boundaries, it is unrealistic to suppose that agreement on the complex question of international waters rights could be negotiated among the parties".

The position taken by the Arab States was vindicated by the report of the United Nations Economic Survey. The Arab states took a serious

view of the Israeli designs of expansion and decided to oppose every scheme to divert the waters of the River Jordan. The chief reason for their strong opposition was that Israel wanted to grab more land because the reservoir and pipelines were to be built on land which was Arab owned. The main waters of the River Jordan had its origin in Lebanon and Syria and it was a boundary line between Palestine and Jordan. Its diversion would have meant hardship and poverty for the Arab cultivators in the Jordan Valley.

Israel has always been, with single-mindedness and meticulous details, following a policy of pushing its frontiers inside the Arab territory. It has been busy preparing for war which provided it the opportunity to appropriate Arab lands and expand its geographical limits. The leaders of Israel have always itched for the Land of the Bible and that opportunity came in 1967 when the Israeli air force was in action against the UAR, Jordan, Syria and Iraq. The plan was to achieve 'secure' and 'recognized' borders by occupying Sinai, the Golan Heights and the West Bank of Jordan including Jerusalem. The plan was executed with great speed and fantastic precision.

Israel's expansionism was in full cry in 1967 and was based on its occupation of Egyptian, Syrian and Jordanian territories. Moshe Dayan was disclosing the Israeli plan of expansion and annexation when he said: (47)

"People abroad must realize that with all the strategic importance to Israel of Sinai, the Golan Heights, and the Tiran Straits - the mountain range west of the Jordan lies at the heart of Jewish history... If you have the book of the Bible, and the people of the book, then you also have the land of the Bible - of the Judges and of the Patriarchs in Jerusalem, Hebron, Jericho and thereabouts".

The military preparedness of Israel in 1967 was far better and superior than 1956. "The armoured corps in 1956" wrote Kimche, (48) "represented a small fraction of the total; by 1967 this had risen to a significant percentage. More than half of the defence expenditure went into the air force. Armour and airpower had become the two decisive factors." With such military might and planned scheme of expansion Israel embarked upon another adventure unparalleled in the annals of history and it endeavoured to preserve, uphold and defend the new status quo. This expansion was to materialise the dream of "Eretz Israel", it was the fulfilment of a people's ancestral dream. The Jerusalem Post wrote: (49) "The land was promised to us by the Almighty, and all the prophets foretold its return to us." Israel had always enjoyed the fruit of aggression and it refused to withdraw from the areas occupied during the June War of 1967.

Israel refused to withdraw its armed forces from occupied areas not because it wanted 'secure' borders. The main reason was its expansionist policy and greed to acquire more and more land to absorb mass Jewish immigration. Eliezer Livenen said: (50) "Israel must make ready for absorbing mass immigration during the next decade, and all resources must be mobilized for that goal, including re-education of the people towards "genuine Zionism". Moshe Talenkin and Professor Harold Fish also spoke at the first post election convention of the Land of Israel Movement held on November 9, 1969. These two gentlemen


also dwelt upon the revolutionary role of the Six Day War of 1967 in Jewish history and scoffed at those people who were arguing to go back to the pre-war position. (51) The Palestinian Arabs, like other human beings, were deeply involved with land of their birth and refused to yield despite the pressure and terror applied by Israel. The Arabs who refused to leave their homes were subjected to inhuman and cruel treatment. Their houses were burnt and their possessions were looted which was in keeping with the Zionists' lust for domination and expansion. An Indian expert of International Law observed: (52)

"Repression of Arabs has become intensified since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. Under the pretext of maintaining law and order Israeli Military started blowing up the homes of suspected Arab patriots and extended the practice to Jerusalem on March 6, 1968 which was denounced by the Mayor Teddy Kolleck. The Arabs in Gaza were subjected to particular humiliations, curfews, searches, detentions and fines".

Israel's policy of expansionism was deliberate and conceived at the time of Israel's birth. Count Bernadotte had perceived future political development when he prophetically said: (53)

"It could not be ignored that unrestricted immigration to the Jewish area of Palestine might, over a period of years, give rise to a population pressure and to economic and political disturbances which would justify present Arab fears of ultimate Jewish expansion in the Near East.

Israel was encouraging mass immigration of the Jews and Ben Gurion in 1961 declared: "Every religious Jew has daily violated the precepts of Judaism and the Torah of Israel by remaining in the Diaspora". (54) Every Jew living outside Israel was, according to Ben Gurion, "godless".

---
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The Jewish immigration gathered new momentum even after June war of 1967. According to Jerusalem Post "the security situation has not affected immigration and prospects for 1970 fluctuate between 55,000 and 60,000." (55) The Israeli press advocate everyday the policy of unlimited immigration disregarding the absorptive capacity of pre-war areas or after war occupied areas with intention and knowledge of dangers which it poses to neighbouring Arab states. The Jerusalem Post wrote: (56)

"The Government coalition negotiations committee November 23, made headway on a number of issues and resolved unanimously to increase settlement both in Israel and the administered areas.

The term 'homeland' was used apparently in order to avoid having to name specific areas in the Golan Heights, the West Bank or Sinai where such new settlements are to be established within the next four years".

Israel is an expansionist state and the Arabs have suffered in terms of material and human loss. "That the Arabs fear and suspicion" wrote (57) Professor Haqqi, "are not groundless have been repeatedly substantiated by the attitude of the British and U.S. Government towards Israel, and the moral and material support extended to Israel by the Anglo-American Jewry and the elite in western countries".

The financial aid given to Israel by American Jews has been fantastic. "American Jews have poured into Israel for the last 15 years, $568 million bonds for Israel, $1,035,000,000 through the UJA and another $250 million in private investments that were often motivated by conscience". (58)

56. Ibid., November 24, 1969, pp. 1, 8.
According to another report the American aid to Israel in the last sixteen years totalled $698 million. (59)

During the years 1948-61, the Joint Distribution Committee (60) expended about $120,000,000 of its share of UJA funds for its programme in Israel.

Many Jewish intellectuals have openly denounced Israel policy of expansion. Albert Einstein was offered to become the President of Israel. The great scientist declined the offer and observed that "he had never been a Zionist and had never supported the creation of the state of Israel". (61) Einstein was concerned with the rights of Palestine Arabs and wanted them to be repatriated to their homes.

Professor Morris Cohen was also opposed to the idea of a separate Jewish State. He did not have a blind love for Zionism which he regarded "not merely a philanthropic movement to help the homeless. It claims to be a solution of the Jewish problem; and its emphasis on Palestine rests on a nationalist philosophy which is a direct challenge to all those who believe in liberalism." (62)

Zionism was an antithesis of liberalism and even of human civilization. The expansion of Israel and expulsion of Arab population were the natural concomitants and logical outcome of Zionist doctrine. Ian Gilmour rightly observed: (63) "Stripped of its pseudo-

historical overtones, Zionism means the displacement of Arabs by Jews and the turning of Arab land into Jewish land."

Israel is not a state. It is a movement which preaches and practises hatred, discrimination against those people whose land it had forcibly acquired. Israel as a movement does not have a frontier - it cannot have a frontier. Its frontiers will be determined by its military strength and by the extent of Jewish immigration. The Law of Return was a clear manifestation of Israel's policy of expansion. On July 5, 1950 the Israeli Knesset unanimously passed the law which stated: (64) "Every Jew has the right to immigrate to the country". A Jew who comes to Israel and after his arrival expresses a desire to settle there may, while in Israel, obtain an immigrant certificate". Israel's vested interest is not in peace but in war because its motto is expansion in the Arab world to help Jews to return to the "Promised Land".

War is a convenient instrument of expansion and Israel has always used it and will always use it to expand in every direction. The best example of Israeli expansionist design was Moshe Dayan's statement in one of Israel's weeklies. (65)

"Our fathers had reached the frontiers which were reorganized in the Partition Plan. Our generation reached the frontiers of 1949. Now the Six-Day generation have managed to reach Suez, Jordan and the Golan Heights. This is not the end. After the present ceasefire lines there will be new ones. They will extend beyond the Jordan - perhaps to Lebanon and perhaps to central Syria as well.

Dayan's statement is an honest confession of Zionist expansionist proposals submitted to the Peace Conference of 1919. Israel has

forced, as Dayan confesses, its way out of the frontiers assigned by
the Partition Plan of the United Nations and will keep grabbing more
and more territories to materialize the religious myth of the
"Promised Land". Israeli expansion has denied the basic human rights
of the inhabitants of Palestine and rendered them homeless in their
own land. The refugee problem is an integral part of the Palestine
question and any effort to solve it later in isolation is bound to
fizzle out. As a matter of fact, the recent State of Israel, is not
the ultimate goal of the Zionists. It is only the first stage for
fulfledged 'ingathering of world Jewry.' Israel in its expansionist
drive passed through many stages and at every stage it was condemned
by the United Nations. The Security Council and the General Assembly
have adopted innumerable resolutions asking Israel to abandon its
policy of expansion. No positive result out of the United Nations
directives has so far come out.

Israel has always treated the United Nations resolutions with
great contempt and has paid them scant heed. Israel's adamant behaviour
constitutes a severe blow to the prestige of the United Nations.
Israel's refusal to refrain from proclaiming full territorial sover-
eignty over the areas under its de facto occupation after each aggression
is a negation of all principles of international law and civilized life.
The United Nations is on trial. The world body should not become and
remain a silent spectator to Israel flagrant violations of the United
Nations Charter.
Political Zionism bases itself on both ideology and expediency. The ideological orientation of Zionism involves a particular attitude of the Jews towards the Arabs. Apartheid was an ideal before the Zionists and they applied it, in full measure, against the Palestinian Arabs. The scheme of discrimination became a part of Zionist ideology because it would help in the achievement of its goal of establishing the Jewish state. The racial content of Zionist ideology was too strong to be ignored. Theodore Herzl and other leaders of political Zionism advocated for naked discriminatory treatment for the gentiles - here the Arabs. Herzl confided a plan to his Diary to "spirit the penniless population across the frontier by denying it employment". (1) The Zionists, as early as 1905, boycotted the Arabs and described Arab employment by Jews as "painful leprosy". The Arabs were treated as an inferior race just as the Jews were treated by Hitler. The Zionists were following Hitler's myth of racial superiority to its logical end and preparing schemes to exterminate Arabs or drive them out of their homes. The Zionist Hitlerite aggressiveness re-enacted Nazi brutalities in Palestine. The most significant aspect of the creation of the 'Jewish State' was that it was to be installed on the land which was already occupied by another people. The Jewish State could be formed only when indigenous people were expelled to accommodate Jewish immigrants. Such a situation was bound to give rise to perpetual conflict between two groups - the alien intruder and the victim of such intrusion.

The conflict between the Jews and the Palestinians became a prominent feature and even during the mandatory rule the two groups were always at loggerheads. Political Zionism was in alliance with British imperialism in its endeavours to colonize Palestine. The Zionists wanted the local people of Palestine to give willing approval to the idea of the Jewish state to be established in their own country. The people of Palestine saw the wickedness of the Zionists and refused to sign their own death warrant. The Zionists were not prepared for the refusal which would have meant defeat for their plan. They resorted to the use of violence against the innocent people of Palestine as the Palestinians resisted the Zionists and their push into their homeland. The Zionists were well armed and had definite plan to achieve the goal of the 'Jewish State'. They had the full support of Britain who encouraged the Jewish immigration into Palestine. The Zionists encouraged by Britain, financed by the United States of America, and armed by Eastern Europe, especially Czechoslovakia, kept up their pressure of terrorism and bloodshed on Palestinians. The Jewish National Fund was established in 1901 during the Fifth Zionist Congress. It was established to purchase land for the Jews. The Fund was devoted "to bring about the settlement of Palestine by Jews in steadily increasing number". (2)

The Jewish Fund had acquired 758,200 metric dunams by 1944 as compared with a holding of 16,379 metric dunams in 1917. (3) This

policy of land purchase meant eviction of the Arabs from Palestine. The Mayor of Nablus told the Shaw Commission in 1930: (4) "The object of Zionism is to get hold of Palestine—and the Zionist policy is to dispose of the Arabs in every possible way and to replace them with Jews".

The Arabs opposed the land transfer to the Jews and demanded the cessation of Jewish immigration. The mandatory power issued white papers restricting the exodus of the Jews into Palestine but not with much success. The Zionists gathered at Biltmore Hotel in New York in May 1942 and issued a call to the world Jewry to get back "to the Land of Israel". Ben-Gurion in the Conference declared: (5) "Immigration was the crucial problem on which there could be no compromise. No political opposition or obstruction on the part of the Arabs... will prevent Jews from getting back to the Land of Israel". The Biltmore programme was adopted and ship loads of Jewish immigrants started pouring into Palestine. Their arrival in Palestine had meant eviction and expulsion of the Arabs of Palestine. The Biltmore programme had discarded the concept of bi-nationalism. According to the programme, the Jews were the only race to live in Palestine and the Jews Commonwealth would not have room for a non-Jew. Yet Weizmann gave the Arabs of Palestine some assurances which were never kept. He said: (6) "If the Arabs


do not wish to remain in a Jewish State, every facility will be
given to them to transfer to one of the many and vast Arab coun-
tries". The facilities promised by Weizmann proved a camouflage
for the Zionist terrorism and massacre. The Partition Plan of
November 29, 1947 was accepted by the Zionists as the "ultimate
minimum acceptable". The Zionist para-military organizations
carried out a fierce psychological warfare against local Arabs. The
Haganah established a communication network to make important
broadcasts to strike terror in the hearts of Palestinians and make
them leave their homes in panic. In 1948 it said: (7)

"We wish it to be known to every Arab in Jeru-
salem — particularly in the Arab City — that we
are able to reach most of their houses and that
we shall find it an easy job to blow up any de-
sired number of houses in any one night".

The reign of terror continued unabated. The USA and other
powers viewed the situation with grave concern and wanted to find
a peaceful solution of the problem. The USA desired no violent
change in the status quo since it would be a severe blow to the US
national interest in the Middle East. The Secretary of State (8)
told the Armed Committee of the Senate on March 20, 1948:

"The grave international situation had emphasized
the compelling importance of preventing the out-
break of open warfare in Palestine. The interest
of the US in a peaceful settlement in Palestine
arises not only out of deep humanitarian consid-
eration but also out of vital elements of our national
policy".

The US coined with the idea of placing Palestine under the
Trusteeship System. The American proposal of trusteeship for

Palestine gave rise to grave apprehensions in the minds of Zionists who thought it was an attempt to undo partition and frustrate their design about the Jewish State. They stepped up their activities in Palestine, Haganah and other terrorist groups launched an undeclared war on innocent people of Palestine in an effort to confront the United Nations with a fait accompli. (9)

Ben Gurion was outlining the policy of extermination and expulsion of the Arabs when he spoke to the Mapai party in 1948. He said: (10)

"In the six, eight or ten coming months of the struggle many great changes will take place, very great in this country and not all of them to our disadvantage, and surely a great change in the composition of the population in the country".

The para military organizations were executing the plan of expelling the Arabs from those areas which were occupied during the hostilities in 1948. During the truce Israel did not abandon its policy of evicting the Arabs from their homes. With the cessation of hostilities most of the Arab population in the Jewish occupied had left their homes, land and property. Count Bernadotte summed up the causes responsible for Arab exodus: (11) "The exodus of Palestinian Arabs resulted from panic created by fighting in their communities by rumours concerning real or alleged act of terrorism or expulsion".

The policy of terror was responsible for the exodus of the Arabs. They had become panicky and abandoned their homes, lands

9. For brutal attacks and massacres, see Chapter I, pp. 69-70.
and property. Menachem Begin, the Commander of Irgun wrote that the Arabs "were seized with limitless panic and started to flee for their lives.... The Arabs began to flee in terror even before they clashed with Jewish forces". (12)

Israel tried to put the blame for the Arab exodus on the Arab states and its leaders. The Israeli leaders held the Arab League, leading Arab newspapers, broadcasts from Arab capitals and secret Arab Radio Stations, responsible for creating panic among the Arabs by presenting to them an exaggerated picture of Zionist brutality. Gabbay accused the Palestinian leaders of having deliberately encouraged the Arab exodus. "The Arab exodus", wrote Gabbay, "however, would never have assumed such a wholesale character during April-May 1948 had it not been for the behaviour of the Arab Palestinian leaders - the Arab Higher Committee, the Municipal authorities, the local commanders, big landlords, wealthy merchants, doctors, lawyers, teachers, clergymen, etc. and to some extent the Arab Governments themselves". (13)

To say that the Arabs left their homes on their own or were asked by their own organizations to leave their homes is a blatant lie. Many objective writers have nipped this lie in the bud and asserted that the Arab exodus was "deliberate and essential part of Zionist scheme of expansion. Edgar wrote: (14)

"It was the Jewish policy to encourage the Arabs to quit their homes, and they used psychological warfare extensively in urging them to do so. Later, as the war wore on, they ejected those Arabs who clung to their villages... The Israelis made no excuse for it as it was all part of their plan for the reconquest of their 'Promised Land', in which there was no room for large, hostile alien groups".

A British writer confronted the Israelis and asked them to show him the documentary proofs of their allegation against the Arab Governments and broadcasting houses ordering the Palestinian Arabs to evacuate their homes. "I asked to be shown", he wrote, "the proofs. I was assured they existed, and was promised them. None had been offered when I left, but I was assured again. I asked to have the material sent to me. I am still waiting". Erskine tried to check it with the records of BBC and found the charge was baseless and unfounded. "There was not a single order, or appeal, or suggestion about evacuation from Palestine from any Arab radio station, inside or outside Palestine, in 1948". (15)

A prominent Jew Nathan Chofshi also ridiculed the Israeli allegation and wrote: (16) "How and in what manner we, Jews, forced the Arabs to have cities and villages... Some of them were driven out by force of arms; others were made to leave by deceit, lying and false promises. It is enough to cite the cities of Jaffa, Lydda, Ramla, Bursheba, Acre from among numberless others".

Professor Khalidi is one of those few chosen Arab scholars who got access to some secret records of the Zionist activities. He

has published a vivid account of one of the most notorious plans called "Plan Dalat" which was undertaken by the Zionists to exterminate the Arabs living in Palestine and expel the remnants of Arab population. The capture of Haifa, Jaffa, Galilee, Tiberias and Jerusalem and complete annihilation of Arab population living in these areas was part of "Plan Dalat". (17)

The ruthless execution of plan 'D' resulted in the mass exodus of the Arabs. The "Partition Plan" had left the Jewish state with 495,000 Arabs to which another 397,000 Arabs were added when Israel captured 3,496 square kilometers of Arab land during the truce and armistice. The total Arab population under Jewish control was 892,000 while the Jewish population was 655,000. The policy of expulsion and extermination was the only alternative for Israel to reduce the numerical superiority of the Arabs in order to avoid their political supremacy. The extermination and expulsion of the Arabs was a manifestation of Zionist ideology. The Zionists wanted to convert Palestine into a racial state exclusively for the Jews. Israel's chief aim was to avoid establishing a bi-national state in Palestine and make it an exclusive Jewish state; such an ideal could not be achieved if the Arabs were allowed to remain in Palestine. The only alternative was to expel the Arabs from Palestine and encourage Jewish immigration. The Zionists followed this alternative because it was expedient.


The number of the refugees in 1948, according to the estimate by Bernadotte was 330,000. The Acting Mediator's report of October 1948 put the figure as 472,000 and stated that the estimate made by the Arab States was much higher and ranged between 740,000 and 780,000.

In June 1949 the Secretary General of the United Nations presented his report before the General Assembly and his estimate of Arab refugees was 940,000.

In July 1948 the Arab League brought to the notice of the United Nations the refugee problem and asked the world body to view the problem with due urgency and undertake relief measures. Count Bernadotte, the United Nations Mediator took a special and keen interest in the refugee problem and requested the United Nations not to delay its measures of relief. He regarded the problem of the Arab refugees as inseparable from the Palestine Question. He wrote in his report: (20) "It is, however, undeniable that no settlement can be just and complete if recognition is not accorded to the right of the Arab refugee to return to home from which he has been dislodged". Count Bernadotte wanted that the refugees must be granted the right of repatriation and no political consideration should be allowed to stand in the way of its implementation.

On September 16, 1948 Bernadotte asked that Israel should be persuaded to agree to the repatriation of the Arab refugees. (21)

"It would be an offence against the principle of elemental justice if these innocent victims of the conflict were denied the right of return to their homes... The right of innocent people, uprooted from their homes by the present terror and ravages of war to return to their homes should be affirmed and made effective".

The General Assembly was seized with the question of refugees and it was at Bernadotte's initiative that it met on December 11, 1948 and adopted a resolution. Bernadotte was assassinated in September 1948 but the General Assembly met to consider his and Ralph Bunche, the Acting Mediator's reports. On December 11, 1948 the General Assembly adopted a resolution which stated: (22)

"The General Assembly..."

"11. Resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation”.

The General Assembly resolution unambiguously asked for repatriation and compensation. The Conciliation Commission consisting of Turkey, France and the United States of America came into existence and was entrusted with the task of facilitating the process of repatriation of the Arab refugees. The conciliation commission failed in its efforts to secure the right of repatriation for the refugees because Israel defied all its directives and denied the Arabs their natural right to return to their own homes. Israel had also disregarded its obligations assured under the Lausanne Protocol which it

signed on May 12, 1949 and whereby Israel undertook the responsibility of receiving the Arabs back to their homes. The Protocol said:

"The United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine anxious to achieve as quickly as possible the objectives of the General Assembly's resolution of December 11, 1948 regarding refugees, the respect for their rights and the preservation of their property, as well as territorial and other questions, has proposed to the Delegation of Israel and to the Delegations of the Arab States that the working documents attached thereto be taken as basis for discussion with the Commission".

The Commission tried its utmost to make Israel agree to repatriation and compensation but all its pleadings fell on deaf ears. Israel remained adamant. The Conciliation Commission admitted its failure and in its Third Progress Report on the refugee question it observed: (24)

"The Arab delegations continue to hold the view that the first step must be acceptance by the Government of Israel of the principle set forth in resolution 194 (111) of December 11, 1948, concerning the repatriation of refugees who wish to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours. The commission has not succeeded in achieving the acceptance of this principle by the Government of Israel".

Count Bernadotte also had tried before his assassination, to solve the refugee problem in keeping with the principles of justice but failed to persuade Israel to accept the refugees back in Palestine because, as he observed: (25) "The Israeli Government had a very great opportunity in connection with the Arab refugee question. It had missed that opportunity. It had shown nothing but hardness and obduracy towards these refugees".

The Israeli Government was guided by its own narrow considerations. The leaders of Israel were showing stubbornness and stating that the refugees were not Israel problem, they were the problem of the Arab State. According to Ben-Gurion, as shown in the 8th Progress Report of the Conciliation Commission, "a real solution of the major part of the refugee question lay in the resettlement of the refugees in Arab States". (26)

One Israeli writer made it very clear that with the expansionist policy of Israel it would be impossible to allow the refugees to come back to their homes. The Jewish immigrants had replaced them and occupied their homes so they could not be accepted. He wrote: (27)

"In Jerusalem, Jaffa, Haifa, Safad, Tiberias, Acre, and Ramleh, Arabs owned many modern houses. As a result of the great on-rush of Jewish immigrants during the last nine months, all houses fit for habitation have inevitably been taken over. There is not a house in the cities of Israel which is free to accommodate its pre-war owners, should they return. The same is true of the bigger and more prosperous villages".

Israel opposed the repatriation of the Arab refugees on racial grounds; it did not want to alter its exclusive Jewish character. Eban of Israel was exposing his Government's racialism and apartheid when he told the General Assembly: (28)
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"One cannot repatriate people in geography alone. To live in a modern state is to live not only within its landscape but also within its tradition and culture, its religious heritage and linguistic expression; its community values and its special impulses of patriotism and nationhood... In this sense resettlement in Israel would be not repatriation but alienation from Arab society and transference to the only state in the area in which Arab loyalties do not predominate."

Sharett of Israel had already rejected the proposal of repatriation on security grounds. He said: (29)

"The return of the Arabs to Israel would undoubtedly create an atmosphere of mutual suspicion which would conduce neither to the stability of the area nor to the contentment of the inhabitants. The repatriation of refugees was being urged as a means of creating within Israel a fifth column which would facilitate a future war of reconquest. Repatriation was impracticable and politically it would be an act of criminal folly."

Israel did not show any sign of accommodation and continued its policy of expansion and expulsion of the Arabs. During the Armistice Israel attacked and occupied many Arab areas and expelled Arab population. The Security Council adopted a resolution on November 17, 1950, asking Israel to allow the expelled Arabs to come back to their homes but it did not listen to and comply with the decision. Israel's non-compliance with the directives of the United Nations was due to the fact that it had taken the Big Powers and their support for granted. Had the Big Powers, especially the United States of America chosen to exert a little bit of pressure on Israel it would have implemented the General Assembly resolution

Whenever the USA had exerted pressure on Israel compelling it to comply with the UN resolutions, Israel had always obliged the USA.

In May 1949 Israel received a note from the U.S. Government insisting that Israel should grant tangible concessions on the question of refugees failing which the US Government would reconsider its attitude towards Israel. The US Government's note "interpreted Israel's attitude as dangerous to peace". (30) Israel responded and immediately made an offer to the Conciliation Commission to permit the return of 100,000 refugees but the Commission considered the Israeli proposal "unsatisfactory" because "Israel reserved the right to resettle the repatriated refugees in specific locations". (31) Again, in 1953, the US Government discontinued financial assistance to Israel when it refused to obey the decision and authority of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization. Israel had no other alternative but to yield to American pressure and abide by the decision of the UNTSO and stop its drainage work in the Syrian-Israeli Demilitarized zone. (32)

The United Nations, confronted with Israeli non-compliance undertook significant measures to provide relief for the Arab refugees. The conditions in which the refugees were living were of hardship and suffering. They did not have even sufficient food to eat but they were eager to return to their homes. Count Bernadotte presented a picture of refugee life at Ramallah: "Never have I seen

a more ghastly sight than which met my eyes here at Ramallah. The
car was literally stormed by excited masses shouting with oriental
fervour that they wanted food and wanted to return to their homes.
There were plenty of fighting faces in that sea of suffering
humanity". (33) In 1949, the United Nations relief for Palestine
Refugees (UNRPR) was organized for the time being to undertake relief
measures. On December 8, 1949 the General Assembly adopted a resolu-
tion whereby the United Nations relief and Works Agency was created
and in 1950 it took over relief work for the Palestine refugees. The
dual task assigned to UNRWA was to remove distress and promote re-
habilitation. The most important thing UNRWA was struck with was the
intense desire of the refugees to return to their homes. In its
first annual report (34) to the General Assembly, UNRWA took note of
their desire:

"The desire to go back to their homes is general
among all classes; it is proclaimed orally at all
meetings and organized demonstrations, and, in writ-
ing, in all letters addressed to the Agency and all
complaints handed into the area officers. Many refu-
gees are ceasing to believe in a possible return, yet
this does not prevent them from insisting on it,
since they feel that to agree to consider any other
solution would be to show their weakness and to re-
linquish their fundamental right, acknowledged even
by the General Assembly. They are, moreover, scepti-
cal of the promised payment of compensation. This
sense of injustice, frustration and disappointment has
made the refugees irritable and unstable".

The Director of the Agency, Howard Kennedy in his foreword wrote: (35)
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"The war in Palestine added to an area that formerly supported five million persons the crushing burden of a million Arab refugees. Over 800,000 were virtually destitute. There is a little margin between subsistence and starvation. Since the end of 1948, needy refugees, who have lost both their homes and livelihood as a result of hostilities in Palestine, have existed principally on relief by the United Nations, supplemented by private contributions from all over the world. Today, after three years, the refugees still wait to know what is to become of them".

UNRWA enjoyed close cooperation of the United Nations Specialized Agencies in carrying out its task of providing relief to the refugees. The Arab countries Lebanon, Jordan, Syria and the United Arab Republic have also shown respect and generosity in assisting UNRWA. These Arab States have spent more than $100,000,000 mostly for education, health services, housing and road improvement. "The people of these countries", wrote Davis, former Commissioner of UNRWA, "have borne with courage the economic, social and other sacrifices and hardships resulting from the presence of large numbers of refugees within their borders. Contrary to much western thinking, the Arab host government have also helped qualified young refugees to obtain employment, both within the host countries and elsewhere". (36)

UNRWA did remarkably well in alleviating the sufferings of unfortunate people who were forcibly expelled by political conspirators. The refugees were always keen to get back to their homes, their sufferings had intensified their attachment to their original home. The Director General of UNRWA wrote: (37) "The great mass of the refugees continued to believe that a grave injustice has been

36. Davis, John, op. cit., p. 66.
37. UN Doc. A/3686.
done to them and to express a desire to return to their homeland". In another report the Director reaffirmed the strong desire of the refugees for repatriation. He informed the General Assembly: "The refugees in general strongly maintain their insistence on the idea and aspiration of returning to their homes. The refugees have also expressed the wish that they should be enabled to receive redress for the loss they have suffered without prejudicing their claims to repatriation". The Commissioner General of UNRWA also informed the General Assembly "of their feeling embitterment at their long exile and at the failure of international community, year after year, to implement the resolutions so often reaffirmed." (38)

In June 1951, John Blandford Jr. became the director of UNRWA. He submitted the famous 'Blandford Plan' to the General Assembly in 1952. According to the report of the Director, his plan was an alternative project for the resettlement of the refugees in the Arab countries. The Blandford proposals were phrased in such a manner that the "refugees interests in repatriation and compensation must not be prejudiced". (39) When the Blandford plan was taken up in the Ad Hoc Political Committee, the US representative supported it: (40)

"The experience thus gained had made it clear that all refugees could not be resettled in the areas in which they were currently located and that some of them would have to be moved to areas of greater economic opportunities. The plan is undoubtedly one of the most constructive enterprises ever sponsored by the United Nations".
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The representative of the United Kingdom was of the opinion that repatriation was inimical to the interest of the refugees. He said: (41)

"The UK Government did not call in question the right of the refugees to return to their homes. What it did question was whether it was in the interests of the refugees themselves that they should exercise that right... The UK delegation felt that the bulk of the refugees would find a happier and more stable home, at any rate in the immediate future, amongst their Arab brethren".

The Arab States saw the snags clearly and they rightly opposed the "Blandford Proposal" which was aimed at denying the refugees their right of repatriation. The Saudi Arabian delegate said: (42)

"It was a mistake to believe that the problem of the Arab refugees of Palestine could be solved by resettling the refugees in the neighbouring countries. That was not a practicable solution because it failed to take account of the needs and feelings of the refugees or of the desires of their Arab and Muslim kinsmen... It was not a realistic solution because it failed to recognize the inherent qualities of the Arabs, who armed by the justice of their cause, had never bowed before their aggressors".

The Egyptian representative also advocated a solution which would not exclude repatriation. He said that the Blandford Plan "should not prejudice the right of the refugees to repatriation and compensation, my government considered them a practical means of relieving the plight of the refugees pending a final solution". (43)

The draft resolution was finally revised and a new provision was added which read "without prejudice to repatriation or compensa-

41. The Times, January 11, 1952.
42. GAOn, 6th sess., Ad Hoc Political Committee, 43rd Meeting.
43. Ibid., 44th Mtg., January 18, 1952, p. 245.
tion". It was adopted by the General Assembly by 47 votes to none and 7 abstentions. (44)

The resolution "endorsed, without prejudice to the provisions of paragraph 11 of Resolution 194 (III) of 11th December 1948 or to the provisions of paragraph 4 of Resolution 393(4) of 2nd December 1950 relative to reintegration either by repatriation or resettlement, the programme recommended by UNRWA, which envisaged the expenditure of $50 million for relief and $200 million for reintegration over and above local contributions". (45)

The plan once adopted got support from the Arab States and the chief factor causing this change of attitude was the inclusion of the provision that it would not prejudice the right of repatriation or compensation.

The plan failed to alleviate the miserable conditions of the refugees and reasons for the failure were clearly spelled out in UNRWA report: (46) "The time has been short and the pace has been slow. Deep misunderstanding and misinterpretation of the new programme have had to be faced".

The United Nations and its specialized agencies were adopting measures to provide the refugees better living, better education and better housing. The real problem, however, remained, namely, repatriation or compensation. The Government of Israel, despite the
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best efforts and persuasion of the United Nations remained unconcerned and adamant. The United Nations passed a resolution every year calling for the return of the refugees or compensation to them, but it always remained unheeded.

The Director of UNRWA confirmed Israel's non-compliance with the directives of the United Nations. He wrote: (47) "The Government of Israel has taken no affirmative action in the matter of repatriation and compensation." Israel had flouted its obligations under the United Nations Charter. The Partition Resolution of November 29, 1947 clearly stated that the rights of the non-Jewish people living in the Jewish State would not be violated. (48)

Israel flagrantly violated the provisions of the Partition Resolution of November 29, 1947. Israel adopted not only worst possible discriminatory attitude toward the Arabs living inside its borders but also confiscated and appropriated Arab property. All the property movable and immovable was seized by Israel in 1948. Israel refused to cooperate with the United Nations Palestine Conciliation Commission when it asked for relevant details about the seized Arab property. Israel was repeatedly asked by the Commission to provide information about the administration of Arab property but they kept it a secret. "Much information concerning the use, amounts and distribution of abandoned Arab property and the government's policy toward it was secret. Even the United Nations in spite of frequent requests, was unable to obtain adequate information about Israel's disposition of Arab property". (49)
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The confiscation of immovable property of the Palestinians was done in a systematic manner. In 1948 the Abandoned Areas Ordinance was passed under which the Government of Israel was empowered to declare any occupied area as "abandoned" and confiscate it. Then came the Absentee Property Regulations 1948. Under this law the scope of seizure was extended and all property owned by the Arabs who had left homes was placed under an Israeli custodian. In 1950 another law the "Absentee Property Law" was enacted under which the Israeli custodian had the authority to sell vested property to a development authority established by Knesset. On July 31, 1950, the Development Authority came into existence to buy, rent or lease property.

The United Nations was supposed to look after the interest of the refugees but it failed to secure for the Palestinian refugees their natural right to go back to their homes. The Conciliation Commission for Palestine was established to try to bring conciliation between Israel and the Palestinians, but its efforts also failed to yield fruit because Israel was not willing to concede basic human rights to the original inhabitants of Palestine now living as refugees. In its Third Report the Commission listed the non-compliance of Israel as an obstacle in achieving a possible solution. It had devised measures to protect the property and interest of Arab refugees but Israel refused to obey the directives of the Commission. It again requested the Government of Israel to abrogate the notorious Absentee Property Law. "The Israeli delegation informed the Committee that its Government was unable to abrogate the Absentee Act or to suspend measures of requisition of Arab property". (50) The Conciliation Commission

for Palestine got a new directive from the General Assembly asking it to carry on negotiations regarding measures for the protection of the rights, property and interests of the refugees. The Conciliation Commission tried afresh but again failed to success for itself and justice for the Palestinian refugees. The Arab States wanted to safeguard the rights of their Palestinian brothers, and when the United Nations and its allied bodies could not do much to help them, they requested for the appointment of an independent custodian to look after the administration of Arab property. In 1961, a draft resolution was introduced but it was rejected. In 1964 again a draft resolution was introduced. The representative of Afghanistan while introducing the resolution, said: (51) "He could not see any reason why Moslem or Christian Arabs should not continue their ownership of property.... To refuse them that right would be an act of racial and religious discrimination condemned by the whole world."

The representative of Israel opposed it on the ground that the Arabs had rejected the Partition Plan hence could not claim any right guaranteed under it. To him, such a step like appointing an independent custodian to look after the management of Arab property would amount to interference in Israeli internal affairs. (52) Israel had always tried to invoke the doctrine of "domestic jurisdiction" or "sovereignty" in its defiance of the United Nations resolutions. The
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Israeli delegate pleaded before the Special Political Committee: (53) "The United Nations cannot be asked to dictate to a sovereign state who should be permitted to enter its territory. That is a matter for the Government of that state to decide in accordance with its laws and with security, economic and demographic factors". This emphatic assertion on the doctrine of "domestic jurisdiction" constituted a violent breach of the undertaking given to the United Nations by Israel at the time of its admission to the UN. Abba Eban very clearly stated: (54) "The Government of Israel will cooperate with the Assembly in seeking a solution to those problems... I do not think that Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter, which relates to domestic jurisdiction could possibly affect" any problem. "My own feeling is that it would be a mistake for any of the Governments concerned to take refuge, with regard to the refugee problem, in their legal right to exclude people from their territories". Such assurances were offered to the world body not because Israel genuinely wanted to observe them but because it was expedient to get into the world forum. It flouted the General Assembly resolutions of November 29, 1947 and December 11, 1948 and invoked Article 2, paragraph 7, contrary to its assurances given to the UN. The resolution of December 11, 1948 spelled the principles of repatriation, the restitution of property of the refugees and compensation for loss or damage.

Israel's refusal to grant the right of repatriation to the refugees is the greatest hypocrisy committed by a state in modern time. The Jews on the one hand claimed statehood on the basis of their right

to return to the land of their ancestors but they on the other hand
denied the Palestinian refugees their natural right to return to
their original homes. Enlightened Jews have also pleaded the refu-
gees' cause and demanded for them the right of repatriation. The
Ihud Association of Israel said: (55) "In the end we must come out
publicly with the truth, that we have no moral right whatever to
oppose the return of the Arab refugees to their land. Political con-
quest cannot abolish private property."

No amount of condemnation and disapproval of Israeli deeds and
attitude could restrain it from adopting a policy of expropriation
and expulsion of the Arabs adding to the numbers of refugees. In the
aftermath of the war of 1967 and subsequent occupation by Israel of
the West Bank of Jordan, the Sinai, the Gaza and the Golan Heights
a new critical refugee problem emerged. "By December 1967, an esti-
mated 245,000 persons had fled from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip
into the area of Jordan East of the river, 116,000 had left the
Israeli occupied area of Syria, and some 61,000 persons, including
11,000 from Gaza and 50,000 from the Sinai Peninsula had taken refuge
in Egypt. Of this total, about 145,000 were UNRWA supported refugees
who had been uprooted for a second time." (56)

During the June war of 1967 Israel personified the Nazi Ghost
of destruction of civil life and property. The people of Jerusalem
and other occupied areas were reminded of the old days of naked bar-
barism and wanton destruction. To give few examples of Israeli rampage
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one would cite Jerusalem. After the June 1967 war 135 houses in the Magharibah Quarter, the area near the Wailing Wall were completely dynamited and bulldozed by the Israeli authorities. Ambassador Thalmann was appointed by the UN Secretary General to observe the situation in Jerusalem and report to him. Thalmann's observations verified the above report and this incorporated by the Secretary General in his report wherein he informed the General Assembly that this illegal action of Israel had rendered 650 Arabs homeless. (57)

The National Council of the Churches of Christ of the United States sent a study team to Jerusalem to probe into the cases of destruction and brutality by Israel. In its report the study team said: "The villages of Yalu, Beit Nuba and Emmuaas were occupied by Israeli military forces on June 9, 1967. Within the next five weeks, all homes and other buildings were systematically destroyed except for a church and two Muslim shrines in Emmuaas which were later demolished. The people of the villages, numbering over 4,000 have been scattered". The Israeli officials stated clearly that "there is no plan to rebuild the three villages or to return the inhabitants to their land". (58)

The Israeli policy of wanton destruction was a well calculated policy intended to be used for its own purposes. Brigadier Shlomo Gazit, the head of the Israeli Military Government for the occupied territories explained his Government's policy in an interview given to Kok Israel. He said: (59) "The act of blowing up houses is essentially...

a deterrent action, a punishment which is supposed to deter others".

The Israeli policy of destroying Arab property was a gross violation of Article 53 of the Geneva Civilian Convention of 1949 which prohibited "any destruction by the occupying power of real or personal property belonging individually or collectively to private persons, or to the state, or to other public authorities, or to social or cooperative organizations". (60)

During the June war Israel followed the policy of mass eviction of the Arabs and individual deportation of Arab leaders in Gaza, West Bank of Jordan and Golan Heights. Between June 5, 1967 and May 30, 1968, a total of 399,248 Arabs from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip were evicted to the East Bank. (61)

One Israeli newspaper also reported on June 13, 1967 that Israeli Major General Yosef Said had said that the "Israeli forces are endeavouring to persuade the Arab inhabitants... or to oblige them to cross the Suez Canal... and that many of them are afraid to leave their homes". (62)

On June 30, 1968, the total number of refugees registered with the UNRWA was 1,364,298. If 30 per cent refugees not registered with UNRWA are also added figure would amount to 1,800,000. Israel does not accept the children born to the refugees in relief camps on the ground that they were born outside Palestine. Since 1948, an average of about 30,000 children have grown to maturity every year. (64)

It means that in two decades a total of over 500,000 young refugees
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have reached maturity. This logic of not accepting first generation of the refugees as Palestinians is fallacious. If the Arabs have forfeited all their rights to their original homeland because they are born in exile outside Palestine with what logic can Zionists claim Palestine as their homeland after the expiry of two thousand years.

The United Nations again moved and passed resolutions containing pious words promising better conditions for the refugees and asking Israel to allow the refugees to go back to their homes.

The Security Council on June 14, 1967 adopted a resolution which said: (65)

"The Security Council,

Calls upon the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities".

Israel did not comply with this directive also and UNRWA in its September 1967 report to the General Assembly said: (66)

"After nineteen years the refugees have still had neither an opportunity of returning to their homes nor compensation for their property. Since the two issues of repatriation and compensation are linked together as alternatives on the resolution, the continuing deadlock over repatriation has had the result of denying the refugees any benefit from the property they left behind in 1948. It would hardly seem that this can have been the intention of the Assembly in adopting its resolution nineteen years ago. Suggestions have been made from time to time for measures to enable the refugees to receive compensation, irrespective of whether they would have opportunity of returning to their homes and without prejudice to this or any other political claims that may have; but these suggestions have not been pursued".

The General Assembly also adopted a resolution on July 4, 1967 confirming the Security Council resolution of June 14, 1967 and


calling on Israel to allow the refugees to return home. Israel continued to hinder the implementation of these resolutions and did not allow the refugees to go back to their homes. Almost 85% of those who had fled to the East Bank applied for return in keeping with the General Assembly resolution. Israel did not allow all of them; a very small fraction of applicants about 15,000 were admitted by Israel. Israel in the meantime had intensified its pressure on occupied areas which resulted in a mini-exodus exceeding the total number of refugees Israel had taken back. The UN Secretary General confirmed this when he said: (67)

"Since June 1967, further violent incidents, especially in the Jordan-Israel sector, have created a new displacement of refugees and other persons in Jordan, many of whom, having fled from the valleys, will be facing an even harder winter this year than they did last year, for they will be in tented camps on the hills, where climatic conditions are severe".

Israel has repeatedly been asked by the United Nations to allow the refugees to go back to their homes but to no avail. Israel has relentlessly gone ahead with its policy of unlimited Jewish immigration with a view to strengthen its military potential and Jewish character. It is believed that "the greater the population of Israel, the greater will be army. A million soldiers will safeguard the state of Israel against any Arab attack. No Arab country will dare to attack Israel if her army will be a million strong". (68) The Israeli policy of mass Jewish immigration constitutes the gravest

---


threat to the Arabs and it also means their permanent displacement. Israel's policy of expansion demands permanent displacement of the Arabs of the occupied area. "Israel's desire for land", wrote Davis, "and for minimising the Arab population on that land, is also reflected in its policy of land seizure and occupation following the fighting of June 1967". (69)

Levi Eshkol confirmed the Davis thesis when he announced "a comprehensive master plan" to develop East Jerusalem occupied in 1967. The Master Plan "will include about 1,000 to 1,500 housing units". (70)

The refugee problem constitutes one of the most crucial and explosive issues in Arab-Zionist confrontation. The people who have been uprooted from their original homes, were and are still living on international charity. "For twenty years", as the Secretary General of the United Nations has observed, (71) "the Palestine refugees - well over one million of them - have had no homeland, no future and even a detectable glimmer of hope on their horizon". The Arab refugees seem to have been condemned by Israel to permanent and perpetual homelessness. Lord Caradon had a little insight into the heart of the refugees when he said: (72) "There is no more terrible sentence than the sentence of leaving home and land to set out on an exile as harsh as it is apparently hopeless".
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Bertrand Russell, the world renowned philosopher, issued a message before his death where he condemned Israel for its aggressive postures against the Arabs. About the refugees he wrote: (73)

"Many of the refugees are now well into the third decade of their precarious existence in temporary settlements. The tragedy of the people of Palestine is that their country was given by a foreign power to another people for the creation of a new state. The result was that many hundreds of thousands of innocent people were made permanently homeless. With every new conflict their numbers have increased. How much longer is the world willing to endure this spectacle of wanton cruelty? It is abundantly clear that the refugees have every right to the homeland from which they were driven, and the denial of this right is at the heart of the continuing conflict. A permanent just settlement of the refugees in their homeland is an essential ingredient of any genuine settlement in the Middle East."

Israel has always ignored world public opinion and fabricated excuses for her unwillingness to solve the refugee problem along the lines suggested by the United Nations. It has tried to link up the solution of the refugee problem with political settlement with the Arab States.

The Israeli stand is untenable and cannot be accepted for two obvious reasons. Firstly, there exists no connection between the solution of the refugee problem and political settlement with the Arab States as the former is a human problem and Israel explicitly for its satisfactory solution under the Laussane Protocol. Secondly, the repatriation of the refugees is an obligation which Israel owes and should owe not to the Arab States but to the Palestinian Arabs whom it has deprived of their homes and property. To hope for peace in the absence of redress and rectification for the wrongs done to
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innocent people amounts to wishing for a thing without having a genuine belief in it.

The point was emphasized by General de Gaulle in his letter to Ben Gurion on December 30, 1967 in which he accused Israel for blocking the way of peace in West Asia through its bellicose attitude. He advised him to persuade his people (74) "to see the path of reason and peace and to come to a settlement with their neighbours by providing a solution to the touchiest and most humane problem of West Asia - the Palestinian refugees."

The representative of Ceylon expressed his Government's stand on the refugee problem and he said that the obligation of Israel to allow the refugees repatriation or compensation had no moral connexion with a peace settlement." (75)

The Zambian delegate told the world body that the repatriation of the Palestinian refugees was an essential ingredient to any peace settlement in the Middle East. He said (76): "No peace was possible in the Middle East unless the Council ensured the restoration of the rights of the indigenous inhabitants of Palestine."

Israel's efforts at linking peace settlement with the solution of the refugee problem are a part of her imperialist design. Whenever Israel has expanded into Arab lands and forcibly evicted Arab population of occupied areas, it has emphasized the need to have peace with the Arab States. According to Bertrand Russell (77) "For
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over twenty years Israel has expanded by force of arms. After every stage in this expansion Israel has appealed to reason and has suggested negotiations. This is the traditional role of the imperial power, because it wishes to consolidate with the least difficulty what it has taken already by violence. Every new conquest becomes the new basis of the proposed negotiation from strength which ignores injustice of the previous aggression.

The Israeli objective has always been to secure Arab recognition for its territorial gains. Until 1956 Israel sought Arab recognition of the Armistice Agreements as its borders. After occupying Sinai and Gaza the demands were stepped up. After the June war, Israel once again tried to obtain Arab acceptance of a peace settlement making it a condition for the solution of the refugee problem.

The Israeli pretence of linking the refugee problem with the peace settlement has now been abandoned for considerations of expediency. It is now openly said that the repatriation of the Palestinian refugees is impossible. Golda Meir declared in the Knesset: (78)

Anyone who speaks in favour of bringing the Arab refugees back must also say how he expects to take responsibility for it, if he is interested in the State of Israel. Not everyone who talks in terms of bringing them back cares about how Israel can continue to exist with hundreds of thousands of Nasser’s emissaries in our midst. It is better that things are stated clearly and plainly: we shall not let this happen."

This new line of Israeli approach was reaffirmed by Ben-Gurion who on October 11, 1961, rejected the proposal mooted in the United Nations to give the refugees a choice of repatriation or resettlement. (79)
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This position was further reaffirmed in the United Nations by the Israeli delegate, who said: (80)

"The solution to the problem lay not in Israel but in the Arab world.... Although it was natural for refugees to wish to return to their former homeland, that wish was irrational for in 1948 Palestine had ceased to exist as a territorial entity on the map".

The role of the United Nations and its two main political organs i.e. the General Assembly and the Security Council lacked effectiveness if not sincerity.

The life of the Arabs living in Israel is extremely suffocating because they are treated as fifth columnists. The Arab minority has been placed in a class 'B' category and their activities have been severely restricted. The Arabs are discriminated against in matters of jobs, education, health facilities and they are forbidden to form their own political parties. "The continuation of military government", says Don Paretz, "in many Arab areas hampers the free and healthy growth of an indigenous Arab political movement". (81)

In the field of education there is a wide disproportion between the Arabs and the Jews living in the Jewish state. A total of 363,247 Jewish students attended public schools while the number of Arabs was only 25,830. Arab students thus constituted 6.5% of the total student population, while the Arab residents of the state were over 11% of its total population. The statistics furnished by the Government of Israel to the United Nations further revealed that, of the total number of Jewish students, 4.6% attended secondary schools

While only 3% of the Arab students had access to secondary education; 4,500 Jewish students attended Universities while among the Arabs there were only 73 students who could reach the universities. (82)

James Warbug writing about the Arabs living in Israel has observed: (83)

"Nothing could be more tragic than to witness the creation of a Jewish state in which the non-Jewish minorities are treated as second class citizens — in which neither a Jew's Christian wife nor their children can be buried in the same cemetery as their father. It is a state based in part upon medieaval theocratic bigotry and in part upon the Nazi - exploited myth of the existence of a Jewish race."

Sabri Jiryis, a Christian Palestinian Arab lawyer and technically an Israeli citizen wrote a book on Arab minority which was first published in Hebrew in Haifa in 1966 and later translated into English in 1968. Detailing the life of the Arabs in Israel, he says: "Every single initiative in the field of social activity of all kinds and in all classes of Arab society is closely watched by the Military Governors or the defence services". Discussing the conditions of the Arab youth, Sabri wrote: "With daily close contacts with neglect and repression from the authorities, many young men have grown desperate and turn to drastic solutions, such as leaving the country". (84)

Israel has denied the Arabs not only political and social freedom but also religious liberty. The great majority of Islamic Waqf possessions have been confiscated by the Custodian of Absentees' Property. The
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restrictions on religious activities of Muslims emanates from the Zionist contempt for Islam. Dr Azreili, Chief Editor of Maariv wrote in 1955: (85) "Islam is the enemy of all fruitful thought, all genuine initiative and all productive ideas. It represents darkness, reaction and imprisonment for five hundred million human beings".

Israel's attitude towards the Palestinian Arabs was a direct violation of the specific guarantees and fundamental human rights which the United Nations had extended to the Palestinian Arabs under the Partition Plan. The United Nations have, no doubt, uttered noble words and passed many resolutions affirming and reaffirming them in each subsequent year. What is the value of such resolutions if they cannot be implemented? The sufferers, the victims of injustice, do not require mere sympathy or verbal assurances, they require effective, and if needed, coercive measures to help them out of the quagmire of suffering and oppression. As John Davis rightly remarked: (86) "In the end, one must even be prepared to impose corrective measures on Israel against her will".

The Palestinian Arabs had all along hoped to get justice through the United Nations but they realized that they were hoping too much from the world body controlled by Big Powers which had a vested interest in the existence of Israel. They therefore resolved to carry out their struggle themselves and seek the restoration of justice denied to them into which they find themselves for no fault of theirs. Shukairy, Chairman of the Executive Committee for Palestine Liberation told (87) the world organization, "the Palestine problem exists in the
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United Nations and outside the United Nations and will continue to exist in the United Nations and outside the United Nations until the people of Palestine are repatriated to their homes and are repatriated to their homeland).

In 1963 the establishment of the Palestine Liberation Organization was a step in the direction of institutionalising the aspiration of Palestinian Arabs to return home. A spokesman of the Palestine Arabs told the Special Political Committee: (88) "After seventeen years of patient waiting" the Palestinian Arabs "had lost all faith in the United Nations but the establishment of the organization had re-awakened their hopes and afforded them an opportunity to renew the struggle for their homeland". In 1963, Ahmad Shukairy again told the United Nations of its failures. He said: (89)

"For the last fifteen years, the United Nations has been reiterating its position in support of repatriation, but not single refugee repatriated. We cannot wait and sit indefinitely. There is a limit to our patience, and the self-restraint of any nation - any nation - is not without bounds and not without limits. When human patience is exhausted, man is bound to succumb to the counsel of desperation. Palestine could be the scene of a liberation movement and no one should be caught by surprise, for Palestine is our homeland and repatriation is our right - our inherent right".

The Palestinian refugee problem is an imperialist problem. It is a by-product of Zionist alliance with imperialism. There is qualitative difference between the Palestinian refugees and the refugees in other parts of the world. The problem of refugees in India and Pakistan, Korea, and other places should not and cannot be put on par with the Palestine tragedy and the refugee exodus. In India and
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Pakistan it was the result of the division which was mutually and voluntarily accepted but in Palestine it was something imposed on the native people by an alien power. The indigenous people were forcibly expelled from their homeland and dispossessed of their property. Ahmad Shukairy succeeded in drawing a dividing line between the Palestinian refugees and refugees in other parts of the world.

He said: (90)

"In Asia and Africa, imperialism was a foreign domination, it was an alien exploitation. But the peoples, the native peoples, remained in their homes, remained on their farms, remained on their land. No doubt all sorts of hardships acts of repression and displacement were inflicted upon our brethren in Asia and in Africa, but here the native people in Palestine were uprooted, dispossessed and thrown out of their country by aliens, strangers, just like the clans who settled in Asia and in Africa. That is what makes the problem of the Palestine refugee of a unique character, more grievous than all the colonial issues that confronted the United Nations, because the Palestine problem has been beclouded by the highly organized and highly financed Zionist propaganda".

The Palestine refugee problem is an inseparable part of the Palestine Question and its solution can be sought only within the general framework of the Palestine Question, on the basis of the right of the indigenous people of Palestine to self-determination. Peace in West Asia depends on the solution of the refugee problem and would be tenable only when it is based upon the principle of justice - the right of repatriation for the Palestinian refugees.

The United Nations has an important role to play in the solution of the refugee problem. The world body has passed many resolutions reaffirming them every year but could not compel Israel to comply with them. The Secretary General of the United Nations said: (91) "All
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these twenty years the General Assembly has not found it possible to take any significant step towards a real solution of this great and tragic human problem. This fact reflects upon us all and certainly upon the United Nations. I believe, however, that the tragedy of the Palestine refugees, who three times in twenty years have known at first hand the cruel blast of war, demands that the United Nations should live up generously to its humanitarian duty towards them."

The activities of UNRWA were, no doubt, helpful in providing relief measures for the refugees but it had not been able to bring the refugees any closer to a basic solution of their problem. They must cease to be refugees and their homeland must be restored to them. The Palestine refugees are a determined and conscientious people who want to live and will not shrink from any sacrifice to safeguard their legitimate rights. The Palestine refugees are a proud and brave people who are prepared to shoulder the grave challenges without foregoing their cherished values - liberation, freedom and justice.

In 1968, The Times (London) brought out a poignant advertisement which read: "Wanted, another Arthur Balfour to provide a national home for one and a half million Arab refugees". (92) The Palestinian refugees are living in worst possible conditions but their national consciousness is being strengthened in exile. Norman Bentwich sounded a warning to Israel when he wrote: (93)

"Jews learn from their own history how national consciousness is strengthened in defeat and exile. It was in the first captivity, when they wept by the waters of Babylon, that Judaism took permanent form, and became a way of life of a people in exile. The Arab exiles of our time weep by the waters of Jordan. Israel may produce a Cyrus to bring back a remnant".
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Chapter V

THE JUNE 1967 WAR AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS

A distinctive characteristic of Zionist strategy is that it does not want to resolve the conflict. It is rather directed at prolonging it. The resolution of conflict would mean abandonment of the fruits of aggression which would ultimately mean the abandonment of a cherished dream and a well-thought out policy, namely, the establishment of a State in consonance with past Israeli history and glory. The expansionist ambitions of Israel constitute a significant link in Zionist conspiracy against the Arabs to destroy their independence and freedom by its planned perfidious attacks. The most important tactic of Zionist diplomacy is military action. This diplomatic military strategy is used as an effective vehicle for territorial expansion which is an expression of the policy of force. A cardinal principle of the strategy is the necessity to carry out "defensive" war outside Israeli territory and to never allow the adversaries to penetrate inside Israel's boundaries. Thus the concept of defensive war is equated with preventive war and it is closely related with the question of boundaries. Israel, in its attempt to thwart the enemy's power of pre-emption always seeks extended borders through territorial expansion and the occupation of more and more Arab territory to effect mass eviction of the Arabs and correspondingly mass immigration of the Jews. Hodgkin, the Foreign Editor of The Times recording his verdict on the Israeli occupation and eviction of the Arabs said the act to be cruel, repressive and profoundly depressing. (1) Israel wanted to displace the Arabs because it thought that unless the Arabs were pushed to desperate conditions they

would not agree to have peace with Israel. Professor Jacob Talmon, one of Israel's foremost historians and leading intellectuals, said: (2) "This is a basic discrepancy in a motto which becomes a disease and which states that Arabs do not understand except the language of power and will even never surrender or agree to peace unless placed under desperate condition". Israel has always launched a war to create "desperate" conditions. The government and people of Israel have, by and large, accepted the 'doctrine' that Israel's security lies in periodic warfare which after every few years must reduce the Arab States to impotence. The doctrine of "periodic warfare" is aimed at delivering a severe blow to the economy and national life of the Arabs. It is also intended to cause "the extensive damage to property and the expulsion of very large number of the Arabs by "applying terror, bloodshed, destitution and misery" (3) in order to establish a 'purely Eretz Israel' on Arab land. Israeli attack of June 5, 1967 on Egypt, Syria, and Jordan was an important link in a chain of events which had started as early as 1947 when Israel came into existence. The war in June 1967 was a very significant event because it further enabled Israel to extend its borders deeper into Arab lands.

The war started with swift and surprise Israeli attack on June 5, 1967 upon Egyptian aerodromes. Israel also invaded the West Bank of the Jordan River and Syria. Israel claimed that it went into action in self-defence against a possible attack by Egypt. It further claimed that its sole aim in using force was to defend its territorial


integrity against Egyptian blockade of the Straits of Tiran on May 22, 1967. The incident of the Straits of Tiran was not a cause but it was merely a pretext. The theory of self-defence has also been falsified by Israeli leaders through their public utterances. General Rabin in an interview published in the Le Monde said: (4) "I do not believe that Nasser wanted war. The two divisions he sent into Sinai on May 14, would not have been enough to unleash an offensive against Israel". Later on Levi Eshkol also stated: (5) "The massing of Egyptian troops in Sinai before the outbreak of hostilities was of a defensive nature".

It is obvious that the causes of the 1967 June war, which were built up sometimes on the sabotage, raids and the other upon the closure of the Gulf of Aqaba for Israeli ships, or the defence pact between Egypt and Syria and between Jordan and Egypt, were not the real causes of the six day war. These developments were immediate excuse for Israeli aggression. The roots of the conflict lie in certain provocative acts committed by Israel much before Nasser announced the closure of Tiran for Israeli ships. The most provocative incidents had occurred in Israeli-Syrian demilitarized zone which was established under the Syrian-Israeli Armistice Agreement of July 20, 1949. Israel constantly disregarded its obligations and committed many breaches of the Armistice Agreement for which it was censured and condemned by the Chairman of the Mixed Armistice Commission and the Security Council. Israel turned a deaf ear to their resolutions and requests and erected fortifications and placed police personnel in

the zone in utter violation of the provisions of the Armistice Agreement. Ultimately Israel established complete control over the demilitarized zone. As Colonel Hutchison, an observer of the UNTSO stated: (6) "the situation on the Syrian-Israeli border was aggravated by Israel's constant attempt to exert total control over the Demilitarized Zones that separate the two countries in some sectors."

General von Horn, Chief of Staff of the UNTSO has also confirmed that Israel was guilty of violating the terms of the Armistice Agreement. General Von Horn observed: (7) "The Jews developed a habit of irrigating and ploughing in stretches of Arab land, for the ground was so fertile that every square foot was a gold mine in grain. Gradually, beneath the glowering eyes of the Syrians, who held the high ground overlooking the zone, the area had become a network of Israeli canals and irrigation channels edging up against and always encroaching on Arab owned property".

Israel was appropriating Arab owned land with the objective to rehabilitate more and more Jewish immigrants in the Demilitarized zone. Israel boycotted all meetings of the Mixed Armistice Commission and did not allow the United Nations personnel to conduct investigations against Israel regarding the Demilitarized zone. The United Nations Secretary General brought this point before the Security Council in his report. He stated: (8)

"Since June 1966, United Nations Military observers have been prevented by Israel from carrying out investigations in the Hagrovrim and Susita areas. Access to the Dardera area, in the central sector of the D/zone, has also been refused to United Nations Military observers. Such restriction has prevented the investigation of Syrian complaints relating to Israeli fortifications in the Demilitarized zone."

The Secretary General also dealt at length with the Israeli policy of forcibly evicting the Arabs and appropriating their land. He said (9) that on the Western Bank of the Demilitarized zone "Arab villages have been demolished. Their inhabitants evacuated. Their lands on the Western Bank of the river, and the Khoury farm in the same area, are cultivated by Israeli nationals".

Israel, however, did not abandon its policy of using the Arab owned land for cultivation. On April 3, 1967 Israel decided to cultivate all areas of the Demilitarized zone. Israeli armoured tractors helped by regular arm forces started cultivation. It was a clear attempt at instigation. Syria defended its land but Israeli planes bombarded Syrian villages. Syria lodged a complaint with the Security Council in which it stated: (10)

"The Israelis continued to cultivate the disputed areas in the Demilitarized zone for the sole purpose of instigating hostilities. This they did by armoured tractors protected by tanks and every armament, illegally placed in the Demilitarized zone, in violation of the General Armistice Agreement. This demonstrates beyond any doubt a clear criminal intent to provoke a large scale war with Syria".

This incident was a rather very serious one and according to one writer, it was "curtain-riser to the six day war". (11) According to
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another observer of Middle East politics this incident was the biggest since 1956 aggression. He wrote: (12) "On April 7, the biggest Arab-Israeli battle since 1956, was fought over Syria. It precipitated all the events which led to the larger war almost exactly two months later".

Israel had launched a massive raid on April 11, 1967 and caused a serious clash by its provocative cultivation of Arab-owned lands. Israel was also responsible for aggravating the situation by its threats to invade Syria and occupy its capital Damascus. General Odd Bull, the Chief of Staff of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization appealed to the two Governments to exercise the utmost restraint, to observe the ceasefire and to use the Mixed Armistice Commission to resolve differences which might arise between them. (13) UN Thant also endorsed General Bull's efforts and supported (14) his "intention to continue, in the light of the responsibilities entrusted to UNTSO by the Israel Syria General Armistice Agreement and by the relevant Security Agreement and by the relevant Security Council resolutions, to exert every possible effort to help maintain an atmosphere of quiet by averting incidents between the parties".

Israel refused to lend ears to the voices of sanity and demoderation and its leaders issued and delivered extremely provocative statements. Charles Yost has quoted (15) many utterances of Israeli Chief of Staff said on May 10, 1967 that Israeli forces might "attack

---
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Damascus and change its Government". On May 13, Israel's Prime Minister Levi Eshkol said that Israel would take drastic measures against Syria "at the place, the time, and in the manner we choose". On May 12, a British United Press message from Jerusalem (Israeli sector) carried the report (16) that "a highly placed Israeli source said here to-day that if Syria continued the campaign of sabotage in Israel it would immediately provoke military action aimed at overthrowing the Syrian regime". There was also a strong rumour that the USSR had warned the UAR about a probable attack on Syria by Israel. Le Figaro, has quoted a Soviet statement distributed by Tass giving the information that the Security Sub Committee of the Knesset had, in its meeting held in early May, empowered the Israel Government to take retaliatory action against the Syrians. (17) The Arab newspapers also expected Israeli aggression against Syria and other Arab States. The Al-Gumhurya gave a warning: (18) "Israel prepares aggression on a broad front in the North." The Al-Huriva (19) expected an aggression by Israel in the near future and also predicted that the Western Powers would help Israel in launching aggression against the Arabs. One day before the war an Israeli newspaper Ha'aretz published a speech by the Minister of Labour Yigal Allon wherein he said: (20) "There is not the slightest doubt about the outcome
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of this war, and each of its stages and we are not forgetting the Jordanian and the Syrian fronts either."

The Israeli threats and the intemperate and bellicose utterances by its leaders deteriorated the situation further. The Secretary General of the United Nations in his report made a reference to these inflammatory speeches with a sense of great concern. He wrote: (21) "Reports emanating from Israel have attributed to some high officials in that state statements so threatening as to be particularly inflammatory in the sense that they could heighten emotions and thereby increase tensions on the other side of the lines". The Secretary-General expected concern at the "steady deterioration along the line between Israel and Syria, particularly with regard to disputes over cultivation rights in the Demilitarized zone, since the first of the year". (22)

The mobilisation of Israeli armed forces was a direct threat to Syria and its territorial integrity. The Israeli strategy and policy of provoking a large scale war appeared to be abundantly clear. Syria was forced to seek Egypt's assistance under the Mutual Defence Pact of November 1966. Egypt was under an obligation to come to Syria's help in case it was threatened by any foreign power and Egyptian troops started moving towards Alexandria and Ismailia.

Nasser took such a step for two reasons. First of all both in Cairo and Damascus there existed a genuine fear of an impending Israeli aggression against Syria. Nasser wanted an effective deterrent to demonstrate Arab strength in order to prevent the situation

---
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from escalating further. He explained his point when asked as to why he chose that time for the confrontation with Israel by request- ing the UN to withdraw the UNEF. Nasser replied: (23) "When Eshkol threatened to occupy Syria it became our duty to come forward to help our Arab brothers. Thus we have to ask for the withdrawal of the UNEF".

The second reason for Egypt's response to Syria's request was severe criticism of Nasser's policy in the Arab world. Jordan and Saudi Arabia were charging Nasser of playing soft with Israel. The Israeli attack on the Jordanian village of Samou on November 13, 1966 which was condemned unanimously by the UN Security Council (24) and Israeli aggression against Syria on April 7, 1967 had gone unpunished and Nasser was under severe criticism for his utter inaction and passivity in the face of Israeli aggression. Egypt was thus placed in a difficult position. It had to face the situation and help Syria in case of the latter was attacked by Israel. But the Egyptian troops could move up to the Egyptian Israeli Armistice line only and so Egypt had to ask for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force stationed on its territory after the 1956 tripartite aggression. The UNEF was created by the proposal originally mooted by Lester Pearson of Canada on November 1, 1956 and the General Assembly Reso- lution of February 2, 1957 which stated that (25) the "scrupulous maintenance of the Armistice Agreement requires the placing of the UNEF on the Egyptian Israeli armistice demarcation line and the imple-
mentation of other measures as proposed in the Secretary General's report ... with a view to assisting in achieving situations conducive to the maintenance of peaceful conditions in the area". There was first a demand for partial withdrawal but the Secretary General said that it could only be total. This left Nasser with no choice for if he had bowed down at that stage, he would have lost prestige both at home and abroad. The demand for total withdrawal was thus forced upon him by U Thant. Nasser made it not out of choice or preference but unwillingly and under pressure of circumstances over which he had no control.

On May 16, 1967, Egypt requested the Secretary General to withdraw the United Nations Emergency Force from the Demilitarized zone along the Egyptian Israeli border. General Fawzi, the Chief of Staff of the United Arab Republic Armed Forces sent a message to Major General Rikhye, Commander of the UNEF, to remove his men from Sinai, and to group them in the Gaza Strip to ensure their safety, should military action become inevitable. (26) General Rikhye immediately communicated the message to the Secretary-General. On May 18, the Secretary General received a request for the withdrawal of the United Nations Emergency Force from the UAR Foreign Minister. On May 19, U Thant announced (27) that "the buffer function which the UNEF had been performing was eliminated". The withdrawal of the UNEF was criticized as a decision in great 'haste' and 'hurry'. Some people thought that the Secretary General should not have readily

complied with the UAR's request for the withdrawal of the UNEF. The United Nations was the only hope for keeping peace in the region and disillusionment became great when it failed to live up to the aspirations set for it. Many were incredulous to see that the complex and magnificent edifice of the peacekeeping UNEF had proved so fragile. The UNEF was likened to a 'fire brigade which vanishes from the scene as soon as the first smoke and flames appear'. (28) The withdrawal of the UNEF was a clear indication of the situation worsening further and it created, among many countries, a sense of irritation with the United Nations and its Secretary General. Preventive diplomacy was conceived by Dag Hammarskjold as an international version of the policy of preventing further escalation of a crisis. This preventive diplomacy was institutionalized by the creation of the UNEF and with its withdrawal the chances of containing the conflict vanished. The armed forces of Egypt and Israel were brought face to face and it was no longer possible for the United Nations to perform the functions of the shock absorber. The Secretary General wanted the presence of the United Nations and he tried to reactivate the Egyptian-Israeli Mixed Armistice Commission. His efforts did not yield any fruit because the Israeli Government refused to have anything to do with it. The decision regarding the withdrawal of the UNEF was highly resented by Israel. It questioned the power of the Secretary General to grant UAR's request for the withdrawal of the United Nations forces. The Secretary General confronted Israel with the suggestion that the United Nations forces should also be stationed on Israeli side of the armistice line. Israel saw in that

suggestion an attempt to tamper with its territorial sovereignty and it turned it down as being "entirely unacceptable". (29)

The Secretary General had acted according to the terms and conditions laid down at the time Egypt agreed to keeping the UNEF on its soil. The Secretary-General in his report submitted to the Security Council explained his position and tried to justify his stand. He stated: (30)

"The UNEF was introduced into the territory of the UAR on the basis of an agreement reached in Cairo between the Secretary General of the United Nations and the President of Egypt, and it therefore has seemed fully clear to me that since UAR consent was withdrawn it was incumbent on the Secretary General to give orders for the withdrawal of the Force. In the face of the request for the withdrawal of the Force, there seemed to me to be no alternative course of action which could be taken by the Secretary General without putting in question the sovereign authority of the Government of the UAR within its own authority".

With the withdrawal of the UNEF the Egyptian troops occupied areas including Sharm El-Sheikh, the most strategic area overlooking the Straits of Tiran. President Nasser took another logical step when he announced the closure of the Straits of Tiran to all ships flying Israeli flag or carrying strategic material. On May 22, 1967, in a speech given at the airforce headquarters in Sinai, he said: (31)

"We are now face to face with Israel and if they want to try their luck without Britain and France we await them. The Israeli flag will not pass through the Gulf of Aqaba and our sovereignty over the entrance to the Gulf is not negotiable". With the closure of the Straits

of Tiran Nasser had restored the status quo ante existing before 1956 aggression.

The position of Egypt and other Arab States was very clear over the question of the Gulf of Aqaba. Since the position of Israel on the Gulf was not fixed by any permanent boundary decision, Israel did not have any sovereign right over the Gulf of Aqaba. The countries having permanent boundaries with the Gulf, namely, Jordan, Egypt and Saudi Arabia had agreed to close it to Israeli ships and their action was lawful. Israel has treated the closure of the Straits of Tiran as a casus belli. Levi Eshkol, the Prime Minister of Israel declared (32) that the blockade was a violation of international law and constituted "an act of aggression against Israel".

On May 23, President Johnson of the USA declared (33) that US considered the Gulf of Aqaba "to be an international waterway and feels that a blockade of Israeli shipping is illegally and potentially disastrous to the cause of peace". The US Ambassador to UAR Richard H. Nolte submitted a five point formula on behalf of the United States of America. The major provisions of the formula were: (1) UNIF troops would not be asked to withdraw; (2) the UAR would not send troops to Sharm El-Sheikh; (3) UAR forces would be barred from entering the Gaza Sector of the UAR-Israeli borders; (4) the United Nations would administer Gaza until the crisis was settled; and (5) UAR and Israeli troops would pull back from the border areas.

Egypt rejected the formula and the Egyptian newspaper the Al-Ahram reported (34) that the formula was not acceptable because
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it would not help solve the problem. The situation was deteriorating rapidly and there seemed to be no sign of amicable settlement of the conflict. Nasser's announcement of the closure of the Straits of Tiran was regarded as an act of war by Israel. He did not want war; his purpose was, as the Observer said, "to deter Israel rather than provoke it to a fight". (35) The withdrawal of the UNEF and closure of the Straits of Tiran had given Nasser much the coveted diplomatic victory and he was ready to negotiate a political settlement of the Palestine Problem. The basic problem was not Aqaba or Tiran or UNEF. Nasser himself declared (36) in the Egyptian National Assembly that "the question today is not of Aqaba nor is it the Tiran Straits or the United Nations Emergency Force. It is the rights of the people of Palestine". The basic problem was that of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs who had been driven out of their homes by Israel. All other problems were ancillary. Nasser's intentions were obvious. Charles W. Yost, US Special Envoy to Cairo, observed: (37) "There does not seem to have been any intention in Cairo to initiate a war". Nasser also told Christopher Mayhew, a member of the British Parliament that if the Israelis do not attack, "we will leave them alone". (38)

Egypt had made a public announcement and issued a declaration renouncing the use of force and assuring that it did not want war.
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Israel did not follow Egypt. It did not issue any public declaration renouncing its intention to attack Syria. Israel, it seemed, was not interested in a peaceful settlement. The real problem before Israel was not of territorial security because its military superiority made it dominate its neighbours. War with Arab States, however, to the Israeli leaders was the only way out to relieve Israel of its economic hardships and severe recession. Since 1965 when the repatriations of West Germany were exhausted, Israel's economy had deteriorated and the rate of growth had fallen sharply, resulting in a peculiar situation, namely, the persons emigrating from Israel exceeded those immigrating to Israel. This process seemed to threaten the very existence of political Zionism as a philosophy. About the deteriorating economic conditions of Israel the Time Magazine wrote: (39) "Crisis was permeating in every sphere of Israel life ... in 1965 Israel's economy began to slow down".

Israeli Labour Minister Yigal Allon also admitted it when he said: (40) "there were 15,000 unemployed Israelis". "A day later the State Bank put the figure 35,000 to 40,000 and two days later the Government's own economic Planning Authority decided that the figure was closer to 60,000 (nearly 10 per cent of the national labour force) and growing". The number of unemployed had reached 100,000 in 1967 and "Labour riots had broken out in Tel Aviv on March 16, 1967". (41)

A military campaign against the Arab world to be justified
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in terms of "self-defence" was the most feasible alternative to put Israel's house in order. Israel's real intentions were, therefore, not to defuse the crisis. It rather wanted to escalate it and looked only for an opportune moment. Before striking against the Arab States Israel wanted to ensure the support of the United States and neutralization of the United Nations. The Arab States seem to be convinced of the fact that Israel was acting in collusion with the United States. Military experts are of the view that Israel could not have carried out its attack on the Arab States without effective assistance of its western supports chiefly the United States. The experts also point out that the vast air operation conducted by Israeli air force against Egypt, Syria and Jordan could not have remained undetected by the US Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean. (42)

The US ship "Liberty" torpedoed by Israel was only 15 miles away from shore. The ship was spying and knew what was going to happen. The very fact that American warships equipped with the most modern and sophisticated electronic devices to detect air attack did not warn the UAR of the impending attack made one suspect the United States intentions. Before the June war "a joint memorandum had been drawn up by the Secretary of Defence and Secretary of States." They advised President Johnson that the United States was faced with two basic policy choices in making good its commitments to Israel. They were: (1) "to permit Israel to deal with the problem alone which in official circle is referred to as the "unleashing Israel" alternative; (2) for the United States to assume responsibility for opening

The United States of America seemed to be possessing information leading to the conclusion that Israel was preparing for a strike but the United States did not warn Israel against such an attack, much less caution to the UAR against it. The Central Intelligence Agency's Director Richard Helms had his own assessment of the whole situation in the Middle East and he was sure of Israel's victory within four days if it took the initiative. General Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the USA expressed the considered assessment of the situation by the Department of Defence when he said: "He had no information of any Egyptian intention to attack, if anything, it was the Israeli army that was pressing to begin hostilities. Israel had nothing to fear. Her army was far superior to that of Egypt."

Israel started war with the connivance of the USA who had asked the UAR to play cautious and not to take the initiative. The United States of America was a major ally of Israel and had a vested interest in its survival as a viable political entity. For its security, Israel mainly depended upon the United States. Having been incessantly backed and supported by Western Imperialism, the "protection of Israel's security" said the Israeli Prime Minister, "depends on the presence of the United States Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean."

The strategic policy of Israel to launch a massive surprise attack on the Arab States became possible only with the aid and assistance
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of the United States as Israel's survival is believed to be of vitally important for strengthening and preserving American interests in the region. The United States wanted to use Israel to encircle the revolutionary movements and to tighten imperialist control over the Arabs to guarantee to western monopolies support in their oil interest. "The continued flow of oil at economically reasonable rates to Western Europe" outlined, (47) Alexis Johnson, Deputy Under Secretary of State for political affairs, "is of great importance ... Access to the air and sea routes to and through the Near East is important to us commercially and militarily". According to US assessment, the main problem or threat in the Middle East is not provided by the Arab-Israeli conflict, but by the progressive policies of the Arab States, adversely affecting Anglo-American interest and promoting the cause of communism. Senator Joseph Clark appeared before the Congressional Sub-Committee on Peace in the Middle East and he said (48) in his testimony that the obstacle "to peace" in the region is the UAR and its progressive orientation. He called for the "destruction of the progressive regimes" in the Arab world and a greater commitment to Israel as the bulwark of American interests in the region. President Johnson was confronted with intensified American Jewish Community criticism over his Vietnam policy. He argued that the American Jews continually exerted pressure on US Administration to support Israel but were opposed to their commitments to South Vietnam. He raised the issue with Abba Eban when he visited Washington in February 1966. Johnson sought American Jews' support for his policy

in Vietnam in return for military aid to Israel. Israel was conducting negotiations for the delivery of American arms, missiles and aircraft. Israel and its supporters agreed to work to muzzle Jewish opposition to his Vietnam policy as a price for U.S. military aid.

Israel is a state created by imperialist powers and propping it to contain the forces of progress in the Middle East. The United States of America was at the time itching to let the UAR down for its anti-American politics. Rabbi Elmer Berger studied the conflict at the level of international politics and according to him the real target of 1967 conflict was neither Aqaba nor the Straits of Tiran nor the Straits of Tiran nor was the issue of Israeli sovereignty. The real aim or object rather was that "both the British and the United States wanted Egyptian forces out of Yemen". (49) Issac Deutscher has blamed the USA for having encouraged Israel to wage war in order to get rid of Nasser. Had Nasser fallen "Egypt might have become another Ghana or Indonesia". (50) In Issac's opinion Israel acted not only with the knowledge of Western powers but was "absolutely sure of American and to some extent British moral, political and economic support." (51) The United States of America was the most important factor behind Israeli bellicosity.

The United Nations had a special responsibility to maintain peace in the Middle East. The Secretary General had not lost all hopes, he undertook his historic mission of peace to Cairo on May 23-25, 1967.
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U Thant had discussions with Nasser, General Rikhye and General Bull but failed to exercise any tangible effect and the situation further worsened. The success of his attempt depended on the Great Powers sharing the Secretary General's perception of the situation and readiness to adopt suitable measures to prevent the outbreak of major hostilities between Israel and the Arab States.

The Security Council was called into session in the absence of the Secretary General. Its first meeting of the year was called at the request of Canada and Denmark on May 24, 1967. The representative of Denmark said: (52)

"There has been a military build-up along the borders of Israel and the United Arab Republic, and there is no way of denying that the stage is set for a major military clash.... the slightest miscalculation, the slightest misunderstanding of one or the other wise of the opponents' intentions, could lead to large-scale hostilities."

The Security Council met twice on May 24 but no positive result seemed to be flowing out of it. A Canadian-Danish Draft resolution was presented before the Security Council which gave "full support to the efforts of the Secretary General" and requested the member states "to refrain from taking any steps which might worsen the situation". (53)

The resolution was not put to vote because of Russian opposition. The Soviet Union considered that the Security Council meeting should not have been called. On May 23, the Soviet Government issued a policy statement on the Middle East situation which was read in the Security Council on May 24. The Soviet Representative Fedorenko said: (54) "Let
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no one have any doubts about the fact that, should anyone try to
unleash aggression in the Near East, he would be met not only with
the united strength of Arab countries but also with strong opposition
to aggression from the Soviet Union and all peace-loving states."

The United States of America also presented a Draft Resolution
which called upon the parties to comply with the Secretary General's
appeal for restraint and caution. (55)

The United Arab Republic also presented proposals which de-
clared that "the Egyptian-Israeli Armistice Agreement was still
valid" and the United Nations machinery should be fully operative.
It asked Israel to abide by the provisions of the Agreement. The
Chief of Staff of UNTSO was requested to reinstitute the Mixed Armis-
tice Commission within two weeks in El-Auja Demilitarized zone. (56)
The Security Council could not take any decision on any draft because
there was no agreement among the Great Powers. In the face of the
failure of the Security Council the only hope of averting a major
conflagration in the Middle East was U Thant who was assessing the
situation in Cairo. On May 26, 1967, the Secretary General presented
before the Security Council his report. The Secretary General said: (57)

"President Nasser and Foreign Minister Riad assured
me that the United Arab Republic would not initiate
offensive action against Israel. Their general aim,
as stated to me, was for a return to the conditions
prevailing prior to 1956 and to full observance by
both parties of the provisions of the General Armistice
Agreement between Egypt and Israel".

The Secretary General renewed his call for reviving the Mixed Armistice
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Commissions to allow the presence of the United Nations to act as a shock absorber. He was of the opinion that a breathing spell was required for a peaceful settlement of the conflict. He urged:

"All the parties concerned to exercise special restraints, to forego belligerence and to avoid all other actions which could increase tension, to allow the Council to deal with the underlying causes of the present crisis and to seek solutions. There are other possible courses of action which might contribute substantially to the reduction of tension in the area.... the Armistice Agreements constitute an important step towards the establishment of permanent peace in Palestine".

In this context, U Thant pleaded for the resurrection of the Egypt Israel Mixed Armistice Commission to provide a limited form of United Nations presence in the area. The Secretary General admitted:

"The problems to be faced are complex and the obstacles are formidable. I do not believe, however, that we can allow ourselves to despair."

"It should be kept always in mind that in spite of the extreme difficulties of the situation, the United Nations has played an essential and important role for more than eighteen years in maintaining at least some measure of peace in the Near East. In that task it has encountered many setbacks, frustrations, crises, conflicts and even war, but the effort continues unabated. We are now confronted with new and threatening circumstances, but I still believe that with the cooperation of all parties concerned the United Nations, and the Security Council in particular, must continue to seek, and eventually to find reasonable, peaceful and just solutions."

U Thant had referred to the role of Big Powers in maintaining peace in the Near East. The Soviet Union and the United States of America were conducting their battle in the Council but they were extremely cautious and trying to avoid a direct confrontation. "There
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were exchanges between Washington and Moscow", wrote Laquair, (60) "about the Middle East situation from May 19, each assuring the other of their desire to preserve peace in the area. It does not seem that any constructive measure was suggested; perhaps these exchanges were thought necessary in view of the movements of the Eastern Mediterranean task force of the Sixth Fleet, and the gradual Soviet naval build-up in the Mediterranean". France wanted the Big Powers to work jointly. George Gorse, Minister of Information of France declared that (61): "the 1950 Tripartite Declaration was no longer binding. The Security Council was powerless to act without agreement between America, the Soviet Union, Britain and France, and its was therefore the special responsibility of these four to meet and to take joint action to preserve peace".

There were hectic activities within the United Nations to revive preventive diplomacy propounded by former Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold. Outside the United Nations the parties concerned were drifting towards more belligerent position. On May 28, Levi Eshkol, the Israeli Prime Minister declared (62) that his Government was fully prepared for any military eventuality and also maintained that the USA, Britain and France were ready "to work without delay for a rapid lifting of the blockade" and the mobilization of Israeli defence force was a "decisive factor in the speeding up of international political activity". The United States of America wanted to
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ensure for Israel the right of innocent passage through the Straits of Tiran. Washington had thrown its full weight behind the British move to rally the maritime nations against the blockade. Most of the countries approached were reluctant to sign a joint declaration which would have led to the loss of oil concessions and other complications with the Arab States. The prevailing view in the State Department and the Pentagon was that the use of military force should be avoided. Such a view emanated from the belief that Israel was militarily superior and General Wheeler, Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff had predicted (63) that "the Israelis would win the war within three or four days if they brought off the first air strike."

By May 29 it was clear that Washington, in spite of earlier pronouncement regarding the closure of Tiran, was not "prepared to take or support physical action to enforce freedom of navigation". (64) Abba Ebban met President Johnson to pressurize him into resorting to the use of force to ensure for Israel free passage through Aqaba. Johnson seemed to have offered Israel "an American commitment to maintain its economic viability". (65) Washington, told Johnson, was willing to sustain Israel's economy, its oil requirements if Israel refrained from using force to break the blockade.

According to one reliable source the substance of American offer to Israel was: (66) "The United States can offer you firm guarantees against your destruction, even including air cover for your
cities against Egyptian bombers provided that a shooting war is unleashed on the Arab side... If, however, Israel makes the first move the United States can offer little but words of sympathy and expression of goodwill."

The State Department of the United States evolved a new compromise formula asking for free passage for all but Israeli ships during an 'interim period', in the course of which a permanent solution would be sought. (67)

The United States of America's stand was dictated by one over-riding consideration: what would the Soviet Union do? The USA did not want to risk another confrontation with the Soviet Union as it was deeply involved in Vietnam. The focus of American effort to solve the Middle Eastern problem without using force was, therefore, in the United Nations. The Security Council met on May 26, 1967.

Arthur Goldberg of the United States told (68) the Security Council:

"The attitude of the States was not partisan. The United States was committed to supporting political independence and territorial integrity of all nations of the area, and opposed aggression by anyone in any form, whether overt or clandestine. In the view of his Government, the first thing the Council must do - as an interim measure and without extended debate - was to endorse the Secretary General's appeal and call on parties concerned 'to exercise special restraint, to forge belligerence'. (69)

According to Goldberg "foregoing belligerence must mean foregoing any blockade of Aqaba during the breathing spell as requested by the
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Mohammad Awad El Kony of the OAU accused Israel of contemplating "an attack against Syria". He said: "The Israeli authorities claimed the right to navigate in the Gulf. That was without foundation. The Gulf had been under uninterrupted Arab control for over 1,000 years. It had always been a national inland waterway subject to absolute sovereignty. It was a mare clausum and so was not an international waterway. There is no shade of a doubt as to the continued existence of the state of war between the Israelis and both the Arabs of Palestine and their brethren in the Arab countries...

My Government has the legitimate right, in accordance with international law, to impose restrictions on navigation in the Straits of Tiran with respect to shipping to an enemy". El Kony charged (71) Israel of "unilateral denunciation of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement" and asked that "this Council should, in its endeavor to deal with the present situation, recognize the continuing validity of the Egyptian-Israeli General Armistice Agreement and that the United Nations machinery emanating therefrom should be fully operative". He asked the Council to call on the Israeli government to respect and abide by its responsibilities under that agreement.

Rafael of Israel said: (72) "Every interference with the freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba was an act of aggression against Israel, an infringement of the sovereign rights of all nations to unimpeded use of this international waterway, and a gross violation
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of international law". George Tomch of Syria said: (73) "The crisis in the Middle East was the direct outcome of the unprovoked, massive attack by regular Israeli forces against the Syrian people and territory on April 7. In its wider and deeper context, it was but a manifestation of the Palestine Question.

Mohammad El Farra of Jordan said: (74) "Israel's persistent violations of the Armistice Agreement had caused the present tensions in the area. War was a tragedy. Nobody wanted war. But when the Council allowed injustice to continue because of power politics and political expediency in order to secure a so-called peace, no peace was secured". About the Gulf of Aqaba and Israeli claim El Farra said: "It must be remembered that Israeli presence on the Red Sea was a military presence resulting from an act of occupation in violation of Security Council ceasefire resolution. The Gulf of Aqaba was an Arab Gulf. Neither the United States nor the United Kingdom was entitled to become self-appointed jurists or to pass judgement on the status of Arab waters".

Fedorenko of Soviet Union condemned Israel for its warlike preparations. He said: (75) "The real culprit in the dangerous aggravation of tensions once more was Israel, which could not have acted as it had without the direct and indirect assistance of certain imperialist powers seeking to restore colonial domination over the Arab lands. The Security Council must decisively condemn provocations and threats against the Arab States."

Parthasarthi of India supported the Secretary General's suggestions and said: (76) "The United Arab Republic was exercising its
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sovereignty in asking for the withdrawal of UNEF. The Gulf of Aqaba was an inland sea and entry into it lay within the territorial waters of the United Arab Republic. No State or group of states should attempt to challenge by force the sovereignty of the United Arab Republic over the Straits of Tiran.

The Security Council could not adopt any resolution and in the meantime the situation in the Middle East was rapidly deteriorating and assuming alarming proportions. The United Nations failed to comprehend the speed with which the situation was worsening. "In view of the extreme gravity and urgency of the situation", observed (77) Arthur Lall, "it was not time that the Council lacked but unfortunately, a clear perspective of the dangers involved and a determination to grasp the full nature of its own responsibility".

Israel had, it seemed, made up its mind about recourse to the use of force. A cabinet reshuffle was announced in Tel Aviv on June 1 which brought Moshe Dayan, a hawk, back as Defence Minister of Israel. Dayan the master of deceit played soft with the press about the prospects of Israeli attack. He said: (78) "it was too late for any military attack and too soon for diplomatic activities and if some formula could be achieved in time he would be glad and surprised". Dayan's appointment as Israel's Defence Minister was the most unambiguous hint of Israeli intentions. Dayan's comeback was the most sensational peace in the whole drama and now subterranean emotions surfaced in patriotic demonstrations throughout the country. It was a


78. The Jerusalem Post, June 5, 1967.
victory for military sector. The chief characteristic of Israeli political system is the constant power struggle between the military sector and the civilian sector. The ascendancy of Eshkol, Ebban, and others was regarded as a victory of the civilian sector. In May-June the people of Israel were getting impatient with political leaders who were talking about peace. "They had become increasingly annoyed with Eban, who they believed had allowed his zeal for peace to impede his judgement". (79)

The appointment of Dayan as Defence Minister was a positive victory of the Militants who had always distrusted Israeli politicians talking softly. They wanted action which meant war with the Arabs and it came on June 5 when in the early hours Israeli airforce bombarded the airfields of the UAR, Jordan, Syria and Iraq. The UAR promptly declared national emergency while Algeria, Jordan, Syria, Iraq, Kuwait and Sudan announced that they were at war with Israel. The Israeli forces advanced swiftly and by 10 June Israel was in possession of the whole of Sinai, Gaza, Jordan's West Bank and the Golan Heights of Syria.

Israeli Prime Minister told the nation that Israel was trying to repulse an aggression. He told his people and the people of the world a blatant lie when he said: (80) "Egypt has imposed a military battle on us. The army and the people will stand firm... We have the power to foil the design of the attacker. Israel seeks peace. It defends peace... Our only aim is to rid our borders of every threat of sabotage and every danger of aggression".
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Rafael of Israel repeated the same lie in the Security Council when he informed (81) the world organization: "Egyptian armoured columns moved in an offensive thrust against Israel's borders. At the same time Egyptian planes took off from airfields in Sinai and struck out towards Israel. Egyptian artillery in the Gaza Strip shelled the Israel villages of Kessufni", etc. "Israel forces engaged the Egyptians in the air and on land and fighting is still going on". Israel was trying to justify its aggression by telling the United Nations that it had been attacked by the UAR.

The Security Council had a letter from the representative of the UAR which stated (82) that Israel had "committed a treacherous premeditated aggression" against his country. The United Arab Republic "in repelling this aggression ... had decided to defend itself by all means in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations." The Secretary General in his report told (83) the Council that "there was a serious military action on land and in the air at a number of points which was spreading". He also told that "three UNEF soldiers in the Indian contingent were killed and an undetermined number wounded when Israeli aircraft strafed a UNEF convoy". Parthasarthi of India asked the Council to condemn Israel (84) for the "wanton irresponsible and brutal action" in which Indian soldiers were killed.
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El Kony of UAR stated (85) in the Council that "for several hours now the Israeli armed forces and the Israeli Air Force have again committed a cowardly and trecherous aggression against my country". "This aggression," asked El Kony, "be vigorously condemned by the Security Council."

On June 6, 1967 the Security Council adopted a resolution unanimously. It said: (86)

"The Security Council,

"Nothing the oral report of the Secretary General in this situation;

"Having heard the statements made in the Council,

"Concerned at the outbreak of fighting and with the menacing situation in the Near East,

"1. Calls upon the Governments concerned as a first step to take forthwith all measures for an immediate ceasefire and for a cessation of all military activities in the area;

"2. Requests the Secretary General to keep the Council promptly and currently informed on the situation."

Arther Goldberg of the United States welcomed the resolution because, according to him, (87) "the ceasefire was the urgent first step to restore peace to the Near East. Once that was done the Council should turn its immediate attention to achieving a more lasting peace". Lord Caradon of Britain welcomed the resolution and said: (88) "The Council had taken a first essential step and only a supreme effort could enable it to rise to its obligation to establish a just settlement and to restore the authority of the United Nations. He
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trusted the Council would not fail to make that supreme effort".

India welcomed the resolution but made it clear that it would have preferred a resolution calling for (89) "a withdrawal of armed forces to positions held by them prior to the outbreak of hostilities, that is as on June 4, 1967 along with the ceasefire".

The Soviet Union adopted the same line and its representative Fedorenko stated: (90) "The Soviet delegation decisively condemns the aggression of Israel, considers it to be the bounden duty of the Security Council to adopt without any further delay a decision concerning the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the forces of the aggressor beyond the Armistice Lines".

Eban of Israel also spoke in the Security Council. He said: (91) "The Government and people of Israel were disconcerted by some aspects of the role of the United Nations in the conflict. Israel welcomed the appeal for the ceasefire as formulated in the resolution, but its implementation depended on the absolute and sincere acceptance and cooperation of the other parties".

George Tomch of Syria said: (92)

"It was clear from the statement of the Secretary General and the death of the UN&F soldiers, that Israel started the aggression against the United Arab Republic. All subsequent events flowed from the premeditated and well prepared Israeli attack on the United Arab Republic. As for the resolution which the Council has just adopted, his Government opposed any gains made by Israel through a fait accompli. It was the duty of the Council to condemn Israel, the aggressor, and to apply the sanctions provided for in the Charter".
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The ceasefire orders were not observed by Israel and it continued with its plan of expansion and occupation. On June 7, the Secretary General reported Israeli violations of the ceasefire order of June 6. He said: (93) "Israeli forces continued bombardment of Mount Scopus in Jerusalem, and occupied the crest". The Secretary General also "informed (94) the Council that "Jordan had accepted the ceasefire resolution and had stated that immediate orders were issued to the armed forces to cease-fire except in self-defence".

Fedorenko of the USSR charged: (95) that "Israel was not heeding the Council resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire". He categorically condemned Israel for its unjustified aggression against the Arab States and introduced a resolution which was adopted unanimously.

The Security Council's resolution of June 7, 1967 noted that military activities in the Near East were still continuing. The resolution demanded "that the Governments concerned should as a first step cease-fire and discontinue all military activities at 2000 hours GMT on 7 June 1967".

Eban of Israel charged (96) that the "Arab states had not complied with the ceasefire resolution". "The Soviet draft resolution lacked balance and distributed responsibility inequitably". Tarabanov of Bulgaria gave Eban a fitting reply when he said: (97)

---

94. Ibid.
95. Ibid., p. 14.
96. Ibid., p. 15.
"The United Arab Republic could not stop resisting aggression until aggression ceased. It could not be contended that the victims of aggression should not defend themselves against a foreign invader only when aggressor had ceasefire and had stopped its military activities, and only then, could a ceasefire begin."

Israel disregarded ceasefire orders and its armed forces kept advancing. Commenting upon Israel's flagrant violations of the Security Council's directives, Arthur Lall has observed: (98) "The strongest debating point against Israel was that, after the Council had adopted its first resolution on a ceasefire, Israeli forces had continued to advance. Indeed, they had continued to advance after Eban himself had reiterated solemnly in the Council his government's acceptance of the ceasefire".

The Secretary General had information about Israeli violation of the ceasefire which he reported to the Council on June 9, 1967. He said: (99) "The Chairman of ISMAC had informed him that the first confirmed bombing by Israeli aircraft north and east of Lake Tiberias was at 0746 hours GMT that day and that bombing, napalming and strafing had been continuous up to 1218 GMT. The Chairman had also confirmed bombing in the vicinity of Damascus at 1246 hours GMT".

Tomeh of Syria also charged Israel of disregarding the ceasefire resolutions of June 6, 7. He said: (100) "an hour after his Government had accepted the ceasefire resolution of June 6 and 7, Israel had unleashed vast air and land operations against it. These operations were proceeding with increasing intensity, leaving no
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doubt that their aim was a total invasion. The ruthlessness of the attack was indescribable. Israel's non-compliance with the directives of the United Nations cast enormous reflection on the international organization which had the job to maintain peace in the world. The Arab States were demanding that Israel should be asked to withdraw from all occupied areas but Israel was non-yielding and insistingly clinging to the policy of aggression. "A new political reality", said (101) Levi Eshkol, "in the Middle East has been created."

He was hinting at the new situation which had arisen as a result of Israeli aggression and occupation of Arab areas. The Arab states wanted the United Nations not to allow the aggressor to enjoy the fruits of aggression. The Soviet Union and India held the same opinion and wanted Israel to vacate the areas it occupied during the June War.

Fadorenko of the USSR was critical of Israel and its main allies. He demanded:(102) "Israel must also immediately and unconditionally withdraw its troops from their (the Arab States) territories.... We cannot allow the forces of aggression to remain on the territory seized by them. This situation brooks of no delay".

Parthasarathi of India also made the same demand when he said:(103) "The Council should, first, reinforce its call for a ceasefire and immediately order withdrawal of all armed forces to positions they occupied before the outbreak of hostilities".
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Israel continued committing serious violations of the cease-fire directives issued by the Security Council. That Israel did not have any respect for the United Nations and its efforts to maintain peace was shown by Moshe Dayan's remark quoted by the USSR representative in the Security Council. Fedorenko charged Dayan of having stated: (104) "I certainly cannot recall that any problem was ever settled by diplomacy or through the United Nations".

Such was the Israeli contempt for the United Nations and its resolution that Israeli leaders poured (105) "fire and brimstone on the UN". "The United Nations" they said, "has become the paradigm of perfidy, the epitome of hypocrisy". The use of force was the only way for Israel to satiate its hunger for expansion. Israel was using force even after the ceasefire orders. Israel was bombing the Arab States in utter disregard of the UN resolutions. Israel had occupied the town of Kuneitra and was pressing forward towards Damascus. The Secretary General read out a report from General Bull, the Chief of UNTSO. (106) "Most immediate Report received from Chairman of Israeli-Syrian Mixed Armistice Commission. Damascus at 0923 hours GMT Air attack on Damascus going on". The attack on Damascus was confirmed by another message from the chairman of ISMAC. The Secretary General read: (107) another message "confirming attack at 7.35 GMT in area - repeat area - of Damascus airport. A second air attack south of Damascus at 8.55 GMT. And a further attack at 9:19 GMT north of Damascus".
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Fedorenko of the Soviet Union expressed his country's indignation and commented: (108) "The circle is complete. The perpetration of the crime is proved...." He asked the Security Council to adopt stern measures to deal with Israeli acts of violation and also be prepared to act according to the Charter to force Israel to comply with the UN resolutions.

The Security Council failed to adopt measures of economic sanctions in order to compel Israel to comply with the ceasefire orders. On June 12 another resolution was unanimously adopted which condemned (109) "any and all violations of the ceasefire". It also requested "the Secretary General to continue his investigations and to report to the Council as soon as possible". It affirmed "that its demand for a ceasefire and discontinuance of all military activities includes a prohibition of any forward military movements subsequent to the ceasefire. Calls for the prompt return to the ceasefire position of any troops which may have moved forward subsequent to 1630 GMT on 10 June 1967".

Apart from the violations of the United Nations ceasefire orders and occupation of Arab areas, another major consequence of June War of 1967 was the aggravation of the Palestine refugee problem. Israel occupied large chunk of Arab territory: the West Bank of the Jordan, the Sinai, the Gaza, the Golan Heights and the Straits of Tiran. The Arabs living in these areas were forcibly expelled. Over (110) 400,000 Palestinians were expelled by Israel or had fled under terror
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from the new occupied territories to the East Bank, so that Jordan had become a large refugee camp. Israel treated the Arab population as war hostages and subjected them to torture and great sufferings. The Security Council adopted a resolution on June 14, 1967, calling upon (111) "the Government of Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of these inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities".

Israel appeared to be yielding to international protest against its policy of expulsion. But it was merely a gesture. It announced to allow the return of refugees to the occupied West Bank in August and approved applications for the return of 170,749 Arabs. By August 31, 1967 deadline Israel fixed for its implementation, only 14,027 refugees had actually returned. (112) Israel did not listen to the United Nations and disregarded the directives of the Security Council and flagrantly violated the Geneva Convention of 1949 on human rights. Israel's treatment of the UN was a replica of Germany's treatment of the League of Nations after the rise of Nazi regime.

The Soviet Union wanted (113) the Security Council to condemn Israel for "its aggressive activities and continued occupation of part of the territory of the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan, and ask Israel to withdraw all its troops from those countries". The Soviet Union did not succeed in the Council so it turned to the General Assembly and invoked Article 11 of the UN Charter which empowered the

111. SCOri, 1361st Meeting, June 14, 1967, Resolution No. 237.
112. The Arab World, vol. IX, Nos. 5-6, May-June 1968, p. 5.
113. S/7951/Rev. 2.
Assembly to discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of peace and security". The Soviet Union asked for special emergency session of the General Assembly through a letter addressed to the Secretary General from Andrei Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR. The emergency session of the Assembly was being convened (114) in order to consider the prospects of "liquidating the consequences of Israel's aggression against the Arab States and the immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops behind the armistice lines".

The United States of America opposed the Soviet move to convene special emergency session of the General Assembly. Goldberg said: (115) "The United States Government does not believe that a situation has arisen in which the Security Council fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Accordingly, the United States is not able to concur in the request for the holding of an Emergency Special Session at this time".

Despite the U.S. objections the emergency session was held on June 17, 1967. Israel was adamant and had made it clear that it would not withdraw its armed forces from the occupied areas. On June 18, 1967, Lban of Israel stated: (116) "If the General Assembly were to vote by 121 to 1 in favour of Israel returning to the Armistice line tomorrow, Israel would refuse to comply with that decision. This has been made clear to the major powers". The General Assembly

heard Alexi Kosygin who demanded (117) the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces to the armistice lines and for "full elimination of the consequences of the aggression". He expressed the hope that the General Assembly will take an effective decision ensuring... the restoration and consolidation of peace and security in the Middle East".

Noureddin Attassi, President of Syria stated: (118) "We shall reject any conditions or discussions based on an invasion. We ask you to firmly condemn aggression and to immediately liquidate its traces".

Mahmoud Fawzi, Deputy Premier of the United Arab Republic dealt with the US Israeli collusion in launching attack against the Arab States. He drew (119) the attention of the General Assembly to "a great number of unbelievable atrocities", Israel committed in the invaded and occupied territories. These atrocities included bombardment of hospitals, killing great number of civilians, using napalm bombs, destroying all constructions and projects.

Mahgoub, Prime Minister of Sudan argued that even conceding the provocation caused by the massing of Arab troops on its frontiers (120) "the action taken by Israel was not legitimate self-defence within the meaning of Article 51 of the Charter because no armed attack on its territory had in fact occurred". He insisted on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories.

Jordan was represented by King Hussein who described Israel as

117. A/PV. 1520, p. 2.
119. A/PV. 1522, p. 36.
120. A/PV. 1530, p. 36.
"the aggressor". He told the world Assembly: (121) "sympathy for the past sufferings of the Jews should not mean accepting aggression. The Arabs wanted peace with justice, not peace by submission. The Hour of decision had come, and unless the Assembly acted speedily and effectively, the plight of the refugees would be doubled. There must be a clear recognition by the Assembly that one member state of the United Nations had deliberately violated the territory of three member states". He said the duty of the UN "can be nothing else but the swift condemnation of the aggressor and the enforcing of the return of Israeli troops to the lines held before the attack of June 5.

Sharifuddin Pirzada, Foreign Minister of Pakistan also spoke about Israeli aggression against the Arab countries. He said (122) that the Assembly should examine all outstanding issues in the Middle East. If the UN Charter is properly applied then "the only course of action for us is to condemn the aggression launched by Israel on 5 June and to demand the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab territories, including the Holy Places, to positions prior to hostilities... The wrong done to the Arabs must be righted".

M. C. Chagla, Indian Foreign Minister also supported the view that Israel must be made withdraw from all occupied territories. According to him (123) "the foundation of a lasting peace in the region could only be based on total, immediate, unconditional withdrawal
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of Israel from the areas now under its occupation". He asked the Assembly to request the Security Council to take the necessary steps to effect the withdrawal of Israeli forces.

From among the western bloc the most outstanding speech made was by Britain's Foreign Minister, George Brown who laid down the stipulation that there should be no territorial acquisitions for Israel as a result of the war. He said: (124) "In my view, it follows from the words in the Charter that war shall not lead to territorial aggrandizement".

Goldberg of the United States of America presented before the Assembly a draft resolution embodying Johnson's Five Principles enunciated in his speech of May 23, 1967. Goldberg opposed the Soviet Union's draft resolution which according to him in effect was (125) "a prescription for renewed hostilities". He said "there were legitimate grievances on all sides of the conflict and a full settlement should deal equitably with them and with outstanding questions from which ever side they were raised".

Maurice Cauve de Murville, Foreign Minister of France said: (126) "The indispensable task was a solution in substance of the existing problems which were, apart from navigation through the Gulf of Aqaba, the situation of the Palestinian refugees and the conditions of vicinity of the States concerned". "Israel had occupied territories belonging to the United Arab Republic, Jordan and Syria and no fait accompli on the spot regarding the territorial boundaries and the situ-
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ation of the citizens of the States concerned could be considered as permanent”.

Eban of Israel expressed his country's stubborn attitude over the question of withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories. He said: (127) "The suggestion that everything go back to where it was before June 5 was totally unacceptable, Israel would reject the concept of returning to the situation of belligerency out of which the crisis arose”.

The absence of a consensus was the hallmark of the emergency session of the General Assembly. It was apparent from the very beginning that the positions of the Soviet Union and the United States of America were as divergent as ever and the chasm between the two appeared to be unbridgeable. The Soviet Union was trying to mobilize support behind her demand for a total and unconditional withdrawal of the Israeli forces from occupied Arab territories.

The United States held the view that withdrawal of Israeli armed forces should not be a pre-requisite to any possible political settlement of the conflict. According to the USA the withdrawal of Israel army from occupied Arab territories should form an integral and inseparable link to the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The US position was in keeping with its policy of supporting Israel and its aggression against the Arab States. The two sides, i.e. the Soviet Union and the USA were trying to secure endorsement for their respective position. On July 4, after a marathon speech making session, two draft resolutions were there before the General Assembly. One resolution was submitted by Yugoslavia on June 28. It called for the immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied Arab territories. It urged
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"all states to render every assistance to the Secretary-General" (128) in helping him to implement it. The Yugoslav draft resolution was a resolution of non-aligned states which according to Lall was (129) "less drastic than that of the Soviet Union and less sweeping than that of the United States".

The second draft resolution was sponsored by the Latin American countries and presented before the General Assembly on June 30, 1967 by Dr Solomon of Trinidad and Tobago. The Latin American draft resolution also called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces but linked such a withdrawal with an end to all forms of belligerency between Israel and its Arab neighbours. It requested (130) "the Security Council to continue examining the situation in the Middle East with a sense of urgency, working directly with the parties and relying on the presence of the United Nations".

The Arab States opposed the Latin American draft resolution for in it the withdrawal of Israeli forces was conditional to peace negotiations. Habib Bourguiba Jr. of Tunisia said (131) "The majority of nations represented here, and particularly by the four Great Powers, none of which has ever called into question the actual existence of Israel as a state, whereas in our eyes it is the very existence of Israel which constitutes permanent aggression." It was made clear that direct negotiations with Israel were ruled out.

According to the Syrian representative the Latin American draft resolution (132) "comes just to deepen our wounds and humiliation. The
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The countries of Latin America... have confirmed that while their hearts are on our side, their swords are brandished against us".

Eban of Israel also spoke and he opposed the non-aligned draft resolution which according to him, (133) "requires Israel to act as though there were peace, while allowing the Arab states to act as though there were war".

Both draft resolutions fell because none of it could secure the required two-thirds vote. The vote on the Yugoslav draft resolution was 53 to 46 with 20 abstentions while that on the Latin American draft was 57 to 43 with 20 abstentions. (134)

The General Assembly found itself seriously deadlocked. The positions of the USA and the USSR were irreconciliable and no agreement in the United Nations was in sight. Israel was aware of the Big Powers' antagonism and it utilized the cleavage to its full advantage. Israel was effectively combining its military strategy with diplomacy. It was steadily pursuing its policies without any consideration or regard of approval or disapproval by the international community. Intemperate and bellicose utterances had become routine. On July 14, 1967 Ben Gurion defended the Zionist policy of colonialism. He told the Jewish community representatives from the USA: (135) "We have to colonize Jerusalem and its outskirts and colonize and industrialize the Negev."

Israeli leaders were refusing to withdraw from occupied Arab territories on the ground of security and survival of Israel. Moshe Dayan stated (136) in August: "We must not allow other countries, acting
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in their own interest, to force us to the situation.... We need to consider the reality of 1967 and the 1967 map. We need not only permanent borders but frontiers that will ensure tranquillity".

The Israeli leaders made their intentions known even to the United Nations as they had fully grasped the realities of international politics and its mechanism. Eban had the courage of defiance when he told the General Assembly session in September that the suggestion to withdraw troops to pre-5th June positions could not be accepted by Israel. (137) "Our road does not lead backward to an armistice eroded by belligerency, destroyed by sovereignty. History summons us forward to a new spirit and structure of relations". Eban repeated Israeli arrogance and stubbornness in the Security Council which met to consider the Middle East situation in November. The Israeli spokesman spoke in a manner reminiscent of the thirties when Hitler hurled defiance right and left and even seemed to hold civilization and humanity cheap as compared to the realization of Nazi aims. Eban stated (138): "It is our firm resolve never, never to return to the danger and vulnerability from which we have emerged. This resolve must prevail over every other consideration. To avoid a return to any of the conditions which prevailed on 4 June is a supreme national purpose worthy of any effort and any consequence".

After a long spell of consultation, negotiations, differences were sought to be ironed out between the USA and the USSR. King Hussein's visit to the USA was instrumental in taking much wind out of Israel's propaganda sails. The USA understood the Arab position better than ever before and tried to win over the Arab States by showing some

Signs of helping them in meeting their demand about the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Arab territories.

Lord Caradon, the British representative submitted to the Council a resolution which was unanimously adopted on November 22, 1967. The resolution of November 22 was the most important directive of the Security Council. It emphasized (139) "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by war" and further affirmed that the lasting peace in the Middle East included the application of both the following principles:

1. "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict";

2. "termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries from threats or acts of force".

3. "affirms further the necessity:
   
   (a) for guaranteeing freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area;
   
   (b) for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem..."

The resolution of November 22, 1967 made the most important contribution when it requested the Secretary General "to designate a special

---


The Security Council had adopted a resolution (S/2322) on September 1, 1951, calling upon Egypt to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal. The UN continued its policy of blockade of Israeli shipping. President Nasser had clarified the UN position, in a Press interview on October 8, 1959 that the resolutions concerning Palestine are indivisible entity - the right of the refugees to return to their homeland, their right to their properties or compensation for their properties, and their right to the Palestine territory cannot be divided... the only starting point would be to implement all the UN resolutions. UN resolutions cannot be imposed on us alone while Israel is allowed to ignore them. Al Ahram. October 9, 1959.
representative to proceed to the Middle East to establish and maintain contacts with the states concerned in order to promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful and accepted settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles in this resolution."

The Secretary-General was swift and quick on November 23, he had designated Gunnar Jarring of Sweden as his special representative in accordance with para 3 of the Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967. The appointment of Gunnar Jarring as the UN mediator to conduct negotiations with Israel and the Arab States was welcomed in the Arab world but Israel could not conceal its unhappiness. The appointment of Gunnar Jarring was a negation of the Israeli policy of direct negotiations with the Arab States. Israel's interpretation of November 22 Resolution was totally unacceptable to the members of the United Nations and subsequently questioned by them. Eban while commenting on the resolution said (140):

"The policy of the Israeli Government and nation remains as it was when I formulated it on 13 and 16 November, namely, that we respect and fully maintain the situation embodied in the cease-fire agreement until it is succeeded by peace treaties... Those are our aims and positions. They emerge from five months of international discussions unchanged, unprejudiced and intact. It is now understood as of a lasting peace establishing recognized and secure boundaries."

Eban's interpretation had meant that it was only with the establishment of a permanent peace and secure, recognized boundaries that other principles could be implemented. Israel did not comply with the resolution of November 22, 1967. The Arab countries had agreed to implement the resolution and as an indication of their willingness Mahmud Kiad, Foreign Minister of the UAR made the following declara-

"We have already emphasized our acceptance of the Security Council resolution which includes the freedom of passage through the Suez Canal. In return to this Israel has to carry out its responsibilities and obligations which include the withdrawal of forces from the Arab territories it occupies, and the settlement of the problem of the refugees. If Israel carries out its obligations we will carry out ours also, thus making for a more stable peace in the Middle East area."

Israel insisted on concluding peace treaties with the Arab States on the basis of direct negotiations. The Arab States rejected Israeli claim because the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 did not mention direct negotiations between Israel and the Arab States. The Secretary General of the United Nations fully vindicated the Arab position when he declared at a Press Conference (142):

"The most comprehensive and, in my view, the most important resolution adopted by the Security Council regarding the situation in the Middle East is the one adopted on November 22, 1967. I do not think there was any mention of direct talks in that resolution."

But there was mention of the Secretary General's Representative promoting agreement between the parties directly involved.

Israel flagrantly violated the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967 by not withdrawing from occupied Arab territories and by undertaking periodical raids of Arab areas. The Security Council on April 1, 1969 adopted (143) a resolution condemning Israel for "its premeditated air attacks on Jordanian villages and populated areas in flagrant violation of the UN Charter and the cease-

fire resolutions".

Israel was not in the habit of listening to noble words of caution and restraint. It did not refrain from indulging in nefarious activities to destroy human life and property of the Arabs. On August 12, 1969 the representative of Lebanon addressed a letter to the Security Council President requesting an urgent meeting to consider (144) "the situation endangering the peace and security of Lebanon" as a result of Israeli raids on civilian population and villages in southern Lebanon.

The Security Council met and unanimously adopted a resolution on August 26, 1967 condemning the premeditated air attack by Israel on villages in Southern Lebanon and deplored all violent incidents in violation of ceasefire. The Council also deplored (145) the extension of the area of fighting and declared that "such actions of military reprisals and other grave violations of the ceasefire could not be tolerated and that the Security Council would have to consider further and more effective steps as envisaged in the Charter to ensure against repetition of such acts".

The Security Council and its resolutions fell on deaf ears and Israel continued its occupation of Arab territories, made no move to solve the refugee problem as envisaged under November 22 resolution. On the other hand it adhered to its policy of annexation to strengthen its hold over occupied Arab areas. The State Minister for Foreign Affairs of Tanzania told the United Nations (146): "In spite of the UN resolutions of November 1967, Israel has not only maintained
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its occupation of Arab areas, but has also acted to strengthen its hold on them."

The Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia was also of the opinion that Israel's intransigence had spoiled all chances of peaceful settlements of the Middle Eastern problem. He said: "Israel to this date has not accepted the Security Council resolution of 1967, has not ceased to insist upon the annexation of occupied Arab territories and maintain a ruthless attitude towards the Palestinian population."

To this day Israel has not accepted or shown willingness to comply with the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967.

The Arab States had made it abundantly clear that they were willing to maintain peace in the Middle East but direct negotiations could never become a condition for a peaceful settlement. The Arab States had rejected direct negotiation because the party primarily responsible for discussing the fate of that area is the people of Palestine whom Israel refuses to recognise. No Arab state has a right to dispose of a portion of Palestinian territory. It is up to the Palestinians to decide what they agree and what they do not agree to, by way of ultimate disposition of their land.

The second most important implication of Israeli insistence on direct negotiation is to leave out the United Nations. The United Nations has been, from the very beginning, a party in Palestine conflict and any move to resolve this conflict without the United Nations seems to be unconceivable as far as the Arabs are concerned.

The war unleashed by Israel on June 5, 1967 was the most important link in the chain of Israeli policy of aggression, it has
resulted in the aggravation of the political, human and economic issues that existed before the conflict.

The war had cost the Arabs about 20,000 soldiers but the most significant aspect of the human situation is the refugee problem. The Government of Jordan has estimated that about 410,243 persons were displaced from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. To the number of Palestinian refugees who were displaced from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, one must add 16,000 Palestinians registered with UNRWA as refugees of the 1948 conflict and 3,000 to 4,000 Palestinian youngmen, also previously registered with the UNRWA, who were expelled by Israel from the Gaza Strip to Egypt. (147)

The total number of registered Palestine refugees with UNRWA according to the report of September 15, 1967 was (148) "to be 70 percent of the total number of refugees and displaced persons". In another report dated June 30, 1968, UNRWA's figure of refugees was 1,364,298. (149)

The condition in which Palestine refugees have been forced to live is far more important than the number of the refugees.

Israel on several occasions had bombarded the dwellings of Palestinian refugees. On November 26, 1967, the refugees camp at Karamch was heavily fired by Israeli artillery which caused enormous loss of human life including children. (150) On February 15, 1968, twenty villages and refugee camps across the Jordan River became victims of the most cruel attack by Israel. This attack took a toll of more than
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one hundred human lives and forced some 70,000 people to move deeper in the hills to search security of life. On March 21, 1968 a huge and well equipped Israeli force attacked Karameh destroying several hundred houses and abducted more than one hundred and fifty Arab Commandoes.

The Security Council adopted a resolution on March 24, 1968 condemning Israel for its brutal attack (151) "in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and the ceasefire resolutions". The Commissioner General of UNRWA reported to the Security Council about the demolition of refugees shelters in Jabaliya and Rafah in Gaza Strip. (152)

The Security Council Resolution of June 14, 1967 requested (153) that "essential and inalienable human rights should be respected even during the vicissitudes of war". The resolution also asked that "all the obligations of the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, of 12 August 1949 should be complied with". It also called upon Israeli Government "to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations have taken place and to facilitate the return of those inhabitants who have fled the areas since the outbreak of hostilities".

Israel, however, went ahead with its policy of repression, destruction and terror in violation of the Security Council resolution of June 14, 1967. The occupation of Arab territories during 1967 war put the inhabitants of Gaza, Sinai, West Bank and the Golan Heights under Israeli administration. The situation in the occupied territories
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was shocking and paled even the atrocities committed by Hitler. A team of correspondents visited the occupied areas and wrote about the shocking scenes they saw and heard about the torture meted out to the Arabs. They wrote: (154)

"We saw 22 years old corporal Souilen Abdel Rasoul Gadak, who had been in a tank near Rafat, in the Gaza Strip. He had lost his left arm and been hit by nine bullets. He had been held for 72 hours and had been hung upside down by his feet. When he asked for a drink they shot at him. A bottle of water."

The United Nations, through many resolutions, recommended to Israel strict compliance with civilized code of behaviour and requested Israel to respect the humanitarian principles governing the treatment of the prisoners of war and the protection of civilians in times of war.

Israel's answer to the United Nations and to its calls for civilized behaviour in keeping with the letter and spirit of international law was its policy of psychological warfare against the Arab inhabitants of the occupied areas. E. C. Hodgkin visited Gaza and the West Bank and witnessed Israeli policy of repression in action. Writing about Israeli occupation Hodgkin wrote (155): "It is not to be expected that such an occupation will be popular; but what surprised me was the intensity with which the Israelis are hated everywhere by all sections of the populations. The mood is perhaps similar to that in occupied France at the beginning of 1942. Repression is severe, and acts of resistance are multiplying." The British journalist saw the destruction of houses (156) "7140 Arab houses have been blown up. This includes entire villages which have been destroyed, innocent or guilty, 
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tenant or visitor or owner, the explosives go in". The Arabs were forcibly deported from occupied territories. Most of the people deported (157) "were prominent in West Bank life - the former Mayor of Jerusalem and the present Mayor of Ramallah: judges, lawyers, doctors, teachers and so on". The Arab inhabitants were treated as fifth columnists and put behind bars without giving them a fair trial or a chance to defend themselves. The prisoners were also treated with brutality. An American newspaper wrote (158): "Beatings to extract information from prisoners are routine". The Economist observed (159): "The allegations of brutality to prisoners under interrogation appear to be substantiated by such evidence as is obtainable by a visiting foreign journalist. Your correspondent has spoken to three people who claim to have been badly beaten or tortured with electrical devices, and he is satisfied that the first hand account of their experiences lends weight to evidence obtained from other sources".

The Arab population of occupied territories was condemned to constant mental and physical torture by Israeli authorities. This policy was aimed at terrifying the people compelling them to leave. The well-known writer Malcolm Muggeridge witnessed a horrifying scene in Jerusalem about which he wrote in the Observer (160): "I was quite abnormally horrified to see in Jerusalem two Arabs, one of them a youth, being arrested, beaten up and then with black bags over their heads, driven away at top speed in a jeep. I wanted to rush after them
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shouting impotently, "It's like Berlin. You should not be doing this."

The *Le Monde* also wrote about Israeli torture which did not discriminate among the Arabs even on the basis of age. "A 75 year old Arab from the Gaza Strip was sentenced to life imprisonment by an Israeli Military Court". (161) To force them out of their houses, many Nazi-like tactics were resorted to. Their houses were blown up and their villages were bulldozed. Many refugees living in Jordan and elsewhere were those who "have left because their houses were blown up or knocked down. Not only has much of Šalqlinya been bulldozed; about 10 other villages have suffered the same fate. In Jerusalem we saw the rubble of Arab houses which have been demolished to make a large piazza and a car park in front of the Wailing Wall." (162) It was in violation of Article 33 of the Geneva Convention which said "Reprisals against protected persons and their property are prohibited."

The *L'Orient* wrote about the destruction of Arab property by Israel. "On December 8, 1967, 100 houses, two mosques and a school in the Jericho were destroyed by the Israeli Army". (163)

The United States of America warned Israel against its policy of destroying Arab houses. Robert Mccloskey strongly condemned Israel which implied (164) that "the Israeli Army violated an international agreement by dynamiting homes of suspected Arab terrorists in Jerusalem."

The Israeli statesmen disregarded American objection and per-

sisted in their activities. They indicated that "there would be no change in their policy of demolishing the homes of suspected Arab terrorists". (165)

In the Latrun area the villages of Yalu, Emmuas, Beit Nouba and Beit Sir were "systematically and completely destroyed by the Israelis 19 days after the ceasefire". (166) In the Hebron area two villages Beit Awa and Beit Mersim were also bulldozed. The Secretary General's Special Representative Gussing submitted a report to the Security Council where he stated that in Beit Awa and Beit Mersim more than 90 per cent Arab houses were completely destroyed. "The Israeli troops demolished the houses with dynamite and bulldozers. Groves around the village were burnt". (167) The destruction of Arab houses was condemned by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights on March 8, 1968. It asked Israel "to desist forthwith from acts of destroying homes of the Arab civilians". On May 7, 1968, the United Nations Conference on Human Rights held at Tehran renewed the call upon Israel to desist from destroying the Arab houses and to respect and implement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Geneva Conventions of 1949. (168)

The Israeli administration resorted to the policy of collective punishment which was a contemporary version of Nazi policy of "Peace Keeping Operations" in occupied Europe. Article 33 of the 4th Geneva Convention stated: "Collective penalties are prohibited." Israel dis-
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regarded this provision. The civilian population was treated harshly and their movements were terribly restricted by imposing curfews.

Michael Adams wrote about the curfew (169):

"When I left Gaza this morning three refugee camps housing 100,000 Palestine refugees were under day and night curfew and there was sporadic shooting in the streets of Gaza City which served no apparent purpose beyond the intimidation of the civilian population. No distribution of food was allowed; not many managed to get water."

The Observer also wrote (170): "Curfews in refugee camps are often accompanied by the rounding up of all male inhabitants between the ages of 16 and 60 and compelling them to spend hours in some cases up to three days in open compounds."

The hospitals also were made target of destruction by Israeli army. "The worst hit building in the whole of Jerusalem", wrote (171) The Economist, "is the Augusta Victoria hospital on a hill next to the Mount of Olives... One whole wing was destroyed and with it research work of a lifetime". The Life verified it by saying that (172) "four Israeli jets dropped Napalm canisters on the Augusta Victoria (hospital) in Jerusalem."

The Israelis also resorted to shooting at groups of people. The Arab demonstrations were wantonly fired at. In May 1968 "Five girl pupils of a secondary school in the Gaza Strip were shot and wounded."

The Arab educational institutions were also subjected to Israeli
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scheme of depriving them of their Arab character. The occupation authorities confiscated all the books proscribed in the schools.

By September 27, 1967, 79 of 134 Jordanian textbooks were cut. One hundred of the 139 books found in Egyptian desks and two-thirds of those taken from Syria were expurgated. Books of literature, geography, religion, Arabic language and even of mathematics were changed. (174) The Executive Board of the UNESCO passed a resolution expressing regret that the textbooks approved by the Director General of UNESCO were not used in the schools operated by the UNRWA for Palestine refugees in the Near East. It called upon the Government of Israel to remove immediately any obstacle to the import and use of the books. (175)

Racial discrimination is instinctive in Israel, it is even taught to children at school. An Israeli newspaper wrote (176): "The contempt in which the white Jews in Israel hold their black brethren is unequalled anywhere else in the world. This is due to the instinctive, deeply rooted chauvinism which is common among European Jews."

Israel discriminated against the Arabs reducing them to the status of second class citizens. What is left of human rights which Israel has not entirely destroyed with regard to its Arab citizens. Aggression, violence, oppression and underhand dealings are all that the Arab inhabitants can expect from the Israeli authorities. The Third Committee of Social, Humanitarian and Culture approved a draft resolution on November 2, 1969, concerning Israeli practices towards

the civilian population in territories occupied by Israel. The draft resolution (177) "called upon the Government of Israel to desist forthwith from its reported repressive policies and practices towards the civilian population in the occupied Arab territories."

The special working group was appointed by the United Nations to investigate into the violations of the Geneva Convention committed by Israel. The group confirmed that there were violations of the convention which the occupying power had committed. The group recommended that Israel should cease all its oppressive policies and comply with the Geneva Conventions on Human Rights. The group also recommended that the "occupying power should refrain from demolishing houses for reasons not provided for in the 1949 Convention and grant adequate compensation in all cases of demolition in violation of the Convention." (178)

These and other United Nations recommendations and directives could not secure Israeli compliance and remain mere palliatives in the absence of an effective international enforcing machinery.

Repercussions - Economic

The most significant and severe impact of June 1967 war was registered in the economic sphere. The loss of the West Bank including Jerusalem and the closure of the Suez Canal depriving Egypt of its enormous revenues dealt shattering blows to the economies of Jordan and the UAR. One of the most important motivating factors behind Israeli aggression against the Arab States has been, as indicated above, to cripple Arab economy and arrest its forward march. The June War of

1967 lasted only six days but in terms of its economic losses it proved to be more shattering and devastating than the 100 years war between England and France. Jordan was the country which suffered the heaviest economic losses. Jordan had lost the entire West Bank; and consequently one-third of its national product. In terms of production the West Bank produces over 65% of the olives and about 30% of the cereals. (179)

In the industrial sector there were in the West Bank over 3,700 industrial establishments or about 48% of the total number of industrial establishments in Jordan employing about 14,000 persons or 37% of the total industrial employment. (180)

Jordan's total foreign exchange earnings in 1966 were roughly $200 million. Jordan's loss in this sphere because of Israeli occupation of the West Bank would be $80 million but it constitutes the main bulk of Jordan's foreign exchange other than grants and aid from foreign countries. The loss of the West Bank brought some indirect effects on its economy. The size of Jordan's consumer market is reduced with its consequent effects on creating excess capacity for the industries and services of the East Bank which would have to look for either new export opportunities or partially close down. Jordan's economy used to get a substantial amount of revenues from tourist trade. With the loss of Jerusalem, Jordan lost the greatest attraction of the tourists and the biggest source of revenues and foreign exchange.

One very significant indirect consequence of the June war was a substantial reduction in the flow of foreign investments in Jordan's economy.
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As far as economic structure of the country is concerned, Jordan finds itself in a very bad situation. With the influx of Palestine refugees Jordan's population has swelled and the problems of housing, food and clothing have got aggravated. A substantial increase in population coupled with a major reduction in its sources of revenues made the survival of Jordan as a viable political and geographical entity extremely difficult. The Development Board of Jordan is engaged in preparing development projects providing job opportunities for skilled and unskilled labour. There are various other schemes at hand aiming at bettering irrigation and agricultural prospects in Jordan.

The UAR suffered enormously and the rate of its economic progress slowed down because of the Six-Day War. As a result of Israeli aggression, navigation in the Suez Canal had come to a standstill because the Canal is closed to traffic. This has produced grave consequences affecting the interest of a large number of countries apart from the UAR. The Canal is the most important link between the East and the West. The goods passing through the Canal in 1966 represented 14% of world trade and it was a matter of grave concern that the movement of oil from its source to consumer market was affected.

The closure of the Suez Canal has resulted in increasing the shipping costs and insurance rates because the Cape route is longer.
The distance between the Arab Gulf ports and the United States has thus increased by 40%. The UAA has lost an annual revenue in foreign exchange of more than £100 million representing about 5% of its gross national income. Thousands of workers engaged in the Canal and others who depended for their income on the Canal were rendered unemployed. There are other countries which have suffered because of the closure of the Suez Canal. Among these are the Arab countries, India, the People's Republic of China, Pakistan, Western Europe and other countries.

India suffered a great loss as a result of the closure of the Suez Canal. According to one estimate the increase in cost of freight from Europe and the USA was about 40%. However, India has been able to compensate some of its losses by increasing its exports of steel and engineering commodities to the Middle East and the Far East, Australia and New Zealand.

The People's Republic of China too suffered some losses and delay in importing phosphates from Morocco. Pakistan was also a sufferer because its wheat requirements were always coming through the Suez Canal. Additional financial liabilities shouldered by European countries importing oil as a result of higher freight costs between June and December 1967 were estimated at about £452 million. The total losses suffered by West European countries until 1968 were estimated at £583 million. (181) Consequently due to the closure of the Suez Canal, Western Europe increased its volume of trade exchange with the United States and came under the American influence. The French paper Tribune des Nations wrote (182): "For the first time in history, the


United States, together with Israel have imprisoned Western Europe in the Mediterranean Sea, barring its road to the Far East and cutting its communication with the West Indies and the Indian Ocean. Europe's future is threatened in Suez, the meeting point of the Mediterranean Europe and the Afro-Asian world; indeed, a vital point since it constitutes the heart of modern industry and civilization."

The closure of the Suez Canal has led to the re-routing of international trade which became a source of great benefit to the United States of America since the closure has won her new markets for her oil products and foodstuffs. Before the closure of the Canal, 20% of Europe's oil passed through the Canal. After its closure the shortage in Europe was covered by oil imports from the USA.

South Africa was the happiest country and benefited most out of the crisis created by the closure of the Suez Canal. The ships started calling at South African ports and an increase in revenues from transit fees, bunkering, ship repairs was registered. During 1966 and 1967 the total number of ships which called on South African ports did not exceed 7,370 but by 1969 the number had shot up to 14,000. Israel also benefited from the closure and it developed its Eilat port in order to maintain its trade with East Africa and Far East. The United States and Israel developed a vested interest in seeing the Canal closed. Julian Amery, member of the British Conservative Party once said: (183) "All considerations taken, the interests of the free world are better served by keeping the Canal closed." Israel prevented Egypt from reopening the Suez Canal in 1968.

---

The Egyptian tourist trade also suffered a serious setback, the loss of military equipment costing enormous money to the UAR, destruction of important factories put Egyptian economy in dire straits but a total breakdown was prevented.

An Arab Summit Conference was held at Khartoum from August 29 to September 1. The Conference decided on measures to replenish the tottering economies of Jordan and the UAR. Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and Libya decided to make an annual contribution of £55 million, £50 million, and £30 million, respectively to help the war torn economies of the UAR, Jordan and Syria. The Conference also decided to "face any possible economic pressure from outside." (184)

Repercussions - Political

The most immediate and significant political development after the June War was that public opinion in the Arab capitals had plunged from the height of elation, of absolute confidence in victory into the depths of despair. The internal political crisis in the UAR seemed far more difficult. The June war of 1967 also gave rise to two military and political developments.

The most significant is the resurgence of a new military-cum-political factor, namely, the Palestinian Resistance Movement which had always been in existence since the inception of Israel but now became more active and more popular-based. The Palestine Resistance Movement is a movement for the liberation of homeland.

The Palestine refugees wanted justice and when the United Nations
failed to give them justice they realized that what they had lost by force could be regained only by force. "After seventeen years of patient waiting" (185) said a spokesman of the Palestine Arabs in the United Nations Special Political Committee, "they had lost all faith in the United Nations". The establishment of the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1963 was a milestone in the Arab struggle to liberate Palestine and it "had reawakened their hopes and afforded them an opportunity to renew the struggle for their homeland". The Palestine Liberation Organization is not the only organization, there are other organizations like the 'Al Fateh' committed to the liberation of Palestine and establishment of a secular democratic state in Palestine. The intensification of revolutionary movement institutionalized by the Al Fateh posed a grave threat to Israel's survival as a religio-cum-racial state. Israel has started a campaign of villification against freedom fighters by calling them as "terrorists and saboteurs". The Palestine Resistance Movement is not an isolated phenomenon, it is a part of world wide revolutionary movements for liberation as, for instance, in Viet Nam. The Palestine freedom fighters realized that "Imperialism can only be felled by a mature and armed population and that the only way to confront the imperialist war machinery is through popular war - through the transformation of the people into a revolutionary reserve armed with political awareness and through the use of the strategy of long-term war to overcome imperialist technological superiority and its blitzkrieg strategy". (186) 

The Palestine Liberation Movement is not a sectarian movement
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which was meant for a particular community professing a particular religious belief. It is a secular, broad based democratic movement and its objective of "the liberation of Palestine" ultimately means the liberation of the needy, toiling Jews oppressed by Zionism to co-exist with other peoples of the world and within Palestine without any discrimination". (187)

Israel's entire existence seems to be in jeopardy at the hands of Palestine liberators and Israel has adopted a policy of repression against these fighters and it also launches raids on the Arab States to wipe off the bases of the Arab commandos.

Jordan and Lebanon have been victims of Israeli raids to intimidate these Arab States. On November 20, 1967 the refugee camp at Karameh was attacked causing huge loss of human lives. Israel undertook many raids to crush Palestinian resistance and punish the Arab States for supporting them. In 1968 Israel turned its wrath upon Lebanon when Beirut Airport was attacked and thirteen planes belonging to the Arab States were destroyed. The Israeli representative in the Security Council tried to justify the attack as a reprisal against the attack made two days earlier by two Commandos on the Israeli Airline at Athens. Such an argument is totally untenable under the accepted principles of international law. The Arab States cannot be held responsible and accountable for the acts of Palestinian Freedom Fighters whom Israel has forcibly thrown out of their homeland. The President of Lebanon was forthright and outspoken when he said (188) "That Israel,
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not Lebanon, is responsible for the presence of Palestinians in Lebanon, responsible for their plight and that Palestinians have got every right to fight for the recovery of the motherland."

The Israeli raids could not be justified under any canon of law and morality. Its attack against Lebanon was motivated by its desire and scheme of advancing up to more defensible frontier of the Litani river in Lebanon.

The Security Council condemned Israel on December 31, 1968 (189) "for its premeditated military action in violation of its obligations under the Charter and the ceasefire resolutions". The Council took very strong note of the Israeli attack on the Beirut air port and warned Israel that "if such acts were to be repeated, the Council would have to consider further steps to give effect to its decisions". The resolution considers that "Lebanon is entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction it suffered, responsibility for which has been acknowledged by Israel." Israel followed the policy of thousand eyes for one eye, retaliation against all the Arab States. Israel's emphasis on peace, negotiated settlement and its theory of retaliation remain irreconcilable. One Israeli Minister has been quoted as saying (190): "I have never heard of peace by retaliation."

Israel has tried, through its theory of retaliation, to cloud the real issue. The acts of the Palestine Freedom Fighters are secondary matters which are nothing but human and natural responses to Israeli acts of "retaliation" undertaken for softening up, terrorising, and expelling the Arabs out of their old homes. The Arab Commandos

---
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are resorting to force because they have been forced to believe that injustice done to them could be undone only through force. The present escalation cannot be reversed so long as the Palestinians remain deprived of their national rights. Israel is worried by the fact that its international lines of communications have become vulnerable. Israel cannot have peace unless and until the rights of Palestinians are restored to them. The establishment of a secular democratic Palestine is the only rational solution. "Peace in the area", says Professor Machower, (191) "can only come through the de-Zionisation of Israel and the termination of the Zionist regime, and this means the renunciation by the Israelis of the absolute priority of preserving a Jewish State."

Another major development resulting from the war has been the Great Powers' involvement with greater intensity in the Arab-Israeli conflict. The USA believes Israel to be a bastion of Western interests and has lent it full support against the Arab world. The Soviet Union which had originally supported the creation of Israel and still stands by its commitment to the territorial integrity of Israel started cultivating Arab friendship to counter the all-out US support to Israel. In 1962 the USA embarked on its policy of 'open door' towards Israel and started open supply of arms to keep the military balance in favour of Israel. In 1966, 200 Patton Tanks were given to Israel and it also received Skyhawk light bombers. The supply of Skyhawks gave Israel "a new striking force". (192) The supply of Skyhawk light bombers got the USA directly involved in the arms race in the Middle East. The

USA has also given Israel complete political support. In 1967 war, the role the USA played was always to the advantage of Israel. There were incidents during June War which confirmed the fact of Israeli-American collusion. The USA was asking Nasser to exercise restraint and through the President's Personal Representative Nasser was requested not to fire the first shot. The USA fully knew that Israel with its strategy of surprise attack could emerge victorious helping the USA to get rid of Nasser - a potential threat to American interests in the area. "The combination of Israel muscle and United States sweet talk had enunciated satisfactory results". (193) President Johnson "knew he could afford to smile suggestively and leave the fighting to General Dayan." (194)

The USA was neutral so long Israel had an upper hand in the military balance and strategy. One American journal has spelled out the US policy in a very forthright manner (195): "Neutral to a point, US Hinges its policy on Hopes that Israel will win - and Quickly: Washington fears it will be Forced to intervene Alone if Arabs Get Upper Hand". The USA was ready to help Israel militarily if it was in danger. One newspaper wrote (196): "The President...ordered alerts to the 82nd Airborne Division and to the 101st Airborne...Divisional officers were summoned to secret briefings at Ft. Bragg, N. C. and assigned their missions and targets in the Arab world which included protection for American oil installations."

The Soviet Union's interest in the Middle East is not recent. She was instrumental in the creation of Israel but a major breakthrough in her relations with the Arab States occurred in 1955 when Egypt struck an arm for cotton deal with Czechoslovakia. The Soviet Union became a main supplier of economic and military aid to the UAR. The Soviet military aid to the Arab world notwithstanding her role in 1967 crisis remains highly ambiguous. It was Soviet Union's intelligence network which gathered the information about probable Israeli attack on Syria and passed it on to Nasser. On May 23, 1967 Moscow cautioned Nasser not to strike first and refrain from taking the initiative which was complied with. The Russian naval fleet equipped with modern radars was present in the Mediterranean and in all probability was capable of detecting even the minutest air activity. That the Soviet Union chose to be silent and did not inform the UAR of the impending danger remains a riddle shrouded in great mystery. After the war was over the Soviet Union tried to help the Arab tottering economy and badly shattered military power.

The Arab Israeli conflict is acquiring global dimension because of greater involvement of the USA and the USSR. Issac Deutscher sees the Palestine problem as an element of the Soviet American competition. He has said (197): "We have to relate this war to the great power struggle and ideological conflict in the world which form its context." This academic verbosity of enlarging the scope of Arab Israeli conflict by putting it in global setting cannot belittle the reality that the essence of the conflict is the rights of the Arabs of Palestine. Unless they are restored their homes and other rights the conflict would remain as a cancer eating up the body politic of the Middle East.

Chapter VI

JERUSALEM

Jerusalem is one of the few holiest cities in the world which has the highest form of spiritual devotion. The faithlessness of the outside world had not touched it; the materialism of urbanity had not contaminated it. Jerusalem is the heart, the soul, the confidant of the three religions of the world: Islam, Christianity and Judaism.

The Christians look for the very essence of their religion in Jerusalem. It encompasses the Roman Catholic, the Greek and the Russian Orthodox, the Armenian, the Coptic and a score of Protestant Churches. It is in Jerusalem that a true Christian finds himself in direct communication with God and identifies himself with the incidents of historical importance.

The holiness and significance of Jerusalem is clearly spelled out in the Holy Quran. Chapter XVII, Verse I of the Quran reads: "Glory be to Him Who carried His servant by night from the sacred Mosque to the Remote Mosque (al Masjid al Aqsa), the precincts of which we have blessed, that we might show Him some of our signs."

In A.D. 638, the second Caliph Umar Ibn al-Khattab accepted in person the capitulation of Jerusalem. Since then Jerusalem has always been a part of Arab culture, history and sovereignty. The Roman name was dropped and it became al-Bait al-Muqaddas. The Muslim rulers of Palestine did not follow the policy of discrimination against other religions and its holy places. Islamic law propounded by Harun al-Hashid accorded special tolerance to "the People of the Book", the Jews and the Christians.

The Christian and Muslim holy places are abundantly described by pilgrims and historians. There is no evidence in the standard works
by early Muslim historians or jurists of the existence of any Jewish place of worship in the city. One Persian traveller who visited Jerusalem some fifty years before the Crusades, however, did mention of a Jewish holy place. Nasir-i-Khusrau mentioned Jews who came to visit the Synagogue. He describes Christian churches but does not say anything more about the Synagogue than merely mentioning it. Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, a Spanish traveller wrote an account of his journey to Jerusalem which he made in 1167. He did not mention about any holy place of Jews but wrote that there were about two hundred Jews living in Jerusalem. (1)

Some ten years later, another Jewish traveller, Rabbi Petachia of Regensburg, "found only one Jew in Jerusalem, a dyer." (2)

The Jewish immigration started after 1187 when the crusades was on and European Jews were taking shelter with Saladin in his Islamic kingdom. The well-known Jewish historian Graetz observed that the Jews found in Saladin's Empire "a safe asylum from persecution." (3)

This practice of granting asylum to persecuted Jews continued even during the Turkish rule. The Arab population of Jerusalem had always shown the Jews consideration and hospitality, and they were treated by the Arabs with courtesy and tolerance. The emergence of Zionism was mainly responsible for the change of attitude among the Arabs which took place after 1914. The Jews under Zionist philosophy assumed extremist and hostile postures and claimed many places as
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holy and sacred. One of the most important claims they put forward was about the Wailing Wall which, according to the Jews, was a part of the Old Temple wall. Dr. Chaim Weizmann wrote a letter to Balfour on May 30, 1918 in which he demanded (4) "the handing over of the Wailing Wall to the Jews". The Zionists wanted to possess the Wailing Wall and under the British Mandate they were encouraged in their demand. In April 1920, the first major clash between the Arabs and the Jews occurred in Jerusalem. The Arabs were alarmed at the Zionist incursions on the wailing place. The Zionists gave an extremely dangerous and explosive twist to the question of the Wailing Wall by removing it from the domain of religion to politics. The most interesting and revealing aspect of the Zionist attempt at giving the issue of Wailing Wall a political colour was an entry on the Wall in "the universal Jewish Encyclopedia" published in 1939, while "The Jewish Encyclopedia" published in 1901 had not included any article on the Wailing Wall. The Zionist propaganda intensified and their pressure on Great Britain increased. The clash between the Zionists and the Arabs became a feature of Jerusalem's life and feelings ran high on both sides. In September 1929, Great Britain appointed an Ad Hoc Commission with an appeal to the Council of the League of Nations to determine the rights and claims of Muslims and Jews in connection with the Wailing Wall. The Commission's conclusions were (5):

"A. To the Muslims belong the sole ownership of, and the sole proprietary right to the western wall, seeing that it forms an integral part of the Haram esh-Sherif area, which is a Waqf property.

4. Letter has been quoted by A. L. Tibawi, ibid., p. 18.
To the Moslems there also belongs the ownership of the pavement in front of the wall and of the adjacent so called Moghrabi (Moroccan) Quarter opposite the wall.

B. "The Jews shall have free access to the western wall for the purpose of devotions at all times".

The Zionists were not ready to accept the verdict because it was not to their liking. They kept up their political struggle for the Jewish State which would include Jerusalem. The scheme of partition granted the Zionists their long cherished Jewish State but Jerusalem and its environs were declared as international zone.

Part III of the United Nations Partition Resolution said (6):

A. "The city of Jerusalem shall be established as a corpus separatum under a special international regime and shall be administered by the United Nations. The Trusteeship Council shall be designated to discharge the responsibilities of the Administering Authority on behalf of the United Nations".

B. The city of Jerusalem shall include the present municipality of Jerusalem plus the surrounding villages and towns, the most eastern of which shall be Abu Dis, the most southern, Bethlehem, the most western, Ein Karim (including also the limit up to area of Motsa), and the most northern Shu'fat, as indicated on the attached sketch map." (7)

The Resolution also requested the Trusteeship Council (8) "to complete the preparation of the statute of Jerusalem."

It is difficult to understand how an international administrative machinery could be imposed upon a city with a clearly defined sovereign. The United Nations had bypassed the state territorial

7. For further details see Chapter I, pp. 57-61.
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competence and issued directives for internationalization without concluding a formal treaty with the concerned competent authorities. The international regime envisaged under the Partition Plan of November 29, 1947 did not come into existence. Fighting broke out between the Jews and the Palestine Arabs. The military balance was in favour of the Zionists and their terrorist groups which were fully armed. When the British mandatory rule came to an end on May 15, 1948 the Jewish attack started on three sides of the old city of Jerusalem. The Palestinian Arabs along with nominal forces from Trans-Jordan and Iraq defended Jerusalem till a truce came into effect on November 30, 1948 followed by an armistice agreement on April 3, 1949. The armistice agreement sanctioned a de facto partition of Jerusalem whereby Israel achieved more territorial gains than the United Nations had granted it two years before. The areas gained by the Jewish forces before and after May 15, 1948 included Western Galilee, the New City of Jerusalem, the area west of Jerusalem to the Mediterranean, the Arab cities of Jaffa, Acre, Ramleh, etc.

The Security Council assigned priority to the question of hostilities in Jerusalem and discussed it. On May 28, 1948 the President of the Security Council, A. Parodi of France read out a telegram from the Truce Commission in which "the bombardment of the suburb of the city" (9) was mentioned. The chairman concluded from the telegram that the situation in the Holy City was alarming and said (10):

"I wonder if we should not now concentrate all our efforts on the situation in Jerusalem" because "if we could bring about a cessation of hostilities in Jerusalem itself, we should have made the authority of the United Nations prevail in one place in Palestine".

9. UN Doc. 8/797/Col. 1, May 28, 1948.

Jessup of the USA also expressed his country's deep concern for what was happening in Jerusalem. He said (11): "The city of Jerusalem is of special concern to mankind... The Security Council should order an unconditional ceasefire in Jerusalem... so that the destruction of Jerusalem will come to an end."

Count Bernadotte in his Report dated September 16, 1948 had suggested that the city of Jerusalem be accorded "special and separate treatment because of its religious and international significance and the complexity of the interests involved". (12) The UN was concerned with the flare up in the Holy City and ordered a ceasefire.

Israel flagrantly and consistently violated the ceasefire directives of the United Nations and its attitude was so stubborn that negotiations at Lausanne could not make much headway regarding Jerusalem. The New City of Jerusalem was under occupation of Israel which was proceeding with its policy of annexation of the area under its control. The Conciliation Commission in its Third Progress Report said that Israel had established (13) "ministerial services" within the area under its occupation which was in contravention of the resolution of December 11, 1948. The General Assembly had adopted a resolution on December 9, 1949 under which an international regime was envisaged. The Resolution had restated the General Assembly's intention
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that Jerusalem should be placed under a permanent international regime, which should envisage appropriate guarantees for the protection of the Holy Places. It confirmed "specifically the following provisions of the General Assembly resolution No. 181 (II):

1. the city of Jerusalem shall be established as a corpus separatum under a special international regime and shall be administered by the United Nations;

2. the Trusteeship Council shall be designated to discharge the responsibilities of the Administering Authority...; and

3. the city of Jerusalem shall include the present municipality of Jerusalem plus the surrounding villages and towns."

Israel after signing the Armistice Agreement with Jordan showed scant respect for its undertakings assumed under the agreement. The Demilitarized Zone of Mount Scopus became the target of Israeli attacks. Jordan was deeply concerned about Israeli encroachments on Mount Scopus. The zone was of immense significance for the security of Jordan's sector of Jerusalem because it dominated the roads leading to Jerusalem. If Israel could capture the zone (15) it "would," according to General E.L.M. Burns, "dominate and could eventually compel the surrender of Jerusalem and probably cause the collapse of Jordanian control of the area west of the Jordan River."

The Israeli attitude has been from the very beginning one of defiance, not to accept the scheme of the internationalization of Jerusalem. The United Nations directives were of no significance as far as Israel was concerned. In 1949 the Trusteeship Council called upon Israel to submit to the UN authority. Its response to this was one

of utmost defiance manifested in its transfer of its capital from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. David Ben Gurion, the Prime Minister of Israel had a sense of pride in defying the United Nations resolution which declared Jerusalem "Corpus Separatum" and which according to him was "wicked counsel" and said that (16): "our rebuttle of this wicked counsel was unequivocal and resolute. The Government and Knesset at once moved their seat to Jerusalem and made Israel's Crown and Capital irrevocably and for all men to see."

Jordan's representative wrote a letter dated September 4, 1957 to the President of the Security Council in which Israel was charged of committing violations (17) of "the General Armistice Agreement in the area of Jabal el Mukabbir," in the Jerusalem Sector. The Security Council made many appeals to Israel to act as a law abiding nation but no amount of efforts proved successful. Israeli leaders were always dreaming and planning to occupy the City of Jerusalem. The Zionist General Council declared (18): "Do not allow yourself any rest; do not give the communities any cause - till Zionism is rebuilt, the unity of the Jewish people assured, and till Jerusalem has become, indeed, the symbol of the Jewish oneness and the glory of the earth." Israel was looking for an opportunity to occupy Jerusalem and make it a part of 'Iretz Israel.' The opportunity came in June 1967 when Israel launched aggression against Jordan, the UAR and Syria.

17. SCOA, 787th Meeting, September 6, 1957, p. 9.
Jerusalem was the main target of Israeli armed forces. The Israelis were itching for the Holy City.

The Israeli Armed Forces had the supreme objective of liberating Jerusalem and conquering it. Their aim was to make divided Jerusalem an all-Israeli city and drive Jordan out from the West Bank. The colonization of Jerusalem and its annexation was the most significant part of Israeli policy of expansion. Levi Eshkol in an interview published in the German magazine Der Spiegel confessed that the people of Israel would not tolerate a Government which did not think of colonizing Jerusalem. He said (19): "Israel without Jerusalem is Israel without head... Jerusalem is the heart of the Jewish people in its present rebirth."

Israel was not prepared to withdraw from Jerusalem come what may. Moshe Dayan was far from being ambiguous when he said (20): "The Israeli Defence Forces liberated Jerusalem. We have reunited the torn city, the capital of Israel. We have returned to this most sacred shrine, never to part from it again". Aba Eban was reiterating the same stand when he told the Fifth Special Session of the General Assembly (21): "In our nation's long history there have been few hours more intensely moving than the hour of our reunion with the Western Wall. A people had come back to the cradle of its birth. It has renewed its link with the mystery of its origin and its continuity".

Israeli Government undertook immediately after the capture of Jerusalem, drastic measures to absorb the old city within Israeli
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administrative fold. A Master Plan was undertaken and a $50 million fund was earmarked for the reconstruction of historical and religious sites (22). On June 21, 1967, the Knesset adopted a series of enabling laws extending Israeli sovereignty in the Holy City. On June 27, 1967, the Knesset passed an act which announced the annexation of Arab Jerusalem to Israel. The measures undertaken by Israel to annex Jerusalem were in direct contravention of the General Assembly resolution of November 29, 1947. Aba Eban denied Israeli annexation of Jerusalem at a Press Conference in New York and suggested that the laws passed were purely administrative in character (23).

The General Assembly was seized of the situation in the Middle East and it recorded its disapproval for Israeli measures aimed at annexing the Holy City. The General Assembly resolution asking Israel to rescind its measures in regard to the status of Jerusalem was sponsored by Pakistan. The resolution was adopted on July 4, 1967 and it said (24):

"The General Assembly,

Deeply concerned at the situation prevailing in Jerusalem as a result of the measures taken by Israel to change the status of the City,

1. Considers that these measures are invalid;

2. Calls upon Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem."

The USA abstained from voting on the resolution but at the same time the US Government made it clear that Israeli policy in Jerusalem was

a direct violation of international law. The USA regarded the Eastern portion of Jerusalem (25) as "occupied territory and therefore subject to the provisions of international law governing the rights and obligations of an occupying power."

The General Assembly resolution of July 4, 1967 was not complied with by Israel and its reaction to the resolution was available the same day when Yigal Allon, Israeli Minister of Labour, gave a statement to the Press. He said: (26) "The world must reconcile itself to the fact that the city has at last returned to the nation that founded it and that turned it into a holy city."

Israel's policy of annexation continued and the General Assembly adopted another resolution July 14 recalling its earlier resolution of July 4, 1967. The resolution took (27): "note with the deepest regret and concern of the non-compliance by Israel" with its earlier resolution. It deplored (28): "the failure of Israel to implement General Assembly resolution" and reiterated "its call to Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any action which would alter the status of Jerusalem."

On May 3, 1968 Rouhi El Khatib, Mayor of Jerusalem, appeared before the Security Council and informed it about Israeli atrocities against the Arabs therein. He said (29): "The Israeli authorities started by spreading horror in all city corners, outside the walls and
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inside, in the mosques as well as in the churches, occupying large buildings and hotels, raiding houses, shops and garages, looting what comes under their hands, treating cruelly anyone who shows the slightest sign of dissatisfaction, gathering the inhabitants from their homes under heavy and disdainful measures, keeping them standing for hours..."

Speaking about the administrative measures aimed at annexing Jerusalem undertaken by Israel, he said (30): "Following the annexation of the Arab sector of Jerusalem by Israel, the Municipality and various Ministerial Israeli offices started to apply Israeli laws and regulations and instruct the Arabs of Jerusalem to observe and abide by these laws and regulations. Israeli currency, customs, excise and income taxes, traffic, telephone rates, municipal taxes and by laws were imposed". Hebrew School curricula were applied for Arab schools and students."

The Israelis seized Arab Land under the stress of military occupation. The area of the land seized (31) "is 3345 dunoms or 848 acres". They seized the land in order to build up a Jewish housing area. Israel embarked upon a vigorous policy of liquidating the Arabs living in Jerusalem in order to expropriate their properties. The houses belonging to the Arabs were bulldozed and many Arab villages were wiped out. The International Herald Tribune reported (32): "Israel announced last Thursday that 338 acres of the former Jordanian sector of Jerusalem were "expropriated" by the Israeli Government". The Arabs
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living in Jerusalem were discriminated against and prevented from participating even in local affairs affecting their destiny. Michael Adams, who visited Jerusalem and saw things with his own eyes wrote that the Arabs living in Jerusalem were (33) "not represented in the Municipal Council which has assumed control of the city's affairs, nor in the parliament of the country which now seeks to claim his allegiance".

Israel was bent upon ignoring world public opinion and the United Nations directives. It tried to hold a military parade in Jerusalem which was a flagrant violation of the Partition resolution. Jordan put up a complaint with the Security Council, which adopted a resolution on April 27, 1968. The resolution said (34): "The holding of a military parade in Jerusalem will aggravate tensions in the area and will have adverse effect on a peaceful settlement of the problems in the area." It called "upon Israel to refrain from holding the military parade in Jerusalem which was contemplated for 2 May 1968." Israel did not pay any heed to the call of the Security Council and showed deplorable disrespect to the resolution of April 27, 1968 by holding the military parade on May 2, 1968. The Security Council deplored (35) "the holding of Israel of the Military Parade in Jerusalem on May 2, 1968 in disregard of the unanimous decision adopted by the Council on 27 April".

34. SCOR, resolution 250, 1417 Mtg., April 27, 1968.
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On May 21, 1968 the Security Council adopted another resolution which reaffirmed all previous resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Resolution reaffirmed (36) that "acquisitions of territory by military conquest is inadmissible", and affirmed that it

"1. Deplores the failure of Israel to comply with the General Assembly resolutions mentioned above.

"2. Considers that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, including expropriation of land and properties thereon, which tend to change the legal status of Jerusalem are invalid".

The resolution further stipulated that the Security Council

"3. Urgently calls upon Israel to rescind all such measures already taken and to desist forthwith from taking any further action which tends to change the status of Jerusalem".

The Israeli response to the Security Council resolution No. 252 was that one of defiance. The Israeli representative said (37): "The resolution (just adopted) is neither practical nor reasonable. It ignores reality and disregards Israel's basic rights. It seeks to violate the natural unity of Jerusalem and to overlook the interests of Jerusalem's inhabitants and their welfare."

Israel continued disregarding the United Nations resolutions. Its spoken words about the welfare of the people and reality of the situation were hardly coterminous. Arbitrary arrests, expropriation of Arab property, violation of religious places were incidents which reminded people of Nazi regime of Hitler.

The Representative of Jordan in a letter dated June 26, 1969, addressed to the President of the Security Council, said that the
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Government of Israel, in complete disregard of the UN directives (38) "had enacted Administrative Regulations Law 1968 which was to be put into force on 23 February and later was extended to 23 May 1969. On April 27, 1969, further provisions—and new regulations were enacted... Israel had continued to violate basic human rights in the Holy City".

The Secretary General's personal representative, Ernesto Thalmann, had confirmed this in his report when he said (39) that "the Israeli authorities had stated unequivocally that the process of integration was irreversible and not negotiable."

El-Farra of Jordan quoted from Israeli newspapers and said that (40) "more than 100 buildings had been destroyed within the Old City and 700 building were expropriated. The Arabs owned 595 of those buildings. The expropriated real estate included 437 places of business and 1,048 apartments housing over 5,000 people."

On July 3, 1969 the Security Council adopted another resolution censuring (41) "in the strongest terms all measures taken to change the Status of the City of Jerusalem". The resolution repeated its call upon Israel "to rescind forthwith all measures taken by it which may tend to change the Status of Jerusalem, and in the future to refrain from all actions likely to have such an effect."

The Arabs living in Jerusalem protested against the measures undertaken by Israeli authorities to undermine the Arab character of Jerusalem but all these protests fell on a deaf ear. Israel went ahead
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with its policy of destroying Arab properties including Muslim Holy Places. The most criminal act was committed when Al-Aqsa Mosque was put on fire on August 21, 1969. The news was received with utmost shock in the entire world specially in the Muslim world. The fire caused much damage to Al-Aqsa, one of the holiest places of the Muslims. The criminal act evoked tremendous anguish and outrage among the Muslims. Israel was held responsible for the tragedy and was also charged with instigating the fire because Jerusalem was under its military control. Akhbar al-Kuwait wrote on August 23, 1969 (42): "When the mosque was burnt, we naively expected the whole world to share with us our indignation and sorrow. The magnitude of the sacrilege was a grave crime against civilization and against a holy place." The matter was brought before the Security Council which registered its anguish and was (43) "grieved at the extensive damage caused by arson to the Holy Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem on 21 August 1969 under the Military Occupation of Israel". The resolution adopted on September 15, 1969 reaffirmed all previous resolutions and also the "principle that acquisition of territory by military conquest is inadmissible." The resolution "calls upon Israel scrupulously to observe the provisions of the Geneva Conventions and international law governing military occupation and to refrain from causing any hindrance to the discharge of the established functions of the Supreme Muslim Council of Jerusalem, including any cooperation that Council may desire from countries with predominantly Muslim population and from Muslim communities in relation to its plans for the maintenance and repair of the Islamic Holy Places in Jerusalem."
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Israel was determined to defy the United Nations and do what was befitting its expansionist policy. From an avowed position of non-annexation, it has gradually proceeded to complete absorption of the Holy City by depriving it of its Arab character. Israel is in occupation of entire Jerusalem and its leaders seem determined to agree to withdraw from the City. Dayan and other Zionists are harping on religious emotions and sentiments and declaring that they had (44) "returned to this most sacred shrine, never to part from it again." Moshe Dayan on June 11, 1967 declared (45): "I think that Jerusalem still should and can be the capital of Israel and entirely under our control and within our country."

The occupation of Jerusalem by Israel imposes a set of duties and obligations on it which it has failed to carry out. Its rule in Jerusalem is extremely partisan, discriminatory and in violation of Geneva Conventions on Human Rights. The occupation of Jerusalem by Israel was not an act of defence, it was rather an act of fulfilment with Israel which was shown and established by many Israeli administrative fiats adopted immediately after the conquest. Israel is acting, and being allowed to act, as an aggressively defiant nation in our contemporary civilized world. Its unbridled behaviour disregarding all the directives of the United Nations and world public opinion is a reflection on our society and constitutes the biggest threat to international order and world peace.

44. Facts on File, June 8, 1967.
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CONCLUSION

The United Nations was envisaged as an international instrument to lessen the area of conflict and enlarge the sphere of peace and understanding. The horrors of two world wars had shaken the entire humanity and forced on it the indispensable need for a shock absorber. The United Nations was the result and it had the supreme task of saving the world from the third major catastrophe. It was also supposed to be the guardian of international justice and fundamental human rights. Whenever the clouds of war started gathering over the world horizon, the only glimmer of optimism came from the hope that the United Nations would somehow be able to step in and avert the disaster. The New York Times was commenting upon the United Nations' peace keeping role when it wrote (1): "The best hope, in fact, lies in a continuing role by the United Nations." But this hope was belied in regard to Palestine Question.

The Palestine problem involved not only the question of preventing a local conflict from becoming a major conflagration threatening the peace of the area. It also involved the issue of fundamental human rights of the Palestinians which were being usurped by an alien community. The British Mandatory Government in Palestine was entrusted by the League of Nations to look after the interest of local people and administrative machinery of Palestine. Great Britain collaborated with Zionism in its crimes against Palestinians. When the Frankenstein created by Great Britain struck at the roots of British imperialism in the Middle East, Britain had no option but to bring the issue to world forum.

On April 2, 1947 the United Kingdom representative requested the Secretary General that the Palestine Question should be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly - a request which was complied with. At the meeting of the General Assembly held on May 15, 1947 the UK representative said (2): "We have tried for years to solve the problem of Palestine. Having failed so far, we now bring it to the United Nations in the hope that it can succeed where we have not."

Great Britain had calculated its move very carefully. She was aware that the then composition of the United Nations would be favourable for any suggestion agreed among Big Powers. Great Britain was acting in collaboration with Zionist colonialism and had already opened the gates of Palestine to the floods of Jewish immigrants. When she found that the Zionists were powerful enough to wrest the country from its Arab inhabitants, the issue was brought into the arena of world diplomacy to lend finality and legality to the criminal design against the Arab world. The agenda before the General Assembly was (3) "the termination of the Mandate over Palestine and the declaration of its independence." The United Nations, however, adopted the Partition Resolution of November 29, 1947 which created a "Jewish State" in the heart of the Middle East. The manner in which Great Britain had referred the issue to the United Nations and the decision taken by it left much to be desired from the point of view of the Arab States and the Arabs of Palestine.

The United Nations had acted in contravention of the principle

of self-determination enshrined in the Charter of world organization. The Arabs of Palestine were asked to share their exclusive territorial sovereignty with aliens and intruders who had encroached upon their rights and territory. The United Nations had failed to protect the political, economic and religious interests of the Arabs of Palestine. The Partition resolution was a triumph for political Zionism and it had provided them a foothold for the full realization of "Eretz Israel" as Ben Gurion and Menachem Begin had envisioned it all along, openly and unashamedly.

The United Nations had and has no doubt, the competence to discuss the Palestine question or any other issue potentially threatening world peace. This does not, however, imply that the United Nations can arbitrarily as it did regarding the Palestine Question. The United Nations is an organization which has to work under various limitations imposed and clearly laid down by the Charter. The gravest violation committed by the United Nations in adopting the Partition resolution was regarding the principle of self-determination enshrined in Article 1, Paragraph 2 of the Charter. The United Nations had assumed the role of a territorial sovereign and adopted the resolution to partition Palestine. According to Professor Brownlie, the partition resolution was ultra vires because it was beyond the jurisdiction and competence of the United Nations. He observes: (4)

"It is doubtful if the United Nations, has a capacity to convey title, inter alia because the Organization cannot assume the role of territorial sovereign... Thus the resolution of 1947 containing a Partition Plan for Palestine was probably ultra vires and, if it was not, was not binding on member states in any case."

The General Assembly under Articles 10 and 14 of the Charter is empowered to consider any question relating to peace and make recommendations. In case of Palestine, the General Assembly overstepped its jurisdiction and adopted a decision which implied coercion. The Partition resolution was not of a recommendatory character; it was a decision supported by a clause that any attempt to alter it by force would be considered as a threat to the peace and an act of aggression, within the meaning of Article 39 of the United Nations Charter. H. Kelsen, a renowned authority on international law and the United Nations observed (5): "Article 14 authorizes the General Assembly only to make recommendations. But the resolution (Partition Resolution) goes beyond simple recommendations."

The decision of the General Assembly was aimed at transforming the status quo and redistributing political power in Palestine without consulting the people living in the area and almost bypassing their rights and wishes. The General Assembly again violated the United Nations Charter and its principles when it provided for the creation of a five member committee to administer Palestine during transitional period. The Assembly's decision that the United Nations shall administer a territory for the purpose of vivisecting it into two halves was not within the competence of the General Assembly. The Syrian Representative attacked the committee and its composition. According to him the constitution of the committee entrusted with the task of administering Palestine was illegal, its members having been appointed by the President of the Assembly and not by the Assembly itself which "was

a breach of Article 84 of the Rules of Procedure." (6)

The General Assembly requested the Security Council to adopt enforcement measures to implement the Partition resolution.

The Charter of the UN has clearly laid down that the responsibility of the Security Council was to maintain peace. The Security Council, whether requested by the Assembly or on its own, was not empowered to implement a decision or recommendation. As Hans Kelsen said (7): "The Charter does not empower the Security Council to enforce a political settlement, whether it was in pursuance of a recommendation made by the Assembly or of one made by the Council itself... The Council's action should not have as an aim the imposition of partition but the maintenance of peace."

The United Nations had flagrantly violated the rights of the majority by granting international status to the Jews who had come and forcibly settled down in Palestine. The Partition resolution of November 29, 1947 had assigned the Jewish state definite areas but the chronology of events in Palestine during the six months preceding the end of the mandate enabled Jewish forces and terrorist groups to grab most of the Arab cities of Palestine before May 15, 1948. The Arabs of Palestine were forcibly expelled from their homes and the United Nations could not do anything to resettle them in their homes. The Palestinian refugees constitute a heavy lump of flesh on the conscience of the United Nations. In his report of September 16, 1948 the UN Mediator suggested (8) certain revisions in the boundaries as envisaged
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by the resolution of November 29, 1947. It also recommended (9) the repatriation of the Palestine refugees. The United Nations failed to act according to the recommendations made by the UN Mediator. Israel was allowed by the United Nations to act as its spoilt child. The United Nations has always spared the rod and allowed Israel to enjoy the fruits of aggression. Israel's expansion and advance inside the Arab Land went unchecked and every time it has confronted the United Nations with a fait accompli and won recognition. Israel was a creation of the General Assembly resolution which had also imposed upon it duties and obligations towards its Arab inhabitants. The UN recognition of Israel was conditional to its capacity and willingness to fulfil these obligations. As Hedley Cooke pointed out (10): "Israel's sovereignty, as contrasted with France's and Switzerland's, is permanently limited by her duties as embodied in the Charter of Existence towards the Arab residents of the area which she controls...."

Israel was bound by the UN resolution to abide by its provisions and respect the territorial integrity of neighbouring states. Israel flouted all its obligations and the United Nations failed to make it accept civilized norms but the world body was not "prepared", as suggested by Davis, former Commissioner General of UNRWA, (11) "to impose corrective measures on Israel against her will."

The United Nations owes a tremendous responsibility towards the Palestine Arabs who were expelled from their home and deprived of their
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political power. As a guardian of international order and fundamental human rights, the United Nations should make efforts to rectify the wrongs done to the Arabs of Palestine by the Big Powers in collaboration with Israel and the United Nations.

The United States of America and the USSR are among the most significant original sinners against the Arabs of Palestine. Both powers voted in favour of the Partition resolution establishing the Jewish State.

The United States of America took a more than normal interest in advocating the Jewish case in the United Nations and outside. Many states which had voted against the partition proposal in UNSCOP were pressurized to vote in favour of the plenary session of the General Assembly. Truman has admitted it in his memoirs. He badly needed the Zionist support in his Presidential election; he, therefore, (12) "instructed the State Department to support the Partition Plan". The US State Department employed more intimidation than persuasion and in that manner states like Liberia, Haiti, Luxemburg, Belgium, Paraguay, etc. were won over to the side of the Zionists.

The United States was firmly committed to support Israel which was regarded as a bastion of western democracy in the feudal society of the Middle East. According to Professor Howard (13): "Israel, it is said, is the natural ally of the United States a kind of western outpost on the Eastern Mediterranean. The idea antedates the establishment of the State of Israel, going back at least as far as the Balfour Declaration in November 1917. When among other things, a Jewish

'homeland' was to serve British Imperial interests in the neighbourhood of the Suez Canal. In later years it was to become a "little bastion" of "embattled democracy" in the 'hostile' and 'feudal' Arab world, said to be anti-democratic, and western and anti-American."

The United States of America emerged, following the withdrawal of Britain from the Middle East, as a major power in the area. Its chief aim was to contain communism which brought her in direct conflict with Arab nationalism. The Truman Doctrine of "containment of Communism" brought military alliances like Baghdad Pact into existence. The twin objectives of the US policy in the Middle East were to contain communism and support and safeguard Israel. Enormous financial and military aid was pumped in a small State like Israel (14). "From 1948 to 1962 apart from the high level direct investments, Government grants and loans totalling 880 million dollars and private gifts (tax free) and bond purchases totalling approximately 1.5 billion dollars have flowed into that small country. Given a population of some two million people, this represents something like, 1,200 dollars for every Israel man, woman and child. According to a U.S. Aid Financial report, covering the period 1949 to 1963, "the total value of all US dollar programme to Israel was $1,002,600,000". (15) To this should be added the 1964 and 1965 grants of "$116,200,000", (16) making a total of $1,118,800 for 1949 to 1965. (17)

The US interest in the Middle East is strengthened by its capital investment in the oil industry. In 1965 the US investment in oil amounted to $1,590,000,000. Between 1954 and 1956 relations between the US and resurgent Arab nationalism were far from happy. The US had the primary objective of saving the Arab world from the 'clutches' of expanding and penetrating communism which had allied itself with Arab nationalism and its main aspirations. The USA was, however, regarded by the Arabs as the chief ally of Zionism which constituted the most potential threat to Arab territorial sovereignty.

The United States of America was committed to Israel's security and had always given it maximum military support enabling it to materialize its expansionist designs. The USA had shown intolerable indifference to the rights and aspirations of the Arab people. Israel has always exploited the US support and in order to maximize it the myth of being a bastion of western democracy and modernization has been created. The USA commands enormous influence in Israel and its determined efforts at persuading Israel to act as a civilized country are bound to succeed. But the US leaders have allowed Israel to take American support for granted.

The United States adopted a more or less disinterested attitude and was never disturbed about the major Israeli raids against the Arab States. In 1966 when Israel attacked Sammu', a Jordanian village, the US Ambassador to the UN Arthur J. Goldberg on November 16, 1966 deplored Israeli "retaliation raid" (18) against Jordan but Washington never took strong measures to discourage Israel in its avowed policy of "reprisal" and "retaliation." The US was, in effect, adopting the

Machiavellian tactics of duplicity. She was showing verbal sympathy towards the Arabs preventing them from total surrender to the Soviet Union. On the other hand, she was giving moral, military and political support to Israel in its tirade and aggressive designs against the Arab States.

The US game of duplicity was exposed during the June War of 1967 when massive collusion between Israel and the USA became known to the world. The United States of America had full knowledge of Israeli military strength and its aggressive intentions.

The Johnson Administration did not make it clear as to what it was prepared to do in case of aggression by one side against the other. Israel escalated political confrontation into a massive military confrontation and the Middle East stood on a volcano. The United States was the only power capable of sounding warning and restraining Israel from launching an aggression on the Arab States. But the policymakers in the US chose otherwise and no measure was adopted to deter aggressor unless he be Arab for whom there was the Sixth Fleet in the area. Israel was encouraged, allowed, and given full military support to carry out its plan against the Arab States. There was an active military collusion between Israel and the US. Louis Heren, Washington correspondent of the London Times wrote (19):

"Most diplomats stationed in Washington are persuaded that the United States was in collusion with Israel... This was obvious in the United Nations. Security Council, or, rather, behind the scenes, when Washington began to press Jerusalem to accept the cease-fire resolutions only when the victory of Israeli arms was assured. Really heavy American pressure to stop the fighting was not applied before Friday, when Israel began to move into Syria... clearly some assurances were given to the Israelis before the hostilities began.

"The more faint-hearted in Jerusalem could rest assured that an Israel defeat would never be allowed. General Moshe Dayan must have been fairly sure of about 96 hours in which to achieve his objectives before the Security Council could call a halt."

The United States and Britain were ready to provide air protection to Israel against any surprise Egyptian attack. Yugoslav observers in Libya noted unusual air activity at the Wheelus base and there was similar unusual air activity at British air bases in Cyprus.

The USA has helped Israel and done the greatest harm to the Arab world. The Johnson Administration, under the formidable Jewish triumvirate who helped to formulate and execute Americans Middle East policy - Arthur Goldberg, Walt Rostow and Eugene Rostow also known as American gentlemen of Jewish persuasion, did not ask Israel to withdraw from Arab territories. The USA has remained callously indifferent to the fate of Arab refugees from Palestine. It did not specifically ask for the return of the refugees to the territories occupied by Israel. The USA holds the key to the solution of the Middle East conflict. Moshe Dayan in an interview said (20): "The United States held the key to the question of whether Israel could continue to insist that there would be no withdrawal from occupied Arab land as long as there was no peace settlement."

The United States of America has chosen to put all its eggs in the Israeli basket and seeks comfort in the Jewish State as the bastion of western democracy and vanguard of modernization. She has, however, not shown equal or similar interest and understanding for the forces engaged in the process of radicalization of political and

social set-up of the Arab world with the result that the USA is totally alienated with the emerging political pattern in the Arab States. She is, therefore, rightly regarded by the Arabs as an ally of politically reactionary forces like Zionism which stands for the revival of exclusive religious and racial identity of the Jews.

The interest of the Soviet Union in the Middle East is not of recent origin. It can be traced to pre-Bolshévik past when Russia was trying hard to gain access to the warm waters of the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. In the post-war II era the interest of the Soviet Union increased and she became a party responsible for the creation of Israel and was the first to grant de-jure recognition to Israel in May 1948 when the United States had accorded to Israel only de facto recognition. "The Soviet Union", wrote W. Z. Laqueur (21), "was described as the only true friend of Jewish National Independence, the United States, on the other hand, merely pretend to support the State of Israel."

The period of Soviet Israeli friendship came to an end when the Cold War was extended to the Middle East. The Soviet Union was disillusioned because of Israel's economic and political commitments. The Soviet Union considered Israel no more as a "democratic and independent state; and those who came to power in Israel were bourgeois Jewish nationalists who enjoyed Anglo-American support and persecuted local communists." (22)


The Soviet Union was fighting a battle of survival as an influential power in the Middle East and its purpose was better served by coming into agreement with Arab nationalism. This support to Arab nationalism was motivated by the desire to counteract the Americans backed military alliance called the Baghdad Pact. The Soviet support to the Arab progressive forces came in a big way in the year 1955 when the Soviet Union announced to help Egypt in its development programme and also agreed to provide military aid. In the Arab-Israeli conflict the Soviet Union showed its "sympathies with the Eastern nations fighting for liberation from colonialism." During the Suez crisis the Soviet Union supported Egypt and threatened to take stern measures to repulse the tripartite attack.

The Soviet Union had acquired higher stakes in the Middle East crisis and given military and financial aid to the Arab countries especially the UAR. Despite its pro-Arab postures the Soviet Union has acted with extreme caution avoiding a direct confrontation with the USA. It seems that the Soviet Union and the USA have developed some understanding and identity of interest during the 1967 June crisis. The area of conflict is being slowly and gradually replaced by ever enlarging area of understanding between the USA and the USSR. The USSR like the USA sounded the UAR not to strike first and secured a firm assurance from Nasser on this point.

The Soviet Union has, no doubt, condemned Israel as an aggressor and always insisted on its withdrawal from occupied territories. It had administered a strong warning on Israel to the effect that if
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hostilities did not cease, it would take drastic action, and if necessary, resort to sanctions. Such sanctions was confined only to severing off diplomatic relations with Israel. The Soviet Union has also replenished the military losses of the UAR and Syria, and massive military assistance is being pumped into the Arab States.

But there exists a credibility gap between the Soviet Union's utterances and actions. The Soviet Union's political support to the Arabs is couched in general terms and offers only vague assurances.

The Soviet Union's support to the Arabs does not emanate from philanthropic or altruistic considerations, it forms an important part of the power politics game being played between the USA and the USSR. The Soviet inhibition of avoiding direct confrontation with the USA is the result of its lack of military strategic mobility. The Soviet Union can give military aid but its men cannot go and fight on foreign soil and this factor is not conducive to active armed involvement.

The Soviet Union and the USA are the two Super Powers who hold the key to the solution of the Middle East problem. Both of them seem to have arrived at some tacit understanding which was exhibited during Johnson-Kosygin talks at Glassboro. Both the Super Powers have developed a vested interest in restricting the scope of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Soviet Union faces the most challenging task in the Middle East. It is confronted with a new factor which may ex-
challenge that the four Great Powers - the USA, the USSR, Britain and France - decided early in 1969 to consult together on how they could bring about a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The basis of the four Big Powers talks was the Security Council resolution of November 27, 1967 which was rejected by the Palestinians. The Palestinians found it difficult to accept the resolution because it did not promise liberation of their own homeland - Palestine. The Middle East conflict is essentially a struggle between Zionism and the Arabs of Palestine who had been forcibly thrown out of their homes. The people depended on the United Nations and the Big Powers to get justice but they were proved wrong. The Palestine Arabs living as refugees in the Arab States gradually realized that no power on earth would help them get justice if they themselves were not willing to fight their own battle. In the post-June War period the Resistance Movement gathered enormous momentum. The Palestinians intensified their armed resistance movement and declared it a part of the heroic movement which the people of Vietnam were conducting to liquidate American colonialism.

Israel, according to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), is an Imperialist base created to defend the monopolistic petroleum concessions and to weaken the Arab movement for national liberation. Al Fateh had always tried to set up the nucleus of a political organization, and from 1962 onwards the movement concentrated all its efforts on the setting up of a military organization to fight against Zionist imperialism which is in collaboration with neo-colonialism. The nucleus of al-Fateh, 'Harakat al-Tahrir al-Falastini' gave rise to the nucleus of the military organization, al-Asifa.

Towards the end of 1966 two other groups appeared: Heroes of the Return, and the Palestinian branch of the Arab Nationalist Movement.
These groups, later on, set up the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP). After June 1967 the more extremist group, PFLP caught popular attention and the young, male and female, were attracted to Marxist-Leninist doctrine which became a guide for all those engaged in the struggle of liberation for their homeland; from the clutches of Zionist colonialism. There exist ideological differences between al-Fateh and PFLP but ideological cleavages mean little because their objective is the same, namely, liberation of Palestine and the establishment of a democratic, secular state in Palestine.

The Palestinian Resistance Movement constitutes the most welcome development in the Middle East. It is a national movement and asserts the Palestinian personality. The Movement is a ferment and will become a catalyst for the radicalization of politics and help to escalate the struggle of Arab peoples for the introduction of basic economic, social and political changes in Arab world.

The confrontation in the Middle East is between the forces of modernity and feudalism. The emergence of the Palestinian Resistance Movement would strengthen and consolidate the forces of progress and modernity in the Arab States. It poses danger to colonial powers abroad as well as to feudal and traditional regimes at home. The recent flare up in Jordan shows nothing but deep rooted antagonism existing between modernites represented by Arab Commandos and traditionalists represented by King Hussein. It is a verdict of history that ultimate victory belongs to those who stand for moving ahead and symbolize a progressive and modern outlook. The Palestine Resistance Movement has a popular support and believes in the people's army. They are determined to fight till they get justice denied to them all these years. They do not depend on any country, they now depend on
their own strength and determination. Any probable future solution of the Middle East problem cannot bypass the aspirations of the Palestinians who have become a force to reckon with. The first and foremost prerequisite for any solution is full restoration of national rights and homes to Palestinians. Until it is done they are determined to continue their armed struggle for the liberation of Palestine in order to establish a secular democratic state where Jews, Christians and Muslims could all live together in peace and complete harmony, and it would be a real service to the cause of international peace and prosperity, for which the UN was established, if the world organization could help in making this transition both speedy and peaceful.
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